FOR THE DOUBTER: A TOUR WITH UNCLE SAM!
I put this binder together to prove to the “Doubting Thomases” that something very serious is going on in this country! The pages are full up with special bona fide documents, and different articles to support the fact that a “new world order” is shaping up that will take away your Constitutional government and put you under a military government!
I used to take people on a tour. Then one day I decided to ask Uncle Sam if he would join me in this effort, and he said he would! He was willing to become the tour guide. He will be with us in just a few minutes. My job is to prepare you for the tour. So first, I must prove to you that it is possible for something to exist that you cannot see! That will make you appreciate the tour better!

I do a little lecture through the next 10 pages and then I introduce you to your tour guide, Uncle Sam! He happens to be the real Uncle Sam! Make no mistake about that! He knows his stuff!

He will zip in and out through the pages of the tour. Sometimes he says a lot, and sometimes he says just a little to make you understand the value of what you are looking at! When he is done, I will come back and wind up the tour with the article I wrote called: "To Sink or Swim."

You may want to read that before you start the tour as it wraps the whole thing up, and you get the overall picture in a hurry, but if you are new to this subject, you'd better stay with Uncle Sam's part of the tour first, because he teaches you from scratch and he goes slowly. After that, I will be back!

See ya'!
Dear Fellow American:

On the opposite page is a picture engineered to trick you! The picture contains 12 objects, all of which are hidden right before your eyes, which at first glance, you didn't see, did you? Most likely -- you would not have noticed all 12 of the following objects -- unless their existence had been told to you:

In all fairness, will you not agree that there is a possibility that certain political arrangements have been developed that could have escaped your sight and evaluation? Going on the basis that you are a fair person, (1) willing to adjust your thinking to new information which previously has been denied you, and (2) willing to re-evaluate the circumstances presented herein, this compilation has been prepared for your consideration.
Evil goals that you would not knowingly approve of, and which are altering the integrity and existence of our system of government, are hidden or are being passed off as "normal" laudable objectives. By bringing the whole picture into conformity, the fog is lifted for a clear understanding of the strange happenings in government.

There is no other reason for the arduous task involved in preparation of this compilation other than to warn fellow Americans of their true predicament. This compilation presents bona fide data taken from original sources. It is not simply by accident that so much highly irregular legislation and portentous treaties are being passed!

Americans are being beguiled by talk show hosts who keep the facts from them or twist facts to keep the public uninformed. Many talk show hosts are also used as disinformation agents, or "change agents". These are professional liars and are hired to be apologists for obvious mistakes of leading new world order (globalist) public officials.

Unfortunately, there are too many Americans who do not understand the proper workings of their own government; therefore, they are not able to recognize when the system is being attacked and seriously undermined. For the safety and endurance of our state and nation, we feel that it is incumbent upon those who are fair-minded and responsible persons to give this evidence its rightful consideration.

Please do your part to preserve the American heritage for those who are too young to understand or to guard against the workings of men with conniving minds. It is the duty of real Americans to guard the young against becoming victims of political oppressors.

Respectfully,
SECOND AMENDMENT COMMITTEE

Bernadine Smith, National Director
It has been demonstrated to you that some things can be hidden from you, and yet truly are in your full view once you have been alerted to their presence!
The documents that follow are exact copies of authenticated originals. They have been reproduced so that you can decide on your own whether or not something harmful is being done by the alterations being made to our Constitutional system of government. It is hoped that you will detect the pattern and grasp the relationship of the parts, and thereby see the full picture.
Samuel B. Pettengill, who represented Indiana’s 3rd Congressional District in the 1930’s published a book in 1940 which was entitled:

**SMOKE-SCREEN.**

In **SMOKE-SCREEN** Pettengill warned:

“The progress will be gradual, but the end inevitable. There will be no sudden coup d’etat. The march will be step by step, and by muffled tread. It will move under the smoke-screen of laudable “objectives” to its hidden goal. That goal is National Socialism.”

Well said, Mr. Pettengill! Before the Congress was taken over by quislings - we used to have some fine - really true patriots in office - who tried to wake up the people as to what was going on! Besides Samuel Pettengill, there was William E. Jenner, James Utt, Larry McDonald, John Rarick, Usher Burdick, John Ashbrook, etc. but the communists took more open control of our movies, radios, news-papers, and TV. after World War II. Our schools and churches also fell victim to those evil policies and our people have been propagandized. People are still being denied the facts about the socialist/communist takeover of America. Now, please turn the page.
People don't want to believe because public officials don't report these issues in the usual news media.

The news media was bought up in the '50's, '60's, and '70's.

The news is controlled and filtered.
Why is it that people don’t believe when you tell them what is happening?

Even though adequate proof is at their disposal, the uninformed often choose not to believe nor to respect the well-meaning informant who had only intended to awaken his fellow citizens.

Each disbelieving person has to undergo a traumatic reaction when irrefutable documents are laid before him revealing the plan to transfer our total armed forces on a permanent basis to the communists who operate the United Nations.

The people’s innocent response to being told of such calamitous betrayals is: "It doesn’t sound real!” After a while, they ask “Is this really true?”

Many choose to rationalize and disbelieve the alarms set off by their fellow citizens. "If it were true," they rationalize, "the newspapers would have printed articles about it!”

We must agree: It doesn’t seem real that certain public officials would betray us, but the truth is that they have betrayed us! In order to import a peaceful way in time to save the country and our American Heritage, we must gain the support of loyal public officials actively holding office. If they come forward and tell of the sedition within government, they will have instant believers!

With the credibility public officials have, they can much more readily break into the news and thus awaken the sleeping giant! In turn, this will broaden the base of support so necessary for a calm solution.

---

1 This is the United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament which also includes the closing of U.S. defense plants, military bases, and prohibiting law-abiding people from possessing firearms. This law has been passed and is found in U.S. Code books under Title 22, Section 2551, etc.
John Swinton, one of the best loved newspaper men in the United States, the Dean of his profession, when asked for a toast before the New York Press Club, is quoted as saying:

"There is no such thing, at this date of the world's history, in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it.

There is not one of you who dares to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid $150.00 a week for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone.

The business of the journalists is to destroy the truth: to lie outright: to pervert, to vilify; to fawn at the feet of mammon and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread, you know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting an independent press.

We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping-jacks -- they pull the strings and we dance--our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes."
Well, friend, this is where I leave you. From here on, Uncle Sam takes over. He used to work 100% of the time, but now he is only working part time, you know! He says only ‘about 10% of the time’ is all! That’s real sad, because the other 90% of the time they try to hide him in a closet.

But he won’t go! He refuses! He wants everybody to know that he loves to work for the people, and he wants to be around helping them. Well, he is ready now to show you lots of papers and documents. He calls it his “evidence of mistreatment” and he is hanging on to the stuff. He says there will be a time when it will all come in handy. That will be Sam’s BIG DAY! Maybe you can help him to get back on full time work. If so, leave your name and number. For now, be attentive and considerate. I’ll pick you back up later... Bernadine
Are you ready for the Tour with the real Uncle Sam?
YES,
I AM THE REAL UNCLE SAM.

I REPRESENT THE TRUE LAW OF THIS NATION.

I AM THE SPIRIT OF THE CONSTITUTION.

I WILL SHOW YOU WHAT IS HAPPENING TO YOU AND ME.
MAN HAS A RIGHT TO LIMIT THE
POWER
THAT MAN CAN EXERCISE
OVER HIS FELLOW MAN.

I WAS NOT INSTITUTED TO BE A
DEMOCRACY.

I STAND FOR A REPUBLIC.
PUBLIC OFFICIALS HAVE TAKEN ON SELF-ENDOWED POWERS WHICH THE PEOPLE HAVE NEVER CONSENTED TO ALLOW THEM.

THERE HAS BEEN NO "CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED" FOR THE THINGS YOU WILL SEE ON THIS TOUR. THESE ARE VIOLATIONS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.
WHAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO SEE IS NOT THEORY!

YOU ARE LOOKING AT AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS THAT EXPOSE A PROGRAM THAT HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED AND ONGOING EVER SINCE IT WAS SIGNED INTO "LAW" IN 1961.
SOMEONE HAS TO ANSWER FOR THIS!

Congress was never authorized to transfer over our armed forces to a foreign power!
Having an armed force to protect your country

is one of your most precious possessions.

It protects your borders, your Constitution, your Bill of Rights, your land, your family, and your personal life.

Do you agree that we should not be eliminating our armed forces? Please take a look at this official law signed in 1961 by John F. Kennedy, calling for the United States to eliminate its armed forces.

It calls for general and complete disarmament including weapons of all kinds in the hands of the law-abiding people!

How safe will you be then?
Public Law 87-297
87th Congress, H. R. 9118
September 26, 1961

An Act

To establish a United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

As enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, PURPOSE, AND DEFINITIONS

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Arms Control and Disarmament Act".

PURPOSE

Sec. 2. An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this Act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of years to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament.

Arms control and disarmament policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and implementation of United States arms control and disarmament policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field. This organization must have such a position within the Government that it can provide the President, the Secretary of State, other officials of the executive branch, and the Congress with recommendations concerning United States arms control and disarmament policy, and can assess the impact of these recommendations upon our foreign policies, our national security policies, and our economy.

This organization must have the capacity to provide the essential scientific, economic, political, military, psychological, and technological information upon which realistic arms control and disarmament policy must be based. It must be able to carry out the following primary functions:

(a) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formulation;
(b) The preparation for and management of United States participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field;
(c) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament; and
(d) The preparation for, operation of, or as appropriate, direction of United States participation in such control systems as may become part of United States arms control and disarmament activities.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The terms "arms control" and "disarmament" mean the initiation, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or discontinuation of armaments and armaments of all kinds under international agreement including the necessary steps taken under such an agreement to establish an effective system of inter-
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Title I—Short Title, Purpose, and Definitions

Short Title

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Arms Control and Disarmament Act".

Purpose

Sec. 2. An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this Act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament.

Arms control and disarmament policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and implementation of United States arms control and disarmament policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field. This organization must have such a position within the Government that it can provide the President, the Secretary of State, other officials of the executive branch, and the Congress with recommendations concerning United States arms control and disarmament policy, and can assess the effect of these recommendations upon our foreign policies, our national security policies, and our economy.

This organization must have the capacity to provide the essential scientific, economic, political, military, psychological, and technological information upon which realistic arms control and disarmament policy must be based. It must be able to carry out the following primary functions:

(a) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formulation;
(b) The preparation for and management of United States participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field;
(c) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament; and
(d) The preparation for, operation of, or as appropriate, direction of United States participation in such control systems as may become part of United States arms control and disarmament activities.

Definitions

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The terms "arms control" and "disarmament" mean the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination, of armed forces and armaments of all kinds under international agreement including the necessary steps taken under such an agreement to establish an effective system of inter-
national control, or to create and strengthen international organizations for the maintenance of peace.

(b) The term "Government agency" means any executive department, commission, agency, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, or any board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment in the executive branch of Government.

(c) The term "Agency" means the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

TITLE II—ORGANIZATION

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Sec. 21. There is hereby established an agency to be known as the "United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency".

DIRECTOR

Sec. 22. The Agency shall be headed by a Director, who shall serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of State and the President on arms control and disarmament matters. In carrying out his duties under this Act the Director shall, under the direction of the Secretary of State, have primary responsibility within the Government for arms control and disarmament matters, as defined in this Act. He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR

Sec. 23. A Deputy Director of the Agency shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. The Deputy Director shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Director may prescribe. He shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during his absence or disability or during a vacancy in said office.

ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

Sec. 24. Not to exceed four Assistant Directors may be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. They shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. They shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Director may prescribe.

BUREAUS, OFFICES, AND DIVISIONS

Sec. 25. The Director, under the direction of the Secretary of State, may establish within the Agency such bureaus, offices, and divisions as he may determine to be necessary to discharge his responsibilities under this Act, including, but not limited to, an office of the General Counsel.

GENERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sec. 26. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint a General Advisory Committee of not to exceed fifteen members to advise the Director on arms control and disarmament policy and activities. The President shall designate one of the members as Chairman. The members of the committee may receive the compensation and reimbursement for expenses specified for

TITLE III—FUNCTIONS

RESEARCH

Sec. 31. The Director is authorized and directed to exercise his powers in such manner as to insure the acquisition of a fund of theoretical and practical knowledge concerning disarmament. To this end, the Director is authorized and directed, under the direction of the President, (1) to conduct the work of research, development, and other studies and development of arms control and disarmament; (2) to make arrangements (including contracts, agreements, and grants) for the conduct of research, development, and other studies in the field of arms control and disarmament by private or public institutions or persons; and (3) to coordinate the research, development, and other studies and development of arms control and disarmament by other Government agencies in accordance with procedures established under section 35 of this Act. In carrying out his responsibilities under this Act, the Director shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make full use of facilities, Government and private. The authority of the Director with respect to research, development, and other studies shall be limited to participation in the following research insofar as they relate to arms control and disarmament:

(a) the detection, identification, inspection, monitoring, limitation, reduction, control, and elimination of armed forces and armaments, including nuclear, missile, conventional, bacteriological, chemical, and radiological weapons;

(b) the techniques and systems of detecting, identifying, inspecting, and monitoring of tests of nuclear, thermonuclear, and other weapons;

(c) the analysis of national budgets, levels of industrial production, and economic indicators to determine the amounts spent by various countries for armaments;

(d) the control, reduction, and elimination of armed forces and armaments in space, in areas on and beneath the earth's surface, and in underwater regions;

(e) the structure and operation of international control and other organizations useful for arms control and disarmament;

(f) the training of scientists, technicians, and other personnel for serving the control systems which may be created by international arms control and disarmament agreements;

(g) the reduction and elimination of the danger of war resulting from accident, miscalculation, or possible surprise attack, including (but not limited to) improvements in the methods of communications between nations;

(h) the economic and political consequences of arms control and disarmament, including the problems of realignment arising in industry and the reallocation of national resources;

(i) the arms control and disarmament implications of foreign and national security policies of the United States with a view to a better understanding of the significance of such policies for the achievement of arms control and disarmament;

(j) the national security and foreign policy implications of arms control and disarmament proposals with a view to a better understanding of the effect of such proposals upon national security and foreign policy;
(k) methods for the maintenance of peace and security during different stages of arms control and disarmament;

(1) the scientific, economic, political, legal, social, psychological, military, and technological factors related to the prevention of war with a view to a better understanding of how the basic structure of a lasting peace may be established;

(m) such related problems as the Director may determine to be in need of research, development, or study in order to carry out the provisions of this Act.

PATENTS

Sec. 30. All research within the United States contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act, shall be provided for in such manner that all information as to use, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Director may find to be necessary in the public interest) be available to the general public.

This section shall not be construed as depriving the owner of any background patent relating thereto of such rights as he may have elsewhere.

POLICY FORMULATION

Sec. 33. The Director is authorized and directed to prepare for the President the Secretary of State, and the heads of such other Government agencies as the President may determine, recommendations concerning United States arms control and disarmament policy. Provided, however, that no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

NEGOTIATIONS AND RELATED FUNCTIONS

Sec. 34. Under the direction of the Secretary of State—

(a) the Director, for the purpose of conducting negotiations concerning arms control and disarmament or for the purpose of exercising any other authority given him by this Act, may (1) consult and communicate with or direct the consultation and communication with representatives of other nations or of international organizations and (2) communicate in the name of the Secretary with diplomatic representatives of the United States in this country and abroad.

(b) the Director shall perform functions pursuant to section 2(c) of Reorganization Plan 8 of 1939 with respect to providing to the United States Information Agency official United States positions and policy on arms control and disarmament matters for which an official is being reimbursed.

(c) The Director is authorized to make preparations for the establishment, operation, and funding of inspection and control systems which may become part of the United States arms control and disarmament activities, and (2) as authorized by law, to put into effect, direct, or otherwise assume United States responsibility for such systems.

SEC. 35. The President is authorized to establish procedures to (1) assure cooperation, consultation, and a continuing exchange of information between the Agency and the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other affected Government agencies, in all significant respect of United States arms control and disarmament policy and related matters, including current and proposed policies and programs, (2) resolve differences of opinion between the Director and such other agencies which cannot be resolved through consultation, and (3) provide for presentation to the President of recommendations of the Director with respect to such differences, when such differences involve major matters of policy and cannot be resolved through consultation.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

GENERAL AUTHORITY

Sec. 41. In the performance of his functions, the Director is authorized to—

(a) utilize or employ the services, personnel, equipment, or facilities of any other Government agency, with the consent of the agency concerned, to perform such functions on behalf of the Agency as may appear desirable. It is the intent of the Congress that the Director only upon the Department of State for general administrative services in the United States and abroad to the extent agreed upon between the Secretary of State and the Director. Any Government agency is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of law, to transfer to or to receive from the Director, under the terms of the provisions of any other law, without reimbursement, supplies and equipment other than administrative supplies and equipment. Transfer or receipt of excess property shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended;

(b) appoint officers and employees, including attorneys, for the Agency in accordance with the civil service laws and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(c) enter into agreements with other Government agencies, including the military departments through the Secretary of Defense, under which officers or employees of such agencies may be detailed to the Agency for the performance of service pursuant to this Act without prejudice to the status or advancement of such officers or employees within their own agencies;

(d) procure services of experts and consultants or organizations thereof, including scientific and technical services, as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (62 Stat. 737) to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and to pay in connection therewith travel expenses and travel expenses of individuals, including transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business, as authorized by section 5 of said Act, as amended (62 Stat. 737), Provided, That no such individual shall be employed for more than one hundred days in any fiscal year unless the President certifies that employment of such individual in excess of such number of days is necessary in the national interest; and provided further, That such contracts may be renewed annually.
SEC. 43. (a) The Director shall establish such security and loyalty requirements, restrictions, and safeguards as he deems necessary in the interest of the national security and to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Director shall arrange with the Civil Service Commission for the conduct of full field background security and loyalty investigations of all the Agency's officers, employees, consultants, persons detailed from other Government agencies, members of its General Advisory Committee, advisory boards, contractors, subcontractors, and their officers and employees, actual or prospective. In the event the investigation discloses information indicating that the person investigated may be or may become a security risk, or may be of doubtful loyalty, the report of the investigation shall be turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for full field investigation. The final results of all such investigations shall be turned over to the Director for final determination. No person shall be permitted to enter on duty as such an officer, employee, consultant, or member of advisory committee or board, pursuant to any such detail, and no contractor or subcontractor, or officer or employee thereof shall have access to any classified information, until he shall have been cleared in accordance with the report of such investigations made to the Director, and the Director shall have determined that such person is not a security risk or of doubtful loyalty. Standards applicable with respect to the security clearance of persons within any category referred to in this subsection shall not be less stringent, and the investigation of such persons from such categories shall not be less intensive or burdensome than in the case of such clearance of persons in a corresponding category under the security procedures of the Government agencies or agencies having the highest security restrictions with respect to persons in such category.

(b) The Atomic Energy Commission may authorize any of its employees, or employees of any contractor, prospective contractor, licensees, or prospective licensees of the Atomic Energy Commission, or any other person authorized to have access to Restricted Data by the Atomic Energy Commission, under section 2155 of title 42, to permit the Director or any officer, employee, consultant, person detailed from other Government agencies, member of the General Advisory Committee or of an advisory board established pursuant to section 41 (f), contractor, subcontractor, prospective contractor, or prospective subcontractor, to have access to Restricted Data which is required in the performance of his duties and so authorized by the Director, but only if (1) the Atomic Energy Commission has determined, in accordance with the established personnel security procedures and standards of the Commission, that permitting such individual to have access to such Restricted Data will not endanger the common defense and security, and (2) the Atomic Energy Commission finds that the established personnel and other security procedures and standards of the Agency are adequate and in reasonable conformity with the standards established by the Atomic Energy Commission, and that such security is not less stringent than that required in the case of such clearance of persons in a corresponding category under the security procedures of the Government agencies or agencies having the highest security restrictions with respect to persons in such category.
COMPENDIUM GENERAL AUDIT

Sec. 46. No moneys appropriated for the purpose of this Act shall be available for payment under any contract with the Director, negotiated without advertising, except contracts with any foreign government, international organization or any agency thereof, unless such contract includes a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall, until the expiration of three years after final payment, have access to and the right to examine any and all pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of, and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts: Provided, however, That no moneys so appropriated shall be available for payment under such contract which includes any provisions precluding an audit by the General Accounting Office of any transaction under such contract:

And provided further, That nothing in this section shall preclude the earlier disposal of contractor and subcontractor records in accordance with records disposal schedules agreed upon between the Director and the General Accounting Office.

TRANSFER OF ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES TO AGENCY

Sec. 47. (a) The United States Disarmament Administration, together with its records, property, personnel, and funds, is hereby transferred to the Agency. The appropriations and unexpended balances of appropriations transferred pursuant to this subsection shall be available for expenditure for any and all objects of expenditure authorized by this Act, without regard to the requirements of appropriation under section 603 of title 31.

(b) The President, by Executive order, may transfer to the Director any activities or facilities of any Government agency which relate primarily to arms control and disarmament. In connection with any such transfer, the President may under this section or other applicable authority, provide for appropriate transfers of records, property, civilian personnel, and funds. No transfer shall be made under this subsection until (1) a full and complete report concerning the nature and effect of such proposed transfer has been transmitted by the President to the Congress, and (2) the first period of sixty calendar days of regular session of the Congress following the date of receipt of such report by the Congress has expired without adoption by either House of the Congress of a resolution stating that such House does not favor such transfer. The procedures prescribed in title II of the Reorganization Act of 1949 shall apply to any such resolution.

USE OF FUNDS

Sec. 48. Appropriations made to the Director for the purposes of this Act, and transfers of funds to him by other Government agencies for such purposes, shall be available to him to exercise any authority granted him by this Act, including, without limitation, expenses of printing and binding without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); purchase or hire of one passenger motor vehicle for the official use of the Director without regard to the limitations contained in section 76(c) of title 5 of the United States Code; entertainment and official courtesies to the extent authorized by appropriation; expenditures for training and study; expenditures in connection with participation in international conferences for the purposes of this Act; and expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the United States, including transportation expenses of dependents, household goods, and personal effects, and expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, not otherwise provided for.

APPROPRIATION

Sec. 49. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Funds appropriated pursuant to this section may be allocated or transferred to any agency for carrying out the purposes of this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligations and expenditures in accordance with authority granted in this Act, or under authority governing the activities of the agencies to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

Sec. 50. The Director shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, not later than January 31 of each year, a report concerning activities of the Agency.

Approved September 26, 1961, 12:45 p.m.
FREEDOM FROM WAR

THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Introduction

The revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences has produced a crisis in human history. In order to overcome the danger of nuclear war now confronting mankind, the United States has introduced at the Sixteenth General Assembly of the United Nations a Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World.

This new program provides for the progressive reduction of the war-making capabilities of nations and the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace. It sets forth a series of comprehensive measures which can and should be taken in order to bring about a world in which there will be freedom from war and security for all states. It is based on three principles deemed essential to the achievement of practical progress in the disarmament field:

First, there must be immediate disarmament action:

A strenuous and uninterrupted effort must be made toward the goal of general and complete disarmament; at the same time, it is important that specific measures be put into effect as soon as possible.
Second, all disarmament obligations must be subject to effective international controls:

The control organization must have the manpower, facilities, and effectiveness to assure that limitations or reductions take place as agreed. It must also be able to certify to all states that retained forces and armaments do not exceed those permitted at any stage of the disarmament process.

Third, adequate peace-keeping machinery must be established:

There is an inseparable relationship between the scaling down of national armaments on the one hand and the building up of international peace-keeping machinery and institutions on the other. Nations are unlikely to shed their means of self-protection in the absence of alternative ways to safeguard their legitimate interests. This can only be achieved through the progressive strengthening of international institutions under the United Nations and by creating a United Nations Peace Force to enforce the peace as the disarmament process proceeds.

There follows a summary of the principal provisions of the United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World. The full text of the program is contained in an appendix to this pamphlet.

**Summary**

**DISARMAMENT GOAL AND OBJECTIVES**

The over-all goal of the United States is a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world which has achieved general and complete disarmament under effective international control; and a world in which adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

In order to make possible the achievement of that goal, the program sets forth the following specific objectives toward which nations should direct their efforts:

- The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;
- The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and...
the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order;
- The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations;
- The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations.

TASK OF NEGOTIATING STATES

The negotiating states are called upon to develop the program into a detailed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved. To this end, they are to seek the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date. At the same time, and without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program, they are to seek agreement on those immediate measures that would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form part of the total program.

GOVERNING PRINCIPLES

The program sets forth a series of general principles to guide the negotiating states in their work. These make clear that:

- As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations must be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of disputes;
- Disarmament must proceed as rapidly as possible, until it is completed, in stages containing balanced, phased, and safeguarded measures;
- Each measure and stage should be carried out in an agreed period of time, with transition from one stage to the next to take place as soon as all measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and verified and as soon as necessary arrangements for verification of the next stage have been made;
- Inspection and verification must establish both that nations carry out scheduled limitations or reductions and that they do not retain armed forces and armaments in excess of those permitted at any stage of the disarmament process; and
- Disarmament must take place in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state.

DISARMAMENT STAGES

The program provides for progressive disarmament steps to take place in three stages and for the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions.

FIRST STAGE

The first stage contains measures which would significantly reduce the capabilities of nations to wage
The armed forces of the United States and the
Soviet Union would be limited to 21 million men
and the total number of active personnel of the
avoid forces of the two countries would be
limited to 5 million. The number of nuclear
stocks held by each country would be reduced
to a level that would not allow for more than
500 nuclear weapons. The United Nations
would be responsible for ensuring compliance
with the above limits.

An experts' commission would be established
to examine and report on the feasibility and means
of accomplishing the reduction of all chemical,
biological and radiological weapons.

The use of chemical and biological weapons
would be prohibited. The production of such
weapons would be stopped and quantities of such
materials would be reduced.

Strategic delivery vehicles would be restricted
by equitable and balanced steps; their production
would be limited or halted.
It would certify to all states that agreed reductions have taken place and that retained forces and armaments do not exceed permitted levels.

It would determine the transition from one stage to the next.

- States would be committed to other measures to reduce international tension and to protect against the chance of war by accident, miscalculation, or surprise attack.

States would be committed to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force contrary to the principles of the U.N. Charter and to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.

A U.N. peace observation group would be available to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or breach of the peace.

States would be committed to give advance notice of major military movements which might cause alarm; observation posts would be established to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.

SECOND STAGE

The second stage contains a series of measures which would bring within sight a world in which there would be freedom from war. Implementation of all measures in the second stage would mean:

- Further substantial reductions in the armed forces, armaments, and military establishments of states, including strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and countering weapons;

- Further development of methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes under the United Nations;

- Establishment of a permanent international peace force within the United Nations;

- Depending on the findings of an Experts Commission, a halt in the production of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological weapons and a reduction of existing stocks or their conversion to peaceful uses;

- On the basis of the findings of an Experts Commission, a reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons;

- The dismantling or the conversion to peaceful uses of certain military bases and facilities wherever located; and

- The strengthening and enlargement of the International Disarmament Organization to enable it to verify the steps taken in Stage II and to determine the transition to Stage III.

THIRD STAGE

During the third stage of the program, the states of the world, building on the experience and confidence gained in successfully implementing the measures of the first two stages, would take final steps toward the goal of a world in which:

- States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.
• The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

• The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

• The peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far-reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

Appendix

DECLARATION ON DISARMAMENT

THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

The Nations of the world,

Conscious of the crisis in human history produced by the revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences;

Determined to save present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of the arms race and to create conditions in which all peoples can strive freely and peacefully to fulfill their basic aspirations;

Declare their goal to be: A free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations; a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and where the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural, and spiritual advance;

Set forth as the objectives of a program of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world:

(a) The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;
(b) The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order;

(c) The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to ensure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations;

(d) The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

Call on the negotiating states:

(a) To develop the outline program set forth below into an agreed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved;

(b) To this end to seek to attain the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date;

(c) Also to seek—without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program—agreement on those immediate measures that would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form a part of that program.

Affirm that disarmament negotiations should be guided by the following principles:

(a) Disarmament shall take place as rapidly as possible until it is completed in stages containing balanced, phased and safeguarded measures, with each measure and stage to be carried out in an agreed period of time.

(b) Compliance with all disarmament obligations shall be effectively verified from their entry into force. Verification arrangements shall be instituted progressively and in such a manner as to verify not only that agreed limitations or reductions take place but also that retained armed forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels at any stage.

(c) Disarmament shall take place in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state, whether or not a party to an international agreement or treaty.

(d) As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

(e) Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next shall take place as soon as all the measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and effective verification is continuing and as soon as the arrangements that have been agreed to be necessary for the next stage have been instituted.

Agree upon the following outline program for achieving general and complete disarmament:

STAGE 1

A. To Establish an International Disarmament Organization:

(a) An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) shall be established within the framework of the United Nations upon entry into force of the agreement. Its functions shall be expanded progressively as required for the effective verification of the disarmament program.

(b) The IDO shall have: (1) a General Conference of all the parties; (2) a Commission consisting of representatives of all the major powers as permanent members and certain other states on a rotating basis; and (3) an Administrator who will administer the Organization subject to the direction of the Commission and who will have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to assure effective impartial implementation of the functions of the Organization.

(c) The IDO shall: (1) ensure compliance with the obligations undertaken by verifying the execution of measures agreed upon; (2) assist the states in developing the details of agreed further verification and disarmament measures; (3) provide for the estab-
lishment of such bodies as may be necessary for working out the
details of further measures provided for in the program and for
such other expert study groups as may be required to give contin-
ues study to the problems of disarmament; (d) receive reports on
the progress of disarmament and verification arrangements and
determine the transition from one stage to the next.

B. To Reduce Armed Forces and Armaments:

(a) Force levels shall be limited to 2.1 million each for the U.S.
and U.S.S.R. and to appropriate levels not exceeding 3.1 million
each for all other militarily significant states. Reductions to the
agreed levels will proceed by equitable, proportionate, and verified
steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be reduced
by equitable and balanced steps. The reductions shall be accom-
plished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the
IDO. When, at specified periods during the Stage I reduction
process, the states party to the agreement have agreed that the
armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the arm-
armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) The production of agreed types of armaments shall be
limited.

(d) A Chemical, Biological, Radiological (CBR) Experts Com-
mmission shall be established within the IDO for the purpose of ex-
amining and reporting on the feasibility and means for accom-
plishing the verifiable reduction and eventual elimination of CBR
weapon stockpiles and the halting of their production.

C. To Contain and Reduce the Nuclear Threat:

(a) States that have not acceded to a treaty effectively prohib-
iting the testing of nuclear weapons shall do so.

(b) The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons shall be
stopped.

(c) Upon the cessation of production of fissionable materials for use in weapons, agreed initial quantities of fissile
material from past production shall be transferred to non-weapons
purposes.

(d) Any fissionable materials transferred between countries for
peaceful uses of nuclear energy shall be subject to appropriate
safeguards to be developed in agreement with the IAEA.

(e) States owning nuclear weapons shall not relinquish control
of such weapons to any nation not owning them and shall not
transmit to any such nation information or material necessary for
their manufacture. States not owning nuclear weapons shall not
manufacture such weapons, attempt to obtain control of such
weapons belonging to other states, or seek or receive information or
materials necessary for their manufacture.

(f) A Nuclear Experts Commission consisting of representatives
of the nuclear states shall be established within the IDO for the
purpose of examining and reporting on the feasibility and means for
accomplishing the verified reduction and eventual elimination of
nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. To Reduce Strategic Nuclear Weapons Delivery Vehicles:

(a) Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified cate-
gories and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such
vehicles shall be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced
steps. The reduction shall be accomplished in each step by trans-
fers to depots supervised by the IDO of vehicles that are in excess
of levels agreed upon for each step. At specified periods during
the Stage I reduction process, the vehicles that have been placed
under supervision of the IDO shall be destroyed or converted to
peaceful uses.

(b) Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapon
delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter
such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

(c) Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons
delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter
such vehicles shall be limited or halted.

E. To Promote the Peaceful Use of Outer Space:

(a) The placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of
weapons capable of producing mass destruction shall be prohibited.
(b) States shall give advance notification to participating states and to the IDO of launches of space vehicles and missiles, together with the track of the vehicle.

F. To Reduce the Risks of War by Accident, Miscalculation, and Surprise Attack:

(a) States shall give advance notification to the participating states and to the IDO of major military movements and maneuvers, on a scale as may be agreed, which might give rise to misinterpretation or cause alarm and induce countermeasures. The notification shall include the geographic areas to be used and the nature, scale and time span of the event.

(b) There shall be established observation posts at such locations as major ports, railway centers, motor highways, and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.

(c) There shall also be established such additional inspection arrangements to reduce the danger of surprise attack as may be agreed.

(d) An international commission shall be established immediately within the IDO to examine and make recommendations on the possibility of further measures to reduce the risks of nuclear war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication.

G. To Keep the Peace:

(a) States shall reaffirm their obligations under the U.N. Charter to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed forces—including nuclear, conventional, or CBR—contrary to the principles of the U.N. Charter.

(b) States shall agree to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.

(c) States shall use all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of disputes and shall seek within the United Nations further arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the codification and progressive development of international law.

(d) States shall develop arrangements in Stage I for the establishment in Stage II of a U.N. Peace Force.

(e) A U.N. peace observation group shall be staffed with a standing cadre of observers who could be dispatched to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or breach of the peace.

STAGE II

A. International Disarmament Organization:

The powers and responsibilities of the IDO shall be progressively enlarged in order to give it the capabilities to verify the measures undertaken in Stage II.

B. To Further Reduce Armed Forces and Armaments:

(a) Levels of forces for the U.S., U.S.S.R., and other militarily significant states shall be further reduced by substantial amounts to agreed levels in equitable and balanced steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be further reduced by equitable and balanced steps. The reduction shall be accomplished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the IDO. When, at specified periods during the Stage II reduction process, the parties have agreed that the armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) There shall be further agreed restrictions on the production of armaments.

(d) Agreed military bases and facilities wherever they are located shall be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses.

(e) Depending upon the findings of the Experts Commission on CBR weapons, the production of CBR weapons shall be halted, existing stocks progressively reduced, and the resulting excess quantities destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

C. To Further Reduce the Nuclear Threat:

Stocks of nuclear weapons shall be progressively reduced to the minimum levels which can be agreed upon as a result of the find-
ings of the Nuclear Experts Commission; the resulting excess of fissileable material shall be transferred to peaceful purposes.

**D. To Further Reduce Strategic Nuclear Weapons Delivery Vehicles:**

Further reductions in the stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be carried out in accordance with the procedure outlined in Stage I.

**E. To Keep the Peace:**

During Stage II, states shall develop further the peace-keeping processes of the United Nations, to the end that the United Nations can effectively in Stage III deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations:

(a) States shall agree upon strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to assure that the United Nations will be able effectively to protect states against threats to or breaches of the peace.

(b) The U.N. Peace Force shall be established and progressively strengthened.

(c) States shall also agree upon further improvements and developments in rules of international conduct and in processes for peaceful settlement of disputes and differences.

**STAGE III**

By the time Stage II has been completed, the confidence produced through a verified disarmament program, the acceptance of rules of peaceful international behavior, and the development of strengthened international peace-keeping processes within the framework of the U.N. should have reached a point where the states of the world can move forward to Stage III. In Stage III progressive controlled disarmament and continuously developing principles and procedures of international law would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force and all international disputes would be settled according to the agreed principles of international conduct.

The progressive steps to be taken during the final phase of the disarmament program would be directed toward the attainment of a world in which:

(a) States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.

(b) The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

(c) The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

(d) The peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far-reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.
The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World

This is the official statement program the U.S. government is engaged in.

The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World

Department of State

This publication is an abridgement of the "blueprint for the peace race," which is more explicit.

Disarmament Stages

The program provides for progressive disarmament steps to take place in three stages and for the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions.

Inspection and verification must establish both that nations carry out scheduled limitations or reductions and that they do not retain armed forces and armaments in excess of those permitted at any stage of the disarmament process; and

As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations must be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of disputes;

Disarmament must proceed as rapidly as possible until it is completed, in stages containing balanced, phased, and safeguarded measures;

Each measure and stage should be carried out in an agreed period of time, with transition from one stage to the next to take place as soon as all measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and verified and as soon as necessary arrangements for verification of the next stage have been made;

All items above have been clipped from the State Department booklet No. 7277 (above).

The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;

The peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far-reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

Measures would be taken to develop and strengthen United Nations arrangements for arbitration, for the development of international law, and for the establishment in Stage II of a permanent U.N. Peace Force.

States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.
THIS IS PUBLIC LAW 81-297:

This law was passed in 1961—signed by John F. Kennedy. Eighteen additions have been added, making it worse, up to and including 1996. It is very viable and forms basis for President Bush’s Summit Conferences. It calls for the elimination of our armed forces, permanently transferring them to the United Nations.

Moore KOs Lavorante in 10th

U.S. FORMULA FOR PEACE
One Military Force Under U.N. Control

U.S. TO PROPOSE END OF NATIONAL ARMIES

Civilian owned guns will not be prohibited and confiscated.
U.S. FORMULA FOR PEACE
One Military Force Under U.N. Control

News Summary

THE WORLD

THE NATION

THE CITY AND THE STATE

SPORTS

2 Children, 4 Men Die in Southland Traffic
U.S. TO PROPOSE END OF NATIONAL ARMIES

Plan for U.N. Peace Force Ready to Be Submitted at Geneva

U.S. THREE-STAGE DISARMAMENT PLAN

STAGE I

STAGE II

STAGE III

INTERNAL SECURITY FORCES

INTERNAL SECURITY FORCES

PEACEKEEPING MACHINERY
There was a time when the newspapers reported on the "general and complete disarmament program" just as you see here, but soon the newspapers were bought out because of the outcry from the then-informed public.

Unfortunately, new generations have come in and they know little or nothing of the continuing plan.

Folks, if you doubt what I am telling you, make a visit to your federal depositary library and ask to be shown a full copy of P.L. 87-297. They may hide Sections 2551, 2552 (a), 2571 (a), etc. of Title 22 U.S.C. Insist that you be shown these sections. These sections have never been rescinded.
Go ahead, pull this page up, and take a look at this shocking booklet printed by the U. S. Arms Control & Disarmament Agency. When John Kennedy spoke to the United Nations on September 25, 1961, this "Blueprint for the Peace Race" booklet was not yet ready, so Kennedy ordered the State Department to briefly summarize its contents using the little blue book called "FREEDOM FROM WAR". (I just showed you that little blue book called State Dept. Publication #7277 just a few pages back.) Six months later this booklet became published. When the president speaks of "peace" this is what he is referring to! No Army! No Navy! No Air Force! And no guns for the citizens!
BLUEPRINT FOR THE PEACE RACE

Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World
BLUEPRINT FOR THE PEACE RACE

Outline of Basic Provisions
of a Treaty on
General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY
"...not to an arms race but to a peace race—to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved."

PRESIDENT KENNEDY
September 25, 1961
Statement by President Kennedy

Press Conference, April 18, 1962

The United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of every basic provision of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. It provides a blueprint of our position on general and complete disarmament as well as elaboration of the nature, sequence, and timing of specific disarmament measures.

This outline of a treaty represents the most comprehensive and specific series of proposals the United States or any other country has ever made on disarmament. In addition to stating the objectives and principles which should govern agreements for disarmament, the document calls for the grouping of individual measures in three balanced and safeguarded stages. We are hopeful through the give-and-take of the conference table this plan will have a constructive influence upon the negotiations now in progress.

I want to stress that with this plan the United States is making a major effort to achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations. We believe that the nations represented at Geneva have a heavy responsibility to lay the foundations for a genuinely secure and peaceful world starting through a reduction in arms.
Foreword

An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments, in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law, and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. Today, in a world riven by dangerous tensions and mistrust, the attainment of this goal necessitates continuing and patient efforts to achieve the progressive reduction of national warmaking capabilities in such a manner as to increase the security of all nations. Thus, responsible arms control and disarmament proposals cannot be directed toward the attainment of unilateral political or military advantage. They must be fully responsive to the legitimate security interests of all nations.

On the basis of these considerations, President Kennedy on September 25, 1961, presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations the “United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World.” To provide a more precise statement of the United States approach to disarmament and the manner in which that approach should be implemented, the United States on April 18, 1962, presented to the conference of the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament, meeting in Geneva, an “Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World.” Although not a draft treaty, the “Outline” elaborates and extends the proposals of September 25 and provides in specific terms a substantial basis for the negotiation of arms control and disarmament treaty obligations.

The principal provisions of the United States Outline are described in the summary that follows. The complete text of the Outline begins on page 3.
SUMMARY

Principles and Process of Disarmament

Disarmament would be implemented progressively and in a balanced manner so that at no stage could any state or group of states obtain military advantage. Compliance with obligations would be effectively verified. As national armaments were reduced, the United Nations would be progressively strengthened.

Disarmament would be accomplished in three stages—the first to be carried out in 3 years; the second, also in 3 years; and the third, as promptly as possible within an agreed period of time. Stage I would be initiated by the United States, the Soviet Union, and other agreed states. All militarily significant states would participate in Stage II; and all states possessing armaments and armed forces, in Stage III.

Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next would take place upon a determination that all undertakings in the preceding stage had been carried out and that all preparations for the next stage had been made.

Disarmament Measures

A. ARMAMENTS. During Stage I, inventories of major categories of both nuclear delivery vehicles and conventional armaments would be reduced by 30 percent. Fixed launching pads would be reduced with associated missiles. Half of the remaining inventories would be eliminated during Stage II, and final reductions would be made in Stage III. Upon the completion of Stage III, states would have at their disposal only agreed types of nonnuclear armaments for forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

Production of armaments during Stage I would be limited to agreed allowances and would be compensated for by the destruction of additional armaments to the end that reductions would not be impaired. In Stage II, production of armaments would be halted except for parts for maintenance of retained armaments. Any further produc-
tion of national armaments would be ended in Stage III except for production of agreed types of nonnuclear armaments for internal forces.

Military research, development, and testing would be subject to increasing limitations during the disarmament process. During Stage III, appropriate action would be taken to ensure that new scientific discoveries and technological inventions of military significance were not used for military purposes.

B. ARMS FORCES. Force levels of the United States and Soviet Union would be reduced to 2.1 million at the end of Stage I. Half of the remaining forces of these two states would be disbanded during Stage II, and final reductions would be made in Stage III. Other states would also progressively reduce their force levels. By the end of Stage III, states would have at their disposal only those agreed forces and related organizational arrangements required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

C. NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons would be halted in Stage I, and limitations would be imposed on the production of fissionable materials for other purposes. The availability of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons would be reduced during Stage I and subsequent stages by safeguarded transfers to nonnuclear weapons purposes.

If nuclear weapons tests had not already been halted under effective international control, arrangements to this end would be undertaken in Stage I. States which had manufactured nuclear weapons would agree in Stage I not to transfer control over nuclear weapons to states which had not manufactured them or to assist such states in their manufacture. States which had not manufactured nuclear weapons would refrain from seeking them. Transfers of fissionable materials between states would be limited to peaceful purposes and would be safeguarded.

Beginning in Stage II, nonnuclear components and assemblies of nuclear weapons would be destroyed and limitations would be imposed on further production or refurbishment of nuclear weapons. At the end of Stage II, remaining nuclear weapons would be registered internationally to assist in verifying the fact that by the end of Stage III states would not have such weapons at their disposal.

D. OUTER SPACE. The placing of weapons of mass destruction in orbit would be prohibited in Stage I, and limitations would be imposed on the production, stockpiling, and testing of boosters for space vehicles. States would support increased cooperation in peaceful uses of outer space.

E. MILITARY BASES. Reduction of military bases, wherever they might be located, would be initiated in Stage II, and final reductions would be made in Stage III.

F. MILITARY EXPENDITURES. Military expenditures would be reported throughout the disarmament process.

Verification

The verification of disarmament would be the responsibility of an International Disarmament Organization, which would be established within the framework of the United Nations. Reductions of armaments and armed forces would be verified at agreed locations; and limitations on production, testing, and other specified activities, at declared locations. Assurance that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded and that activities subject to limitation or prohibition were not being conducted clandestinely would be provided through arrangements which would relate the extent of inspection at any time to the amount of disarmament being undertaken and to the risk to the disarming states of possible violations.

Such assurance might, for example, be accomplished through arrangements under which states would divide themselves into a number of zones through which inspection would be progressively extended. By the end of Stage III, when disarmament had been completed, all parts of the territory of states would have been inspected.

Reduction of the Risk of War

To promote confidence and reduce the risk of war during the disarmament process, states would, beginning in Stage I, give advance notification of major military movements and maneuvers, establish observation posts to report on concentrations and movements of military forces, and insure rapid and reliable communications among heads of governments and with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

An International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War would examine possible extensions and improvements of such measures as well as additional measures to reduce the risk of war through accident, miscalculation, failure of communications, or surprise attack.

Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

In Stage I, states would undertake obligations to refrain from the threat or use of force of any type contrary to the United Nations Charter. Throughout the three stages of disarmament, states would use all available means for the peaceful settlement of disputes, would seek to improve processes for this purpose, and would support measures to improve the capability of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security.

A United Nations Peace Observation Corps would be established in Stage I, and a United Nations Peace Force, in Stage II. The United Nations Peace Force, which would be equipped with agreed
Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World

COMPLETE TEXT

In order to assist in the preparation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the United States submits the following outline of basic provisions of such a treaty.

A. Objectives

1. To ensure that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and (b) general and complete disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the settlement of disputes and by effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. Taking into account paragraphs 2 and 4 below, to provide, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for:

(a) Dismantling of armed forces, dismantling of military establishments, including bases, cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;

(b) Elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, biological, and other weapons of mass destruction and cessation of the production of such weapons;

(c) Elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction;

(d) Abolition of the organizations and institutions designed to organize the military efforts of states, cessation of military training, and closing of all military training institutions;

(e) Discontinuance of military expenditures.

3. To ensure that, at the completion of the program for general and complete disarmament, states would have at their disposal only those non-nuclear armaments, forces, facilities and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

4. To ensure that during and after implementation of general and complete disarmament, states also would support and provide agreed manpower for a United Nations Peace Force to be equipped with...
agreed types of armaments necessary to ensure that the United Nations can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms.

5. To establish and provide for the effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose of ensuring that all obligations under the disarmament program would be honored and observed during and after implementation of general and complete disarmament; and to this end to ensure that the International Disarmament Organization and its inspectors would have unrestricted access without veto to all places as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.

B. Principles

The guiding principles during the achievement of these objectives are:

1. Disarmament would be implemented until it is completed by stages to be carried out within specified time limits.

2. Disarmament would be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any state or group of states gain a military advantage, and so that security would be ensured equally for all.

3. Compliance with all disarmament obligations would be effectively verified during and after their entry into force. Verification arrangements would be instituted progressively as necessary to ensure throughout the disarmament process that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded.

4. As national armaments are reduced, the United Nations would be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to ensure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

5. Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next would take place upon decision that all measures in the preceding stage had been implemented and verified and that any additional arrangements required for measures in the next stage were ready to operate.

Introduction

The Treaty would contain three stages designed to achieve a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. The Treaty would enter into force upon the signature and ratification of the United Nations of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and such other states as might be agreed. Stage II would begin when all militarily significant states had become Parties to the Treaty and other transition requirements had been satisfied. Stage III would begin when all states possessing armed forces and armaments had become Parties to the Treaty and other transition requirements had been satisfied. Disarmament, verification, and measures for keeping the peace would proceed progressively and proportionately beginning with the entry into force of the Treaty.

Stage I

Stage I would begin upon the entry into force of the Treaty and would be completed within three years from that date. During Stage I the Parties to the Treaty would undertake:

1. To reduce their armaments and armed forces and to carry out other agreed measures in the manner outlined below;

2. To establish the International Disarmament Organization upon the entry into force of the Treaty in order to ensure the verification in the agreed manner of the obligations undertaken; and

3. To strengthen arrangements for keeping the peace through the measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of Armaments

a. Specified Parties to the Treaty, as a first stage toward general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, would reduce by thirty percent the armaments in each category listed in subparagraph b below. Except as adjustments for production would be permitted in Stage I in accordance with paragraph 3 below, each type of armament in the categories listed in subparagraph b would be reduced by thirty percent of the inventory existing at an agreed date.

b. All types of armaments within agreed categories would be subject to reduction in Stage I (the following list of categories, and of types within categories, is illustrative):

(1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 40,000 kilograms or greater: missiles having a range of 5,000 kilometers or greater, together with their related fixed launching pads; and submersible-launched missiles and air-to-surface missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

(Within this category, for example, the United States, would declare as types of armaments: the B-52 aircraft; Atlas missiles together with their related fixed launching pads; Titan missiles together with their related fixed launching pads; Polaris missiles; Hound
Dog missiles; and each new type of armament, such as Minuteman missiles, which came within the category description, together with, where applicable, their related fixed launching pads. The declared inventory of types within the category by other Parties to the Treaty would be similarly detailed).

(2) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 15,000 kilograms and 40,000 kilograms and these missiles not included in category (1) having a range between 200 kilometers and 3,000 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(3) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 2,500 and 15,000 kilograms. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(4) Surface-to-surface (including submarine-launched missiles) and air-to-surface aerodynamic and ballistic missiles and free rockets having a range of between 10 kilometers and 300 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(5) Anti-missile missile systems, together with related fixed launching pads. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(6) Surface-to-air missiles other than anti-missile missile systems, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(7) Tanks. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(8) Armored cars and armored personnel carriers. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(9) All artillery, and mortars and rocket launchers having a caliber of 100 mm. or greater. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

(10) Combatant ships with standard displacement of 4,000 tons or greater of the following classes: Aircraft carrier, battleship, cruiser, destroyer types and submarines. (The Parties would declare their armaments by types within the category).

2. Method of Reduction

a. Those Parties to the Treaty which were subject to the reduction of armaments would submit to the International Disarmament Organization an appropriate declaration respecting inventories of their armaments existing at the agreed date.

b. The reduction would be accomplished in three steps, each consisting of one year. One-third of the reduction to be made during Stage I would be carried out during each step.

c. During the first part of each step, one-third of the armaments to be eliminated during Stage I would be placed in depots under supervision of the International Disarmament Organization. During the second part of each step, the deposited armaments would be destroyed or, where appropriate, converted to peaceful uses. The number and location of such depots and arrangements respecting their establishment and operation would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

d. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in a Treaty annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing reduction and would provide assurance that retained armaments did not exceed agreed levels.

3. Limitation on Production of Armaments and on Related Activities

a. Production of all armaments listed in subparagraph b of paragraph 1 above would be limited to agreed allowances during Stage I and, by the beginning of Stage II, would be halted except for production within agreed limits of parts for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

b. The allowances would permit limited production in each of the categories of armaments listed in subparagraph b of paragraph 1 above. In all instances during the process of eliminating production of armaments:

(1) any armament produced within a category would be compensated for by an additional armament destroyed within that category to the extent that the ten percent reduction in numbers in each category is carried out. Each resulting thirty percent reduction in Stage I, would be achieved; and furthermore,

(2) in the case of armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 15,000 kilograms or greater and of missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater, the destructive capability of any such armaments produced within a category would be compensated for by the destruction of sufficient armaments within that category to the extent that the ten percent reduction in destructive capability as well as numbers in each of these categories in each step, and the resulting thirty percent reduction in Stage I, would be achieved.

c. Should a Party to the Treaty elect to reduce its production in any category at a more rapid rate than required by the allowances provided in subparagraph b above, that Party would be entitled to retain existing armaments to the extent of the unused portion of its production allowance. In any such instance, any armament so retained would be compensated for in the manner set forth in subparagraph b (1) and, where applicable, b (3) above to the extent that the ten percent reduction in numbers and, where applicable, destructive capability in each category in each step, and the resulting thirty percent reduction in Stage I, would be achieved.

d. The flight testing of missiles would be limited to agreed annual quotas.
a. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

4. Additional Measures

The Parties to the Treaty would agree to examine unresolved questions relating to means of accomplishing in Stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction. In light of this examination, the Parties to the Treaty would agree to arrangements concerning chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

B. ARMED FORCES

1. Reduction of Armed Forces

Force levels for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be reduced to 2.1 million each and for other specified Parties to the Treaty to agreed levels not exceeding 2.1 million each. All other Parties to the Treaty would, with agreed exceptions, reduce their force levels to 100,000 or one percent of their population, whichever were higher, provided that in no case would the force levels of such other Parties to the Treaty exceed levels in existence upon the entry into force of the Treaty.

2. Armed Forces Subject to Reduction

Agreed force levels would include all full-time, uniformed personnel maintained by national governments in the following categories:

a. Career personnel of active armed forces and other personnel serving in the active armed forces on fixed engagements or contracts.

b. Conscription performing their required period of full-time active duty as fixed by national law.

c. Personnel of militarily organized security forces and of other forces or organizations equipped and organized to perform a military mission.

3. Method of Reduction of Armed Forces

The reduction of force levels would be carried out in the following manner:

a. Those Parties to the Treaty which were subject to the foregoing reductions would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating their force levels at the agreed date.

b. Force level reductions would be accomplished in three steps, each having a duration of one year. During each step force levels would be reduced by one-third of the difference between force levels existing at the agreed date and the levels to be reached at the end of Stage I.

c. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the reduction of force levels and provide assurance that retained forces did not exceed agreed levels.

4. Additional Measures

The Parties to the Treaty which were subject to the foregoing reductions would agree upon appropriate arrangements, including procedures for consultation, in order to ensure that civilian employment by military establishments would be in accordance with the objectives of the obligations respecting force levels.

C. NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. Production of Fissionable Materials for Nuclear Weapons

a. The Parties to the Treaty would halt the production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons.

b. This measure would be carried out in the following manner:

(1) The Parties to the Treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration listing by name, location and production capacity every facility under their jurisdiction capable of producing and processing fissionable materials at the agreed date.

(2) Production of fissionable materials for purposes other than use in nuclear weapons would be limited to agreed levels. The Parties to the Treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization periodic declarations stating the amounts and types of fissionable materials which were still being produced at each facility.

(3) In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared facilities and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared facilities.

2. Transfer of Fissionable Material to Purposes Other Than Use in Nuclear Weapons

a. Upon the cessation of production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would each transfer to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons an agreed quantity of weapons-grade U-235...
from past production. The purposes for which such materials would be used would be determined by the state to which the material belonged, provided that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

b. To ensure that the transferred materials were not used in nuclear weapons, such materials would be placed under safeguards and inspection by the International Disarmament Organization either in stockpiles or at the facilities in which they would be utilized for purposes other than use in nuclear weapons. Arrangements for such safeguards and inspection would be set forth in the annex on verification.

3. Transfer of Fissionable Materials Between States for Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

a. Any transfer of fissionable materials between states would be for purposes other than for use in nuclear weapons and would be subject to a system of safeguards to ensure that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

b. The system of safeguards to be applied for this purpose would be developed in agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency and would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

4. Non-Transfer of Nuclear Weapons

The Parties to the Treaty would agree to seek to prevent the creation of further national nuclear forces. To this end the Parties would agree that:

a. Any Party to the Treaty which had manufactured, or which at any time manufactures, a nuclear weapon would:

(1) Not transfer control over any nuclear weapons to a state which had not manufactured a nuclear weapon before an agreed date;

(2) Not assist any such state in manufacturing any nuclear weapons.

b. Any Party to the Treaty which had not manufactured a nuclear weapon before the agreed date would:

(1) Not acquire, or attempt to acquire, control over any nuclear weapons;

(2) Not manufacture, or attempt to manufacture, any nuclear weapons.

5. Nuclear Weapons Test Explosions

a. If an agreement prohibiting nuclear weapons test explosions and providing for effective international control had come into force prior to the entry into force of the Treaty, such agreement would become an annex to the Treaty, and all the Parties to the Treaty would be bound by the obligations specified in the agreement.

b. If, however, no such agreement had come into force prior to the entry into force of the Treaty, all nuclear weapons test explosions would be prohibited, and the procedures for effective international control would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

6. Additional Measures

The Parties to the Treaty would agree to examine remaining unresolved questions relating to the means of accomplishing in Stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles. In the light of this examination, the Parties to the Treaty would agree to arrangements concerning nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. OUTER SPACE

1. Prohibition of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Orbit

The Parties to the Treaty would agree not to place in orbit weapons capable of producing mass destruction.

2. Peaceful Cooperation in Space

The Parties to the Treaty would agree to support increased international cooperation in peaceful uses of outer space in the United Nations or through other appropriate arrangements.

3. Notification and Pre-Launch Inspection

With respect to the launching of space vehicles and missiles:

a. Those Parties to the Treaty which conducted launches of space vehicles or missiles would provide advance notification of such launches to other Parties to the Treaty and to the International Disarmament Organization together with the track of the space vehicle or missile. Such advance notification would be provided on a timely basis to permit pre-launch inspection of the space vehicle or missile to be launched.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would conduct pre-launch inspection of space vehicles and missiles and would establish and operate any arrangements necessary for detecting unreported launches.

4. Limitations on Production and on Related Activities

The production, stockpiling and testing of boosters for space vehicles would be subject to agreed limitations. Such activities would be monitored by the International Disarmament Organization.
in accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

E. MILITARY EXPENDITURES

1. Report on Expenditures
   The Parties to the Treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization at the end of each step of each stage a report on their military expenditures. Such reports would include an itemization of military expenditures.

2. Verifiable Reduction of Expenditures
   The Parties to the Treaty would agree to examine questions related to the verifiable reduction of military expenditures. In the light of this examination, the Parties to the Treaty would consider appropriate arrangements respecting military expenditures.

F. REDUCTION OF THE RISK OF WAR

In order to promote confidence and reduce the risk of war, the Parties to the Treaty would agree to the following measures:

1. Advance Notification of Military Movements and Maneuvers
   Specified Parties to the Treaty would give advance notification of major military movements and maneuvers to other Parties to the Treaty and to the International Disarmament Organization. Specific arrangements relating to this commitment, including the scale of movements and maneuvers to be reported and the information to be transmitted, would be agreed.

2. Observation Posts
   Specified Parties to the Treaty would permit observation posts to be established at agreed locations, including major ports, railway centers, motor highways, river crossings, and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces. The number of such posts could be progressively expanded in each successive step of Stage I. Specific arrangements relating to such observation posts, including the location and staffing of posts, the method of receiving and reporting information, and the schedule for installation of posts would be agreed.

3. Additional Observation Arrangements
   The Parties to the Treaty would establish such additional observation arrangements as might be agreed. Such arrangements could be extended in an agreed manner during each step of Stage I.

4. Exchange of Military Missions
   Specified Parties to the Treaty would undertake the exchange of military missions between states or groups of states in order to improve communications and understanding between them. Specific arrangements respecting such exchanges would be agreed.

5. Communications Between Heads of Government
   Specified Parties to the Treaty would agree to the establishment of rapid and reliable communications among their heads of government and with the Secretary General of the United Nations. Specific arrangements in this regard would be subject to agreement among the Parties concerned and between such Parties and the Secretary General.

6. International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War
   The Parties to the Treaty would establish an International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War as a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization to examine and make recommendations regarding further measures that might be undertaken during Stage I or subsequent stages of disarmament to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, failure of communications, or surprise attack. Specific arrangements for such measures as might be agreed to by all or some of the Parties to the Treaty would be subject to agreement among the Parties concerned.

G. THE INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT ORGANIZATION

1. Establishment of the International Disarmament Organization
   The International Disarmament Organization would be established upon the entry into force of the Treaty and would function within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Treaty.

2. Cooperation of the Parties to the Treaty
   The Parties to the Treaty would agree to cooperate promptly and fully with the International Disarmament Organization and to assist the International Disarmament Organization in the performance of its functions and in the execution of the decisions made by it in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty.

3. Verification Functions of the International Disarmament Organization
   The International Disarmament Organization would verify disarmament measures in accordance with the following principles which
would be implemented through specific arrangements set forth in the annex on verification:

a. Measures providing for reduction of armaments would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization at agreed depots and would include verification of the destruction of armaments and, where appropriate, verification of the conversion of armaments to peaceful uses. Measures providing for reduction of armed forces would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization either at the agreed depots or other agreed locations.

b. Measures halting or limiting production, testing, and other specified activities would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization. Parties to the Treaty would declare the nature and location of all production and testing facilities and other specified activities. The International Disarmament Organization would have access to relevant facilities and activities wherever located in the territory of such Parties.

c. Assurance that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded and that activities limited or prohibited by the Treaty were not being conducted clandestinely would be provided by the International Disarmament Organization through agreed arrangements which would have the effect of providing that the extent of inspection during any step or stage would be related to the amount of disarmament being undertaken and to the degree of risk to the Parties to the Treaty of possible violations. This might be accomplished, for example, by an arrangement embodying such features as the following:

(1) All parts of the territory of those Parties to the Treaty to which this form of verification was applicable would be subject to selection for inspection from the beginning of Stage I as provided below.

(2) Parties to the Treaty would divide their territory into an agreed number of appropriate zones and at the beginning of each step of disarmament would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating the total level of armaments, forces, and specified types of activities subject to verification within each zone. The exact location of armaments and forces within a zone would not be revealed prior to its selection for inspection.

(3) An agreed number of zones would be progressively inspected by the International Disarmament Organization during Stage I according to an agreed time schedule. The zones to be inspected would be selected by procedures which would ensure their selection by Parties to the Treaty other than the Party whose territory was to be inspected or any Party associated with it. Upon selection of each zone, the Party to the Treaty whose territory was to be inspected would declare the exact location of armaments, forces and other agreed activities within the selected zone. During the verification process, arrangements would be made to provide assurance against underreported movements of the objects of verification to or from the zone or zones being inspected. Both aerial and mobile ground inspection would be employed within the zone being inspected. In so far as agreed measures being verified were concerned, access within the zone would be free and unimpeded, and verification would be carried out with the full cooperation of the state being inspected.

(4) Once a zone had been inspected it would remain open for further inspection while verification was being extended to additional zones.

(5) By the end of Stage III, when all disarmament measures had been completed, inspection would have been extended to all parts of the territory of Parties to the Treaty.

4. Composition of the International Disarmament Organization

a. The International Disarmament Organization would have:

(1) A General Conference of all the Parties to the Treaty;
(2) A Control Council consisting of representatives of all the major signatory powers as permanent members and certain other Parties to the Treaty on a rotating basis; and
(3) An Administrator who would administer the International Disarmament Organization under the direction of the Control Council and who would have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to ensure effective and impartial implementation of the functions of the International Disarmament Organization.

b. The General Conference and the Control Council would have power to establish such subsidiary bodies, including expert study groups, as either of them might deem necessary.

5. Functions of the General Conference

The General Conference would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

a. Electing non-permanent members to the Control Council;
b. Approving certain accessions to the Treaty;
c. Appointing the Administrator upon recommendation of the Control Council;
d. Approving agreements between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations and other international organizations;
e. Approving the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;
f. Requesting and receiving reports from the Control Council and deciding upon matters referred to it by the Control Council;
g. Approving reports to be submitted to bodies of the United Nations;

h. Proposing matters for consideration by the Control Council;
i. Requesting the International Court of Justice to give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation or application of the Treaty, subject to a general authorization of this power by the General Assembly of the United Nations;
j. Approving amendments to the Treaty for possible ratification by the Parties to the Treaty;
k. Considering matters of mutual interest pertaining to the Treaty or disarmament in general.

6. Functions of the Control Council

The Control Council would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

a. Recommending appointment of the Administrator;
b. Adopting rules for implementing the terms of the Treaty;
c. Establishing procedures and standards for the installation and operation of the verification arrangements, and maintaining supervision over such arrangements and the Administrator;
d. Establishing procedures for making available to the Parties to the Treaty data produced by verification arrangements;
e. Considering reports of the Administrator on the progress of disarmament measures and of their verification, and on the installation and operation of the verification arrangements;
f. Recommending to the Conference approval of the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;
g. Requesting the International Court of Justice to give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation or application of the Treaty, subject to a general authorization of this power by the General Assembly of the United Nations;
h. Recommending to the Conference approval of certain accessions to the Treaty;
i. Considering matters of mutual interest pertaining to the Treaty or to disarmament in general.

7. Functions of the Administrator

The Administrator would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

a. Administering the installation and operation of the verification arrangements, and serving as Chief Executive Officer of the International Disarmament Organization;
b. Making available to the Parties to the Treaty data produced by the verification arrangements;
c. Preparing the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;
d. Making reports to the Control Council on the progress of disarmament measures and of their verification, and on the installation and operation of the verification arrangements.

8. Privileges and Immunities
The privileges and immunities which the Parties to the Treaty would grant to the International Disarmament Organization and its staff and to the representatives of the Parties to the International Disarmament Organization, and the legal capacity which the International Disarmament Organization should enjoy in the territory of each of the Parties to the Treaty would be specified in an annex to the Treaty.

9. Relations with the United Nations and Other International Organizations
a. The International Disarmament Organization, being established within the framework of the United Nations, would conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It would maintain close working arrangements with the United Nations, and the Administrator of the International Disarmament Organization would consult with the Secretary General of the United Nations on matters of mutual interest.
b. The Control Council of the International Disarmament Organization would transmit to the United Nations annual and other reports on the activities of the International Disarmament Organization.
c. Principal organs of the United Nations could make recommendations to the International Disarmament Organization, which would consider them and report to the United Nations on action taken.

NOTE: The above outline does not cover all the possible details or aspects of relationships between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations.

H. MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN ARRANGEMENTS FOR KEEPING THE PEACE

1. Obligations Concerning the Threat or Use of Force
The Parties to the Treaty would undertake obligations to refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force of any type—including nuclear, conventional, chemical or biological means of warfare—contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

2. Rules of International Conduct
a. The Parties to the Treaty would agree to support a study by a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization of the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament.
b. The Parties to the Treaty would refrain from indirect aggression and subversion. The subsidiary body provided for in subparagraph a would also study methods of assuring states against indirect aggression or subversion.

3. Peaceful Settlement of Disputes
a. The Parties to the Treaty would utilize all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of all disputes which might arise between them and any other state, whether or not a Party to the Treaty, including negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, submission to the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, or other peaceful means of their choice.
b. The Parties to the Treaty would agree that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Treaty which were not settled by negotiation or by the International Disarmament Organization would be subject to referral by any party to the dispute to the International Court of Justice, unless the parties concerned agreed on another mode of settlement.
c. The Parties to the Treaty would agree to support a study under the General Assembly of the United Nations of measures which should be undertaken to make existing arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature, more effective; and to institute new procedures and arrangements where needed.

4. Maintenance of International Peace and Security
The Parties to the Treaty would agree to support measures strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to improve its capability to maintain international peace and security.

5. United Nations Peace Force
The Parties to the Treaty would undertake to develop arrangements during Stage I for the establishment in Stage II of a United Nations Peace Force. To this end, the Parties to the Treaty would agree on the following measures within the United Nations:
a. Examination of the experience of the United Nations leading to a further strengthening of United Nations forces for keeping the peace;
1. Examination of the feasibility of concluding promptly the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the United Nations Charter;

2. Conclusion of an agreement for the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force in Stage II, including definitions of its purpose, mission, composition and strength, disposition, command and control, training, logistical support, financing, equipment and armaments.

United Nations Peace Observation Corps

The Parties to the Treaty would agree to support the establishment within the United Nations of a Peace Observation Corps, staffed with a standing cadre of observers who could be despatched promptly to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or a breach of the peace. Elements of the Peace Observation Corps could also be stationed as appropriate in selected areas throughout the world.

I. TRANSITION

1. Transition from Stage I to Stage II would take place at the end of Stage I, upon a determination that the following circumstances existed:

a. All undertakings to be carried out in Stage I had been carried out.

b. All preparations required for Stage II had been made; and

c. All militarily significant states had become Parties to the Treaty.

2. During the last three months of Stage I, the Control Council would review the situation respecting these circumstances with a view to determining whether these circumstances existed at the end of Stage I.

3. If, at the end of Stage I, one or more permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances did not exist, the agreed period of Stage I would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended by a period or periods totaling no more than three months for the purpose of bringing about the foregoing circumstances.

4. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances still did not exist, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council; transition to Stage II would take place upon a determination by the Security Council that the foregoing circumstances did in fact exist.

Stage II

Stage II would begin upon the transition from Stage I and would be completed within three years from that date.

During Stage II, the Parties to the Treaty would undertake:

1. To continue all obligations undertaken during Stage I;

2. To reduce further the armaments and armed forces reduced during Stage I and to carry out additional measures of disarmament in the manner outlined below;

3. To ensure that the International Disarmament Organisation would have the capacity to verify in the agreed manner the obligations undertaken during Stage I; and

4. To strengthen further the arrangements for keeping the peace through the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force and through the additional measures outlined below.

A. ARMAMENTS

1. Reduction of Armaments

a. Those Parties to the Treaty which had during Stage I reduced their armaments in agreed categories by thirty percent would during Stage II further reduce each type of armaments in the categories listed in Section A, subparagraph 1.b of Stage I by fifty percent of the inventory existing at the end of Stage I.

b. Those Parties to the Treaty which had not been subject to measures for the reduction of armaments during Stage I would submit to the International Disarmament Organisation an appropriate declaration respecting the inventories by types, within the categories listed in Stage I, of their armaments existing at the beginning of Stage II. Such Parties to the Treaty would during Stage II reduce the inventory of each type of such armaments by sixty-five percent in order that such Parties would accomplish the same total percentage of reduction by the end of Stage II as would be accomplished by those Parties to the Treaty which had reduced their armaments by thirty percent in Stage I.

2. Additional Armaments Subject to Reduction

a. The Parties to the Treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organisation a declaration respecting their inventories existing at the beginning of Stage II of the additional types of armaments in the categories listed in subparagraph b below, and would during Stage II reduce the inventory of each type of such armaments by fifty percent.

b. All types of armaments within further agreed categories would be subject to reduction in Stage II (the following list of categories is illustrative):

1. Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of up to 2,500 kilograms (declarations by types).
(2) Specified types of unarmed military aircraft (declarations by types).

(3) Missiles and free rockets having a range of less than 10 kilometers (declarations by types).

(4) Mortar and rocket launchers having a caliber of less than 100 mm. (declarations by types).

(5) Specified types of unarmored personnel carriers and transport vehicles (declarations by types).

(6) Combatant ships with standard displacement of 400 tons or greater which had not been included among the armaments listed in Stage I, and combatant ships with standard displacement of less than 400 tons (declarations by types).

(7) Specified types of non-combatant naval vessels (declarations by types).

(8) Specified types of small arms (declarations by types).

c. Specified categories of ammunition for armaments listed in Stage I, Section A, subparagraph 1.b and in subparagraph b above would be reduced to levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of Stage II.

3. Method of Reduction

The foregoing measures would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner corresponding to that provided for in Stage I, Section A, paragraph 2.

4. Limitation on Production of Armaments and on Related Activities

a. The Parties to the Treaty would halt the production of armaments in the specified categories except for production, within agreed limits, of parts required for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

b. The production of ammunition in specified categories would be reduced to agreed levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of Stage II.

c. The Parties to the Treaty would halt development and testing of new types of armaments. The flight testing of existing types of missiles would be limited to agreed annual quotas.

d. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

5. Additional Measures

a. In the light of their examination during Stage I of the means of accomplishing the reduction and eventual elimination of production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, the Parties to the Treaty would undertake the following measures respecting such weapons:

(1) The cessation of all production and field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

(2) The reduction, by agreed categories, of stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction to levels fifty percent below those existing at the beginning of Stage II.

(3) The dismantling or conversion to peaceful uses of all facilities engaged in the production or field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

b. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

c. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that retained levels of chemical and biological weapons did not exceed agreed levels and that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared locations.

B. ARMED FORCES

1. Reduction of Armed Forces

a. Those Parties to the Treaty which had been subject to measures providing for reduction of force levels during Stage I would further reduce their force levels on the following basis:

(1) Force levels of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be reduced to levels fifty percent below the levels agreed for the end of Stage I.

(2) Force levels of other Parties to the Treaty which had been subject to measures providing for the reduction of force levels during Stage I would be further reduced, on the basis of an agreed percentage, below the levels agreed for the end of Stage I to levels which would not in any case exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of Stage II.

b. Those Parties to the Treaty which had not been subject to measures providing for the reduction of armed forces during Stage I would reduce their force levels to agreed levels consistent with those to be reached by other Parties which had reduced their force levels during Stage I and as well as Stage II. In no case would such agreed levels exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of Stage II.
c. Agreed levels of armed forces would include all personnel in the categories set forth in Section B, paragraph 2 of Stage I.

2. Method of Reduction

The further reduction of force levels would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner corresponding to that provided for in Section B, paragraph 3 of Stage I.

3. Additional Measures

Agreed limitations consistent with retained force levels would be placed on compulsory military training, and on refresher training for reserve forces of the Parties to the Treaty.

C. NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. Reduction of Nuclear Weapons

In the light of their examination during Stage I of the means of accomplishing the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles, the Parties to the Treaty would undertake to reduce in the following manner remaining nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons:

a. The Parties to the Treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating the amounts, types and nature of utilization of all their fissionable materials.

b. The Parties to the Treaty would reduce the amounts and types of fissionable materials declared for use in nuclear weapons to minimum levels on the basis of agreed percentages. The foregoing reduction would be accomplished through the transfer of such materials to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons. The purposes for which such materials would be used would be determined by the state to which the materials belonged, provided that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

c. The Parties to the Treaty would destroy the non-nuclear components and assemblies of nuclear weapons from which fissionable materials had been removed to effect the foregoing reduction of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons.

d. Production or refabrication of nuclear weapons from any remaining fissionable materials would be subject to agreed limitations.

2. Registration of Nuclear Weapons for Verification Purposes

To facilitate verification during Stage III that no nuclear weapons remained at the disposal of the Parties to the Treaty, those Parties to the Treaty which possessed nuclear weapons would, during the last six months of Stage II, register and serialize their remaining nuclear weapons and would register remaining fissionable materials for use in such weapons. Such registration and serialization would be carried out with the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with procedures which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

D. MILITARY BASES AND FACILITIES

1. Reduction of Military Bases and Facilities

The Parties to the Treaty would dismantle or convert to peaceful uses, agreed military bases and facilities, wherever they might be located.

2. Method of Reduction

a. The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measures and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures.

E. REDUCTION OF THE RISK OF WAR

In the light of the examination by the International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War during Stage I the Parties to the Treaty would undertake such additional arrangements as appeared desirable to promote confidence and reduce the risk of war. The Parties to the Treaty would also consider extending and improving the measures undertaken in Stage I for this purpose. The Commission would remain in existence to examine extensions, improvements or additional measures which might be undertaken during and after Stage II.
F. THE INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT ORGANIZATION

The International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened in the manner necessary to ensure its capacity to verify the measures undertaken in Stage II through an extension of the arrangements based upon the principles set forth in Section C, paragraph 3 of Stage I.

G. MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN ARRANGEMENTS FOR KEEPING THE PEACE

1. Peaceful Settlement of Disputes

a. In light of the study of peaceful settlement of disputes conducted during Stage I, the Parties to the Treaty would agree to such additional steps and arrangements as were necessary to assure the just and peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature.

b. The Parties to the Treaty would undertake to accept without reservation, pursuant to Article 38, paragraph 1 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the compulsory jurisdiction of that Court to decide international legal disputes.

2. Rules of International Conduct

a. The Parties to the Treaty would continue their support of the study by the subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization initiated in Stage I to study the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament. The Parties to the Treaty would agree to the establishment of procedures whereby rules recommended by the subsidiary body and approved by the Control Council would be circulated to all Parties to the Treaty and would become effective three months thereafter unless a majority of the Parties to the Treaty signified their disapproval, and whereby the Parties to the Treaty would be bound by rules which had become effective in this way unless, within a period of one year from the effective date, they formally notified the International Disarmament Organization that they did not consider themselves so bound. Using such procedures, the Parties to the Treaty would adopt such rules of international conduct related to disarmament as might be necessary to begin Stage III.

b. In the light of the study of indirect aggression and subversion conducted in Stage I, the Parties to the Treaty would agree to arrangements necessary to assure states against indirect aggression and subversion.

H. TRANSITION

1. Transition from Stage II to Stage III would take place at the end of Stage II, upon a determination that the following circumstances existed:

a. All undertakings to be carried out in Stage II had been carried out;

b. All preparations required for Stage III had been made; and

c. All states possessing armed forces and arms had become Parties to the Treaty.

2. During the last three months of Stage II, the Control Council would review the situation respecting these circumstances with a view to determining at the end of Stage II whether they existed.

3. If, at the end of Stage II, one or more permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances did not exist, the agreed period of Stage II would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended by a period or periods totaling no more than three months for the purpose of bringing about the foregoing circumstances.

4. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances still did not exist, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council; transition to Stage III would take place upon a determination by the Security Council that the foregoing circumstances did in fact exist.
Stage III

Stage III would begin upon the transition from Stage II and would be completed within an agreed period of time as promptly as possible.

During Stage III, the Parties to the Treaty would undertake:
1. To continue all obligations undertaken during Stages I and II;
2. To complete the process of general and complete disarmament in the manner outlined below;
3. To ensure that the International Disarmament Organisation would have the capacity to verify in the agreed manner the obligations undertaken during Stage III and of continuing verification subsequent to the completion of Stage III; and
4. To strengthen further the arrangements for keeping the peace during and following the achievement of general and complete disarmament through the additional measures outlined below.

A. ARMAMENTS

1. Reduction of Armaments

Subject to agreed requirements for non-nuclear armaments of agreed types for national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens, the Parties to the Treaty would eliminate all armaments remaining at their disposal at the end of Stage II.

2. Method of Reduction

a. The foregoing measure would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements that would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.
b. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organisation would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that retained armaments were of the agreed types and did not exceed agreed levels.

3. Limitations on Production of Armaments and on Related Activities

a. Subject to agreed arrangements in support of national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens and subject to agreed arrangements in support of the United Nations Peace Forces, the Parties to the Treaty would halt all applied research, development, production, and testing of armaments and would cause to be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses all facilities for such purposes.

b. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

c. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organisation would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undisclosed locations.

B. ARMED FORCES

1. Reduction of Armed Forces

To the end that upon completion of Stage III they would have at their disposal only those forces and organizational arrangements necessary for agreed forces to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens and that they would be capable of providing agreed manpower for the United Nations Peace Force, the Parties to the Treaty would complete the reduction of their force levels, disband systems of reserve forces, cause to be disbanded organizational arrangements comprising and supporting their national military establishments, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing.

2. Method of Reduction

a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.
b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organisation would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that the only forces and organizational arrangements retained or subsequently established were those necessary for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and to protect the personal security of citizens and those for providing agreed manpower for the United Nations Peace Force.

3. Other Limitations

The Parties to the Treaty would halt all military conscription and would undertake to annul legislation concerning national military establishments or military service inconsistent with the foregoing measures.
C. NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. Reduction of Nuclear Weapons

In light of the steps taken in Stages I and II to halt the production of fissionable material for use in nuclear weapons and to reduce nuclear weapons stockpiles, the Parties to the Treaty would eliminate all nuclear weapons remaining at their disposal, would cause to be dismantled or converted to peaceful use all facilities for production of such weapons, and would transfer all materials remaining at their disposal for use in such weapons to purposes other than use in such weapons.

2. Method of Reduction

a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that no nuclear weapons or materials for use in such weapons remained at the disposal of the Parties to the Treaty and that no such weapons or materials were produced at undeclared facilities.

D. MILITARY BASES AND FACILITIES

1. Reduction of Military Bases and Facilities

The Parties to the Treaty would dismantle or convert to peaceful uses the military bases and facilities remaining at their disposal, wherever they might be located, in an agreed sequence except for such agreed bases or facilities within the territory of the Parties to the Treaty for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

2. Method of Reduction

a. The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measure and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses during Stage III would be set forth in an annex to the Treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measure at declared locations and provide assurance that there were no undeclared military bases and facilities.

E. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE

1. Reporting Requirement

The Parties to the Treaty would undertake the following measures respecting research and development of military significance subsequent to Stage III:

a. The Parties to the Treaty would report to the International Disarmament Organization any basic scientific discovery and any technological invention having potential military significance.

b. The Control Council would establish such expert study groups as might be required to examine the potential military significance of such discoveries and inventions and, if necessary, to recommend appropriate measures for their control. In the light of such expert study, the Parties to the Treaty would, where necessary, establish agreed arrangements for verification by the International Disarmament Organization that such discoveries and inventions were not utilized for military purposes. Such arrangements would become an annex to the Treaty.

c. The Parties to the Treaty would agree to appropriate arrangements for protection of the ownership rights of all discoveries and inventions reported to the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with subparagraph a above.

2. International Cooperation

The Parties to the Treaty would agree to support full international cooperation in all fields of scientific research and development, and to engage in free exchange of scientific and technical information and free interchange of views among scientific and technical personnel.

F. REDUCTION OF THE RISK OF WAR

1. Improved Measures

In the light of the Stage II examination by the International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War, the Parties to the Treaty would undertake such extensions and improvements of existing arrangements and such additional arrangements as appeared desirable to promote confidence and reduce the risk of war. The Commission would remain in existence to examine extensions, improvements or additional measures which might be taken during and after Stage III.

2. Application of Measures to Containing Forces

The Parties to the Treaty would apply to national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens...
the applicable measures concerning the reduction of the risk of war that had been applied to national armed forces in Stages I and II.

G. INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT ORGANIZATION

The International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened in the manner necessary to ensure its capacity (1) to verify the measures undertaken in Stage III through an extension of arrangements based upon the principles set forth in Section G, paragraph 3 of Stage I so that by the end of Stage III, when all disarmament measures had been completed, inspection would have been extended to all parts of the territory of Parties to the Treaty; and (2) to provide continuing verification of disarmament after the completion of Stage III.

H. MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN ARRANGEMENTS FOR KEEPING THE PEACE

1. Peaceful Change and Settlement of Disputes

The Parties to the Treaty would undertake such additional steps and arrangements as were necessary to provide a basis for peaceful change in a disarmed world and to continue the just and peaceful settlement of all international disputes, whether legal or political in nature.

2. Rules of International Conduct

The Parties to the Treaty would continue the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament in the manner provided in Stage II and by any other agreed procedure.

3. United Nations Peace Force

The Parties to the Treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force established in Stage II until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it.

1. COMPLETION OF STAGE III

1. At the end of the time period agreed for Stage III, the Control Council would review the situation with a view to determining whether all undertakings to be carried out in Stage III had been carried out.

2. In the event that one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that such undertakings had not been carried out,
the agreed period of Stage III would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended for a period or periods not exceeding three months for the purpose of completing any uncompleted undertakings. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that such undertakings still had not been carried out, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council, which would determine whether Stage III had been completed.

2. After the completion of Stage III, the obligations undertaken in Stages I, II and III would continue.

General Provisions Applicable to All Stages

1. Subsequent Modifications or Amendments of the Treaty

The Parties to the Treaty would agree to specific procedures for considering amendments or modifications of the Treaty which were believed desirable by any Party to the Treaty in the light of experience in the early period of implementation of the Treaty. Such procedures would include provision for a conference on revision of the Treaty after a specified period of time.

2. Interim Agreement

The Parties to the Treaty would undertake such specific arrangements, including the establishment of a Preparatory Commission, as were necessary between the signing and entry into force of the Treaty to ensure the initiation of Stage I immediately upon the entry into force of the Treaty, and to provide an interim forum for the exchange of views and information on topics relating to the Treaty and to the achievement of a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

3. Parties to the Treaty, Ratification, Accession, and Entry into Force of the Treaty

a. The Treaty would be open to signature and ratification, or accession, by all members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies.

b. Any other state which desired to become a Party to the Treaty could accede to the Treaty with the approval of the Conference on recommendation of the Control Council.

c. The Treaty would come into force when it had been ratified by states, including the United States of America, the Union
of Soviet Socialist Republics, and an agreed number of the following states:

d. In order to assure the achievement of the fundamental purpose of a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the Treaty would specify that the accession of certain militarily significant states would be essential for the continued effectiveness of the Treaty or for the coming into force of particular measures or stages.

c. The Parties to the Treaty would undertake to exert every effort to induce other states or authorities to accede to the Treaty.

d. The Treaty would be subject to ratification or acceptance in accordance with constitutional processes.

e. A Depository Government would be agreed upon which would have all of the duties normally incumbent upon a Depository. Alternatively, the United Nations would be the Depository.

4. Finance

a. In order to meet the financial obligations of the International Disarmament Organisation, the Parties to the Treaty would bear the International Disarmament Organisation's expenses as provided in the budget approved by the General Conference and in accordance with a scale of apportionment approved by the General Conference.

b. The General Conference would exercise borrowing powers on behalf of the International Disarmament Organisation.

5. Authentic Texts

The text of the Treaty would consist of equally authentic versions in English, French, Russian, Chinese and Spanish.
Do you believe that we can retain our sovereignty without an armed force to sustain it?
Read this diagram across. It came from the "Second Annual Report to Congress". You are now in the last stage: Stage III. It gives proof that when you no longer have any national armed forces, you will be policed by military forces. Soldiers from many lands have already been trained to occupy this country.
New World Order

As you read the above diagram, across the span of the three helmets on a horizontal plane, notice that nations go through a reduction in all three stages until there are Z-E-N-O armed forces in the third stage while the Peacekeeping Machinery becomes increasingly strengthened for COMMAND under the Security Council of the COMMUNIST-CONTROLLED United Nations. It is planned that the United States shall be permanently WITHOUT AN ARMY, A NAVY AND AN AIR FORCE. The Internal Security Forces that are to be assigned the duty of keeping order MAY OR MAY NOT be U.S. citizens. Martial rule shall prevail throughout the United States. Long guns and collector's items MUST also be banned so that the Internal Security Forces CANNOT BE CHALLENGED BY THE CITIZENS. Consult your local librarian or your U.S. Congressman for a copy of these important documents which show how the United States' military might is to be TRANSFERRED to INTERNATIONAL CONTROL.

Tell your congressman that THIS IS AGAINST THE LAW. Tell him to repeal Public Law 87-297 and all the Amendments to that law.
THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

U.S. THREE-STAGE DISARMAMENT PLAN

STAGE I
US

STAGE II
US
USSR

STAGE III
INTERNAL SECURITY FORCES
INTERNAL SECURITY FORCES

PEACEKEEPING MACHINERY
UN

(a) Disbanding of armed forces, dismantling of military establishments, including bases, cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful use.

Armed forces would be cut to a level of 2,100,000 men each for the Soviet Union and United States in the first stage, to 1,050,000 in the second stage, and to zero, except for small internal security and U.N. Peace Force contingents, in the third. Similar reductions in all of the foregoing categories would also have to be applied to other militarily significant powers in the second stage and to all states in the third stage.
FREEDOM FROM WAR
THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

- The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.
- The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force.

ZERO MILITARY
Armed forces would be cut to a level of 2,100,000 men each for the Soviet Union and United States in the first stage, to 1,050,000 in the second stage, and to zero, except for small internal security and U.N. Peace Force contingents, in the third. Similar reductions in all of the foregoing categories would also have to be applied to other militarily significant powers in the second stage and to all states in the third stages.

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Visit or call your state representatives and protest the state's co-operation in these acts to overthrow our republic and the Constitution of the United States. A military defense is an essential to the American Union and the preservation of our Constitutional Compact and the Bill of Rights. The federal government cannot proceed without the help of the states.

Public Law 87-297

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—
(a) the terms "arms control" and "disarmament" mean the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination, of armed forces and armaments of all kinds under international agreement including the necessary steps taken under such an agreement to establish an effective system of international control, or to create and strengthen international organizations for the maintenance of peace.
This is an update to the parent document, Public Law 87-297.

The appropriations to keep financing the "general and complete disarmament program" are allocated every two years.

Here is the one done in December of 1989.

It was only 3 -1/2 pages in all!

How could the Congress miss the section that is highlighted?

The voting record is on the next page.
George H. Bush signed this law in 1989 which is an Amendment to the General and Complete Disarmament Law (P.L. 89-297). Look on back to see who voted in favor of it!

"(2) as defined in this Act, the terms 'arms control' and 'disarmament' mean 'the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination, of armed forces and armaments of all kinds under international agreement to establish an effective system of international control';"
A vote for Public Law 101-216 is a vote to support its parent document, Public Law 87-297. This is a clear-cut violation of the oath of office. Elimination of the nation's common defense destroys the sovereignty of the nation and obsoletes its Constitution!

Republicans and Democrats! Is there a dime's worth of difference? Public Law 101-216 was only a 3 page bill! It was no big job to find the definition of disarmament which was plainly in view, yet Congress voted to continue financing the giving away of our armed forces to the United Nations.

Look closely at the names of the congressmen who voted to support Public Law 101-216. It passed the Senate by voice vote.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE
Public Law 101-216
October 12, 1989

[Table of votes]

George H. W. Bush! You signed this into law! As president neither you nor the Congress were vested with the power to deprive this nation of its military.

The Clerk announced the following vote:
On this vote:
Mr. Murphy led, with Mr. Quie against. Messrs. KYL, BATEMAN, ASH, and KOLBE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Look over this list to see who voted to eliminate the right to have armed forces to protect us, and to transfer them to the communists who dominate the United Nations. Many of the members of this House of Representatives are still in office posing as "conservatives". Perhaps, you can visualize what can happen when you are left completely unprotected.
Public Law 87-297 was signed into "law" for the United States by Pres. John F. Kennedy.

Public Law 101-216 was signed into "law" for the United States by Pres. George Bush.

This is the speech that was delivered→ before the United Nations by John F. Kennedy on September 25, 1961. Check back on Public Law 87-297 and note that the very next day after Kennedy's speech, the Congress signed it into law!
Vital Speeches of the Day
REG. U.S. PAT. OFF.
OCTOBER 13, 1961
Reprint: VOL. XXVIII
VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

Future Of The United Nations Organization
PROPOSALS FOR NEW DISARMAMENT PROGRAM
By JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States

WE MEET in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjöld is dead. But the United Nations lives. His tragedy is deep in our hearts, but the tasks for which he died are at the top of our agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone, but the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man—the problem is the life of this Organization. It will either grow to meet the challenges of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die—to enfeebles its vigor—to cripple its powers—we would condemn our future.

For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war—and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great Powers alone. For a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war—or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjöld did not live—or die—in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations. For disarmament without checks is but a shadow—and a community without law is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided—in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa this year in the Congo—a means of holding men's liberties within bounds.

or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—one million times more powerful than any that the world has ever seen, and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror and disorder and disquiet. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must avert the settlement of all disputes—for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness—for in a spiralling arms race, a nation's security may be shrinking even as its arms increase.

For fifteen years this Organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream—it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.

It is in this spirit that the recent Belgrade Conference—recognizing that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem, but a human problem—endorsed a program of "general, complete, and wholly internationally controlled disarmament." It is in this same spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency and with a new, now statutory agency fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation. And it is in this spirit that we have presented, with the agreement of the Soviet Union—under the label which both nations now accept of "general and complete disarmament"—a statement of newly agreed principles for negotiation.

But we are well aware that all issues of principle are not settled—and that principles alone are not enough. It is therefore our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race, to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved. We invite them now to go beyond agreement in principle to reach agreement on actual plans.

The program to be presented to this Assembly—for general and complete disarmament under effective and international control—moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machinery of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no State a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs—not with the big Powers alone, nor with one's adversary or one's self, but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament—true inspection—and apply it in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the control of an international disarmament organization, a
But the great question which confronted this body in 1945 is still before us—whether man's cherished hopes for progress and peace are to be destroyed by terror and disruption?—whether the "foul winds of war" can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason—and whether the pledges of our Charter are to be fulfilled or defiled: pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights and world law.

In this hall there are not three forces, but two. One is composed of those who are trying to build the kind of world described in Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter. The other, seeking a different world, would undermine this Organization.

Today of all days our dedication to the Charter must be maintained. It must be strengthened, first of all, by the election of an outstanding civil servant to carry forward the responsibilities of the Secretary General—a man endowed with both the wisdom and the power to make meaningful the moral force of the world community. The late Secretary General, Fransisco A. Alkire, sharpened the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the Charter. It is still there in the Charter.

However difficult it may be to fill Mr. Hammarskjold's place, it can be better filled by one man rather than by three. Even the three horses of the troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They had only one—and so must the United Nations executive. To install a triumvirate, or any panel or a giving authority, in the United Nations administrative offices would replace order with anarchy, with paralysis, with confusion.

The Secretary General, in a very real sense, is the servant of this Assembly. Diminish his authority and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

Effective and independent executive action is not the same as administrative action. In view of the enormous change in the membership of this body since its founding, the United States delegation will join in any effort to get the prompt review and revision of the composition of United Nations bodies.

But to give this Organization three drivers—no, no such plan will be as a whole the cold war in the headquarters of peace. Whatever advantages such a plan may hold out to any country as one of the great Powers, we reject it. For we prefer world law, in the age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.

III.

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the thinnest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they destroy us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom

It had abolished all arms and all armament except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations peace force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament must no longer be a slogan used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan, and a test—a test of those only willing to talk and a test of those willing to act.

Such a plan would not be a world free from conflict and greed but it would bring a world free from the tensions of mass destruction. It would not usher in the era of superpower—but it would usher in an era in which no State could annihilate or be annihilated by another.

In 1945 this nation proposed the Baruch plan to internationalize the atom bomb and make it available to the use of all nations. We proposed that we and our allies, the disarming nations of 1945, would work in concert. And we proposed that those proposals today, while building our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent or insecure or intimidated, but because the rights of free men will prevail—because, while we are compelled against our will to resist, we look confidently beyond Berlin to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.

I therefore propose, on the basis of this plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly, and continue without interruption until an entire program for general and complete disarmament has been agreed upon and has been actually achieved.

IV.

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests of all kinds, in every environment, under worldwide controls. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed such a treaty that is both reasonable and effective and ready for signature. We are ready to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing, without inspection or controls, in order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fallout. We regret that that offer has not been accepted.

For fifteen years we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth rather than of war. But for fifteen years our demands have been met by obstruction, our patience by intransigence, and the plea of mankind for peace have met with disregard.

Finally, as the exploitation of others beclouded the skies, my country was left with no alternative but to act in its own interest and in the interests of the free world's security. We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenal. Nor can we endanger it by another long, unimportant ban on testing. For three years we accepted those risks in our open society while seeking agreement on inspection. But this year, while we were negotiating in good faith in Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction.
Our tens are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our scientists and scientists stand ready to help any nation measure and meet the hazards to health which inevitably result from the tens in the atmosphere.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the air, to halt the spiraling nuclear arms race, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement. Our new disarmament program thus includes the following proposals:

—First, signing the test-ban treaty, by all nations. This can be done now. Test-ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament.

—Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons, and preventing their transfer to any nation now lacking in nuclear weapons.

—Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not own them.

—Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from seeding new battlegrounds in outer space.

—Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons and converting their materials to peaceful uses; and

—Last, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and gradually destroying them as well.

V.

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy—creating world-wide law and law enforcement as we outlaw world-wide war and weapons. In the world we seek United Nations emergency forces which have been hastily assembled, unequipped, under-supplied and inadequately financed will never be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends that all Member nations earmark special peace-keeping units in their armed forces—to be on call to the United Nations, to be specially trained and quickly available, and with advance provision for financial and logistic support.

In addition, the United States Delegation will support a series of steps to improve the United Nations machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes—for on-the-spot fact-finding, mediation and adjudication—convention of the role of international law. For peace is not solely a matter of military or technical problems—it is primarily a matter of politics and people. And unless men can match his strides in weapons and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control—and, like the dinosaur, will vanish from the earth.

VI.

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we also extend it to man’s new domain: outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union. The new voyage of cosmic space—man must be given by the new forms—of exploration and astronomical claims. The subjugation of the poor by the rich. My nation was once a colony—and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whoever their continent, their clan or their color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the idea of self-determination has not yet reached the communist empire where a population far larger than that officially termed “dependent” lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free elections—under a system which knows only one party and one belief—which suppresses free speech, free elections, free newspapers, free books and free trade unions—and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free elections and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

IX.

Finally, as President of the United States, I consider it my duty to report to this Assembly on two threats to the peace which are not on your crowded agenda, but which cause us, and most of you, the deepest concern.

The first threat on which I wish to report is widely misunderstood: the mounting costs of war in South East Asia. South Vietnam is already under attack—sometimes by a single attack, sometimes by a band of guerrillas, recently by full battleships. The peaceful borders of Burma, Cambodia and Laos have been repeatedly violated. And the peaceful people of Laos are in danger of losing the independence they gained not so long ago.

No one can call these “wars of liberation.” For these are free countries living under their own governments. Nor are these aggressions any less real because men are killed in their homes and not shot in the fields of battle.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be devised to protect the small and the weak from such tactics. If they are successful in Laos and South Viet-Nam, the gates will be opened wide.

The United States seeks for itself no base, no sanctuary, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living in peace with themselves and with their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, and under a Government comparable as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna—to Cambodia and Burma.

But now the negotiations over Laos are reaching a crucial stage, the cease-fire is at hand, and the long, the rainy season affecting South Viet-Nam which would bring us to the end. Laos is entering the new United Nations South Viet-Nam. The world community must recognize—and all those who are involved—that this present threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all other threats to others own.
cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

To this end, we shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the universe, reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting the use of the moon for any purposes of war, and opening to all nations the benefits of space technologies.

We shall propose that a new international organization be formed to work for the peaceful uses of outer space and to prevent the militarization of space. This body should be a part of the United Nations system and be under the direct supervision of the Security Council. It should be equipped with the means to enforce its decisions, including the authority to place satellites in orbit for peaceful purposes and to prevent their use for military purposes.

VII.

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our fellowmen. Political sovereignty is but a mockery, without the means of meeting poverty, illness, and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.

That is why my nation—whose share in the capital and the national technology to help others help themselves—now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations Decade of Development. Under the framework of that resolution, the United Nations' existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and coordinated. Regional surveys and training programs can now pool the talents of many. New research, technical assistance and aid projects can unlock the wealth of less developed lands and uncapped waters. And development can become a co-operative, not a competitive, enterprise to enable all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become in fact as well as in law both free and equal nations.

VIII.

My country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a world-wide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into forty-two free and independent states. Less than 2 per cent of the world's population now lives in "dependent" territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. These problems will be solved, with patience, goodwill and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my country intends to be a participant, and not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing side of self-determination which runs so strong has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its nastiest form is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light—or and Berlin. This is not the time or the place for Immoderate tones, but the world community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If there is a crisis it is because an existing peace in the area is under threat because an existing island of free people is under pressure because colonial agreements are being treated with indifference. Established international rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

One recalls the order of the Czar in Pushkin's "Boris Godunov": "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be free of barriers… that not a single soul pass over the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow fly."

It is absurd to argue that we are threatening a war merely to prevent the Soviet Union and East Germany from signing a so-called treaty of peace. The Western allies are not concerned with any paper agreement but the Soviets see it as making a regime of their own creation, one territory occupied by their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can, however, affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin—and there is—it is because of threats against the vital interests and the deep commitments of the Western Powers, and the freedom of West Berlin. We cannot yield these interests. We cannot fail these commitments. We cannot surrender the freedom of these people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which carried with it provisions which destroyed the peace would be a fraud. A "free city" which was not genuinely free would suffocate freedom and would be an infamy.

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the security right, without economic, political or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And, as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary. The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are to be found in the Charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who make them. Established rights are to be respected. The political disposition of peoples should rest upon their own wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites and free elections. If there are legal problems, they can be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be resisted. If there is a desire for change, it must be a subject for negotiation. And if there is negotiation, it must be record in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations and their rights as the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation learned from bitter experience that either bandwagoning or yielding to threats can only lead to war. But firmness and reason can lead to
the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We are committed to no rigid formulas. We seek no perfect solution. We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however untrue that policy may seem to us. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and allied presence and access, while recognizing the historic and legitimate interests of others in ensuring European security.

The possibilities of negotiation are now being explored; it is too early to report what the prospects may be. For our part, we would be glad to report at the appropriate time that a solution has been found. For there is no need for a crisis over Berlin threatening the peace—and if those who created this crisis desire peace, there will be peace and freedom in Berlin.

X.

The events and decisions of the next ten months may well decide the fate of man for the next ten thousand years. There will be no avoiding these events. There will be no appeal from these decisions. And we in this hall shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming funeral pyre or as the generation that met its vow to 'save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.'

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort that this nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither consent nor provoke aggression, that we shall neither flee nor invoke the threat of force, that we shall never negotiate out of fear and we shall never fear to negotiate.

Terror is no new weapon. Throughout history it has been used by those who could not prevail either by persuasion or by example. But inevitably they failed—either because men are not afraid to die for a life worth living, or because the tyrants themselves came to realize that free men cannot be frightened by threats and that aggression would meet its own response. And it is in the light of that history that every nation should know, by its friend or foe, that the United States has both the will and the weapons to join free men in standing up to their responsibilities.

But I come here today to look across this world of threats to a world at peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph—for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems—for conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by cowardice, by flirt or even by the wishes of all.

But however close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere, if we can in every land and office look beyond our own selves and ambitions, then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure, and the peace preserved.

Ladies and gentlemen of this Assembly: The decision is ours. Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet—or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can—save it we must—and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peace-makers, the eternal blessing of God.
Public Law 87-297 includes the disarming of every law-abiding citizen in the United States!

This law is the reason for the gun grabbing that is going on in state legislatures.

How safe will you be when there are no armed forces and no guns possessed by law-abiding citizens?

It's worth thinking about, folks!
The yeas and nays were ordered, The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 54, no, voting 81, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the record of how the House of Representatives voted when the general and complete disarmament law was in front of them. 290 congressmen voted to do away with our armed forces and our citizens' guns. Only 54 were opposed. 91 did not vote. This would destroy our nation. This is treason!

This is a page from the Congressional Record for September 19, 1961 showing how the House voted on Public Law 87-297 to force Complete Disarmament of the United States and all of its citizens.
The following is taken from the Congressional Record showing how the House of Representatives and the Senate voted to eliminate our armed forces and bring us down to general and complete disarmament!

Note that the father of ex-president George Bush (Prescott Bush), who was a strong supporter of this law (Public Law 87-297), is listed as voting in favor of the idea! Note that Al Gore's father is also listed as being in favor of the same law!
AS EX-PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH SO PROUDLY PUTS HIS ARM AROUND HIS SON (TEXAS GOVERNOR GEORGE W. BUSH), YOU HAVE ALL THE EVIDENCE THAT YOU NEED TO PROVE THAT "LITTLE GEORGE" IS GOING TO FOLLOW IN HIS PAPPY'S AND HIS GRANDPAPPY'S FOOTSTEPS, AND WILL CONTINUE THE #7277 PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 87-297) TO COMPLETELY DISARM EVERY DECENT LAW-ABIDING AMERICAN CITIZEN.
Bush's grandfather was director of bank seized by government

Feds seized it in 1942 under the Trading with the Enemy Act

By JONATHAN D. SALANT
Associated Press Reporter

WASHINGTON — President Bush's grandfather was a director of a bank seized by the federal government because of its ties to a German industrialist who helped bankroll Adolf Hitler's rise to power, government documents show.

Prescott Bush was one of seven directors of Union Banking Corp., a New York investment bank owned by a bank controlled by the Thyssen family, according to recently declassified National Archives documents reviewed by The Associated Press.

Fritz Thyssen was an early financial supporter of Hitler, whose Nazi party Thyssen believed was preferable to communism. The documents do not show any evidence Bush directly aided that effort. His position with Union Banking never was a political issue for Bush, who was elected to the Senate from Connecticut in 1962.

Reports of Bush's involvement with the seized bank have been circulating on the Internet for years and have been reported by some mainstream media. The newly declassified documents provide additional details about the Union Banking-Thyssen connection.

Union Banking was owned by a Dutch bank, Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart N.V., which was "closely affiliated" with the German conglomerate United Steel Works, according to an Oct. 3, 1942, report from the federal Office of Alien Property Custodian. The Dutch bank and the steel firm were part of the business and financial empire of Thyssen and his brother, Heinrich Thyssen-Bornemisza, the report said.

The 4,000 Union Banking shares owned by the Dutch bank were registered in the names of the seven U.S. directors, according to a document signed by Homer Jones, chief of the division of investigation and research of the Office of Alien Property Custodian, a World War II-era agency that no longer exists.

E. Roland Harriman, the bank chairman and brother of former New York Gov. W. Averell Harriman, held 3,991 shares. Bush had one share.

Both Harrimans and Bush were partners in the New York investment firm of Brown Brothers, Harriman and Co., which handled the financial transactions of the bank as well as other financial dealings with several other companies linked to Bank voor Handel that were confiscated by the U.S. government during World War II.

Union Banking was seized by the government in October 1942 under the Trading with the Enemy Act.

No charges were brought against Union Banking's American directors.
Like father, like son, like grandson!
While the armed forces of America depart
to fight in foreign lands, little do they know
that the advancement of the
"New World Order" continues....

SEPTEMBER 14, 2001

...but is hidden behind 3 bushes:
Prescott Bush,
George H. Bush,
and
George W. Bush.
"...and securing the peace that will follow this war."  "...those who defend the peace and freedom."  "Our world will be more free and peaceful".

George W. Bush  March 25, 2003  Excerpts from his speech relating to the war with Iraq.
Question:
When Public Law 87-297 was before the Congress, did they realize that it called for the "elimination of all armed forces and armaments of all kinds" which includes taking away all guns from law-abiding people?

Answer:
Yes!! Mr. Quie laid it bare before their eyes, as you can see from the discourse below. P.L. 87-297 called for the United States to eliminate its armed forces. Mr. Quie wanted the Congress to delete the word "elimination" from the bill by voting "aye" on his amendment. He could not get sufficient support from the Congress, and the word was left in. This happened during the administration of John F. Kennedy, who at the time ordered the State Department to publish the policies of disarmament in a little blue book which is called Publication 7277. Read the following text from the Congressional Record.

This provision has never been rescinded.
YOU want to believe that what YOU just saw is AN OLD LAW, and not in use, but you are WRONG!

YOU enjoy thinking that it won’t happen in YOUR lifetime but YOU are WRONG! It will be finished in YOUR lifetime!

Public Law 87-297 is a very active law!

YOU have been revamped so that YOUR system is now in accord with military concepts.

Public Law 87-297 is called the “parent document” for “The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World”. Every two years money is appropriated by the Congress to keep it going. Public Law 87-297 is on-going and is in its last stages! Can you guess why the Congress and the president keeps this information away from the public?

Turn this page over and look at the list of additions that have been added to it.
Every two years the Congress appropriates funds to keep the Disarmament Program rolling. Usually these additions are assigned their own ‘public law’ number and they are classed as “an amendment” to Public Law 87-297.

Many additions have been added to Public Law 87-297 since it was signed in 1961 by President John Kennedy. Look over this grid that has been taken from a government source showing some of the amendments added to the initial Public Law 87-297. This grid covers the period from 1963 through 1983:

Sometimes the appropriations for Public Law 87-297 are tucked into a huge piece of legislation called “Appropriations Bills” and it takes an enormous amount of searching to locate the Disarmament funding; nevertheless, it continues on every two years. Public Law 87-297, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, has never been rescinded.
Here is more, giving evidence that Public Law 87-297 is an active law, and is funded every two years or earlier.

You may pull the sheets out that are behind here and check over these pages that come from the Internet.

Notice that they are updated to 1999.

When you read the additional amendments to Public Law 87-297 you would think you are reading "world law"! The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (A.C.D.A.) is so expanded and intermeshed with Human Rights Treaties (designated to replace our Bill of Rights). Notice how much money is allocated to the president to reduce our army to a stated size and then transfer it on a permanent basis under the control of the communists who operate the "Security Council of the United Nations".

Can we trust that the Russians and the Chinese will not hide military equipment while we completely disarm ourselves? Notice that Public Law 101-216, referred to on Page 2 in these Internet pages, is also in this binder. Disarming of the law-abiding citizens is also a part of Public Law 87-297. Keep in mind that "democracy" is actually a stand-in word for communism.

Section 2551 referred to in these pages lists the goal of the United States to be a world free of the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of possessing armaments. It is a general overview of complete disarmament of the United States and all of its citizens. In the Federal Depository Library you may find the parent document, Public Law 87-297 listed in The United States Code Books, under Title 22 -- Foreign Relations and Intercourse, beginning with Section 2551. Also see 2552, 2571, and 2573, etc.
Notes on Sec. 2551.

SOURCE
Pub. L. 87-297, title I, Sec. 102, formerly Sec. 2, Sept. 26, 1961, 75 Stat. 631
Pub. L. 94-141, title I, Sec. 144, Nov. 29, 1975, 89 Stat. 758
renumbered Sec. 102 and amended Pub. L. 105-277, div. G, subdiv. A, title XII, Sec. 1223(1), (21),

AMENDMENTS
1998 - Pub. L. 105-277, Sec. 1223(1)(A), in first undesignated par., substituted "addressing" for
"creating a new agency of peace to deal with".

Pub. L. 105-277, Sec. 1223(1)(B), struck out second undesignated par. which read as follows:
"Arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy, being an important aspect of foreign
policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and
implementation of United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy in a
manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization
charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field. This organization must have such a
position within the Government that it can provide the President, the Secretary of State, other
officials of the executive branch, and the Congress with recommendations concerning United
States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy, and can assess the effect of these
recommendations upon our foreign policies, our national security policies, and our economy."

Pub. L. 105-277, Sec. 1223(1)(C), in last undesignated par., in introductory provisions,
substituted "The Secretary of State for "This organization", substituted "The Secretary shall
have" for "It shall have", and struck out "and the Secretary of State after "the President", in
subpar. (1) inserted ", nonproliferation," after "arms control", redesignated subpar. (3) as (2) and
struck out former subpar. (2) which read as follows: "When directed by the President, the
preparation for, and management of, United States participation in international negotiations and
implementation for in the nonproliferation field.", redesignated subpar. (4) as (3) and struck out
", as appropriate," before "direction of", and redesignated subpar. (5) as (4). 1994 - Pub. L. 103-236,
Sec. 719(a), inserted ", nonproliferation," after "Arms control" in second undesignated par.
and after "arms control" wherever appearing in second and third undesignated pars.

Pub. L. 103-236, Sec. 703, substituted subpars. (1) to (5) for former subpars. (a) to (d) which
read as follows: "(a) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and
disarmament policy formulation; "(b) The preparation for and management of United States
participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field; "(c) The
dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament;
and "(d) The preparation for, operation of, or as appropriate, direction of United States
participation in such control systems as may become part of United States arms control and
disarmament activities." 1975 - Pub. L. 94-141 substituted "It shall have the authority, under the
direction of the President and the Secretary of State," for "It must be able"

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1998 AMENDMENT
Amendment by Pub. L. 105-277 effective Apr. 1, 1999, see section 1201 of Pub. L. 105-277,
http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/22/2551.notes.html
11/10/2002
set out as an Effective Date note under section 6511 of this title

SHORT TITLE OF 1999 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 106-113, div. B, Sec. 1000(a)(7) (div. B, title XI, Sec. 1101), Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A-485, provided that: "This title (enacting sections 2652c and 2797b-2 of this title and section 1526 of Title 50, War and National Defense, amending sections 2577, 2593a, 2797b, 2797b-1, 2797c, and 3282 of this title, enacting provisions set out as notes under sections 2593a, 2652c, 3282, 5601, 5853, and 6723 of this title and section 7704 of Title 42, The Public Health and Welfare, and amending provisions set out as a note under section 2155 of Title 42) may be cited as the 'Arms Control and Nonproliferation Act of 1999'."

SHORT TITLE OF 1994 AMENDMENT

Section 701(a) of Pub. L. 103-236 provided that: "This part (part A (Sec. 701-719) of title VII of Pub. L. 103-236, enacting sections 2578 and 2593a to 2593d of this title, amending this section, sections 2562, 2565 to 2568, 2571, 2573 to 2577, 2579, 2581, 2585, 2591, 2593, 2791, 2797, and 2797b of this title, section 5315 of Title 5, Government Organization and Employees, and section 2139a of Title 42, The Public Health and Welfare, repealing sections 2578, 2589, 2590, and 2952 of this title, enacting provisions set out as notes under this section, and repealing provisions set out as notes under this section) may be cited as the 'Arms Control and Nonproliferation Act of 1994'."

SHORT TITLE OF 1989 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 101-216, Sec. 1, Dec. 11, 1989, 103 Stat. 1853, provided that: "This Act (enacting sections 2577a and 2595 to 2595c of this title, amending sections 2563, 2567, 2588, and 2589 of this title, and enacting provisions set out as notes under sections 2565 and 2567 of this title) may be cited as the 'Arms Control and Disarmament Amendments Act of 1989'."

SHORT TITLE OF 1987 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 100-213, Sec. 1, Dec. 24, 1987, 101 Stat. 1444, provided that: "This Act (enacting sections 2578, 2579, and 2593 of this title, amending sections 2589 and 2592 of this title, and enacting provisions set out as a note under section 2578 of this title) may be cited as the 'Arms Control and Disarmament Amendments Act of 1987'."

SHORT TITLE OF 1982 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 97-339, Sec. 1, Oct. 15, 1982, 96 Stat. 1635, provided: "That this Act (amending sections 2571, 2585, and 2589 of this title) may be cited as the 'Arms Control and Disarmament Amendments Act of 1982'."

SHORT TITLE OF 1977 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 95-108, Sec. 1, Aug. 17, 1977, 91 Stat. 871, provided that: "This Act (enacting sections 2567 and 2577 of this title and amending sections 2571, 2581, and 2589 of this title and section 5315 of Title 5, Government Organization and Employees) may be cited as the 'Arms Control and Disarmament Act Amendments of 1977'."

SHORT TITLE


INTERNATIONAL ARMS SALES CODE OF CONDUCT
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This subtitle may be cited as the 'International Arms Sales Code of Conduct Act of 1999'.

(a) Negotiations. - The President shall attempt to achieve the foreign policy goal of an international arms sales code of conduct. The President shall take the necessary steps to begin negotiations within appropriate international fora not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act (Nov. 29, 1999). The purpose of these negotiations shall be to establish an international regime to promote global transparency with respect to arms transfers, including participation by countries in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, and to limit, restrict, or prohibit arms transfers to countries that do not observe certain fundamental values of human liberty, peace, and international stability.

(b) Criteria. - The President shall consider the following criteria in the negotiations referred to in subsection (a):

(1) Promotes democracy. - The government of the country - (A) was chosen by and permits free and fair elections; (B) promotes civilian control of the military and security forces and has civilian institutions controlling the policy, operation, and spending of all law enforcement and security institutions, as well as the armed forces; (C) promotes the rule of law and provides its nationals the same rights that they would be afforded under the United States Constitution if they were United States citizens; and (D) promotes the strengthening of political, legislative, and civil institutions of democracy, as well as autonomous institutions to monitor the conduct of public officials and to combat corruption.

(2) Respects human rights. - The government of the country - (A) does not persistently engage in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including - (i) extrajudicial or arbitrary executions; (ii) disappearances; (iii) torture or severe mistreatment; (iv) prolonged arbitrary imprisonment; (v) systematic official discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, national origin, or political affiliation; and (vi) grave breaches of international laws of war or equivalent violations of the laws of war in internal armed conflicts; (B) vigorously investigates, disciplines, and prosecutes those responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; (C) permits access on a regular basis to political prisoners by international humanitarian organizations; (D) promotes the independence of the judiciary and other official bodies that oversee the protection of human rights; (E) does not impede the free functioning of domestic and international human rights organizations; and (F) provides access on a regular basis to humanitarian organizations in situations of conflict or famine.

(3) Not engaged in certain acts of armed aggression. - The government of the country is not engaged in acts of armed aggression in violation of international law.

(4) Not supporting terrorism. - The government of the country does not provide support for international terrorism.

(5) Not contributing to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. - The government of the country does not contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(6) Regional location of country. - The country is not located in a region in which arms transfers would exacerbate regional arms races or international tensions that present a danger to international peace and stability.

(c) Reports to Congress. - (1) Report relating to negotiations. - Not later than 6 months after the commencement of the negotiations under subsection (a), and not later than the end of every 6-month period thereafter until an agreement described in subsection (a) is concluded, the President shall report to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the progress made during these negotiations.

(2) Human rights reports. - In the report required in sections 116(d) and 5028(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(b) and 2304(b)), the Secretary of State shall describe the extent to which the practices of each country evaluated meet the criteria in paragraphs (1)(A) and (2) of subsection (a).'

CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATIONS; PURPOSES OF 1994 AMENDMENT

REPORT ON REVITALIZATION OF ACDA

Section 717(b) of Pub. L. 103-236 provided that not later than Dec. 31, 1995, Director of United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was to submit to Congress a detailed report describing actions undertaken to revitalize United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

SOVIET WEAPONS DESTRUCTION


"This title may be cited as the "Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991," "PART B - FINDINGS AND PROGRAM AUTHORITY "SEC. 211. NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SOVIET WEAPONS DESTRUCTION. "(a) Findings. - The Congress finds - "(1) that Soviet President Gorbachev has requested Western help in dismantling nuclear weapons, and President Bush has proposed United States cooperation on the storage, transportation, dismantling, and destruction of Soviet nuclear weapons; "(2) that the profound changes underway in the Soviet Union pose three types of danger to nuclear safety and stability, as follows:

(A)

ultimate disposition of nuclear weapons among the Soviet Union, its republics, and any successor entities that is not conducive to weapons safety or to international stability;

(B)

seizure, theft, sale, or use of nuclear weapons or components; and

(C)

transfers of weapons, weapons components, or weapons know-how outside of the territory of the Soviet Union, its republics, and any successor entities, that contribute to worldwide proliferation; and "(3) that it is in the national security interests of the United States

(A)

to facilitate on a priority basis the transportation, storage, safeguarding, and destruction of nuclear and other weapons in the Soviet Union, its republics, and any successor entities, and

(B)

to assist in the prevention of weapons proliferation. "(b) Exclusions. - United States assistance in destroying nuclear and other weapons under this title may not be provided to the Soviet Union, any of its republics, or any successor entity unless the President certifies to the Congress that the proposed recipient is committed to - "(1) making a substantial investment of its resources for dismantling or destroying such weapons;

"(2) forgoing any military modernization program that exceeds legitimate defense requirements and forgoing the replacement of destroyed weapons of mass destruction;

"(3) forgoing any use of fissionable and other components of destroyed nuclear weapons in new nuclear weapons; "(4) facilitating United States verification of weapons destruction carried out under section 212; "(5) complying with all relevant arms control agreements; and "(6) observing internationally recognized human rights, including the protection of minorities. "(c) As part of a transmission to Congress under subsection (b) of a certification that a proposed recipient of United States assistance under this title is
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comitted to carrying out the matters specified in each of paragraphs (1) through (6) of that subsection, the President shall include a statement setting forth, in unclassified form (together with a classified annex if necessary), the determination of the President, with respect to each such paragraph, as to whether that proposed recipient is at that time in fact carrying out the matter specified in that paragraph.

**SEC. 212. AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM TO FACILITATE SOVIET WEAPON DESTRUCTION.**

"(a) In General. - Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, consistent with the findings stated in section 211, may establish a program as authorized in subsection (b) to assist Soviet weapons destruction. Funds for carrying out this program shall be provided as specified in part C. "(b) Type of Program. - The program under this section shall be limited to cooperation among the United States, the Soviet Union, its republics, and any successor entities to:

1. destroy nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, and other weapons,

2. transport, store, disable, and safeguard weapons in connection with their destruction, and

3. establish verifiable safeguards against the proliferation of such weapons. Such cooperation may involve assistance in planning and in resolving technical problems associated with weapons destruction and proliferation. Such cooperation may also involve the funding of critical short-term requirements related to weapons destruction and should, to the extent feasible, draw upon United States technology and United States technicians."

**PART C - ADMINISTRATIVE AND FUNDING AUTHORITIES **SEC. 221. ADMINISTRATION OF NUCLEAR THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAMS.

"(a) Funding. "(1) Transfer authority. - The President may, to the extent provided in an appropriations Act or joint resolution, transfer to the appropriate defense accounts from amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for operation and maintenance or from balances in working capital accounts established under section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, not to exceed $800,000,000 for use in reducing the Soviet military threat under part B. "(2) Limitation. - Amounts for transfers under paragraph (1) may not be derived from amounts appropriated for any activity of the Department of Defense that the Secretary of Defense determines essential for the readiness of the Armed Forces, including amounts for - "(A) training activities; and "(B) depot maintenance activities. "(b) Department of Defense. - The Department of Defense shall serve as the executive agent for any program established under part B. "(c) Reimbursement of Other Agencies. - The Secretary of Defense may reimburse other United States Government departments and agencies under this section for costs of participation, as directed by the President, only in a program established under part B. "(d) Charges Against Funds. - The value of any material from existing stocks and inventories of the Department of Defense, or any other United States Government department or agency, that is used in providing assistance under part B to reduce the Soviet military threat may not be charged against funds available pursuant to subsection (a) to the extent that the material contributed is directed by the President to be contributed without subsequent replacement. "(e) Determination by Director of OMB. - No amount may be obligated for the program under part B for fiscal year 1992 or fiscal year 1993 unless expenditures for that program for that fiscal year have been determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to be counted against the defense category of the discretionary spending limits for that fiscal year (as defined in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 665(a))
(2)) for purposes of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.). "SEC. 222. REPAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS. "(a) Reimbursement Arrangements. - Assistance provided under part B to the Soviet Union, any of its republics, or any successor entity shall be conditioned, to the extent that the President determines to be appropriate after consultation with the recipient government, upon the agreement of the recipient government to reimburse the United States Government for the cost of such assistance from natural resources or other materials available to the recipient government.

"(b) Natural Resources, Etc. - The President shall encourage the satisfaction of such reimbursement arrangements through the provision of natural resources, such as oil and petroleum products and critical and strategic materials, and industrial goods. Materials received by the United States Government pursuant to this section that are suitable for inclusion in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve or the National Defense Stockpile may be deposited in the reserve or stockpile without reimbursement. Other material and services received may be sold or traded on the domestic or international market with the proceeds to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury. "SEC. 223. DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS.

"It is the sense of the Senate that the committee of conference on House Joint Resolution 157 (enacted into law as Pub. L. 102-229) should consider providing the necessary authority in the conference agreement for the President to transfer funds pursuant to this title. "PART D - REPORTING REQUIREMENTS "SEC. 231. PRIOR NOTICE OF OBLIGATIONS TO CONGRESS.

"Not less than 15 days before obligating any funds for a program under part B, the President shall transmit to the Congress a report on the proposed obligation. Each such report shall specify - "(1) the account, budget activity, and particular program or programs from which the funds proposed to be obligated are to be derived and the amount of the proposed obligation; and "(2) the activities and forms of assistance under part B for which the President plans to obligate such funds." (Memorandum of President of the United States, May 10, 1996, 61 F.R. 26033, delegated to Secretary of State authority and duty of President under section 211(c) of Pub. L. 102-228 set out above.

REPORT ON FULFILLMENT OF PRIMARY FUNCTIONS

Pub. L. 102-228, title IV, Sec. 401(c), Dec. 12, 1991, 105 Stat. 1699, directed Inspector General of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to submit, not later than Dec. 15, 1992, to President, Speaker of House of Representatives, and chairman of Committee on Foreign Relations of Senate a report on Agency's fulfillment of primary functions described in section 2551 of this title and directed President to submit comments on any recommendations contained in the report dealing with executive branch organization and direction, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 103-236, title I, Sec. 139(18), Apr. 30, 1994, 108 Stat. 398

CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRADE

Pub. L. 93-559, Sec. 51, Dec. 30, 1974, 88 Stat. 1817, as amended by Pub. L. 97-113, title VII, Sec. 734(a)(8), Dec. 29, 1981, 95 Stat. 1560, provided that: "(a) It is the sense of the Congress that the recent growth in international transfers of conventional arms to developing nations - "(1) is a cause for grave concern for the United States and other nations in that in particular areas of the world it increases the danger of potential violence among nations, and diverts scarce world resources from more peaceful uses; and "(2) could be controlled progressively through negotiations and agreements among supplier and recipient nations. "(b) Therefore, the President is urged to propose to the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that it consider as a high priority agenda item discussions among participating nations of that Conference for the purposes of - "(1) agreeing to workable limitations on conventional arms transfers; and "(2) establishing a mechanism through which such limitations could be effectively monitored. "(c) (Repealed. Pub. L. 97-113, title VII, Sec. 734(a)(8), Dec. 29, 1981, 95 Stat. 1560.)"
EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 12946

Ex. Ord. No. 12946, Jan. 20, 1995, 60 F.R. 4829, which established within Department of Defense the President's Advisory Board on Arms Proliferation Policy, was revoked by Ex. Ord. No. 13062, Sec. 3(c), Sept. 29, 1997, 62 F.R. 51756, formerly set out as a note under section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act in the Appendix to Title 5, Government Organization and Employees.

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS
This section is referred to in section 2595a of this title.
High Ranking Military Told To "Play-Ball" With New World Order Agenda Or Get Out NOW!

We received information today from a close friend having communication with a military personnel who reports to him that "there have been reports of high ranking officers, that within the last couple of weeks, have abruptly resigned from the military -- we are talking about line officers, full bird Colonels through three star generals. There have also been low ranking officers, but the report that we have was that they were concerned about the resignation of line officers as well as full bird's and above."

Also, our friend just received confirmation from a seconded independent source of these military resignations. "It seems that 56 days ago all military officers were told that they must agree with the coming military agenda. Anyone who did not want to go along would be given an Honorable Discharge. Anyone who did not make a decision within this 100 days, would be given a Dishonorable Discharge."

"In addition, Gen. Shallikashvill (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs) was ordered to change the (Uniform Code of Military Justice) UCMJ so that any soldier or officer not obeying any order, regardless of whether or not such order is lawful or constitutional, they will be court-martialed."

P.S. Something is coming!

From: H & M

**Fax Any Detailed Support Info To:**
Fax: 941-473-3622
Help! Stop! NATIONAL SUICIDE

Russian 'peacekeeping' forces in U.S. under Full & Complete Disarmament Program.

The Intermediate-range Nuclear Force Treaty (INF) has recently been ratified by Congress calling for the destruction of weapons we need to protect ourselves! The treaty creates a verification process to be used for full and complete disarmament of our nation, with Russians under the sole command of communist Russia, being stationed on United States soil with the right to enter and inspect our national defense installations at any time without prior notice or permission. This is national suicide.

California State Senator Donald A. Rogers
SOLDIERS OF MANY LANDS — A Bulgarian platoon, right, is followed by a platoon from Britain during opening ceremonies for the start of a month-long exercise at Fort Polk, Louisiana. Soldiers from 17 countries are participating.
Base closure bill a 'taxpayer victory'

By CHRIS ROSE
Sentinel Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON—The House's move to trim fat from the nation's military budget by approving legislation to expedite the closure of obsolete military bases is a 'major victory for American taxpayers,' lawmakers say.

On a 223-186 vote, the House last week adopted the Defense Savings and Reorganization Act, which streamlines procedures for closing major military bases recommended for shutdown by a nonpartisan commission. The measure has the potential to shave $2 billion to $3 billion off the Pentagon's budget.

It also may indirectly benefit Lemoore Naval Air Station.

"We struck a blow for the taxpayer," said Rep. Dick Armey, R-Tex., sponsor of the bill. "The measure will eliminate billions of dollars in wasteful defense spending by making it possible to close bases in a fair and non-political way."

Under the measure, a base closing commission would be appointed by the Pentagon to come up with a list of facilities to be closed. The list would be submitted by Dec. 31 this year, and the Secretary of Defense would have 11 days to decide whether all or none of the bases would be shut down.

Congress would have no authority to manipulate the panel recommendations, but would have 45 days to appeal to the Supreme Court if the list is approved. A large majority of members believe the panel was deliberately set up to avoid political influence.

"We've known for years what could be saved if we would close obsolete bases," said Rep. John Murtha, D-Pa. "The Pentagon has failed to give us the numbers we need."

For example, one version of a plan to close NAS Lemoore Naval Air Station, which is 88 percent of the base, shows a savings of $73 million per year. But when it comes to closing bases on the West Coast, the results have been disheartening. The Office of the Secretary of Defense has studied 20 bases on the West Coast and found that after 30 years, a total of $1 billion was spent on bases that were not closed.

In an effort to improve the process, a plan was presented to Congress by the Pentagon that included a list of bases to be closed. The plan was approved, but the final decision was left to the base closing commission. Congress has yet to approve the plan, and it is unclear whether the bases will be closed as planned.

Despite widespread support for the measure, some members of Congress have expressed concerns about the impact on local economies and military readiness. The measure has been controversial, with some members arguing that it would lead to a weaker military and increased spending on defense.

The bill was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Clinton on July 1, 1995. Since then, the Pentagon has been required to submit a list of bases to be closed, and the base closing commission has been empowered to make the final decision on which bases will be closed and how they will be closed.
The Push for Deeper Cuts in U.S. Military

Gen. Powell favors a steady, but slow decline in forces

By Eric Schmitt

Washington

As General Colin Powell recently reiterated, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is running into strong congressional pressure to cut deeper and faster than he would like.

Democratic leaders in Congress have already made clear that cutting military spending will likely be a major weapon in their campaign to reduce the deficit.

In speeches and congressional hearings, Powell has reiterated his view that the military is still too big and must be reduced to levels that are consistent with the nation's security needs.

The goal is to achieve a more sustainable defense budget that reflects the nation's priorities and resources.

Powell's vision is reflected in a three-year plan for military spending that will include significant reductions in personnel and equipment, which he believes are essential to maintaining a strong and modern force.

The plan is subject to congressional review and approval, and it remains to be seen how much of it will be implemented.

However, Powell's message is clear: the military must be more efficient and effective, and its size and capabilities must be aligned with the nation's strategic interests and financial constraints.

The path to achieving these goals will be challenging, but Powell believes it is essential for the long-term health and security of the armed forces.
California beware in new base closing plan

The Sentinel — Tuesday, October 9, 2001

From Ft. Irwin in the Mojave Desert to Port Hueneme Naval Station on the Ventura County coast, China Lake Naval Weapons Center at Ridgecrest and Travis Air Force Base beside Fairfield, alarm bells should be ringing as the Bush Administration proposes a plan for devising a new list of military base closures.

Not even the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11 could deter the U.S. Senate from passing that plan.

 Entirely aside from its impact on California cities and other communities around the nation, some military experts worry that closing too many bases could leave America short of defenses.

They note that when radar picked up the aberrant courses of the hijacked American Flight 77 and United Flight 93, it took 40 minutes to scramble jets into the Washington, D.C. area because closer bases are shut down. Fighter jets needed even longer to arrive over Los Angeles, scheduled destination of three of the doomed flights.

That's a far cry from how it could have been in the 1st Toro Marine Air Station or George Air Force Base near Victorville had been active. It would take even longer for jets to reach San Francisco in an emergency, with Hamilton Air Force Base in Marin County closed and Moffett Field in Mountain View at much reduced levels.

What's more, California is still not over the shock of an eight-year round of base closings between 1988 and 1996 which saw the American military shut down 22 bases around the world — 87 of them here. This state lost almost one-third of the 87 bases the military once operated here.

While the once-tiny town of San Francisco is largely packed today and the former Ft. Ord outside Monterey became a state college campus, the long-form loss is still felt for shuttered bases like 1st Toro in Turlock, the naval base at Veracruz, and Treasure Island in San Francisco Bay and the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

California Focus

Tom Elias

In the last two rounds of base closings, the 56 Californians in Congress at least had some small voice when the final closure plan went to a vote. This time, the 56 Californians in Congress would have virtually none.

When they talk of base closings, Pentagon officials like to use the phrase "temporary dislocation." But many of the workers who once drew large government salaries for highly skilled labor are still impacted by the closures. They've either been forced to move or, in many cases, take civilian jobs at far lower pay.

That's why, when the Pentagon continues pushing its recognition of the need for a new closure commission plan, to be charged with similar staff, 25 percent of all current bases for elimination, the California voice should stand up on the backs of California necks.

In formal terms, the Bush administration wants a nine-member independent commission to receive a list of base-closing recommendations from Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, which did not resist when the only base in his former Illinois congressional district — the only one anywhere near Chicago — was closed and turned into a pitch of upscale, luxurious housing.

Commissioners would be appointed by President Bush, in "consultation" with House and Senate leaders. With no Californians now in the

highest levels of congressional leadership, it's unlikely this state's interests will be represented on the commission.

And even if the commission wanted to make changes, the administration plan would let Rumsfeld block them with a simple written notice. So Rumsfeld, a longtime fixture in Republican administrations who didn't even think of fighting for his old constituents, would have almost exclusive power to decide who loses a base and who doesn't.

Yes, Bush himself would have veto power over whatever Rumsfeld submits, but he couldn't change the plan. He'd either have to take all of it or nothing. Of course, nothing prevents Rumsfeld from discussing it with his boss ahead of time.

And when Congress eventually receives the plan, supposedly around September of 2002, it also could make no changes, but could only accept the entire list or reject it by passing a joint resolution. It's not likely Rumsfeld would consult any of the Californians in Congress ahead of time.

In real life, that means Rumsfeld would make the decisions, and there's no reason to believe he'll care a hoot that many parts of California still have not completely recovered from the last round of base closings.

This plan is now before the House. If the Californians there don't stand fast against it, without regard to party, they'll be ignoring the best interests of this state and subjecting even more areas to the trauma and dislocation of losing thousands of quality jobs.

Elias is an author and syndicated columnist.

MEANWHILE: THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE PASSING MORE ANTI-GUN LAWS TO DISARM ALL LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS.
The Internal Security Forces of Stage III are now assembled.

They constitute a merger of the civilian law enforcement systems with foreign military.

This is never done in a Republic (that is, if it is to remain a Republic)!

This governmental structure is used to operate a military dictatorship.

It is later than you think, folks!
People are now complaining that George W. Bush could take absolute power over the U. S. government, and put everybody under a full military government since he has instituted the "Homeland Security Agency." And they are asking me if this is true. IS IT TRUE?
Yes, it is true!

Remember, when there used to be a sharp line separating (a) the civilian law enforcement system from (b) the military?

Well, that line no longer exists! In line with his father, George W. has merged the military and the civilian law enforcement together under one head! Republics become dictatorships when (a) and (b) get merged together under one head.

Control of civilian law enforcement rightly belongs to the individual states, but the federal administration through encroachment has usurped the civilian law enforcement system. It still rightly belongs to the states.
When "Terrorism" became an accepted excuse for all sorts of alterations in the system, the Homeland Security Agency was created! It is the basis of a military government system.

Under the federal Homeland Security Agency every policeman in the U.S.A., all the way down to the beat officer, is now "on line" and answerable to that Agency. This is not right at all!

The whole law enforcement system has been revamped so that it is now in accord with military concepts on a regional basis. This means it is in accord to an international basis.

Public Law 87-297, the General and Complete Disarmament Law, which was already shown a few pages back, requires a force "to preserve internal order" for use when the nation is fully disarmed on a permanent basis. That force is the reason why the Homeland Security Agency was instituted.

In some states sheriffs, and police chiefs are being merged with federal marshals. The federal marshals will soon take over, and eventually eliminate the sheriffs which has been a long sought after goal of the federal administration.
CREATION OF THE
HOMELAND SECURITY

SUMMARY

DISARMAMENT GOAL AND OBJECTIVES

The over-all goal of the United States is a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world which has achieved general and complete disarmament under effective international control; and a world in which adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

In order to make possible the achievement of that goal, the program sets forth the following specific objectives toward which nations should direct their efforts:

• The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;

• The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and
The United Nations wants to disarm all law-abiding Americans! They want you to transfer all your armed forces over to them on a permanent basis! Does it really make sense?

No nation ever did, nor ever can, retain its sovereignty after the loss of its armed forces.

Keep in mind that the aggressor is always peace loving, for he wants to enter the territory of his victim unopposed. You see, folks, war exists for the benefit of the defender; it comes about only if the defender wishes to fight for his vital interests rather than surrender them! Tell me, how will you defend your vital interests when you are made totally helpless by being completely disarmed under these treasonous so-called "laws"?
Gorbachev is a member of the Commission which oversees the closing of U.S. military bases.

SAN FRANCISCO—In an event that would have been unfathomable a few years ago, former Soviet President Mikhail S. Gorbachev opened an office Friday on one of America's most hallowed military posts, the Presidio of San Francisco.

Gorbachev, who resigned from office in 1991 as the Soviet Union crumbled, was given the key to new digs for his pro-democracy foundation by the Presidio's commanding general in a ceremony rich with irony and symbolism.

"Please accept this key as a gesture of our goodwill and our best wishes to you as the newest President," Lt. Gen. Glynn C. Mallory Jr. told Gorbachev.

"I assure you this key is in reliable hands," the world's former top communist replied with a grin.

The Gorbachev Foundation USA was invited to sink roots at the Presidio as part of the post's conversion from the headquarters of the 6th U.S. Army to a national park. The base, a stunning piece of oceanfront real estate that has stood guard over the Bay Area for two centuries, is one of dozens scheduled for closure in cost-cutting moves by the Pentagon.

The Army will vacate the Presidio next year, and the National Park Service is reviewing 350 proposals for potential uses in the new park. They range from construction of a bungee-jumping tower to creation of a center for global environmental studies.

Gorbachev is the first applicant granted permission to move onto the post. His foundation is considered a desirable tenant because it may lure other prestigious organizations with an international focus, a theme the Park Service is promoting.

The foundation's small staff will occupy a stately white house that was formerly home to a Coast Guard commandant. Ringed by Monterey cypress trees and just steps from the surf, it commands views of the Golden Gate Bridge and San Francisco's skyline.

"The entire Presidio is spectacular, but he got one of the best spots, that's for sure," said Park Service spokesman Howard Levitt. He said the lease arrangements are temporary and may change when the park blueprint is completed next year.

Gorbachev launched his Moscow-based foundation soon after resigning as president, declaring as his top goal global peace and the strengthening of democracy in the former Soviet republics. The foundation's U.S. arm, run by a board chaired by former Sen. Alan Cranston of California, raises money and provides technical support.

On Friday, few who attended the ceremony failed to herald the historic significance of Gorbachev—a one-time Cold War adversary—visiting the oldest continually operating military base in the United States.

"It is only fitting for the leader of a peace foundation to be welcomed by a soldier," said Lt. Gen. Mallory. "It shows that the defenders of the Golden Gate have been successful...and now we proudly stand aside."

Gorbachev gave this assessment of the moment to the crowd of dignitaries shivering in the San Francisco fog.

"This is the symbol of our irreversible transition from an era of confrontation and militaristic insanity to a new world order, one that promises dividends for all."

At the close of the ceremony, Gorbachev was joined via satellite by singer Billy Joel, who announced a June benefit concert to raise money to immunize children in the United States and Russia.

THE EX-PRESIDENT OF SOVIET UNION NOW OPERATES OUT OF SAN FRANCISCO.
The President of San Francisco has been shut down and the former president of the Soviet Union is now a member of the National Task Force on U.S. military base closings.

Something's gotta be wrong here?

Mikhail Gorbachev is upset at De Anza College.

The former head of the Soviet Union is giving the U.S. government a hard time. He said, "I think the U.S. government is irresponsible. They are shutting down bases and closing military bases without proper notification." He also added, "I feel that the U.S. government is not being fair to the Soviet Union."
PRESIDENT DWIGHT EISENHOWER

LET THE CAT OUT OF THE BAG!

ONCE THE UNITED NATIONS TAKES OVER ALL THE WORLD'S MILITARY AND WEAPONS, THEY WILL HAVE THE CAPACITY TO BLACKMAIL ANY COUNTRY WHICH DOES NOT GO ALONG WITH ITS COMMUNIST IDEAS AND COMMANDS. THE U.N. WILL DROP AN ATOMIC BOMB ON THEM.
Here's the reason, folks! George H. Bush calls it "peace" yet they want to put you under a peaceforce. Force is force! You are trading national armed forces for a worldwide communist force. Do you suppose you'll have "peace" under such a peaceforce?

“We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order, a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders.”

BUT THE TREATY POWER DOES NOT ALLOW THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENT TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS WITH COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE GIVE-AWAY OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES!
WHY IS IT THAT NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON WHEN A U.S. PRESIDENT PLANS THE OVERTHROW OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT??

The Program for General and Complete Disarmament is NOT a program for achieving peace! Make no mistake about that!

Resolution Adopted by the Twelfth General Assembly
November 14, 1957
(on the report of the First Committee (A/3729))

2119 (XII). Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an International Convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction.

The General Assembly,
Bearing in mind resolution 818 (IX) of 4 November 1954,
Emphasizing the urgency of decreasing the danger of war and improving the prospects of a durable peace through achieving international agreement on reduction, limitation and open inspection of armaments and armed forces,
Welcoming the narrowing of differences which has resulted from the extensive negotiations in the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Committee,
Believing that immediate, carefully measured steps can be taken for partial measures of disarmament and that such steps will facilitate further measures of disarmament,

1. Orders that the States concerned, and particularly those which are members of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Committee, give priority to reaching a disarmament agreement which, upon its entry into force, will provide for the following:

(a) The immediate suspension of testing of nuclear weapons with prompt installation of effective international control, including inspection posts equipped with appropriate scientific instruments located within the territories of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in Pacific Ocean areas, and at other points as required;

(b) The cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and the complete devotion of future production of fissionable materials to non-weapons purposes under effective international control;

(c) The reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons through a programme of transfer, on an equitable and reciprocal basis, and under international supervision, of stocks of fissionable material from weapons to non-weapons uses;

(d) The reduction of armed forces and armaments through adequate, safeguarded arrangements;

(e) The progressive establishment of open inspection with ground and aerial components to guard against the possibility of surprise attack;

(f) The joint study of an inspection system designed to ensure that the number of objects through open space shall be exclusively for research and scientific purposes;

2. Requests the Disarmament Commission to reconcile its Sub-Committee as soon as possible for this purpose;

3. Requests the Disarmament Commission to invite the Sub-Committee to establish, as one of its first tasks, a group of groups of technical experts to study inspection systems for disarmament measures on which the Sub-Committee may reach agreement in principle and to report to it within a fixed period;

4. Recommends that any such technical group or groups be composed of experts from each of the States members of the Sub-Committee and one from each of those other States Members of the United Nations which shall be designated by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Sub-Committee;

5. Persuades States concerned, and particularly those which are members of the Sub-Committee, to consider the possibility of devoting, out of the funds made available as a result of disarmament, as and when such progress is made, additional resources to the improvement of living conditions throughout the world and especially in the less developed countries;

6. Requests the Sub-Committee to report to the Disarmament Commission by 1 April 1958 on the progress achieved.

25th plenary meeting,
14 November 1957.


THE U.N. IS A COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION -- CATCH ON, FOLKS!
Well, I guess by now you have caught on to how I conduct this tour. I'm trying to wake you up, especially if you have been a "Doubting Thomas". I show you key things, key pages out of important documents. You don't have to see the whole document! You don't have the time it takes to go hunt up so many documents. I get right down to brass tacks! I get right into the parts you need to know about and I tell you what you need to look at. It saves time and it saves you a lot of research work trying to find these things. Take a look at this article, on the opposite page, for example.

Can't you see how you are spending your substance, fighting foreign countries, forcing them into a global government which they do NOT want. You get weaker and your defenses grow thin. Then some day, one of the big countries (that you think are your friends!), such as Russia or China, will attack you, and you won't be strong enough to defend yourself because you will have spent yourself silly all over the world.
General warns of declining Army

Doubts the ability to fight two wars

By Rowan Scarborough

The Washington Times

The commander for all Army forces in the United States warns in an internal memo that "we can no longer train and sustain the force" under current defense spending and says "this threatens our ability to mobilize, deploy, fight and win."

The three-page Aug. 20 memo from Gen. David Bramlett was sent to Gen. Dennis Reimer, Army chief of staff, outlining Army Forces Command's dire outlook for the fiscal year beginning in less than three weeks.

"My assessment is not good news," Gen. Bramlett wrote. "Funding has fallen below the survival level in [fiscal year] 99. Current funding levels place FORSCOM's ability to accomplish its mission at an unacceptable risk."

The document is one of the strongest pieces of evidence in recent months showing that the armed forces' ability to stay sharp and win wars is slipping badly.

The issue is particularly important for Army divisions based in the United States because it is these forces that must be deployed rapidly in time of crisis to back up troops in Asia, Europe and the Persian Gulf.

"We can no longer train and sustain the force, stop infrastructure degradation, and provide our soldiers the [quality-of-life] programs critical to long-term readiness of the force," Gen. Bramlett wrote.

"Unit readiness will be degraded," he wrote. "Commanders at Fort Lewis, Stewart and Bragg support units will drop below ALO in the fourth quarter of [fiscal year] '99. This threatens our ability to mobilize, deploy, fight and win."

"ALO" refers to allowable level of organization. It means the minimum level a unit is supposed to reach when it is deployed in a crisis.

Fort Lewis in Washington is home to the 1st Corps, which would reinforce 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia should, for example, North Korea invade South Korea. Stewart Army Base, Ga., holds the 3rd Infantry Division, a rapid-response unit. And Fort Bragg, N.C., is the address for the 18th Airborne Corps, which includes the 82nd Airborne Division.

The ability of these units to carry out their mission is crucial if the Defense Department is to meet its principal objective of fighting two regional wars nearly simultaneously.

Army headquarters at the Pentagon issued a statement last night saying: "The Army leadership depends on candid assessments from the Army's major commanders to evaluate the impact of budget decisions on their commands. This memorandum is the [Forces Command] commander's initial assessment of his potential [fiscal] '99 funding distribution. However, no final decision has been made on funding distribution for the Army major commands."

Gen. Bramlett's memo was immediately cited by a Republican senator as proof the 1.4 million-man armed forces is degrading in operational quality despite Clinton administration assurances to the contrary.

"These concerns indicate that we are returning to the hollow force that our military experienced in the late 1970s," Sen. James M. Inhofe of Oklahoma said yesterday in a letter to Gen. Reimer. "I agree with Gen. Bramlett that your unfunded requirements can only be realized with an increase in the overall funding level for the department."

Mr. Inhofe is a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which later this month plans a special hearing on the state of today's armed forces.

The hearing was urged by Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, Miss., Republican.

The senator told President Clinton in a letter this summer that the services are not adequately manned to carry out global missions such as Bosnia peacekeeping, Persian Gulf air and sea patrols, and defending South Korea.

In a reply letter, Mr. Clinton rebuffed Mr. Lott's call for added defense spending to a budget of about $260 billion.

Gen. Bramlett's memo shows how declining defense budgets over the last decade are harming personnel where they train, live and eat.

The four-star general, who oversees about 200,000 active-duty troops, says his command "mortgages" building repairs and quality-of-life accounts to maintain training.

"Infrastructure maintenance and repair are now funded below survival levels," he wrote. [Next year] marks the second consecutive year in which FORSCOM could not fund installation infrastructure repair beyond 'break and fix.'"

The Air Force has spare-parts shortages and can't retain enough pilots.
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PEACE?

oh yeah, sure!

When George W. Bush tells you that he is bringing about "peace", he means "peace" as is defined in these U.S. government books that call for the complete disarming of all citizens of the United States, and permanently placing our military under international control.

Meanwhile, gun control laws keep increasing for the purpose of slowly and completely divesting every American citizen of his firearms. The United States military is the main force structured behind the "World-wide Military Command and Control Systems" already underway. The reason the United States has been held back as the last country in which his "peace" program will be enforced is that it is the only country wealthy enough to finance wars against those countries that will not come in line with a "new world order".

George W. Bush is enforcing the legislation his father signed while the elder Bush was president: Public Law 101-216, an additional amendment to the parent disarmament document, Public Law 87-297. Every two years the Congress appropriates funds to keep the general and complete disarmament program progressing. The funding continues with every president. The "Human Rights" treaties George W. touts are communist doctrines (instituted by Lyndon Johnson and James Carter) that do not include citizen possession or use of arms.

Second Amendment Committee P.O. Box 1776 Hanford, Ca. 93232
"The aggressor is always peace loving, for he wants to enter the territory of his victim unopposed. War exists for the benefit of the defender; it comes about only if the defender wishes to fight for his vital interests rather than surrender them." ....Karl Von Clausewitz

How are you going to defend your vital interests after the "United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" goes into full effect? Under Public Law 87-297 and State Dept. Publication #7277 (the policy book) the United States must continue giving its armed forces away to the communist dominated United Nations. It requires the closing of U.S. military bases, and the complete disarming of all law-abiding citizens!

War must occur in defense of your nation! You should never be asked to go to war when the benefit is to serve the aggrandizement of greedy men.
LET'S SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT, GEORGE!
THIS ISN'T THE KIND OF FREEDOM THAT WE WANT!

THIS KIND OF FREEDOM DOESN'T MAKE US FREE!

SECOND AMENDMENT COMMITTEE P.O.BOX 1776 HANFORD, CA. 93232
Every president, since the
United Nations Charter
was signed in 1945
by Harry Truman,
has been a supporter of the
U.N.'s requirement for
"general and complete"
disarmament!

Franklin Roosevelt
had hoped to sign the Charter,
but he died
before it was scheduled
to be signed.

It was unlawfully passed
as a "treaty".
"IF we desire a secure peace, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

---George Washington

The soundness of Washington's judgment still applies:

True peace must be an armed peace.
The President pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE OF SENATOR BARKLEY AS MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be entered in the body of the RECORD, in regular type, a letter from the President of the United States, dated July 25, 1945, congratulating Senator Barke\  

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think, should go into the RECORD because it is expressive not only of the commendation and the honor which the President of the United States pays the majority leader, but also the honorable Senator from Kentucky, has served in the capacity of majority leader for a longer period of time than anyone else in the history of the Senate, so far as I am advised.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished majority leader has at all times maintained the dignity of his political party in this body, but he also has approached the discharge of all his duties with that sense of responsibility and that regard for the welfare of our Nation which are so essential to the success of the mission which he has filled with such distinguished ability and credit and profit to the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEVAN in the Chair). Without objection, the letter will be read in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The letter is as follows:

The White House,  

Dear Senator:

Today marks the eighth anniversary of your service as majority leader of the United States Senate, and it is a day on which we feel keenly the loss of the able services which you have rendered to the Senate and to the Nation during your tenure in that high position. The success of the work of Congress is largely dependent upon the ability of the leaders, and your efforts have always been directed with great skill and efficiency toward the attainment of the objects which you and your colleagues have in view.

I am deeply grateful to you for your devoted service and for your able leadership during these eight years. Your loyalty and integrity have been an inspiration to all who have served with you.

Very truly yours,

Harry S. Truman,
President of the United States.
MRS. BALDWIN: YOU WERE SO RIGHT!

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 24, 1948, at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the Record the corrected testimony of 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 Appendix, as follows:

Mrs. Baldwin, my name is Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin, 1124 Madison Avenue, New York City. I represent myself—an American woman, a mother, a grandmother.

The Constitution.

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 one who has office in the highest degree, to this Government, is sworn to uphold. If you sign this charter you are giving away everything that we have fought for, everything that we are going to fight for.

I do not agree with Senator Vandenberg when he says we should accept this because it was agreed upon by President Roosevelt at Tientsin when he was told that he was in 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 absence of the American people without the concurrence of two-thirds of this body—nothing has been given.

There was an effort to substitute the Constitution of the United States, to take away our American rights. There's a new plan. It is one that has been going on for twenty years. It must finish after the last war the prosecution started. The strongly drawn propaganda, the school, our churches, in fact, they are against our American way of life. Attempts have been made to destroy our American way of life. They are still going on. Those historians who were rewritings, they want you to recognize American rights.

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 that World War III, the war we are going to have with Russia. That war will be in the Middle East. We women are not willing to be about
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MRS. BALDWIN: YOU WERE SO RIGHT!

The following prophetic speech delivered to the United States Senate (in the hope of stopping the adoption of the United Nations Charter) was published in the Congressional Record, recording the testimony of Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin who pleaded with the Senators to reject adoption of the United Nations Charter, and to realize that acceptance of this global Charter would lead to divesting our nation of its substance, (that which held the nation together), and would erode the barriers and safeguards, which had always protected the foundation and principles of our freedom and liberty. Evidence now abounds that U.N. membership (globalization) is destroying U.S. substance.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD
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 ideas 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 history of every country when the people's silence 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.
Here's a second speech made by another good lady in 1945 who tried to warn the Senators that they were making a wrong move, but they were pre-programmed and would not listen.
On March 1, 1945, at the Roxborough High School in Philadelphia, a forum meeting was held by the United Nations Council under the auspices of the American Legion. The principal speakers were Dr. John Nash, a Rhodes scholar, president of Swarthmore, Pa., College, and Mrs. Beeden Harrison. At the conclusion of his speech, Dr. Nash said that after full debate on the question of whether or not we should adopt the United Nations-Dumbarton Oaks Conference proposals for a world security organization to be set up at the San Francisco Conference, he knew the American people would want it and they should write their Senators to that effect.

At the question period I challenged Dr. Nash to debate, and he refused to do so. Then I asked the question, "Is it or is it not true that the United Nations-Dumbarton Oaks Conference proposals for a world security organization to bring peace to the world is none other than the British-Israel World Federation plan for a world government, world currency, world police, world court, world religion, and a world flag to fly above our Stars and Stripes?"

This is the flag, gentlemen [exhibiting], and it is treason to America, and the women will never let it happen. There it is, that flag [indicating].

The CHAIRMAN. Your time is about up. You have another minute.

Mrs. Somers. Only yesterday, former Governor Harold Stassen of Minnesota told this committee that the Charter does not assure us that it will prevent war. Yet the American people, and even the members of the committee, are given the impression that it will prevent war.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I pray that God Almighty will inspire you, and so, blessed with the knowledge presented to you by the opponents of this vicious plot to destroy our Republic, you will, like our founding fathers in the First Continental Congress at Carpenter's Hall in Philadelphia, humbly kneel in prayer and ask Almighty God in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, our Lord, to give you the strength and courage to vote against this vicious Charter, and by so doing, your names, like Washington, will be immortal in the annals of American history. You will then vote against this vicious Charter.

Senators, all of you, I beg of you, you whom we have elected to represent us, please, gentlemen, do not let us women have to fight these wolves in sheep's clothing alone. Be men like those that William Cullen Bryant wrote about:

So live that when thy summons comes to join the innumerable chorus that moves on to that mysterious region where each shall take his chamber in the houses of death, chose do not like the quarry slave at night, cowed to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust, approach the grave like one who wraps the shroud of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Please be in order. You are not supposed to express your approval or disapproval or applause or make any other demonstration.

Mrs. Somers. In one morning, to rise, to shine upon and greet again the Re-united States, the British-American Union.
He left all of his money for the accomplishment of that objective. This world movement of the British-Israelites is identical with the Andrew Carnegie-Cecil Rhodes-Theodore Herzl plan to reunite the United States to the British Empire. The British-Israel literature boasts of Britain being mighty and that she will be mightier to rule the world.

What is to happen then to our beloved United States? Where will we be? Can you see this? Gone with the wind—to where? It is not said. The women of this country have anything to say about it. Never. We will not betray our country to any foreign power.

General Patton, speaking in London to the Officers Club said, "It is our destiny, Britain and America, to rule the world."

In British-Israel, you will learn that Edward, Duke of Windsor, is to be the messiah, the king of the world. In an article in the True Story Magazine, Wally, running himself on the beach at Nassau in the Bahamas, dreams of the day when the common people of the world will call an Edward to lead them and become the first President of the United States of the World.

Senator Pepper expressed the same thing about President Roosevelt. Congressman Huber wants to know how the Duke of Windsor, the repudiated leader of our ally, Britain, can travel around our country, with a private coach and crew, while our soldiers and civilians are denied transportation facilities. Gentleman, Edward, the Duke, is here surveying our lands and looking forward to the day you ratify the United Nations Charter and then will be king of the world. You will find the evidence right here in this folder.

The CHAIRMAN. You may file the folder if you desire.

Mr. SOMERS. It says so.

His excellency, the world potentate, shall create, organize, build, acquire, maintain, test, and command such armies, navies, air forces, and other military means, together with all properties, structures, devices, and means which he deems essential thereto in his sole and absolute discretion necessary to maintain and secure peace throughout the world.

His word, I suppose—and shall we use them for no other purposes whatsoever.

Now, here is the picture, gentlemen, of the world flag hanging in the British-Israel World Federation Meeting in London, England, 6 Buckingham Gate.

The CHAIRMAN. Just file that and go ahead with your testimony.

Mr. SOMERS. You will also see the picture of the flag which is to fly above our Stars and Stripes.

On February 4, 1944, Scholastic Magazine conducted a poll in 1,503 high schools throughout our Nation, asking our children seven questions, the last of which was, "Are you willing to see a flag of the world fly above the Stars and Stripes?" This questionnaire appeared in the Junior Post of the Upper Darby Junior High School of Pennsylvania. This chart compiled on the subject proves it is all one world movement.

Gentlemen of the committee, do not be deceived; the proponents of this measure are either wolves in sheep's clothing or just the fools, for no sane American would knowingly vote away our sovereignty. Surely you men won't vote yourselves out of office.

The CHAIRMAN. Please use the microphone. Some of the Senators cannot hear you well.

Mr. SOMERS. On April 9, 1944, at the last meeting of the Home in the Upper Darby High School, the subject of the discussion was World Government. Professor Frazier, of Swarthmore College, spoke on the political and economic aspects after advocating World Government, World Court, World Bank, world currency, he concluded his talk by saying, "You will have world government whether you like it or not. It will be accomplished more through the religious-minded than the political."

Rabbi William Fincher spoke on the moral—he sanctioned all Professor Frazier said, and when questioned later as to his being a member of the World Fellowship Foundation, the special counsel of which is World Government Foundation, whose founder trustee is Charles H. Davis, who has repeatedly urged our Congress to empower President Roosevelt to set up and create the Federation of the World, a world peace government under the title "United Nations of the World," including its constitution and personnel. Charles Davis prophesies, if world government is not established before this war is over, the world will be headed toward a third World War, on the soil of the United States. Members of this committee, this statement should be investigated.

April 13, 1945, at the Town Meeting of the Air held at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, Pa., under the auspices of the Salvation Army, the subject for discussion was, Do we have a definite foreign policy now? Congressman Iden, who took the negative side, when questioned as to the legality of Cordell Hull's advocacy of an International Organization with an International Court, admitted it could not be done within the Constitution—"they have to circumvent it.

On November 10, 1944, at the national convention of the Kingdom Message Association, which is an affiliate of the Anglo-Saxon Federation Convention, held in the Hotel Whittier, Fifteenth and Cherry Streets, Philadelphia, the Reverend Louis Fowler presided. The whole back of the stage was covered by an enormous British Union Jack, and on the left corner a small Star and Stripes. Mr. Fowler said, "The old order must go. Every nation must be pulverized, because only Israel is to survive." He said, "Even the foundation stones must go.

That verifies Dr. Frazier's statement at the Upper Darby Junior High School when he said, "World government will be accomplished through the religious-minded."

Yes, gentlemen, these men are wearing the cloak of religion and interpreting the Bible to put over their political planning. Please get their literature and see for yourselves. There are tens of thousands throughout the Nation.

The September a year previous, Harold Rand, speaking at the same convention held there, he said:

Had anyone told you people here in Philadelphia, the birthplace of liberty, that you would be in a Senate bill 665 you will witness the destruction of this Republic, the end of the gentle domination of the world and then Israel would come into its own, you would not believe it, but it is going to happen—and then he quotes the Bible to prove it.
Don't they know that it's against the law?

Yes – they do know that what they are doing is against the law!

Oh – are you asking me how can they pull off so much unlawful stuff that is against the law? Well, it's because so few people have caught on to the tricks, and those who do know, can't break through the controlled news media.

Even informing their families and neighbors is quite difficult. Because "the news media doesn't print it" people just won't believe the truth when it gets told to them!

The connivers know that they must put on two faces: one, is used on the people they deal with in the back rooms where the unlawful moves are planned out; and the other face is used on the general public "to keep up the trust" the people have in them! Most people don't realize that I am getting crowded out!
IF YOU NEED PROOF THAT OUR
PUBLIC OFFICIALS ARE
PLANNING TO TAKE
AWAY ALL FIREARMS
AND PUT OUR ENTIRE
U.S. ARMED FORCES
UNDER COMMunist CONTROL -- go to these

Internet sites for proof from U.S. Government sources.

If you go to the library, ask the librarian to show you how to get into the United States Government Code Books. They contain the laws of the United States that are approved and in effect. The law for General and Complete Disarmament is known as Public Law 87-297. Look for it under Title 22, Foreign Relations and Intercourse: Section 2551, 2552, 2571 & 2573. So that you will know what you are looking for, the following is a brief description of four key sections and their Internet locations.

IN SECTION 2551, you will find the Statement of Purpose, which is to make the world free from scourge of war and the danger and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law, and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. Locate this Section on the Internet at:
http://assembler.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode22/usc_sec_22_00002551----000-.html

IN SECTION 2552, you will find a definition of what the U.S. Government means by the term "disarmament". It reads:

(a) The terms "arms control" and "disarmament" mean the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination of armed forces and armaments of all kinds under international agreement including the necessary steps taken under such an agreement to establish an effective system of international control or to create and strengthen international organizations for the maintenance of peace.

Locate this Section on the Internet at:
http://assembler.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode22/usc_sec_22_00002552----000-.html

The policy book published by the State Department that details this law is called Freedom from War -- The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World. It documents the elimination of our armed forces on a permanent basis. We shall have no more Army, no more Navy, no more Marine Corps, and no more Air Force! It also calls for the elimination of armaments of all kinds, and they do mean ALL civilian owned guns. Look for this booklet at: http://www.mikenew.com/pub7277.html
IN SECTION 2571, you will find the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is authorized and directed, under the direction of the president, to achieve a long list of goals numbered from (a) through (m) which massively diminishes our defense capabilities, ravages our security, and obliterates our sovereignty. Elimination of armed forces and armaments is listed twice in this section. It also includes the requirement for elimination of conventional weapons. As we witness the conduct of public officials as they encroach upon the unalienable right of the people to keep and bear arms, and witness the disregard for the non-repealable status of the Second Amendment of the Bill of Rights, it gives proof of the true intent behind the terms "conventional weapons", and "general and complete disarmament". The pursuit is for total and complete disarmament of the United States and its people, and for the surrender of U.S. sovereignty to international communist dominated organizations. State Department Publication 7277 makes these facts indisputable. Locate this Section on the Internet at:
http://assembler.law.cornell.edu/usc/code/html/usc code/22/usc sec 22 _00002571----.000-.html

IN SECTION 2573, you will find "Policy Formation". It contains two prohibitions; one states, "No action shall be taken pursuant to this chapter or any other Act that would obligate the United States to reduce or limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States in a militarily significant manner, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President, or unless authorized by the enactment of further legislation by the Congress of the United States." Realize that the U.S. president and the Congress hold the power to activate their complete disarmament goals! Then it will be permissible for the United States to reduce or eliminate Armed Forces and armaments, and to prohibit individuals from the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms. The second prohibition is a swinging door. It was first added in 1963, at which time the federal government tried to silence the heavy public outcry when word got around that two years prior, in 1961, John F. Kennedy had signed the Disarmament Law: Public Law 87-297! That resulted in adding the following disclaimer: "Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government Agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training." At times this disclaimer is removed; other times (for the convenience of the government) it is entered back again, depending upon the extent of the outcry. Locate this Section on the Internet at:
http://assembler.law.cornell.edu/usc/code/html/usc code/22/usc sec 22 _00002573----.000-.html

Note: Ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt encouraged enactment of a New World Order, and called it "The New Deal", every United States president since has favored this General and Complete Disarmament Law, which is a component of global government planning. Harry Truman officiated in signing the United States under the obligation of the United Nations Charter and began to implement globalism. The United Nations proffers to be 'peaceful' and claims that "the use of force is subordinated to the rule of law". It believes "international adjustments to a changing world can be achieved peacefully". Has anyone ever heard of a workable law where there is no force behind it? The U.N. was built to have the only army in the world and all nations would have to give troops and access over their territory to the powerful U.N. Security Council. Neither the U.S. presidents nor the Congress are vested with the power to deprive this nation of its military; nor to prohibit the people from owning arms; nor to overthrow the Constitution! Meanwhile, the newly established Homeland Security (a militarized "agency" composed of unelected persons over which the people have no power, have not voted for, nor have any way to remove them from office), is being given more and more authority and federal money to expand its control over the people of this nation. "Consent of the governed" has never been given to any president to engage in these pursuits. Whenever the current President George W. Bush speaks of "peace", "freedom", "a safer world", and "a more peaceful world" — it is the 1961 General and Complete Disarmament Law to which he is referring.

---

1 Once the total disarmament law is enforced, there will be no recognized "lawful" purpose left to protect the right of individuals.
2 Note that neither national defense nor tyranny is included as reasons for the people to retain possession and use of arms.
3 The global-minded resolutions that are passed in the United Nations are sent to the heads of state of all member nations for enactment within their own country.
4 Pres. George W. Bush is the grandson of Senator Prescott Bush from Connecticut, who in 1961 helped push passage of Public Law 87-297 through the Congress. Pres. George Herbert Walker Bush (Prescott's son) signed Public Law 101-216, an amendment to Public Law 87-297, and it includes a repeat of the definition you see in Section 2552 on the reverse side of this page.
DO THEY REALLY WANT TO TAKE AWAY ALL OF OUR FIREARMS?

YOU BE THE JUDGE!

Look at Public Law 87-297 which was passed into law in 1961, signed by President John Kennedy. On Page 1, it says they are going to eliminate weapons of ALL kinds.

The State Department Document No. 7277 says:

"The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes."

Maxine Waters, a member of the state legislature, said just before the bad gun bill (Rooz-Robertti) was passed:

"Let me be honest. I don't like this bill, but I'm going to vote for it, because I hope this bill represents the day when we take every single gun from the hands of Californians and all America across the country."

On January 27, 1984, Senator Bill Richardson reported in the "RICHARDSON REPORT" that Willie Brown, the Assembly speaker, is strongly opposed to gun ownership. Senator Richardson debated the issue on a San Francisco television program at which time, during a break in the filming, Willie Brown told Senator Richardson that his (Brown's) long range interest was the confiscation of ALL guns, but at the present time, it was only feasible to restrict handguns. "When the debate continued, minutes later," Senator Richardson declared, "I brought his comments to the attention of the audience, where upon Brown promptly developed a bad case of amnesia." (Politicians like Willie Brown should be required to read the U.S. Constitution and made to understand that such actions are actually against the law.)

The new "Constitution" these same anti-gun people want to bring in to replace our 1789 Constitution reads as follows in Article VIII Section 12:

"No person shall bear arms or possess lethal weapons except police, members of the armed forces, or those licensed under law according to rules established by the Court of Rights and Duties."
The answer to the question -- "Do they really want to get all of our guns?"

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (L.E.A.A.) was a federal agency which worked over the laws and divisions of state governments. It was a strong promoter of gun control. It operated in all the states of this country. One of its many purposes was to link firearms to crime. The reason for that effort was to make possible a totally disarmed civilian population to support the treaties which President Bush is now negotiating with the Russians, Chinese, French, English, etc. for "General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World". These treaties are not confined to just nuclear weapons--they call for the destruction of ALL weapons, except those of the world army and the military systems that will take control over us.

L.E.A.A. was brought into California by an act in the California legislature, which then-Senator George Deukmejian introduced along with another legislator (Moretti). A scenario was then set to brainwash the population so that outlawing firearms would get the approval of the general public. Although firearms are an essential protective tool, keeping us safe against crime and invasion, they have unjustly been linked and wedded to crime. The following is from the Marlowth Report June 15, 1983:

Director of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), Professor Dean Morris, testified ten years ago before the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. He made astounding remarks concerning gun confiscation: "I am one who believes that as a first step the U.S. should move expeditiously to disarm the civilian population, other than police and security officers, of all handguns, pistols and revolvers... no one should have a right to anonymous ownership or use of a gun. That is not a right that we can safely allow anyone... I think the truth is that we will ultimately have a police force not equipped with guns."

"There can be no right of privacy in regard to armament... We seek a disarmed populace." (L.E.A.A.)

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was a federal commission which altered all the states' law enforcement systems, federalized all police systems, designed the maneuver for the end run around the Second Amendment. Page 340 (attached) is a summary of their work to ban handguns.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards & Goals in its publication entitled "A National Strategy to Reduce Crime" called for each state to take the following action no later than January 1, 1983:

1. The private possession of handguns should be prohibited for all persons other than law enforcement and military personnel.
2. Manufacture and sale of handguns should be terminated.
3. Existing handguns should be acquired by States.
4. Handguns held by private citizens as collector's items should be modified and rendered inoperative.

California's Roos-Roberti bill which has been signed by the governor (former senator, George Deukmejian) is open-ended. It is a blank check to the liberals who want all the guns taken away. It has a provision by which the courts can add more guns to the banned list. Unless this legislation is repealed, its ability to wipe out all our guns will be used by those anti-gun legislators who are planning to get all of our guns.
GUN OWNERS! ARE YOU READY FOR THIS?

(Over)

the
PUGWASH MOVEMENT
and
U.S. ARMS POLICY

Duane Thorin

being a study of the private deliberations and publications of the Pugwash Movement (Conferences on Science and World Affairs) -- its aims, claims and proposals relating to U.S. military and foreign policies.

of special significance to the 1964-65
HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TOPIC

Should Weapons Systems be placed under
"International Control"

Monte Cristo Press, New York, N.Y.

You will find Page 50 & 51 from the above book on the reverse side. These pages reveal what the "general and complete disarmament" engineers think about the individual's right to keep and bear arms.
THE U.N. "PEACE FORCE" WILL ARREST U.S. GUNOWNERS

Public law 87-297 (the United States Law -- For General and Complete Disarmament --) will be enforceable upon individuals after the president signs the second disarmament treaty. State Dept. Publication 7277 (see page 10) states that all armaments (except those used by the world army) shall be destroyed.

Some answers preceding the questions:

Answers to some of their questions had actually been offered within the Pugwash before Professors Brown and Katz got around to asking them. The proposed nature of the international security forces, for example, had been discussed at some length at the Sixth Conference. Professor Wiseman had suggested:

There are many ways to create an international security force. An attractive way would be to have the small nations of the world take this responsibility with financial and material support from the larger powers. It has even been suggested that France might be willing to join such a group and supply it with a nuclear capability, if it proved desirable to include a nuclear component.

Another American participant at the Sixth Conference, Mr. Richard Leghorn, had suggested:

"National" arguments to disarmament are three specific authorities empowering the U.N. to enforce the peace. First, there must be a U.N. security force adequately armed, equipped and controlled to deter resort to violence and maintain impartial security force or other combination of units national security forces in the event of any armed outbreak in any international security. Second, the force would be made up of U.N. military personnel, selected to support the U.N. disarmament treaty, and follow the U.S. national security forces as they witnessed on make streets when necessary.

(Norm.-Little consideration seems yet to have been given in Pugwash to the matter of by whom and how a U.N. force thus empowered would itself be controlled.)

Enforcing disarmament on individuals

Although Mr. Leghorn seems to have covered most of the questions, during the Sixth Conference, which Professors Brown and Katz got around to asking at the Eighth, he perhaps was not very explicit as to how a world tribunal would be empowered to try individuals on charges of violation of the disarmament treaty. He did state that, so-called, any tribunal could operate only when the U.N. Security Council was already at war and by which such tribunal might effectively operate.

Both the West and the U.S.S.R. as well as the U.N. have already endorsed an analogous procedure. The Nuremberg trials established as crimes against humanity not only the conduct of aggressive war but also preparing for them; and when it became clear that, for governments to agree on a right existence of such a crime against humanity, any group or group of persons carrying on a crime against humanity. For the next time, let us all have the tribunals ahead of time and not after the mischief is done.

WORLD PEACE THROUGH WORLD PEACE COURT

More detailed answers—or least proposed answers—to the questions posed by Professors Brown and Katz at the Eighth Conference were offered in that same meeting by another American participant, one of the founding members of the Movement, Prof. Leo Szillard. Dr. Szillard's presentation touched on all points where his two colleagues had raised, and more. Most specific of them were his proposals regarding enforcement of a disarmament treaty on individuals.

"CRAZY" IDEA

Professor Szillard is recently deceased. It might therefore seem prudent to disregard his above-noted statements, or put them quietly aside as just some of those "crazy ideas" which are said to crop up again and again in the privacy of the Pugwash Conferences. But to do so might be to deny ourselves the very details about the ultimate Pugwash goal which others of the U.S. members have proved either unable or unwilling to provide.

Dr. Szillard was one of the few in Pugwash who could call himself a scientist by virtue of actual accomplishment, rather than merely by profession. His scientific genius helped this nation to obtain atomic
Not long ago the federal government’s ‘Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations’ tried to eliminate powers belonging to the sheriff, but they were not successful. The attempt today is to move the federal marshals in and merge them with the sheriff into the sheriff’s office! I can see it coming; the marshals will be assisted by federal funding to prevail over the sheriff and eventually, the marshals will have ALL the power. This concerns me because, the Sheriff takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution. The marshal takes an oath to follow out orders given to him but it is not an oath to “support and defend” the Constitution.

Do you see why this situation worries me?
Folks, you're about to see "Page 340"- this is an official document out of the State of California.

Alert California citizens caught Gov. Reagan sneaking this in, as state policy! It is still the policy guiding, not only California, but the nation.

When you have no personal firearms, you will be totally unable to object to what is coming at you.

Here's some stuff that you may not know about that is going on without your knowledge!

Take it seriously, folks!

This is no dress rehearsal!
Handguns In American Society

RECOMMENDATIONS

Enforcement of Current Laws

The Commission recommends that existing Federal, State, and local laws relating to handguns be strenuously enforced. It further recommends that States undertake publicity campaigns to educate the public fully about laws regulating the private possession of handguns.

Penalties for Crimes Committed with a Handgun

The Commission urges enactment of State legislation providing for an extended prison term with a maximum term of 25 years for committing a felony while in possession of a handgun.

Stop-and-Frisk Searches

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation providing for police discretion in stop-and-frisk searches of persons and searches of automobiles for illegal handguns.

Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the manufacture of handguns, their parts, and ammunition within the State, except for sale to law enforcement agencies or for military use.

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the sale of handguns, their parts, and ammunition to other than law enforcement agencies or Federal or State governments for military purposes.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation establishing and funding a State agency authorized to purchase all voluntarily surrendered handguns, and further authorized to register and modify handguns to be retained by private citizens as curios, museum pieces, or collector's items.

Prohibiting the Private Possession of Handguns

The Commission further urges the enactment of State legislation not later than January 1, 1983, prohibiting the private possession of handguns after that date.

Only the 1983 date has been changed. It has been moved up. It ties in with P.L. 87-297

Have you seen this? It has been the impetus behind all the anti-gun bills since 1968. This summary was compiled from the federal government's book called "A National Strategy to Reduce Crime". Its Handgun Chapter was quietly passed around to state governors to be their directive. This 340th page was taken from a state governor's own Master Book which he intended to quietly enact. Arlen Specter and Richard Lugar were members of the committee that created it. They did nothing to expose and stop these 'goals'.

340
What you are looking at is the 340th page in the Master Set done up for Ronald Reagan when he was the governor of California. All the "insider" type of public officials know that Page 340's directives are the milestones they must achieve!

Here are some points for you to know about Page 340:

#1 At the time this was first uncovered by an alert citizen who dug into Reagan's "Master Set", it was planned that public officials would go after hand guns first which was pretty bold for the '70's! Long guns were not written into the directive. Nevertheless, ALL guns were scheduled to be outlawed.

#2 Laws had been written (but did not get passed) to permit hunting only if you checked a gun out at the Club Master's and returned it at the end of your hunt.

#3 Relate this to the little blue book from the State Department called "FREEDOM FROM WAR" (some pages back from here). The plan is total disarmament!

#4 The anti-gun legislators did not make the goal of 1983 (see opposite page) and the date obviously had to be moved up.

#5 Page 340 is still viable! You will find current bills and actions on the next few pages that prove that the direction of current day legislation is complying with the directives on Page 340.
Handguns In American Society

RECOMMENDATIONS

Enforcement of Current Laws

The Commission recommends that existing Federal, State, and local laws relating to handguns be strenuously enforced. It further recommends that States undertake publicity campaigns to educate the public fully about laws regulating the private possession of handguns.

Penalties for Crimes Committed with a Handgun

The Commission urges enactment of State legislation providing for an extended prison term with a maximum term of 25 years for committing a felony while in possession of a handgun.

Stop-and-Frisk Searches

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation providing for police discretion in stop-and-frisk searches of persons and searches of automobiles for illegal handguns.

Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the manufacture of handguns, their parts, and ammunition within the State, except for sale to law enforcement agencies or for military use.

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the sale of handguns, their parts, and ammunition to other than law enforcement agencies or Federal or State governments for military purposes.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation establishing and funding a State agency authorized to purchase all voluntarily surrendered handguns, and further authorized to register and modify handguns to be retained by private citizens as curios, museum pieces, or collector's items.

Prohibiting the Private Possession of Handguns

The Commission further urges the enactment of State legislation not later than January 1, 1983, prohibiting the private possession of handguns after that date.

This secret planning was going on in Ronald Reagan's office when he was the governor of California. Alert citizens caught him. It never hit the newspapers. It is still the source for nation-wide gun prohibition, achieved by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in Washington, D.C.
Bill aims at ban on handguns

REICH HARRIES
Associated Press Writer

SACRAMENTO — Democrats in the California Assembly are once again ban the manufacture and sale of the cheap handguns sometimes referred to as "junk guns," and say this time they think they have the votes to do it.

Also known as "Saturday Night Specials," the inexpensive weapons — often mechanically unreliable — are frequently used in crimes, sponsors of the bill said.

Previous attempts to ban such guns, many of which are manufactured in the state, have failed.

But Democrats have regained the majority in the Assembly, and sponsors of the new bill said Monday they believed they could win passage of the bill this year.

"We're going to be working very hard to convince those legislators who are in swing districts that this is a high-profile issue and one they should care about," said Assemblyman Louis Caldera, D-Los Angeles.

The bill would require all guns made and sold in California to conform to the safety standards required of weapons manufactured outside the country, which are tough than the standards for domestically manufactured weapons.

The bill would also require that all guns sold in California after June 1, 1999, be equipped with child-proof features such as trigger locks, loaded chamber indicators or "smart gun" sensors which permit a weapon to be fired only by the person to whom it is registered.

continued
THE SURRENDER AGENCY
A Federal/State Alliance

The 1968 Gun Control Act was accepted by the state governors. The Act brought into being the "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration". The L.E.A.A. secretly promoted the chapter on handguns in the federal book entitled: "A National Strategy to Reduce Crime".

That chapter is summarized on only one page. It is known as Page 340. Page 340 is the official guide for public officials in state legislatures to gradually get all guns away from the law-abiding citizens.

Notice that the 'surrender agency' now includes long guns. Also the deadline has been extended for prohibiting private possession.

Planned by Nixon and Reagan in the early seventies.
Reno seeks state tests for gun owners

By Kevin Johnson
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON - Prospective gun owners should be required to pass state-recognized proficiency tests before they obtain weapons, Attorney General Janet Reno said Thursday.

Reno said applicants should have to pass both written and written tests designed to measure basic knowledge of gun operation and safety. "I don't think anybody should have a weapon unless they demonstrate a proficiency to use it," Reno said.

The attorney general's proposal is not binding on the states, and the Justice Department is not advocating federal legislation that would mandate proficiency tests.

But Reno said the National Rifle Association offers the kind of training the states should require. "The NRA makes it clear, however, that it would not support making such training mandatory," the attorney general said. "The state authorities ought to spend as much time enforcing the law as she does cooking up more rules for law-abiding gun owners," said James Baker, the NRA's chief lobbyist. "What does she want to do next, tattoo every gun owner?"

Reno's proposal comes as the Clinton administration continues to push for stronger gun laws in the aftermath of the Columbine High School massacre. Several Colorado students were with Reno and President Clinton at the White House on Thursday as Clinton continued his campaign for mandatory background checks at gun shows. The administration's proposal also would requirechild safety locks on handguns.

"Don't allow the victims of Columbine to have died in vain," Clinton said. "We must not lose the urgency of our mission."

The president also criticized Congress for stalling gun legislation.

Reno said the NRA could serve as an "active partner" in conducting training because it already offers training programs.

Baker said the NRA trains hundreds of thousands of gun owners every year. But he argued that there is no reason to mandate proficiency testing.

"Quoting the most recent information compiled by the National Center for Health Statistics in 1997, the NRA says accidents caused by firearms were at an all-time low," Baker said. "How is something like a proficiency test going to impact crime?" Baker said. "Are criminals going to stand in line for a test? I don't think so."

This page documents the fact that the federal attorney-general's office controlled the missions of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The L.E.A.A. laid out the agenda for divesting the law-abiding people of their guns. They set the maneuvers for making an end run around the Second Amendment. The N.R.A. installed L.E.A.A.'s "state pre-emption". Will the N.R.A. accept Janet Reno's offer next?
NO MAN IS ABOVE THE LAW!

NO, NOT EVEN THE GOVERNOR!

Gray Davis has violated his oath of office by signing counterfeit legislation which tramples upon the the Second Amendment. This is a serious offense. This collusion with the federal government constitutes an act of perjury. He must be held accountable!

A constitutional governor would have invoked the power of the Second Amendment against the nefarious activities of equally guilty errant state legislators. The governor is supposed to keep the ship of state on an even keel! Davis was not hired to participate in federal plans to disarm all the law-abiding citizens of this state! How safe will the people of California be when Davis's complicity with the federal government's secret goal of complete elimination of all citizen owned firearms is carried out?

Handguns in American Society

Recommendations

Enforcement of Current Laws

The Commission recommends that existing Federal, State, and local laws relating to handguns be vigorously enforced. It further recommends that the Governor and his public officials campaign to educate the public about the harmful effects of handguns.

Penalties for Crimes Committed with a Handgun

The Commission urges the enactment of laws providing for penalties directing to double or treble the sentence of persons and societies of any magazine of illegal handguns.

Stop-and-Frisk Searches

The Commission urges the enactment of laws regulating the police and search of persons and societies of illegal handguns.

Punishing the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of laws punishing the manufacture of handguns, and providing with the State, except for such as are for enforcement agents or for military use.

Punishing the Sale of Handguns

The Committee urges the enactment of laws prohibiting the sale of handguns, their parts, and accessories to other than law enforcement agents or federal or state government for military purposes.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Committee urges the establishment of a state agency authorized to purchase all illegally possessed handguns, and further authorized to remove and yearly destroy to be returned by private citizens to carry, display, possess, or harbor them.

Punishing the Private Possession of Handguns

The Committee further urges the enactment of laws prohibiting the private possession of handguns after this date.

SECOND AMENDMENT COMMITTEE  P.O. BOX 1776  HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93232
Assembly OKs Bill

The Moreland Sunland Times, August 20, 1999

Unconstitutional pork gun laws must be stopped in California. Last year's state failed like dominoes. From Reagan to DAVIS, California has been the pilot state for enforcing the goals of Page 340."
It's police safety vs. privacy rights

Hostile Supreme Court hears case; Reno argues for the government

RICHARD CARELLI
Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON — Attorney General Janet Reno, in her debut as a Supreme Court advocate, met a skeptical audience today as she argued for allowing police more power when they make routine traffic stops.

In her 10-minute appearance, Reno argued that it was being too easy for police to be challenged on the wisdom of giving police routine authority to stop all motorists who pass out of a car.

The nation's highest law enforcement official traditionally looks at least one argument before the highest court. It was thought that Reno had followed the standard practice of picking out the government was likely to win.

But even the court's most conservative members seemed puzzled by the argument Reno used in a Maryland case by a trooper and three other civilians.

While he contended that the trooper was imposing excessive punishment on a driver and his passengers, Justice Anthony M. Kennedy disagreed. "This is a rarefied case," he said.

"Every time the trooper stopped him, he was seeking police authority for a 'brief, nongovernmental' purpose of a car," Justice John Paul Stevens said.

"This is a serious issue," Stevens said.

Janet Reno

not just from the driver but from the passenger," she argued. "It's the person seated in the vehicle that creates the danger."

Reno, who prevailed Reno, immediately ran into a series of questions from the bench when he argued that the trooper should be declared a police officer who could be stopped at any time.

"That might be a more difficult case," Reno said, but then indicated that officers should have the discretion.

They are vulnerable to attack,

Is it acceptable for a nation of free people to allow the communist military from Russia, to enter the U.S.A. training as police officers, searching cars and American people?
Bill Flower, right, talks to Soviet law enforcement militiamen Sergei Soldatenkov, left, and Yuri Volobuyev

Soviet CHP cadets relish unique challenge

By ROB WALTERS California staff writer

For the last three months, from dusk to dawn, they've been learning in the classroom before returning to the dorms to hit the books.

The two cadets admit they have to study harder than others attending the California Highway Patrol Academy in Sacramento.

That's because for the two Soviet militiamen, English is their second language.

Lt. Col. Yuri Volobuyev, 44, of Tula in the Russian Republic and Lt. Sergei Soldatenkov, 39, of St. Petersburg (formerly Leningrad), are the first two Soviet militiamen to ever attend a police academy in the United States.

"It takes a great deal more time to learn a subject than other cadets," Volobuyev said in a rich Russian accent.

Other than that, Volobuyev says, there is little difference between Soviet militiamen and American officers.

"We're doing the same job," he said. "We have the same problems." Some problems are universal. Volobuyev said traffic jams are common in metropolitan areas, and the drunken drivers are "really a big problem in our country."

Soviet punishment for drunken drivers is stiff, Volobuyev said. First-time offenders are fined about 200 rubles — more than a half-month's salary — and they lose their licenses for a year. Second-time offenders lose their licenses for three years.

While the Soviet Union deals severely with drunken drivers, the United States holds the edge in resources, the militiamen said.

Computers are more widely used to aid law enforcement than in his country, Volobuyev said. "Your highway patrol is better equipped (and) have better stats," he noted.

In addition, the Soviet "highways are in bad condition" and are "very dangerous sometimes," he said.

With the collapse of communism, more Soviets will have the chance to own cars. The two officers hope to use what they learn at the academy to turn back problems.

A year in the making, the plan to bring to Russian traffic officers to the academy belongs to Capt. Richard J. Breastvedt, commander at the Bakersfield office of the CHP.

Breastvedt said his primary reason for jumping through "several hoops" was to "enhance understanding" between officers of both countries.

"We have one common enemy," he said. "That's apprehending criminals."

The trip was arranged by Kern County sheriff's Deputy Bill Flower, founder and director of the Soviet American Police Exchange Program, now in its third year.

Volobuyev and Soldatenkov left the Soviet Union in the days that followed the failed coup against President Mikhail S. Gorbachev. At the academy, the militiamen have been learning about the California courts, how to make an arrest, about search and seizure laws and enforcement techniques.

Thanksgiving marks the halfway point of their four-month stay. Before graduating in February, the militiamen will be given a chance to apply what they've learned in text books to real-life situations.

As part of the curriculum, the pair are in Bakersfield for five days to observe their counterparts from the CHP, Bakersfield police, and Kern County sheriff's departments.

While being exposed to local officers, they will "not be out making arrests," Breastvedt said.

Back at the academy, the two will be put behind the wheel of U.S.-made patrol cars to learn defensive, high-speed pursuit and other tactical driving skills.

The two were selected in June from a pool of about 15 to 20 militiamen who sought the chance to come to the United States, Breastvedt said. Breastvedt and Flower interviewed the pair and selected them, for among other reasons, because they are fluent in English.
Russian Police Officer Alexey K. Gankin of Moscow directs traffic in front of Lincolnton High School.

TOUR of DUTY
Moscow police visit Gaston, Lincoln

By Leslie Weaver
Gazette Staff Reporter

LINCOLNTON — Greater Gaston police departments will get some extra help this week, but not from a crime bill or a federal grant.
The help will come from Russian police officers visiting Gaston, Lincoln, Mecklenburg and Catawba Counties to swap stories and ideas with their American counterparts.

The two officers visiting Gastonia — Vladimir Dedyouchin and Vladimir Morozov — have a packed schedule.
They'll attend a Gastonia City Council meeting, visit the courthouse and jail and see demonstrations by a police dog, bomb squad and SWAT team.
The Lincolnton Police Department welcomed nine Russian officers Saturday, who like their colleagues will visit until March 12.
The Russian officers decided to come here after accepting an invitation from Lincolnton Chief Terry Burgin as part of a nationwide exchange program. Lukach had visited Moscow last May.
"There are also 300 (American) police officers working in our station in Moscow," said Ekaterina Arefeva, a Moscow patrol officer, visiting Lincolnton.
Here's a quick quiz for all the doubters who think it is O. K. for the governors to sign into law legislation that violates the Second Amendment.

**Question:** "Can you come up with a reason why state legislators and governors want to take away all the firearms belonging to law-abiding people?"

(Think hard now!)

**Check one:**
- To stop criminals from obtaining guns.
- To reduce the power of gangs.
- To eliminate all resistance to tyranny.

(By now even doubters should be able to guess that Reason #3 is the correct answer.)
Why should people have guns?

"The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

...Thomas Jefferson

Why ask the Supreme Court to interpret the meaning of the Second Amendment? Those justices were appointed to the bench by the same presidents who are in charge of the general and complete disarmament program! Besides, the purpose of the Second Amendment was interpreted over 200 years ago by the men who wrote it. Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson told the importance of all able-bodied citizens being trained in a well-regulated militia as the best way to protect the people from tyranny in government. Does anyone think that they didn’t understand what they were writing?
I am the spirit of liberty, of freedom, of independence, of self-government, of your sovereignty, of the pursuit of happiness, of your right to make your own decisions, guarded with checks and balances. Now please, let me show you the rules written to preserve in perpetuity God's endowment to you, and to your posterity, so that you can place a limit on the power others have over you, and to keep you as the ultimate power in this great republic. Amen!
Guns are tools - just “tools”! How can you preserve these three precious documents if the globalists take away your tools? Hey! It simply can’t be done!

These documents contain the rules by which all public officials in the service of the United States must conform. All three documents belong exclusively to the people and none of the principles within can be altered or revoked without the consent of the governed.
Hey, the only reason for disarming a nation is -- if they have lost a war! If you do not intend to be made defenseless, you must understand the necessary right to arms. The men who founded this nation were confirming divine laws that already existed. They placed them for security into a Bill of Rights. These immutable laws are beyond the power of any public officials to infringe or deny.
YOU MUST DEFEND YOUR RIGHT TO ARMS!

No interpretation by the Supreme Court members or any other public official is necessary. The Second Amendment is a confirmation of a God-given right. Those men who drafted the Second Amendment meant for it not only to protect us from invasion, but also to limit the power that man can exercise over his fellow man. The founders who wrote this Amendment, did not place anything into this shelter that did not already exist! It is a right that belongs to the people exclusively which no one can take away!

Those who drafted the Bill of Rights did not place anything for protection into this shelter that did not already exist! The right of the people to keep and bear arms existed before there ever was a Bill of Rights and a Second Amendment! The purpose of the Second Amendment was to confirm that the people already possessed the right to arms, individually and collectively, as an endowment from the Creator, and that no one would be allowed to take this right away! The Second Amendment documents a natural, inherent, and immutable right. It bars all things from taking preeminence over this endowment!

The meaning of the Second Amendment was clear from the first day in which it was demanded by the anti-federalists. There was no doubt about its meaning or its intent. Simply put, it is an individual right that can be exercised in a collective manner. At that time, it was openly stated that the strongest reason for the people to protect and retain the right to arms was to protect themselves from tyranny in government. Its authors chose language and a sentence structure to command conformity and adherence to the absolute nature of the right. They sustained it by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

It is against the law for the Supreme Court or other public employees to "interpret" the language or the meaning of the Second Amendment, because a second Preamble, one preceding the Bill of Rights, was added which restricted any federal level interference whatsoever with its contents. It also included a declaratory element to prevail over states.

As well as being the First Ten Amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights is a separate document of its own. This special storehouse possesses unique attributes and prerogatives of its own. By its basic nature, none of its contents can be repealed. It cannot be superseded by the treaty power, the commerce clause, executive orders or agreements, or federal or state law-making powers. Its contents are not subject to public vote nor to the outcome of any elections. No one can divest himself of these God-given rights, even if they chose to do so. The people are obligated to preserve these rights for their posterity.
THE COMMAND IN THE SECOND AMENDMENT OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

*...the sentence means that the people are the militia...*

Declaratory*  Supreme Law - Not repealable
God-given rights  and restrictive*
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Diagram work by Bernadine Smith
The Second Amendment confirms the existence of an individual right that can be exercised by the people in a collective manner.

and it proves"that the people have the right that is mentioned." ... A. C. Brocki

* The Preamble to the Bill of Rights reads as follows:

The Conventions of a number of the States having, at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconception or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best insure the benefitent ends of its Institution:
ENGLISH USAGE EXPERT INTERPRETS SECOND AMENDMENT

By J. Neil Schulman

...the sentence means that the people are the militia...

I recently had a conversation with Mr. A.C. Brocki, editorial coordinator for the Office of Instruction of the Los Angeles Unified School District. Mr. Brocki taught Advanced Placement English at Van Nuys High School for several years, as well having been a senior editor for Houghton Mifflin. He is considered the foremost expert in grammar in the school district, the person others go to when they need a definitive answer on English grammar. I asked Mr. Brocki to parse the following sentence:

"A well-schooled electorate, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Mr. Brocki informed me that the sentence was over-punctuated, but that the meaning could be extracted anyway.

• "A well-schooled electorate" is a nominative absolute.
• "being necessary to the security of a free State," is a participial phrase modifying "electorate."
• The subject (a compound subject) of the sentence is "the right of the people -" shall not be infringed is a verb phrase,
• with "not" as an adverb modifying the verb phrase "shall be infringed."
• "to keep and read books" is an infinitive phrase modifying "right."

I then asked him if he could rephrase the sentence to make it clearer. He responded,

"Because a well-schooled electorate is necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

I asked if the sentence could be interpreted to restrict the right to keep and bear arms to a well-schooled electorate, say, registered voters with a high-school diploma? He said, "No." I then identified my purpose in calling him, and read him the Second Amendment in full:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Mr. Brocki said he thought the sentence had sounded familiar, but that he hadn't recognized it.

I asked, "Is the structure and meaning of this sentence the same as the sentence I first quoted you?" He said, "yes." I asked him to rephrase this sentence to make it clearer. He transformed it to:

"Because a well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

I asked him whether the meaning could have changed in 200 years. He said, "no." I asked him whether this sentence could be interpreted to restrict the right to keep and bear arms to "a well-regulated militia." He said, "no." According to Mr. Brocki, the sentence means that the people are the militia, and that the people have the right which is mentioned.

I asked him if another professional in English grammar or linguistics could interpret the sentence to mean otherwise. He said that he couldn't see any grounds for another interpretation. I asked him if he would be willing to stake his professional reputation on this opinion, and be quoted on this. He said, "yes." At no point in the conversation did I ask Mr. Brocki his opinion on the Second Amendment, gun control, or the right to keep and bear arms.

J. Neil Schulman is the author of Alongside Night (1982) and The Rainbow Cadenza (1983). He has recently founded the Committee to Enforce the Second Amendment. He can be reached at P.O. Box 94 Long Beach, Ca. 90801
The right to arms is not subject to repeal!

Interpreting the Meaning & Purpose of the Second Amendment
By Bernadine Smith

The framers of the Constitution were quite skillful in the use and drafting of the English Language. By putting the Militia at the forefront of the sentence which comprises the Second Amendment of the Bill of Rights, they stressed the importance of the collective use of the right to arms. The collective right used in this manner, has equal status with the individual aspects of this absolute right.

When the 1787 Constitution was ready to be submitted to the governors of the states for ratification, Patrick Henry, the immortal voice for liberty, lectured daily against it in the Virginia State House for three weeks, criticizing the Constitution, warning that it has been written "as if only good men will take office!" He asked what they would do when evil men took office. "When evil men take office, the whole gang will be in collision," he declared, "and they will keep the people in utter ignorance and steal their liberty by ambushade!"

("Entrapment from a concealed position.

Patrick Henry asked, "What resistance could be made if the people have no guns?" ... "Your guns are gone!" ... "Your laws on treason are a sham and a mockery because of their mutual implication." Henry told the Continental Congress that a major reason for his objections to the Constitution was that "It does not leave us the means for defending our rights or waging war against tyrants!" He declared, "This Constitution will trample on your fallen liberty!" Patrick Henry warned that the new federal government would be given "too much money and too much power", and that it would end up "consolidating all power unto itself", convert us "into one solid empire". Amongst other things, one of the areas upon which he felt the need for modification and limitation was the use of the treaty power, an area in which he predicted that "the President would lead in the treason". His fervor and graphic descriptions of "execrable tyranny" which would befall the people if they could not take arms against evil men who might take office, placed Patrick Henry in the forefront of the effort to protect the natural rights of the people. He wanted the immediate opening of another Constitutional Convention to strengthen particular parts of the Constitution. That suggestion not being workable, he proclaimed, "The least

"The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

Thomas Jefferson

you can do is guard it with a Bill of Rights!"

Young James Madison, at the time, saw no need for a Bill of Rights, since the new federal government was to exercise only those powers which were delegated to them. Patrick Henry then said, "Let Mr. Madison tell me when did liberty ever exist when the sword and the purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle shall interpose, no nation ever did, nor ever can retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse." At first, James Madison could not ever envision the possibility of tyranny happening under this Constitution. However, Madison was later blocked from taking a seat in the first Senate. That blow to a man who had been the Secretary of the Constitutional Convention, caused Madison to re-think the probability of danger. His promise to follow through with a proposed Bill of Rights garnered support for him to take a seat in the first House of Representatives. So it was that the Bill of Rights, palladium of man's natural rights, was finalized on December 15, 1791 and it became the un-revocable and superior part of the Constitution of the United States.

Patrick Henry placed all his hopes upon the vigilance of the people of the states to protect the liberty that he helped win in the War of Independence, by their standing behind the Bill of Rights, forbidding any infringement or curtailment of not only the Second Amendment, but of the sworn oath taken "to support and defend the Constitution."

Thomas Jefferson, our Third President, supported the idea of a Bill of Rights, confirming the authority of the people by saying: "The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

May the words that Patrick Henry spoke always be heeded through all the ages to come, as he cautioned: "Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel! Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force, and whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined."
THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR ANTI-GUN LAWS TO BE VALID

The Constitution of the State of California

"The State of California is an inseparable part of the United States of America, and the United States Constitution is the supreme law of the land."

California State Constitution Article II Section 1

All California public officials are sworn to support the supreme law of the land.

The Constitution of the State of California

"I... do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California... that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California."

California State Constitution Article II Section 3

This Rule Book that public officials must obey is still in effect. Violation of the oath of office is an impeachable offense.

The Constitution of the United States of America

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof,... shall be the supreme law of the land.

United States Constitution Article VI General Provisions (2)

The "Bill of Rights" is a part of the Constitution of the United States. The "Bill of Rights" cannot be repealed.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Second Amendment

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

The "Bill of Rights" is a part of the Constitution of the United States. The "Bill of Rights" cannot be repealed.

United States Constitution Article VI General Provisions (3)

All public officials are required to swear allegiance under oath to support and defend the principles within these Constitutions, but if they break this trust, they must be dishonorably discharged. This is the function and reason for taking an oath of office.
GUNS: THEIR DEMOTION FROM A NATURAL RIGHT TO A "CONFERRED" RIGHT.
THE GOAL: CONFISCATION!

HELP US TO WIPE OUT CRIME. GIVE OUR MAYORS PERMISSION TO CONFISCATE ALL GUNS.
AFTER ALL, THE SUPREME COURT knows guns are a "STATE-CONFERRLED PRIVILEGE" THey'll co-operate!

THIS IS HOW WE INTERPRET THE SECOND AMENDMENT... GUN RIGHTS ARE NOT A RIGHT PROTECTED BY THE CONSTITUTION.

THE SUPREME COURT in order to further P.L. 91-297 tries to separate the pernicious gun rights from the fortification of the 2nd Amendment, revising and altering its meaning, constraining it out of existence.

THE COURTS DECIDING THE SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE APPOINTMENT OF NO OTHER AMENDMENT GIVES TO ALL FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS INCLUDING THE STATE GOVERNMENTS.

THE STATE GOVERNMENTS

AHH... NOW, WE SHALL SAY WHAT IS LAWFUL IN FIREARMS! THEY SHALL BE A STATE-CONTROLLED RIGHT. WE WILL PASS "STATE-PREEMPT" LEGISLATION. WHADDYA KNOW, WE PRE-EMPTED THE BILL OF RIGHTS!

The Collusion between local, state, and federal governments! The court decision for "all states to write their own gun laws", referred to above, is one that was given off the record. In order for federal strategy to achieve the objective of complete prohibition of all firearms, it was first necessary for firearms to be classified as a "state-controlled" right. Unfortunately, the National Rifle Association has promoted state-preemption all over the nation! In a letter dated 8-13-75 the Legislative Council of California claims that the state has the power to destroy gun rights entirely because of public safety or the public welfare. It is a fatal mistake for gun owners to believe that there is any substantial protection existing outside of the fortification of the Second Amendment! Neither can a state "take pre-eminence over the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights!" Stay with the Second Amendment—it's unrepeatable!
HOW THE SUPREME COURT HAS PARTICIPATED IN THE COLLUSION WITH THE STATES TO CONFOUND THE ISSUE

The Supreme Court's instruction to the States:

The Supreme Court is part of our trouble! If the Court wants to play the game this way, then why do they allow the federal government to create harmful gun laws???

Oh, yes! It is true that the Second Amendment applies to the federal government, but it also applies to the states as well! The Second Amendment is a part of the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights contains a Preamble which states that its contents are both declaratory and restrictive, which means that all must observe these rights as Supreme Law, and in particular, the federal government is put on notice that they are not to violate these natural laws.

How long can we put up with deliberate lies that are twisting around truthful words so that errant public officials can operate in areas that are actually forbidden to them?

We, Americans, have never given our consent, and never will give our consent, to being divested of the keystone right that backs all of our most sacred rights!

Second Amendment Committee  P.O. Box 1776  Hanford, California 93232
THE SECOND AMENDMENT IS A CLEAR CUT CONFIRMATION!

There is nothing to dispute! We must stop anti-gun public officials from lying about this right!

A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

The Second Amendment is a clear cut confirmation of the right to keep and bear arms. The Second Amendment was built to confirm. No "interpretation" of this amendment by the courts was ever necessary! Today those who approve anti-gun legislation are operating against the law!

No court should be trusted to give us their interpretation of the meaning of the Second Amendment; nor, should we allow the untruthful claims of hired public officials to go unchallenged! Their purpose is to support laws calling for the complete disarmament of the nation.

The confirmation stated in the Second Amendment is in itself a corroboration of a pre-existing law that the founders wanted known and adhered to by all. The reason we are now being subjected to the abusive laws which are intruding upon the right of the people to keep and bear arms is that the correct thinking and the true purpose behind the writing of the Second Amendment has not been enforced.

All of the laws being written which infringe upon the right of the law-abiding people to keep and bear arms are despicable violations of the true law. We must make this clear to all who serve as hired public officials. We must not honor the false proposition that "the courts have not as yet interpreted the Second Amendment". The judicial system has been compromised.

We must demand that our hired public officials obey the true sense of the Second Amendment and insist that they adhere to the correct thinking and purpose behind the drafting of it. Public officials must be required to stop infringing and confounding the people as to what it means.

At the time the Second Amendment was being written, it was the intention of the founders to confirm, document, and secure the right to arms that already existed. They affirmed by the language chosen that this right of the people holds individual and collective elements.

The nation's founders did not create the right -- they themselves were not giving the right to the people -- conversely, they were confirming that the right already existed -- a most essential and absolute right -- and that it was inextricably given to the people by the Creator. It was only necessary for the founders to confirm the existence of this eternal right. This right had its existence even before any constitution was ever put to use. They purposely forbid any curtailment, or prohibition of the individual or collective facets by virtue of the structural language chosen for the amendment.

What we need most is for our hired public officials to stop! -- to stop muddying up the waters by putting forth ridiculous statements, claiming that the right applies to a state militia only. No! The founding fathers would not have entered a principle into law, expecting us to wait 200 years to have unfaithful global government supporters render their interpretation of it!

The purpose for writing the Second Amendment was to erect a barrier against future tyrants who would dare to interfere with the only tools capable of maintaining liberty. Now, what the people need is the resolve to require adherence to the amendment's true purpose, and the courage to prosecute the tyrants of today who abuse and deliberately misconstrue it.

Two avenues are open: (1) Legislative action to repeal anti-gun laws (there is no automatic court review in a bill of repeal) or (2) Ample support to pass the Hanford Pro-Gun Legislation.

Second Amendment Committee  P.O. Box 1776  Hanford, California 93232  559 584 5209
The Bill of Rights

The right to keep and bear arms is not “given” to us by the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights. The right to keep and bear arms is CONFIRMED by the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights. The right is an endowment from the Creator. The right to arms is a part of the common law. The United States is a common law country. The need to use arms is a part of the right of self-preservation. The right of self-preservation is the first law of nature, and an eternal right. The right of self-preservation is an absolute right. The right to arms is an absolute right. Even though governments may try to misconstrue this right, it shall go on forever since it is part of the law of nature. Alexander Hamilton had the arms rights of the people in mind when he said... “They are written, as with a sunbeam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of the Divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.” Federal Supreme Court Justice Jackson said in 1943:

“The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majority and officials, and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One’s right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.”

Jackson, J. West Virginia State Board of Education versus Barnette (1943 319 US 624,638, 87 L ed 1628, 1638. 63 S Ct 1178, 147 ALR 674

While it is true that repeal is one of our most important judicial acts to which we have a right, the Bill of Rights itself can not be repealed. It is irrevocable. The Bill of Rights contains rights which are ordained by God. They are endowments from our Creator. They are our birthrights! No man can undo that which God has endowed!

When the Constitution was first drafted, James Madison, who was the secretary at the Constitutional Convention, was so enamored with this document that he could see no need to go on with any further additions to it. Patrick Henry warned him that they were preparing their document with the idea that only good men would take office. “What are you going to do when evil men take office?” he demanded of them. He declared that the Constitution was a “crazy machine”, and that it would stomp on their fallen liberty. He insisted that a Bill of Rights was the least thing they could do to
guard against the power being given to the “monarchistic” federal government. James Madison could not see the necessity of a Bill of Rights. He felt that the federal government was being delegated only limited power which they could not exceed with all the checks and balances that were built into the system. Mr. Henry warned that “When evil men take over, the whole gang will be in collusion. They will keep the people in utter ignorance and steal their liberty by ambuscade.” (Ambuscade means from a concealed position.)

To make Madison realize how serious it would be to proceed with the Constitution as it was, without a Bill of Rights, Madison was deliberately blocked from obtaining a seat in the first Senate, a position which he had longed for.

Hadn’t Patrick Henry lectured for 20 days in the Virginia Statehouse over the weaknesses in the Constitution? On one occasion he struck out at Madison and said:

“Let Mr. Madison tell me, when did liberty ever exist when the sword and the purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle shall interpose, no nation ever did, nor ever can, retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse.”

“Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force, and whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined!” Mr. Henry warned.

George Mason, Thomas Jefferson, Elbridge Gerry, Richard Henry Lee, among others, stood with Patrick Henry in his efforts to require a Bill of Rights. Mason declared that he would rather do without his right arm than to continue on without a Bill of Rights!

At this point the seats in the Senate were all gone. Young Madison’s thinking was forced to broaden into additional expectations. He finally agreed to the need for a Bill of Rights. Trusting in his sincerity, no one blocked him from obtaining a seat in the newly forming House of Representatives. There he carried through with his promise to bring forth a Bill of Rights.

All who contributed to the drafting of the Bill of Rights did not place anything into this shelter that did not already exist! The amendments within confirm the existence of natural rights. These are the highest of laws and yet the most endangered! Without the right to keep and bear arms, individually and collectively, being included, any other rights in the Bill of Rights would not have been self-sustainable. Arms are the keystone that backstops all of the other rights. It was intended to secure and maintain the people’s superiority over their hired public assistants, and to protect them against tyranny and treasonous acts within the government. Government was never intended to possess greater force than the force which the people themselves possessed.

Preservation of our Constitutional Compact, maintaining the perpetual nature of the Bill of Rights, providing security to a free state, maintaining a well regulated militia of respectful citizen soldiers, and preventing tyranny in government are obligations of the people themselves which they cannot entrust to government officials. The Second Amendment is the only Amendment that possesses the necessary force to make these objectives possible. The Second Amendment is sustained by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

The right of the people to keep and bear arms cannot be repealed. It was meant to be beyond the reach of the treaty making power, beyond the reach of the commerce clause, beyond the reach of executive orders or presidential agreements, and beyond the reach of federal or state law-making powers. The Bill of Rights consists of immutable law that no man can put asunder.
These documents contain the rules by which all public officials in the service of the United States must conform. These two documents belong exclusively to the people. None of the principles within can be altered or revoked without the consent of the governed.

This instrument guards you against the loss of your authority over your public officials, and sustains your right to limit the power that they can exercise over you.

This instrument guards against the loss of liberty and forbids public officials from interfering with these, your most endangered rights and essential needs.

The people do not have to give up their armed forces and their firearms! What is happening is without their consent, and is being done behind their backs. It is not valid.
This fact is as old as the Revolutionary War: You've got to have one in order to have the other two!

Public opinion has been manipulated. The only way the people will retain their sovereignty is by having guns! Only free people have guns! Are you listening to the manipulators call the best defensive weapons that good men own "assault weapons"?
Listen folks,

GET THIS STRAIGHT!
ONCE AND FOR ALL!
Good men do not have
assault weapons.
More than ever before in American history, law-abiding people need to be armed, but because of the awesome predominance of public officials in the United States, programmed to vote against firearms, legislatures are passing more and more restrictive firearms bills as "law". The result is that the law-abiding people are becoming less and less able to retain their basic rights, fulfill their responsibilities to secure the state, and defend society against men of evil intent.

Good people are being treated the same as those who are admitted criminals. All are to be disarmed as the legislators engage in an engineered war against their own respectable fellow citizens. Meanwhile, men of the most evil intent, go free.

Good arms are being classified under false titles, and are being banned as "assault weapons". The real truth behind this smear campaign to vilify arms is a devious master plan to render the whole nation completely disarmed. The plan includes transferring the nation's armed forces to commanders from foreign countries. (Reference: Public Law 87-297 United States Code Books Title 22 Section 2551, etc.)

Law-abiding people do not own "assault weapons". Theirs are weapons of defense. They have the right and the duty to possess the best weapons available in order to defend against the criminal element of our society. They must at all times be able to defend against invasion by the enemies of the United States. Disarming the people will impair the energy of the entire system. It will transform the nation from a republic to a full dictatorship overnight. Crime and "public safety" have been used as excuses to cover up the real reasons for divesting the people of items essential to their well being.

Restricting law-abiding people from arms is an assault to the Constitutional system, as well as being an assault upon the sovereignty of the people. If these "assault laws" are not removed and rescinded, they will be responsible for fatally undermining the system.

Whether they will admit it or not, legislators who vote to pass anti-gun "laws" (devious acts called "laws") are guilty of altering the American system of government. The people are the ultimate power in the American system of government only if they remain as armed citizens. Arms are the only tools by which they are able to maintain their liberty. If they lose their arms, they will lose their sovereignty. Liberty will be lost and a dictatorship will take its place.

George Washington warned of the consequences in allowing public officials to make assaults upon the system of government when he stated in his Farewell Address: "One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown."

Isn't it time for law makers to start writing real laws and to stop assaulting the Constitutional system?
These two are violating more than our supreme law of the land. The laughing they do is because the people are so easy to fool.
Looking back on it all, Bill, didja’ ever think it was going to be that easy to get the guns away from the people?

No, Hillary, ah didn’t think so at first, but then, ah saw how little they knew about their own government, and all their safeguards. Then, I realized we had ’em!

Gunowners! Keep in mind that the Founding Fathers left you, your rights and liberty, well defended against tyranny from the likes of those above.

Oath of office, & the absolute right of the people to keep and bear arms, individually & collectively.
A detective in San Diego, California has put together an article exposing how socialist/communist public officials have been forcing mind-bending techniques upon our local police, and training the rookies for a militarized communist replacement for our former law enforcement system. The article is written by Phillip Worts. His article puts the pieces together and exposes how Marxists tactics are being used to change the performance of American law enforcement officials.

Up to now even our older police officers have not been able to explain the changes and operational alterations that have been forced upon them, but with this expose by Detective Phillip Worts all the pieces fall into place for the benefit of police officers as well as those of us researchers who have been tracking the subversion emanating from the smoky corridors in Washington, D.C.

Worts shows how Communist strategies have been revived, redefined, and implemented for the purpose of controlling the American people.

You already know what they have done to the teachers in our schools, who are forced to practice techniques which mind control the thinking of the young. You have also seen how the courts and the law-making bodies push subversive legislation which our president and governors willingly sign into "law". Now you will have a bona fide expose on what is happening to those in law enforcement.

I strongly urge you to go to the following web site for Detective Phillip Worts' well written article:

http://www.crossroad.to/articles2/Community-Policing.htm

Make a copy of this article and take it to those you trust in law enforcement. Many police officers know something is wrong, but they don't know how to explain it. Worts' article is so clear-cut! If we can wake up this important segment of our governmental system, and get law enforcement to stand with us instead of against us, we will have reached a turning point against the new world order. If we fail to do this now, we will lose major support when it comes to enforcing New Jersey Representative Rush Holt's bad gun bill H.R. 124. There is a lot more to say on this subject, but I think you will value the information you will find on the web site.

If you desire, I can fax over to you his article with the underlining and marginal notes I did on my copy. It runs about 10 pages as I will include a copy of Maureen Heaton's article entitled "Participatory Democracy". The latter is also found on my web site (www.libertygunrights.com) under the category entitled "Federal State Collusion". My phone number is 559 584 5209. Whatever you do — spread the word heavily about Worts' article.

Some of you researchers are familiar with the technique called "Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System" (PPBS). This was the prototype that was first introduced into both the schools and general government, forced by the Office of Management and Budget, during the late 60's. It is also based upon a predetermined marxist outcome. It gets its momentum from the federal block grant programming.

Contact me if you have any questions. We could turn the tables on the global internationalists that are holding down the seats and the presidency in our government!

Remember Lincoln once said: "You can fool some of the people, all of the time, and all of the people, some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time!" Much credit goes to Phillip Worts for assembling a great article!

Sincerely hoping you will follow through, and spread the word, yours truly,
SOVIETIZATION OF OUR POLICE

Phillip Worts shows how Communist strategies have been revived, redefined and are now being used to control the American people:

"Communist Oriented Policing?"

©2000 Phillip Worts, Detective San Diego Police Department

There is a myth that communism is dead and that the cold war is over. Nothing could be further from the truth. The problem is that few people today understand what communism really is and just where the cold war battle lines are actually drawn. Crack open a dictionary and look up the term “Dialectical Materialism.” You should find something like this:

"A philosophy founded by Karl Marx… which forms the basis of Communist doctrine: it combines the materialistic idea of matter over mind with the Hegelian dialectic in which opposing forces are constantly being reunited at a higher level." — Lexicon Webster Dictionary

But that definition might beg the question, “What is the Hegelian dialectic?” For modern man, the answer to that question is epic. The Hegelian dialectic has profoundly impacted the world in which you live.

What is communism?

The Dialectic: Fomenting the Revolution

The concept of the dialectic has been around for a long time. It is simply that of opposite positions: Thesis (position) vs. Antithesis (opposite position). In traditional logic, if my thesis was true, then all other positions were by definition untrue. For example, if my thesis is $2 + 2 = 4$, then all other answers (antithesis) are false. Georg W.F. Hegel, the nineteenth century German philosopher, turned that concept upside down by equalizing Thesis and Antithesis. All things are now relative. There is no such thing as absolute truth to be found anywhere. Instead, “truth” is found in Synthesis, a compromise of Thesis and Antithesis. This is the heart and soul of the consensus process.

This is diametrically opposed to the Judeo-Christian world-view prevalent in the Western world for the better part of two millennia that held that God existed, that He existed outside of the material creation and that man had a moral obligation to Him and His laws. God was transcendent and thus truth was absolute and transcendent, outside of our ability to manipulate it. This all changed with Hegel and modern man was born. Man could not challenge any authority and position, even God. Since there is no such thing as absolute truth, “my truth” is just as good as “your truth”, so don’t tell me what to think or how to behave. As Nietzsche, the “God is Dead” philosopher, would later say, “There is absolutely no absolute.” Now $2 + 2$ can equal 5,
or 17, or whatever you feel is right. (Hint: This is why our schools are failing. All teachers are certified on Benjamin Bloom’s work. He said “...we recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and all places”).

At about the same time that Hegel was passing from the scene, Karl Marx caught the revolutionary fever. He drew heavily from Hegel (the dialectic) and Feuerbach (materialism). He picked up where the other philosophers left the discussion, but with a twist. He scornfully stated, “The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways. The point, however, is to change it.” To CHANGE the WORLD was to become the warp and woof of Marxism. In the Marxian interpretation of reality, God had been abandoned. Alone in his universe, man was to fill the vacuum left by religion with materialism. Religion was the enemy of all progress. As he wrote in 1843, “Religion is the opium of the people.” No longer bound to a relationship with his Creator, the social relationship of “man to man” became the principle of Marx’s theory. It followed that these social relationships, which necessarily involve conflict, cause the changes in human progress. As the opening words of the Communist Manifesto announce: “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.” Note the dialectic reasoning: the clash of opposites produces synthesis and change. Man, freed from religious restraints will carry the revolution (change via conflict) forward until all are equal in a man made utopia on earth. To that end, the Manifesto concludes, “Working men of all countries, unite!”

To summarize Marxism:

- It is Dialectical Materialism, or, in simpler terms: a God-expunged human reasoning process.

- REVOLUTION is its goal, to “change the world”, Marx said.

- The CHANGE is to be from a Theistic World View (Old World Order) to a Humanistic World View (New World Order). The term New World Order was a popular euphemism for world communism for years. Conspiracy kooks did not invent it. When it started to take on negative connotations, it was dropped for the nicer sounding label, Global Governance.

- Change is to occur through CONFLICT, (Crisis/Problems/Issues).

**The Cold War. Where is the battlefield?**

Change Happens: The Re-culturing of America

Even as the worldwide communist revolution got underway in earnest around the globe, a rift was forming within Marxist intellectual circles. Around the turn of the century there was a growing trend within this movement that a better way to change the world is not abruptly and violently at the point of a bayonet, (traditional Marxist revolution), but rather it should be done slowly and incrementally by transforming individuals and their cultural institutions. Then you
can control a country as effectively as if you conquered it militarily. In fact, this method is preferred because one does not have to rebuild bombed out cities and dig all those mass graves!

The home for this new wave of dialectical Marxist thinking became the emerging “science” of socio-psychology. It may come as a surprise to many to discover that virtually all of the pillars of modern psychology were humanistic utopians who believed that there is no God, that mankind can and should be manipulated (for its own good, of course), and that all social problems can be solved by the proper reprogramming of man’s mind. This would lead to an era of peace and prosperity based on diversity, tolerance and unity. Most of their work dealt with the details of human behavior, but their over-arching view was that of transforming society (echo the revolution). Hence, they came to be known as “Transformational Marxists”.

One such group was the Fabian Socialists, who took their name from the Roman general, Fabius. Fabius, it will be remembered, was confronted with Hannibal’s invasion of Italy. Hannibal with his elephants held the advantage of superior forces, but was far from home and supplies. Instead of confronting his foe head on, a battle he would have certainly lost, Fabius utilized hit-and-run tactics. Harassing his enemy and wearing him down incrementally piece-by-piece over time until Hannibal capitulated, Fabius won the war. The Fabian Socialists adopted this strategy in their goal of world socialism. In a similar vein, the transformational Marxists advocated a “slow march through the institutions,” as famous Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci would say. Gramsci’s theories cannot be overstated in this regard, as this strategy has become synonymous with his name. The Gramsci Strategy is the “War of Position”, (i.e. the battle ground is for the mind and culture) vs. the “War of Maneuver”, (i.e. traditional battlefield warfare with guns and bombs). Gramsci engendered the anger of his communist counterparts in Moscow when he basically told them they were doing it all wrong. Gramsci died in prison under Mussolini’s regime, but his strategy has become the strategy for changing society.[1]

Meanwhile, in Germany, a group of some 21 Marxist socio-psychologists gathered in Frankfurt and formed the Institute of Marxist Research. Perhaps that was a little too obvious for their opponents and they renamed it the Institute for Social Research. When Hitler rose to power, most of these men fled to America and continued their work here. Kurt Lewin, J.I., Moreno, Theodor Adorno, Erik Fromm, Max Horkheimer and others found positions in American universities and had their work funded by pro-Marxist foundations.

Kurt Lewin is of special interest for this discussion because it was he who went to M.I.T. and conducted the research involving group dynamics that laid the foundation for Total Quality Management. At the risk of oversimplifying how the process of group dynamics works, it could be summarized as a method of belief and behavior modification, using dialectic-reasoning skills (remember, all truth is relative), in a group setting. It utilizes the inherent fear an individual person has of being alienated from the group. By use of a change agent, or “facilitator”[2], individuals are herded toward “consensus” by compromising their position for the sake of “social harmony.” According to Lewin,

“A successful change includes, therefore, three aspects: UNFREEZING the present level, MOVING to the new level, and FREEZING group life on the new level.”[3]
This is precisely the technique with which the communists brainwashed American POWs, the only difference being they could accelerate the "unfreezing" phase with physical torture. In group dynamics the pain is not physical, it's emotional. Do not underestimate the force of emotional pain. POWs frequently described their long periods in isolation as worse than some of the most brutal physical torture. Isolation from the group is a powerful behavior modification weapon. Transformational Marxists such as Kurt Lewin refined their weapon for the new battlefield: Using group dynamics to invade the culture to affect the paradigm shift.

The weapon looks like this:

- A Diverse Group ("Diversity" needed for conflict)
- Dialoging to Consensus (Dialectic process)
- Over a Social Issue (Problem/Crisis/Issues)
- In a Facilitated Meeting (Controlled environment using facilitator/change agent)
- To a Predetermined Outcome (Paradigm shift)

The Marxist Trojan Horse

**TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT**

TQM is an organizational transformation strategy that uses:

- Group Dynamics
- Facilitator/Change Agents ("Strategic Planning" occurs in councils)
- "Problem Solving"
- Systems Management (ISO 9000) ← The P.P.B.S.

Decoding the term "Total Quality Management" is impossible without an understanding of the Marxist foundation upon which it was built. I use the word "decoding" because so many of the dialectic concepts are masked by nice sounding double-talk.

```
TOTAL = Holistic, Gestalt, Global
QUALITY[5] = People. (Also slang, short for TQM systems in general, e.g. "We have a Quality organization").
MANAGEMENT = The facilitators, the agents of change.
```

With this background we arrive at our current application of the dialectic in our nation. I would like to now focus on the role that your local law enforcement agency has in the "re-
culturings of America.” Your local beat cop has a special part to play, and he doesn’t even realize it. Not only has TQM change agents restructured many of the police departments in America, they are now in a position to turn the police themselves into the facilitators of the community through a program called COPs, or Community Oriented Policing. COPs is a federally funded program administered through the U.S. Department of Justice. What is COPs? The most succinct definition I found was in a DJ brochure:

**COMMUNITY POLICING WHAT IS IT?**

Shift in philosophy about police duties vs. community responsibilities to a team concept of **TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT** of the community.  
Rede[identifying the police role as a **FACILITATOR** in the community.  
(Emphasis mine).

Translation: Transformation from a constitutionally empowered local police force performing their duty to keep the peace to that of a change agent working within the community to affect a Marxist paradigm shift. Pay close attention to what the influential German Marxist Georg Lukacs had to say about who the facilitators are in the community:  “The institutions in socialist society which act as the facilitators between the public and private realms are the Soviets. They [facilitators] are the congresses [diverse groups], which facilitate the debate [dialoguing to consensus] of universal problems [social issues] in the context of the everyday.”[6]

- Leaders of the community (law enforcement, government, business, education, health, civic, non-profit, medical, religious, etc.) collaborating to identify problems in the community, what the significant impact on people will be, and suggesting solutions to those problems.  (This is POP, or Problem Oriented Policing. See footnote).[7]

- Identifying common ground, where all factions of a community can work together for the **COMMON GOOD** of the community in a broader problem-solving approach. Forming a partnership between police and the rest of the community where each is accountable to each other and the community as whole.  (Emphasis mine. End of COPs definition).

Note the reference to the “common good”, the ever-present ideal in the communist state. Individual rights become subordinated to the so-called greater good. This raises serious concern over the role of the police officer in society as a “partner” with community groups and social service programs, which due to the blurring of lines of responsibility, are unaccountable to the public [voters].

To further understand the philosophy of COPs, one does not have to look further than the late socio-psychologist Dr. Robert Trojanowicz. Formerly the director of the National Center for Community Policing at the University of Michigan, he is considered the father of Community Oriented Policing.
Consider the following selections from his writings:

"Social control is most effective at the individual level. **THE PERSONAL CONSCIENCE IS THE KEY ELEMENT** in ensuring self-control, refraining from deviant behavior even when it can be easily perpetrated."\[8\]

"The family, the next most important unit affecting social control, is obviously instrumental in the initial formation of the conscience and in the continued reinforcement of the values that encourage law abiding behavior."\[9\]

This is an astonishing admission of the fundamental dynamics of crime prevention and social disorder. The most conservative thinkers alive today couldn’t have better articulated what makes for domestic tranquility in any society. Our founding fathers were keenly aware of this fact. James Madison cited the fact that our form of limited government is “wholly inadequate” without personal conscience as the internal social control. So then, in an effort to solve America’s moral chaos, we are going to restore the personal conscience by encouraging accountability to a higher authority (ten commandments) and strengthening the family, right? Don’t be silly, says Dr. Trojanowicz.

"Unfortunately, because of the reduction of influence exerted neighbors, the extended family and even the family, social control is now often more dependent on external control, than on internal self-control."\[10\]

Oh, darn, he says. Since that “unfortunate” breakdown of conscience and the family structure, the social order is now dependent on “external control”. Read that, “The State”. Unfortunately indeed! Dr. Trojanowicz ponders the dilemma of the current state of affairs in his paper *Community Policing and the Challenge of Diversity*:

"In addition to raising questions (dialectic reasoning questions all absolutes) about our national identity, increasing diversity also raises questions about how we define American ‘values’ and ‘morality.’ (Absolute values of right and wrong vs. relative values). Many strongly held traditional beliefs derive from Judeo-Christian traditions, blended with faith in the intrinsic virtues of family and the American Dream of the United States as a meritocracy where those who are willing to work hard will succeed. Can this model encompass the experience of the growing number of Muslims, Hindus and Buddhists among us? (What, Muslims Hindus and Buddhists aren’t willing to work hard?) Does it reflect sufficient sensitivity to the concerns of people of color, women and gays?"\[11\]

Got that? Traditional Judeo-Christian beliefs (with their absolute truths and morals) are out, diversity and relative values are in. If we are not to restore the personal conscience and the family, what is his solution? He continues:

"The community of interest generated by crime, disorder and fear of crime becomes the goal to allow community policing officer an entre into the geographic community."\[12\]
If you did not fall out of your chair with that line, you weren't paying attention. Social chaos is the GOAL for the transformational Marxist. The crisis of crime and disorder is the door for the police officer as facilitator/change agent to enter the community (the "client", or the latest term, "customer") and to initiate the paradigm shift! Even though these social architects plainly admit what is most vital in making for a crime free community, they have absolutely no intention of restoring "individual conscience" or going back to repairing the traditional family. On the contrary, for the past sixty years these socio-psychologists have been introducing these very dialectic concepts into our school system with the intent on demolishing personal conscience. Is there any doubt they have succeeded? For them, there is no going back:

"They Americans may not yet recognize that there is no 'going back to basics' in education." Training manual for Goals 2000.

"If 'Equality of Opportunity' is to become a part of the American Dream, the traditional family must be weakened." Socio-psychologist James Coleman.

"In order to effect rapid change, one must mount a vigorous attack on the family lest the traditions of present generations be preserved." Socio-psychologist Warren Bennis in his book, The Temporary Society. Bennis' book "Leaders", was recommended reading at one time when one was promoted to sergeant on the S.D.P.D., wherein he identifies the leaders in any organization as "agents of change".

Dr. Trojanowicz admits in no uncertain terms that is what his research is all about:

"It should also be noted that the continuing interest in finding a viable definition for the term community has not merely been an intellectual exercise. The theme underlying much of the research is that once you can identify a community, you have discovered the primary unit of society ABOVE the level of the individual and the family that can be mobilized to take concerted action to bring about POSITIVE SOCIAL CHANGE."[14]

Just in case you doubt the Marxist nature of their concepts of community transformation, Trojanowicz quotes Saul Alinsky, the extreme Marxist change agent of the '60's who authored Rules for Radicals. Alinsky proposed "we begin viewing community through the prism of issues (issues=problems=crisis=conflict) which, in essence, constitutes the most urgent kind of community of interest."[15]

"What community policing does is put an officer in daily face-to-face contact with the community, so that he or she can have the input of the community in setting priorities. Unlike police programs of the past where police administrators or so-called community leaders set the police agenda, the community policing movement encourages average citizens to become involved."[16]
Formerly, the police administrators were accountable to the elected officials who were accountable to the voters (representative democracy). This new paradigm that Trojanowicz describes is exactly what Marxist Georg Lukacs termed “participatory democracy” and is nothing more than the Soviet style council. The United States Constitution was the law of the land (absolute authority) restraining government intrusion into the rights of the individual. The framers designed it to insulate the private realm (the individual) from the public realm (government). Allow me to repeat Lukacs:

“The institutions in socialist society which act as the facilitators between the public and private realms are the Soviets.”

By practicing the dialectic, we are removing the only barrier between a tyrannical government and the private citizen. Your neighborhood cop is now that facilitator, the Soviet. Why a police officer?

“In the role of the community ombudsman/liaison (i.e. facilitator), the community policing officer also acts as the community’s link to other public agencies. The police are the only governmental agency open 24 hours a day, which makes them the ideal public agent to begin regenerating community spirit.”[17]

The Soviet:

A Diverse Group
Dialoging to Consensus
Over a Social Issue
In a Facilitated Meeting
To a Predetermined Outcome

Conclusion: Useful idiots?

When Lenin was consolidating the Bolshevik revolution, he wrote how he would implement the communist bureaucracy without hardcore Marxist believers. While the elite rulers of his inner circle understood the structure he was building, Lenin said he would exploit the natural vanity and ambition of people to forward his agenda without them knowing what they were really doing. Eager to gain his favor and to enhance their political careers, they would fall all over themselves trying to promote his agenda. He called these types of people “Useful Idiots.” Before you brand every police officer you see as an undercover Marxist, understand that most of them comprehend little of what they are participating in. In reality, most officers intuitively know that something is wrong in their organization, but they play the game rather than risk damaging their career. Sadly, they constitute a vast army of “useful idiots.”

I’m all for “promoting mutual trust” and “cooperation between the people and the police” and “empowering neighborhoods.” These “positive social changes” are the selling points for
Community Policing. But in reality, those appealing ideals camouflage the vehicle of Marxist change.

Who asked the citizenry if they wanted their communities “transformed” and their government “reinvented?” Who asked parents if they wanted their children to learn with their feelings instead of learning facts? Who asked your local police officers if they wanted their beliefs and attitudes manipulated? No one asked because if someone did, they would have been run out of town. Instead, using dialectic-reasoning skills, they have schemed to seduce, deceive and manipulate every community in the land into a utopian vision of so-called “unity in diversity.” These social engineers have no intention of taking America back to individual conscience within the family structure in order to preserve domestic peace and tranquility. That would mean a return to recognizing and submitting to the Higher Authority. This “vision” has failed whenever it has been tried. By participating in the dialectic, we have deified human reason; traded in God and truth for relative values and consensus; and abandoned individual liberty and inalienable rights for the common good and diversity. In the final analysis, we are destined for Totalitarian, and worse, the loss of our souls.

The terms “collectivism,” “socialism,” “Marxism,” “New World Order” etc., may be worn out and abandoned. The names change, because deception is one of the rules of the game. Many erroneously believe that the cold war is over and that we actually won. But the revolution is still very much alive and America is losing. The culture war is raging in our schools, our workplaces, our media and our churches. Antonio Gramsci would be very pleased if he could see just how effective his strategy has been.

Contact Phillip Worts at Xmarkxspot@aol.com

Endnotes:

[1] A certain governor from Arkansas attended the Gramsci Institute in Italy.

[2] In early works from the ‘40s and ‘50s such as Kenneth Bennis’s Human Relations in Curriculum Change, Warren Bennis’s Planning of Change and Planned Change by Ron Lippett, they frequently refer to those helping bring about change as “change agents” or “agents of change”. The “change agents” eventually were referred to simply as “Facilitators”, from the word Facile that means to guide and make easy.

[3] Kurt Lewin, Human Relations in Curriculum Change, p.34 (I recently attended training sponsored by the COPs program, “Facilitation Skills for Law Enforcement”, which was a crude re-hash of Kenneth Bennis’s book on organizational change. It prominently features Lewin’s material).

[4] Socio-psychologists Edgar Schien and Warren Bennis studied how the communists brainwashed POWs so they could apply their techniques “humanely” in American classrooms.

[5] Antonio Gramsci categorizes objects, things that can be reproduced, as quantity. “Quality” he says, “should be attributed to men, not to things....” Prison Notebooks p.308. If that sounds like convoluted reasoning, that’s because it is!

[6] Georg Lukacs, The Process of Democratization, p.46. Soviet can mean an individual, someone who practices the dialectic, or a political system. In Russia, the soviet system consists of a hierarchy of councils, from the local
level all the way to the top echelon, the Supreme Soviet Council. In this context, the soviet is the system, particularly the local council.

[7] Problem Oriented Policing (POP) was supposedly “invented” by Dr. Herman Goldstein. But the “problem solving techniques” embodied in POP were laid out by Lewin in the 1940’s and is simply a rip-off of one aspect of TQM.


[11] Dr. Trojanowicz, Community Policing and the Challenge of Diversity, p.2


[13] In Planned Change, by Ron Lippitt, the organization or individual that is targeted for change is the “client”, as if he were a “consumer” of the change agent’s services. I think “victim” more accurately describes the recipient of such “service.” The San Diego Police Department recently opened a new division entitled The Business Center. The concept is right out of Lippitt’s work. The police dept.’s “customers” are “consumers” of police services.


[16] Ibid, p.9

[17] Ibid, p.10, emphasis added

TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

* In the United States this method has long ago been put into practice by the Office of Management and Budget (O.M.B.). The overall method being used is called by an innocent sounding name: “Planning, Programming and Budgeting System” (P.P.B.S.). O.M.B. controls the federal block grants given to communities. Grants come with federal “strings” attached.
THE MILITARIZATION OF UNITED STATES CIVILIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT UNDER INTERNATIONAL UNIFIED COMMAND

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL PRESS RELEASE #6397 REVEALS U.N. INTENTION TO COMMANDEER U.S.A. CIVILIAN POLICE FOR U.N. OPERATIONS

United Nations Rapid Response Mechanism

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION** AND INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

U.N. Standardized Training Recruitment of Local Police

Mil-standards 499-A systems

U.S. President enacts U.N. Resolutions via Executive Orders

N.A.C.C.J.S.G. L.E.A.A.****

HOMELELAND SECURITY BASED ON STATE DEPT. PUB. 7277

Total Quality Management: Dialectics & Facilitators

F.E.M.A. & E.M.A.

Public Safety Agency merges police and military

C.S.T.J. C.E.M.C.

Federal control of state law enforcement systems

City Managers -- Lowest Link in Chain of command -- have control of City Councils, and Chiefs of Police.

Under 1313 Control***

Community Oriented Policing (COPS) Sovietization of Police

Bringing to a Consensus Use of Delphi Technique

Soviet-American Police Exchange Program

Planned elimination of Sheriffs

Participatory Democracy


THE BUILDING OF THE "RAPID RESPONSE MECHANISM" -- LONG DESIRED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THEIR QUEST FOR "NEW WORLD ORDER" MANAGEMENT.

The obvious encroachment of the United Nations into U.S. sovereignty makes it imperative that the U.S. should withdraw from the United Nations as soon as possible. Call your State Governor and demand action.


** The U.N. has already been given control to set standards for U.S. jails.

*** Public Administration Clearing House -- 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois under Rockefeller dominance.

**** Nat’l. Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals & Law Enforcement Assistance Administration restructured nation for militarized police.

Updated 4-23-03
WHEN LEADERS LEAD BY POLLSTERS POLLS

CLOSE-UP VIEW

STEADY AS SHE GOES, SIR! OUR CALCULATIONS SHOW YOU ARE STILL IN THE MAINSTREAM...

VIEW FROM AFAR

...IN FACT, WE SEEM TO BE GAINING SPEED!

The Commander-in-chief steers the U.S.S. Constitution into the New World Order
We are indebted to the National Economic Council of New York City for the above map and the research involved. The plans on identical plans to the Geneva Conference for approval. An official document, No. 727, issued by the State Department, lists all the nations. Colombia, Venezuela. Etc. United States and Canada to be mentioned. Zones of Latin America. Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Paraguay. This plan would be larger in scope than the proposed Pan American Peace Conference. It would cover a wide area of the Western Hemisphere. United States and Canada would not be involved. The idea is to create a world police force, to maintain order, and to promote world peace. The size and scope of the proposed peace force would be determined by the nations involved. The plan has the support of the United Nations.
"10. Directors will receive unlimited travel facilities on all scheduled air services throughout the World....

"15. The World Organization system of security comes into force forthwith. Troop movements will be co-ordinated by the Commander World Security Forces."

"16. Detail of World Security Land Forces and their initial locations is given below."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government to raise divisions</th>
<th>Initial Location (zones)</th>
<th>Initial HQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>61 Com. F/F</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eire</td>
<td>62 PC</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>63 MW</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>64 Southern</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia, Venezuela</td>
<td>65 Atlantic</td>
<td>Williamsport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam, Burma</td>
<td>67 Cant</td>
<td>Havana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"20. The remaining armed land forces of all nations, unions and commonwealths will be disbanded and personnel absorbed into industry and agriculture."

"21. Ships, personnel and equipment whatsoever of national, union or commonwealth sea forces will be reallocated as required by the Commander Sea Security. The remainder will be disposed of under orders issuing from the World Organization."

"22. Sea bases and areas necessary for him to effect sea security and the free movement of shipping through canals and straits will be nominated by and handed over to the World Organization, if necessary or lease from the owner nation."

"23. Personnel and planes of all national, union or commonwealth air forces whatsoever will be incorporated within the World Organization scheme for air security and will move under the direction of the Commander Air."

"24. Permanent installations and airfields necessary for him to effect his plan will be handed over, on lease if required, to the World Organization."

"26. The Undersea Command will operate under the orders of their Commander as from time to time appointed. The Commander Undersea will take over underwater craft and paraphernalia whatsoever from Governments. He will use this as required in his plan and dispose of the remainder as ordered."
"'27 Research and development projects for the furtherance of scientific discovery and invention will be coordinated by the Commander Research and Development Section. All scientific and technical establishments and equipment whatsoever will be handed over to the World Organization by whom co-ordination in effect will be made.'"

"'28 All personnel of the World Security Forces are professional. The retiring age for officers is 57, rank service is 15-22 years.'"

"'21 To ensure even flow of standard-making commodities the following raw materials and utility will come forthwith within the direction scope of the World Organization:
(a) Petroleum
(b) Metals and supplies usually described as strategic materials.
(c) Shipping completed and in the sea.'"

"'32 All trade agreements between Governments and their plans for future development of basic needs will be co-ordinated by the World Organization . . . . . .
AB: "'Task Force' January 1955 as published and distributed by "Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc.' Map showing police districts reprinted in American Legion magazine May 1955.'"

"'ONE-WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT' THE PLAN IN OUTLINE
"'(For World Government by 1955)'

"'That the existing organization of the United Nations under the terms of its Charter specifically retains and safeguards the sovereignty of National States and envisages the continuance of armed forces as instruments for the enforcement of their will.'"

"'It is necessary, therefore, to amend the Charter. Amendment is, however, impossible without the unanimous consent of the Great Powers.'"

Note: The Great Powers (five) are to be Great Britain, France, U.S.S.R., China and the United States. (8th 43 - 67 - 79, 1951)

"'(1) We propose, therefore, that another World Organization should be created to replace U.N.O. with membership open to all the nations of the world who are willing to forego national sovereignty in order to achieve peace. This organization would, in effect, be the World Government.'"

"'We propose that the United Kingdom should be divided into four separate multi-member constituencies: England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales.'"

"'It is intended that a similar plan should be simultaneously put into action in every other country of the world . . . . . .'

"'It is obvious that the creation of a World Government cannot be postponed until every nation in the world has ratified the Charter; such a delay will perpetrate a veto. Hence one of the clauses of the Charter of World Government will, it is anticipated, contain some such provision as the following:
""When 50 percent of the nations of the world, or the nations representing 50 percent of the peoples of the world, have ratified this Charter, the Legislative Authority herein described shall be deemed to be set up.'"

"'It is impossible to foresee what form the World Government will assume . . . . . . But it is likely that the following powers at least will in any event still have to be contained in the authority of World Government.'"

"'(1) A monopoly of armed forces to be used as a world police force. Participating States to be disarmed to the level of their internal policing commitments.

'(2) The establishment of a World Bank for the purpose of creating a common linked currency throughout the world to hold funds for the Central Authority in order that it may initiate and finance large scale economic planning such as that operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority.'"

"'This plan was endorsed by the World Government Conference held at Montreux, August 17-24, 1947. Representatives of twenty nations were present.'"


IS THE SOUTH TO BE A COLORED REPUBLIC?

'This 'Black Belt' plan which emanated from the Sixth World Congress contemplated confiscation of all white property, seizure of all government agencies in the Southern States, and merger of the States into a Negro Soviet. See the Communist, February 1933, pp. 153-167; W. A. Foster, The Negro People in American History, II, Rept. 2284, pp. 255-276.'


"'In close connection with the unskilled workers is the problem of the Negro worker. The Negro problem is a political and economic problem. The racial oppression of the Negro is simply the expression of his economic bondage and oppression, each intensifying the other. The Communist Party will carry on agitation among the Negro workers to unite them with all class-conscious workers.'"
Folks, this is sedition! Treaties have no power to overrule the U.S. Constitution or the Bill of Rights! There is no consent of the governed for the president to disarm the nation. This is madness!

North American Aviation didn't realize back in the '70s, when it was working with the U.S. government, how long it would take to complete the partial and final disarmament treaties. Look below: Mikhail Gorbachev and United World Federalist Ronald Reagan are signing the first treaty for partial disarmament (INF) in 1987. Prepare yourself for the final treaty to be signed by George W. Bush and Russia's President Putin. Then the communists will have the only army in the world. Meanwhile, the avowed enemies of this nation, including Russia and China, are secretly building up for a first strike against the U.S.A.

Missile pact signed

General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union and President Ronald Reagan of the United States signed the intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) treaty at the White House on 8 December 1987. “Patiens, dedication and goodwill have prevailed over the difficulties and obstacles that were encountered in achieving this historic agreement,” the Secretary-General said, calling the treaty a “truly remarkable development.”

WASHINGTON (AP) -- President Reagan and Soviet Leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev today signed a historic treaty to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear missiles and launched in work toward a more stable arms control pact during their three days of Jasson. “The pact is a great step forward,” said Reagan. “It is a step in the right direction.”

Reagan expressed the treaty with a firm handshake. “This is a historic moment,” he said in reference to the agreement. “It is a historic moment in arms control and a historic moment in our relationship with the Soviet Union.”

Reagan noted that “the world is waiting” as they sit down to begin negotiations.

With that, the two men signed the INF treaty at the Oval Office for the first time. They signed the treaty on behalf of the United States and the Soviet Union.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1987

Hanford Sentinel
THE GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT TREATIES

The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) Allows Mikhail Gorbachev To Oversee The Destruction Of American Defensive Weaponry

Spread over a series of two specific treaties

INF

- Destruction of entire class - short and medium Ground Launched Ballistic Missiles & Cruise Missiles.
- Entry by Russians into key military installations, bases, defense plants, shipyards, major ports, railway centers, motor highways for 13 years as resident inspectors who sequester and destroy above equipment.**
- Greatest achievement: the Verification Process upon which Treaty No.2 depends for completion of its tasks.

THE FIRST TREATY
Signed & passed into law on December 8, 1987

MOBILE SUMMIT
- Communist control of U.S.
- Elimination or conversion of military bases.
- Elimination of national armed forces. (Transferred to U.N.)
- World army which no nation can challenge under United Nations control.
- Elimination of long range missiles & conventional weapons.
- Continual divestiture using Verification System.
- Elimination of citizens guns.

THE SECOND TREATY
The above can be built upon the foundation laid by the first treaty.

*Except for the world peace-keeping force which will be under the command of the United Nations (specifically the Secretary-General of the Security Council who has always been from a socialist or a communist country.)

**Encourages invasion by terrorists inside U.S. borders and terrorists lined up at U.S. Northern and Southern borders.

This purported treaty is not valid! It does not meet the requirements of the U.S. Constitution! For proof, refer to the Sentence Diagram of the Treaty Clause, which is contained in Article VI of the U.S. Constitution. Transferring of the U.S. Armed Forces to the United Nations on a permanent basis is being gradually achieved by use of Presidential Decision Directive-25 (PDD-25) and other quiet presidential agreements.
What makes anybody think they can trust their avowed enemies?

**The Sentinel — WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2002**

**U.S., Russia finalize nuclear arms deal**

**By ANGELA CHARLTON**
Associated Press Reporter

MOSCOW (AP) — A landmark U.S.-Russian agreement slashing each nation's nuclear arsenals by two-thirds has been finalized, the Russian Foreign Ministry said today, a day ahead of President Bush's arrival in Moscow to sign it.

"The text is fully ready for signing," the Foreign Ministry said in a statement, following meetings in Moscow between U.S. Undersecretary of State John Bolton and Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Georgy Mamadov. No details were announced.

Bush announced last week that the deal had been reached after months of tense negotiations, but U.S. and Russian officials have been scrambling to work out final details in recent days.

Bush arrives in Moscow on Thursday. On Friday, he and Putin are to sign the deal, which foresees cuts in each country's arsenal to 1,500 to 2,200 warheads from the current 6,000 each is allowed.

U.S. officials have said that the deal could be the last arms reduction agreement between the two countries, which are increasingly working as partners rather than foes. But Russian officials say the 30-year-old U.S.-Russian arms control efforts should continue.

"I'm convinced that we will continue to work with the Americans side, including preparation of additional agreements on increasing transparency of nuclear weapons cuts," Mikhail Ly senko, head of the Russian Foreign Ministry's security and disarmament department, said today.

A second accord to be signed by the two presidents on Friday, a declaration on shared political and security priorities, is still being negotiated, said a high-ranking Russian diplomat who spoke on condition of anonymity. That document will include a treaty on cooperation in the missile defense field, including early missile warning systems and other measures to increase "predictability and trust," the diplomat said.

"No joint work on a missile defense system is foreseen at this point, the diplomat said.

The Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions is the centerpiece of this week's summit. Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Yakovenko said the deal covers warheads and delivery vehicles, "and everything connected to reducing strategic offensive weapons."
MOSCOW, May 24 — President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin on Friday signed a landmark arms reduction treaty that slashes existing arsenals by two-thirds — the largest ever cut in their nuclear capabilities. Bush said the deal "ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our countries."

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep.

So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. Then capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction.

They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."
PROCESSING THE USA MERGER WITH THE USSR

Compare this article taken from the McAlvany Report printed in 1988 to the public speech by George W. Bush given in 2002.

It sounded preposterous back in 1953 when militant patriotism was still in style. Nobody believed the White House was planning any kind of gradual surrender to the Soviet Union.

Still, when the president of the Ford Foundation, spilled the beans to a Congressional committee man, it did sound believable -- barely -- as Rowan Gaither, then 44, admitted to Norman Dodd, Chief Counsel of the Congressional Reese Commission Investigation of Subversion in Tax Free Foundations, saying:

"I have news for you. Most of us at the executive level here were, at one time or another, active in either the O.S.S., the State Department or the European Economic Administration. During those times, and without exception, we operated under directives issued by the White House, the substance of which were to the effect that we should make every effort to so alter life in the United States as to make possible a comfortable merger with the Soviet Union. We are continuing to be guided by just such directives." ....Roland Gaither

Most Americans, old enough to remember the report, have long since shrugged it off because the press has not relayed any more such news since then.

In light of today's revelations, however, Gaither's words sound prophetic. After 35 years, the muzzle is still on the press and the "comfortable merger" is at hand. A new center of power, christened "the Washcow Axis", now runs between Washington and Moscow.

Compare this Report with the public speech made on May 25, 2002 by Pres. George W. Bush in which he repeatedly referred to America as being a "democracy" (a stand-in word for communism). Bush spoke of a "shared interest" and referred to Russia as:

"a new Russia to be our full partner. Our partnership with Russia will continue to grow....We are entering upon a new chapter in our relations with Russia....We have the opportunity to build a world that is safe."

...President George W. Bush May 25, 2002

Safe for whom? While China continues to build their military machine, including a much larger arsenal of deadly nuclear bombs, George W. Bush has committed the United States to a law which he signed within the last year that requires another large round of U.S. military bases to be shut down, starting in the year 2003. Just what does it take to wake up Americans?

Second Amendment Committee Post Office Box 1776 Hanford, California 93232
The men who sat in Philadelphia in 1787 held entirely different views of the presidency than what we see today. They drew their inspiration and formed policies from the revolutionary doctrines enunciated in the Declaration of Independence that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." They held, that sovereignty resides in the people. Governmental power originates in the people, and a government, therefore, can have and exercise only such powers as the people yield. Thus, while other Constitutions had been grants from the government to the people, ours was a grant from the people to the government. Consequently, the government established by the Constitution was one of limited powers.

Bush, Putin sign arms deal
Leaders also pledge cooperation on missile defense

May 24, 2002 Posted: 10:42 AM EDT (1442 GMT) CNN.com/WORLD

MOSCOW. (CNN) - U.S. President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin put pen to paper Friday, signing a landmark nuclear reduction treaty that would remove from deployment two-thirds of each nation's long-range nuclear weapons over 10 years.

"This is a historic and hopeful day for Russia and America," Bush said. "It's a historic day for the world as well. President Putin and I today ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our two countries."

When the people granted limited powers to the federal government, did they expect public officials to have the perfidy to weaken the ability of the citizens to defend their republican system of government, caused by treaties, such as this, that lessen the amount of defense equipment that the people of the United States may possess?

The treaty, Bush said at the signing ceremony, "liquidates the Cold War legacy of nuclear hostility."

"President Putin and I today ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our two countries."

--- President Bush

The pact will remove from deployment each nation's existing store of roughly 5,000 to 6,000 warheads by about 65 percent over the next decade. The resulting number of warheads held by each country would range from 1,700 to 2,200.

Bush and Putin also discussed the U.S.-led global war on terrorism and economic relations between the two countries.

"Our nations will continue to cooperate closely in the war against global terror," Bush said. "We understand full well that the people of Russia have suffered at the hands of terrorists, and so have we."
Bush, Putin sign historic arms pact

The signing marks the biggest arms-reduction treaty in history

By Ron Fournier
AP White House Correspondent

MOSCOW — Beneath the Kremlin's glistening domes, President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin signed the biggest nuclear arms-reduction treaty in history on Friday, writing a friendly postscript to their nations' Cold War rivalry.

But before the ink had dried on their 10-year pact, the leaders were struggling to keep Russia's nuclear ties to Iran from straining their new partnership. "Our nations must spare no effort at preventing all forms of proliferation," Bush said as his aides considered offering incentives to win Russia's cooperation.

Elbow to elbow with Putin in the gilded St. Andrews Hall, Bush said the treaty-signing ceremony "ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our countries."

"The Cold War is now "in the rearview mirror of both countries," he said.

Putin called the treaty "a serious move ahead to ensure international security." It marked another tentative step away from Russia's Communist past and toward the West in ways once considered unthinkable.

Next week, Putin will join Bush in Rome to sign an accord binding Russia with NATO, though not as a member of the military alliance formed in the Cold War to contain the Soviet Union.

The arms accord would limit the United States and Russia within 10 years to between 1,700 and 2,200 deployed strategic nuclear warheads each, down from about 6,000 apiece now.

The U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma are expected to ratify the three-page treaty. The relatively small size reflects Bush's informal diplomatic style as well as his reluctance to commit the United States in writing to anything more than he had to.

The treaty allows the United States to store warheads rather than destroy them as Putin wanted. And it leaves both nations with enough missiles to destroy each other's major cities many times over.

"Friends really don't need weapons pointed at each other. We both understand that," Bush said. "But it's a realistic assessment of where we've been, and who knows what'll happen 10 years from now. Who knows what future presidents will say and how they'll react?"

After the ceremony, Bush met with media executives and business leaders, then toured the Kremlin's main square.

Hanford Sentinel
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East, West Practice Partnership For Peace

by Gary Fields

Fort Polk, Louisiana — About 2,500 U.S. troops and 750 soldiers from nations formerly behind the Iron Curtain will conclude the first NATO Partnership for Peace exercise on U.S. soil on Saturday.

As part of the three weeks of exercises, troops from the United Kingdom, United States, Canada and 14 members of the partnership—made up of nations once belonging to or under the domination of the Soviet Union—performed various peacekeeping operations at mock villages on this post.

JOINT EXERCISES: Lt. Col. Vladimir Maringos of Moldova, right, is instructed by U.S. Army Sgt. Author Colver at Fort Polk, Louisiana.

Latvia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. (Editor: Platoons of 50 men are not large numbers, but later each of these young militarily and politically conditioned men becomes the commander of a platoon or larger unit.)

Warrant Officer Pete Arsenault said the most realistic part of the training is the unknown factor "the villagers" represent. At Fort Polk, local residents play the roles. It is "very realistic" Arsenault says. "In the actual situation, the armies might know what's going on, but the civilians don't...understand what we're trying to do."

(Editor: Just as we have long been told, the civilians are the problem, and the target as well. However, although many civilians "don't understand what we're trying to do", thousands do understand, and hundreds of thousands are being informed.)

See stories on pages 9 and 10 about mock assaults on cities and communities in the U.S. These assaults, usually using black helicopters and special military units, are being carried out as practice exercises to prepare the military and multi-jurisdictional forces to "take out" areas of resistance to the New World Order which has been planned for us "future serfs". The young people in military service, and the gung-ho members of the ATF, FBI, and other Federal agencies, just haven't got the picture yet. We pray they will in time.
FACTORS OPERATIVE IN A POST - ARMS CONTROL SITUATION

CONTRACT NO. AF 49(638)-1411

NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION, INC.
SPACE AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS DIVISION
AEROSPACE SCIENCES DIVISION
OPERATIONS ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

APRIL 1965

METHODOLOGY

MATRIX ANALYSIS - TO DETERMINE GROSS INTERACTIONS

DYNAMIC CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS - TO DETERMINE RELATIONSHIPS & FACTORS

- SELECT U.S. OBJECTIVES - (INCLUDING MILITARY OBJECTIVES & GOALS)
- SPECIFY CURRENT SITUATION - RELEVANT TO ARMS CONTROL
- ANSWER QUESTION - "ARE OBJECTIVES BEING ACHIEVED?" IF NO:
- SELECT STRATEGIES TO CHANGE SITUATION
- PREPARE SCENARIO - LIST RELEVANT, CREDIBLE & FEASIBLE ACTIONS
- ANALYSE SCENARIO - TO DETERMINE RELATIONSHIPS
# Chronology of Scenario for Bilateral U.S.-USSR Agreement for Exchange of Military Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General situation stable in Europe</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese situation unchanged Southeast Asia situation improves</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West tensions are eased</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral US-USSR agreement for exchange of military missions is signed</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident at U.S. Naval War College involving ASW problem</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security leak from USSR mission at U.S. Pacific</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO military leaders unofficially protest liberality of the bilateral agreement</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. DOD tightens security in administration of the agreement</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Legend
- ▲ Action occurring at specific time
- ■ Actions or situations continuing over a period of time
# Nuclear Free Zone Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political and Arms Control Developments</td>
<td>Increased cooperation at Geneva Conference</td>
<td>Communist Chinese government leaders commit suicide</td>
<td>Development of nonproliferation treaty</td>
<td>U.S. government removes Central European nuclear-free zone treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More liberal economic policies between east and west become effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. and U.S.S.R. curtail tests on nuclear materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective date for nuclear-free zone treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French policies move toward U.S., U.S.S.R., and NATO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communist China admitted to U.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Developments</td>
<td>AGGRESSIVE ACTS BY COMMUNIST CHINA AND NORTH VIETNAM AGAINST U.S. AND SEATO</td>
<td>U.S.-S.R.E. mutual defense treaty</td>
<td>U.S. JCS order implementing action conforming to Central European nuclear-free zone treaty</td>
<td>U.S. JCS approves nuclear redeployment plan with NATO concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.-S.R.E. mutual defense treaty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. offensive war vs Communist China and North Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- ▲: Action occurring at specific time
- ❌: Action or actions occurring over a period of time

**Note:** The table outlines key events and developments related to the nuclear-free zone initiative, highlighting significant actions and agreements between 1964 and 1967, with particular emphasis on the political and arms control measures taken by various nations.
Treaties do NOT supersede the Constitution!

Those, who claim they do, are daydreaming! The Constitution in Sentence 2 of Article VI referring to the making of treaties, refers to itself when it defines the making of treaties:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

Here it declares that laws must be made in accord with itself (the Constitution). The only authority that public officials have to make law is "law of the United States" and that law is required to be in pursuance of the Constitution.

Treaties do not have any power to supersede the Constitution! It is the most supreme law! Treaties have to agree with the Constitution.

YOU CAN TAKE IT FROM ME, FOLKS, CAUSE I DO KNOW!
TREATIES DO NOT SUPERSEDE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
By Bernadine Smith

Diagramming of the treaty clause proves that there is no other way to interpret the treaty clause in the United States Constitution except as presented on the reverse side. The intent of the treaty clause is obvious. All treaties must respect, be subjected to, conform to, and be in pursuance of the United States Constitution — the required criterion for judging validity. The treaty-making power is not boundless. It cannot violate the principles, nor the spirit or the energy of the Constitution. The language used in it verifies that the construction of the treaty clause was designed to prevent misconception of the treaty power.

Those who seriously claim that the treaty clause says that “treaties are supreme over the Constitution” — or that “treaties can cut clear across the Bill of Rights” intend to deceive for unlawful purposes! (Refer to John Foster Dulles as the promoter of this untruthful remark.)

Thomas Jefferson said: “Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction. I say the same as to the opinion of those who consider the grant of the treaty-making power as boundless. If it is, then we have no Constitution. If it has bounds, they can be no others than the definitions of the powers which that instrument gives.”

The Constitution, laws of the United States, and treaties are, all three, on an equal footing -- only if the criteria is met.

Note that there are two dependent clauses within the compound subject of the diagrammed sentence which restrict treaties from becoming boundless. (See reverse side.)

First, no treaty can be valid if it is not made under the authority of the United States. Under the authority of the United States, all public officials who could participate in the treaty-making process are already bound by their oath of office taken to support and defend the spirit and principles of the Constitution.

Second, in order for a treaty to take effect within the nation, it is required that “enabling” legislation be written in order to make the subject matter of the treaty incumbent upon states, courts, individuals, etc. In order to

It is self-evident: the Constitution has pre-set the standards a treaty must meet before it can qualify as being equal to the Constitution.

draft the “enabling” legislation, lawmakers are bound by that dependent clause (within the main treaty clause) to respect the rule to which they must adhere, and which, of course, is that, it must be drafted in pursuance thereof to the Constitution.

The president is not above the law nor the requirements of these clauses. The president’s oath reads “to preserve, protect, and defend” the Constitution. That oath was especially written by the nation’s founders for all future presidents and placed within the body of the Constitution as a part of the supreme law so that the nation’s chief executive would have to keep himself within the bounds of Constitutional limitations.

Thomas Jefferson also said: “By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaty and cannot be otherwise regulated... It must have meant to except out of these the rights reserved to the states, for surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole government is interdicted from doing in any way.” Manual of Parliamentary Practice. Srgt 2:43 (1881)

The Constitutional duty of states to call out against the federal government whenever it has transgressed, has not been kept. For instance, the Charter of the United Nations, enacted initially as a “treaty” in 1945 was in gross violation of the principles of our Constitution. The Charter has generated a concatenation of sequential unlawful “treaties”, which (passed into so-called “law”) have resulted in the development of an international socialist world government (the “New World Order”). The United Nations Charter, bestows powers upon our president which are forbidden by the United States Constitution! This is why the presidents have been passing executive orders as “laws”, are signing “treaties” which are altering the structure, energies, and principles of the Constitutional system, and are transferring all power under the control of the socialist world government.

The people are the guardians of the Constitution. They should hold their state public officials responsible and require them to take action against the destruction of the republic, caused by the unlawful use of the treaty power, while there is still time! They must declare unqualified laws and treaties as non-laws.
PROOF THAT TREATIES DO NOT SUPERSEDE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

“This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land;...” U.S. Constitution Article VI Line 2

Diagramming of the treaty clause discloses that the subject noun “treaties” does not have exclusive use of the predicate. The structure of the sentence does not allow it. The compound subject is composed of three parts. The latter two parts, “laws” and “treaties”, have been modified by two dependent clauses, providing evidence of the superior position that the first part holds over the latter two. What the sentence is saying is that the “laws” and all “treaties” are subordinate to the “Constitution”, and only if and when this criteria is met, all three shall share equally as the supreme law of the land.

Key:
| Indicates separation of subject from predicate |
There is something you should know about the American power structure!

It consists of three parts:

These are the lesser two.

1. State power .......... These two powers were delegated by the people to secure the blessings of liberty and justice.

This is the superior

and the ultimate power.

2. Federal power ...... of liberty and justice.

3. People power ...... which the people can remain the ultimate power and retain their liberty.
“DELEGATED AUTHORITY
IS NOT SURRENDERED AUTHORITY”
.....James Madison

"Ultimate authority resides in the people”
.... James Madison
Federalist Papers #46

The authority given to public officials is not absolute! The people have the right to retrieve the authority given to public officials if those officials are found to be overthrowing the government.

To give the armed forces to the known enemies of our Constitutional government system,* to close our military bases, and to take away firearms from the law-abiding people, all are acts authorizing the overthrow of our government!

If we have retained ultimate authority, when and how should we begin to exercise it?

Surely, we are not expected to wait until it has reached the stage of hopelessness!

* See Public Law 87-297 U.S. Code Title 22 Sec.2551
THE PIECES ALL FIT TOGETHER FOR SEDITIOUS ACTIVITY!

STATE LEGISLATION
TO DISARM THE LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS ON A PERMANENT BASIS, DESPITE THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO SUPPORT AND DEFEND THE SECOND AMENDMENT. (PERSUARY IS A FELONY)

1967 GUN CONTROL ACT WHICH BROUGHT THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION, WHICH IN TURN LAID PLANS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF U.S. ARMED FORCES—TRANSFERRING PERMANENTLY TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL. THE CHARTER CONTAINS NO RIGHT TO U.S. MILITARY BASES, MORE AND MORE U.S. MILITARY BARRIES CLOSED DOWN.

SECRET DIRECTIVES LAYING OUT PLAN FOR ELIMINATION OF FIREARMS POSSESSSED BY LAW-ABIDING AMERICAN CITIZENS.

U.S. STATE DEPT. DOCUMENT 7277

PUBLIC LAW 87-277

REQUIRING ELIMINATION OF U.S. ARMED FORCES—BUFFING PERMANENTLY TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL. NO MORE MILITARY BASES, NO MORE MILITARY BASES CLOSED DOWN.

A DELIBERATE PLAN FOR THE TOTAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT OF THE UNITED STATES!

Controlled in O.M.B.

"Blue Print for the Peace Race" issued 5 months after State Dept. Pub. 7277.

Public Law 87-297 U.S. Code - Title 22 Sect. 2351

Public Law 101-216

"The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World."

No more Army, no more Navy, and no more Air Force.

U.S. national military transferred to United Nations on a permanent basis.

In 3 stages down to "Zero" national military.

States and Counties near bankruptcy.

NAFTA GATT WTO

COP SWAP WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Police exchanges with foreign countries. Includes Russia and China.

Human Rights Treaties

They are communist documents to be enforced upon all American citizens. No right to own a gun. They replace the American Bill of Rights.

Groups involved in conversion: Council on Foreign Relations, Trilateralists, Bilderberg, etc.

"Delphi Technique" bringing diverse groups to a consensus.

Facilitators, Change Agents

Can sell off roads, tunnels, bridges, rail transportation, airports, mass transit, schools, housing, water supply, etc. E.O. 12803 Privatization Intent to eliminate states.

Human Rights Treaties

They are communist documents to be enforced upon all American citizens. No right to own a gun. They replace the American Bill of Rights.

Groups involved in the conversion: Council on Foreign Relations, Trilateralists, Bilderberg, etc.

All American citizens who refuse to be disarmed will be classed as domestic terrorists.

Bridges widened over nation to accommodate large vehicles like tanks, etc.

Second Amendment Committee P.O. Box 1776 Haddam, Ca 93222 (655) 564-5259

Here's what happens when the states allow all power to be consolidated on the federal level.

All power now consolidated on federal level.

DEPT. OF PEACE H.R. Bill No. 2459 (Rep. Kucinich) which is capable of consigning and transferring all United States federal powers under the U.N.

Dialectics

Citizen patrols

Neighborhood Watch

Total Quality Management

Community Oriented Policing

Since 1970's the United Nations has been setting the operational standards for the jails in United States. Possibly as far back as 1955.

California Specialized Training Institute

DEP. OF PEACE

H.R. Bill No. 2459

(REP. KUCINICH)

PLANNED ELIMINATION OF SHERIFFS

First:

Removal of his control of the courts and over the jails.

Gun Control Act of 1968 created L.E.A.D. project.

GEORGE WASHINGTON
LEFT THESE WORDS
OF WARNINGS IN HIS
"FAREWELL ADDRESS"
WHEN HE COMPLETED
HIS TWO TERMS AS THE
THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES IN 1796

"One method of assault may be
to effect, in the forms of the Con-
stitution, alterations which will impair
the energy of the system, and thus to
undermine what cannot be directly
overthrown..."

....George Washington
THE CONGRESS PLANNED A WORLD GOVERNMENT ON YOUR TAX MONEY
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
CHARTER OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 a.m., in the
caucus room, room 318, Senate Office Building; Senator Elbert D.
Thomas (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.
Present: Senators Thomas of Utah, Wiley, and Smith of New
Jersey.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 66

Senator Thomas. The committee will come to order.
The subcommittee will take up first consideration of Senate Con-
current Resolution No. 66.
I will instruct the reporter to place a copy of this resolution in the
record at the proper place.
(S. Con. Res. 66 is as follows:)

[S. Con. Res. 66. 81st Cong., 1st sess.]
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, in order to achieve universal peace and justice, the present Charter
of the United Nations should be changed to provide a true world government
constitution; and
Whereas article 109 of the present Charter of the United Nations provides
for a general conference to make alterations in said Charter; and
Whereas similar amendatory powers in the Articles of Confederation were
used by the people of the United States in 1787 to adopt a new Constitution to
insure a unified, peaceful nation; and
Whereas the combined effort of many able and intelligent citizens has resulted
in the preparation of a proposed world constitution based upon the principles
of peace through justice with both social rights and civil rights for all peoples:
Now, therefore, be it
Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is
the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should immediately
take the initiative in requesting a general conference of the United Nations
pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of establishing a true world govern-
ment through adoption of such a constitution; and if such a general conference
is not called within one year after the adoption of this resolution, the President
of the United States should then call a world constitutional convention of dele-
gates elected directly by the people for the purpose of adopting a world govern-
ment constitution.

Senator Thomas of Utah. Senator Glen Taylor is our first witness
this morning.
Will you come forward, please, Senator Taylor?
STATEMENT OF HON. GLEN TAYLOR, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Senator Taylor. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am appear here in behalf of Senate Concurrent Resolution 66.

Here are some copies of a proposed constitution for a world federal government. I thought possibly you gentlemen might be interested in it. The document was prepared by Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins, G. A. Borgese, Mortimer J. Adler, Stringfellow Barr, Albert Guerard, Harold A. Innis, Erich Kahler, Wilbur G. Katz, Charles H. McIverain, Robert Redfield and Rexford G. Tugwell. It is a very interesting document. I am particularly impressed by the regional arrangements for representation which it encompasses to prevent large blocs of population on the face of the earth from getting control of any proposed world federation that might be set up.

Senator Wiley. This Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, as I understand, meshes into this draft of a world constitution—in other words, this would be the preliminary step to bring about a world constitution, is that it?

Senator Taylor. Yes, Senator Wiley. Dr. Borgese is here to testify, and I think he does suggest an amendment or two to the resolution.

Senator Wiley. Your resolution suggests, the same as the one that we had yesterday, the calling of a general conference of all the nations, instead of a conference for seven nations.

Senator Taylor. Yes. I cannot go along with the idea that we ought to set up any kind of an organization that is exclusive, or that does not leave the door open for all nations to come in, because I think that is further dividing the world, and I think what we need is unity, rather than further division or a drawing of lines.

Senator Thomas of Utah. Senator Taylor, the germ of your Resolution 66 goes back to previous resolutions introduced at the time of the formation of the United Nations. The idea, or the germ of this idea has now seen fruit in the Hutchins study?

Senator Taylor. Yes, sir.

Senator Thomas of Utah. But, your resolution of several years ago called for that to happen which actually has happened, as far as the study stages is concerned, isn’t that true?

Senator Taylor. Yes, I would say that.

PAST RESOLUTIONS FOR WORLD REPUBLIC

Four and one-half years ago I introduced my first resolution in the United States Senate. Each year since, I have presented similar resolutions all calling for creation of a world republic.

I might say that each resolution was modified as further study and circumstances would seem to indicate. It has taken over 4 years and some earth-shaking events to crystallize sufficient support among the people and in the Congress to convene these hearings and afford me the privilege of testifying on behalf of this resolution. Naturally, I am happy that this has come to pass and I deeply appreciate the privilege of appearing before this distinguished committee.
On that momentous day in my life in October 1945 I said:

I believe the people of America are ready—not only ready, but anxious and definitely craving—to have something done to preserve peace in the world and to prevent the beginning of another armament race which, in view of the development of far greater instruments of destruction, can result only in leading to the absolute erasing from the face of the earth of our civilization and of a large percentage of the actual inhabitants of the earth.

During the intervening years I have reiterated time and again my belief in the crying need for world disarmament, the outlawing of all instruments of war and the importance of instituting a program for peace. Slowly, but surely, I felt that we were embarking on a world armament race that must inevitably, inexorably, lead to destruction.

In March of 1948 I proposed an amendment to the ECA act which provided that the United States institute a program of reconstruction and economic development for all of Europe with an initial contribution of at least $5,000,000,000 a year for 5 years. This was to be done through the UN, with smaller contributions from other nations. Universal disarmament was to be our ultimate goal also.

Last week we heard a great address by the Chairman of the Committee on Atomic Energy on the need for stopping the atomic-bomb race and finding a path to peace. This week we were privileged to listen to the statesmanlike utterances of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and who is also a member of this committee, who made an eloquent plea for world disarmament.

The events of the past 6 months have had world-shaking repercussions. Many of us who have appeared to be divergently opposed on vital subjects in the past now find ourselves echoing sentiments that are similar in word and equal in purpose. In 1945 I said to the Senate:

It has been my observation that always when great armies are built up they are not disbanded until they have been used for purposes of making war upon some other nation.

The senior Senator from Connecticut said last Friday:

Arrayed against the choice of such a policy, meaning an armament-race policy or balance-of-power policy, is 5,000 years of recorded history, which teaches again, and again, and again that armament races lead to war—under today's conditions, hydrogen war.

I wish to congratulate both of my colleagues on the eloquence and wisdom of their remarks. I hope and pray that the resolution, or at least the idea for which I speak today will have the support of these influential and honored gentlemen and all others who sincerely seek ways and means of establishing permanent peace on earth.

However, I have not come before you for the purpose of claiming credit as a pioneer in this or any other field. It is rather with a feeling of humility and Christian spirit that I speak today. The hour of self-analysis and communion with our Creator is at hand. We must face the realities of life as they exist at this moment. Yesterday it was the atom bomb. Today it is the hydrogen bomb. Tomorrow it may be a bomb that will destroy all civilization. And even then, there are the revolting and inhuman instruments of bacteriological warfare to haunt men's souls. I am told on good authority that bacteria is available that can wreak even worse havoc than atom bomb and hydrogen bombs. Whole cities and States can fall prey to germ-carrying bombs that can
bring suffering, privation, unimaginable misery, and lingering death to millions of people.

DESIRED TO STRENGTHEN UNITED NATIONS

I have always been a firm believer in using the United Nations and doing everything possible to strengthen this existing instrument into an adequate world organization. All of my votes in the Senate on foreign policy issues have been based upon the firm belief that the United Nations should be strengthened and used in every possible way. Consequently, my resolution attempts to strengthen this existing world organization and give it the power necessary to enact, interpret, and enforce world law. Historical precedent in the writing of our own Constitution can be followed in adopting an entirely new constitution for the United Nations, preferably one such as that drafted by the Committee to Draft a World Constitution. The United Nations Charter provides for calling a convention to amend or make alterations in the existing charter and this entire new constitution can be adopted in the same manner that the Constitution Convention adopted our Constitution to replace the Articles of Confederation. If this machinery is not used and the United Nations continues to have inadequate power, I have provided an alternate method for the people of the world through their own constitutional convention to create a true world government with the firm foundation of a constitution such as that drafted by the Committee to Draft a World Constitution, thus providing the basis of world law based upon justice.

Five years ago $25,000,000,000 for world rehabilitation, as I suggested at that time, was an astronomical figure. Universal disarmament was scarcely an acceptable subject in parlor conversations. A voice raised on behalf of world government was heard with a skeptical ear and the speaker watched with a suspicious eye. Today, thank God, we applaud utterances on behalf of disarmament and economic rehabilitation for all peoples. Tomorrow we may be willing to raise our thoughts on peaceful expenditures to $100,000,000,000, $200,000,000,000; certainly no monetary figure can be too high for the actual accomplishment of peace and brotherhood.

WORLD GOVERNMENT NEEDED

Let us be consistent in our outlook, in our approach, and in our thinking. We are sincere in our desire for peace even though it may have taken a hydrogen bomb to awaken us to reality. Let us follow that course to its logical conclusion—it can and must be world government. Anything else is a mere stopgap, a compromise in the face of the cold hard facts. Only a true world government can achieve everlasting peace.

The Charter of the United Nations could and should be changed to provide a true world government constitution. Such a change could be made by calling of a general conference as provided for in article 109. If that cannot be done under present conditions, then let us call a world constitutional convention of delegates for the purpose of adopting a world government constitution. True, this may involve sacrifices of sovereignty that are alien to our way of thinking. But, surely, the terrifying prospect of extermination by fire should provide
sufficient incentive for us to embrace new concepts of thinking. It is imperative that we do so both from the point of view of self-preservation and Christian doctrine.

The time for final fateful decision is upon us. Either we will make the supreme effort for peace now, or we will be doomed to extinction. Getting tough is not the answer—armaments races can only lead to disaster. Balance of power arrangements are a discredited device recorded in past history. Even disarmament will not suffice. Half measures are not enough. The idealism of yesterday is the realism of today. Let us obey the convictions that arise from the innermost recesses of our hearts and go forward in a consistent and practical approach to achieve world peace through world government. Let us hope and pray that the sacred fervor of the flame of peace, now kindled, remain alive within us, and that some day soon, the peoples of the earth may be relieved of the unbearable burden of fear and uncertainty which hangs over mankind like the sword of Damocles. We must either press forward now and make a supreme effort to actually and literally establish the brotherhood of man or resign ourselves to a way of life more regimental and degrading than anything the world has ever known.

Senator Thomas of Utah. Senator Wiley?

Senator Wiley. Well, Senator, you express, I think, in the words of one noble writer, "A consummation devoutly to be wished for."

MECHANISM OF WORLD GOVERNMENT NOT ENOUGH

The point is, and I think that is what everyone has testified to with some force, as to the various ideas, as to how to bring about this consummation, and the point is—how, through any mechanism can you find the answer to the situation in the world today, with Russia at one end, and apparently the free world at the other?

If you called this conference, is that mechanism going to just automatically, of itself, change the mental approach that one or the other of these two great ideologies reflect in the minds of men?

I would like to get your reaction to that question.

I might say, parenthetically, it was admitted the other day, in relation to the other resolution, where they had in mind the getting together of the nations of Europe, and the Atlantic Pact nations, and ourselves, they admitted that there really was a conflict in ideology that was so basic that the only thing that would be recognized by the Russians was superior force, that otherwise they would proceed in their course of world domination and that is the argument for the creating of this group of nations into a confederation with the surrender of each nation of certain of its inherent sovereignty, in order to create an arm that would be an effective rebuff against this coming of the Russians.

Now, I understand your proposition is either change the United Nations, or change or create, by a separate convention, a world order.

Now, I am asking, assume you get them all together; you see how they are getting together at times in the United Nations, how ineffective at times they are. The question involved is how the mere instituting of a mechanism that will bring about one or the other, how that will have a result, either as a modification of the United Nations so that one side will be the democracies and on the other side will be the
Russians and their satellites, which is pretty much of the world—how that is going to bring the answer that we all want, this consummation devoutly to be wished for, with peace in the minds of men.

That is our real problem. We are all seeking the answer, and I am sure that we want to make no mistake. I cannot understand how a mere mechanism, no matter whether it is the Ten Commandments or anything else, could do the job unless that mechanism became a thing of the spirit in the hearts and minds of men. Then what are we going to do to meet this tremendous challenge that comes to this generation, to maintain peace?

You said that armament leads to war. Armament is just a result of the internal warfare in the minds of men, the result of fear, the result of the inability to get together, the inability to apply the Golden Rule. Armament, you might say, is just the excreta that comes from men's hates, distrust, and inability to love and serve one another. That is what an armament is. The armament by itself does not lead to war; it is just a result of the war within nations, and within the minds of men; and so, we have to think deep. If there is any hope that the race can find the answer, let's find it.

Pardon me for suggesting these things, but I am a seeker after the truth that will make us free.

Senator Taylor. I am convinced of your sincerity, Senator Wiley; and, I must say that you have very eloquently expressed your fears and doubts and your estimate of the existing situation, and I am forced to agree that the condition in the world is most distressing and terrifying. There is no use crying over spilled milk.

PAST OPPORTUNITIES LOST

I think we were in a much better position to make an approach to a problem of this kind, and a solution of this kind 5 years ago almost, when I introduced my first resolution. Then, there was no argument. We were the strongest nation on earth. We could have led through strength. At the present time, the balance of power is shifting, and I am almost inclined to agree with my reactionary columnist friend, Constantine Brown, who said that these gestures toward this armament and plans for world peace now might be construed by people of other nations as an indication of weakness at this moment. That is deplorable, but it is a fact that we let the time go by when we were on top of the crest of the wave, so to speak, and the situation is not nearly so propitious at this time, I will agree, but it is more desperate.

The hydrogen bomb promises literally the extinction of mankind. While I am not an atomic scientist, it does seem to me that if they can set off an explosion like this hydrogen bomb, it won't be long until somebody will find a key to making one explosion out of the earth, and certainly we should seek some means to prevent that.

I imagine it would be rather painful for all of us to be blown up at once, in one big explosion, but I just cannot reconcile myself with the idea of no continuation of this world and a life on it.

SOVIET REACTION

There is no guaranty that you could even get to the Russians, or their satellites, to participate in this proposal of mine, at this time.
I am not that optimistic, but I do think that when we do set up an organization, if we do, I pray we will go ahead with the idea, that we will leave the door open and try to behave in a Christian spirit to demonstrate that we do want peace. I certainly am not an advocate of unilateral disarmament. I want to see the world disarmed, but I would never advocate or agree to our disarming alone, or ahead of others. I am afraid that we were a little autocratic at the time of our greatest strength.

I, in reading over the Baruch proposals for atomic control, felt that it was more in the nature of a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. If we had considered the pride and aspirations of other people, if we had acted upon something like the McMahon proposal shortly after the war, I think it would have had excellent chances of being accepted and succeeding; but in my estimation, instead of doing that, we proceeded unilaterally and most generally outside of the United Nations.

Of course, I say there is no use in hashing over what has gone before. The thing to do is try to make the best of circumstances as they are today.

So, I think that we should go ahead and try to set this up, certainly not with the idea of simply formalizing a military alliance which is already in existence between us and certain other nations, but invite all peoples, everywhere, to join this idea.

As I said before, I am not offering this proposed constitution as the ultimate, neither are its authors. It is simply an idea, something to think about. But there are provisions in there for groupings of nations and peoples to prevent any one very populous section of the earth from getting control of this world government. I think it is a very able world document, and I do hope that you gentlemen will see fit to report out my resolution, or the so-called World Federalist resolution. It has a great deal of merit. I do not believe it has as much as mine, naturally, or I would not have introduced mine, but I am hopeful that some action can be taken.

Senator Thomas of Utah. Senator Smith?

Senator Smith of New Jersey. Just one or two questions, Senator.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN WORLD GOVERNMENT AND WORLD FEDERATION

In the first place, let me get your thought as to the distinction between the World Federalist resolution and yours. What is the distinction between the two? They referred to Dr. Hutchins' study as being too complicated at this stage of the game. You don't share that point of view?

Senator Taylor. I think the main difference between their resolution and mine, is the provision in my resolution that if the United Nations fails to act, then the President takes the initiative in inviting nations directly to elect representatives to a world constitutional convention.

Senator Smith of New Jersey. And you would like to see us take the position that we want a world constitution, a world state, and just put in a call to have the delegates meet? You are not in the attitude of exploring what Justice Roberts referred to yesterday, exploring the different possibilities?

Senator Taylor. I presume that what you gentlemen are holding these hearings for is to explore the different possibilities, and after you explore them, action is required, I believe.
Senator Smith of New Jersey. My question is whether you are today advocating the actual calling of a convention to set up a world state—period. Is that what you want to do?

Senator Taylor. First, it calls upon the President to ask for the convention, or the convening of such a convention through the mechanism of the United Nations.

Senator Smith of New Jersey. I understand that.

Senator Taylor. And, after that, if that fails and they take no action, then to appeal directly to the people of the world.

Senator Smith of New Jersey. But you are asking us to take the all-out position that we are for a world state and act accordingly?

Senator Taylor. Yes.

Senator Smith of New Jersey. I wanted to get that clear for the record.

Senator Taylor. Yes.

**EFFECT OF WORLD GOVERNMENT IN FAR EAST**

Senator Smith of New Jersey. I have not studied this program or the other suggestions with regard to setting up the state, but I am interested in knowing how you would deal with those areas of the world that have the numerous populations like India and China, and so forth, on the basis of a world state. How do you approach that problem today, under your plan?

Senator Taylor. It would be difficult to explain offhand. It is encompassed, however, in the proposed draft of a world constitution. It makes provision for representation from various regions of the earth, to do away with the balance of population in certain places, and gives each region a certain representation.

I hope you will find time, Senator Smith, to read that document.

Senator Smith of New Jersey. I plan to. I am reading everything I can get because I think we are all searching for the answer, and especially this subcommittee. We are searching to see if we can get a proposal which will be a step ahead.

Senator Taylor. It is quite evident that there has been a tremendous amount of effort put into this proposal.

Senator Smith of New Jersey. I understand there has been plenty of work; but the question is, “What can we do as a practical reality now?”

**SURRENDER OF SOVEREIGNTY**

Now, two more questions: Do I gather, from your proposal, that you would eliminate the separate identity of the United States, as such, in your plan? Do we just go into a new world scheme that forgets the fact that there is a United States of America that is part of the world?

Senator Taylor. We would doubtless be known as the United States of America, just as the section of the United States which I represent is known as Idaho. We did not lose our identity as Idaho by going into the Union; we are simply a part of the Union; we are still Idaho. However, we would have to sacrifice considerable sovereignty to the world organization to enable them to levy taxes in their own right to support themselves, so that they will not be dependent on hand-outs.
Declaration of Duties and Rights

A.

The universal government of justice as covenanted and pledged in this Constitution is founded on the Rights of Man.

The principles underlying the Rights of Man are and shall be permanently stated in the Duty of everyone everywhere, whether a citizen sharing in the responsibilities and privileges of World Government or a ward and pupil of the World Commonwealth:

to serve with word and deed, and with productive labor according to his ability, the spiritual and physical advancement of the living and of those to come, as the common cause of all generations of men;

B.

In the context therefore of social duty and service, and in conformity with the unwritten law which philosophies and religions alike called the Law of Nature and which the Republic of the World shall strive to see universally written and enforced by positive law:

it shall be the right of everyone everywhere to claim and maintain for himself and his fellowmen:

release from the bondage of poverty and from the servitude and exploitation of labor, with rewards and security according to merit and needs;

*From each according to his ability and to each according to his needs.*
The Founding Convention having discussed and approved by individual majority vote this Constitution, ratification by collective majorities within as many delegations of states and nations as represent two-thirds of the population of the earth shall be sufficient for the establishment of the Federal Republic of the World.

The Committee to Frame a World Constitution
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There is another one of those impractical, shortsighted world government constitutions that the globalists have waiting in the wings and in one place it starts out saying:

"No person may possess a lethal weapon...."

It's just another trap by the big "planners."

DOTTED LINE AC symbolizes intervention of Council in tenure of the President's Cabinet and Acting Presidency of the Chairman of the Council during vacancies in the Presidency.

diagonal AD symbolizes Chairmanship of the President in the Chamber of Guardians.

diagonal CB symbolizes Council's veto power on appointments to the Judiciary and membership of the Chairman of the Council in the Tribunal and Supreme Court.

DOTTED LINE BD symbolizes intervention of the Judiciary in elections to the Chamber of Guardians.
The oath included in the Constitution for all public officials to take was written expressly for them by the Founding Fathers in order to keep them from exceeding the limits of power which the people have delegated unto them in state and federal Constitutions, and to make them subject to punishment if they exceed the limits of the authority to which they have been assigned. Keep in mind that delegated power is not surrendered power!

VIOLATION OF THE OATH OF OFFICE IS A SERIOUS OFFENSE!

There must be collusion amongst federal officials and state governors in order for these massive changes to transpire. Obviously, this madness affects the security and economic stability of the individual states!
IT IS A HIGH CRIME TO TAKE THE OATH OF OFFICE AND THEN GIVE AWAY THE ARMED FORCES, CLOSE OUR BASES, AND DISARM THE PEOPLE!

THE PRESIDENT MUST BE HELD TO ANSWER FOR SIGNING GUN BILLS AND UNLAWFUL "TREATIES".

IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE GOVERNORS NOT TO KNOW THE DAMAGE BY CLOSING THE BASES, GIVING AWAY OUR ARMED FORCES, AND TAKING AWAY THE PEOPLE'S FIREARMS UNDER PUBLIC LAW #87-297!

FEDERAL AND STATE COLLUSION
Stand by the president only as long as he stands by the Constitution. No man is above the law!

Every United States President, since F.D.R., bar none, has supported the surrender of U.S. sovereignty to the United Nations, which is controlled by communists. There is a revolution built into the U.N. Charter which intends to overthrow U.S. government! Wake up, folks!
Resolution Adopted by the Twelfth General Assembly
November 14, 1957
(on the report of the First Committee (A/3729))

1148 (XII). Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction

The General Assembly,
Recalling its resolution 806 (XIX) of 4 November 1956,
Emphasizing the urgency of decreasing the danger of war and improving the prospects of a durable peace through achieving international agreement on reduction, limitation and open inspection of armaments and armed forces,
Welcoming the narrowing of differences which has resulted from the extensive negotiations in the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission,
Believing that immediate, carefully measured steps can be taken for partial measures of disarmament and that such steps will facilitate further measures of disarmament,
1. Urges that the States concerned, and particularly those which are members of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, give priority to reaching a disarmament agreement which, upon its entry into force, will provide for the following:
   (a) The immediate suspension of testing of nuclear weapons with prompt installation of effective international control, including inspection posts equipped with appropriate scientific instruments located within the territories of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in Pacific Ocean area, and at other points as required;
   (b) The cessation of the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes and the complete destruction of future production of fissile materials for non-weapons purposes under effective international control;
   (c) The reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons through a program of transfer, on an equitable and reciprocal basis and under international supervision, of stocks of fissile material from weapons to non-weapons use;
   (d) The reduction of armed forces and armaments through adequate, properly arranged arrangements;
   (e) The progressive establishment of open inspection with ground and aerial components to guard against the possibility of surprise attack;
   (f) The joint study of an inspection system designed to ensure that the handling of materials through inspection shall be for the purpose of safeguarding particularly those which are members of the Sub-Committee, to consider the general facilities of disarmament in the fashion made available as a result of disarmament, as and when sufficient progress is made, additional resources to the improvement of living conditions throughout the world, especially in the less developed countries;
   (g) Requests the Sub-Committee to report to the Disarmament Commission by 20 April 1958 on the progress achieved.

Tenth plenary meeting,
14 November 1957.

These clippings report what has been going on in recent months of this year. We've been put in a totally unlawful set of circumstances. It's bad deal, folks, no matter how you want to slice it. Wake up!
NEW WORLD ORDER BRIEFS:

"Clearly we cannot meet the challenges of the new millennium with an instrument designed for the very different circumstances of the middle of the twentieth century. Make no mistake about it, the anticipated reforms will erode national sovereignty, infringe on personal liberties, and lead the world into a system of global governance. Sovereignty has been the cornerstone of the interstate system. In an increasingly interdependent world, however, the notions of territoriality, independence, and non-intervention have lost some of their meaning. It is time to think about self-determination in the context of a global neighborhood rather than a world of separates states." — UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, Council on Foreign Relations speech, 4/22/97

The McAlvany Intelligence Advisor, September 1999

How can anyone expect to sustain national sovereignty when the United Nations has already been granted total and permanent control over all United States Armed Forces and law enforcement systems?
Here's some of the stuff that is going on, folks. I call it tyranny against the Constitution. What do you call it?

- Deliberate plan to abolish the United States!
- Deliberate plan to collapse American government!
- California plan to sell off counties E.O. 12803!
- No political representatives - complete computer management!
- Erasing National Boundaries!
- Constitutional U.N. Charter passed off as a treaty!
- No private ownership of land allowed!
California has led in some of the worst things!

California State Senator Alan Cranston was the one who headed up Assembly Joint Resolution #26 which enlisted California under world government. He had 25 other states signed up before he was stopped. When California dropped out, that attempt lost out.

California (under the Reagan/Nixon alliance) led the nation as the pilot state during the reign of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which engineered the nation into a "national police force"; "merged the military with the civilian police systems for a military government; sneakad Page 340 goals behind the scenes to make gun prohibition happen; endangered the states by advancing regional government; etc. etc.

California used L.E.A.A. funds to finance the California Specialized Training Institute for teaching how to convert civilian government into military operation and assisted in building F.E.M.A.

California was home to the leftists known as the "Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions" where the world government constitutions and "New states Constitution" were drafted.

California taxpayers' money was taken to finance the study on how to collapse our states in order to convert the system under international management (Houlihan Plan).

California led the nation in the gun grab with the Roos-Roberti anti-gun law, the most strict legislation in the nation.

California now leads the nation in the recall of personal firearms. Page 340 is has been the guideline for more than 25 years, and I predict that what is happening in California will happen to every state if it is not stopped in California.
This law was on California's books for one year before enough strength was garnered to repeal it.

STATUTES OF CALIFORNIA
1949
CONSTITUTION OF 1879 AS AMENDED
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE
OF ELECTORS, 1948
GENERAL LAWS, AMENDMENTS TO
CODES, RESOLUTIONS, AND
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS
PASSED AT THE
1949 REGULAR SESSION OF
THE LEGISLATURE

542491
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE:
"CALIFORNIA PLAN" WOULD HAVE ABOLISHED THE UNITED STATES

California's politics may not have been as zany in the past as, perhaps, appeared on the horizon in other states during the depression days. Here we only had the socialist, Upon Sinclair, appear as a candidate on the democrat ticket for governor.

In the later thirties Culbert Olson became the first democrat of the century to guide the affairs of state. It was his administration that was so infested with communists that even the democrats could not take it. Sam Yorty and Jack Tenney, both democrats, started a "witch hunt" that ferreted out communists, pinkos, dupes and fellow travelers in all sorts of places.

But perhaps the most extreme venture into the fields of erratic legislation came during the administration of Earl Warren and a republican controlled legislature when Alan Cranston, now State Controller, convinced the legislators to pass a World Federalist proposal to abolish the United States.

"The California Plan", which would have amalgamated the sovereign U. S. A. in a world state, was so well-liked that the Assembly passed the resolution unanimously, and the Senate found only eight who opposed such a measure.

The resolution memorialized Congress to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of amending the United States Constitution to expedite and insure United States participation in a World Federal Government.

Several senators tried to rescind the 1949 resolution in the same session, but only one vote could be mustered for passage in the Senate committee that considered the proposal.

In a special session that followed, the effort to get a rescinding action out of committee again failed, although two senators voted this time.

In March, 1950, after defeat on the floor of the senate and a motion to reconsider, the rescinding motion was passed without a vote to spare. The Assembly finally passed the measure with only two votes over the required majority.

About a year later, the proposal adopting the Cranston plan for liquidating the sovereignty of the United States. The plan of action of the United World Federalistas had been...
Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26—Relative to the participation of the United States in a world federal government.

[Filed with Secretary of State April 8, 1949.]

WHEREAS, War is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization, because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no sure defense; and

WHEREAS, The effective maintenance of world peace is the proper concern and responsibility of every American citizen; and

WHEREAS, The people of the State of California, while now enjoying domestic peace and security under the laws of their local, State and Federal Government, deeply desire the guarantee of world peace; and

WHEREAS, All history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and that law and order are the product of government; and

WHEREAS, The United Nations, as presently constituted, although accomplishing great good in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret or enforce world law, and under its present charter is incapable of restraining any major nations which may foster or foment war; and

WHEREAS, The charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in Articles 108 and 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the charter; and

WHEREAS, The necessity for endowing the United Nations with limited powers rendering it capable of enacting, interpreting or enforcing world law adequate to prevent war, and guaranteeing the inalienable rights of freedom for every human being on earth and the dignity of the individual as exemplified by the American Bill of Rights, has been recognized in the California state conventions and platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties; and
WHEREAS, Many states have memorialized Congress, through resolutions by their state legislatures or in referenda by their voters, to initiate steps toward the creation of a world federal government reserving to the nations and to the people those rights not specifically granted as necessary to the establishment and the maintenance of world law and order; and

WHEREAS, Several nations have recently adopted constitutional provisions to facilitate their entry into a world federal government by authorizing a delegation to such a world federal government of a portion of their sovereignty sufficient to endow it with powers adequate to prevent war; now, therefore, be it.

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendment of the Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a world federal government, open to all nations, with powers which, while defined and limited, shall be adequate to preserve peace, whether the proposed charter or constitution of such world federal government be presented in the form of amendments to the charter of the United Nations, or by a world constitutional convention, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures of the several states, requesting their cooperation.

June 21, 1949

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Senate Joint Resolution No. 36—Relative to withdrawing the application to Congress made by Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 to propose a constitutional amendment for American participation in a World Federal Government.

Whereas, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 was passed at a recent session of the Assembly of the State of California; and

Whereas, That Assembly Joint Resolution urged an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting this Country's participation in a World Federal Government; and

Whereas, It has come to the attention of certain Members of the Legislature that not all the pertinent facts relating to that subject were available and presented when this resolution was passed; and

Whereas, Said resolution, if acted upon and fulfilled by the Government of the United States, would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty, bring into being a form of government whose authority would supersede that of the United States Government, and institute a system of laws whereby American citizens could be tried by citizens of other countries and imprisoned in foreign jails; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the proposal in Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 be withdrawn; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, to the members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officer of each of the legislatures of the several states.
What is the reason that law makers do not differentiate between criminals and law-abiding people?
DELIBERATELY INCREASING "CRIME" AS AN "O.K. REASON" TO CONTINUALLY REDUCE FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

These are some of the methods and programs that have been used to deliberately engineer an increase in crime:

Most crime is drug related. The importation of drugs is traceable to government sources.

Television has promoted violence, barbarous and uncivilized behavior, and has laid before the youth of America role models which denigrate and pollute our society. Talk show hosts parade deviate lifestyles and pam them off as the "norm", weakening the moral fiber of our society. Blame for sex crimes against children should be laid at the doorstep of the Supreme Court for ruling that pornography is an acceptable First Amendment right.

The youth have been subjected to liberal educational programs which weaken the traditional American virtues and culture.

Schools have mandated sex education upon young children, the consequence of which has forced them to assume adult responsibilities for which they are not prepared to handle.

Public libraries were closed during off-school hours and on weekends.

The time-proven moral guidelines were removed from the grade school curriculum, and in its place there was deliberately instituted a non-religious, humanistic document that shifts "morality" from traditional principles of morality, truth, justice, and patriotism to concern for environment and social change.

Easy divorce laws contributed to the break up of the family which, in turn, often resulted in the delinquency of children.

Uncontrolled immigration, which allows immigrants to enter the United States who do not understand our system and laws. They enter without proper screening or assimilation.

Russia opened its prison cells and allowed their criminals to migrate to the United States. The Russian mafia was allowed to take over big cities in the U.S.

Cuba opened its jails and allowed its worst criminals to migrate to the United States with very weak resistance by the United States government.

Most crime is drug related. The importation of drugs is traceable to government sources.

Experimental programs, such as the Probation Subsidy Program, which provided County Probation Departments with guidelines, awarded $4,000 to the county for every convicted felon that would be allowed to return to the community under minimum supervision; despite the fact that the Bureau of Criminal Investigation reported that 72% of probationers were re-arrested while still on probation.

Up until recently, laws were too soft on the criminal element who use firearms for ill purposes.

Claiming that he could cut costs of the California operating budget, Ronald Reagan, as governor of the State of California, closed down the mental hospitals and put mentally disturbed people out on the streets to shift for themselves.

The death penalty was almost eliminated for a time, and then slowly the death penalty was attached to only a few specific crimes.

Laws are too soft on all criminal behavior, including murder for which a criminal is penalized for only 7 years or even less.

Parents have become fearful of disciplining their own children.

Increased socialism under the programs of the welfare state contributing to a decline in the incentive of the people to accept available work.

Laws discouraging law-abiding citizens from owning firearms encourages burglary and other crimes.

The planned collapse of government via the Houlden Plan will dramatically increase unemployment and contribute to the increase of thievery.
The United States Constitution:

1. It acknowledges the sovereignty of the Creator, the source from which we receive our endowment of inalienable rights, some of which are the right to life, to free speech, to freedom of the press, to religion of our own choosing, to keep and bear arms, to trial by jury, to petition, to seek justice, to privacy, to own property, to due process, etc.

2. It is the authority to judge, to act, or to command against oppressive government, prohibiting the quartering of soldiers in our homes, unreasonable searches and seizures, double jeopardy, excessive bail, cruel and inhuman punishment, violations of liberty, curtailment of rights, tyrannical rule, etc.

3. It puts limits on the power that man can exercise over his fellow man.

4. It reserves to the people and their posterity all rights and powers not specifically granted to government.

5. It guarantees a republican form of government in which the people are the ultimate authority.

6. It secures the right to liberty, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness.

7. It sustains our independence.

8. It allows people to be self-governing, to make decisions, to vote, to choose their representatives, and to judge the laws.

9. It promotes a more perfect union of our states, provides for their common defense, and insures domestic tranquility.

10. It furnishes a framework for the necessary separation of powers, sets standards for proper governmental operation, promotes the general welfare of the states, and provides checks and balances to maintain the stability and energy of the system.

DON'T SURRENDER IT BY YOUR SILENCE.

Second Amendment Committee

P.O. Box 1776

Hanford, Ca 93230

*These are natural laws endowed to all people which no man can remove from his fellow man.
Planning to erase our national borders

and our state boundary lines is coming out from

the federal executive branch of U. S. government.

Note that the map for a "Dis-United United States" is produced by geographers working in the office of the

U. S. State Department!
MAPS: Geographers Redraw Future National Boundaries

Continued from Page 1

details of the future world map—the charts on these pages are composites based on the predictions of half a dozen experts. (See note on Page 3.)

But they do agree that recharting the globe will be the byproduct of several concurrent trends, ranging from the powerful pull of ethnicity and the spread of democracy to changes in the very concept of a modern state.

First, some borders will be altered as nations break away from traditional states, as has happened painfully in Yugoslavia over the past year and peacefully in Czechoslovakia this year.

"Borders of present countries or so-called natural boundaries will increasingly lose their importance when they do not correspond to well-recognized linguistic and territorial identities," said Fabrizio Eva, an Italian geographer.

Second, other new countries will be added as the last colonies become independent countries—the dominant trend during the second half of the 20th Century and evident most recently when the Soviet empire's collapse spawned 15 new states.

"We are now in a major new phase of demands for 'self-determination'—demands which, if all are agreed to, will result in significant changes to the world's political map at both state and sub-state levels," said David R. Knight, chairman of a special Commission on the World Political Map of the International Geographical Union (IGU).

On a third and more sweeping level, the new lines on a map will be produced by fundamental changes in the role of states, largely in response to economic and social pressures and political alienation.

Commented George Demko, a geographer and director of the Rockefeller Center at Dartmouth College, "The current changes in the political and economic geography of the world are as significant as what the world went through after the Twenty of Years War." The 1983 peace accord ending Europe's Thirty Years War

"It's a bit radical," Minghi conceded. "But it's what we're evolving toward."

All the major trends contributing to a new world map have one important common denominator: They reflect a new push toward devolution, or the transfer of political power from traditional states to smaller units—a shift encouraged by such factors as the spread of democracy, population pressures, communications and technology innovations, and political alienation.

"In Europe, the long-rebellious Basque and Catalan regions formally leave Spain. Brittany splits from France. Belgium disintegrated into the new states of Wallonia and Flanders. And Finland is carved from the northern Lapp-populated areas of Norway; Sweden and Finland, then joins the northern regions of Canada and Russia in the new Circumpolar Arctic Confederation."

The union of boundaries as we've known them, in terms of absolute sever-

control over defined space.

But experts at this month's 21st International Geographical Congress in Washington suggested self-determination will often prevail.

More than ever before, "political movements are inclined toward a subdivision within states," said Eva, the Italian geographer.

Since up to a third of the world's current states face border challenges either from neighboring nations or from minorities at home, geographers are already urging steps to prevent repetitions of the bloody conflict in what used to be Yugoslavia.

"What we will need is a U.N. commission on border modifications to adjudicate and initiate negotiations before fighting erupts," said H.J. de Blij of Georgetown University.

In the longer term, the political geographers think the importance of borders will actually wane, as economic and technological interdependence span not only states, but continents.
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"The union of b
People want empowerment at the local level. When they feel their lives are being run by others far away who can’t identify with them, they retreat into regionalism and local identities to counter the dehumanizing effect,” Knight said.

To avoid being marginalized in traditional states, for example, communities are increasingly likely to seek smaller alternatives that are more familiar, convenient

‘The notion of boundaries as we’ve known them, in terms of absolute sovereignty and legalities, will in time dwindle.’

JULIAN MINGH
American geographer

and accountable to them, a trend more important in larger or densely populated states. The possibilities range from Canada’s Quebec to Iraq’s Kurdistan.

Technology also facilitates fragmentation by opening more options for smaller nations.

“It’s like a circuit board. You can now move from one point to another without having to go through all the middle points. The world’s going to be like that, which means the old ideas of hierarchy and hegemony will become obsolete,” Cohen said.

“Nations of all sizes, shapes and manners will be able to reach out to other nations of all sizes, shapes and manners without having to ask for permission from larger powers or without having to go through intermediaries.”

Even the emergence of regional blocs encourages the creation of smaller states by offering similar economic, political or strategic protection as the original nation state. Scotland could afford to break from Britain, for example, because it is a member of the European Community.

The accumulative impact of these trends is expected to reach every corner of the globe. Among just a few of the geographers’ predictions:

- Australia breaks up into four pieces, giving birth to new states like “Swanland,” named after the river, in the west, and “Aboland,” after the aborigines. In the Par East, the Ora, and East and West Siberia; assorted small ethnic enclaves such as Tajikistan and Dagestan gain independence, and places like Karimpur and Turan and Buryat become virtually independent autonomous zones.

- In Asia, India loses Punjab and part of Kashmir. Afghanistan breaks into at least three ethnic pieces. The Philippines loses Muslim-dominated Mindanao. And a large part of Kazakhstan secedes to join Russia.

- In China, despite the longstanding dominance of the Han Chinese, Tibet and Xinjiang move out on their own. Taiwan is absorbed, while Inner Mongolia merges with independent Mongolia. Three new areas, Inner, North and Southeast China, gain autonomy, while developed Guangdong and Shanghai become quasi-independent economic hubs more like present-day Hong Kong than Beijing.

- In Africa, Ethiopia loses northern Eritrea and Tigre to secession and southern Ogaden to Somalia, while Kasa and mineral-rich Katanga secede from Zaïre. Sudan splits into two. And South Africa splits into three pieces, creating “Anania” and “Zuland” in the process.

- In the Americas, Brazil breaks up into three autonomous pieces, Canada, as it has been known, disappears altogether, Mexico separates into four or more distinct pieces, and over time, even the United States takes on different form.

The dimensions of change are almost certain to provoke an international debate over the next decade on a basic issue: Should the world’s current powers give priority to the right of self-determination, thereby potentially threatening the current configuration of states? Or should they be committed to preserving territorial integrity—potentially at the expense of individual rights?

The United States was founded on the principle of self-determination, but since the onset of global change in 1989 Washington has supported territorial integrity in both Yugoslavia and Iraq—largely due to fears of fragmentation and its rippling effect both in the Balkans and in the Persian Gulf.

“The tendency now and in the future will be to preserve the status quo,” said the State Department’s Wood. “The United Nations is the best example. Its member states are recognized governments with...
WHAT UNLAWFUL TREATIES ARE DOING TO THE U.S.A.!

To the right is a reduced diagram of the United States partitioned off in regions. Note that it was taken from a 1935 issue of the New York Times Magazine. Note the similar names being used today by the State Department Geographers to classify the regions. This article speaks heavily on the intent of the Federal Government to abolish the states, which was F.D.R.'s plan.

21st-Century North America?

Some believe economics will help redraw the continent's boundaries, dividing America, creating a Pacific Rim zone and blurring the U.S.-Mexican border.
The Dis-United States

We may think of the U.S. borders as among the most permanent in the world, but even this country is not immune from the forces that a panel of political geographers sees reshaping the globe.

Even as the just-negotiated North American Free Trade Agreement takes shape, for example, Canada is wrangling to keep Quebec part of the country. Over time, Canada's stranded Maritimes could join the United States, while Alberta and Saskatchewan merge and go their own way, and the Indian- and Eskimo-dominated north joins a polar confederation, the geographers said.

In turn, the western United States and Canadian provinces now integrating their economies with Asia's Pacific Rim—Alaska, British Columbia, Washington and Oregon—may also be emboldened to create their own "zone," either autonomous or independent. The geographers tentatively dub the new state, stretching from the Arctic's Beaufort Sea to the sunny climes of Northern California, "Pacifica."

On the other U.S. border, the increasingly fuzzy demarcation line between the United States and Mexico could evolve into another new zone, tentatively called "Angelica" by geographers. The rest of Mexico may then fragment into three or more parts.

The overall result: Instead of three large states, NAFTA could eventually contain a dozen smaller pieces—or more.

Even after losing Pacifica and Angelica, the United States may be vulnerable to further splits. A map designed by Stanley D. Brunn, an International Geographical Union panelist from the University of Kentucky, divides America into nine other independent or autonomous zones, not necessarily coinciding with current state boundaries.

They include a Gulf Coast zone, pulling together Florida with the southern parts of Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, and an Industry state grouping all of Michigan and Wisconsin, northern chunks of Illinois, Indiana and Ohio, and western Pennsylvania. On Brunn's map, the southern sections of the Midwest states would join a New South zone, while eastern Pennsylvania would be grouped with a Mid-Atlantic state.
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The notion of boundaries as we've known them, in terms of absolute sovereignty and legalities, will in time dwindle.

JULIAN MENIGH
American geographer

and accountable to them, a trend more important in larger or densely populated states. The possibilities range from Canada’s Quebec to Iraq’s Kurdistan.

Technology also facilitates fragmentation by opening more options for smaller states.

“Move from one point to another without having to go through all the middle points. The world’s going to be like that, much the way the chicken and dumplings has become obsolete,” Cohen said.

“Boundaries of all sorts—shapes and manners will be able to reach out to other nations of all sorts, shapes and manners without having to ask for permission from larger powers or without having to go through intermediaries,” he said.

Even the emergence of regional blocs encourages the creation of smaller states by offering similar economic, political or strategic protection as the original nation state. Scotland could afford to break from Britain, for example, because it is a member of the European Community.

The cumulative impact of these trends is expected to touch every corner of the globe. Among just a few of the geographers’ predictions:

- Australia breaks up into four pieces, giving birth to new states like “Swantast,” named after the river in the west, and “Abonald” after the aborigines, in the northern regions of Canada and Russia.

In Russia, new states emerge in the Far East, the Uralis, and East and West Siberia; assorted small ethnic enclaves such as Tatarstan and Dagastan gain independence, and places like Kalmykia, Tuva and Buryat become virtually independent sovereign states.

In Asia, India loses Punjab and part of Kashmir, Afghanistan breaks into at least three ethnic pieces. The Philippines loses Muslim-dominated Mindanao. And a large part of Kazakhstan secedes to join Russia.

In China, despite the longstanding dominance of the Han Chinese, Tibet and Xinjiang move out on their own. Taiwan is absorbed, while Inner Mongolia merges with independent Mongolia.

Three new areas, Inner, North and Southeast China, gain autonomy, while developed Guangdong and Shanghai become quasi-independent economic hubs.

In Africa, Ethiopia loses northern Eritrea and Tigre to succession and southern Ogaden to Somalia, while Kasai and mineral-rich Katanga secede from Zaire. Sudan splits into two, as does the Sudanese Republic, creating “Asania” and “Zololand” in the process.

In Latin America, Brazil breaks up into three autonomous pieces, Canada, as it has been known, disappears altogether, Mexico splits into four, while the United States takes on different forms.

The dimensions of change are almost certain to provoke an international debate over the next decade on a basic issue: Should the nation’s current powers give priority to the rights of self-determination, thereby potentially threatening the current configuration of states? Or should they be committed to preserving territorial integrity—potentially at the expense of individual rights?

The United States was founded on the principle of self-determination, but since the onset of global change in 1989, Washington has supported territorial integrity in both Yugoslavia and Iraq—largely as a matter of fragmentation and its rippling effect both in the Balkans and in the Persian Gulf.

The “tendency now and in the future will be to preserve the status quo,” said the State Department’s Wood. “The United Nations is the best example. Its member states are recognized governments with legal independence spanning not only states, but continents.

“The notion of boundaries as we’ve known them, in terms of absolute sovereignty and legalities, will in time dwindle,” Menigh said.

In the meantime, however, the number of states will grow.

“For the next decade, we cannot stop this trend,” said Ewa. “Afterward, the wish for cooperation will prevail. I am a pessimist for the next decade, but I am optimistic over the long term.”
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IS IT TIME TO ABOLISH THE STATES?

As I see it, the hidden purpose behind the grand overtures in Executive Order 13083 (Federalism), issued by William Clinton on 5-14-98 is to increase the number of federally mandated uniform national standards over the American states and their subdivisions [Refer to Section 3 (d)3 under title of Federalism Policymaking Criteria in government in Executive Order 13083].

The states, which once delegated a small portion of their own authority to accommodate a limited federal system, are now being informed that they are subordinated to the authority and judgements of federally appointed “agencies”. These “agencies” are composed of unelected personnel responsible only to the federal government whose goal has been for scores of years to abolish the states. One of those federal advocates was Franklin D. Roosevelt himself with his plans for The New Deal. Luther H. Gulick, a members of FDR’s Committee on Administrative Management, came right out, agreeing with his chief, and stated this very bold position:

“Is the state the appropriate instrumentality for the discharge of important functions? The answer is not a matter of conjecture or a delicate appraisal. It’s a matter of brutal record: the American state is finished! I do not predict that the states will go! I affirm that they have gone.”

Federal attitudes since those days have not changed. Abolition is more of a threat now than ever before. Executive Order 13083 is guiding the United States in the same direction to which Adolph Hitler took Germany before he abolished the German states.

It is worthwhile to review Hitler’s pattern revealed in the Chapter entitled “The Twilight of the German Free States” of the book entitled “The New Deal in Europe” written by Emil Lengyel. Here is Lengyel’s account:

“Two weeks after the March (1933) elections, Adolph Hitler served notice in the Garrison Church of Potsdam, where Frederick the Great lies buried, with this:

“In spite of their traditions, the independent lives of the scattered German States are not only useless, but disastrous for the prestige and welfare of our nation.”

“A long chapter of Germany’s history ended with the promulgation of the ‘Law for the Uniformity of the States with the Reich’ in the late spring of 1933. It was an important move in the transformation of the Federal Reich into a single centralized state. It was as if the Federal government in Washington had abolished the sovereignty of the forty-eight States of this country by dismissing their governors and putting in charge of them appointees responsible only to the President. Young Nazis burning the State line markers, merely imitated what the barbarians of the French King had done centuries ago.

The Nazi reorganization of the Reich is a revolutionary break with the past, with ancient traditions, and with national sentiments. It is, however, in keeping with the National Socialist policy to establish a ‘totalitarian’ State in which there is only one God (Germany), and only one prophet (Adolph Hitler). This policy demands the unification of the Reich both physically and spiritually – an autocratic country, bending to the will of the leader. The individual States must be abolished because their existence spells the danger of rival loyalties, eclipsing the only true faith.

Political and spiritual resistance must be made impossible. Every function of the State must be coordinated...

Under the Law for the Uniformity of the States with the Reich the central government in Berlin, acting through the President, appointed Vice-Regents for each of the seventeen States. The Vice-Regents were made responsible only to the Federal government, and they could not be overthrown by a vote of ‘no-confidence’ of the State legislatures. They were empowered to appoint the State governments, which were responsible to them and not to their States. Both the legislatures and the governments were threatened with being put out of business in the near future and then the map would be clean of German States. Meanwhile, the legislatures and governments were allowed to lead a shadow existence, stripped of the right to voice opinions or to command. Celebrating the first anniversary of the Nazi rule on January 30, 1934, the Reichstag adopted in five minutes the Reich Reform Bill, permanently abolishing the State Legislatures and placing their governments under the direct authority of Berlin, of which they will be merely the executive local organs.”

Lengyel’s account confirms that the many past alterations made in the power structure of the American state governments, and their state-and-federal relations, have been but a prelude to the potential that now exists toward their final abolition through the application of Executive Order 13083.
6 April 1984

President Ronald Reagan
Executive Office of the President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Privatization

President Reagan, congratulations on rejecting the political system negatives. Now why not adopt the all positive system — privatization? Hold a White House conference on privatization and appoint a Presidential Task Force on privatization.

Privatization is documented in the enclosed paper from The Heritage Foundation and dates back at least to Adam Smith, Plato, Aristotle and Jesus.

Privatization's more recent advocates include most of the non-profit sector — and the entire profit sector. To name a few, Peter Drucker, Milton Friedman, Heritage Foundation, Reason Foundation, Pacific Institute, Manhattan Institute, National Legal Center for the Public Interest, VOLUNTEER — National Center for Citizen Involvement, International Executive Service Corps, United Way with its Services Identification System, churches, labor unions, etc.

Privatization is now "an idea whose time has come". The knowledge, communication, and computer industry can make political representatives obsolete.

Privatization might well be the theme for the 200th anniversary of the Constitution. Privatization is essential for national salvation.

To restore privatization is the National Center for Privatization's purpose. May we help you?

With best wishes,

WILLARD W. GARVEY

WOGska

Encl: Heritage Foundation paper
National Center for Privatization brochure
The United Nations Plan for replacing America's states with international world regions.

When the states are eliminated, their Compact, known as the Constitution of the United States, will also disappear.
National Association of Realtors President Julio S. Laguarta in presenting the NAR plan to the International Real Estate Federation in Toronto, Canada warned that "Failure to change an official United Nations policy that explicitly opposes the right of private property ownership will ultimately result in the destruction of our industry".

"Land, because of its unique nature and the crucial role it plays in human settlements, cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Social justice, urban renewal and development, the provision of decent dwellings and health conditions for people can only be achieved if land is used in the interests of society as a whole."
FIABCI announces major effort to change U.N. policy

TORONTO — The International Real Estate Federation (FIABCI) is launching a major effort aimed at changing the United Nations' housing policy, which for the past six years has opposed the right of private property ownership.

The board of the federation approved the plan at FIABCI's 33rd World Congress here last month.

The plan, prepared for the international organization by the National Association of Realtors, calls for coordinated efforts over the next 12 months by national chapters from each of the federation's 41 member nations.

The main focus of the FIABCI effort is next year's meeting in Helsinki, Finland, of the U.N. Habitat Commission, created in 1976 by the Vancouver Habitat Conference to formulate U.N. housing policy. In 1976, the western democratic governments were outmaneuvered by socialist nations in Vancouver, and agreed to a U.N. policy on land use that states:

"Land, because of its unique nature and the crucial role it plays in human settlements, cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Social justice, urban renewal and development, the provision of decent dwellings and health conditions for people can only be achieved if land is used in the interests of society as a whole."

The fact that "land for human settlements" is the theme for the 1983 Habitat Commission meeting means that FIABCI will have the opportunity to change that U.N. policy.

Introducing the FIABCI plan in Toronto, NAR President Julio Laguardia warned, "Failure to change an official United Nations policy that explicitly opposes the right of private property ownership will ultimately result in the destruction of our industry. In 1983, FIABCI must take...

See! As a member of the United Nations, the U.S.A. must accept this U.N. policy on land. This policy has never been rescinded! When you lose the right to own property, you become somebody's property!
"But until the people of America shall have lost all virtue —
until they shall have become totally insensible to the difference between freedom and slavery;
until they shall have been reduced to such poverty of spirit as to be willing to sell that pre-eminent blessing, the birthright of a Freeman, for a mess of pottage; in short,
until they shall have been found incapable of governing themselves and ripe for a Master —
those consequences, I think, can never arrive."

...George Washington revealed his trust in the American's ability to stand firm against any future foreign rule.

**Washington's pages found under sofa**

LONDON (AP) — A London auction house says it has recovered two handwritten pages of the 1789 inaugural speech that George Washington never gave.

The excerpt — a rambling, florid discourse covering both sides of a single sheet of paper — was found in an album stashed under a sofa at a house in Aldershot, 85 miles northeast of London, Phillips Auctioneers says.

Auction company assistant Simon Roberts said a gardener showing him around the house pointed out the album.

"It was in a tatty, stained silk slip case but the album inside was in very good condition," he said.

"When I saw the piece by Washington in his own hand, I knew I had found something important."

The auction company says it authenticated the writing as Washington's and the pages as part of the 64-page draft for his April 30, 1789 inauguration as the first president of the brand-new United States.

The auctioneers expect the pages to go for at least $200,000 at a June 13 sale in London.

Washington put aside the long speech after he wrote it.

Part of the excerpt upholds "Americans" then-untested ability to govern their new country after shaking off King George III, and stands firm against any future foreign rule — in one single, breath-draining sentence.

"But until the people of America shall have lost all virtue — until they shall have become totally insensible to the difference between freedom and slavery; until they shall have been reduced to such poverty of spirit as to be willing to sell that pre-eminent blessing; the birthright of a Freeman, for a mess of pottage; in short, until they shall have been found incapable of governing themselves and ripe for a Master — those consequences, I think, can never arrive."
Highlights taken from his Farewell Address as he finished eight years as the first president of the United States, September 17, 1796:

"Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor and caprice?"

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world....

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so;...you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness....think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned;....resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext.

One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown....

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres....
Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?

Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle. It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government......Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?.....

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.....

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible.....

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.*

George Washington

United States
September 17, 1796

George Washington is listed as No. 1 in the Hall of Fame. His *Farewell Address* has gone down in history as one of the greatest writings of all time. In it he warned against engaging in foreign influence and entanglements, weakening of the fabric of government, loss of respect for national morality and religious principles, growth of party spirit, and devastation brought on by pretended patriotism. The above highlights should stimulate the interest of Americans not only to read the *Farewell Address* in its entirety, but to demand that Congress and other public officials begin to adhere to George Washington's advice.

It was a disgraceful effort which caused February 22nd, Washington's birthday, to be renamed as President's Day, thus reducing the respect due to a man who had contributed so much of himself to fight against tyranny, to carefully lead the nation in setting precedents for all who were to follow in his footsteps as president, and to bequeath to the nation his immortal advice.

A great danger for us to guard against is the call for a Constitutional Convention. Many excuses are being used that are very appealing to loyal Americans such as, "a required balanced budget", "right to life", and "prayer in school". The proponents of a new constitution use these excuses to endear themselves to the unsuspecting, who are not aware of how deceitful the perpetrators of global government can be in seeking their objective.
The Bill of Rights

As provided in the FIRST TEN AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE
UNITED STATES
Effective, December 15, 1791

PREAMBLE

The Convention of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added. And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficial ends of its institution.

1 Right to Freedom of Religion, Speech, Press, Assembly, Petition. 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.

2 Right to Keep and Bear Arms. A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

3 Rights on Quartering of Soldiers. No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

4 Right Against Unreasonable Search and Seizure. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable search and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

5 Right to Protection of Persons and Property. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger, nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any Criminal Case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

6 Rights of Persons Accused of Crime. 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.

7 Right of Trial by Jury. In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

8 Right to Protection Against Excessive Fines; Bail, Punishment. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

9 Rights not enumerated retained by the people. The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

10 Rights reserved to the States and the People. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights protect more rights than those that are listed here. The list is a mile long, but your Founding Fathers thought these most endangered rights deserved to be in placed in a special palladium, which is positively not subject to repeal. Only you can enforce these rights against the tyranny that has sprung up in the various administrations.
Yes, your ‘General Plan’ means socialism! See if you can figure out how it has been a vehicle for the New World Order! Richard Nixon issued Executive Order 11647 which partitioned the nation off into ten international federal ‘regions’ co-terminus with plans held by the United Nations. The intent from the onset was to break down our states and national borders, and to fully internationalize U.S. territory. Although they were nearly bankrupt, the federal planners in the ‘70’s announced that they had ‘revenue’ to share with the states and communities.

In order for the ‘revenue’ to get ‘shared’, the states and communities had to adopt a ‘regional’ government ‘General Plan’ or they would not receive any federal money. The ‘Plan’ was connected to federal control. This control extended not only to the infrastructure of a community, it also included forced acceptance of socialistic policies and programs. Today ‘local control by the people’ is practically dead, and cities are governed by federally controlled ‘General Plans’.

Most everyone fell for the idea of ‘free’ money. Real estate developers, seeking those low interest loans were always included as members of the Citizen Advisory Committee, so adoption of the regional government ‘General Plan’ easily won over any unwilling Committee members. While majority action provided adequate approval for adoption of a federalized ‘General Plan’, this move destroyed local control for the people of their own local governments. Dollar signs blinded Committee members to the damage they were doing to the Constitutional Check and Balance System. All power was then moved to Washington D.C. One lone Citizen Advisory Committee member in Hanford, California tried to stop acceptance of federal ‘revenue sharing’ funds and to keep truly local government in control of her community, but she was asked to resign from the General Plan study in her city. She refused and sent out this warning via the local paper.

Now possessing massive federal control, combined with Executive Order 12803 (issued by his father), George W. Bush thinks he has the power to sell off the nation’s infrastructure to foreign investors. This will lead to a breakdown of the states, eliminate national borders and collapse the nation!
"General Plan’ Means Socialism
By MRS. LESTER SMITH
Member, Citizens Advisory Committee
Hanford Area General Plan

After two years of preparation and study on the area “general plan” for Hanford, with one dissenting member of the Citizens’ Advisory Committee nearly being dismissed for disagreeing with the program, the work is now nearing completion.

These persons who understand the structure and objectives of the newly formed 10 federal regions (which are to replace the “city-county-state” system) of representative government will have no difficulty in identifying the relationship with the Hanford area “general plan.” General plans for cities (noting “Model Cities” programs) have been successful because they were generated not to deliberately engage the community in participation of the program while at the same time restricting them from learning the true intent and purposes. Those who have not done an honest and unbiased research, and who hold positions of public trust, should undoubtedly be considered a public menace. The promotion of regional planning in any way, increases the support of this “general plan,” is clearly a violation of the code of ethics pledging “in reserve and defend the constitution of the United States of America,” since the same men who on Monday and Tuesday are known as “supervisors” and “counselors,” and then on Wednesdays give themselves to be the “board members” of the unconstitutional Kings County Regional Planning Agency, that certain dissenting member of the Citizens’ Advisory Committee wonders whether there exists any reason at all to hope that these men will reject the regional general plans when they come before them for final passage. The deck does appear to be “stacked.” Time will prove that the last real chance in stop regionalism was in the planning act, as we are now engaged.

There are all sorts of programs in the proposed “general plan” for Hanford. Some help the poor (such as subsidized housing, the job programs, and the program in which the local taxpayers are to establish members of minority groups in business, etc.) while other programs will hurt the poor by throwing them out of homes (urban renewal) which they thought they owned and could stay in, placing them in the streets with a check in hand, worth only one-third of the value of their former property. These are the “workable programs” that will come with urban renewal plans called “rehabilitation programs”) which bring on house-to-house inspections all over the area. Once urban renewal gets into an area it never releases the area. (Everything in regional government demands “in perpetuity” rights.) Not only the poor will be affected by these inspections, but in “upgrading” the homes, many new unsuspecting home owners will need bank loans in order to pass the inspection code, if not in one campaign, probably in another.

For the businessmen the future under the proposed plan for the central business district may look nothing but “rosy.” They may anticipate great increases in their profits. Many may not be able to see that a trap is being set for them as they align themselves up into an economic order that further the necessary economic conversion needed by those who would impose a totally radical economic system upon all of us. The plans you carry out in a “totally planned economy” are the plans the government has for your business, which may not be at all to the liking of the owner, Profits will become secondary “to the enrichment of all mankind.” It is astonishing how few businessmen realize that they are assisting in the creation of the “New Order.”

GENERAL PLANS throughout the country these days are called “programs to eliminate poverty.” The Hanford “general plan” is no exception to this if it states the same goal “to eliminate the causes of poverty” (Population - Economic Policy Considerations—Task III - Basic Studies Report Pg. 7 - Spiral Bound Book). Have the American people become so unworried these days that they could forget it takes an unfeeling, ingrown group, a distorter of what we call “freedom” in these countries now operating under this objective of “eliminating poverty,” ALL the people are poor as a result. The fragile flowers of incentive does not thrive too well in totally planned economies. After these programs in the general plan are enacted, more will follow as we are in the "conversionary period" with so much more left to be done.

Many of the poor are now beginning to awaken to the fact that there has been a purpose behind all the "free" things they have been receiving from the outstretched regional federal hand. They are now seeing that it is their children who are to be taken up in the radical new state-operated child care centers to be trained as the socialistic leaders of tomorrow, Space limitations restrict a proper discussion of the new "regional schools," but we will be aware that Hanford’s "general plan" does introduce them to the area. The regional school will operate in connection with the child care centers. Whether the president votes the Headstart (H.R. 13351) or not, the goal will still be the same, i.e. the general state control of all children up to 14 years of age, with a "child advocate" in each area to protect the younger children. The parents will be the ones who will benefit from their regional advantages in the state.

Another regional program, the P.P.S. System (A.B. 2300 signed into law 10-23-71) is the vehicle by which human nature is to be "changed" and "restructured" in regional schools guaranteeing compliant subjects to promote the "New Order." Schools will also be centers for sending data on every person in the region, young and old, to computer data banks centers.

On the subject of land, if you doubt the goal is full control of all the land, read Capitol, bill 1, R. 1301 (fast passed and signed) requiring that you get governmental "permision" before you can sell any land, even a part of it. Possibly this ends the item that a few parcels of land in the Hanford area will automatically be rezoned to multi-family residence with acceptance of the "general plan," so no special public hearings will be had.

SOCIALISM is behind every phase of the program. The transportation study is working toward the complete manageability and maneuverability of each person in the region, young or old. It is essential in the goal of "full employment." It doesn't take much imagination to see that we may be required to live not where we "choose" but where we are "told" in order to achieve one of the "job slots" (if it can be done). The mass transit system will also be need for picking up daily mail and packages at the "centralized stations," if the plans are carried out to eliminate door-to-door delivery of mail.

All the programs being written into the regional general plan for Hanford are costly and our taxes should skyrocket when implementation of them begins. Needless to say we can not expect to maintain our former freedoms or the Bill of Rights when we live under this coming economic and social order. (Formerly known as the "government," the American people now have been deposed to the status of "human resources").

If you feel "secure" in thinking that the wealthy and powerful people in this nation "would never let this happen," bear in mind that these are the very people pushing for it. They themselves will live outside the communal system which they are setting up for the masses, and will maintain their same power and wealth (which is not earmarked for "sharing") as they become the "ruling elite."

If we are not to continue on to the point of no return, Americans lead better arm themselves with the facts, and put a stop to regional general plans and other regional advances.
Foreign governments and other investors could buy America out -- lock, stock, and barrel!! Look where I check marked below.

Executive Order 12803——
Infrastructure Privatization
April 30, 1992

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to ensure that the United States achieves the most beneficial economic use of its resources, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Definitions. For purposes of this order, (a) "Privatization" means the disposition or transfer of an infrastructure asset, such as by sale or by long-term lease, from a State or local government to a private party. (b) "Infrastructure asset" means any asset financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government and needed for the functioning of the economy. Examples of such assets include, but are not limited to: roads, tunnels, bridges, electricity supply facilities, mass transit, rail transportation, airports, ports, waterways, water supply facilities, recycling and wastewater treatment facilities, solid waste disposal facilities, housing, schools, prisons, and hospitals.

(c) "Originaly authorized purposes" means the general objectives of the original grant program; however, the term is not intended to include every condition required for a grantee to have obtained the original grant.

(d) "Transfer price" means: (i) the amount paid or to be paid by a private party for an infrastructure asset, if the asset is transferred as a result of competitive bidding; or (ii) the appraised value of an infrastructure asset, as determined by the head of the executive department or agency and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, if the asset is not transferred as a result of competitive bidding.

(e) "State and local governments" means the government of any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, and any county, municipality, city, town, township, local public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, regional or interstate governmental entity, council of governments, and any agency

Note: The President spoke at 12:05 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.
or instrumentality of a local government, and any federally recognized Indian Tribe.

Sec. 2. Fundamental Principles. Executive departments and agencies shall be guided by the following objectives and principles: (a) Adequate and well-maintained infrastructure is critical to economic growth. Consistent with the principles of federalism enumerated in Executive Order No. 12512, and in order to allow the private sector to provide for infrastructure modernization and expansion, State and local governments should have greater freedom to privatize infrastructure assets.

(b) Private enterprise and competitively driven improvements are the foundation of our Nation's economy and economic growth. Federal financing of infrastructure assets should not act as a barrier to the achievement of economic efficiencies through additional private market financing or competitive practices, or both.

(c) State and local governments are in the best position to assess and respond to local needs. State and local governments should, subject to assuring continued compliance with Federal requirements that public use be on reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms, have maximum possible freedom to make decisions concerning the maintenance and disposition of their federally financed infrastructure assets.

(d) User fees are generally more efficient than general taxes as a means to support infrastructure assets. Privatization transactions should be structured so as not to result in unreasonable increases in charges to users.

Sec. 3. Privatization Initiative. To the extent permitted by law, the head of each executive department and agency shall undertake the following actions: (a) Review those procedures affecting the management and disposition of federally financed infrastructure assets owned by State and local governments and modify those procedures to encourage appropriate privatization of such assets consistent with this order; (b) Assist State and local governments in their efforts to advance the objectives of this order; and (c) Approve State and local government requests to privatize infrastructure assets, consistent with the criteria in section 4 of this order and, where necessary, grant exceptions to the disposition requirements of the "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments" common rule, or other relevant rules or regulations, for infrastructure assets, provided that the transfer price shall be distributed, as paid, in the following manner: (i) State and local governments shall first recoup in full the unadjusted dollar amount of their portion of total project costs (including any transaction and fix-up costs they incur) associated with the infrastructure asset involved; (ii) if proceeds remain, then the Federal Government shall recoup in full the amount of Federal grant awards associated with the infrastructure asset, less the applicable share of accumulated depreciation on such asset (calculated using the Internal Revenue Service accelerated depreciation schedule for the categories of assets in question); and (iii) finally, the State and local governments shall keep any remaining proceeds.

Sec. 4. Criteria. To the extent permitted by law, the head of an executive department or agency shall approve a request in accordance with section 3(c) of this order only if the grantee: (a) Agrees to use the proceeds described in section 3(e)(ii) of this order only for investment in additional infrastructure assets (after public notice of the proposed investment), or for debt or tax reduction; and (b) Demonstrates that a market mechanism, legally enforceable agreement, or regulatory mechanism will ensure that: (i) the infrastructure asset or assets will continue to be used for their originally authorized purposes, as long as needed for those purposes, even if the purchaser becomes insolvent or is otherwise hindered from fulfilling the originally authorized purposes; and (ii) user charges will be consistent with any current Federal conditions that protect users and the public by limiting the charges.

Sec. 5. Government-wide Coordination and Review. In implementing Executive Order Nos. 12291 and 12498 and OMB Circular No. A-19, the Office of Management and Budget, to the extent permitted by law and consistent with the provisions of those authorities, shall take action in ensuring that
the policies of the executive departments and agencies are consistent with the principles, criteria, and requirements of this order. The Office of Management and Budget shall review the results of implementing this order and report thereon to the President 1 year after the date of this order.

Sec. 6. Preservation of Existing Authority. Nothing in this order is in any way intended to limit any existing authority of the heads of executive departments and agencies to approve privatization proposals that are otherwise consistent with law.

Sec. 7. Judicial Review. This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch, and is not intended to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

George Bush
The White House,
April 30, 1992.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:17 p.m., April 30, 1992]

Note: This Executive order was published in the Federal Register on May 4.

Message to the Congress
Transmitting the District of Columbia Budget and Supplemental Appropriations Request
April 30, 1992

To the Congress of the United States:


The District of Columbia Government has submitted two alternative 1993 budget requests. The first alternative is for $3,311 million in 1993 and includes a Federal payment of $691 million, which is the amount contained in the 1993 Federal budget. My transmittal of this District budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of the contents.

As the Congress considers the District's 1993 budget, I urge continuation of the policy enacted in the District's appropriations laws for fiscal years 1989-1992 of prohibiting the use of both Federal and local funds for abortions, except when the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetuses were carried to term.

George Bush
The White House,
April 30, 1992.

Statement by Press Secretary
Fitzwater on the President's Meeting With President Richard von
Weizsäcker of Germany
April 30, 1992

The President met for approximately one hour with President Richard von Weizsäcker of Germany, who is in the U.S. on a state visit. The discussion focused on the nature of the new partnership between the U.S. and united Germany. The President stressed our intention to maintain a strong presence in Europe, along with the importance of NATO and the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. He also reiterated our support for reform and controlling nuclear weapons in Russia and the other republics. President Bush said it was important to reach an agreement on GATT soon and that he looked forward to addressing these and other issues at the upcoming G-7 meeting in Munich.

Nomination of Robert L. Barry To Be United States Ambassador to
Indonesia
April 30, 1992

The President today announced his intention to nominate Robert L. Barry, of New
A nation for sale

Ports sale spurs debate about foreign ownership of U.S.

By MARTIN CHUTINSING
AP Economics Reporter

WASHINGTON — The furor over efforts by an Arab company to buy U.S. port operations has focused attention on a little noticed economic fact of life: America increasingly is foreign-owned.

From the ritzy Essex House hotel in Manhattan, owned by the Dubai Investment Group, to the nationwide chains of Caribou Coffee and Church's Chicken, owned by another company serving Arab investors, foreigners are buying bigger and bigger chunks of the country.

The U.S. must borrow more than $2 billion per day from foreigners to finance its trade deficits. In 2006, for example, there was a record deficit of $786 billion in the current account, the broadest measure of trade.

Foreigners sell their televisions, cars and oil to Americans and hold dollars in return. Those dollars are invested in stocks, bonds and other assets, including real estate and factories.

Foreigners already own half of the U.S. government's publicly traded debt. As of January, some $4.19 trillion in Treasury securities were in the hands of central banks, including China and Japan, and private investors abroad.

At the end of 2006, the total foreign direct investment in this country — actual factories, office buildings and other tangible assets as opposed to stocks and bonds — came to $1.33 trillion, 8.3 percent more than in 2005.

That investment shows up in all of the 50 states.

In Oakland, Maine, it's a customer service center for T-Mobile USA Inc., which is a subsidiary of German-based Deutsche Telekom. In Glendale, Calif., it's the U.S. headquarters for Nestle, the Swiss-based food and beverage company.

Arab investment has gotten the most scrutiny of late because of the now-withdrawn bid by a Dubai-based company to buy operations at six major U.S. ports. But statistics show that Arab investments represent only a fraction of the total direct investment in the U.S. by foreigners.

European nations accounted for $977 billion, or two-thirds, of the $1.53 trillion of foreign direct investment, according to figures compiled by the Commerce Department.

By contrast, Arab countries in the Middle East accounted for $33.3 billion, led by $4.7 billion in investment from Saudi Arabia. The United Arab Emirates was second among Middle East Arab countries with $1.8 billion in investments, according to the data.

DP World of Dubai said last week it intends to sell its U.S. operations to an American-owned company. But that has not stopped some members of Congress from seeking to overhaul the way such deals are reviewed by a secretive government panel.

"That strikes me as scary. When you make yourself so dependent on inflows of capital from the rest of the world, the question is what happens if the inflows slow down."

— DAVID WYSS,
CHIEF ECONOMIST FOR STANDARD & POOR'S

A bill by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, GOP Rep. Duncan Hunter of California, would bar foreign ownership of U.S. infrastructure deemed critical to the national security.

"To those who say this is protectionism, I say — America is worth protecting," Hunter said.

Opponents say his proposal would mean the fire sale of billions of dollars of assets now in foreign hands and end up hurting the U.S. economy.

Consider that for more than a decade, French tire maker Michelin has been the exclusive supplier of tires for NASA's space shuttles. DSM, a Dutch company, makes body armor for U.S. troops, while French-owned Sodexo provides meals for the troops at a number of military installations.

Nearly one in five U.S. oil refineries is owned by foreign companies. Foreign companies also have a sizable presence in running power plants, chemical factories and water treatment facilities in the United States.

"People don't understand how integrated the U.S. economy has become with the global economy, how dependent we have become on other nations," said Clyde Prestowitz, president of the Economic Strategy Institute, a Washington think tank.

Some analysts believe such realities are getting lost as politicians try to respond to growing anxiety about the trade deficits, the loss of nearly 3 million manufacturing jobs since 2000, immigration problems and the threat of more terrorist attacks.

"We have to be very careful that we don't overreact in the legislative process and enact economic policy masquerading as national security policy," said Todd Malin, head of the Organization for International Investment. The Washington group represents foreign companies that do business in the United States.

To the puzzlement of some economists, the current debate centers on direct foreign investment, the most stable type of investment. Yet the far larger share of foreign investment is in Treasury securities, corporate bonds and stocks.

If foreigners suddenly decide to reduce their holdings of those assets, the dollar could plunge in value, interest rates could soar and stock prices could suffer a big blow.

David Wyss, chief economist at Standard & Poor's in New York, cited the 51 percent share of foreign ownership of the federal government's debt — and that share is rising.

"That strikes me as scary," Wyss said. "When you make yourself so dependent on inflows of capital from the rest of the world, the question is what happens if the inflows slow down.

The amount of federal debt that must be financed each year is climbing because of the budget deficits. On Thursday, Congress acted to raise the debt ceiling — the amount the government can borrow — by $735 billion, to nearly $9 trillion.
Our Policy shall be this:

1. We, the U.S.A., in cooperation with our allies, for the defense of our national safety and in the interest of international morality, are determined to crush and completely destroy the military power of the Axis aggressors, and to promote respect for, and an international understanding of, the principles of a just and lasting peace. The United Nations will seek to establish a world order which will be stable and peaceful, and will be a force for good in the world.

2. The old world order of colonial exploitation, domination, and imperial rule must be replaced by a new world order of free and equal states. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

3. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

4. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

5. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

6. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

7. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

8. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

9. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

10. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

11. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

12. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

13. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

14. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

15. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

16. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

17. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

18. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

19. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

20. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

21. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

22. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

23. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

24. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

25. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

26. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.

27. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. In this context, the United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations. The United Nations shall seek to promote the economic and social welfare of all nations.
On the pages that follow you will see that merging the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Central American states under one united government has been in the works since F.D.R.'s time, and even before! George W. Bush makes it look like Mexico is the cause behind it!

F.D.R.'s desire to abolish the states fits in with the overall plan to merge us with these other countries. Be sure to read the last paragraph in the article entitled: "NINE GROUPS INSTEAD OF THE 48 STATES" which says:

"The revisionists may never be heard from publicly --especially if the federal courts soon experience a miraculous transformation and begin with unanimity interpreting law in the light of social change."

You will be able to connect the dots yourself when you look at the next several pages. You will see that the things that are happening to the United States were planned away back!

Why the loose borders? Why are our industries moving out of the United States? Why all the treaties that are erasing our borders? Why? Why? Why?

When Ronald Reagan was president, he boldly displayed his presidential book on television, stating that we are going from an industrial society to a services and information society. Reagan also wanted to replace the "Star Spangled Banner" as our national anthem.
The New World Order—Ain't So New!

Ten Groups Instead of the 50 States

Pres. Geo. Bush's New World Order is a rehash of F.D.R.'s World Govt. Plans

The diagram of the U.S. on the left is the plan set forth by the National Resources Planning Board in the 1930's during the administration of F.D.R. with the stated purpose of abolishing the states. Read the attached article which accompanied the map as they ran in the New York Times in 1935. In the least, read the first paragraph and the last paragraph. Since the public outcry was so great, the Congress shut down the National Resources Planning Board in 1942; however, the plans of the NRPB were shelved only temporarily.

The diagram on the right depicts the updated version of a "regionalized" United States. The dormant plans were activated in 1969 under Pres. Richard M. Nixon who partitioned the nation thusly in order to install the regional system. In 1935 "regionalists" were called "revisionists". The plans today are the same as they were then — to disintegrate the states and the counties and to substitute a socialist management system. The new management system is not only geographical in change — it is a totally different concept of government, socially and economically. It means complete control — a totally centralized government in Washington, D.C. It is both totalitarianism and dictatorship commanded under the United Nations system.

When the States are abolished entirely (which is very near) our palladium of freedom & liberty will simultaneously be abolished. The regional system is military in full operation. These activities being carried out by Government officials are against the law. Protest to your State Representative.
The Map of the United States as It Might Be Redrawn by the "Revisionists"—States' Rights Would Be Abolished and the Country Would Be Divided Into Nine Departments

NINE GROUPS INSTEAD OF THE 48 STATES
NINE GROUPS INSTEAD OF THE 48 STATES

By HERBERT CLARK

There is a growing sentiment - it is still too insistent to be termed a movement - among certain members of Congress with advanced social views and a willingness to break with tradition in favor of a new and more practical scheme of federalism. The whole question of the nature and extent of federalism is now under consideration, and the results of the national elections will determine the future of the movement.

A Proposal for Rebuilding the Structure of Government
In Order to Deal With Issues on a National Scale

The proposal presented in the article is based on the idea that a more effective and efficient government can be achieved by reducing the number of states from 48 to nine. This would allow for a more unified and coordinated approach to national issues.

ATTACKS on the constitutionality of the power development program of the Federal Government, on the regulation of natural resources such as timber and oil, on its efforts at alum clearance, have multiplied to such an extent that New Deal administrators go about their day's work with their fingers habitually crossed. And it is not always the Federal foot that does the crossing. Only a few weeks ago a sovereign State - New York - was told by the Supreme Court of the United States that it must not regulate the price of milk within its borders if that milk was produced in another State, since that would constitute an interference with interstate commerce.

While many of the more advanced school do not necessarily quarrel with these decisions on legal grounds, they are tremendously irked by the system which makes them possible. It takes a very great Judge indeed, they admit, to fly in the face of tradition and establish an important precedent.

Among those who believe the States should accept social and economic change as a controlling factor in approving or rejecting legislation, and who are profoundly dissatisfied with the insubstantial barriers provided by State lines, is Senator Wagner of New York.

Senator Wagner, himself a lawyer and former State court judge, is president of the State Bar Association, and a sponsor of his senatorial career of much social reform legislation. He believes that adherence to the letter of a document drafted nearly 135 years ago by thirteen seaboard States, with few of our present problems, tends to make all of the dead things, rather than the living organism it was intended to be. Such interpretation, he believes, is contrary to the best legal thought of our time and tends to cheapen what慷慨 amount to a blockade of "public welfare" legislation unless State frontiers come to be barriers in the path of social advancement.

As for that, he pointed out recently, two major considerations before the Supreme Court when it is called upon to determine the constitutionality of a given law. The first is: "Does the legislation violate due process of law or infringe the liberty of contract?" This, he added, "involves determination of whether the power of government has overstepped the boundary that separates it from freedom of the individual, or have we continued to exist as a normal system?"

The second consideration is: "How the Federal Government stands within the limits of its delegated authority under the Constitution?" It overstepped the boundary that separates national action from State action.

Neither of these boundaries, said Senator Wagner, should be fixed or inflexible, because "changing social and economic conditions transform our federal and state relations, and State and State issues into national issues." As an example of what once was considered unconstitutional in that it infringed the rights of the individual, the Senator recalled a decision in 1904, when the

(Continued on Page 32)
Nine Groups in the Place of Our 48 States
A Proposal to Rebuild the Structure of the Federal Government in Order to Deal With Important Issues on a National Scale

The New York Times Magazine, April 21, 1935

This matter of local autonomy, as they see it, would be a step too far back, making possible a set of local governments, each of which would have its own tariff and income tax. The only genuine remedy is whatever constitutional change may be necessary to get rid of the unsoundness of commerce. This disposition would in any case work out for a smaller survival of the idea that States might levy tariffs. The jurying of tariffs between States is specifically forbidden in the Constitution, and there is no question about that, but the distinction between inter-State and intra-State commerce is allowed to remain. It is possible now to give more than a small encouragement to the big State. But taxation, general social and economic regulation, that is all, for which there would be no good reason for local differentiation, would be in the province of the Federal Government.

There would be a uniform system of marriage and divorce, a uniform system of social insurance and unemployment regulation, uniform national banking and uniform traffic regulation, and also the like. But taxation, general social and economic regulation, in fact, anything for which there would be no wise reason for local differentiation, would be in the province of the Federal Government.

To the argument that elimination of this particular set of checks and balances would affect all sorts of vital legislation by a simple act of Congress, it would be the danger of large numbers of all considered laws being filled with the commonality that is a factor in the constitution, reply is made that, on the other hand, bad laws would be equally easy to get rid of.

There is no purpose to abolish the Constitution or deprive the Supreme Court of its self-given power to pass an legislation. There would still be that system of checks that the Federal system remaining the same, except that State governments as such would remain.

Strange as it may seem, a majority of the Federal States followed roughly sectional lines. There are children's problems, whose cases would be removed, and the Federal Court would be removed in the appropriate basket. One proposed division would be as follows:

The problem of designations for the proposed departments would be considerable. Certain others of the States, and of the States with which they have no business, would have to be designated.

The first group is simple enough: it includes all of England, plus the south coast of France. But the difficulty starts with the names. How devise a name to describe the territory that the great commercial group bound by the Hudson River on the north and the Gulf of Mexico on the south? The name would have to be descriptive, it would have to be meaningful.

Group 5 might be called the Department of the Middle Atlantic States. Group 4 might well be named the Department of the Gulf, the Department of the Middle West, or, better, the Department of the Plains. Group 6 suggests the Department of the West.
In the 1930's when people rejected the idea of abolishing the states, the method by which the effort was to be continued is revealed in the very last two paragraphs in this article. Judges were selected who did begin with unanimity to interpret law in the light of the changes desired by the designers of the new world order. Geographical, physical, economic, and social changes were then engineered to accommodate and promote the transition with the Congress supplying continual legislation to advance the effort.

By keeping the people in utter ignorance, what was once a theory in the thirties, thus became an accomplished fact. Dual governments have been in operation since the above United Nations ten regions were installed. Constitutional government hangs on a thin thread. As soon as our sins get taken away, our constitution and individual land ownership will cease, which is a stated goal of the United Nations. Your state legislature could stop this again as in F.D.R.'s day.
THE MEXICAN ARMED FORCES IN TRANSITION

INTRODUCTION: NORTH AMERICAN SECURITY AND THE MEXICAN MILITARY

Since coming to power in December 2000, Mexican President Vicente Fox continually has expressed a willingness to pursue further North American integration beyond the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). At the Quebec City Summit of the Americas in 2001, for example, he declared his hope of moving toward a "North American Union"—an arrangement similar to the European Union (EU) that would involve a common currency, a customs union, new political institutions, the harmonization of a wide range of policies, and the establishment of a North American Regional Development Bank. The then Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien received the proposal somewhat coolly, stating his view that North American integration should be strictly economic. George W. Bush did not appear any more receptive, but has continued, nonetheless, to express his interest in North American integration, but, despite having developed a relationship with Bush, his proposals have not gotten explicit that cooperation may be limited only to an agreement.

The attacks in the United States in September 2001 changed the foreign policy priorities of the Bush administration to the extent that even an immigration agreement between the United States and Mexico may not now be achievable. In 2001, the United States has focused on issues of security and terrorism, and other parts of the world such as the Middle East have taken precedence over North American issues. Fox's desire for closer North American integration does not appear to have abated, however, and he has, in fact, added a defense component to his vision of a more integrated continental system. Soon after the attacks of September 11, he declared:

"We consider that the struggle against terrorism forms part of a commitment of Mexico to Canada and the United States, as a result of the need to construct the framework of the North American Free Trade
Franklin Delano Roosevelt opened the doors of government for the socialist/globalists to apply their 'planning' techniques upon unaware American citizens. Borders between Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.A. were to be eliminated as well as the boundary lines separating the 48 states. Hawaii and Alaska had not yet become 'states'. F.D.R.'s National Resources Planning Board in which this subversive planning for global government was engineered was declared 'unconstitutional' in 1942, and the NRPB was ordered to be closed down because of the vigorous outcry from patriotic people who learned what F.D.R. was planning. The intent was to install a whole different foreign system of governing over the people of this nation. The Congress was fearful of the exposure and they had to order the NRPB to be closed down. All funding was ordered by the Congress to be stopped. As time passed, Roosevelt died and Harry Truman picked up the pen and signed the Roosevelt/Hiss inspired United Nations Charter, which activated an international management system over the world. When Eisenhower came into office he re-instituted the NRPB under a different name in 1959. It was then called the "Advisory Commission of Intergovernmental Relations". Funded by Rockefeller money, it spent scores of years drafting model laws for statesmen and Congressmen to use which would gradually alter the system, seep its strength, and permit the conversion of the U.S.A. into machinations as you see in maps as above. The united "states" were to be replaced by a totalitarian communist global management system. International transportation planning only is being shown above, but the intent has been to take away land, cars, guns and American sovereignty and to integrate the people of these countries not only economically, but in every facet of human relationship. You will not be allowed free use of your automobile! Look for Cananes and the various Corridor maps also on the Internet. Treaties such as NAFTA, CAFTA, FTAA make such sedition possible. This 'super corridor' will be 4 football fields wide. Eminent domain which will seize people's private land is endorsed by George Bush's E.O. 13406. The East, West corridors are not shown here. Now you may find various maps, maps not only revealing the plans for merging all the North American countries into one government, but altering the whole world. Some candidates for election in the U.S.A. today push the global system upon the unsuspecting people by calling it "democracy". Landowners haven't been able to catch on due to the political double talk! Some people enjoy planning other people's lives for them whether the victims want that kind of cradle-to-grave tyrannical militarized government or not! How about you, my friend? Here is where your tax money has been going! 

You need to pull out the map on the other side. It shows all the ten federal regions and subregions for the whole nation. These delineations are for replacement of the American states! Interstate compacts have been written to merge several states into one -- within each region.

What a mistake it was to sign the United Nations Charter! It was signed as a "treaty" but the Charter did not qualify as a "treaty" in 1945! This can all be stopped. The U.N. did not acquire sovereignty until March 19, 1970 at which time the U.S. Senate voted 78 to 22 on "Executive J" to bestow "sovereignty" upon the U.N. Do you know that you can void a treaty? The process is known as "Rebus Sic Stantibus. Look for it up ahead."
States and counties are no longer desired by the recasting group in Washington, D.C. Those lines are scheduled to become inactive. Elected representation is also no longer desired. The order for this recasting system came from the United Nations.

"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other state, nor any State formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as the Congress."

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
Article IV, Section 3, Paragraph 1

REGIONALISM—PRESIDENT NIXON'S NEW FEDERALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>STATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.Y.C.</td>
<td>N.Y., N.J., Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phila</td>
<td>Del., D.C., Md., Pa., Va., West Va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Ill., Ind., Illn., Mich., Ohio, West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Ark., La., Tex., Okla., Okla., Tex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Iowa, Kan., Mo., Neb., Colo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Colo., Mont., N.D., S.D., Utah, Wyo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Fran.</td>
<td>Calif., Calif., Calif., Calif., Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Alaska, Idaho, Ore., Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Nixon on 3-27-69 through the Government Reorganization Act divided the United States into ten regions. To further implement this Regional Governance over the U.S.A., President Nixon signed Executive Order 11647 and entered it in the Federal Register Feb. 12, 1972, Vol. 37, No. 301

Through the authority vested in him as President of the U.S., he established a Federal Regional Council for each of the ten standard regions. It is stated that, the President shall designate one member of each such Council as Chairman of that Council and such chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the President.
The United Nations Regional Method of Operating The States of America Under World Control. California is "In Transition".

# 1 = ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS: S.F., Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Solano, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo
# 2 = ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS: Monterey, Santa Cruz
# 3 = BUTTE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS:
# 4 = CENTRAL SIERRA PLANNING COUNCIL: Amador, Alpine, Calaveras, Tuolumne
# 5 = CITIES AND COUNTY OF COLUSA PLANNING COMMISSION (Inactive since October, 1973)
# 6 = CITIES AND COUNTY OF SAN JAOQUIN ADVISORY PLANNING ASSOCIATION
# 7 = COUNCIL OF FRESNO COUNTY GOVERNMENT
# 8 = HUMBOLDT COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVTS.
# 9 = INYO-MONO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES
#10 = KERN COUNTY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
#11 = KINGS COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
#12 = LAKE COUNTY AND CITIES AREA PLANNING COUNCIL
#13 = MENDOCINO COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVTS.
#14 = MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVTS.
#15 = SACRAMENTO REGIONAL AREA PLANNING COMMISSION: Sacramento, Yolo, Sutter, Yuba, El Dorado, Placer
#16 = SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ORGANIZATION
#17 = SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY CITIES COORDINATING COUNCIL
#18 = SANTA BARBARA COUNTY-CITIES AREA PLANNING COUNCIL.

# 19 = SHASTA COUNTY-CITIES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
# 20 = SISKIYOU ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES
# 21 = SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS:
The above delineations have been called by many titles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Metropolitan Districts</th>
<th>Substate Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella Multi-jurisdictional Organizations</td>
<td>Super &quot;counties&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Districts</td>
<td>Area-wide Planning Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the most popular titles. What they are in actuality is administrative units of the United Nations System. They are part of the conversion to operation of America under full world (socialist) government. The implementation of these units to abolish our counties is simultaneously the process of abolishing our states. As the governing board of a district takes control (at first 51% are elected officials and 49% are unelected officials) there exists the directive that members of the state and federal government are also a part of the governing board. Because the reaction was so strong against it, the DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE was removed as a part of the governing board at the Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. This was in Jimmy Carter's administration. There are a great many evidences that a military government is being structured to replace the Constitutional system of government in America.

Substate District No. 6 has been colored in. This is your assigned "Umbrella Multi-jurisdictional Organization." We are not addressing "theory." The plan has been forced upon us and has been operational for some years (1971). Because local government was reluctant to give up its county structure, the state accepted what combinations it could get, haphazardly which resulted in differences in regional alignments of Comprehensive Health Program Planning, Air Resources Regions, Criminal Justice Regions, Water Quality Regions, Caltrans Districts, etc., melding counties together so that these above districts are ultimate management systems after all counties (and cities) have disappeared. Consider this: The above "Umbrella Multi-jurisdictional Organization" with six melded counties will operate with one governing board over the whole area. Too large, too remote, and too dictatorial, these boards will have these powers and functions: Comprehensive Planning Process over the whole area with one planning director in charge; Power of the purse with one treasurer collecting the money from the area's residents; One taxing authority; Control of everything including Special Districts; Holds veto power over actions of the whole area; Holds clearinghouse power and functions; Mandatory membership requirements (and if an area does not direct its taxes to them, the area or former county gets no voting rights; Ultimate direction is full appointive management and not elected representation; Holds the "right to perpetual succession" for its form of government; Operated by "intellectuals" calling themselves welfare scientists, political and behavioral scientists, etc. Civilian administrations and military concepts are being integrated on a regional basis.
Hired by F.D.R., these three men were the central figures in the early day planning for the overthrow of the American government. One of their intentions was to abolish the states and replace them with "regions". They conceived the methodologies and techniques now being used in the gradual step-by-step transformation of the United States from a republic into a link in a socialist world order. They used the word "democracy" as a stand-in word for communist/socialist practices and principles that were to come.

Luther Gulick expressed his feelings for the states in this way:

"Is the state the appropriate instrumentality for the discharge of important functions? The answer is not a matter of conjecture, or delicate appraisal. It's a matter of brutal record: The American state is finished! I do not predict that the states will go! I affirm that they have gone!"

Charles E. Merriam who was the go-between for the Rockefeller family and Franklin D. Roosevelt stated:

"Fortunately, our Constitution is broad enough in its terms, flexible enough in its spirit, and capable of liberal enough interpretation by the judiciary to permit the adaptation of democracy to changing conditions without serious difficulty."

In his book, entitled: "On the Agenda of Democracy," Merriam revealed what is meant by democracy. It means the adoption of communist/socialist principles and goals. Many gradual step-by-step alterations were introduced leading toward the decline and eventual elimination of the state as an entity.
George W. Bush, like all other presidents, in both parties, venerates Franklin D. Roosevelt. Bush, just as all presidents before him, adheres to the doctrine of F.D.R. and his mentor, Charles E. Merriam. Merriam summed up his doctrine by saying: "Revolution is the old way! The new way is Education, Persuasion, Co-Operation, and Participation". Merriam set the course for F.D.R. and all future presidents on how to discreetly "...bring in socialism (communism)..." In Merriam's book entitled "On the Agenda of Democracy", he advocated and defined communism, but he deliberately labeled it "democracy". So, by using "democracy" as the 'stand-in' word, they would be able to gradually convert America into a socialist/communist country. Regarding the tactics they would use, one of the revealing statements Merriam made was: "Fortunately, our Constitution is broad enough in its terms, flexible enough in its spirit, and capable of liberal enough interpretation by the judiciary to permit the adaptation of democracy to changing conditions without serious difficulty."
The idea was to get past the people's objection, to daunt their resistance by bringing in communism on the coat-tails of the Constitution, and by cloaking it with Constitutional rhetoric, they could justify and force its acceptance. Essentially, what he was saying is that the socialists could use the Constitution to successfully bring in communism without the people catching on! Obviously, Merriam's technique has worked. F.D.R. instituted that method in government and every president since has operated under it.

President Bush is so obvious in his adherence to Merriam's instruction by his most frequent use of persuasion. "Just trust me" he pleads as he converts the U.S.A. into a dictatorship type of government under the name of 'Homeland Security', something so necessary to the New World Order! F.D.R.'s "New Deal" previously consolidated much power at the federal level and led to the breakdown of local control in cities all over the nation. "Human Rights", "Four Freedoms", "Regional Government", Redevelopment, the 'General and Complete Disarmament Program' (including taking guns away from the law-abiding citizens), Unification of Laws, the "United Nations", etc., all can be documented in their origin in the Franklin D. Roosevelt time period. Roosevelt and Merriam broke ground for every president that followed. The "New Deal" at that time was also called the "New World Moral Order". They laid out the plans and structure, which is why so many presidents pay tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt, regardless of party. Truly, Charles E. Merriam and F.D.R. are the phantoms behind the scene!

Charles E. Merriam
He was the mentor to F.D.R. Merriam was funded by the Rockefeller family. He was acclaimed to be the father of the behavioral approach to political science. He held three Master degrees in subjects dealing with people, politics, and power. These subjects were co-ordinated in his mind enabling him to plan out and chart the road to a socialist U.S.A.

Franklin D. Roosevelt
Franklin D. Roosevelt was a socialist. F.D.R.'s casual manner and his father-like appearance gave confidence to the nation in the Depression days. He collaborated with Alger Hiss, the convicted communist spy who drafted the United Nations Charter. It is a plan for overthrowing the American system of government.
SHOULD WE ALLOW THE NULLIFICATION OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE TO GO UNCHALLENGED??

ABOVE IS A PHOTO OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY S. REUSS, D-WISC. SIGNING A DECLARATION OF INTER-DEPENDENCE

He was joined in this act to attempt to nullify our Declaration of Independence by about 124 other members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. It was set forth by the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia. The ceremony was held on Friday, January 30, 1976.
You cannot serve two masters - either you believe in this document or else you believe in the document for world government which is being signed on the other side.

It is well to remember that this Declaration of Independence is documentary proof of your natural rights, confirmed by the founders of this republic.

"Before entering on so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its memories, its benefits, its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly to are greater than the ills you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?" .....Abraham Lincoln

The people who are signing the document on the reverse side are doing so without the consent of the governed.

These people were not sent to Washington, D.C. to do this. They were not hired for this purpose. They must be told that what they do is against the law!
Declaration of INTERdependence:

(p. 37) "To establish a new world order of compassion, peace, justice and security, it is essential that mankind free itself from the limitations of national prejudice..."

—Henry Steele Commager

U.S. Ambassador to Italy: "If instant world government, Charter review, and a greatly strengthened International Court do not provide the answers, what hopes for progress is there?"

—Richard Gardner (see p. 4)

U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain: "Maybe by 1987 we could...celebrate the 200th year of the Constitution with at least the beginning of global arrangements and institutions...."

—Kingman Brewster, Jr. (see p. 6)

Adviser to Pres. Carter: "...some international cooperation has already been achieved, but further progress will require greater American sacrifices."

—Brzezinski (see p. 4)

Former U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: "...the trilateral community of the developed nations...could well be a major factor in building a new world order."

—Gerald C. Smith (see p. 7)

Former Sec. of State: "...there exists an extraordinary opportunity to achieve for the first time in history a truly global society, carried by the principle of interdependence."

—Henry Kissinger (see p. 5)
The signing of the INTERdependence Declaration was given no attention in the nation's press and, of course, the Congressmen endorsing the instrument have not been publicized. They are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward W. Brooke (R.-Mass.)</td>
<td>Gale W. McGee (D.-Wyo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Clark (D.-Iowa)</td>
<td>George McGovern (D.-S.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Cranston (D.-Cal.)</td>
<td>Thomas J. McIntyre (D.-N.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Church (D.-Idaho)</td>
<td>Mike Mansfield (D.-Mont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob K. Javits (R.-N.Y.)</td>
<td>Charles Mathias (R.-Md.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Gravel (D.-Alaska)</td>
<td>Lee Metcalf (D.-Mont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Hart (D.-Mich.)</td>
<td>Walter Mondale (D.-Minn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance Hartke (D.-Ind.)</td>
<td>Gaylord Nelson (D.-Wisc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hatfield (R.-Ore.)</td>
<td>Robert Packwood (R.-Ore.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert H. Humphrey (D.-Minn.)</td>
<td>James B. Pearson (R.-Kans.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| John B. Anderson (R.-III.) | Donald M. Fraser (D.-Minn.) |
| Les Aspin (D.-Wisc.) | Sam M. Gibbons (D.-Fla.) |
| Herman Badillo (D.-N.Y.) | William J. Green (D.-Pa.) |
| William A. Barrett (D.-Pa.) | Gilbert Gude (R.-Md.) |
| Berkleley Bedell (D.-Iowa) | Thomas R. Harkin (D.-Iowa) |
| Edward G. Biester, Jr. (R.-Pa.) | Michael Harrington (D.-Mass.) |
| Edward Boland, Jr. (D.-Mass.) | Henry Heilooaki (D.-N.J.) |
| Richard Bolling (D.-Mo.) | Frank Horton (R.-N.Y.) |
| John Brademas (D.-Ind.) | Robert E. Jones (D.-Ala.) |
| William Brodrick (D.-Mich.) | Barbara Jordan (D.-Tenn.) |
| George E. Brown, Jr. (D.-Cal.) | Martha E. Keys (D.-Kan.) |
| Yvonne B. Burke (D.-Cal.) | Robert L. Leggett (D.-Cal.) |
| Goodloe E. Byron (D.-Md.) | Norman F. Lent (R.-N.Y.) |
| Cardiss Collins (D.-Ill.) | Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (R.-Cal.) |
| Silvio O. Conte (R.-Mass.) | Matthew F. McHugh (D.-N.Y.) |
| James C. Corman (D.-Cal.) | Spark Matsunaga (D.-Hawaii) |
| George E. Danielson (D.-Cal.) | Lloyd Meeds (D.-Wash.) |
| Ronald V. Dellums (D-Cal.) | Ralph H. Metcalfe (D.-Ill.) |
| Robert B. Duncan (D.-Ore.) | Edward Mervinsky (D.-Iowa) |
| Robert W. Edgar (D.-Pa.) | Ahner J. Mikva (D.-Ill.) |
| Don Edwards (D.-Cal.) | Norman Y. Mineta (D.-Cal.) |
| Joshua Eilberg (D.-Pa.) | Patay Mink (D.-Hawaii) |
| Millicent H. Ferwick (R.-N.J.) | William S. Moorhead (D.-Pa.) |
| Daniel J. Flood (D.-Pa.) | John E. Moss (D.-Cal.) |
| James J. Florio (D.-N.J.) | Thomas E. Morgan (D.-Cal.) |

*Those names with an X marked before them have either removed their names—or have announced that their name was used without their permission.*
A Declaration Of INTERdependence

WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HISTORY the threat of extinction confronts mankind, it is necessary for the people of The United States to declare their interdependence with the people of all nations and to embrace those principles and build those institutions which will enable mankind to survive and civilization to flourish.

Two centuries ago our forefathers brought forth a new nation; now we must join with others to bring forth a new world order. On this historic occasion it is proper that the American people should reaffirm those principles on which the United States of America was founded, acknowledge the new crises which confront them, accept the new obligations which history imposes upon them, and set forth the causes which impel them to affirm before all peoples their commitment to a Declaration of Interdependence.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that the inequalities and injustices which afflict so much of the human race are the product of history and society, not of God or nature; that people everywhere are entitled to the blessings of life and liberty; peace and security and the realization of their full potential; that they have an inescapable moral obligation to preserve those rights for posterity; and that to achieve these ends all the peoples and nations of the globe should acknowledge their interdependence and join together to dedicate their minds and their hearts to the solution of those problems which threaten their survival.

To establish a new world order of compassion, peace, justice and security, it is essential that mankind free itself from the limitations of national prejudice, and acknowledge that the forces that unite it are incomparably deeper than those that divide it—that all people are part of one global community, dependent on one body of resources, bound together by the ties of a common humanity and associated in a common adventure on the planet Earth.

Let us then join together to vindicate and realize this great truth that mankind is one, and as one will nobly save or irreparably lose the heritage of thousands of years of civilization. And let us set forth the principles which should animate and inspire us if our civilization is to survive.

WE AFFIRM that the resources of the globe are finite, not infinite, that they are the heritage of no one nation or generation, but of all peoples, nations and of posterity, and that our deepest obligation is to transmit to that posterity a planet richer in material bounty, in beauty and in delight than we found it. Narrow notions of national sovereignty must not be permitted to curtail that obligation.

WE AFFIRM that the exploitation of the poor by the rich, and the weak by the strong violates our common humanity and denies to large segments of society the blessings of life, liberty and happiness. We recognize a moral obligation to strive for a more prudent and more equitable sharing of the resources of the earth in order to ameliorate poverty, hunger and disease.

WE AFFIRM that the resources of nature are sufficient to nourish and sustain all the present inhabitants of the globe and that there is an obligation on every society to distribute those resources equitably, along with a corollary obligation...
upon every society to assure that its population does not place upon Nature a burden heavier than it can bear.

WE AFFIRM our responsibility to help create conditions which will make for peace and security and to build more effective machinery for keeping peace among the nations. Because the insensate accumulation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons threatens the survival of Mankind we call for the immediate reduction and eventual elimination of these weapons under International supervision. We deplore the reliance on force to settle disputes between nation states and between rival groups within such states.

WE AFFIRM that the oceans are the common property of mankind whose dependence on their incomparable resources of nourishment and strength will, in the next century, become crucial for human survival, and that their exploitation should be so regulated as to serve the interests of the entire globe, and of future generations.

WE AFFIRM that pollution flows with the waters and flies with the winds, that it recognizes no boundary lines and penetrates all defenses, that it works irreparable damage alike to Nature and to Mankind — threatening with extinction the life of the seas, the flora and fauna of the earth, the health of the people in cities and the countryside alike — and that it can be adequately controlled only through international cooperation.

WE AFFIRM that the exploration and utilization of outer space is a matter equally important to all the nations of the globe and that no nation can be permitted to exploit or develop the potentialities of the planetary system exclusively for its own benefit.

WE AFFIRM that the economy of all nations is a seamless web, and that no one nation can any longer effectively maintain its processes of production and monetary systems without recognizing the necessity for collaborative regulation by international authorities.

WE AFFIRM that in a civilized society, the institutions of science and the arts are never at war and call upon all nations to exempt these institutions from the claims of chauvinistic nationalism and to foster that great community of learning and creativity whose benign function it is to advance civilization and the health and happiness of mankind.

WE AFFIRM that a world without law is a world without order, and we call upon all nations to strengthen and to sustain the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and other institutions of world order, and to broaden the jurisdiction of the World Court, that these may preside over a reign of law that will not only end wars but end as well that mindless violence which terrorizes our society even in times of peace.

WE can no longer afford to make little plans, allow ourselves to be the captives of events and forces over which we have no control, consult our fears rather than our hopes. We call upon the American people, on the threshold of the third century of their national existence, to display once again that boldness, enterprise, magnanimity and vision which enabled the founders of our Republic to bring forth a new nation and inaugurate a new era in human history. The fate of humanity hangs in the balance. Throughout the globe, hearts and hopes wait upon us. We summon all Mankind to unite to meet the great challenge.

— Henry Steele Commager
October 24, 1975
U.S. Acknowledges Supremacy of the UN

It was only a matter of time: The United States has answered to the UN for human rights violations.

By James P. Tucker Jr.

The U.N. has superseded U.S. sovereignty in so many ways. It is causing Constitutional limited government to be overthrown! Even the Bill of Rights is looked down upon at the U.N. Isn't it about time you put the pieces together and realize what is happening to you?

Under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the United States has to account to the United Nations Human Rights Committee for its conduct.

So the State Department submitted a 216-page "compliance report" effectively apologizing to the world government because some states execute murderers and some local police officers reportedly were less than gentle in handling violent felons.

Throughout history, John Shattuck, assistant secretary of state, wrote in the report, the United States has experienced "egregious human rights violations in [the] ongoing struggle for justice."

The report apologizes for slavery of more than a century ago, destruction of Native American culture, ill treatment of illegal aliens and denial of rights to women.

"It's part of conditioning the minds of Americans to accept a world government to which the United States will ultimately surrender all sovereignty," said a career State Department official who has tracked the movement for years.

Each year, we will read short news stories about the United States accounting to the world body for its behavior, and the public will be conditioned to accept the fact that the United Nations is the ultimate
President Wm. Clinton has issued his presidential Executive Order No. 13107 to replace our precious Bill of Rights with an "International Bill of Rights" also known as the Human Rights Treaties. As we are pushed into international command and control, our own endowments from the Creator, listed in the American Bill of Rights will no longer be honored. This constitutes a massive loss!
EXECUTIVE ORDER 13107 OF DECEMBER 10, 1996

IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and bearing in mind the obligations of the United States pursuant to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), and other relevant treaties concerning the protection and promotion of human rights to which the United States is now or may become a party in the future, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Implementation of Human Rights Obligations.
(a) It shall be the policy and practice of the Government of the United States, being committed to the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms, fully to respect and implement its obligations under the International human rights treaties to which it is a party, including the ICCPR, the CAT, and the CERD.

(b) It shall also be the policy and practice of the Government of the United States to promote respect for international human rights, both in our relationships with all other countries and by working with and strengthening the various international mechanisms for the promotion of human rights, including, inter alia, those of the United Nations, the International Labor Organization, and the Organization of American States.

Sec. 2. Responsibility of Executive Departments and Agencies. (a) All executive departments and agencies (as defined in 5 U.S.C. 101-105, including boards and commissions, and hereinafter referred to collectively as "agency" or "agencies") shall maintain a current awareness of United States international human rights obligations that are relevant to their functions and shall perform such functions so as to respect and implement these obligations fully. The head of each agency shall designate a single contact officer who will be responsible for overall coordination of the implementation of this order. Under this order, all such agencies shall retain their established
institutional roles in the implementation, interpretation, and enforcement of Federal law and policy.

(b) The heads of agencies shall have lead responsibility, in coordination with other appropriate agencies, for questions concerning implementation of human rights obligations that fall within their respective operating and program responsibilities and authorities or, to the extent that matters do not fall within the operating and program responsibilities and authorities of any agency, that most closely relate to their general areas of concern.

Sec. 3. Human Rights Inquiries and Complaints. Each agency shall take lead responsibility, in coordination with other appropriate agencies, for responding to inquiries, requests for information, and complaints about violations of human rights obligations that fall within its areas of responsibility or, if the matter does not fall within its areas of responsibility, referring it to the appropriate agency for response.

Sec. 4. Interagency Working Group on Human Rights Treaties. (a) There is hereby established an Interagency Working Group on Human Rights Treaties for the purpose of providing guidance, oversight, and coordination with respect to questions concerning the adherence to and implementation of human rights obligations and related matters.

(b) The designee of the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs shall chair the Interagency Working Group, which shall consist of appropriate policy and legal representatives at the Assistant Secretary level from the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other agencies as the chair deems appropriate. The principal members may designate alternates to attend meetings in their stead.

(c) The principal functions of the Interagency Working Group shall include:

(i) coordinating the interagency review of any significant issues concerning the implementation of this order and analysis and recommendations in connection with pursuing the ratification of human rights treaties, as such questions may from time to time arise;

(ii) coordinating the preparation of reports that are to be submitted by the United States in fulfillment of treaty obligations;

(iii) coordinating the responses of the United States Government to complaints against it concerning alleged human rights violations submitted to the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and other international organizations;

(iv) developing effective mechanisms to ensure that legislation proposed by the Administration is reviewed for conformity with international human rights obligations and that these obligations are taken into account in reviewing legislation under consideration by the Congress as well;
(vi) developing recommended proposals and mechanisms for improving the monitoring of the actions by the various States, Commonwealths, and territories of the United States and, where appropriate, of Native Americans and Federally recognized Indian tribes, including the review of State, Commonwealth, and territorial laws for their conformity with relevant treaties, the provision of relevant information for reports and other monitoring purposes, and the promotion of effective remedial mechanisms;

(vii) developing plans for public outreach and education concerning the provisions of the ICCPR, CAT, CERD, and other relevant treaties, and human rights-related provisions of domestic law;

(viii) coordinating and directing an annual review of United States reservations, declarations, and understandings to human rights treaties, and matters as to which there have been nontrivial complaints or allegations of inconsistency with or breach of international human rights obligations, in order to determine whether there should be consideration of any modification of relevant reservations, declarations, and understandings to human rights treaties, or United States practices or laws. The results and recommendations of this review shall be reviewed by the head of each participating agency;

(ix) making such other recommendations as it shall deem appropriate to the President, through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, concerning United States adherence to or implementation of human rights treaties and related matters and

(x) coordinating such other significant tasks in connection with human rights treaties or international human rights institutions, including the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Special Rapporteurs and complaints procedures established by the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

(d) The work of the Interagency Working Group shall not supplant the work of other interagency entities, including the President's Committee on the International Labor Organization, that address international human rights issues.

Sec. 5. Cooperation Among Executive Departments and Agencies. All agencies shall cooperate in carrying out the provisions of this order. The Interagency Working Group shall facilitate such cooperative measures.

Sec. 6. Judicial Review, Scope, and Administration. (a) Nothing in this order shall create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

(b) This order does not supersede Federal statutes and does not impose any justiciable obligations on the executive branch.

(c) The term "treaty obligations" shall mean treaty obligations as approved by the Senate pursuant to Article VI, section 2, clause 2 of the United States Constitution.
(d) To the maximum extent practicable and subject to the availability of appropriations, agencies shall carry out the provisions of this order.

{Presidential Sig.}<clinton1><clinton2>

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 10, 1996.

Refer to "And not a shot was fired" for an understanding of the objectives of an "agency."

The rights covered in the American Bill of Rights are bestowed upon man by the Creator.

No man can take these rights away!

They are superior to the rights which are granted to the people by government.

Government-granted rights in these Human Rights Treaties can also be taken away by government!

There is no provision for firearms!

We will be helpless without our own Second Amendment!
THE AWFUL TRUTH ABOUT THE  
HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES

Once again, by applying an innocent-sounding name or title to a goal, which is not so innocent, it helps the evil aspirations of internationalists to pass over the eyes of the unsuspecting public! This time an innocent sounding title is being used which glorifies the subversive Human Rights Treaties. This beguiling action replaces the inherent and natural rights of the people and substitutes “rights” that conform to totalitarian goals and world-wide management systems. Through the years, many of our presidents (George W. Bush is no exception!) have been forcing other nations to accept these communist Human Rights Treaties lest they run the risk of losing U.S. foreign aid. A section in the U.S. Foreign Aid & Assistance Act of 1961 supports this fact.

A false impression of these treaties is being given to the people of the United States, so that they will continue to be the suppliers of the money that is required to finance the 1961 Foreign Aid & Assistance Act.

Unfortunately, the people continue to honor the term “human rights” that they so feebly hear mentioned on a media broadcast without contest. Contrary to the impression given by our presidents in news releases, the treaties really are not intended to stop war crimes and related cruelties. As you review the treaties you will see that this is not their intention; instead, these treaties are codifying laws for the rights of (communist) man, laying down policies for world government management, and erecting segments of the world judiciary system. The underpinnings of the world court are being erected. Those rights that international law will allow to U.S. citizens are to be subject to restrictions and modifications in accordance to changes that occur in international law.

The initial enticements can easily be dropped later after adoption of these treaties.

When the United Nations organization first presented these four Human Rights Treaties (covenants), they described them as a “Global Bill of Rights” which took them “thirty years of endeavor”. They are undeniably a communist Bill of Rights. Accordingly, it has become a RIGHT — FOR EVERYONE — ON A WORLD SCALE (whether they earn it or not) — to receive adequate food, clothing, housing, health care, recreation, etc. As government steps in to fulfill these “rights” — regardless of what name you may choose to call it — it still is communism!

Have you ever wondered what is happening to the rights we speak of as being our birthrights, meaning those rights that are confirmed by the Americanist Bill of Rights and defined by it as being unalienable, and an endowment from the Creator? The answer is that our birthrights are being detrued and superseded by these United Nations Human Rights Treaties!

The demotion is immediately apparent: our birthrights are being removed from God’s authority to man’s authority. Henceforth, our rights will be subject to alteration by the humanists, communists, and socialists who control these Human Rights Treaties.

The world judiciary that has been erected negates our own rightful judiciary. It must be recognized that we are undergoing many changes forced upon us as a result of various other interrelated treaties signed by many U.S. presidents. The result is that your right to control your local government, the direction of your state and nation, and even the course of your own personal life, is now being eliminated.

Meanwhile, Congress is passing laws to negate the principles within the Americanist Bill of Rights, which delete those rights that our founding fathers confirmed and declared as not being subject to repeal. This situation will continue, provided you allow these treaties to stand.

Lyndon B. Johnson signed the first Human Rights Treaty in 1966. James E. Carter signed the other three of the four treaties in 1977. Not all have been ratified by the Senate of the United States; however, the required number of worldwide ratifications by countries that are members of the United Nations has been acquired by that international body; therefore, these treaties are considered to be “in force on an international level”.

All four treaties are now considered to be binding upon the United States without ratification, ascensions, or adherences due to U.S. membership in the U.N. It is required of U.N. members to adhere to all treaties that have been ratified within the General Assembly.

Sandra Day O’Connor was selected for the appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court because reportedly, she was prepared to make decisions in favor of international human rights. John Foster Dulles has falsely stated that treaties supersede the U.S. Constitution and are supreme law of this land. This is not true!

Before you deem it so essential to rally in support of our president’s call to defend “human rights”, better familiarize yourself with them first.

Note: A copy of the Human Rights Treaties are available upon request.
Presidentional Documents

Executive Order 13107 of December 10, 1998

Implementation of Human Rights Treaties

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and bearing in mind the obligations of the United States pursuant to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR), the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CEDR), and other relevant treaties concerned with the protection and promotion of human rights to which the United States is now or may become a party in the future, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Implementation of Human Rights Obligations.
(a) It shall be the policy and practice of the Government of the United States, being committed to the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms, fully to respect and implement its obligations under the international human rights treaties to which it is a party, including the ICPR, the CAT, and the CEDR.

(b) It shall also be the policy and practice of the Government of the United States to promote respect for international human rights, both in our relationships with all other countries and by working with and strengthening the various international mechanisms for the promotion of human rights, including, inter alia, those of the United Nations, the International Labor Organization, and the Organization of American States.

Sec. 2. Responsibility of Executive Departments and Agencies. (a) All executive departments and agencies (as defined in 5 U.S.C. 101-105, including boards and commissions, and hereinafter referred to collectively as "agency" or "agencies") shall maintain a current awareness of United States international human rights obligations that are relevant to their functions and shall perform such functions so as to respect and implement these obligations fully. The head of each agency shall designate a single contact officer who will be responsible for overall coordination of the implementation of this order. Under this order, all such agencies shall retain their established

AND NOW IT IS THE BILL OF RIGHTS BEING SUPPLANTED BY OTHER COMMUNIST DOCUMENTS: THE HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES!

The treaty referred to here called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights declares food, clothing, housing, etc. to be a "right" -- whether you have earned it or not! It applies to everyone all over the world. It's communism! When they set your salary, you will know who is going to finance it. That, too, is already planned!

There are also several Constitutions for the World and a global Charter waiting for enactment. About 100 or so members of the U.S. Congress have signed a Declaration of Inter-Dependence to cancel out what happened in Independence Hall.
WOULD ANYONE WANT TO CANCEL OUT OUR BILL OF RIGHTS?

You could call the Bill of Rights an endangered species!

Are you aware that there is no court review on a Bill of Repeal?

He Labels It 'Ridiculous' 7-22-70

Link Agnew With Plan To Cancel Elections

NEW YORK (UPS) - Scandal's monthly today published a section of a memo allegedly filed in the office of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew with a purported plan to cancel the 1972 elections and repeal the Bill of Rights. Agnew, according to 'The New York Times', denied the memo as "completely false" and "ridiculous."

The memorandum, published without comment, is marked "page 2 of 4 pages" and dated March 11. It is marked "confidential" and is headed "The Vice President, Washington, D.C."

It picks up half way through a sentence, saying "and the stand that was taken that a position was taken that the right thing to do is to hold national elections in '72, to the extent selected, or course at the time to in the way to do this!" to the extent that the right thing to do is to hold national elections in '72, to the extent selected, of course at the time to in the way to do this!"

The Times quoted Agnew as saying "my denial is unequivocal not only for that document but for anything else concerning that subject in writing, in conversation or in thought. You can't get much more unequivocal than that."

Scandal's editors, Warren Black and Henry E. Brown, said "the Vice President's denial is as unequivocal as it is thrombolytic. The document came directly from Mr. Agnew's office and he knows it."

JULY 22, 1970
Hanford - Sentinel

Yes! There are many in the federal administration who would be willing to do that! The Human Rights treaties can do just exactly that; however, not all the world's countries have accepted them.

Repr. Major Owens of New York carried legislation for years calling for the repeal of the Bill of Rights, but he did not get enough supporters in the House of Representatives to get it passed.

Owens' legislation will be kept "on ice" until all of the "Human Rights" treaties are fully recognized by all of the countries in the world. Then Owens' legislation will be pulled "out of the hat" for swift and sudden enactment.
Although Vice-Pres.Spiro T. Agnew denied any connection with cancellation of the Bill of Rights, three years later this article was published in the Los Angeles Times (August 7, 1973). It exposed the intent to cause the 2nd Amendment to be interpreted so that it would cast a different slant opposite to its true intent. The goal was to force a national viewpoint, and stymie the individual so that he could not use the amendment in the defense of his individual right. It would be "defined" only as protecting the right of the state to have a militia -- "national" in its outlook.
There is a lot of talk these days from George W. Bush about forcing China to observe Human Rights. Don’t be fooled, folks! What’s really going on is that China has to conform to all the multitude of things in four treaties on “human rights” (so-called) which is the global government’s idea of what rights people and world-wide governments can have. Yes, they’re in conformity to communist doctrine, but there are some provisions that restrict the communist Chinese government from doing what they want to their own people. They will lose authority to continue to do so. These treaties force a doctrine in the management of mankind, according to communist international rules. Has the United States signed into these treaties? Yes, they have!

What I am telling you is that the Human Rights treaties replace your own Bill of Rights. The views and God-given rights the founding father’s sought to protect are not found in the Human Rights Treaties. Bush makes it sound good, but you’re being defrauded, folks. How can I make you wake up??
FOUR TREATIES PERTAINING TO 
HUMAN RIGHTS 
[United Nations Treaties]

MESSAGE 
FROM 
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES 
TRANSMITTING 
THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, SIGNED ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 28, 1966 (EXECUTIVE C, 66-3); THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, SIGNED ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES ON OCTOBER 3, 1976 (EXECUTIVE D, 76-2); THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, SIGNED ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES ON OCTOBER 3, 1976 (EXECUTIVE E, 76-2); AND THE AMERICAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, SIGNED ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES ON JUNE 1, 1977 (EXECUTIVE F, 77-2)

February 23, 1978—Treaties were read the first time and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed for the use of the Senate.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 
WASHINGTON : 1978


Here's how the cover looks on the set of four 'Human Rights' treaties. Jimmy Carter signed the "American Convention on Human Rights" at the Pan American Union on June 1, 1977 while he was president. It was not attached to the set shown. A copy of these treaties were printed in the Department of State Bulletin in July 4, 1977. These treaties are also known as Executives C, D, and E in the publication below. The set was too thick for me to include it here for you.
The presidents have become ‘administrators’ of the transition into global communist government, and folks, that ain’t good!

The Senators and Congressmen in various administrations since 1945 have been approving of what the presidents are doing with treaties, executive orders and laws that are converting us into world government! You can’t expect much help from them! You do need to stop them by using the power of your state. With some changes in who is governor, it still can be done.

This sort of planning for world government all came about under Franklin Roosevelt working with the global Fabian socialists back in the old League of Nations days. Did you know that Roosevelt campaigned to be vice-president with James Middleton Cox who ran as president in 1920? Cox was a former governor of Ohio. F.D.R. gave over 20 bold speeches during that campaign with Cox in which he advocated a world government, but the people were too smart then to be taken in, so years later different tactics were adopted to use on the general public to slowly and unknowingly guide them into a communist world government, without their even being aware of what was happening to them! Roosevelt even fooled the people during the Depression days to elect him as president. His efforts were also focused on elimination of the states. The states were the federal government’s superiors and their existence helps the people hold the Constitution in place. Read the article to the right for more detail on how your government is being overthrown by the very people you have elected to protect it!
Folks, you now have two conflicting governments in operation in the United States!

The United Nations is a parallel government!

The United Nations Charter was unlawfully ratified as a "treaty". It did not qualify as a treaty because it calls for General and Complete Disarmament of the United States. Any instrument of any sort or kind which calls for the elimination of the nation's common defense systems is in gross violation of imperishable principles of liberty. It can't be a treaty!

The United Nations itself was not a sovereign government at the time the "treaty" was prepared and ratified. On this basis alone the so-called "treaty" could be declared 'null and void'. Years later (Mar. 19, 1970) the U.N. declared itself to be a sovereign government.

At the time the U.N. Charter was ratified as a "treaty" (July 1945), the proponents of world government began the move from theory into implementation of the world government systems. The United Nations organization had set itself down as a parallel government. Assisted by advancements, gained through the use of Executive Orders of the President, additional "treaty" agreements, and legislative acts of the U.S. Congress, the U.N. grew! Surely you must know that no treaty can lawfully supersede the principles of the U.S. Constitution, nor the confirmed endowments of the Creator embodied in the Bill of Rights! One U.N. "treaty" calls for the complete disarming of every American citizen. This destroys the function of the militia (the people at large) even though it is commanded in the Second Amendment of the Bill of Rights! There is no doubt about it, folks, the U.N. Charter does not care about the security of your free state. Its intent is to overthrow your state and federal Constitutions!

No nation can survive after its common defense has been seised by a foreign power and its citizens have been disarmed! Keep in mind also that a treaty, if it meets Constitutional requirements, is enforceable upon every individual! Because there are no withdrawal rights written into the U.N. Charter, it is mandatory for the individual states to initiate an action demanding that the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 and the 1949 Amendments thereto be revoked, rescinded, and repealed. One of the goals of the proponents of the U.N. Charter is to disintegrate the federal Constitution so slowly that the people will adapt and not object to the switch-over; thus, the parallel government will ultimately remain as the only government. The formula for the operation of this vicious plan was conceived by Charles E. Merriam, the Rockefeller engineer who guided Franklin D. Roosevelt. Merriam, who believed that outright revolution was "the old way" and that communism could be brought in using the coat-tails of the Constitution itself, is quoted as having said: *Fortunately, our Constitution is broad enough in its terms, flexible enough in its spirit, and capable of liberal enough interpretation by the judiciary to permit the adaptation of democracy to changing conditions without serious difficulty.* He also promoted the use of the word democracy to be used as a stand-in word for the word communism. Catch on, folks!
THE UNITED NATIONS

and the NEW WORLD ORDER

U.S.A. - FORCED TO CONVERT TO SERFDOM

& REGIONALISM UNDER A PEACE-KEEPING FORCE

PROHIBITION OF all citizen-owned *arms

Establishment of a world army & a special police force

Establishment of a world army & a special police force

Perpetual stationing of foreign troops to prevent or quell any uprising to former system

ALL CONTROL VESTED IN THE UNITED NATIONS

COMMUNIST UNITED NATIONS
THERE ARE NO WITHDRAWAL RIGHTS IN
THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER!

Read this before it is too late!

There are no withdrawal rights in the United Nations Charter! The only way left for the American people to get out of the United Nations is to repeal the law entitled: "The United Nations Participation Act of 1945" and all amendments.

This can only be done while the United States still has its lawful framework of American government structure in place. This means that the "states" as entities must exist!

It is the intent of the United Nations to abolish our states and replace them with international "regions." The ruling elite in the regional system are non-elected.

The United Nations intends to be successful in abolishing our states! That includes the dissolution of the federal government in order to satisfy an international arrangement. The American system of government does not permit for such treasonous activity to transpire. To resolve the problem of how to withdraw, it is mandatory for the people to maintain their traditional framework of American government.

The destruction of the American system of government would not only jeopardize and make it difficult to assert the Bill of Rights, it would also eliminate two peaceful possibilities and methods for withdrawing from the United Nations.

To attain a peaceful method in which to withdraw, either the federal government (which is not very likely!) or the state legislatures can meet and rescind the "The United Nations Participation Act of 1945" and all amendments. Those are the only two peaceful options available to the people. The states have the power to override any action which exceeds the powers delegated to the federal government. Hopefully, there will be enough constitutional representatives in state legislatures to repeal this Act and all amendments.

Unfortunately, most people are not aware of some of the facts presented here. Does your state legislator realize his responsibility to you? Surely, he should not sit idly by while the United States system of government is being overthrown.

Second Amendment Committee  P.O. Box 1776  Hanford, Ca  (559) 584-5209
Various members of government on all levels have accepted the false premise that the parasitic United Nations Charter and the International Court of Justice are now the "supreme law of the land". This is not true! The U.N. Charter was supposedly "ratified" on July 28, 1945 with the consideration that is extended to a valid treaty. At the time Pres. Harry Truman signed this so-called "treaty", and the United States Senate ratified it, the U.S. and its Allies were still at war with Japan! The "United Nations" was non-existent as a sovereign entity. That precluded any possibility of its being a valid treaty.

Treaties are made only with sovereign governments, which the "United Nations" then was not! Sovereignty was not conferred upon the United Nations group until March 19, 1970 at which time the U.S. Senate took an action which conferred sovereignty upon the United Nations. Even if these facts were set aside, it still remains that the principles within the U.N. Charter disqualify it from ever becoming a treaty.

In other words, even if it had been a sovereign entity at the start, the principles of the Charter which intended, from the onset, to overthrow our form of government, would disqualify it as a "treaty"! Unfortunately, the nation has been victimized by this "treaty" that, in turn, has caused more and more purported "treaties" to be enacted which are completely destroying our sovereignty. The U.N. Charter is responsible for dissolving our sovereignty!

People are concerned and they feel an urgency to enforce the U.S. Constitution, but because of agreements entered into by virtue of the U.N. Charter, the people are reticent about using physical resistance; consequently, they are being "expected" to stand by while not only their inherent rights are being dissolved, but also the structure of the American government system, and the authority over our nation's resources are being dissolved!

They are under the threat of being totally disarmed by the new laws coordinated with P.L. 87-297. If they try to defend themselves against what is happening to their national and personal sovereignty, the U.N. will bring in its international troops. The U.N. Charter has assumed for itself an unlawful position claiming superiority, and is superseding the authority that rightfully belongs to the American people. Americans have never consented to yielding their sovereignty to international communists, nor to the hired help that is supposed to serve them. The U.N. Charter and its sequential "laws" must be declared nullities and the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 and amendments rescinded either by federal or state action before the states, too, are dissolved.
Executive J

The United Nations is given full diplomatic recognition of being a SOVEREIGN WORLD GOVERNMENT.

Treaties can be made only between sovereign countries. In 1945 the United Nations Charter was put over on us as a "treaty"! Look! It wasn't until 1970 that the globalists decided to bestow sovereignty upon the United Nations! What does that tell you?

Anaheim Bulletin
April 20, 1970

---Anaheim Bulletin
By Steinbacher

Historians of the future may point to March 13, 1970 as the day when the United States of America became an arm of a One World government.

It happened quietly, unnoticed by the press, in a Senate chamber only partly filled, as few Senators waited their turns to praise or condemn Judge Harold Cardwell.

In this almost sleepy atmosphere, with the voices of the Senators drowning out and on intermittently, the Presiding Office suddenly refused to recognize another speaker and addressed the floor himself.

"The Senate will proceed to vote," he said, "on Executive J, 1st session, 89th Congress, the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations. The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll."

At the end of the roll, the vote showed 78 yeas and zero nays, with 2 Senators abting.

So it was that the United Nations would no longer be honored as a mere "International Organization". It now has the status of a SOVEREIGN GOVERNMENT.

This stage-managed operation had its full dress rehearsal the day before, when majority leader Mike Mansfield gained the floor, at a time when no quorum was present, and said the following things:

"Mr. President, discussion of this convention should not long detain the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Senate has already once approved it in 1947, by passing a joint resolution authorizing the President to accord it on behalf of the United States, but for essentially irrelevant reasons the joint resolution did not pass the House. Now, some 20 years later, the matter is brought up for approval in THE FORM OF A TREATY.

"During this time, the provisions of the International Organization Immunities Act of 1945 and of the Headquarters Agreement Act of 1947 have provided the necessary privileges and immunities for most of the officers covered by the convention. Apparently the executive branch was satisfied with this situation, but THE UNITED NATIONS WAS NOT. One hundred and one of its members have become parties to the convention, but the United States, the principal host government, did not.

"The anomaly of this situation has not escaped other UN members, as a reflection of the lack of U.S. interest in the UN.

"Briefly, the convention provides for certain immunities and privileges to the UN as an organization, to the representatives of member states, to UN officials and to experts on missions for the UN.

"While the convention largely (to be voted on) represents the existing practice in regard to immunities and privileges, IT DOES ENLARGE UPON THEM."

Since the Senate's advise and consent of the UN enabling acts of 1945, the Immunities Act, 1945, and the Headquarters Agreement Act, 1947, the UN has looked upon itself as a sort of WORLD GOVERNMENT in fact, now it has become A WORLD GOVERNMENT de facto.

As an explanation of the difference we will quote Webster:

"A de facto government is one serving and functioning as a government, but one not permanently established and recognized as such. A government de jure is a legally established and lawfully recognized government."

So, the moribund UN was given astounding new life by this new Senate action, paving the way for a whole raft of new UN proposals, including a World Tax; the push to ratify the Genocide Treaty and the UN involvement in grabbing valuable space for a new $300 million UN building development adjacent to the present landmarks on the East River.

Further, President Nixon, giving the UN still another shot in its stilted arm, has called upon schools and colleges across the nation to hold annual United Nations day, when they will conduct model UN sessions.

In Orange County, 12 high schools took part in that affair this year on April 25 at Chapman College.

The UN is also pushing for "World Habenus Corpus," according to the March 26 Congressional Record, in an article by Rep. Fucillo of Illinois. Fucillo suggests that we need a World Habenus Corpus system, in order to "protect human rights" in every nation according to the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

World Habenus Corpus, ipso facto, is just one more step closer to World Government. Only governments can grant Habenus Corpus, so we must assume that the UN now considers itself as a World Government in fact, if it is even broaching such a suggestion, another indication of the power given the UN on that day in March in the sleepy, over-heated Congressional chambers.
BY THE INVERSE USE
OF THE TREATY POWER,
THE U.S.A. IS BEING
SOLD OUT
TO THE COMMUNISTS
OF THE WORLD!

All treaties are subject to Constitutional scrutiny. Hundreds of treaties have been passed which are blatantly unconstitutional!

The purpose of this is to transform the United States of America from a sovereign nation into a component of the international government system for a socialist/communist New World Order!

The United Nations Charter which was signed in 1945, which is the basis for so many unlawful treaties being passed, was itself presented as a “treaty” for this country’s adherence! How ridiculous! The Charter is filled with reverse goals and is the primary source responsible for the strange dictums now prevalent in the current method of operating our government system!

The U.N. Charter never could have qualified as a treaty; yet, it was afforded “treaty” status, and its provisions were installed to deliberately reverse our rightful government system. One of the shocking treaties provides for the “General and Complete Disarmament of the United States.”

Are there ways to avoid unconstitutional treaties that are selling us out? Yes, the principle is known as “Rebus Sic Stantibus,” the premier principle for voiding a treaty on the basis that more has been introduced than what was originally agreed upon.
QUESTION: ARE THERE WAYS TO VOID UNCONSTITUTIONAL TREATIES THAT ARE SELLING US OUT?

ANSWER: YOU BET THERE IS!

ONE ANSWER IS:

REBUS SIC STANTIBUS.

Although it is not commonly known, there is a principle in International Law that the Congress can use to void treaties! What has to happen is that the people must first create a demand for public officials to initiate action to cause the United Nations Charter, the matrix of the problem, to be declared void. The United States membership in that organization will then cease to be obligatory; thus, the United States would no longer be a member of the United Nations.

This principle is known as Rebus Sic Stantibus* which is recognized as the highest reason in rank for a country to void a treaty, and it means that:

"the situation has changed!"

Rebus Sic Stantibus means that "there was more to the treaty than what met the eye".....more than the states and the citizens were aware of at the time of its ratification! This is the case with the United Nations Charter which was enacted as a "treaty"! Unfairly and unjustly sold as a "program for peace," the U.N. Charter was actually engineered to overthrow the American system of government and restructure the United States as a part of a global government. The series of purported treaties that followed are being passed as "laws" and are not at all what the general public has been led to believe that they are supposed to contain.

"An unconstitutional act is not law....as inoperative as though it had never been passed." -- Norton vs. Shelby County, 118 US 425 p. 442

Another route the states may choose to force the repeal of a treaty is by using the decision of the Supreme Court. Keep in mind that it takes only one state to force the Supreme Court to rule on an issue. If the ruling comes out unfavorable, the recourse for the state(s) is to override the Supreme Court and undertake a repeal action themselves. Such an action takes thirty-eight (38) states to successfully override the Supreme Court. Repealing "enabling legislation" alone (negating previous national action) does not complete the necessary procedure to
Rebus Sic Stantibus is the premier principle of international law and is held as the highest reason in rank for voiding a treaty!

A treaty can be rescinded, a repeal, rescinding, and revoking action should be effected against an aberrant previously passed treaty in order to negate previous international action. It is a well known fact that one of the checks in the Check and Balance System places the responsibility upon the states to keep the federal government from exceeding the limits of power they delegated to it. Chances are that your state governor or representatives are not versed in international law and do not realize that Rebus Sic Stantibus is a recognized principle of international law which exists between nations and that it allows for the revocation of disastrous treaties that destroy the structure, sovereignty, and liberty of a nation.

The facts regarding the objectives of the United Nations were not known by the general population at the time the U.N. Charter was enacted. Transferring U.S. armed forces to permanent control of communist commanders, allowing the avowed enemies of our country to supervise the closing of our defense plants and military bases, and to prohibit law-abiding Americans from owning firearms is in violation of the United States Constitution! These U.N. objectives do not meet the criteria to qualify the U.N. Charter as a treaty! Also, little known is the fact that a treaty is enforceable upon every individual!

The people have been lied to about the "peace" program and the "safer world"! They were not told of the inverse purposes of the United Nations! Now the truth is being laid bare before the people! The situation has changed! The U.N. was plastered onto the U.S. by using laudable goals as a way of bringing in the U.N.'s hidden objectives! Plenty of grounds exist for putting pressure on representatives to void the U.N. Charter and related world government treaties.

A Word of Warning Regarding the Use of Rebus Sic Stantibus. There is a possibility, because of the deviousness of the courts, that the courts may insist that Rebus Sic Stantibus is a nullification procedure, the type of which they threw out when the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions were defensively tried in more recent times. The courts need to understand that it is not the courts who have the "final say" on protection of the nation's sovereignty! In a united action the states have superiority over all three branches of the federal system!

* Source: Black's Law Dictionary — At this point of affairs; in these circumstances. A name given to a tacit condition, said to attach to all treaties, that they shall cease to be obligatory so soon as the state of facts and conditions upon which they were founded has substantially changed.

SECOND AMENDMENT COMMITTEE       P.O. BOX 1776       HANFORD, CA 93232       (559) 584-5209
Folks, it looks like we are going to have to defend ourselves darn soon or there won't be any United States left to defend! *The real seat of power is in the state, with the people of the state.* The federal government got its authorization to exercise certain (limited powers) from the states, and the people in the state. The federal government will only come back down to its proper size when the states and the people assert themselves and tell it get back in place.

The states have the power *now* to nullify all the unconstitutional federal laws, treaties, presidential `agreements`, executive orders, etc. that the federal government has been tying this republic in with. It is power they haven't used for some time. It won't be summoned into action until the people demand it. Only when the states begin to realize what the future holds for them under this "democracy dictatorship", will turn-about begin to happen.

It is our own fault that our country is being destroyed.
Now....
.... hear this!

Only 4 pages out of the 195-page Houlihan Report (the plan to collapse the government) are being presented here for your review.
A DELIBERATE PLAN TO COLLAPSE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT
THE POLITICS OF CHANGE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOW I OBTAINED THE REPORT

by K. Maureen Heaton

In any production, behind the actors seen on stage, there is a crew of "hands" -- the "advance man", in charge of props, costumes, and all related matters; the producer; script writer; set designers; stagehands; stagehands; electricians; "prop"; and the ubiquitous "backers" or "angels" -- the money people. In the real life drama on the world stage today, parallel positions are known as publicists; consultants; planners; aides; directors; facilitators; "change agents", and generally, "experts". And, of course, the ubiquitous financiers -- who may or may not be YOU. Sometimes, the curtain part enough to allow a fleeting glimpse of the 'hidden hands' behind the scenes which prepare the production for public viewing. When this "happens", well-trained stagehands quickly close the curtain, and any watchers who note the action and attempt to describe it are given to understand that they didn't see it, because there was nothing to see. In the real world, this is known as a "cover-up". Such was the nature of the exposure of the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System. Its existence was denied, its name was changed, its capability was disguised, and the rest was silence. Such, too, was the policy paper known as "The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform" (TPOC). One of the tactics of the revolutionaries is to respond in silence, when they receive a telling blow. It sometimes works against them when they do that, and the matter of this document "TPOC" was one such incident.

I had been receiving the output from the California Council on Intergovernmental Relations (CCIR) for some time, when I went before the Governor's Task Force on "Local Government Reform", to present testimony against CCIR and the State meddling in local government affairs. After my appearance there, the CCIR reports stopped coming to my mailbox. I complained to their staff about it, but could not get them to reinstate me as a recipient, so I went to a State Senator, and told him my problem. He called the CCIR office, and told them I was to be reinstated as a recipient, and that I would be over to pick up the documents I hadn't received. When I got there, I was ushered into the office of the person in charge, who apologized profusely for any inconvenience I had suffered, and told the secretary to see that I had whatever documents they had, which I had not received.

They were just moving into a big new office, and there were huge boxes of material still not put away. The girl started showing me what was there, going to each box in turn, and handing me a copy of its content. I selected those which I had not received. I noticed, though, that there was one box near her desk, which she studiously avoided. When we had finished checking the other boxes, I asked her for a copy of the minutes of the last CCIR meeting, and she had to go into another room to get them. While she was gone, I idly picked up one of the documents from the box she had not looked into. It was titled "The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform" (better known now as TPOC). "Local Government Reform" was the name of the game at that time, so I added it to my stack. (I was supposed to have anything I had not received, and I sure had not received that!)

So that was one time when they would have been better off, it they had just continued sending me the public material. For TPOC was certainly never intended to be seen by such as me. It was a textbook on mind control techniques -- an appalling negation of the principle of self-government, as it told 'public servants' how to use "the politics of change" to obtain programs which the citizens did not want.

After I had studied that document which had come into my hands so fortuitously, I was at a loss as to what to do with it. The first step was suggested by the document itself, because it included three "case studies" of situations in California where use of the strategies it provided "to bring about change in local government structures" was discussed. Two of those cases were already history, but the third concerned a matter of Sacramento City-
County-Consolidation (C/C/C), where these techniques were then being used to create a single entity, neither city nor county, but a hash of both.

Now listen up, all you who might think I press too hard for election of representatives. It just so happened that there was one representative on the Sacramento City Council, Sandra Smoley, who had been fighting a courageous but lonely battle against consolidation. I did not know her personally, so I arranged for the TPOC document to be taken to her by a mutually trusted ally, and she blew the whistle on the "hands" using TPOC to reconstruct her city. Thanks to Sandra Smoley, Sacramento City-County-Consolidated (C/C/C) was defeated for that time.

Suppose Sandra Smoley had not been elected to that seat on the Council. Would there have been a different result?

Let's look at another elected official, this one a "politician", sometime mayor of Oakland, California, John C. Houlihan. As Mayor of Oakland, Houlihan gave an interview to the Oakland Tribune in 1966, in which he stated that he would be ready to step aside as Mayor, if "full-blown government reform" was implemented statewide. Such "reform", he said, would do away with Mayors; it would also do away with "cities, counties, districts, and boards of supervisors", and he predicted that this would come to pass before the turn of the century -- possibly by the 1980s.

Houlihan did not have to wait for his prediction to come true to "step aside". Later in 1966 he was taken to court, for looting the estate of an elderly widow, for whom he was conservator. Staunchly maintaining his innocence, he resigned his office under fire. But when he appeared in court, he entered a surprise plea of "guilty", and was sent to prison.

Now the plot thickens. John C. Houlihan was Executive Director of The Institute for Self Government at Berkeley, in January, 1974, when TPOC was issued. On November 17, 1974, the San Diego Union reported that he had been granted a "full and unconditional pardon" by Governor Ronald Reagan for his crime. So, apparently he was out on parole, at the time he participated in the production of this document which was designed to be a tool to build that governmental structure which he had predicted almost ten years before!

Houlihan is a classic example of a politician, as opposed to a representative.

The second step I took regarding TPOC was to ask for time at the next meeting of the CCIR, to challenge the members to repudiate this document, which listed the CCIR as a sponsor.

While waiting to hear from CCIR, I took the TPOC document to my County Supervisor, and he shared it with the El Dorado County Board, with the result that they passed a Resolution condemning such practices generally, and TPOC in particular. That Resolution was sent to every person of interest involved at the State level, every County Board of Supervisors in California, and eventually was reprinted in a number of newsletters and a few local papers and thus found national distribution. To my knowledge no other action was ever taken against the strategies recommended in TPOC.

In my testimony to CCIR, I read portions of that textbook for "change", such as the one which called for the use of "change agents" to manipulate public opinion and to "mislead, coerce and inhibit the rights of citizens" to decide what "changes" they want in their local government (quote from the E.D.Co. Resolution). I asked for a response as to whether or not the members of the CCIR Board were aware that this document was put out in their
name, and whether they approved of the use of such tactics. The response was -- silence! Not one of the twenty or so members spoke up.

When the next CCIR minutes arrived, they simply said that I had spoken against local government reform. I wrote and demanded a correction of the minutes from the Chair, and a minor correction was made, but no mention of the nature of the material I protested was included.

I wrote again, and repeated my demand for an accurate reflection of my testimony, and received a non-committal reply. I then wrote to my State Senator. No reply! I then wrote to the governor (Ronald Reagan), and sent him a copy of my testimony, copies of the letters mentioned above, and requested action from him. No reply! Silence!

It is of interest to note that, when a citizen wrote to the Institute for Self-Government in Berkeley for a copy of TPOC, the response was that that report had been ‘compiled’ at the request of the California Council on Criminal Justice (CCCJ), and was not ‘published’, but had been sent to the successor agency, the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP). The citizen was told it would cost $8.00 to reproduce the manuscript and mail it.

Now, there are two interesting things about that:

(1) In the Foreword to TPOC, it states that it was compiled under a contract with the Office of Intergovernment Management, in coordination with the California Council on Intergovernmental Relations (CCIR) and the Governor’s Office. Make of that what you will.

(2) Then, there is the box which contained the TPOC documents. It was in the California Council on Intergovernmental Relations (CCIR) office -- NOT OCJP! The container was humongous -- and it was half full -- or half empty, if you like. Make of that what you will.

It is important for all citizens to know that California’s TPOC is not an isolated instance. There are think tanks all over the country, applying themselves to mass behavior modification techniques, such as this, and the evidence of the use of such strategies is increasing.

It is simply amazing that so little notice has been taken of what these would-be manipulators are doing! Uncovering TPOC was a pure and simple happenstance, but thousands of “change agents” are being prepared in our institutions of higher education to continue developing this psywar technique, and that is no accident!

Why do you suppose none of those being trained to control their fellowman protest? Why no recognition of the dangers inherent in “change” agency, which has become an integral part of government action, with elected officials attending seminars, at public expense, to learn how to get their constituents to accept programs neither wanted or needed?
THE PLAN TO COLLAPSE OUR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

This study (Report) was paid for by the State of California during the term of Ronald Wilson Reagan as the governor. It cost close to $300,000.00 for this study which was prepared to assist in forcing the public officials to go under regional government. The Report is too thick to reproduce with this set. (For the full report of 195 pages, it will cost $30.00 shipped.)

Note: For a copy of the Hawkins Task Force Report in abbreviated mini version, send $2.00 to Bernadine Smith P.O. Box 1776 Sanford, Calif. 93232. It supports our legal California government and criticizes regional government.

THE POLITICS OF CHANGE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

Written by John C. Houlihan who for many years advocated that we abolish city and county governments. SEE PAGE NO. 122 FOR COLLAPSE OF GOVERNMENT.

INSTITUTE FOR LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Hotel Claremont Building
Berkeley, California 94705

This is the actual simple cover of the Houlihan Report. The bordered boxes above were added for relaying information. No one outside of the governor’s office was supposed to see this Report, but by accident, Maureen Heaton obtained a copy. Her interesting story of how she happened to get a copy is inside this plastic sheet. She took the thick document to her county supervisors who subsequently issued a statewide resolution against it.
They defend all the subversive changes that are taking us away from the Constitutional system by saying they are “updating”, “streamlining”, “modernizing”, “making more efficient”, “economizing”, “eliminating duplication”, etc.

FOREWORD

This report was authorized and compiled under a contract dated July 1, 1972, between the Office of Intergovernment Management, State of California, and the Institute for Local Self Government, Berkeley, California.

In general, the Project Director, Mr. Ronald B. Frankum, and the Assistant Project Director, Mr. Vigo G. Nielsen, Jr., conducted this study in coordination with the staff of the Council of Intergovernment Relations and with the Governor’s office, which was initiating a program for the study of restructuring of local government.

This study, following previous C.I.R. activities, is part of a statewide undertaking to modernize and improve California local government, increase its responsiveness, efficiency and economy.

This particular report, using documented case material, focuses on the process---“How to”---by which political and administrative leadership is employed to bring about reallocation and reorganization.

Under the contract, the investigators were to provide the necessary “real world” insights into what happens to bring about change in local governmental structures. The investigators were not charged with providing an exhaustive analysis but, rather, to find, examine and document the practical methodology of change.

The project was performed under the general direction of Randy H. Hamilton, Ph.D., former Executive Director of the Institute, and the final report was edited by its present Executive Director.

January 31, 1974

John C. Houlihan
Executive Director
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. There must be a climate for change in order for the restructuring of local government to occur, whether this restructuring involves drastic reform, reorganization, modernization, or a minor administrative realignment. While the following does not represent an exclusive list, the factors mentioned here are those which most often create such a climate:
   a. a Collapse of government's ability to provide needed services;
   b. a Crisis of major magnitude;
   c. a Catastrophe that has a physical effect on the community;
   d. the Corruption of local officials and
e. the high Cost of government and the desire for a higher level of services.

2. Some change will occur, in one form or another, if any of the first four factors (Collapse, Crisis, Catastrophe or Corruption) are present, especially when they are of major dimension. It is up to governmental leaders who are directly affected to employ the available alternatives. However, information obtained during the research study does not indicate that any of these four factors are currently generating a climate for change in California.

3. Preoccupation with the Cost of government and desire for more efficient service delivery does exist in California at this time. These factors are a motivating force but,
by themselves, do not cause change to occur. It is necessary
to organize and carry out a change Campaign capitalizing
on the factors that provide a climate for change.

4. The campaign may vary in scale but regardless of the size
of the effort, every campaign contains some very specific
features.

The larger the scale of the restructuring attempt,
the more important it is that all features are included.
The features are: Planning and Contemplation, Education and
Involvement, Community, Compromise, Concern, Cadence,
Cooperation, Comprehension, and Concentration.

5. If an optimum combination of these features is absent, it
will take longer to accomplish the change than originally
anticipated by the change instigator.

6. Every successful reorganization has an instigator, who is
the principal change agent, and a nucleus of workers who
manage the change effort from the beginning stages through
final implementation.

7. Unsuccessful reorganization efforts, while often character-
ized by many of the same features as a successful campaign,
frequently lack the factor of a climate for change, and the
campaign, if there is a semblance of one, is not well
executed.

8. Local government reform is a Political Campaign.
RESOLUTION No. 447-74
OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of El Dorado County has consistently upheld the principle of local elective government, elected by popular vote of the citizens involved; and

WHEREAS, essential to such elective procedures is an informed electorate, basing their decisions freely on accurate information, openly debated, and

WHEREAS, inherent in this process is the right of the citizens not to be misled, coerced, or otherwise inhibited in the free exercise of the elective franchise, and

WHEREAS, any effort to nullify these rights is in direct conflict with the intent of the Constitution of the United States and the State of California, and

WHEREAS, it has been brought to the attention of this Board that a report has been issued by the Institute for Local Self Government, asserting the authority of the Governor's Office, the Office of Intergovernment Management, and the Council on Intergovernmental Relations, which presents prima facie evidence of a deliberate, calculated attempt to mislead, coerce, and inhibit the rights of citizens to determine the need for, the desirability of, and the method to bring about changes in the structure of their local governments; and

WHEREAS, the "Summary of Conclusions" in this report states:

"There must be a CLIMATE FOR CHANGE in order for the restructuring of local government to occur, whether this restructuring involves drastic reform, reorganization, modernization, or a minor administrative realignment. While the following does not represent an exclusive list, the factors mentioned here are those which most often create such a climate:

- a. COLLAPSE of government's ability
to provide such needed services;
- b. a CRISIS of major magnitude;
- c. a CATASTROPHE that has a physical
effect on the community;
- d. the CORRUPTION of local officials;
- e. the high COST of government and the
desire for higher level of services."

(emphasis in the original); and

WHEREAS, it would appear from this document, which is entitled "The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform", that it was received by the Council on Intergovernmental Relations; and

WHEREAS, the techniques described in this report have apparently been used in San Diego County Government Reorganization, in the Consolidation of the Contra Costa Fire Department, and the current effort to consolidate Sacramento City and County; and
WHEREAS, the cited report actually states that LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS MEETING THE PROBLEMS OF TODAY, and that no pressure is building up to cause the citizens to wish the desired reforms, then recommends the use of "change agents" to DEVELOP a climate for change, using diversionary tactics to confuse and disorient the citizens, and to deceive them about the need for reform; and

WHEREAS, this Board of Supervisors is at a loss to understand any legitimate function served by such proposals as these;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado, in the State of California, on this 17th day of September, 1974, that all persons by whom this present Resolution is received be informed that this Board herewith goes on record in strong opposition to any such attempt to deprive the citizens of the State of California, and particularly of El Dorado County, of their right to determine for themselves the forms and functions of their government, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Board notify the Governor of the State of California, the Institute for Local Self Government, the Office of Intergovernment Management, the Council on Intergovernmental Relations, the League of California Cities, the California Supervisors Association, and the Boards of Supervisors of the several counties of the State, that such political abuse as is disclosed in this document is intolerable, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of El Dorado County hereby calls on all responsible citizens and officials to be on guard against any such attempt to usurp their rights and privileges.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado at a regular meeting of said Board, held on the 17th day of September, 1974, by the following vote of said Board:

Ayees: Franklin E. Lane, William V. D. Johnson, W. P. Walker, Raymond E. Laywer
Nees: Thomas L. Stewart
Absent: None

I CERTIFY THAT:
THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT IS A CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE.

DATE

ATTEST: CARL A. KELLY, County Clerk and ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
The Houlihan Plan is an official state government document, paid for by the executive branch of California State government, and is working to build a "climate for change".

It appears that the many extraordinary calamities, all converging upon the United States at one time have been employed to promote Items (a), (b), & (c) of Houlihan's Plan (listed below) to force acceptance by Americans for a change into a different form of government! After all, that was the aim of the Houlihan Plan! The document proposes:

(a) a Collapse of government's ability to provide needed services;
(b) a Crisis of major magnitude;
(c) a Catastrophe that has a physical effect on the community;
(d) the Corruption of local officials; and
(e) the high Cost of government and the desire for a higher level of services.

The directive of the "change agents" is to make the people willing to surrender their Constitutional form of government and to adopt the regional world government system. It is important for all citizens to be concerned about the Houlihan Plan entitled "The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform" because the "change agents" are now working over the whole nation to subvert every facet of American standards.

---

1 This nefarious planning went on behind the scenes under California Governor Ronald Reagan.

2 Some of the calamities now facing Americans are the Y2K computer dysfunctions and massive electrical outages threatening to gridlock government operations; bankrupt condition of states and cities; impending currency collapse; predicted on-coming depression; overflowing of the Mississippi River including other severe flooding by abnormal storms, tornadoes, hurricanes, fires causing massive damage and other hardships; weather modification; on-coming food shortages; global warming; NAFTA, GATT, HAARP and other such modern technology; and the vulnerability which has resulted from the reduction of our defensive capabilities due to the "United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament" (Public Law 87-297); etc. As a result of the latter, there exists two more serious crises: (1) the Mexican crisis to capture the U.S. Southwestern States, and (2) the Chinese crisis to drop a nuclear bomb on Los Angeles if the U.S. interferes with their takeover of Taiwan. All these crises have been purposely created.

3 "Politics is the conduct of war by peaceful means. War is the conduct of politics by force". Karl von Clausewitz
Ex-governors, speaker talk on state's problems

Brown blasts counties as outmoded idea

Brown seeks to Abolish Local Governments

The safety of the state is the highest law.
"Salus populi suprema lex esto." ....... Cicero

Not being told is the fact that the movement includes eventual abolition of the states.
If State Sen. Tom Hayden succeeds in becoming the mayor of Los Angeles, there is a great possibility that the alliance of these two mayors could impact enough radicalism upon California to crash the state’s proper and traditional county system, thus facilitating in the ultimate objective of abolishment of the state itself.

Hayden mulls run for LA mayor

LOS ANGELES (AP) — State Sen. Tom Hayden is laying the groundwork for a possible run for mayor, issuing a pamphlet accusing incumbent Richard Riordan of ignoring problems of the inner city.

Hayden, a ‘60s radical and former husband of actress Jane Fonda, contends the city needs new liberal leadership. The pamphlet, which his office began issuing last week, accused Riordan of favoring the wealthy.

“No one has played the conductor’s role on the gravy train more than Richard Riordan,” the brochure said. “While spending billions on boondoggles, the mayor has been insensitive to the needs of the inner-city.”

Hayden, 56, has expressed interest in being mayor of Los Angeles for months but has not officially declared his candidacy. The pamphlet is the most concrete indication yet that he may pursue the office.

The 16-page pamphlet — titled “Why Run for Mayor of Los Angeles?” — was sent to supporters, contributors and others.

Hayden currently lives in Santa Monica and has said he is seeking a home in Los Angeles to establish residency.

Neither he nor Riordan could be reached for comment Saturday.

Hayden was a defendant in the Chicago Seven trial. He and four others were convicted of intent to riot at the 1968 convention. Their convictions were overturned.


Hanford-Sentinel
March 31, 1996

Where will the militia be if county government is dissolved?
Isn’t it included in the safety of the state?

Regional government is international government forced upon the United States by its membership in the United Nations. It dissolves United States sovereignty and abolishes states, cities, and counties. Regional governments are administrative units of the United Nations control. The United Nations is communist dominated. It seeks comprehensive control over the lives of American citizens from cradle to grave.

Los Angeles Times
Sunday, Oct. 25, 1987
Most people don't know that Ronald Reagan was a founding member of the United World Federalists, an organization dedicated to global government promotion. Always appearing to be a 'conservative', he did much damage to me!

Reagan Begins Ambitious Streamlining Dream

SACRAMENTO (UPI) — With little more than two years remaining in his final term, Gov. Ronald Reagan has embarked on perhaps his most ambitious project yet: the possible merger of counties and cities into more streamlined local governments.

"I call it a dream but it is not the impossible dream," Reagan said.

"We just believe that the time has come to review the existing governmental structure in California and see if there isn't a way to streamline and eliminate duplication."

He suggested the possible merging of some counties with other counties, cities with other cities, counties and cities together and within counties.

California's 58 counties have remained virtually the same since the youngest—Imperial—was formed 65 years ago. Local governments have mushroomed in recent decades into a bureaucratic maze of 400 cities and more than 4,000 other taxing entities, ranging from school districts to mosquito abatement districts.

Merger efforts frequently have encountered stiff opposition from local politicians whose public office and power would be ended if their governmental entities were merged.

With that background, Reagan unexpectedly announced Friday that probably within the month he would appoint a blue-ribbon group to study the possibility of overhauling California's local government from top to bottom.

The idea, he said, would be to provide not only more efficiency but "accountability," by clearly separating the lines of governmental authority so taxpayers would know specifically which entity was responsible for providing a given service. If this happened, he said, the state could shift some of its functions back to local government and also "the tax sources for funding them."

Reagan departed from his prepared text to a state faction-oriented breakfast meeting of California business leaders to tell of his plan. He went into detail later with newsmen.

"I have a dream—that perhaps California can set a standard of government reform that will make possible efficiency and economy in government at a level never before realized," Reagan told the businessmen.

"There is not a single thing I've proposed that can't be done. If there is a need to help city and county and service together to get the job done better and more economically, it can be done if the people decide they want it done."

"If there are areas of our state where the county boundaries do not make sense any more and they should be brought together into a single county, that too can be done."

Reagan later told newsmen some counties were created in "horse and buggy days" and perhaps had outlived their need, but he declined to name them.

The governor noted that any merging of local entities would have to be approved by voters residing in the area. But he said his administration could furnish the facts and begin a dialogue.

Any massive governmental overhaul also would require extensive legislation and undoubtedly amendments to the state constitution.

Sat., Sept. 9, 1972 The Hanford Sentinel Page 2
The international regional government 'planners' have already rigged the states for
collapse! When President Richard Nixon divided the United States into 10-Standard
Federal Regions by a stroke of his pen (Executive Order 11647), it was left to the
governors to encourage the merging of counties within their own respective state in order
to establish international U.N. control over local government. The 'planners' intended for
'Interstate Compacts' already written to handle the task of eliminating state boundary
lines and merging states together within each federal region. California was intended to
be the lead state in various endeavors for international recasting.

'Stemlining,' 'eliminating duplication,' 'updating' and 'making more efficient' were the
terms Governor Ronald Reagan of California used to sell local communities and voters on
the need to enter California into regional government alignments. These machinations
were supported by the introduction of federally controlled 'General Plans' for cities which
became required all over the nation. This was the method by which the people of America
lost control over their local governments.

There was considerable opposition to what Reagan was proposing because some citizens
already knew that regional government alignments were segments of international
government management. Reagan hired Robert D. Hawkins to study California's "horse
and buggy" government (as Reagan called it) in the hope that he would reduce the
opposition and present evidence that California's government should be overhauled from
top-to-bottom and revamped for regional alignment. For example, 7 or 8 counties (or
more) would then be merged into a single entity with one governing board to oversee the
spacious area. This recasting of governmental operation was hailed as being supposedly
less costly.

Fortunately, the study made by Robert D. Hawkins proved that California's government
was not unplanned, not uncoordinated, not inefficient, and not uneconomical. The ten
criticisms you see on the page to your right led to this age old proven conclusion:
Government is best by letting people at the lowest level make their own decisions.

Incidentally, the reason for California to compile the secret Houlihan Report was because
Governor Reagan was having difficulty trying to convince local voters and their county
 supervisors to accept the mergers into 'substate regional government districts'. The 5
drastic methods within the Houlihan Report were proposed to force 'change' and assist in
the breakdown of my Constitutional underpinnings.

When alert citizens began putting up a howl over what was happening, the
planners were slowed down a bit on their "bottom up" work so they re-grouped
to do the "top down" work by using treaties, and other "agreements" which would also gradually
eliminate your states and your national borders.

You are caught in between the two! It is coming at you from both ends: top and bottom!
When these two ends finally meet together, your goose will be cooked, my friends! You'd better
WAKE UP IN A HURRY!
Reagan task-force surprise: special district is the most efficient form of local government

By Ed Saleman

Governor Ronald Reagan last April issued the following statement in forming a highly publicized Task Force on Local Government:

"Today, California has some 5,800 units of government below the state level, including 58 counties, 497 incorporated cities, more than 1,160 school districts and almost 4,200 special districts. The average citizen is not even aware of all these different units of government. The only time he gets a first-hand knowledge of their existence is when he has a complaint about service, or more likely when he receives his property-tax bill. When they are looking at that long list of governmental units which their tax dollars are taken to support, many citizens wonder whether they are getting their money's worth and whether all these different layers of government are really necessary. The reform and modernization, indeed the streamlining, of local government is, and should be, one of our top priorities.

The Governor rejected proposals to establish regional government as a move toward creating another layer of government. But in doing so he echoed the very claims about the present structure of local government made by the proponents of regionalism -- that the present system makes no sense because there is too much overlapping and duplication, that the public has no real voice in local government, and that wholesale changes must be made to make the system economical and efficient. [Governor's "legacy" task forces seek ways to strengthen local government. C.J., January 1973, p. 7].

Task force findings

Now the study period of the task force is about at an end. In his state-of-the-state message, the Governor will tell the Legislature in general terms what his six-man panel has found. Meanwhile, the task force will give Reagan's cabinet a range of policy options, and the recommendations should be published about March 1st.

Will, as the Governor suggested, the task force propose radical changes in local government structure? On the contrary. The task force chairman, Robert B. Hawkins Jr., 32, former director of the state Office of Economic Opportunity, will report that the Governor's premises were wrong and that all the literature on the restructuring of local government is based on false assumptions. Hawkins reported that his group has found:

- Once a local agency hits the population range of 30,000 to 50,000, it reaches its peak in efficiency and economy.
- The claim that special districts are inefficient is wrong; they are more efficient than other forms of local government.
- Independent special districts (as contrasted to those operated by cities and counties) go out of business at the rate of five percent a year. This counters the contention that, once formed, a district will remain in business forever.
- In the last election, 60 percent of all special district seats were contested. This rebuts the argument that district boards are self-perpetuating and that the public has no voice in their operation.
- There is a tremendous amount of cooperation between governmental agencies, although city and county folk don't speak quite the same language.
- Multipurpose or umbrella regional governments are not the solution because air basins run east and west, water runs north and south, transportation routes differ, and there is no logical boundary for such a governmental agency in any of California's urban areas.
- Changing county lines on a wholesale basis is not practical. Each of the six members of the task force independently drew what he considered ideal lines and all six plans were different.
- Local agency formation commissions, which can veto new districts and annexations in each county, should be weakened.
- There has to be one level of government with an absolute relationship between what the citizen pays in taxes and what he gets in services -- without the possibility of veto by a higher-ranking level of government. The task force has gone deeply into the concept of small neighborhood governments.

If Hawkins rejects the common beliefs about the future of local government, what then will be recommended to the Governor? The above findings and the recommendations that come from him have a common thread -- letting people at the lowest level make their own decisions. This means, for example, making it easier for special districts to be formed and dissolved, allowing governmental agencies to make contracts with each other and with private enterprise on a more sweeping level, making it much easier for county lines to be changed when the people in the affected region choose to do so, eliminating the veto power of the local agency formation commissions and replacing it, perhaps, with a higher voting requirement for the formation of new districts.
While some of your fellow citizens sit around watching old movies, or running to the gambling parlors, the "government termites" are hard at it 24/7 doing everything they can to wipe me out, and put you under a military government. When Homeland Security goes full blast using martial law status, they are going to say that I am permanently suspended!

Have you ever thought what is going to happen to you when I am not here any more? You can be arrested for protesting abuses of your rights. Do you have to lose me to find out that I am the best friend you ever did have?
How do you tell your son that he is going to have to live as a communist without the freedom and benefits you've had?

“My dear son,
I am so sorry you are going to have to live under Communism.
It seemed to come so quickly.
I didn't think their lies could win.
I guess we were so busy with other things.
Not enough of us spoke up for freedom when we had the chance.”

Were you “too busy” watching out for your own future — that you forgot to consider what was happening to his?
People are not aware that there has been a treaty giving control to the United Nations of all “wetlands”. The treaty is called “The Ramsar Convention” and was adopted in 1971. The U.S. became a contracting party in 1986. — Bernadine Smith

### Rivers That Have Been Officially Nominated For United Nations Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALABAMA</th>
<th>Ohio River</th>
<th>Upper Mississippi River</th>
<th>Yellowstone River</th>
<th>TÉXAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calusa River</td>
<td>Ocmulgee River</td>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>Rio Grande River</td>
<td>Brazos River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattahoochee River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Rio Grande River (at Brownsville)</td>
<td>Sabine River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa River</td>
<td>Chino River</td>
<td>Ocmulgee River</td>
<td>Sabine River</td>
<td>San Antonio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>CROSS River</td>
<td>Upper Mississippi River</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>UTAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz River</td>
<td>Ocmulgee River</td>
<td>St. Joseph River</td>
<td>Black River</td>
<td>Jordan River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>River (two applications)</td>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Cuyahoga River</td>
<td>Jordan River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas River</td>
<td>Macamini River</td>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Great Miami River</td>
<td>San Juan River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(two applications)</td>
<td>Chino River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Maumee River</td>
<td>Morning Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita River</td>
<td>Chino River-Pigton Creek</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Maumee River</td>
<td>Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>RYAN River</td>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Mississinui River</td>
<td>VÉRNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe River</td>
<td>Chino River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>Connecticut River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower American River</td>
<td>Dubuque River</td>
<td>Missouri River (two applications)</td>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>Virgin River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Jackson River (two applications)</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Rey River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Kansas River</td>
<td>New River</td>
<td>Payette River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>Arkansas River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Shoshone River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Cheat River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison River</td>
<td>Licking River</td>
<td>Connecicut River</td>
<td>River of Steel</td>
<td>Kanawha River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(North Fork)</td>
<td>Chino River (two applications)</td>
<td>Connecticut River</td>
<td>Seneca River</td>
<td>New River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Platte River</td>
<td>Buffalo River</td>
<td>Cocheco River</td>
<td>Seneca River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>MIAMI River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>White River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississipi River</td>
<td>Winnipesaukee River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Charlestown</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New River</td>
<td>Merced River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>White River</td>
<td>Trippe River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>LUSKIN River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Payette River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware River</td>
<td>Patuxent River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>St. Joseph River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Merimack River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>St. Louis River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>Mullin River</td>
<td>Upper Mississippi River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacostia River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>North River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patuxent River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocowhatchee River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>Merimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everglades</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coosa River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanalei River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago-Illinois River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubuque River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaskaskia River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mississippi River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mississippi/St. Paul)</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Merrimack River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Water Creek</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BYE, BYE, NATIONAL PARKS.
HELLO UNITED NATIONS!

UPDATED LIST FROM ORIGINAL ARTICLE BY
CAJA NEWS SERVICE ARTICLE OF 2-96

BY SILVER STATE 7 FAX NET 4-96

UNITED NATIONS WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The World Heritage List was established under terms of the UN Convention concerning the protection of world culture and Natural Heritage adopted in November 1972 at the 17th General Conference of UNESCO...Congress turned over our National Parks and sites to the UNITED NATIONS!

1. Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge
2. Beaver Creek Experimental Watershed
3. Big Bend National Park
4. Big Fish National Preserve
5. California Coastal Range "Biosphere"
6. Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site, Ill.
7. Carlsbad Caverns, New Mexico
8. Carolina-South Atlantic "Biosphere"
9. Cascade Head Exp. Forest & Scenic Research Area
10. Central California Coast "Biosphere" Reserve
11. Central Gulf Coast Plain "Biosphere"
12. Central Plains Experimental Range
13. Chaco Culture Nat'l Historic Park, New Mexico
14. Chumash-Anaheum "Biosphere" Reserve
15. Channel Islands "Biosphere" Reserve, California
16. Colorado Desert "Biosphere"
17. Coconino Experimental Forest
18. Death Valley Nat'l Monument "Biosphere"
19. Denali National Park & "Biosphere" & Reserve
20. Desert Experimental Range
21. Everglades National Park
22. Frazier Experimental Forest
23. Glacier Bay-Adak Island "Biosphere"
24. Great Smoky Mountains National Park
25. Guanica Commonwealth Forest Reserve
26. H.J. Andrews Experimental Forest
27. Hawaii Islands "Biosphere" Reserve
28. Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest
29. Independence Hill, Philadelphia
30. Isle Royale National Park
31. Jordan Experimental Range
32. Kings Canyon National Park
33. Kona Research National Area
34. Land between the Lakes
35. Lausilis Experimental Forest
36. Mammoth Cave National Park
37. Meadow Loop National Park
38. Mesa Verde National Park
39. Mojave Desert "Biosphere"
40. Monticello
41. New Jersey Pinelands "Biosphere"
42. Niwot Ridge "Biosphere" Preserve
43. Norfolk National Preserve
44. Olympic National Park
45. Organ Pipe Cactus Nat'l Monument
46. Pueblos De Tierra, New Mexico
47. Redwood National Park
48. Rocky Mountain National Park
49. San Dimas Experimental Forest
50. San Juan National Historic Site
51. Sequoia National Park
52. South Atlantic Coastal Plains "Biosphere"
53. Southern Appalachian "Biosphere"
54. Stanislaus-Tuolumne Experimental Forest
55. Statue of Liberty
56. Three Sisters Wilderness
57. U. of Michigan Biological Station
58. University of Virginia
59. Virgin Islands NP and "Biosphere"
60. Virginia Coastal Reserve
61. Yellowstone National Park
62. Yosemite National Park
This map indicates the sites and areas that the United States has submitted for special United Nations designation. The World Heritage Sites are listed through the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage signed by President Ford on March 1, 1976. The UN designated biosphere reserves have been listed as a result of the United States government's participation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's Man and Biosphere Program. As a result of UN treaties it is now questionable as to whether any future American development will be permitted inside these UN-designated biosphere reserves.
The Great Conspiracy to Destroy the United States
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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 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 groundwork 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 farsighted 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 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.
THE GREAT SPEECH THAT EXPOSED
THE GREAT CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY THE
UNITED STATES

If you are not too far down the road to serfdom to care about the harness of tyranny you are saddling upon the young and the uninformed in our society, then, without a doubt, you will agree that the following speech by Representative Usher L. Burdick, is one of the most remarkable speeches of the 20th Century. Notice the April 28, 1954 date on the speech. Rep. Burdick delivered this great speech without the advantage of having irrefutable documents which today’s ‘watchmen-on-the-wall’ can easily access to support charges of fraud, malfeasance, sedition, and treason by presidents and other public officials. Today’s ‘watchmen-on-the-wall’ have the tremendous advantage of displaying Public Law 87-297, (and one of its amendments, P.L. 101-216), as part of the proof to show that there has been an on-going conspiracy by our own government officials to destroy the United States, the very government these public officials were elected to protect!

Burdick delivered this speech, seven years prior to the passage of The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World™ that was enacted by Congress, and signed by J. F. Kennedy in 1961. Burdick did not have access as we have to the State Department’s Publication #7277, the policy book that expounds upon this idiotic law, and gives details of the three-stage plan for the General and Complete Disarmament of the United States, including the prohibition of all handguns belonging to the people. No, Burdick did not have our advantage, but he knew what was coming, because he had read the United Nations Charter!

As the former governor of North Dakota, Congressman Burdick was fearless. He expounded openly upon what was happening within the United States. Its people were being mentally conditioned to surrender their liberty, to permit the circumventing of their rightful Constitution, and to assist in destroying the United States without the communists firing a shot! This is the same plan that is being forced upon us by President George W. Bush who with a beguiling and persuasive smile makes continual veiled references to Public Law 87-297 with such phrases as “a more peaceful world”; “in the name of peace”; “safety”; “peace and freedom”; etc.

As he begins his speech, Burdick lifts their tyrannical mask as he says in his opening statement:

"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?"..... Then again, he says: "Some very influential men in public life say that we can afford to give up some of our sovereignty to obtain world peace. Many advocates of the United Nations have come out openly for this world government. I am here to tell you that we can not afford to give up any of our national sovereignty for any cause."

As he concluded this speech, Burdick reasoned with Americans to reconsider what is happening to them under the United Nations Charter stating in these words:

"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
Burdick was aware that the communists had changed their method of conquering from force to the slow infiltration method, using mind-bending techniques. Devious manipulation of the public mind under the brainwashing technique, caused Americans to give approval to so-called “peace” as a solution to engineered “terrorism”.

While it is true that Americans could not be taken by blatant exterior force, they have been induced to surrender their Constitution by interior methods of circumvention of their rights. Even the military government (called the “Homeland Security” — required by State Dept. Publication #7277, which must be set down over the people of the United States), is being accepted by the great mass of people as a protection for their supposed “safety”. Under this military government, the Constitution will be suspended on a permanent basis. Wake up!!

President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1912 said: “The President is merely the most important among a large number of public servants. He should be supported or opposed exactly to the degree which is warranted by his good conduct or bad conduct, his efficiency or inefficiency in rendering loyal, able, and disinterested service to the nation as a whole. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that there should be full liberty to tell the truth about his acts, and this means that it is exactly as necessary to blame him when he does wrong as to praise him when he does right. Any other attitude in an American citizen is both base and servile. To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public. Nothing but the truth should be spoken about him or any one else. But it is even more important to tell the truth, pleasant or unpleasant, about him than about any one else.”

In a letter on January 10, 1917, Roosevelt also said “The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, safety-first instead of duty-first, the love of soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory of life.”

When the United Nations Charter was signed in 1945, every president since, bar none, has been an administrator of the transition of the United States into a communist global government, and an intermediary for the elimination of the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Much of the planning to overthrow the United States was laid out in Franklin Roosevelt’s administration. Until the respectable people realize that the command center of the subversion is located in the office of the president, assisted by the governors of each state, and they put an end to U.S. membership in the United Nations, there will be no hope for themselves nor the coming generations in finding true peace and security.

"Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the president or any other public official, save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the country. In either event, it is unpatriotic not to tell the truth, whether about the president or anyone else.".. President Theodore Roosevelt
They are stealing your country! Get the straw out of your head! Wise up!

But you can stop it! All you have to do is protest at your state level. How can a state refuse to retain its sovereignty? George Washington told you that government was a dangerous servant but it could also be a fearful master. If you lose your 50 state governments, and your firearms, your goose is cooked! The state governments have higher authority than the federal government. If the federal government is allowed to continue dissolving the states, you are in for mighty tough sledding! Right now, while they exist, the states can meet, and those representatives can declare the 1945 United States Participation in the United Nation Act and its Amendment of 1947 to be repealed! Grounds to help the charge are found in Rebus Sic Stantibus, the highest reason in rank in international law to void a treaty! Include all other treaties that sprung up as a result of this initial (fraudulent) U.N. "treaty". This really has to be done!

This 1945 Act was a massive violation of the intents and purposes of the treaty clause. It was a real snow job! A bigger crime than any you'll find behind prison bars. The United Nations Charter never was a treaty to begin with! Remove the wool that has sat over your eyes for scores of years, folks! It is rotting you out! It was not a sovereign nation, only a subversive plan for the ignorant to sell themselves out! It was a plan to overthrow the United States government and that of many other countries. At the rate you are going, may I ask you if are you willing to let your children live under the fearful military master that is being built over them? You also need a constitutional governor that will put all tax money that normally goes to the federal government to be placed in escrow and cut them off at the pockets until they get back in line where they belong.
A PROPER VIEW OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM
How it was designed to operate.
Armed, ready and able, to preserve liberty, the purpose for which it was formed.

A SELF-GOVERNING SYSTEM
OF THE PEOPLE BY THE PEOPLE AND FOR THE PEOPLE

The government of the Union, then, is emphatically and truly a government of the people. In form and in substance it emanates from them. Its powers are granted by them, and are to be exercised directly on them and for their benefit.

John Marshall, Case of Mr. Calhoun vs. Maryland, 1819. (Wheaton, IV, 318.)

The adversaries of the Constitution seem to have lost sight of the people altogether in their reasonings... these gentlemen must be reminded of their error. They must be told that the ultimate authority, wherever the derivative may be found, resides in the people alone... The Federalist Papers No. 46: MADISON
THIS IS THE WRONG CONCEPT,

WRONG

FOR PEOPLE TO USE, TO VIEW THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM.

This system is a dictatorship!

No wonder We, the people, are losing out! Unfortunately, the people view themselves as being "on the bottom of the pack" as illustrated above! This is not the way the constitutional system was designed or intended to operate!

THE PYRAMID IS THE WRONG CONCEPT IN WHICH TO VIEW THE POWER STRUCTURE AND AUTHORITY OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

Please refer to the attached circular Diagram, entitled "The Constitutional System - How it was designed to operate." This diagram instructs in the proper operation of the power system. Just powers, allocated to state and federal government public officials, are limited powers only, and are derived from the consent of the governed. The president is not the head of the system! The president himself has limited powers! For too long all public officials have been violating the system. The people have been endowed with unalienable, inherent, natural rights, bestowed upon them by their Creator. It is high time the people realized that it is they who sit in the real seat of power and begin to assert themselves against unlawful legislation being passed as "law".
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Federal officials are not the supreme power.*
As can be seen, the purpose of the federal government is to act as a "go-between" for the benefit of the people of the states, exercising only the limited delegation of power allowed to them by the people for the purpose of conducting special enumerated duties, one of which is the protection of the national security through the maintenance of a common defense. Although it is true that the federal Constitution is the "supreme law", federal officials who get their work assignments as an outgrowth from it, are not "supreme" officials. The system was not set up to be a dictatorship. The people have never relinquished their sovereignty!

The unappealable Bill of Rights is a document in its own right. It is the American Magna Carta. Its preamble makes content declarative and restrictive.

It is the duty of the governors to guard against usurpation by the federal government and to interpose and arrest its evils.

Limited authority.

These documents place limits on the power that man can exercise over his fellow man.

Forms a more perfect union, establishes justice, insures domestic tranquility, provides for the common defense, promotes the general welfare, secures the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity, and guarantees a republican form of government.

Provides for the separation of powers.

States that power comes from the consent of the governed, all men are created equal, declares our independence, gives us full power of a free nation and documents that the purpose of government is to protect the rights of the people.

Limited authority.

The Sheriff is the Chief Law Enforcement Officer responsible to no one but the county that elected him.

Local government co-operating with the people to maintain an armed nation, as a last resort, against tyranny in government.

Limited authority.

All three branches of the federal government are co-equal. The judiciary is not superior to the other two branches.

All three comprise the "supreme law of the land". All three documents belong to the people. The people ratified the Constitution and it cannot be changed without their approval. All three documents - uncodified - the inherent power of the people over public officials.

Limited authority.

All power emanates from the approval of the people.

Provides checks and balances, which if maintained, secure the energy, stability and integrity of the system.

It's up to the people to keep the system going!

* On the ninth day of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, under Resolution No. 15, James Madison was successful in achieving a change in the wording from "We, the states" to "We, the people", thus the responsibility for the endurance of the system fell directly upon the shoulders of the people. In his Farewell Address George Washington left us with this warning: "One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown."

The real seat of power is with the people themselves and with the state houses which the people are expected to control. The people-at-large are responsible for their own liberty and independence.
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It is up to the people to keep the Constitutional system going!

No one can divest himself of the natural rights that the Constitution confirms — even if he so choose to do so! Neither can anyone deprive his posterity of God's endowment!

Did you notice on the diagram on the previous page, that the people are represented at the **core** of the system — all the way down to, and including, the local level?

Only by keeping the right to keep and bear arms, and by use of the **proper** militia system — established from day "one" — will the people maintain their **rightful** authority over the state and federal governments!
A Chronological History:  
THE NEW WORLD ORDER

by D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D.

In the mainstream media, those who adhere to the position that there is some kind of "conspiracy" pushing us towards a world government are virulently ridiculed. The standard attack maintains that the so-called "New World Order" is the product of turn-of-the-century, right-wing, bigoted, anti-semitic racists acting in the tradition of the long-debunked Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, now promulgated by some militias and other right-wing hate groups.

The historical record does not support that position to any large degree but it has become the mantra of the socialist left and their cronies, the media.

The term "New World Order" has been used thousands of times in this century by proponents in high places of federalized world government. Some of those involved in this collaboration to achieve world order have been Jewish. The preponderance are not, so it most definitely is not a Jewish agenda.

For years, leaders in education, industry, the media, banking, etc., have promoted those with the same Weltanschauung (world view) as theirs. Of course, someone might say that just because individuals promote their friends doesn't constitute a conspiracy. That's true in the usual sense. However, it does represent an "open conspiracy," as described by noted Fabian Socialist H.G. Wells in The Open Conspiracy: Blue Prints for a World Revolution (1928).

In 1913, prior to the passage of the Federal Reserve Act President Wilson's The New Freedom was published, in which he revealed:

"Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men's views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the U.S., in the field of commerce and manufacturing, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it."

On November 21, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote a letter to Col. Edward Mandell House, President Woodrow Wilson's closest advisor:

"The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the larger centers has owned the Government every since the days of Andrew Jackson..."

That there is such a thing as a cabal of power brokers who control government behind the scenes has been detailed several times in this century by credible sources. Professor Carroll Quigley was Bill Clinton's mentor at Georgetown University. President Clinton has publicly paid homage to the influence Professor Quigley had on his life. In Quigley's magnum opus Tragedy and Hope (1966), he states:

"There does exist and has existed for a generation, an international network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no avarice to cooperating with the Communists, or any other group and frequently does so. I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960s, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no avarice to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies...but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known."

Even talk show host Rush Limbaugh, an outspoken critic of anyone claiming a push for global government, said on his February 7, 1995 program:

"You see, if you amount to anything in Washington these days, it is because you have been plucked or handpicked from an Ivy League school -- Harvard, Yale, Kennedy School of Government -- you've shown an aptitude to be a good Ivy League type, and so you're plucked so-to-speak, and you are assigned success. You are assigned a certain role in government somewhere, and then you, your success is monitored and tracked, and you go where the pluckers and the handpickers can get you."

On May 4, 1993, Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) president Leslie Gelb said on The Charlie Rose Show that:

"...you [Charlie Rose] had me on [before] to talk about the New World Order? I talk about it all the time. It's one world now. The Council [CFR] can find, nurture, and begin to put people in the kinds of jobs this country needs. And that's going to be one of the major enterprises of the Council under me."

Previous CFR chairman, John J. McCloy (1953-70), actually said they have been doing this since the 1940s (and before).

The thrust towards global government can be well-documented but at the end of the twentieth century it does not look like a traditional conspiracy in the usual sense of a secret cabal of evil men seeking clandestinely behind closed doors. Rather, it is a "networking" of like-minded individuals in high places to achieve a common goal, as described in Marilyn Ferguson's 1980 insider classic, The Aquarian Conspiracy.

Perhaps the best way to relate this would be a brief history of the New World Order, not in our words but in the words of those who have been striving to make it real.
They built a republic for you so that you could defend against tyranny!

What would these men say if they could see that you are not making any moves to stop it?

Don't you see that the Homeland Security is structured to operate as a military government and it is bound to bring back TYRANNY? The president has consolidated enough power on the federal level that is sufficient enough for a military dictatorship, which happens to be required by the General and Complete Disarmament Law! Didn't Patrick Henry tell you that the president was going to lead in the treason and stomp on your fallen liberty?

**Why did you let it get this far?**

**What would the nation's founders say now?**
WE, THE PEOPLE, ASK
OUR BIG QUESTION:
How come we have these Rhodes
Scholars, socialists, communists,
various globalists, totalitarians
‘progressives’ and communitarians,
holding down the seats on every
governmental level wrecking our
republic? Who can explain that?

THE ANSWER THE NATION’S FOUNDERs WOULD GIVE:

It is your own fault! We
left you with two ideal
documents for your pro-
tection! We created the
Constitution for the pro-
er operation of the gov-
ernment system, and we
confirmed your natural
rights in the Bill of
Rights, to ensure your
ability to remain the
ultimate authority. You
should be looking at it,
this way: What the oath
of office does for the
Constitution is equal to
what firearms do for the
Bill of Rights!

Working together, the oath
and firearms were meant
to maintain the proper
status quo: only limited
powers to those holding
positions in government.

Did you understand
the principle and the reason
for which the oath was
interwoven into the Con-
stitution? Why haven’t
you enforced adherence to
that principle? The oath
was intended to screen out
such ineligible persons as
you’ve mentioned, social-
ists, communists, totalita-
rians, traitors, and others
of that ilk. Our objective
was to force them to step
down from office imme-
diately upon discovery.

Why isn’t your Justice
Department calling for
their resignations instead
of allowing such people to
be seated? Why haven’t
those public officials who
have taken the oath in all
sincerity defended the
people against this inva-
sion? What effort have
you made to enforce the
oath of office? Have you
ever put up an outcry?

Throughout history there
have always been liars bent
upon fooling voters during
elections. This is the
reason we interlaced the
oath into the Constitution!
It was a major item woven
into the ‘check and balance
system’. No one should
hold office who does not
adhere to the basic rules
within the Constitution.
The big intent behind the
Constitution is to prohibit
public officials from
diminishing the authority
of the people. The oath
was set to screen out those
who would enter office
under false colors. No one
was given a blank check to
do what he pleased once in
office! If it isn’t working, it
is your fault! Have you
ever held to a demand, or
have you just sat back and
grumbled while these
destroyers altered the sys-
tem, infringed your arms,
and drained your authority?

The worst crimes going on
now in the USA are those
being committed every day
by public officials who, as
they were delegated a little
authority, thought that the
people had surrendered
their own authority! This
is not so! It was our
intent that armed citizens
would exercise their
power to enforce the oath.

Second Amendment Committee PO Box 1776 Hanford, California 93232
WHAT YOU COULD LEARN FROM A
VOICE OF THE PAST

You live in a self-governing nation and are supposed to be able to defend your liberty! Your most precious personal liberty is found in the Bill of Rights and your collective liberty is in the original Constitution. You can protect these two documents only if you maintain a nation where the people are allowed to use guns! There are many good uses for guns and many good reasons for maintaining an armed nation.

The Bill of Rights has unrelenting power to protect your guns because its provisions cannot be repealed. Its Second Article confirms your right to keep and bear arms, and is known commonly as the Second Amendment. This amendment also is the only amendment that has energy capable of protecting the other nine amendments.

There is a reciprocating alliance between guns and the Bill of Rights. Only guns, which are time-proven tools, have the capability of protecting your Bill of Rights. Without guns, there is no Bill of Rights. Without the Bill of Rights there will be no guns! Both must be equally protected. When either is gone, so is the other; then all freedoms are dead.

Freedom can be taken away from without or from within. A nation must be prepared at all times to defend itself against the threat of invasion from foreign enemies without or by corruption within. No matter what the size, wars usually end up in ground-to-ground encounters, or house-to-house fighting. In former years every house-holder kept weapons of defense in his house. It deterred the intentions of would-be intruders.

Firearms are tools -- just tools! They were meant to be used for good purposes; however, they can also be used for bad purposes. Unfortunately, there is a small percentage of the people who are not law-abiding, and they will use guns for evil purposes. Criminals are people who use good tools for unlawful behavior. Society needs to be able to protect itself from them, too! Nevertheless, criminals are not a proper reason to disarm the whole population which is what the federal government is doing under the guise of preventing crime.

You must maintain ownership of guns in American society for the great good that they provide!

The police cannot protect the public-at-large. Even the courts admit that the police are not liable for protecting individuals from intruding burglars and robbers. The general function of the police is to stop crime after it has been committed. The people themselves must be equipped to defend themselves against such criminal activity when it occurs.

If the people became sold on the idea of giving up their guns in order to stop crime, they will be denying themselves the good use of guns. Guns are necessary tools for them to defend themselves against grave danger. To allow themselves to be propagandized into surrendering the right to use guns, despite the many good purposes guns serve, it would be like 'throwing out the baby with the bath water'.

The fact is that the federal government wants the nation of law-abiding citizens to become disarmed. They have a sinister reason for this. That reason is the general and complete disarmament law known as Public Law 87-297. That same goal is again evidenced in a 1989 law signed by George H. Bush that is known as Public Law 101-216. If the people go along with the federal government's maneuver to disarm them, and allow the entire United States armed forces to be transferred over to a foreign power on a permanent basis, which is what is being called for in those two laws, they will soon lose control of their government and control of their personal lives.

If your house were on fire, and you had the deed to your house, and a pack of greenbacks locked in a drawer, but you also had two little kids asleep in their beds, plus one in a crib as the fire raged, what would you do first? Naturally, you would grab up the three children and rush them out of the blistering smoke-filled house before it was too late! Opening up the drawer would waste time and the children could die! In other words, even among your most precious possessions, you must establish priorities! Certain things must come first! So it is with your Constitution and your Bill of Rights! They can only be protected by guns! More simply said:

You can't have one without the other two!

Second Amendment Committee
PO Box 1776 Hanford, Ca. 93232
The Constitution would have died in 1788 if it had not been for acceptance of the logic presented by Patrick Henry which forced the drafting of the Bill of Rights, a contractual agreement that perpetuated his views on the right to arms.
This Constitution will trample on your fallen liberty. It squints toward monarchy. It will convert us to one solid empire.

This Constitution substitutes a consolidated in lieu of a confederated government, and this threatens the total annihilation of the state sovereignties. It will lead to a consolidation of the states into one consolidated government instead of a confederation of the states.

When government removes your armaments, you will have NO power but government will have ALL power! What will you do when evil men take office?

You are writing this Constitution as if only good men will take office.

When evil men take office, the whole gang will be in collusion. They will keep the people in utter ignorance and steal their liberty by ambushade.*

A standing army we shall have, also to execute the execrable commands of tyranny.

Your guns are gone! What resistance could be made?

Will you assemble and just tell them? Even if you could assemble, how will you enforce rightful punishment when due? Your guns are gone!

My great objection to this government is that it does not leave us the means of defending our rights, or waging war against tyrants. Have we the means of resisting disciplined armies, when our only defense, the militia, is put in the hand of the congress?.....

Oh, sir, we should have fine times, indeed, if to punish tyrants, it were only necessary to assemble the people.

Let Mr. Madison tell me when did liberty ever exist when the sword and the purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle shall interpose, no nation ever did, nor ever can, retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse.
Guard with jealous attention the public liberty! Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force, and whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined!

They are being allowed too much money. They are being given too much power.

The power of the federal courts would swell the patronage of the president.

The president will lead in the treason. Your militia will leave you and fight against you.

The clause before you gives a power of direct taxation unbounded and unlimited.

Your laws on impeachment are a sham and a mockery due to mutual implication of government officials.

The cession of the whole treaty-making power to the president and the senate is one of the most fearful features in this Constitution, as they can enter into the most ruinous of foreign engagements.

The pay of the members is to be fixed by themselves without limit or restraint.

You are not to inquire how your trade may be increased, nor how you are to become a great and powerful people, but how your liberties can be secured! For liberty ought to be the direct end of government.

Will the abandonment of your most sacred rights tend to the security of your liberty? Liberty, the greatest of all earthly blessings -- give us that precious jewel and you may take everything else.

The adoption of this instrument has been maintained upon the ground that it would increase our military strength. You are negligently suffering our liberty to be wrested from us.

Even if you could assemble, how will you enforce rightful punishment when due? Oh, Sir, we should have fine times, indeed, if to punish tyrants, it were only necessary to assemble the people. A standing army we shall have, also to execute the execrable commands of tyranny.

The policy or impolicy of any provision does not depend upon itself alone, but on other provisions

The policy or impolicy of any provision does not depend upon itself alone, but on other provisions with which it stands connected.
I am not well versed in History, but I will submit to your recollection whether liberty has been destroyed most often by the licentiousness of the people, or by the tyranny of the rulers. I imagine, sir, that you will find the balance on the side of tyranny. Happy will you be, if you miss the fate of those nations, who omitting to resist their oppressors, or negligently suffering their liberty to be wrested from them, have groaned under intolerable despotism!

Let not gentlemen be told that "it is not safe to reject this government". Wherefore is it not safe? To encourage us to adopt it, they tell us, that there is a plain easy way of getting amendments. When I come to contemplate this part, I suppose that I am mad, or that my countrymen are so. The way to amendments is, in my conception -- shut!

Hence it appears that 3/4th of the states must ultimately agree to any amendments that may be necessary. Let us consider the consequence of this. Let us suppose (for the case is supposable, possible and probable) that you happen to deal these powers to unworthy hands; will they relinquish powers already in their possession, or agree to amendments? 2/3rds of the Congress, or of the state legislatures are necessary even to propose amendments. If one-third of these be unworthy men, they may prevent the application for amendments; but a destructive and mischievous feature is, that 3/4ths of the state legislatures, or of the state conventions, must concur in the amendments when proposed. In such numerous bodies, there must necessarily be some designing bad men!"

The least you can do is guard this Constitution with a Bill of Rights!

Patrick Henry

The brunt of the battle fell on Henry alone. Madison and others were accusing him of disunion. Henry told them that the dissolution of the Union was abhorrent to his mind. He considered himself a sentinel over the rights of the people, their liberties and happiness. He declared that even if twelve states had adopted the 1787 Constitution as it was without a Bill of Rights, he would still reject it.

*ambuscade means attacked from a concealed point.
Patrick Henry addresses the Virginia Convention of 1775. His "torrents of sublime eloquence", as Jefferson once described the patriot's words, won him recognition as the spiritual leader of the Revolution. Future Presidents Washington and Jefferson are depicted in the background.
Mr. President, no man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the house. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen, if entertaining, as I do, opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely, and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony. The question before the house is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery. And in proportion to the magnitude of the subject, ought to be the freedom of debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offense, I should consider myself guilty of treason toward my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, it is natural for a man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth -- and listen to the song of that siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation. For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it might cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the house? Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet.

Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation -- the last arguments to which kings resort.

I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy in this quarter of the world to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us; they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bend and rivet upon us those chains which the British ministry have been so long forging. And what have we to oppose to them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the
subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer. Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned -- we have remonstrated -- we have supplicated -- we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne.

In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free -- if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending -- if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained -- we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of Hosts is all that is left us!

They tell us, sir, that we are weak -- unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs, and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak, if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us.

The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat, but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged, our clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable -- and let it come!! I repeat it, sir, let it come!!

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace -- but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the North will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

MARCH 23, 1775
ST. JOHN'S CHURCH
St. John's Church
Erected 1741
Don't forget about me, folks.
There was a time when folks like you fought for me.
Back then I was called the Spirit of '76.
Well, folks, the tour is over! I've presented enough documented evidence now for you to see that what I've been warning you about is really true! The situation is even worse than what I've told you, but if you have not been convinced by now, there is no use going on any further!

You're really in a bad spot! You deserve to be told where you're at! This is what I've tried to do for you. You've been on the losing end for too long! You've been trusting those who have done you in!

It's dangerous to waste any more time doubting! You still have a choice — but not for long!! Hope is fast sliding in the past! In any case, "thanks" for the courtesy of your time and attention. I hope I have at least peeked your interest in time to do some good — and now back to Bernadine, as I turn you over to her for the conclusion of this interview.

So long, folks,

Sam
Thank you, Uncle Sam!
The tour was great! I'll take over from here...

...but as you leave, I want to repeat that old saying:

"It's Adios, but not goodbye!" We are going to find a way to put you back on the job, Sam!

I can see that we're just going to have to pull ourselves up -- by our own boot straps! -- and that has to start at the local level! I have some thoughts of my own, Sam. I wrote them down in the article that follows. I can see that it comes down to just one choice:

It's sink or Swim!
Uncle Sam said he could have told you a lot more on what he has to put up with these days while the country is undergoing what George W. Bush calls “the transformation” into a “global economy!”

Sam told me recently: “All that outsourcing is wrecking me economically, and all those treaties like NAFTA, GATT, CAFTA etc. are erasing my borders! I keep wondering if this is still the land of the free and the home of the brave!” Then he added: “Anyone can see that we’ve ALL been betrayed!”

Well, Sam is right! We’ve been betrayed! There is more you should know! Time is short. ‘Bone up’ in a hurry! There are many people who live in fear of the moment when a knock comes at their door by those who are assigned to search every home, seize every gun and render us helpless! The searchers may also seek any evidence critical of the ‘new world order’ which they may use against you! You could be classified as a terrorist for wanting to retain personal arms for protection, or sustain your other rightful heritages. You may be in serious trouble if you object to the imposition of a permanent military government, or the mandatory installation of a microchip in your hand. Worse still, you may find yourself hopelessly yearning to return to the true liberty you once had and lost! This dreadful situation will undoubtedly occur if the present transformation agenda fulfills its missions.

You may soon find yourself asking: “How did this mess get this far?” “How did they get the power to take us over?” “Where was there any ‘consent of the governed’ to allow this seizure to occur?” “Why didn’t some one stop it from happening?” “Can we stop it?” “Do we have a chance?” You have already been shown enough evidence by Uncle Sam to prove that ever since the United Nations organization took us in, we have been regionalized, internationalized, globalization and mesmerized!

The answers are not simple! It will be necessary to relate various incidents and give the names of people involved, to show how the governing system has been gradually altered, and why the harmony between the people and their local officials has resulted in such conflict. I'll try to make the subject as simple and clear as possible.

Almost every week something new comes along that we didn’t know they were pulling off. The United Nation’s greatest “adversary” has become our very own UNCLE SAM! The United Nations wants to destroy our real Uncle Sam! It is high time to assess what options are still open for Constitutional people to pursue.

I told Uncle Sam I would do all I possibly could to support him, so I worked up this article that I decided to name “Sink Or Swim”. I have included with it a peaceful solution you may try called the Circle of Hope. It is based on something that did work once before. It’s explained in my article. I’ve tried to warn you of things I tried in the past that didn’t work, but who knows, you may have better luck trying those same ideas by yourself!

There is one last thing I need to warn you about! You must do your best to keep what you do in a peaceful manner – we need a peaceful solution! If fighting would start, keep in mind that the globalists have already trained so many armies from the communist countries, right here, on our own soil, and the globalists would call upon them to put you down. It won’t be fun with foreign mercenaries backing up the Homeland Security Agency. So keep your cool! I think you will like my article, so go on and read it now. It’s called: Sink or Swim!
TO SINK OR SWIM

Many books have been written to expose the sedition that has overtaken the government of the United States of America. Actually, there is an overabundance of books and articles by great patriotic American writers that report on the sedition. They openly identify the adherents of global government, and the devious techniques and activities to which such conspirators have willingly attached themselves in an ill-conceived effort to install a "new world order". In their lust the conspirators are knowingly overturning the rightful Constitutional government of the United States of America! The last days of the American Republic are upon us. Too many people continue to stand aside like deaf and dumb mute, while the transformation progresses. It is up to us who care to find ways to generate enough interest to stop those who are overthrowing our Republic: we must now sink or swim!

This binder is dedicated to protecting the benefits, rights, and glories that resulted from the sacrifices made by those who fought and died in the War for Independence. May we never forget their sacrifices! It is the duty of the watchmen of today to alert their fellow citizens to the great disaster that is occurring in front of them: clear and unmistakable sedition! If enough people can be alerted and made responsive, hopefully three of the world's greatest documents: "The Declaration of Independence," "The Constitution of the United States" and the "Bill of Rights" will be respected and retained.

Some people will argue that nothing is really wrong! They are not aware that there are two conflicting systems of government operating in this country today. One is what is left of the traditional Constitutional system, and the other is the "new world order" global government system. There are 'doubters' found in all occupations who should benefit most by this compilation. But will they? There are many people working in our government system that do not understand the harm they are doing to the nation. They are completely oblivious as to how their efforts could possibly destroy the stability of the United States! Their inability to detect the harm they do is one thing, but the contribution of their combined energies to erect and sustain the framework of a Helterian totalitarian regime, almost unforgivable!

City, county, and state planning departments, the law enforcement system, the school teachers and professors, the religious community, the medical profession, the building trades, the legal profession, and the business owners, all are failing to denounce the transformation that is going on, and because of that, are contributors to the overthrowing of their own rightful American government. Some people have become so callous to the alterations being made (a reversal of the Constitutional concepts, principles, and laws that originally formed this country), soothed by the gentle persuasive techniques that accompany acceptance of federal funding for social, economic, or administrative "planning", that nothing but the equivalent of what happened one day in the Colorado state legislature will awaken them. Further on, I will explain what happened in 1943

---

4 Britain's Lord Macaulay's prediction in 1857: "Your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th Century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th, with the difference that the Huns and Vandals that ravaged the Roman Empire will have come from without and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."
when the outgoing Colorado governor 'blew the whistle' and alerted the nation to the seditious activity going on in the president's office in Washington, D.C.

Today the sedition is even worse than it was in 1943. Socialist planning techniques directly or indirectly govern city, county, and state governments, schools, churches, police departments, hospitals, universities, media, and building trades in general whenever they receive federal financing in one way or other.

Do the lower practitioners in city, county, and state planning offices that practice these socialist planning techniques know from where these planning techniques originated? In 1945 the United States rumbled over what was left of Adolph Hitler's Third Reich. The result was that this country received a "tremendous augmentation, not only when the United States picked up Hitler's scientists, but also when the U.S. 'planners' retrieved the inductive type of reasoning and logic, which Hitler used to operate that totalitarian government. His management systems were taken up and installed as a part of our own government management systems."

"These elementary concepts were first taken over by the U.S. Air Force and were amalgamated within the prerogative of their responsibilities, which at that time resulted in the setting up of what we now call the 'Military Standards 499 Systems.' The 499 Systems is a systematic process (a methodology) of solving sequential problems."

"The result of this amalgamation is that 99% of the lower practitioners of these engineering techniques and methodologies in city and state planning departments (with their short and long range 'plannings') are completely unaware and totally oblivious to the fact of where from these concepts were developed or why these concepts were developed. Many of our government 'planners' - local and state - were then set to deploy, and are still deploying techniques about which they realize little or nothing! They are ignorant of the whole picture. They complete only their own little piece, which federal officials have forced upon them."

"The objective of the whole thing is the formation of a Hitlerian global system, and the gradual disappearance of protective Constitutional concepts of government, replacing them entirely with a militarized form of government. In other words, people must face the fact that it is upper level federal officials that are overturning the government of the United States. The actualization of this can be proven by the way our nation is being operated, the policies, the treaties, and the sort of laws that are being passed. Then there is the obvious, the installation of the 'Homeland Security Agency', which is being accepted without the volume of resistance, understanding, or great protest it should have received from the outset."

"The totality of 499 Systems has been split up into a million different little portions, and all the various committees and divisions of government, all over the country in various governmental endeavors, are practicing different little portions of it. They get the parameters and details of the tasks they have been asked to perform, but they are not given, nor do they understand, the total integrated picture."

It is possible for people (who are lead people working and structuring under the 499 Systems) not to understand how their part fits into the overall picture. They do not realize how they are assisting in "the overthrow of their own government!" The big trouble (whenever you try to tell them about this) is that these people will not only resist your explanations and defend their associates, but they will even defend the 1% that does have full and complete knowledge and control of the sedition, those who are key participants in the betrayal that is destroying this nation. Nevertheless, the revamping and transformation goes on so that we are in accord with military concepts on an
international regional basis. This they must do, because the orders come to them from an upper
level of government.

The same situation is prevalent when you try to awaken members of our civilian law enforcement.
Our local police officers are not aware of how they are being used to violate our laws; nor do they
realize the part they play in overthrowing the American (rightful form) of government. They do
not realize that it is a dangerous circumstance for the regular law enforcement system to be
removed as a prerogative of the state, and to be seized for use by the federal government. Yet, this
has been allowed to happen, and your local police have now been federalized and merged with the
military under one agency head! That change alone (from state authority to federal authority)
converts a republic into a dictatorship type of government! What has happened to the intelligence
of our police officers? Did we have to change our form of government to guard against terrorism?
Something is very wrong with this!

For over 200 years there always was a sharp line separating the civilian law enforcement from the
military. Today, that line no longer exists! Now every police officer all over the nation is “on-line”
taking orders from the illegal ‘Homeland Security Agency’! Merging the civilian law enforcement
with the military under one agency head has always been a real no! no! — something that is never
done in a republic, if it is to remain a republic! Operation under a global dictatorship is now in
place! Someone has to answer for this!

Some years ago (1967 to 1975 thereabouts) when the federally funded Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration (L.E.A.A.) was first working out the process to merge the military and the civilian
law enforcement systems together under one agency head, MB-Standards were brought in to
restructure the command and control functions of the police departments. Richard M. Nixon was
president and Ronald Reagan was the nation’s “pilot” governor. That was the time when the
groundwork was first laid for institution of the ‘Homeland Security Agency’. The point is; H.S.A.
didn’t just happen over night! It was planned a long time ago to meet requirements of the law for
General and Complete Disarmament of the United States (Public Law 87-297 signed by John F.
Kennedy in 1961).

When Philip Worth, a California detective, tries to explain to police officers that they are being
taught Soviet tactics on a gradual basis, they do not comprehend it, nor understand how their part
fits into the overall effort to replace the Constitution with a militarized new world order!

You and I are caught in the middle, while the big patriotic pretense from the federal level continues
on, day after day after day by our presidents, and other state and federal public officials! They
make a deliberate effort to get the public to think that they are “following the Constitution!” They
pretend to idealize it! Nothing could be further from the truth! The real truth is that these Fabian
socialists have from long ago despised the 1789 Constitution and our Bill of Rights because it limits
the power that man can exercise over his fellow man! They have us going in the wrong direction
now. Someone has to answer for this!

Wouldn’t you think that when we are told by our presidents that we are under a “new world order”
and are undergoing “transformation” into a global society, wouldn’t you think it’s time to “catch on”
to the consequence of these acts? Most people can feel the impact of the expense involved in
building a new world order as our currency becomes more and more inflated. Wouldn’t you think
they would catch on to who is behind it?

---

2 In Stage III of the Disarmament process, the armed forces of the United States will be transferred to the United
Nations on a permanent basis. An armed force is required to preserve internal order as the Disarmament process
proceeds. State Dept. Pub.7277. Pg. 3
Outsourcing our jobs and undermining our economy; unresolved illegal immigration; the disregard for so long of our state and national borders under NAFTA and the 'Security and Prosperity Partnership' plan (S.P.P.); the General & Complete Disarmament Program which calls for the transfer of our armed forces on a permanent basis to the United Nations and disarms every U.S. citizen; 'no knock' searches; the upcoming 'no private ownership of land' policy; the U.S. Supreme Court approval of taking land from one private owner to give to another private owner; the dumbing down of the kids in school and indoctrinating them in globalism; the Patriot Act; imperialistic wars; licentiousness disguised as liberty; etc.; etc. — all these are reversals of true American government!

The question before us is: "How are we going to get out of this predicament and restore the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to their proper place?" In order to explain a possibility that offers some promise, I will first have to explain what did work before, in 1943, which we might use as an example and a pattern to guide us now. At least it is worth a try!

In order for you to get the point, we must first look back to the '20's when Franklin D. Roosevelt made many public speeches in favor of world government. At the time, he ran as vice-president with James Cox as president. (This was prior to FDR's becoming a victim of infantile paralysis.) His bold effort was rebuffed by the voters, but by the time the big Depression struck the nation, FDR had adopted a fatherly image, and won the confidence of the American voters. They had to choose between him and Herbert Hoover: FDR then gained the seat in the oval office for himself!

FDR could deliver a speech quite well. People did not realize it then, because he was listed as a Democrat, but FDR was a socialist. Under the shrewd guidance of Charles E. Merriam, his crafty socialist advisor, FDR began implementation of the Fabian socialist goals using tactics to deceive, confuse, and befuddle the American people. Merriam taught FDR how to use the coattails of the Constitution as a way to bring in the socialist agenda. Mind-bending became a skill and an ongoing art. Double meanings for words, called "dual-speak" took hold. Merriam advised FDR that revolution was the old way and the new way was his four-step method: "Education, Persuasion, Participation and Co-operation". He taught FDR to disguise socialism by using the term 'democracy.' These tactics have been used by all the presidents ever since FDR's time period to the present day. Deceptive strategy to advance world socialism (communism) is still being presented by our presidents with a persuasive smile, wrapped up in sophistry, and dipped in false patriotism.

But, in 1943 a surprising thing happened! When the outgoing Colorado Governor, Ralph Carr, made his Farewell Address to his state legislature, he spoke out boldly in front of them, and publicly

---

3 Security and Prosperity Partnership (S.P.P.) brings Mexico, United States and Canada under a common border, a first-step to eliminating the borders of the 50 states and creating new little countries in its place. The population of the three countries would flow freely across borders.

4 Planning techniques and directives for altering the U.S. government were promoted by Franklin D. Roosevelt and one of his advisors, Charles E. Merriam. Merriam was a socialist who wrote books, one of which was called "On the Agenda of Democracy". In his book on 'democracy' it was explained how to use the same system of people management as that which is used to operate communism. Merriam taught that this 'democracy' system could be brought in by 'using the coattails of the U.S. Constitution'. He said: "Fortunately, our Constitution is broad enough in its terms, flexible enough in its spirit, and capable of liberal enough interpretation by the judiciary to permit the adaptation of democracy in changing conditions without serious difficulty." The 4-word formula he introduced for action was "education, persuasion, participation, and co-operation". (George W. Bush uses Merriam's persuasion to a fault!) Merriam and F.D.R. advocated the abolition of our states and replacing them with 'regions'. Functions were to be shifted quietly, unostentatiously, gradually, so that there would be no sudden jolt to cause alarm. Even before Pearl Harbor was bombed Maurice Gomberg drew a map in October 1941 showing the elimination of national boundary lines which separate the United States from Canada and Mexico. Treaties such as NAFTA, CAFTA, GATT, etc. are doing the job of erasing our national boundary lines and making them disappear.
told what FDR was doing (regional government, elimination of the states, socialism, etc.) and Governor Carr condemned it. It hit the newspapers. The public got abold of it, and the outcry became great! — great enough that Congress was forced to shut down FDR's National Resources Planning Board! It was called "unconstitutional". The Congress cut his funding off. They gave him a six-month deadline to get rid of all the paper work in his N.R.P.B. He was cut off at the pocketbook!

Roosevelt tried desperately to stop the action, but wasn't successful and the N.R.P.B. was shut down. When the people learned that FDR was going to eliminate the states, they knew that would kill the Constitution! The outcry was sufficient to stop him and his N.R.P.B. The people went after their congressmen and the congressmen went after the purse and the purse got closed!

Perhaps by now you have guessed that as I view it, the most peaceful manner to solve our problem today with the new world order, is to try a repeat of what they did in 1943. More on that up ahead.

Were you wondering what happened to FDR's socialist staff? They moved into other areas of public service and continued to make modifications in the operation of the government. Of the 29 paid staff at the time Congress cut off the NRPB funds, all but 7 were transferred to other executive jobs, some at increased pay levels. 5 of the 7 were placed on other 'planning' boards where they were in a position to aid in the new phase of implementing the N.R.P.B. plan. That new phase was the creation of a demand for 'planning' at the state and local levels. Here's what happened to the gang: Albert Lepausky left but surfaced in the 1960's as an advisor on the Lake Tahoe Regional Area Plan. Victor Jones later became an advisor to the A.C.I.R., which Eisenhower would institute in 1959. (More on that up ahead.) Beardsley Ruml devised the plan for weekly withholding taxes on businessmen's weekly payrolls. Rexford Guy Tugwell wrote a Constitution for the World, parts of which are already instituted today. Louis Brownlow was the first director of the Public Administration Clearing House and master co-coordinator of the 1313 Rockefeller funded Associations. Brownlow worked with Luther Gulick and predicted that our states would be abolished and replaced with international regions. And, of course, Charles F. Merriam who masterminded the style of the take over, also worked with the Public Administration Clearing House. His son, Robert Merriam later headed the A.C.I.R. (More on that ahead.)

Here's how it all began in 1943: Governor Ralph Carr of Colorado was leaving office and he made his lengthy Farewell Address to the state legislature on the subject he was exposing, hoping they would carry on his effort. In part, he said: "(This plan) to commence the remodeling of the lives of American freemen (is) on a basis so dictatorial, so monarchistic, so bureaucratic, that its very exposition proves its hostility to our American form of government...when we mix the lives and hopes and dreams of human beings with physical resources, and attempt to measure and modify and restrict men and their intangibles, then we should proceed slowly..."

5 Eisenhower established the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (A.C.I.R.) in 1959. It was a rebirth and revitalization of the old N.R.P.B. and became a go-between for Merriam's Public Administration Clearing House and all levels of government. A.C.I.R. wrote 'model' laws for use all over the nation, passed them to public officials that were their legmen who enacted them under their name on all levels of government, which made possible the consolidation of all power on the federal level. A.C.I.R.'s approach to 'planning' was done in a more sophisticated way than the old N.R.P.B. A.C.I.R. gained undeserved respectability by having mayors, state and federal legislators, governors, private citizens etc. as members of its Commission. It was funded by the Rockefellers, and eventually became attached to the federal government as being "advisory"! It worked in conjunction with Brookings Institute, etc. Brookings Institute attended the summit conferences along with the president and was in a position to dictate what legislation was needed for global development and cooperation, which A.C.I.R. could produce in conjunction with the transformation. Charles Merriam's son became the presiding official for some years. Ronald Reagan replaced Rockefeller on this Rockefeller Commission!
Congressmen in 1943 made their comments about the N.R.P.B. and the direction in which FDR was taking them:

Repr. John Rankin: “If this program, proposed by our so-called National Resources Planning Board, were put into effect, it would wreck this republic, wipe out the Constitution, destroy our form of government, set up a totalitarian regime, eliminate private enterprise, regiment our people, and pile on our backs a burden of expenditures that no nation on earth could bear....”

Repr. Gerald W. Landis: “...It is a sugar-coated proposal, to be directed by bureaucrats in Washington. The social planners propose to build this program on a foundation of debt....”

Repr. Noah M. Mason: “...It is a scheme to give the federal government control of every activity of the nation, with the states pushed back into a position of impotence, if not entirely obliterated...any state that does not cooperate with the program is to be policed from Washington until it sees the light....”

Repr. Clare Hoffman: “That horde of bureaucrats which promulgates the multiplicity of orders, rules, regulations and directives...have presumed to take solely unto themselves the prerogative of interpreting the intentions of the Congress, of reading into its enactments, meanings never even thought of by the Congress....”

Repr. Frederick C. Smith: “To me, it is truly alarming that such a destructive force as this could grow to its present size and power, without the Congress and the country becoming more aware of its dangers than it apparently has....There is not the remotest possibility of reading into that law (The Economic Stabilization Act of 1931 used as the authority for this program) any authority whatsoever for performance of the whole range of functions that are now being carried out.... There is nothing in the Act which gives this federal agency any authority to plan a new economic, and social order, as its activities clearly indicate it is undertaking to do....”

Abeer Hiss, FDR’s companion, along with Leo Paslovsky and Russia’s Molotov had been busy drafting the United Nations Charter to sell to this nation as a ‘treaty’. This was a great mistake. The U.N. Charter from the onset was a parasitic blueprint for in itself that was going to be imposed over this nation as soon as the war was over. It was signed in 1945! But it never was a real ‘treaty’!

Dwight D. Eisenhower took office after Truman, and opened FDR’s Pandora’s box back up, so the world government planning group once again took hold, returning with the new title of Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (A.C.I.R.). A rebirth of the old N.R.P.B. occurred! Eisenhower signed a law to institute A.C.I.R. in 1959. It was a law making factory and a think tank.

This rebirth was our fault because we thought each presidency started anew. We didn’t realize back then that international money powers controlled both parties, and it really didn’t matter which party got elected. They gave us their choices as candidates for the presidency all along: Tweedledee or Tweedledum! Converting the U.S. to world government via the president’s office has never stopped since FDR’s presidency! Every president, no matter who ever took office since, has kept that ball quietly rolling! The people did not realize what the A.C.I.R. was doing until Jo Hindman began writing books exposing what that group was doing.

The events that followed is a history of one president after the other, moving the nation into a global government up to an including the presidency of George W. Bush.

Remember, FDR died before he reached his dream goal of signing the United Nations Charter, but the next president, Harry Truman, signed the U.S. away under the U.N. Charter, which was dressed up to act as a “treaty”. It really didn’t qualify as a “treaty”, but with some fast footwork it unlawfully got accepted as a “treaty”. In the United States of America the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and no treaty can be valid if it is not in pursuance thereof. How could a
foreign constitution of a non-existent government be considered to be a valid treaty? Even if it had been a "treaty" (which it was not!) it would have to be "in pursuance of the Constitution" (which it was not!) Its purpose is to supersede our Constitution! From the onset, the drafters of the U.N. Charter knew it was a blueprint for construction of a global system. Somebody pulled the wool over our eyes!

If Roosevelt's "democracy" is not exposed, you will find that when you need our safeguards the most, they will all be gone! During FDR's administration the socialist dream moved from theory to implementation. Every president (bar none) since the United Nations Charter was signed has played a part in recasting the American government for socialist "global government" management. But it is not too late! Don't despair! There is still hope as to what people can do to stop all this that is so unfairly being enforced upon them.

We must try to repeat the action that Governor Ralph Carr set into motion. There is no deadline on certain frauds. Charges should be made by the people under the principle of Rebus Sic Stantibus since the general population had no knowledge until it had become evident in recent days that the United Nations Charter was built to overthrow the government of the United States. The general population now has available proof that those who were given positions of trust have betrayed us, and there is evidence to prove such seditious activity exists, so the situation has changed!

That is what Rebus Sic Stantibus mean: "...the situation has changed!" It is the premier principle of international law and is held as the highest reason in rank for voiding a treaty. It means that "there was more to the treaty than what met the eye". Our government officials said the United Nations Charter would bring peace and security. The opposite is showing itself to be what is true! There will be no peace! There will be no Security! "An unconstitutional act is not law...as inoperative as though it had never been passed." Norton vs. Shelby County, 118 US 425 p.442.

The blueprint for international global government (U.N. Charter document), that gave birth to the organization called the United Nations, and was put over on the American people as a "treaty" in reality is no "treaty" at all! All funding for this seditious activity must cease. When you cut the federal government off at the pocketbook, you will also stop the U.N. Nevertheless, enactment of Rebus Sic Stantibus must be done, as it is the process to make official the position of the United States, and to clear the record. The U.N. fraternity should be asked to move out of this nation.

Even before signing the Charter, the federal government was trying to eliminate the states! Now it is by far worse! The servants have declared themselves above their master. Shouldn't it be obvious to all members of the state governments that something has to be done to correct this situation? Despite any P.A.C.H. problem, there should be no worry in asking the state houses to protect the state itself as an existing entity? Any member of the state house that cannot support this view should be suspected to be a federal government collaborator. Let's get the ball rolling! Until we get out of certain groups, there will be no chance to stop the plan to overthrow our Constitution.

Since there are no withdrawal rights in the U.N. Charter, it is also necessary to enact Repr. Ron Paul's legislation which is attached to the back of this binder: H.R. 1146 - 106th Congress - 1st Session. Such an action would repeal the two Acts that caused the U.S. to become enlisted as a member of the United Nations. We must get out of the U.N. It is good to include the words: rescinded, revoked and repealed. If the federal system does not comply, the repeal action can be done by the states themselves. The federal government received its limited authority from the states, and the states still hold power to censor federal violations of the power they delegated. The Four Resolves will also support the process of getting public officials to obey the law. Leave no stones unturned! I have outlined the following steps in a format attached that is called: The Circle
of Hope! It reads: Use only (a) Reliable documented information. (b) A respectable notable telling the shocking facts. (c) Broad coverage including national news attention. (d) An aroused public protesting super loudly and continually. (e) Newspapers have to report complaints and print about it. (f) Demonstrations are broadcasted and public begins to connect the dots. (g) Awareness reaches sufficient percent of national population and word spreads. (h) State pressure is brought to bear, and federal officials cannot refuse to cut off funding. (i) Outcry becomes sufficient. Demands for sovereignty of the states continue from the public. Federal funding must be stopped. (j) If needed, IRS tax money is put in escrow. All funding of the federal government is stopped until they agree to repeal the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 and 1949. Federal government has no access to funds until people approve of releasing it. (k) If the federal government refuses, to make proper corrections, the states are forced by the people to meet, draft proper legislation themselves, and mandates both United Nations Participation Acts as being repealed. (l) The jig is up! The states hold the power to do this. There is no court review on a bill of repeal. (m) Use the premier principle in international law to void the United States Membership in the United Nations: Rebus Sic Stantibus. The U.N. Charter was never a treaty as pretended. (n) Use the ideas listed in “Four Resolves” to withhold salaries in accord with the stipulation in the Fourteenth Amendment. You have to cut them off at the pocketbook! (Now look at the back to find “The Circle of Hope”.)

There is no violence in using this method. It is a peaceful way to end the sedition. If the United States stops funding it, the United Nations would collapse anyway! If funds are put in escrow, no law is violated since the taxpayers would have met their obligation by paying taxes. The only thing is that the federal officials would not get use of the funds until they start to obey the Constitution. If you use the legislation that Ron Paul has already written H.R. 1146, 106th Congress, 1st Session, be sure to include all current Annexes, etc. into which the disarmament law has been extended. You will find Annexes referred to in the “Blueprint for the Peace Race” booklet which detail the General and Complete Disarmament Law. Add a clause to deny any future global government related treaties or international agreements.

Representatives of the states also have the power to meet and execute the repeal action. All it takes is for representatives in each state to send representatives to a conference and vote on the issue on behalf of the people of their state. This effort can be made. If Patrick Henry were here today, he would wind it up by asking: “Why stand we here idle?”

Former California State Senator, Richard Mountjoy once used the idea of holding federal money in escrow. He did not acquire enough support from fellow state legislators to get it passed. The idea still holds great potential and should be tried with the general public’s support behind it. How can any state legislator in his right mind refuse to save the state that pays his salary?

Use your First Amendment with them as much as possible to protect yourself. Do not waste time, lest the day will come when neither of the two Amendments you need so much, will exist! Remember to keep a peaceful but highly vocal campaign going. You can organize committee headquarters in every state. What the federal government is doing with the money is against the law! The people have no choice but to defend the nation against sedition. If this recourse is successful, never forget that the globalists will come back again and again. Generations in the future must remain on guard at all times, and teach their children how to avoid the trials that you are experiencing today, because sedition never ever ceases! The insurrection and civil disobedience that is going on these days, is not caused by the people, it is caused by the Oval Office.

Another threat facing gun owners is federal legislation, H.R. 124 introduced by Rush Holt D-N.J., which if allowed to pass, will precipitate a great catastrophe. Under H.R. 124 every person must report to the federal government every unlicensed and/or unregistered gun he possesses. After H.R. 124 is enacted, anyone found to be in possession of a firearm not declared, will be in violation
of that law, and will be sentenced to serve a mandatory 15-year prison sentence without mitigation. That is a pretty stiff penalty, and it is unfair to force people to provide such information, as the federal government will be seeking. The purpose of such a bill can only be to force disclosure of any firearm previously unknown to the government. The acquisition of such information makes possible a total cleanout of all guns in the hands of the people!

Sequentially, the long sought objective by the federal government to confiscate from every law-abiding U.S. citizen, every firearm he possesses, down to the very last gun, in house-to-house searches (already planned) may then be conducted — with surety! There is no doubt about it! This legislation is subject to the federal law Uncle Sam told you about on the tour: Public Law 87-297, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (also known as the General and Complete Disarmament Law). As Uncle Sam told you, it was written to bring about total disarmament of this nation for a so-called “peaceful world” and completely disarming every U.S. citizen.

Passage of Holt’s legislation will make possible the thorough search and seizure the federal government is seeking to tie into Public Law 87-297. H.R. 124 is being held in the federal Judiciary Committee at this time, and will be assigned a new number when re-activated. This year another bill has been assigned the 124 number, so if you write for a copy of the Holt bill, you must identify the year the Holt bill held that number, which was January 7, 2003; in the 108th Congress - 1st Session.

If H.R. 124 passes, the people will later be expected to surrender the very tools that constitute a natural defense against tyranny? Something is wrong here with that kind of thinking? The irony is this: The idea behind writing such legislation as H.R. 124 is particularly that H.R. 124 is an act of tyranny in itself! It lays the groundwork to take away those very tools with which you are supposed to use to fight against tyranny! That is an illegal and illegitimate act! Therefore, it is an act of tyranny to write such illegitimate legislation. Bottom line: A public official has enacted tyranny with illegitimate legislation, and at the same time, he pretends that his tyrannous act and illegitimate legislation has the force of law behind it to destroy the legitimate means of resisting tyranny. Something is very wrong with Holt’s kind of thinking?

When you lose your guns, you will have lost all authority! Authority is always backed by force. Without force, you will not be able to sustain the rest of the Bill of Rights, which even now are being legislated out of existence! When guns go, it will become even worse! The effort of all those who have been trying to restore the “republic” could become near hopeless! The right to arms, the lynchpin, was an absolute right from the onset! Patrick Henry caused the Second Amendment to be written as a confirmation that the right to arms is a God-given right that is absolute: an endowment from the Creator. No one can prohibit a decent law-abiding person from exercising that right. H.R. 124 also violates the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

The original intent for instituting the Constitution and the Bill of Rights was so that the power that man could exercise over his fellow man would be limited! Now our “fellow man” sitting in public offices is writing unjust laws, trying to pass them off as if lawfully begotten — as if they are true law; so that a select few can rule the earth with unlimited power. Constitutional restraints, safeguards, prohibitions and restrictions that were meant to apply to public officials have been tossed aside, just as if disregard of the restraints could cause these safeguards to not exist! But they DO exist! Cicero, a Roman orator, statesman and philosopher, dealt with the issue of true law. He said: “There is a higher law based on the nature of things. This natural law has an authority transcending man-made laws, institutions and customs.” He gave this definition of true law:

---

*In part it reads: “The court shall not suspend a sentence of imprisonment imposed under this paragraph or impose a probationary sentence under this paragraph.”*
"True law is right reason in agreement with nature. It is of universal application, unchanging and everlasting. It summons to duty by its commands and averts from wrongdoing by its prohibitions. It is a sin to try to alter this law, nor is it allowable to attempt to repeal any part of it and it is impossible to abolish it entirely."........"Unjust laws are not true laws; therefore, unjust laws should not be called laws at all. If many pernicious and mischievous enactments are made which have no more right to the name of law than the mutual engagements of robbers, are we bound to call them laws?.....For as we cannot call the recipes of ignorant and unskilful empirics, who give poisons instead of medicines, the prescriptions of a physician, so likewise we cannot call that the true law of a people of whatever kind it may be, if it enjoins what is injurious. Let the people receive it as they will."

Regardless of the disrespect shown to the U.S. Constitution by federal public officials, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are still the supreme law of this land! These two documents belong exclusively to the people. They were ratified by the people! They are the people's own possession! Since the people have never signed off of either document, public officials have no authority to override the principles within either of these documents without the consent of the governed! The people have never given consent for either to be dissolved, prohibited or overthrown! No matter what treaties the presidents sign, they have no authority to give away or destroy things they do not own! There is no consent of the governed for what is happening today! It is up to the people to stop them!

The excuse used by public officials for enacting all the disarmament law and anti-gun legislation was to prevent war. For a nation to be unprepared for war is the most probable way to invite a war, to attract oppressors onto its territory who will victimize the people of that defenseless nation.

The inter-related and interfacing nature of Public Law 87-297 and H.R. 124 cannot be denied! Neither law can be judged to be valid or true law! P.L. 87-297 is the reason why our state legislatures and local police officers co-operate with anti-gun rulings handed down to them for enactment. These should be called non-laws!

Police departments have already created "gun surrender" agencies for the people to submit to, but most police officers have no idea that there are plans in the offing to disarm them also. Only a world international army would be allowed to have firearms. It has been reported that Handgun Control, Inc. has stated:

"We cannot survive into the 21st Century unless we remember the need to expand our ways to new thinking to the total disarmament of America. With much of the public disarmed we can become more like Great Britain, where we can also eliminate the need for much of our police to be armed. This would take a long time; however, a concerted public relations campaign can pressure local law enforcement to give up their arms, when the time comes. Weapons would be still available to special units like SWAT or the military."

After the people are disarmed, to whom will our police officers turn for assistance when they are slated to be disarmed? Certainly not to the government who desires them to be disarmed also! Certainly not to the people whom the police so eagerly had already disarmed, because the people would have no tools to help them! Then, too, they could be transferred off to some other country! These are things that must be taken into consideration now by the police, while time permits. We are forced to defend ourselves against poorly informed politicians, courts, police officers, etc., who are unwittingly supporting non-laws in violation of the written true law of the Second Amendment.

\footnote{Karl Von Clausewitz, a German strategist, said: "The aggressor is always peace loving, for he wants to enter the territory of his victim unopposed. War exists for the benefit of the defender; it comes about only if the defender wishes to fight for his vital interests rather than surrender them."}
Some state and local public officials exhibit a sense of superiority and self-righteousness over the people as they interfere with a person’s right to arms, even though they may not really realize the basis of why or what they are asked to do. The word is sent to them from the federal level (from what they consider to be the political ladder) as to what they are expected to do. Local police officers are conditioned to think that they themselves are following the law when orders are given to them to go counter to the provisions of the Second Amendment. They, in turn, expect the people to think that they are enforcing valid law when their only source is really a bluff — a non-law. The point is that the police officers at the bottom of the “chain of command” do not realize that they are being put in a position of actually operating against the law.

Police officers are not necessarily Constitutional scholars! God bless them! Most are dedicated people and duty bound to see that the law is obeyed, but unfortunately, they are merely told what the law is, and told what to do. Simply put, they do what they are told to do! They follow orders that are given to them, including the Chief of Police himself, because their orders come down supposedly from ‘on high’, and they are greatly concerned with what they are expected to do. They do not question the constitutionality of what they are told to do, because the persuasion that accompanies the instruction to which they are to conform, has been so authoritatively engineered, that law enforcement’s involvement and participation appears plausible, and is thus accepted by them!

Yet, one wonders why in the case of the anti-gun (so-called) ‘laws’, police officers haven’t sensed that there really is a difference between an honest, decent, law-abiding citizen and a criminal! Afraid to offend those ‘higher up on the ladder,’ or be accused of ‘rocking the boat’, police officers treat honest decent law-abiding gun owners the same as if they were criminals and lawbreakers: because it is ‘the law’. All the while they do not know that ‘the law’ they are enforcing is subjective under the umbrella of non-law Public Law 87-297! The police officer has to face up to this ridiculous situation in which he has been manipulated, that being an out-and-out violation by our own ‘protectors’ of the essential reasons for which this nation was formed: security and liberty! In other words, our police officers are given orders to violate the law! When the police officer turns on his television, he has before him some of the big reasons why crime is so rampant. Crime should be the reason to keep law-abiding people equipped with arms! Hopefully, the police officers that dedicate their lives to serving the people will put the pieces together, and begin to participate in restoring the principles of this nation before we are fully and irrevocably taken over by a new world order, which is actually destroying the system.

Police officers need to realize that the concept of our system of government has been woefully altered, and deliberately misdirected so that the nation can be ruled by a global management system, an amalgamation of all the communist countries of the world merged into a ‘new world order’. Indirectly, the police are destroying the future of their own children when they carry out orders that harm their own posterity. The proper spirit and reasons why this government was formed is becoming lost!

There is no use trying to go through the Supreme Court for justice in this issue. One determined person in California already presented to them the ideal defense of the Second Amendment, and the federal Supreme Court declined to hear it, even after he had gotten that far with this urgent subject, and even received a Docket Number from the high court! The case was so well written that even the Supreme Court would have had to agree that public officials are in violation of the law whenever they disarm decent law-abiding citizens. The Court refused to hear the case! Remember, the members of the Supreme Court are appointed by the same presidents who have been supporting Public Law 87-297, (including Public Law 101-216) ever since John F. Kennedy signed P.L. 87-297 into law. Expect no help to come from there!
Would I suggest going through a Grand Jury to tell all that is happening to this country? I have tried that in two different counties of the State of California where I live: Kings and Kern Counties. Each time I tried, the foreman saw what subject I was exposing, and I was stopped and not allowed to continue addressing the full body of the Grand Jury. Even the individual packet given to each Grand Jury member was ordered collected up and returned to me. Perhaps some other Grand Jury may have an uncompromised foreman at the head. If the judge appoints your foreman, you are wasting time!

Can you vote these anti-constitutional people out? The globalists have the big money and they can afford to spend big bucks to promote their lamego into office! That represents another one of the checks and balances not working adequately! Voting machines can be rigged. The solution is to return to the former system of paper ballots that are hand counted by reputable local people and certified in each precinct.

Do you think impeachment will work? Re-read Patrick Henry's thoughts on that. He called the laws on treason a “sham and a mockery” because “when evil men take over, the whole gang will be in collusion”. It is now, just as he predicted. Now check back on the voting record Uncle Sam showed you relating to Public Law 101-216 in the front section of this binder, and see what sort of people get elected to office! Do you want to risk your case to the hands of those who are authorized to “control” the impeachment process? Henry foresaw the situations we face now, which is why he forced the Bill of Rights to be written, the only reliable defense we have against sedition. Henry's reasonings are perpetual and apply to the tyrants who have now taken over the American government.

While it is true that the best hope we have is to work with those who are on the local level, there are a couple of other suggestions that I have to offer. Go to sensible local police officers and ask them to reconsider why they enforce “laws” (so-called) that are destroying the republic. Show them that at the present time, we have two systems of government existing in the United States. One is called the Constitutional Republic System (what remains of it) and the other is called “democracy” - a stand in word for the global transformation, which is headed by our presidents, and is being supported by various levels of our elected officials. Although they appear to be fighting amongst themselves, both the Republican and the Democrat parties are involved in the transformation into the other system, called “democracy”. Both parties are supporting it! Both parties constantly call this republic a “democracy”? Merriam's version of democracy is not representative government.

The headquarters for conversion into the new world order is centered right in the Oval office of the nation’s capitol with each and every president guarding and continuing past global milestones, regardless of whether his predecessor be Republican or Democrat! Each president has had to shelter and enforce whatever global legislation, public laws, executive orders, treaties, or programs that were enacted in previous administrations, continue to expand them, and introduce new global milestones that were prepared and set for his administration to launch. He has to use a technique or manner with the public, which obscures his real motive. Every president since Hoover has played this game, but none!

The longer it takes to finish the global transformation, the more transparent the president has become, as is the case with George W. Bush whose ratings are at an all time low. The milestones themselves become more and more daring, as the finish line is approached. Some people can sense that things have been going wrong, but are still conditioned to believe that the president himself must be beyond suspicion! It is exactly the reason why the people have not been able to put all the pieces together. That is exactly what has been going on without regard to what political party they represent. Didn't Patrick Henry warn you back in 1788 that the president would lead in the treason?
Every president (mostly since entry into the United Nations) has had to hold on to the globalism work, done by his predecessors, before his own administration came into office, and then he must find ways to implement the new legislation, executive orders, treaties, and other programs the planners have prepared and assigned for him to achieve. The transformation is continual. Each president has a greater task than the one before him, because of compounding the load. The people will not welcome the thought that all of our presidents since the U.S. signed onto the United Nations Charter have become “administrators of global government” — but it is true!

Our brightest students in schools have been trained to think the opposite of realism! Big business and big government envision a future for themselves, which requires a serfdom below to support and glorify them. Parents end up befuddled when they see how their “educated” children think!

Now do you wonder why so many alterations have been made, destroying the original concept of how our true government and no one has been called to account? Why has George H. Bush not been called to account for his participation? Why didn’t someone in one of the recent Congresses object? Why not one of the governors? Why didn’t our own police officers call it unconstitutional when Bush openly called for a new system of government — an international system? Someone has to answer for this!

Ever since this nation was formed, a sharp line had always existed — a sharp line that for 200 years had always wisely kept the civilian law enforcement separated from the military, but when the Homeland Security “Agency” was instituted by Pres. George H. Bush’s son (Pres. George W. Bush), a massive change in the concept of operation of this nation transpired: Operation of the country under a military government came into being with the creation and installation of the Homeland Security Agency! It crossed over the line, and the merger of the military with the civilian law enforcement system under one head began, a circumstance desired for the fulfillment of Public Law 87-297.* This merger then provided the “force to preserve internal order” (as required on Page 3 of the little blue book, State Department Publication #7277 — “Freedom From War”).

The essential sharp line so necessary that once separated the military from the civilian law enforcement has not only been eliminated, there has been enough public outcry! This merger is never done in a republic if it is to remain a republic! Once accepted by a republic, its people are henceforth prepared for rule under a dictatorship. Instantly, the military government which is set in place changes all its former values! The indispensable Constitutional principles that formed us into a republic have been disposed of! And there is little more than a whimper because the great majority has been listening to the false patriotic statements being made by their high-ranking public officials. The bottom line reads: “This nation has been revamped so that it is now in accord with military concepts on a regional (international) basis.” As a result, every policeman in the United States, all the way down to the last beat officer, is now federalized and he is now ‘on line’

---

8 “We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order, a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real chance at this new world order: an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.’s founders.” — George H. Bush, 1-17-91

* Public Law 87-297 reads as follows: “Definitions: Sec. 3. As used in this Act— (a) The terms “arms control” and “disarmament” mean the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination, of armed forces and armaments of all kinds under international agreement including the necessary steps taken under such an agreement to establish an effective system of international control, or to create and strengthen international organizations for the maintenance of peace.” The attending policy book from the State Department is even more explicit. On Page 3 of Publication 7277 it states: “The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force”.
with the federal Homeland Security “Agency”, ready for military command. Someone has to answer for this!

Did you know that the federal administration has used the people’s tax money to pay for the construction of a “World-Wide Military Command and Control System” (W.W.M.C.C.S.)? This was built at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology – Research Engineering Department. It shows how far the goals of Public Law 87-297 have been carried. Funding for the W.W.M.C.C.S began during the Nixon administration. In 1997 the United Nations put out a strong appeal to use our American civilian law enforcement systems to be a part of its World-Wide Rapid Response Mechanism for unified international command and control. In 2006 Kofi Annan is seeking this again and is also preparing a program intent upon getting the guns away from the American citizens.

George W. Bush has gotten by with instituting the Homeland Security “Agency” by claiming it was essential to deal with terrorists, but in all actuality, he moved the United States from being a government of the people, by the people and for the people under the massive global communitarian dictatorship! He appointed the director of this “agency”, someone who is not responsible to the people.

Currently, Bush has the nerve to appeal to the nation’s religious practitioners to help control the people, to keep the peace when martial rule is put into effect. The churches are to instruct the people to obey the government. Will it be an order to turn in all weapons, or to take the chip in the hand, or submit to a forced vaccination that could include a chip?

Apparently, members of our local law enforcement systems do not know that it is against the law for local police departments to be commandeered and controlled by the federal government! They do not know that being placed under the Homeland Security “Agency” (H.S.A.) was done for international management purposes. The H.S.A. is the force required to preserve internal order referred to in the State Dept. Publication #7277 -- the policy book that accompanies Public Law 87-297. Police officers do not know that they are now being trained in Soviet tactics. Review the article Uncle Sam showed you by a San Diego detective, Phillip Worts on how the police are being sovietized. Our police officers have an obligation to us, the law-abiding people of the United States, not to an international government! Law enforcement didn’t understand the consequences of this unconstitutional activity any more than they reasoned out the Soviet-American Police Exchange Program, but someone has to answer for this!

Civilian law enforcement is a prerogative belonging exclusively to a state! It is unlawful for the federal government to encroach upon the powers that belong to your state! Even worse is that our police officers apparently do not understand how these alterations being made in the government system will affect them personally. Their own families will suffer. They do not know that this “agency" is not responsible to the electorate! Their orders will come directly from the federal government! This is reprehensible!

How many police officers or chiefs ever questioned why they were federalized? Every police officer should know that it is bad enough for the federal government to usurp from the state its authority over its own law enforcement system, but didn’t they ‘smell a rat’ (as Patrick Henry would say) when they were merged with the military under one agency head? Why didn’t they see the consequence of this revision?

If we had continued the Constitutional system as was established by the founding fathers, such vandalism would never have gained so large a foothold in our government. We must demand restoration of the “enrolled militia” of the whole people. Today the people lack a unified protective
system, such as that which would be present if the "enrolled militia" were in operation, providing them with proper organized training, adequate to defend the nation. Even nuclear wars end up with ground troops coming in to take command of the territory. If a nuclear bomb or two get dropped on the U.S. our own people will be told to huddle in their homes. Great defense for the land of the free and the home of the brave!

We should have been spending the money on a properly trained citizen militia system instead of spending the money on the expensive maintenance of the United Nations and all its subversive global government planning. Now we face the U.N.'s NAFTA treaty idea, which is openly the cause for dissolving the borders between our nation and Mexico and Canada. This has caused the Security and Prosperity Partnership to begin the process of eliminating not only our national borders, but the borders of our states as well will dwindle away as a new political system takes effect — a long ago desired milestone of the globalists. The United Nations Charter never was a 'treaty'. From the onset it was a parasitic constitution conceived to unravel the American Constitutional system.

We need to restore the proper interpretation of the Second Amendment as George Washington and his staff demonstrated it. He took the farmers out and taught them the meaning of a well-regulated militia. Every able-bodied man was ordered to be trained to arms for the defense of the republic. Only those persons who could pass the test by two practicing surgeons were excused from annual militia duty. Every man's name was turned over to a Brigade Inspector for what was called the "enrolled militia". Each man was required to spend a couple of weeks every year in training with firearms. Each man paid 50 cents to cover costs of the citizen procedure, and the people took their arms home with them as they left. Each man was trained in proficiency with arms. He was expected to be a citizen soldier, ready to be an immediate defender of the republic against tyranny, sedition or invasion. These men did not wear uniforms, but they were all citizen-guardians of the nation's liberty on immediate call. As a matter of fact, Washington won the War for Independence with the militia of his day.

The closest thing we have today is the Minutemen. They are indispensable! These are brave men who have sprung into action, caused by spontaneous natural emotions, the heartfelt reaction by men of our day to defend their families and their country. The militia of the Second Amendment is not the national or state guard. It is the whole people. The militia written into the Charter George Washington signed, has a different function than the militia as written into the Second Amendment. The militia, which is referred to in the 1789 Constitution, protects us from danger from insurrection or foreign invasion. The militia referred to in the Second Amendment gives support in this regard also, but its primary purpose is to protect the people from danger caused by sedition or treasonous acts of government.

George W. Bush's opinion that the Minutemen are 'vigilantes' is wrong! His globalist opinions render him an improper criterion upon which to base conclusions. He is guilty of slander. Bill Clinton is also guilty as he, too, has called the militia 'vigilantes'. The handlers of the presidents (those who write their speeches) put them up to this! The Minutemen, who are protecting our

---

[88] Leonard B. Wood, a State Department geographer in 1992 said: "What we're dealing with is the re-creation of countries." The countries that emerge from the process may bear little resemblance to today's states. For example, many states won't have armies, only police. We are told that a stratified system of governance and power is likely to replace traditional states. "At the top will be a stronger United Nations or an equivalent body responsible for peace, environment and other global issues," explained Julian Minshie, an American geographer and U.S. representative to the IGU commission on the World Political Map. Minshie also said: "The notion of boundaries as we've known them, in terms of absolute sovereignty and localities, will in time dwindle." The Geenberg map entitled the "New World Moral Order" showed all borders erased from Canada to Panama and re-named as the United States of America. It included Greenland and Iceland.
borders, are upsetting Bush's plans to eliminate our national borders, because Bush has signed the Security and Prosperity Partnership agreement in 2005 which calls for a free flow of persons over the borders of the three nations: USA, Mexico, and Canada.

The drive by the United States to force a "new world order" upon the world has caused us to have many enemies throughout the world. We are more in danger of being attacked. There never was a greater time for re-instituting the militia of the whole people. How long can we allow this deficiency to continue before we will no longer be able to protect ourselves? Question: Where did the United Nations get the idea to move in and ban our guns? Think reality, folks! When a foreign organization starts talking like that, it is time to shape up your own country's defenses! Does George W. Bush think it is good to impose martial law in such a situation? Will he then suspend the Constitution and call in all the guns himself? Someone has to explain how these statements all fit together! Meanwhile, we need to prevent martial law from being imposed.

David Davis (1815-1886) U.S. Supreme Court Justice, Ex Parte Milligan, 4 Wallace 2 (1866) said:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity upon which it is based is false, for the government within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it, which are necessary to preserve its existence; as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority."

Yet, strange things happen in Washington, D.C. An effort to repeal the Second Amendment (another impossible dream) has already been attempted! Reptr. Major Owens (N.Y.) once introduced legislation calling for the 'repeal' of the Second Amendment! Owens' legislation did not get support to pass it as 'law', and it should not, because he should have known that the Bill of Rights is not subject to repeal! That's why a Bill of Rights was chosen in the first place to store our precious endowments from the Creator. The Bill of Rights is higher law than the rest of the Constitution. It is a sacred palladium. The Founding Fathers knew that! They knew what they were doing! They outsmarted future seditionists when they moved from "We the states..." to "We, the people..." James Madison made that move on the 9th day of the Convention with Resolution #15 so that protection would extend to a more broad range.

Did you know that the federal administration has used the people's tax money to pay for the construction of a "World-Wide Military Command and Control System" (W.W.M.C.C.S.)? This was beginning to be built at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology – Research Engineering Department about 30 years ago. It shows how extensive the goals and connections are of Public Law 87-297! Funding for the W.W.M.C.C.S began during the Nixon administration. In 1997 the United Nations put out a strong appeal to use our American civilian law enforcement systems to be a part of its World-Wide Rapid Response Mechanism for a unified international command and control. Again in 2006 the U.N. under Kofi Annan is seeking use of our law enforcement systems for use by the U.N.

The 10 Federal Standard Regions over our 50 states which President Richard M. Nixon signed into law with Executive Order 11647 were made co-terminous with the lines the United Nations drew to comply with global management. Nixon's action caused federal offices to be set up in each region to manage it. The facts speak for themselves: It indicates the federal administration agrees with
the globalists who want our 50 states and the system provided for us by our nation's founders to exist — no more! Now they dare to call the people their "human resources". Should the federal
government be allowed to cultivate this type of attitude toward us? Is it the kind of world we want
to leave to our children?

George W. Bush will not admit that the pitch he makes for "peace" and "freedom" were set for
him by John F. Kennedy, who signed the umbrella disarmament law (Public Law 87-297). On
September 26, 1961 the day following John Kennedy's speech before the United Nations JFK signed
P.L. 87-297. In addition to the General and Complete Disarmament, this law is responsible for the
Base Realignment and Closing Commission (B.R.A.C.), which has been closing down some of our
most critical military bases. No approval was ever obtained for this Commission to be appointed.
What is left from the closings constitutes the future use by the U.N. World Army on American soil!

Despite the objections of the American people to the downgrading of American preparedness, in
2005 George W. Bush ordered another round of U.S. military bases to be shut down. Bush ordered
nearly two dozen major military bases and a half dozen military institutions essential to the defense
of the nation to be shut down via this last negotiations with his Base Realignment and Closing
Commission — (B.R.A.C.). He defended the action claiming that such closures were saving the
nation billions of dollars! The truth is that these closures are referred to in Freedom From War —
The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World — (State
Department Publication #7277) See Pages 9 and 10 in the little Blue Book. 11

Reduction of military bases and facilities is also reported in the Blueprint for the Peace Race. (Refer
to Pages 26 and 31 of your booklet, Stages II and III. How safe will you be when we have no
national military of our own, and our only bases will be those the world army occupies? The
Constitution requires us to have a national defense, so isn't this blatantly against the law? Where is
the authority for any administration to give away our armed forces and close essential military
bases? There is none! Where is the outcry from those who are responsible for maintaining the law
of this country? Someone has to answer for this!

You will also find on Page 19 of "Freedom From War — The United States Program for General and
Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" — (State Department Publication #7277) the following
statement:

(There will be) "progressive controlled disarmament and continuously
developing principles and procedures of international law (which) would
proceed to a point where no state (country) would have the military power
to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force...."

As you view these booklets, you will see more clearly that when George W. Bush refers to "peace" —
it is the "peace" described in these General and Complete Disarmament publications. How insane

11 To find “Freedom from War - The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a
Peaceful World” in the Internet, go to:  http://www.makenew.com/pub7277.html
To find “The Blue Print for the Peace race”, go to:
http://www.aftercapitalism/Blueprint_for_the_Peace_Race.pdf
Ask your local police officer to join you in an Internet search of Public Law 87-297 by using the following sites:

Section 2551 – http://assemblers.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode22/sec_22_00002551-000.html
Public Law 87-297 — Title 22 Section 2552 –
http://assemblers.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode22/sec_22_00002552-000.html
Public Law 87-297 Title 22 Section 2571 –
are we supposed to become? This is really not “peace”! According to some of the world troop maps, the armed forces which are scheduled to “secure internal order” for us in the U.S. very easily can be troops from foreign nations we once trained on our own soil.

It is an unwise and foolish future, which George W. Bush is promoting for Americans, as he speaks, selling us “peace” and “freedom” in his televised speeches. This type of “peace” and “freedom” is not what Americans want or need! Some people are taken in by the sophistry that Bush uses, not understanding that his words have double meanings. He has no problem telling untruths! These things should be pointed out to your local police departments so that the police officers may begin to put the pieces together.

Geographers working in the nation’s State Department are admitting that certain treaties such as NAFTA, CAFTA, GATT, etc. are expected to erase our national boundary lines. Is there any wonder why George Bush doesn’t get excited about the runaway condition on our borders?

Another thing you should know: Back in the early seventies, there was a report ordered called the Houlihan Report. The full title of the report was known as: “The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform”. It was done to support then-Governor Ronald Reagan’s rush to eliminate California’s 58 counties and replace them with “regional government” entities. As governor, Reagan was in favor of making the ‘change’ from counties into regional organizations. He was unsuccessful in trying to persuade county supervisors to give up their current structure and combine into large regional government units. Hence, the Houlihan Report was written to help guide or force the counties to adopt “regions”.

The Report listed 5 methods in which to bring about a change in a government. The cost of the study was roughly $300,000.00, which was paid by California taxpayers without their knowledge. The Report was not written for the use of the public. Oh, no! It was not meant to be seen by the public! It listed 5 ways (that were time-tested ways) which would influence people to desire and adopt a different form of government. Here are the 5 ways it summarized that could be used:

1. A collapse of government’s ability to provide needed services;
2. A crisis of major magnitude;
3. A catastrophe that has a physical effect on the community;
4. The corruption of local officials; and
5. The high cost of government and the desire for a higher level of services.

During the same time period, Reagan paid another large sum to Robert Hawkins to conduct a study of the feasibility of converting California counties into regions (U.N. regions). Reagan, flashing his best movie role smile, declared that California’s government was a “horse and buggy” government; that it needed to be streamlined, updated, and made efficient. Hawkins undertook the study and when Hawkins finished his summary study, and submitted the Study findings, it declared the opposite of what Reagan had said about California’s government! The Report and the findings were printed in the California Journal about 1974.

Hawkins Task Force Report stated that: California’s government was not unplanned, not uncoordinated, not inefficient or uneconomical, as Reagan had charged. Hawkins summarized ten findings in his report to show that California’s present county system was superior to the regional government system that Reagan wanted! Hawkins summarized: “...the findings, and recommendations that come from them (the findings), had a common thread — letting people at the lowest level make their own decisions.” This was a very important victory for the defenders of the state. County regionalization was meant to get the groundwork rolling for eventual elimination of city, county and state borders. The statement regarding the findings, made by Hawkins — is a
major point to apply to the dream that other ‘planners’ are involved in, building their new world order. “The best government is where people at the lowest level make their own decisions.”

The one world government is bound to be a fiasco! Before they are allowed to launch the world under such an impossible dream, this important factor has to be realized: World government—one government over the whole world—is just too damned big! I could add many other reasons why one government over the world will not work! Elsewhere, you will find some other reasons on Patrick Henry’s list. Even with all that inductive stuff they sneaked in from Hitler’s regime, a world government is still going to be a fiasco!

When Reagan became president, he signed Treaty 97-19, the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), to foster the industrialization of developing countries, “to deal with the problems of development in an increasingly interdependent world”, it said. The objective was to establish a new international economic order over the world. That treaty placed the United States on the list of being a nation willing to participate in a new international “economic and social order”. It was the foundation for NAFTA, etc. It meant a new government! Where did Reagan get the authority to sign that treaty, or to agree to replace the United States Constitution with a global government? Incidentally, Reagan also signed an Executive Order for the creation of a “Courts-Martial” Manual (continued on by later presidents). This Manual will be put to use and operate the judicial system when martial law comes into effect.

Lyndon Baines Johnson promoted “The Great Society” (to take from the “haves” and give to the “have not’s”). He called it a more ‘orderly world’. The same as every other president, he worked on the Disarmament Law, Human Rights Treaties, etc. Presidents James Carter and William Clinton both dealt prominently with the Human Rights Treaties in addition to carrying the load forward from other presidents’ milestones. These are communitarian lifestyle documents. Refer to Clinton’s Executive Order 13107, Implementation of Human Rights Treaties. These “treaties” did not include owning a gun! As a matter of fact, one of the global constitutions states: “No person may possess a lethal weapon...” The whole nation was slowly drawn under, and revamped decade after decade by those who occupied the Oval office. Someone has to answer for this!

Gerald Ford will be remembered for having chosen Nelson A. Rockefeller to be his vice-president! Ford was an appointed person who assumed the presidency after Richard Nixon was forced out. One time he chastised the nation saying “...don’t ever criticize that office - the office of the president!” It was a ‘standard’ that was put up to guard against any awareness or suspicion that sedition could be centered in the office of the president, when in truth, the Oval office has been the headquarters of the Cavalcade Of Conquest by Every President Since the League of Nation Days!

Some other catastrophes now facing Americans are the devaluation of our currency; runaway inflation; the bankrupt condition of our cities and states; unrestricted immigration without quota limitations; hiring of illegal immigrants who have increased the cost of medical care up to 50 billion dollars while stealing jobs from citizens; the Aztlán threat to seize the south/western American states; the importation and addiction of people to illegal drugs; outsourcing of jobs; high cost of housing; big business corporations deserting the U.S. and moving to foreign countries; giving away American technology to Communist countries; the exhausting cost of wars on too many fronts; large scale weather tragedies such as Katrina, etc. To what extent have these situations been magnified on the drafting boards of global minded legislators?

If the various unconstitutional situations being reported here were part of a movie scenario, it could be dismissed as foolish entertainment, but what is being documented here are truly serious happenings that are being planned or have been instituted by our own government officials, the purpose of which is to break down our rightful government!
Every president (since the United Nations Charter was unconstitutionally accepted on the grounds of being a “treaty”) has been planning the overthrow of our Constitutional government. Ever since we became members of the United Nations organization, we have been losing our wealth, our economic integrity, our rights, our safeguards, our independence, our sovereignty, and our proper form of government! The federal government bought compliance of state representatives for socialist programming by promising local governments that they would receive “revenue sharing” money. These were the same dollars the federal government had taken from the people in the first place, via IRS 1040 tax money. So what did they have to “share”? When the people’s own IRS 1040 tax money (which should have stayed locally) did come back as “revenue sharing money,” it was loaded with so many federal strings, and mandated elements, it caused changes in the state’s operational concepts and policies, and made the states subservient to the federal government.

In order for the states to qualify for funds (receiving their own people’s money back) first, they had to submit to being “regionalized.” That included approval by the federal government of a “General Plan,” for which the states received some planning grant money to produce. Then came the “federally-ordered-and-mandated-socialist-programs,” which the states had to maintain. They had to surrender control over their own local governments (subdivisions, counties and cities) to satisfy requirements of the federal government. This caused massive damage to the Tenth Amendment, and to the Check and Balance System as well.

Teachers were trained to holler and teach: Change! Change! Change! Licentiousness sprang up all over and was made acceptable. Some constitutionally loyal legislators like California’s Floyd Wakefield, Louisiana’s John Rarick, and Ohio’s John Ashbrook made great efforts to stop what was happening, but there were not enough other loyal public officials left in office to give them adequate support. Most others had joined P.A.C.H. or A.C.I.R. and were obligated to the Rockefellers.

The people in general have been put to sleep by their own representatives who followed Charles Merriam’s tactics. If we had had more constitutional governors like Ralph Carr through the years, the federal government would not have been able to bamboozle the states and usurp their powers. The trouble with governors since then is that they have become members of the Rockefeller organizations. The Rockefellers gave Charles E. Merriam 8 million dollars in the ’30’s to organize the Public Administration Clearing House (P.A.C.H.) which influences and controls decisions and performances of elected public officials. They gave another 8 million to buy land to erect the U.N. building. The Governor’s Conference, the National Conference of State Legislatures, City Manager’s Association, American Society of Planners, Mayor’s Conferences, Supervisor’s Associations, League of Cities, are all Rockefeller controlled P.A.C.H. groups. They get “advised” as to what legislation to support, or oppose; or to introduce under their own name by adding a Bill Number to pre-written legislation (adjusting for the ‘change”). The “Metro Chart” by Jo Hindman gives you an insight into the parasitic organization that has taken over our representative system. You must realize that your republic (representative government) is only 10% in operation, and the other 90% of the system is under the guidance of Merriam’s democracy and the groups that practice under it: A.C.I.R., P.A.C.H., C.F.R. etc., etc. Be sure to review Jo Hindman’s Metro Chart.

The purpose of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (A.C.I.R.) has been to write the laws that P.A.C.H. public officials use to convert our nation into a global government. A.C.I.R. is known as the “law-making factory” and is Rockefeller controlled. Merriam’s P.A.C.H. links in with A.C.I.R. Public officials can get any sort of legislation from A.C.I.R. Its Commission is composed of members of the federal Senate, House of Representatives, Executive Branch Officers, Governors, Mayors, State Legislators, and elected County Officials, which lend prestige to it. P.A.C.H. public officials take A.C.I.R. written legislation and introduce it as their own idea. A.C.I.R. was instituted in 1959 by a bill signed by Pres. Dwight D. Eisenhower. P.A.C.H. & A.C.I.R. caused power belonging to states and local governments, to be consolidated on the federal level.
Did you get the connection when you looked on the back of Public Law 101-216, the disarmament law George H. Bush signed into law in December 1989, and saw how the House of Representatives voted? It was only a 3½ Page bill so no one could be excused for betraying us because of the bill’s length. Our so-called representatives got told to vote it in! On April 30, 1992 George H. Bush signed Executive Order 12803, that allows any U.S. infrastructure to be sold or leased into private hands (even into foreign ownership or control). The president also gets told what to do (See below).

Mary Davison once wrote a warning in her column, exposing the method by which the United States Constitution could be written off, thus eliminating the whole Constitutional system of government via the Department of Peace. The previous Department of Peace legislation, (once unsuccessfully carried by Senator Vance Hartke in 1970), has been revived (but is still in a committee). Reviving it in recent years was done by federal representative, Dennis Kucinich of Ohio. His legislation is called the Department of Peace and was drafted in July 2001, 107th Congress, 1st Session, listed then as H.R. 2459. H.R. 2459 awaits future passage, and possibly a number of changes. Davison explained the potential for the Secretary of State to officially sign away this nation by merging it totally under the United Nations global government system and to formalize the end of the United States government. Who do you suppose wrote Denain* H.R.2459?

Think on this: Under full globalism, all salaries will be determined by the government. Everyone will be told where he or she can work and where he or she can live. There will be no private ownership of land! Appointees will rule, and there will no longer be elections. It will be, of necessity, a militarized government: an iron hand! People will not be able to recall or vote out new world order public officials, because it is an appointive regional system! The new world order officials will have more power over our private lives than any of our former public officials ever had! A world religion will replace your right to choose your own religion! Euthanasia will be in government hands! The chip in your hand will hold your history as the government wants it to

---

12 In December 1989, Geo H. Bush signed Public Law 101-216, which gave almost word for word, the same definition of disarmament as the first disarmament law. It states on Page 3:

"(2) as defined in this Act, the terms ‘arms control’ and ‘disarmament’ mean ‘the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination, of armed forces and armaments of all kinds under international agreement to establish an effective system of international control’.

13 Executive Order 12803 dated April 30, 1992 reads as follows: “By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to ensure that the United States achieves the most beneficial economic use of its resources, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Definitions. For purposes of this order: (a) “Privatization” means the disposition or transfer of an infrastructure asset, such as by sale or by long-term lease, from a State or local government to a private party.

(b) “Infrastructure asset” means any asset financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government and needed for the functioning of the economy. Examples of such assets include, but are not limited to: roads, tunnels, bridges, electricity supply facilities, mass transit, rail transportation, airports, ports, waterways, water supply facilities, recycling and wastewater treatment facilities, solid waste disposal facilities, housing, schools, prisons, and hospitals.

14 Mary Davison was the head of the “Council for Statehood” (Florida based). She was an expert on the United Nations. In 1970 she put out a warning that a mechanism was being set up for transferring U.S. government powers. It read: “Legislation is pending to merge the executive branch of the federal government with the United Nations through an all-powerful cabinet post to be known as the Department of Peace.” “The theory is that the U.S. will be involved in war after war until we bow meekly to one world tyranny as a way out. Under the proposed legislation, carried by Senator Vance Hartke and Congressman Halpern, the functions, powers and duties of the Secretary of State and the Department of State will be transferred to the Department of Peace,” reported Davison. “The President may transfer to the Secretary of Peace any function of any other agency or office or part of any agency or office in the Executive Branch to the Department of Peace.” Davison’s prediction is that this will result in a merger of the United Nations and the Department of Peace. Recently, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been transferred to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice who has announced recently that her intention is to effect changes to refocus the Department on the President’s mission to promote “democracy.”
read! It will be a checkless, cashless society! You may be refused the right to own an automobile! Check out life in China for a preview of things to come. Isn’t it better to stop all this while you can?

The City Police Departments and your local sheriff may some day come to realize how they have been manipulated. They may not accept your explanation right off as to how they fit in the new world order, or that their lack of understanding of our Constitutional system is to blame for the detriment we are now suffering, but as they have time to reason out the facts by the government documents which we have reported on here, they will have cause to reconcile their conscience with their patriotism. Police officers were meant to be our friends. If your City Police Department is sincere, and intent upon routing out lawbreakers, why have they joined in with the lawbreakers? Who remembers, or was ever taught, that Patrick Henry had warned that evil men could take over, and keep the people in utter ignorance, and gradually steal their liberty? Or that the president himself would lead in the treason? He also said, “Your laws on impeachment are a sham and a mockery due to mutual implication of government officials. When evil men take office the whole gang will be in collusion. They will keep the people in utter ignorance and steal their liberty by ambuscade.”

All three divisions of the federal government know of the move into a global government, and are members of some A.C.I.R./P.A.C.H. group. Most all of our state governors are co-operating with the transition. The globalists have stacked the deck from the top down for building a totalitarian form of government. We must decide whether we care enough about our heritage and our children — enough to form groups in every state that will speak out against this unlawful seizure of our nation, our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, our liberties and independence — and the heritage bequeathed to us by our forbears in the War for Independence. The legislatures have to take action on our behalf! Members of the state legislatures can’t refuse the pleas of the people to take a stand and maintain the existence of the state! The documentation you use has to be flawless.

The real seat of power is with the people on the local level. It is up to the police, the legislators, and the churches to address our grievance. A great American, Maureen Heaton once said: “When the older people have died, the younger people will be like putty in the hands of the manipulators.” They will be inexperienced and ignorant of the history and type of warfare we face. It is up to us now to protect our families and our country, and to instruct our children, and the generations that come thereafter, on the eternal need to be ever watchful against endless sedition and treason. We are justified in trying to protect our families and our American heritage from these dangers.

I have presented what appears to be the only peaceful and workable solution left for saving this nation. The solution has to come from an action controlled by the people themselves on the local level, and on state level, by putting up the lowest unified outcry ever in a call for justice and due process, demanding that the federal officials’ disguised new world order global government building activities be ended! You can see that with Merriam’s formulas, the Rockefellers, and their fellow collaborators, redirected American government so it could be used to end itself and build a new world order in its place! Is your state legislature a member of P.A.C.H.’s National Conference of State Legislatures or a member of A.C.I.R.? If so, they need to be held to answer for this!

Americans were meant to be the last to wake up, because they were to be used to finance the venture. It was meant that they would not awaken until the gates had been slammed closed on them. They were to also be fully disarmed at that point. Then it would no longer matter what the people knew! Besides, they think their progress is such that you can’t stop them, but that is not true! The Constitution is still the property of the people and the people have never given their informed consent to abandoning it! One of the two systems operating in this country has got to go, and it should not be the rightful 1789 Constitution! There never was any consent of the governed to abandon it. Non-laws are not laws! The Constitution is still supreme law of this land!
Senator William E. Jenner was one of the loyal men in the federal legislature who reported to the people what was happening to them. He made great speeches in the 50's and the 60's against the drive toward world government, and he woke up many people, but the slow subtle changes, which were occurring at that time, were not enough to rouse people and convince them as to how serious the threat was. Not all the globalizing legislation had been passed at that time. Today you have the benefit of so much more adequate documentation to prove it. There is no excuse now for people not to understand what is happening to their country.

The old adage: “Let the buyer beware!” strikes me! As a nation we, the people, never bought into a new world order, but our public officials sure did! The changes made in the system were given false covers disguised as Constitutional actions, which we never consented to at all! All the years of using Charles E. Merriam’s defrauding techniques must now be exposed! The new world order can be made to fizzle! All the administrators of global government who have defrauded us have done so under false pretenses, just as Merriam taught them to do! It is time to unmask all the presidents who came into office since Charles E. Merriam took control of our government, and since the United Nations came into being.

Ever since the United Nations Charter was accepted as a treaty, all of our presidents have betrayed us. Yes, all the way down to the P.A.C.H. trained city managers, and all the way up to George W. Bush. Bush is still trying to fool people with his “peace” and “freedom” and persuasive smile. Actually, it is Bush who is causing wars to happen (for enforcement of the Disarmament Law), and making our own people hated all over the globe.

One last word of warning! Many false and dangerous excuses are being used to pass a constitutional amendment with a cover that appeals to the unjusified general public. The deviousness behind this action is that the amendment can be used to move the whole thing, the whole effort, under a convention – a constitutional convention. During a “convention” the 1789 Constitution can be ‘officially’ opened up and a global government constitution can be inserted in its place! There would be two constitutional actions taken by the new world order gangs: One - to formally declare the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights as a decedent and obsolete document; and Second - to put in place a global Constitution that would supersede the U.N. Charter.

The Charter has served as a blueprint for construction of a global system, but now they want a global Constitution for authoritative command and control which will supersede the working Charter. (The acquisition of a convention is their Ace card, which indications show they will push for before too long. Sort of like ‘putting the icing on the cake’). The push is on more than ever to get an amendment to achieve the fraudulent convention objective! We should guard against all excuses given ‘for the need’ to pass a constitutional amendment, innocent though it may seem!

Now you can see what Merriam meant by using the Constitutional system itself to bring in a (new world order) socialist government! It was once reported that George W. Bush was going to hold office when the final take-over happened. Bush still has to transform the social security and the federal income taxing system yet. When the time comes for this, he will have to close the national federal system and open up under an international federated world government system all at the same time. Since he has not made the progress that was expected in his administration, because of

[3] These excuses have been used for the supposed need of a Constitutional Amendment: Bricker Amendment; Term Limits Amendment; Spending Limits Amendment; Balance Budget Amendment; Tax Limitation Amendment; Pro-Life Protection of the Unborn Amendment; Prayer Amendment; Unlawful Treaties Amendment; Direct Democracy Act (Mike Gravel’s effort); Continuity of Government Act; Apportionment of Census Act; Pledge of Allegiance Act; Defense of Marriage Act; Flag Desecration Amendment (tried in 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003 and 2006. (The effort in June 2006 lost by only one vote in the Senate. The House of Representatives passed it in 2003.)
the long Iraq war, the powers that control our presidents may have to resort to using an upcoming successor! In that case, be warned how clever their next charlatan will be — to keep you fooled!

William E. Jenner¹⁹ left us this warning that we had better remember: “When they spring the trap, my friends, you will be helpless! You will have had it!” Jenner meant that if you waited too long, you would lose out against the time clock, and your chance to stop the fraud and sedition would have come and gone! The decisions would no longer be yours to make! It is time to say:

“We are tired of being regionalized, internationalized, militarized and mesmerized! Ladies and gentlemen of the new world order, please be advised that your masquerade is over!”

Folks, I have given you enough evidence, reason, and a method to be successful in standing against the ‘new world order’ and the predicament that is before you. You have some work to do, but at least you know where to begin. Unless you force your state house to admit to the Cavalcade of Presidential Betrayals, and the Rockefeller P.A.C.H./A.C.L.R. hammerlock on public officials, you will not be able to work a peaceful settlement of the problems of this country. Without stopping the mechanics of treason, you will sink as sure as the Titanic! The Circle of Hope could be a starter and a lifesaver! You have but a short time to make your peaceful stand: Sink or Swim!

Most sincerely,

Bernadene Smith
National Director, Second Amendment Committee

Attachments:

The Circle of Hope
The Four Resolves
Jo Hindman’s Metro Chart

Second Amendment Committee Post Office Box 1776 Hanford, California 93232

¹⁹ William E. Jenner: was a dedicated Constitutional federal Senator. Prior to World War II he served in the senate of the State of Indiana. He was injured in the war and upon his return was elected to take a seat in the federal Senate. After he saw the direction the government officials were taking the country, he made public appearances, such as speaking to groups like the Daughter of the American Revolution. He tried to tell the public in general what was going on. Too few tried to take action against what was happening. He died in 1985 with a saddened heart, reflecting upon his disappointment, as he described himself as a “weak reed in the wind” and “a lone voice crying in the wilderness”.

Permission to copy granted if no deletions or additions are added.
THE CIRCLE OF HOPE

There is no better advice I can give you than what worked at the time when FDR was stopped: "cut the globalists off at the pocketbook". Give this effort your support! Try to repeat the successful solution Governor Ralph Carr set into motion.

A guide line!
Here's how it would work:
(a) Reliable and documented information.
(b) A respected notable telling the shocking facts.
(c) Broad coverage including national news attention.
(d) An aroused public protesting super loudly and continually.
(e) Newspapers would have to report complaints and print about it.
(f) Demonstrations broadcasted and public then begins to connect the dots.
(g) Awareness reaches sufficient % of national population and word spreads.
(h) State Pressure brought to bear. Federal officials cannot refuse to cut off funding.
(i) Oustry sufficient. Demands continue from the public. Funding must be stopped.
(j) If needed, IRS1040 tax money is put in escrow. All funding of the federal government is stopped until they agree to repeal the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 and 1949.
(k) If the federal government refuses, the states are forced by the people to meet, draft proper legislation themselves, and mandates both United Nations Participation Acts as being repealed.
(l) The jig is up! The states hold the power to do this. There is no court review on a bill of repeal.
(m) Use the premier principle in international law to void the United States Membership in the United Nations: Rebus Sic Stantibus. The U.N. Charter was never a treaty as pretended.
(n) Use the ideas listed in "Four Resolves" to withhold salaries in accord with the Fourteenth Amendment. You have to cut them off at the pocketbook! There is no violence in using this method. It is a peaceful way to end the subversion. If the United States stops funding it, the United Nations would collapse. However, it is necessary that an official action be executed, which calls for the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 and 1949 to be rescinded, revoked, and repealed. Use Ron Paul's legislation H.R. 1146, 106th Congress, 1st Session. If Patrick Henry were here today, he would wind it up by asking: "Why stand we here idle?" Even if you are successful using this effort, the globalists will come back again and again. Generations in the future must stay on guard because sedition never ever ceases!
AMERICAN DECLARATION II
RESOLVES FOR THE
RESTORATION OF THE REPUBLIC

No. 1 - Resolved: None of the taxes or other funds received, held, or appropriated by the United States government, or any branch of the United States government, its agencies, or any affiliate thereto, including funds received from any private person, group, or foundation; and none of the taxes or other funds received, held, or appropriated by the government of a State, or any of its subdivisions, agencies, or any affiliate thereto, including funds received from any private person, group, or foundation, shall be expended to fund any person, group, political or non-political organization, national or international, directly or indirectly, which in any way advocates, promotes or engages in the continued installation, principle or doctrine of world government.

No. 2 - Resolved: No citizen of the United States is obligated to pay tax on any income, or sales transaction, or to contribute to any excise or other form of levy or taxation which can be used to benefit, promote or advance, directly or indirectly, the current implementation of world government.

No. 3 - Resolved: No person may receive a salary, nor continue to hold public office, on either the state or federal level of government who has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States who exercises that trust to initiate or support any action that contributes to the installation, maintenance, or continuance of the world government; or who is not in keeping with the principles and limitations set for public officials by the lawful government of the United States: the original Constitution of the United States of America.

No. 4 - Resolved: No person may continue to hold a public office on either the state or federal level of government who has taken the required Constitutional Oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States who uses that delegated power and trust to initiate or support actions that contribute to the desecration of the rights of the people under the 1791 Constitutional Bill of Rights.
This network, developed by the Rockefellers, to indoctrinate our public officials and redirect the course of American gov't. so it could be managed by global government.
WHY THE CHECK AND BALANCE SYSTEM FAILED

The Public Administration Clearing House (P.A.C.H.) at 1313 E. 6th Street in Chicago was organized under the direction of a socialist named Charles E. Merriam who was funded by the Rockefeller family. The purpose of the P.A.C.H. has always been to bring all public officials under one system of control as is evidenced by the Hindman Chart (reverse side).

The Rockefeller family provided 8 million dollars in the thirties to establish this clearing house so that they could control the indoctrination of state-wide public officials, and persuade them as to the direction they ought to pursue, all the while, rendering themselves submissive to the consolidated power building up in Washington, D.C.

Merriam authored a book which was published in 1941 entitled: On The Agenda Of Democracy. In his book, Merriam defines democracy. It is what is also known as communism! He said that revolution was "the old way...the new way is education, persuasion, participation, and cooperation". He taught how to achieve communism:

"Fortunately, our Constitution is broad enough in its terms, flexible enough in its spirit, and capable of liberal enough interpretation by the judiciary to permit the adaptation of democracy to changing conditions without serious difficulty."

"Legislative bodies are incompetent, it may be said, or corrupt, or dilatory, or unrepresentative of the general interest of the community."

"The elective process is not favorable to the choice of the leaders of the community."

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (A.C.I.R.) was grafted onto the federal government in 1959. Its duty was to draft legislation to be handed to public officials all over the nation. These were called "slip bills". Public officials were thus expected to get whatever was handed to them -- passed into law! This made the public officials look like great thinkers to the folks back home! A.C.I.R. thus became the nation's law-making factory. In this manner unified laws were passed that took over. Gradual consolidation of all power and control was then achieved by public officials in Wash., D.C.

The governors also became members of P.A.C.H. and A.C.I.R. Their indoctrination and co-ordination for a "new world order" comes by their attendance at the annual "Governor's Conferences". Elections have been engineered so that those who will co-operate (with the desired power and other structural changes being sought to alter American Constitutional government) get heavily financed and then moved into key positions of elected office.

During the seventies, all local control was moved to the federal level by persuading local and state officials to accept federal revenue sharing funds and to adopt "general plans" for cities and communities. These must comply with the federal mandates set down for socialism and centralized control. Having achieved the objective of acquiring all control over every aspect of American government, including people, land, armed forces, etc., the federal government has devised ways by which it now transfers (what it has formerly consolidated unto itself) to the United Nations through purposed "treaties" to empower the United Nations to have complete control over the "New World Order" government. Included in the plan is gradual abolishment of states, cities, counties and land ownership. The nation's governors quietly co-operate in the planned arrangement for the dissolution of the very states they were elected to "preserve, protect, and defend." State officials were supposed to keep the federal system in check! They have actually joined in the subterfuge!
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United Nations Participation Act, December 20, 1945

see also Amendment of United Nations Participation Act, October 10, 1949

AN ACT To provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United Nations Participation Act of 1945".

SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary, shall receive annual compensation of $20,000, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council who shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, shall receive annual compensation of $12,000, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of the representative.

(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative. Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to
receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period as the President may specify, except that no member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under this subsection as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed $12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified meeting thereof in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified meeting of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The advice and consent of the Senate shall also be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

SEC. 3. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 4. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United
States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service
Amendment of United Nations Participation Act, October 10, 1949

AN ACT To amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative and a deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations, both of whom shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative and deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as United States representative on any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of both the representative and the deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations.

"(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative.

"(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he
may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representative and deputy representatives appointed under section 2: (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter. The advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of such Act is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(f) All persons appointed in pursuance of authority contained in this section shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress) for chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsections (c) and (d) of this section as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 5 of such Act is hereby amended by inserting "or aircraft," after "or vehicle,"

SEC. 4. The proviso in section 6 of such Act is hereby amended by inserting after "That" the following: ", except as authorized in section 7 of this Act,"

SEC. 5. Such Act is hereby amended by inserting after section 6 the following new section:
"SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President, upon his request by the United Nations for cooperative action, and to the extent that he finds that it is consistent with the national interest to comply with such request, may authorize, in support of such activities of the United Nations as are specifically directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes and not involving the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter-

"(1) the detail to the United Nations, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine, of personnel of the armed forces of the United States to serve as observers, guards, or in any noncombatant capacity, but in no event shall more than a total of one thousand of such personnel be so detailed at any one time: Provided, That while so detailed, such personnel shall be considered for all purposes as acting in the line of duty, including the receipt of pay and allowances as personnel of the armed forces of the United States, credit for longevity and retirement, and all other perquisites appertaining to such duty: Provided further, That upon authorization or approval it the President, such personnel may accept directly from the United Nations (a) any or all of the allowances or perquisites to which they are entitled under the first proviso hereof, and (b) extraordinary expenses and perquisites incident to such detail;

"(2) the furnishing of facilities, services, or other assistance and the loan of the agreed fair share of the United States of any supplies and equipment to the United Nations by the National Military Establishment, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine;

"(3) the obligation, insofar as necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, of any funds appropriated to the National Military Establishment or any department therein, the procurement of such personnel, supplies, equipment, facilities, services, or other assistance as may be made available in accordance with the request of the United Nations, and the replacement of such items, when necessary, where they are furnished from stocks.

"(b) Whenever personnel or assistance is made available pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section, the President shall require reimbursement from the United Nations for the expense thereby incurred by the United States: Provided, That in exceptional circumstances, or when the President finds it to be in the national interest, he may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement of such reimbursement: Provided further, That when any such reimbursement is made, it shall be credited, at the option of the appropriate department of the National Military Establishment, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the purposes for which expenditures were made.
(c) In addition to the authorization of appropriations to the Department of State contained in section 8 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Military Establishment, or any department therein, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse such Establishment or department in the event that reimbursement from the United Nations is waived in whole or in part pursuant to authority contained in subsection (b) of this section.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

SEC. 6. Section 7 of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the Act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); cost-of-living allowances for personnel stationed abroad under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communications services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; rent of offices; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); allowances and expenses as provided in section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress), and allowances and expenses equivalent to those provided in section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress); the lease or rental (for periods not exceeding ten years) of living quarters for the use of the representative of the United States to the United Nations referred to in paragraph (a) of section 2 hereof, the cost of installation and use of telephones in the same manner as telephone service is provided for use of the Foreign Service pursuant to the Act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U. S. C. 679), and the allotment of funds similar to the allotment authorized by section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, for unusual expenses incident to the operation and
maintenance of such living quarters, to be accounted for in accordance with section 903 of said Act; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5)."

Source:
A Decade of American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1941-49
Prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
By the Staff of the Committee and the Department of State.
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To end membership of the United States in the United Nations.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A BILL

To end membership of the United States in the United Nations.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the 'American Sovereignty Restoration Act of 1999'.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT.

(a) REPEAL- The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (Public Law 79-264, 22 U.S.C. 287-287e) is repealed.

(b) TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS - The President shall terminate all participation by the United States in the United Nations, and any organ, specialized agency, commission or other formally affiliated body of the United Nations.

(c) CLOSURE OF UNITED STATES MISSION TO UNITED NATIONS - The United States Mission to the United Nations is closed. Any remaining functions of such office shall not be carried out.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT ACT.

(a) REPEAL- The United Nations Headquarters Agreement Act (Public Law 80-357) is repealed.

(b) WITHDRAWAL- The United States withdraws from the agreement between the United States and the United Nations regarding the headquarters of the United Nations (signed at Lake Success, New York, on June 26, 1947, which was brought into effect by the United Nations Headquarters Agreement Act).

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES ASSESSED AND VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) TERMINATION- No funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for assessed or voluntary contributions of the United States to the United Nations or any organ, specialized agency, commission or other formally affiliated body thereof, except that funds may be appropriated to facilitate withdrawal of United States personnel and equipment. Upon termination of United States membership, no payments shall be made to the United Nations or any organ, specialized agency, commission or other formally affiliated body thereof, out of any
funds appropriated prior to such termination or out of any other funds available for such purposes.

(b) APPLICATION- The provisions of this section shall apply to all agencies of the United Nations, including independent or voluntary agencies.

SEC. 5. UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) TERMINATION- No funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any United States contribution to any United Nations military operation.
(b) TERMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS- No funds may be obligated or expended to support the participation of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States as part of any United Nations military or peacekeeping operation or force. No member of the Armed Forces of the United States may serve under the command of the United Nations.

SEC. 6. WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED NATIONS PRESENCE IN FACILITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND REPEAL OF DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY.

(a) WITHDRAWAL FROM UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROPERTY- The United Nations (including any affiliated agency of the United Nations) shall not occupy or use any property or facility of the United States Government.
(b) DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY- No officer or employee of the United Nations or any representative, officer, or employee of any mission to the United Nations of any foreign government shall be entitled to enjoy the privileges and immunities of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of April 18, 1961, nor may any such privileges and immunities be extended to any such individual. The privileges, exemptions and immunities provided for in the International Organizations Immunities Act of December 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 669; 22 U.S.C. 288, 288a-f), or in any agreement or treaty to which the United States is a party, including the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the United Nations and the United States of America Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations," signed June 26, 1947 (22 U.S.C. 287), and the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, entered into force with respect to the United States on April 29, 1970, (21 UST 1418; TIAS 6900; UNTS 16), shall not apply to the United Nations or any organ, specialized agency, commission or other formally affiliated body thereof, to the officers and employees of the United Nations, or any organ, specialized agency, commission or other formally affiliated body thereof, or to the families, suites or servants of such officers or employees.


SEC. 9. REPEAL OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION - The joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor," approved July 14, 1948 (22 U.S.C. 290, 290a-e-1) is repealed.
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SEC. 10 REPEAL OF INVOLVEMENT IN UNITED NATIONS CONVENTIONS AND AGREEMENTS - As of the date of enactment of this act, the United States will end any and all participation in any and all conventions and/or agreements with the United Nations and any organ, specialized agency, commission or other formally affiliated body thereof. Any remaining functions of such conventions and/or agreements shall not be carried out.

SEC. 11 - REEMPLOYMENT WITH UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AFTER SERVICE WITH AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the rights of employees under subchapter IV of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, relating to reemployment after service with an international organization.

SEC. 12 - NOTIFICATION

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall notify the United Nations and any organ, specialized agency, commission or other formally affiliated body of the United Nations of the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 13 - EFFECTIVE DATE

Except as otherwise provided, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.
Say!! Just WHO are the REAL anti-government extremists?

WE didn't write and pass laws* requiring the give-away of our entire armed forces on a permanent basis to foreign communist commanders under the United Nations leaving us a "zero" military!

WE didn't approve membership in that organization whose policy is that there can be no private ownership of land!

WE didn't authorize Washington, D.C. to federalize our police for purposes of creating a national police force to be used by the communist United Nations!

WE didn't approve of all our parks, rivers, and historical sites being placed under the custody of the United Nations!

WE didn't approve of a 'new world order*' which expects us to dissolve our American states and give up our national sovereignty!

WE didn't write Clinton's Executive Order #13107 in which he has pledged to substitute for our Bill of Rights a communist document called The Universal Declaration of Human Rights! WE always DID prefer the Constitution over any other form of government!

As a matter of fact, WE, NEVER HAVE consented AT ALL to being turned into communists!

SO JUST WHO IS ANTI-GOVERNMENT??

Public Law 87-297* calls for the complete disarmament of the United States 'down to the very last gun' owned by law-abiding people.
The motto of the Fabian Society:

"For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did most patiently when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes, you must strike hard as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain and fruitless."
THE FABIAN SOCIALISTS
ARE IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT
OF AMERICA

Conquest Through ‘Gradual Peaceful Development’

The Fabian Society Emblem

The emblem above is an enlargement of the one in the Fabian window. Notice that the wolf is
hiding underneath a sheep skin. The Fabian Society took its name from the Roman general Fabius
Maximus who lived 200 years B.C. Fabius Maximus employed careful, and slow-moving
policies with great success. His tactics were to infiltrate the existing government in the nation he
wished to conquer. This also gave the Fabians time to train socialists to take over top positions
in the military, as teachers in the schools, in law enforcement and the courts, and in the state
and federal governments. The intent was to eliminate any resistance to totalitarian rule during the
transition. In this way, through gradualism, the people would not feel the sudden jolt of what
they were expected to ultimately become.

Arrogantly, the Fabians depicted themselves as reshaping the whole world in the stained glass
window which once hung in the Beatrice and Sidney Webb home. The Fabian Society was
established in 1884. The stained glass window was made in 1910. Beatrice and Sidney Webb
set up the London School of Economics and Political Science.

In the Fabian window on the left, E. R. Pease is shown operating a bellows. Sidney Webb is in
the center striking with a hammer. George Bernard Shaw is on the right also striking with a
hammer as they “Remould The World Nearer To The Heart’s Desire”. On the lower right row is
H.G. Wells thumbing his nose at the other Fabians because they think they must work
secretively. Wells believed that they should come out and be open about it.
Samuel B. Pettengill, who represented Indiana's 3rd Congressional District in the 1930's published a book in 1940 which was entitled:

**SMOKE-SCREEN.**

In SMOKE-SCREEN Pettengill warned:

"The progress will be gradual, but the end inevitable. There will be no sudden coup d'etat. The march will be step by step, and by muffled tread. It will move under the smoke-screen of laudable "objectives" to its hidden goal. That goal is National Socialism."

Today we are told that government is protecting the people against crime, yet the government is bringing in drugs by the planeloads, and allowing the negative corrupt influences on television to continue."
WHO KNOWS WHAT IS GOING ON AND HOW MUCH?

\{ Fabian Socialists \\
\{ Chosen public officials \\

NEOTERIC (Those who set the direction and do the planning. They have full knowledge.)

ESOTERIC (Those who have a limited knowledge of what is going on.)

Those who provide the money through taxation but are not allowed to know what is happening to them.

EXOTERIC (Those who have no knowledge at all of what is going on, but they continue to do what they are told to do.)

HOW THE FABIAN SOCIALIST OPERATE.

Second Amendment Committee P.O. Box 1776 Hanford, Calif. 93232
THREE DIVISIONS OF PEOPLE AS THE FABIAN SOCIALISTS VIEW THE WORLD

1. NEOTERIC GROUP

This is their group: the 'select' few, the inmost group, that has full knowledge of the transition to a totally planned socialistic society under a world government. With special consultants and advisors, they lay out the new moves to be made. They make contacts with others at summit conferences, hold special secret organized meetings, and work with governors of states. They desire a completely disarmed world except for the world army that they control in order to operate a world-wide totalitarian society.

2. ESOTERIC GROUP

The Neoteric group gives secret but limited information and directives to this group that does the legwork because of the positions they hold, or influence they have that is essential to the Neoteric group. They are let in on secret activity because of key social, civic, educational, govermential influence or political offices held.

3. EXOTERIC GROUP

This group is the general public which is kept unaware of the real motives for unusual laws, changes, etc. They would not approve of socialists control so they are kept outside of secret planning. Delphi Technique and sophistry must be applied to keep this group from learning what is happening to their government. They must accept the excuses they are given for encroachments and infringements on their rights.

Joseph Stalin said in effect:

"It matters not that they are members of the party. What is important is whether they serve the same common cause."
There's another old saying:
"You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink."

Naturally, I hope you are now realizing that what the real Uncle Sam and I have been telling you is true! Backed by official documentation taken from sources on various levels of the government, what you see here is quite easily checked out in your local library.

Those of us, who are resisting the destruction of our rightful system of government, and oppose our merging with communist-and-socialist totalitarian all over the world, feel duty bound to warn our fellow Americans. We wonder what is behind the problem that is paralyzing the will of some people to grasp the situation. Is it apathy? Is it fear? Is it shock and unacceptable disappointment which causes disbelief?

Hopefully, you are not one of these!
THE FATE OF THE DISBELIEVERS!

TOO FEW ARE WAKING UP.
Hate to rush off, but I must go! In closing, I want to tell you that the most patriotic act I could do for my country is to write "To Sink or Swim". The 24-page brief dissertation is the proper assessment of the problems before us. I hope it will connect the dots and clear the thinking for those who need it.

God bless the United States!

“Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpation.”

......James Madison

“If tyranny and oppression come to this land, it will be in the guise of fighting a foreign enemy.”

......James Madison
This chart illustrates the dominance by the Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg of the major decision making processes and institutions of the United States of America over the last seventy years. Members are identified by "C", "T" or "B".

The Council on Foreign Relations is the American branch of a society which organized in England and believes national boundaries should be obliterated and one world rule established." [WITH NO APOLOGIES by Senator Barry Goldwater, Berkley Books, New York, p 126].

"The Trilateral Commission is international (and) is intended to be the vehicle for multinational consolidation of the commercial and banking interests by seizing control of the political government of the United States." [WITH NO APOLOGIES, by Senator Barry Goldwater, Berkley Books, New York, p 293]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents of the United States</th>
<th>Chief of Staff - Army</th>
<th>Secretaries of Energy</th>
<th>Current House of Representatives</th>
<th>Secretaries of Health &amp; Human Services</th>
<th>Secretaries of HUD</th>
<th>Secretary of Interior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Earl Carter</td>
<td>Edward C. Meyer</td>
<td>William H. Webster</td>
<td>Norman D. Dick</td>
<td>Elliot L. Richardson</td>
<td>James A. L. Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald R. Ford, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>David H. Ruckelhaus</td>
<td>Barney Frank</td>
<td>Abraham A. Ribicoff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Brooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Milhous Nixon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard A. Gephardt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William L. Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight D. Eisenhower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amory Houghton, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John H. Chafee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Clark Hoover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Hyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William S. Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Presidents of the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Lee Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard B. Cheney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James T. Kolbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. W. Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James A. S. Leach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Mondale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John P. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert T. Matsui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George J. Tenet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James A. McDermott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O. Studeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Duetch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THOMAS E. PETRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Woolsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES B. RANGEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert M. Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED PASTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H Webster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THOMAS E. PETRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Casey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stansfield Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. W. Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William E. Colby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Schlesinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Helms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. McConile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen W. Dulles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Bedell Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current U.S. Senators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Schumer</td>
<td>(D) NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia J. Snowe</td>
<td>(R) ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J. Torricelli</td>
<td>(D) NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former U.S. Senators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Benetisen</td>
<td>(D) TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Boren</td>
<td>(D) OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Boschwitz</td>
<td>(D) MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Brooke</td>
<td>(R) MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Bradley</td>
<td>(D) NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Chafee</td>
<td>(R) RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Cohen</td>
<td>(R) ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secretaries of Defense

Donald Rumsfeld
William S. Cohen
William J. Perry
Les Aspin
Richard B. Cheney
Frank C. Carlucci, III
Casper W. Weinberger
Harold Brown
Donald H. Rumsfeld
James R. Schlesinger
Elliot L. Richardson
Mehin R. Laird
Robert S. McNamara
Neil H. McElroy
Charles E. Wilson
George C. Marshall
James V. Forrestal

Secretaries of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Cordell Hull

Chief of Staff - Air Force

Ronald R. Fogleman
Merrill A. McPeak
John T. Chain, Jr.
Lew Allen, Jr.
Michael J. Dugan
Charles A. Gabriel
Larry D. Welch

Secretaries of Labor

Elaine L. Chao
Lynn Martin

Secretaries of State

Colin Powell
Madeline Albright
William B. Richardson
Warren M. Christopher
Lawrence S. Eagleburger
George P. Schultz
Alexander M. Haig, Jr.
Edmund S. Muskie
Cyrus R. Vance
Henry A. Kissinger
William P. Rogers
Dean Rusk
Christian A. Herter Jr.
John Foster Dulles
Dean G. Acheson
George C. Marshall
Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

Current U.S. Senators

Evan Bayh
Hillary Rodham Clinton
Christopher J. Dodd
Dianne Feinstein
Bob Graham
Chuck Hagel
John F. Kerry
Joseph I. Lieberman
John McCain
John D. Rockefeller, IV
Paul Sarbanes

Former House Members

John B. Anderson
Michael D. Barnes
Anthony C. Bellenson
Landrum R. Bolling
John Brademas
Thomas J. Campbell
Richard B. Cheney
William F. Clinger, Jr.
Barbara B. Conable
Mervyn M. Dymally
Dan B. Fascell
Geraldine A. Ferraro
Thomas S. Foley
Donald M. Frager
Sam Gejdenson
Newton L. Gingrich
William H. Gray, III
Bill Green
Lee Hamilton
Jane Lakes Harmon
Mel Levine
**Dominance of the U.S.A.**

The Bilderberg is a quasi-secret consortium of international elite who meet annually to plan world economic and political policies. The Bilderberg has no membership per se. Those identified with "B" in this chart have attended past Bilderberg meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council on Foreign Relations</th>
<th>The Trilateral Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Harold Pratt House</td>
<td>345 E. 46th Street, New York, NY 10017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 East 68th Street</td>
<td>Tel. (212) 661-1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY 10021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. (212) 734-0400; FAX (212) 861-1789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The World Bank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica P. Einhorn</td>
<td>Mng. Dir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James David Wolfensohn</td>
<td>Pres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Strange McNamara</td>
<td>Pres. (fmr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Vernon</td>
<td>Visitor Prof. (fmr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Page, Jr.</td>
<td>Ch Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David A. Wirth</td>
<td>Econ. Asst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Herz</td>
<td>Div. Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann O. Hamilton</td>
<td>Dir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Int'l Bank of Reconstruction & Develop.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Thompson Preston</td>
<td>Pres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew M. Kamarck</td>
<td>Washington office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bank of America (Bankamerica Corp)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. W. Clausen</td>
<td>Chmn &amp; CEO (fmr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Burks Binkley</td>
<td>Chmn &amp; CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolph A. Peterson</td>
<td>Chmn Exec Comm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George William Coombe, Jr.</td>
<td>Exec VP (fmr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignazio E. Lozano, Jr.</td>
<td>Dir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bankers Trust Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles S. Sanford, Jr.</td>
<td>Chmn &amp; CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George J. Voyta</td>
<td>Vice Chmn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald L. Staheli</td>
<td>Dir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brown Brothers Harriman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Livingston Ireland, III</td>
<td>Gen. Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Tonio Eckelartz</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter H. Brown</td>
<td>LIs Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank W. Hoch</td>
<td>LIs Partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal Judiciary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen G. Breyer</td>
<td>Assoc. Jus. S.Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Bader Ginsburg</td>
<td>Assoc. Jus. S.Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Day O'Connor</td>
<td>Assoc. Jus. S.Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Frankfurter</td>
<td>Fmr. Assoc. Jus. S.Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles E. Hughes</td>
<td>Fmr. Assoc. Jus. S.Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Baldwin Bonsal</td>
<td>Dist. Ct. Judge, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Alberto Cabrantes</td>
<td>Dist. Ct. Judge, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. Schwarzer</td>
<td>Dist. Ct. Judge, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington D. Parker</td>
<td>Dist. Ct. Judge, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Clark Allison</td>
<td>U.S. Claims Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Myron Schwebel</td>
<td>Int. Ct. Judge, The Hague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Tannenwald, Jr.</td>
<td>Tax Ct. Sr. Judge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College & University Presidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hazard Edwards</td>
<td>Bowdoin College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varten Gregorian</td>
<td>Brown Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Abel Aroniego</td>
<td>Cal. State, Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Richard Lewis, Jr.</td>
<td>Carlton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph S. Murphy</td>
<td>CUNY Grad School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Warren Harston</td>
<td>CUNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Reckling Cotter</td>
<td>Colby College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guigg Newton</td>
<td>Colorado Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ira Sovern</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Lynn Gaudiani</td>
<td>Connecticut College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay Iselin</td>
<td>Cooper Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Harold Trevor Rhodes</td>
<td>Cornell Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas H. Kean</td>
<td>Drew Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanuker Overchuster Keshanie</td>
<td>Duke Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas James Laney</td>
<td>Emory Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Alykis O'Hare</td>
<td>Fordham Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Joel trachtenberg</td>
<td>George Washington Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwendolyn Mikeli</td>
<td>Georgetown Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Summers</td>
<td>Harvard Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil L. Rudenstine</td>
<td>Harvard Univ. (fmr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David M. Abshire</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bruce Zoelfick</td>
<td>Center Strat &amp; Int. Stu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Muller</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Irvin Rottberg</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Albert Gardner</td>
<td>Lafayette College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nara Sudarkase</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark Coll (fmr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Joel Steinberg</td>
<td>Lincoln Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville Peter McPherson</td>
<td>Long Island Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Adams Stratman</td>
<td>Michigan State Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT (fmr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Greenspan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Mitchell Rivlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stuart Blinder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Adolph Volcker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene R. Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur F. Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McC. Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas B. McCabe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Meyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. William Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Victoria Futter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice R. Greenberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chase Manhattan Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Rockefeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Vincent Shippley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas O. Lebreque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Royal Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Donald Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Lipinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riorden Roett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Von N. Whitman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citigroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter Bigelow Wriston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Reginald Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard A. Freytag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Elizabeth Bains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Nat’l Mortgage Assoc. (FNMA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Delano Raines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Banks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Steinmiller, Chmn., Amalgamated Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard L. Carroll, Chmn., Banco do Brasil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odor Felix Abunderson, Mgr., Citibank Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell W. Haddad, VP, Citibank, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Leslie Huber, Vice Chmn., Cont. Bank Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson B. Gilbert, 2nd Chmn., Esp. Sants Bank, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Shapiro, Dir., Fed., Jr., Bank, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Robert Petty, Mgr., Nat’l. Payables, Citi, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard J. Toll, Jr., Mgr., First Boston Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C. Holbrook, Mgr., Chmn., CS First Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David C. Malloch, Vice Chmn., CS First Boston, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Hennessy, Pres., &amp; CEO, CS First Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred R. Abbott, Director, &amp; CEO, First City Bancorp, Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony P. Terracciano, Chm., Pr., Fidelity, Bancorp, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph A. Rice, Dir., Chmn., &amp; CEO, Irving Bank Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Weatherstone, Chmn., &amp; CEO, J.P. Morgan &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas S. Johnson, Chmn., &amp; CEO, Irene Fin. Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert O. Wilmers, Pres., &amp; CEO, MRI &amp; Trids Trust, Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Furlong Baldwin, Chmn., Mercantile Bankshares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander M. Vagianos, Chmn., &amp; CEO, Michigan Financial Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon de Vries, Sr. VP, Morgan Guaranty Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick L. Deming, Director, National City Bancorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E. Beeman, Chmn., &amp; CEO, The Private Trust Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Export-Import Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John D. Macomber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth D. Brody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugen K. Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Richard Cline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Maria Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Monetary Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Brown Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen B. Jurcz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard David Erb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) Exposed
by Walter J. Burien, Jr.
© December 17th 1999
This is a comprehensive disclosure of governmental financial operations that have been deliberately concealed and kept from the American people by the governmental financial agencies as well as by the syndicated media. The scope is huge: the personal financial impact of vital concern to all.
Do the people of this great land own the government or do the collective governments think they own the people? Is it time to mandate "effective action" through united efforts of the American people? Can David still fling the rock true and straight to hit its mark and defeat Goliath?
Are you aware that 30 years ago only 8-12% of the financial activity and ownership of our nation resulted from the activity of the government, but today the figure is conservatively 48%? We the People have been victimized by the largest organized syndicate on the face of the Earth. The Constitution declares that all political power is inherent in the people and that all powers not directly and specifically delegated to public servants remain with the people.
Our public servants are accountable to us and it's time we hold them accountable with genuine liability and cause the profits resulting from governmental activity to directly benefit the people!!!
I became aware of something approximately 10 years ago, which changed my life. I will give you a little analogy of how I learned about the complete financial takeover of the wealth of this country by composite government.
Back in 1989 I lived in New Jersey. There was a governor who ran for office under a no-new-tax platform. He won, and as soon as he got into office a $2.8 billion tax increase was enacted—the largest in the state's history. It's obvious that the public was not too thrilled about Mr. Florio's actions and one of the local radio stations, 101.5 FM, started doing some rabble-rousing, taking calls from listeners on examples of waste and misspending in government. My first two days I was listening, and I heard people calling in with examples of $5,000, $15,000, $85,000 was the highest figure I heard. I then called the station. I was not returned. I called the station. It was not returned. I called the station. It was not returned. I called the station. It was not returned.

for the total cash gross receipts. As I mentioned, what IRS would ask for in an audit. I found it on page 174.
Now this is 1989's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. On page 174 under Cash Additions, all agencies, all departments, all sources, here's a state with a declared service budget of $17 billion, who was bringing in $86 billion, 799 million in cash. I saw that figure remain three times the definition of syndicated organized crime. Here, we had a representation to the public that the state of New Jersey was bringing in $17 billion when in reality, they were bringing in to $86 billion. They had $188 billion in liquid investment funds. I also learned the principle of operation that day.
Anything that was a cost and an expense, traditional service side of the budget report, health and welfare, human services, motor vehicles, was left under the budgetary basis, and the public footed 100% of the bill for 100% of the services. Now, anything that was a profit center had the ability of being a profit center, large investment fund that generated tens and hundreds of millions of dollars, totally restricted by a statute for no tie or inclusion whatsoever with the budgetary basis.
Now, this is what I have called The Biggest Game In Town. I saw it first in New Jersey and I said the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report... here I am a Commodity Trading Advisor, I was doing a national news line coast to coast at the time and I never heard of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. I wanted to find out why was I mad. I mean, there was such a distinct difference between the revenue shown on the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and the minuscule revenue that was shown now on the budgetary basis. I said, "Why did I not see this in a newspaper, radio show, TV show?"
Now, the department that mailed out the report the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report was from the Department of Treasury. I called the mailroom, and the mailroom usually doesn't get a call from the public, so they were very cooperative. I wanted to find out who the report was sent to. I thought it was a short list. They said, "I'm sorry, sir. The list is too long - we can't read it to you on the phone." So I start qualifying. I found out it was sent to every editor of every paper on the East Coast. It was sent to the deans of all the colleges. It was sent to the CEO and one of the directors from ABC, CBS, and NBC. When I checked, I started smelling cooperative effort for nondisclosure. I then got the telephone number for ABC and NBC than the private sector. We are starting the government, 35% the private sector, and 65% the government. Now, when you look at stocks, as I saw. I also saw the Government I saw, had $70 billion in stocks. That floored me. I never even thought the state owning $70 billion in stocks. One state and federal on stock ownership is $32 billion. That's over 53% of the equities issued stocks from all exchanges in the United States government sources. You won't have a problem owning a phenomenal base in one of the thousands of the different cities, counties, and composite totals. They own over 50% of all the individual corporations, Xerox Corporation, all the primary owners are composite government and listed as institutional funds - who are "institutions"? That's government monies. This state has a supposed public corporation, a composite government fund. I would say that's a government. This is approximately 72% owned by composite government. The tax base is up around 42%, so on and so on. Up until this point when the comprehensive annual financial report I always thought government was stealing this country and this was a free-market system wrong. Basically, what the public has left is a open door. In fact, 95% of the public vault? And those sharp little cracks in the much. Have a good day."

and the Federal government, in 1981, prepare a Comprehensive Annual Financial Statement for every city, every county, every state, every all these Combined Financial Statements, if it is the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. The background on the Comprehensive Annual Financial Statement is Group by the name of GFOA, Government Finance Association, in 1946 created the Comprehensive Annual Financial Reporting accounting structure. It has produced one of the first ones in 1965, the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, quite a long time. There are 54,000 local governments, cities, counties, school districts, universities, and so on.
only thing I was aware of at that time. They had $11 billion on budget, $6 billion off budget; the total annual service budget was $17 billion a year. I called in to the show and I made the comment, "Come on, guys; you're missing the whole point. The highest figure I heard was $55,000. The state's dealing with billions of dollars." I read off the figures. I said, "If there's fraud, waste, and mismanagement taking place, it's taking on tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions of dollars." The DJ at that time challenged us, the listeners, to start a tax protest organization to repeal the $8.2 billion tax increase.

Ten of us got together the next day and incorporated a group called Hands Across New Jersey. We scheduled our first rally ten days out from that point. And basically, with the help of 101.5, we had 115,000 people converge on Trenton from all the shore points in New Jersey, effectively shutting the city down. Now, during the course of organizing that rally, I took over looking at the budget, revenue, and finance of the state.

For about fifteen years I was a Commodity Trading Advisor, and I was one of the first tenants of the World Trade Center, back in 1979. And large figures didn't bother me a hundred million and one dollar - there was no difference. So when I started looking at the figures on the New Jersey budget report, as I mentioned, there were $11 billion on budget, $6 billion off budget. It showed a net available of $25.6 billion. Then, I asked myself the number one question that IRS asks in an audit:

What are the cash gross receipts? I started noticing the large cash cow groups in state government - the New Jersey Turnpike, Garden State Parkway, Port Authority of New York, and New Jersey. The revenue was not inclusive in the budget report. I didn't see any large returns from investment funds on the budget report. And I said, "They have to have two sets of books here. They aren't accounting for the whole picture." The director of the budget at that time was an individual by the name of Richard Keeley. He was on vacation till the following Tuesday of that week. I found out who his lower assistant was, called in, and the conversation went just like this:

I said, "Hi, this is Walter Burien. I'm working on a report for Richard. Have to have it done by Tuesday when he gets back from vacation. I need all the figures on the autonomous agency accounts, interest accounts, investment accounts. And the reply I got was, "Oh, you want the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report." Bing! First time I ever heard that before in my lifetime. Got it Friday. Started crunching numbers. It showed a total liquid investment funds of $188 billion dollars - $188 BILLION DOLLARS - of which common stock ownership $70 billion, insurance company equity participation $14 billion, loan to public and private corporations $10 billion. And I started looking

on where the report was sent to. I called, and the conversation went just like this:

"Hi. This is Walter Burien calling from the Department of the Treasury. We've been sending you our Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the last fourteen years and we're doing a logistical survey on how many other states are sending you their reports. Could you please help me?"

ABC was getting it from 36 states; NBC was getting it from 34 states. When I heard that, now I'm getting very mad. I'm starting to see a cut-off cooperative effort for nondisclosure on the most important information that exists in this country. The extent of the financial takeover by composite government of the wealth of this country, with full cooperation of the syndicated media for nondisclosure.

My next step was I called New York, got New York's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, which showed approximately $735 billion in liquid investment funds. Then I got the city of Manhattan's report. Now, when I mention the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, it's not just the state, it's the majority of all cities, counties, school districts, pension funds, autonomous agencies such as the New Jersey Turnpike or New York Throughway Authority, put out a Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. When I got Manhattan's report it showed liquid investment funds of $1.2 trillion, more than the entire state. My mind started getting boggled, thinking of the composite totals for all the states, all the cities, and all the counties.

Subsequently, over the last ten years I've been factoring in, compiling the aspect of composite totals. The current figure stands at about $60 trillion plus, in liquid investment funds - the composite totals for all cities, counties, states, and the federal government. Now, you may say "Oh, wait a second here! I thought we were in debt for the state, in debt for our school districts, or in debt for the federal government." Well, let me explain something. I'm going to give you the biggest wake-up call in your life. This example holds true across the country, for every city, county, state, and the federal government. You always hear the budgetary basis referenced - "the budget report, the budget report."

Governments across this country on the city, county, state levels, and federal, have created a two-tier accounting structure. One, the annual operating budgets, the cost side of operating government for the year - the monies they bring in for the year to handle that cost and what they expend. What's being left out is the decades - the decades of investment wealth, enterprise ventures which generate hundreds of billions of dollars each year, which are not inclusive in the budgetary basis. When you start looking at composite totals of revenue and compare it to the private sector, government currently now is substantially bigger

produce their own separate reports. Moreover, they are not including composite totals of the revenue from non-revenue sources, such as the counties, the states - and you may think, with federal government's revenue, New Jersey's. According to New Jersey's 1998 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, they have $295 billion in total funds. That's just the state report. Then you have hundreds of cities and municipalities, and they produce their own separate reports. If you take the income from investment funds, you're well in excess of the population of New Jersey and the state. It comes out to a cash allocation of $1.7 trillion for the child living in the state or family of five. It's in the trillions of dollars. The number has been excessive.

Federal government's playing the elephant. When you break down the actual revenue, it's an anomaly - it belongs to the local governments, the city, states - and one-third belongs to the federal government.

In the appendix of the federal report, there is a list of significant government entities. You'll see there are agencies which most people never heard of. In the last column, down below, it says "sent from these statements." Now, they're not even listed. The Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to which I think we all know by now are they listed under the Federal Domestic Savings Plan, the Farm Credit System, the Banks, financing corporations, Freddie Mac, Resolution Funding Corporation, the government mortgage investment groups of government. Also, I want to make special note to put the bottom. We have the Army and the Navy Exchange Service Command, the Foreign Exchange. Folks, this is not the PX, not the PX on the PX. The PX is for exchange of foreign troops to the PX. This foreign soil, which they kept separate - The Financial Statement of the federal government is so easily seen. But if we take the federal government's cash cow investment groups, and, very important, they have a private bond issue on loan, that's been loaned out through the federal government's receivables and their current cash and not $1.7 trillion on the top, but about $1.6 trillion on the top. So, here, even the federal government keeps the expense side - leaving it on the income side - they call that their budgetary basis, their cash cow investment groups of federal.
GAME IN TOWN $$

ending at about 65%

don't show on the budgetary basis. So, currently, the federal
government shows a slight deficit on budgetary basis, but the
profit centers, which would show a $16 trillion positive, are
excluded.

We started our national exposure on the Comprehensive Annual
Financial Report and the structure behind it, you may have heard
on the network news the feds saying, "Oh, by the way, we
happened to find we're going to have a $6 trillion surplus going
into the year 2004." Keep in mind, that $6 trillion surplus is on
the budgetary basis. They're not including the cash cow investment
agencies. If they were being 100% honest, inclusive of all
revenue, the federal government would have approximately a $12
to $14 trillion surplus. And, in fact, if they included the cash cow
investment agencies in with the budgetary basis, they could
probably have a 50% reduction across the board of all taxation,
on the federal side. Something to think about.

Let's go back to the local governments. The states, the cities, and
the counties, they have their budgetary basis, the annual
operating budget but they have enterprise funds. In my little city of
Prescott, Arizona, where I live, the city owns a golf course. Why
does the city own a golf course? So the judges and the attorneys
can get lower green fees? Here is a $45 million dollar asset
which is paid for by tax payer funds, developed, and not $1 goes
back directly to support the budgetary basis. They have
investment funds sitting as idle funds — $48 million.

With this much money out there, this phenomenal base of wealth,
empires that are being built, it is mandatory to keep the public
oblivious to what was going on. If the public was aware that this
type of wealth was being built and obfuscated as tax dollars are
being drained out of their pockets, where people are citing a
shortfall of budgetary revenue, there would have been an uprising
30 years ago. But the government, to perpetuate this game, they
needed the 100% cooperation of the syndicated media. That they
have. You will not see ABC, NBC, saying, "Oh, by the way, we just
happened to find out about the Comprehensive Annual Financial
Report." You will not see that happen. They have been in
cooperative nondisclosure for 25 years. That's why the situation
has taken place.

It's mandatory to get the word out. It's mandatory to have your
local radio show, your local TV show... call in, mention the
Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Depending upon what

doing it, it's the principle of operation.

Every problem I've seen in this country to date has to do with
extraction of revenue from the public. It is the root of evil in this
country - the wealth being taken from the populace. And one of
the problems here is, a lot of people have been looking for the
needle in the haystack, trying to find government corruption and
wealth being stolen from us. Well, we're not looking for the needle
in the haystack here, folks. It's the haystack sitting on top of the
needle. All you have to do is look and start adding up the
composite figures. Stop being distracted by one leaf or branch or
tree in the forest. Start qualitying the forest. And when you do
you'll see the clear and unequivocal financial takeover of the
wealth of this country by composite government, right from the
city level to the state to the federal level. It's power mongering; it's
empire building. For the boys that are in there on the inner circle,
the wealth is absolute.

The game is absolute, and there is so much money behind the
game, and you have the participation of the syndicated media in
the game, the public really has not stood a chance. The only way
the public stands a chance is through full and open disclosure of the
wealth— not being distracted, just sitting down crunching numbers.
Not looking at one leaf, or branch or tree in the forest, just looking at
the forest, adding up the totals, and it becomes evidently clear. Corrective action is needed and is needed immediately.

With the scope of the financial takeover that is in existence today, they're consolidating that ownership. Within
several years you'll have composite government owning 85% of
the wealth in this country.

This is no game, folks. We've had our heritage stolen from us
right under our noses. As I mentioned, if you go back 25 years
ago government was about 8-9 percent of the GNP. Currently,
we're standing at over 48%, and that's a conservative figure.
That's a phenomenal amount of wealth. We have the largest
orchestrated syndicate on the face of the planet, which is
composite government wealth. A little notation. This is
supposed to be a country of laws, correct? Law is supposed to
protect people of this country, correct? Well, when I got New
Jersey's report, it had the pension plans listed. I didn't understand
pensions or the actuarial basis used. One of our Volunteers for
Hands Across New Jersey, he wrote the pension funds for Blue
Cross/Blue Shield nationally. I gave him the book, and I asked him
to break down the pension funds and compare them to a Fortune
You start looking at the
54,000 reports - the cities,
the counties, the state, the
city, what county, what state you're looking at the ratio of the
budgetary basis, the annual service budget, to the reality of the
total wealth, usually ranges from a ratio of 8:1 to as high as 40:1.
I briefed a federal auditor of 30 years. He was in charge of
auditing one of the largest federal agencies in the country and
also eight of the central western states prior to his retirement.
He was always looking at individual budget reports, the individual
leaves, branches and trees in the forest. And I briefed him on the
composite totals. Flirled him! He looked, he verified, and three
months later he made the comment to me. He went, "Waiter, what
we have here in this country is 100% Communism under the
guise of a free market capitalist system." He goes, "The
government owns everything." (http://www.cafrm.com) Now, the
public is constantly complaining about higher taxes, higher taxes,
more money being taken for this, for that. And they're conditioned
- year in, year out. We had the Boston Tea Party - I think it was for a
3% tax on tea, caused the revolution. Here we've been
conditioned to 45% of our pay going back to government.
And when you look at all aspects of what the government's getting -
import tax, import duties, manufacturing, the composite total is
phenomenal on the money that's taken by government.
On the government pension funds - city, county, state, federal -
they're standing at about $28 trillion. The private sector will never
see $28 trillion in their lifetime.

Talking also about the runaway freight train of growth on the city level,
the county level, the state level. If you go back 25 years,
government was approximately 6 to 8 percent of the GDP
of this country, gross national product total revenue base. Currently,
today, composite government - city, county, state and federal - it's 45%
of the GDP based on cash and ownership.

Let's look at the state of California, with approximately $12 trillion
under management. Now, under the Comprehensive Annual
Financial Report you'll see a total of about $3 trillion. But when you
start tracking down the cities, the counties, all the revenue
base, you're up to about $12 trillion. Now, in California, say, for
example, one of the investment managers who is handling, say,
$400 billion in funds, and he had, say, $150 billion - with Shearson
Lehman Hutton American Express institutional banking. That's a
very powerful position. If that individual contacts the director of the
institutional banking, and said his nephew in Argentina needed a
$120 million loan in Argentina for a sugar cane energy
development project, unsecured, do you think he's going to say
NO? I don't think so. He'll have one of his associates from another
city that he deals with closely cut the loan. If it's defaulted on
he'll just make up the difference on some business he'll do with that
firm.
The power mongering and the elbow rubbing that takes place
here is obscene! And it's not just one group, one organization,
Dear Gun Owners:

Attached you will find a copy of Treaty #97-19. It is a constitution. This constitution is only one of many constitutions that the United Nations has "in force" upon the United States, causing our once free people to be merged with the communist nations of the world. This is the basis upon which President George Bush and the U.S. State Department hinge their authority for converting the United States system of government from a Constitutional Republic into a segment of the international socialist world government: the "New World Order".

The hand-entered comments in the margins are there either to highlight important sections of the treaty, or to offer additional pertinent information to show the dovetailing with other United Nations documents that are in force (all being components of the worldwide command and control "New World Order")

This treaty is now in force worldwide, having been enacted on behalf of the American people, who not only DO NOT KNOW that this treaty exists, much less the serious changes that it will make in their lives as the treaty helps overthrow the United States Constitution. Consent of the governed has never been granted to permit such destructive treaties and changes.

Two hundred years ago our forefathers engineered the best form of government that could ever be created by man as it conforms to the natural law, places limits on the power that man can exercise over his fellow man, and safeguards our natural rights, which are an endowment from the Creator. This includes the right of the people to keep and bear arms.

The P.P.B.S. (Program, Planning, and Budgeting System referred to on page 5) is not an ordinary accounting system. It is a computerized command and control system, based upon predetermined goals and objectives. It is in operation in the United States in order to socialize the American people and their government in all the economic, social and political aspects of human endeavor. Government funding is granted only when recipients comply to given management performance.

Even though the attached Treaty #97-19 does constitute a great threat to the existence of our U.S. Constitution, and our gun rights, there are several resources available to us, one of which is attached to this set of papers (see Nebus Sic Stantibus, a principle in international law by which treaties can be nullified). If we fail to stand against these intrusions to our sovereignty, our independence, our right to keep and bear arms, then we, as individuals, as a state, and as a nation, are ruined.

Constitutionally yours,
SECOND AMENDMENT COMMITTEE
Bernadine Smith

BS/jf
Attach.
THE UNITED NATIONS LOYALTY OATH

This is the loyalty oath to the United Nations, which all in our government must take who work for the United Nations. Their loyalty to the United Nations must supersede loyalty to the United States Constitution while the United Nations Charter goes on destroying the United States Constitution:

I solemnly swear to exercise in all loyalty, discretion and conscience, the functions entrusted to me as a member of the international service of the United Nations; to discharge those functions and regulate with the interests of the United Nations only in view, and not to seek or accept instructions in regard to the performance of my duty from any government or authority external to the Organization.

Note: Saddling upon us of the United Nations Charter was also done by unlawful use of the treaty-making power. Now the United Nations is calling for all U.S. citizens to be totally disarmed. Aided by Public Law 87-297, and other new laws, their disarmament treaties will confiscate every gun.

"The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against the tyranny in government." .......Thomas Jefferson

"Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction. I say the same as to the opinion of those who consider the grant of the treaty-making power as boundless. IF IT IS, then we have no Constitution! If it has bounds, they can be no others than the definitions of the powers that instrument gives." .......Thomas Jefferson

"Before entering on so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its memories, its benefits, its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly TO are GREATER than the ills you fly FROM? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?" .......Abraham Lincoln

"The Constitution shall never be construed...to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms." .......Samuel Adams

"Let Mr. Madison tell me when did liberty ever exist when the sword and the purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle shall interpose, no nation ever did, nor ever can retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse." "Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force and whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined." .......Patrick Henry
CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
TRANSMITTING
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS' INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO), ADOPTED BY THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION AS A SPECIALIZED AGENCY ON APRIL 8, 1970, AND SIGNED ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON JANUARY 17, 1980

October 5, 1981.—Treaty was read the first time and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed for the use of the Senate.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
Washington, D.C.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 6, 1981.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a copy of the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). This Constitution was adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency on April 8, 1970, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on January 17, 1980. The report of the Department of State with respect to the Constitution is also transmitted for the information of the Senate.

The Constitution would establish UNIDO as an independent specialized agency of the United Nations system. It does not create a new entity, but rather revises UNIDO's existing legal framework in a way that significantly improves the position of the United States and other major donors in budget, program and assessment determinations.

UNIDO's principal purpose is to foster the industrialization of developing countries. It is currently the third largest executing agency for the United Nations Development Program. UNIDO's wide-ranging activities are geared to aid developing countries in establishing the technical and institutional skills necessary for industrialization. Many of these activities are consonant with United States development priorities, including development of indigenous entrepreneurial and productive capabilities in the private sector.

United States commercial and academic interests also benefit from UNIDO activity.

In recent years, there has been growing recognition of the need to formulate more effective institutions within the United Nations system to deal with the problems of development in an increasingly interdependent world. Such institutions need to serve the interests of all member nations and to be governed in a manner that realistically reflects the political and economic situation in the world today.

The Constitution would give UNIDO a new governing machinery that will make it more responsive to its member governments and that will give greater recognition to the special role of major donors, including the United States, other industrial democracies, and the Soviet bloc. If they act together, the major donors will be able to block decisions on UNIDO's program and budgets. In this respect, the Constitution is a precedent-setting document.

The Constitution would also provide a specific right of withdrawal from UNIDO if the United States should ever determine that its interests are not served by continued membership. This could not be
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accomplished under UNIDO's current statute without withdrawal from the United Nations.

While the Constitution refers to the objectives of helping establish a new international economic order, the United States has made clear its view that this does not refer to any preconceived notion of such an order as outlined in some U.N. resolutions to which the United States has taken exception.

The Constitution offers the United States important advantages over UNIDO's current status. It provides an opportunity to increase UNIDO's effectiveness in promoting economic development in the developing countries and, thus, its contribution to a more equitable and peaceful international environment. In addition to helping create a better institutional framework, ratification of the Constitution by the United States will be a strong reaffirmation of our commitment to the industrial development of the less developed countries and demonstrate our political will to pursue beneficial relations with those countries.

I recommend that the Senate give prompt consideration to the Constitution and advise and consent to its ratification.

Ronald Reagan.

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

Department of State, Washington, September 12, 1981.

The President: I have the honor to submit to you, with a view to its transmission to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification, the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency on April 3, 1980, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on January 17, 1980.

The Constitution would establish UNIDO as an independent specialized agency of the United Nations system. UNIDO now exists as an organization formally within the United Nations system, reporting to the General Assembly.

UNIDO has a mandate to provide developing countries with industrial-related technical assistance, including programs in industrial planning, institutional infrastructure, factory establishment and management, training, feasibility studies, and investment promotion. Virtually all of UNIDO's technical assistance expenditures are funded by voluntary sources, primarily the United Nations Development Programme. UNIDO activities funded by the United Nations regular assessed budget ($47 million in 1980) are largely in support of its technical assistance activities, and include: macro-economic studies of factors affecting industrialization; advice to LDC governments on development policies; industrial sector, regional, country and case studies; statistical data collection and analysis; expert group meetings including sectoral consultations; information processing and investment promotion. UNIDO's highly diversified activities include many which are congenial to United States development priorities such as: employment generation, private sector development, basic human needs, appropriate technology, and rural and agricultural related development. American commercial and academic interests also benefit from UNIDO activity.

UNIDO was established as an organ of the United Nations General Assembly pursuant to United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3280 (XX), and 2289 (XXI), adopted in 1975 and 1976, respectively. In 1980, the United Nations General Assembly, endorsing the recommendation of the Second General Conference of UNIDO, adopted Resolution 3282 (S-VII) which established an intergovernmental committee of the whole followed by a conference of plenipotentiaries to draft and consider a constitution to transform UNIDO into a specialized agency of the United Nations. The intergovernmental committee of the whole met five times over a two-year period and was succeeded by the Conference on the Establishment of UNIDO as a Specialized Agency.
The Constitution, while not creating a new entity, revises UNIDO's existing legal framework, significantly improving the provisions relating to control of budget and programming. Under the current regime, UNIDO's work program is decided upon by its governing body, the Industrial Development Board, while its program budget is set by the United Nations General Assembly as one component of the overall United Nations Program Budget. Thus, UNIDO's budget is currently not subject to intergovernmental review by a body directly responsible for UNIDO activities; nor do the present institutional arrangements, by which all questions are decided by majority vote, adequately reflect the special interest of major donors.

The Constitution seeks to correct these defects by providing that the program and budget of UNIDO shall be determined by the three governing bodies in succession: the Program and Budget Committee (the Committee), the Industrial Development Board (the Board), and the General Conference (the Conference). Each body must decide on the program and budget by a two-thirds majority vote. In the Committee and the Board, the industrial democracies and the Soviet bloc (i.e., the major donors) hold substantially more than a third of the vote and thus control, if most of them agree, block adoption of a program or budget. (The Soviets have traditionally taken a very conservative position on budgetary issues.) The Constitution thereby establishes for the first time in the United Nations system, an effective system of governance for the specialized agencies, a special place for the United States in United Nations affairs. The Constitution is therefore a significant setting document responsive to the political realities of the United Nations and beyond.

The Constitution and the related resolutions on transition to specialized agency status also achieve another objective of the United States in that they do not mandate any increase in United States contributions to UNIDO, but only change the method of assessment and payment in ways beneficial to the United States. Currently, United States assessed contributions to UNIDO are determined and paid indirectly through the mechanism of the United Nations assessed budget, making it difficult for the United States to achieve a degree of influence within UNIDO commensurate with the level of these indirect contributions. The Constitution will move toward correcting this situation by instituting direct assessed budget payments to UNIDO and providing for assessments to be determined in a manner similar to the determination of the program and budget, with major donor States holding more than a third of the vote in the Board which must decide on assessments by a two-thirds majority.

The fact that United Nations General Assembly Resolution 36 (XXXIV) on Transitional Arrangements on the Establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency provides for the termination of United Nations funding for UNIDO from the United Nations regular program budget and a corresponding reduction in this budget upon establishment of UNIDO as a specialized agency.

The Constitution consists of a preamble, twenty-nine articles (in six chapters) and three annexes. The Preamble states that the States Parties, while bearing in mind the "broad objectives" of resolutions adopted by the sixth and seventh special sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and the Second General Conference of UNIDO pertaining to the establishment of a new international economic order, make certain declarations regarding economic development. The declarations include the necessity of establishing a just and equitable economic and social order; the essential role of industrialization to rapid economic and social development; the right of all countries to pursue industrialization; the necessity of concerted measures to promote the development, transfer and adaptation of technology internationally; and a determination to promote the common welfare through expanding international economic cooperation. The Preamble is basically horitory, and contains no operational tasks to the rest of the Constitution.

The objectives and functions of UNIDO are contained in Chapter I. Article I states that the primary objective of UNIDO will be the promotion and acceleration of industrial development in the developing countries with a view to assisting in the establishment of a new international economic order. The language used in the Constitution, as indicated in the statement of the United States at the time of adoption of the Constitution, can be interpreted to make clear that Article I refers to UNIDO's participation in an evolutionary and truly consensual process to achieve a new international economic order and that Article I does not refer to any preconceived notion of a new international economic order as outlined in certain resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, sixth and seventh special sessions, regarding which the United States has reservations.

Article II lists the functions of UNIDO, all related to promoting industrial development and basically similar to the functions specified in UNIDO's current statute, General Assembly resolution 8159 (XXI). The important functions include: coordinating United Nations industrial development activities, providing technical assistance for industrialization, including training and pilot facilities; managing an industrial information clearinghouse; advising and assisting developing countries in formulating and executing development plans; assisting in the establishment and operation of industries, to achieve full utilization of local human and natural resources; and requesting the countries concerned, providing a forum for contacts and negotiations.

Chapter II provides for participation in UNIDO. Membership is open to all States members of the United Nations. Article 6 provides for withdrawal from membership not possible now without withdrawing from the United Nations, subject to providing a reasonable period of notice. The right of withdrawing from UNIDO alone may provide useful leverage, although actual withdrawal would entail a difficult decision.

Chapter III establishes the organs of UNIDO. Article 8 specifies a General Conference composed of all members which will act upon the reports of the Board and the Director-General and determine the guiding principles and policies of the organization. Article 9 provides for the Board to be composed of 53 members elected by the Conference, with the following distribution of seats: 33 members elected from the 64-77 (developing countries), 15 members elected from Group B (industrialized democracies) and 5 members elected from Group D (the
Soviet bloc). Article 10 establishes a Programme and Budget Committee to consist of 27 members elected by the Conference with the following distribution: 15 from the G-77, 9 from Group B, and 3 from Group D.

Chapter VI delineates the process for approval of the program of work and the regular budget (i.e., the budget expenditures to be met from assessed contributions) and the operational budget (i.e., budget expenditures to be met from voluntary contributions). Article 14 stipulates that the Director-General shall prepare and submit a draft work program, regular budget and operational budget to the Board through the Committee. The Committee will consider the Director-General's proposals and make recommendations to the Board by a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting. The Board will examine the Director-General's proposals and the recommendations of the Committee and adopt the program of work, regular budget and operational budget, for submission to the Conference, by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. The Conference will approve the submission of the Board by a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting. The Conference may make no decision or amendment involving expenditures unless the Committee and the Board have had an opportunity to act as indicated above. By commanding more than a third of the votes in the Board and the Committee, the major donor States (i.e., Groups B and D), which share a common desire to keep United Nations agency budgets to a reasonable level, will be able to block work programs and budgets of which they disapprove, if they act together.

Article 15 provides that the scale of assessments for members shall be established by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, upon a recommendation of the Board adopted by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. The Board's recommendation is to be based on a draft prepared by the Committee. The Constitution thereby provides a mechanism for the major donors as a group to veto a scale of assessments which they disapprove. Article 15 also stipulates that the scale of assessments shall be based on the extent possible on the scale most recently employed by the United Nations and no member shall be assessed more than 25 percent of the regular budget.

Chapter VII covers legal matters. Article 27 states that no reservations may be made to the Constitution. The practical effect of the entry into force provisions is that the Constitution will not enter into force without the agreement and participation of major donors, including the United States. Once the Senate has given its advice and consent to ratification, this provision will allow the United States a strong position to ensure that the basic concerns of the United States, such as budgetary restraint, are taken into account.

Article 27 states that no reservations may be made to the Constitution.

A major problem in the constitutional negotiations was to balance the desire of major contributing countries for control over the regular budget with the insistence by developing countries that funding for technical assistance activities continue to be available on an assured basis. Under current arrangements, a portion of UNIDO's activities in the field of technical assistance is financed by assessments from the regular budget of the United Nations. Under Annex II of the Constitution, 6% of the regular budget of UNIDO will be set aside for technical assistance activities which have heretofore been financed by assessed contributions to the United Nations budget. The six percent figure sets a constitutional ceiling on the portion of the new organization's regular budget which can be devoted to technical assistance. All other technical assistance activities must be financed by voluntary contributions. Since the United States together with the other major contributing countries will have more than a third of the votes in the Board, which must approve the regular budget by a two-thirds majority vote, we will have substantial influence on the overall figure with regard to which the 6% technical assistance figure will be calculated and, therefore, over the absolute amount of technical assistance expenditures from the regular budget.

The combined effect of the 6 percent ceiling, the major donors having more than a blocking third of the votes, and the withdrawal provisions will provide the United States with much greater capacity than presently exists to ensure that regular budget funds for technical assistance are used for programs which we believe should qualify for such funding. In this connection, the United States representative to the Constitutional Conference proposed that UNIDO consider an amendment to the United Nations charter which would allow for the establishment of technical assistance programs by voluntary contributions, thus supplementing the regular budget. Specifically, such technical assistance would deal with emergency situations and financial activities that primarily benefit the United Nations and its member States.

There has been growing recognition in UNIDO of the need to achieve a true consensus on development questions if UNIDO is to operate effectively with development problems. At the same time, there has been growing recognition within the United States of the need for the United Nations to be more responsive to our basic programmatic and budgetary concerns, especially in light of the large United States assessed contributions. The Constitution of UNIDO is a product of both these movements. It gives an already existing institution a new mechanism of decision-making which provides special recognition of the essential role of major contributors, including the United States. In this way, it is truly a precedented setting document.
The abuse of treaty power above this "Constitution" to supersede the United States Constitution.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

PREAMBLE

The States Parties to this Constitution,

in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations,

bearing in mind the broad objectives in the resolutions adopted by the sixth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the establishment of a New International Economic Order, in the UNIDO Second General Conference's Final Declaration and Plan of Action for Industrial Development and Co-operation, and in the resolution of the seventh special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on Development and International Economic Co-operation,

declaring that:

It is necessary to establish a just and equitable economic and social order to be achieved through the elimination of economic inequalities, the establishment of rational and equitable international economic relations, implementation of dynamic social and economic changes, and the encouragement of necessary structural changes in the development of the world economy.

Industrialization is a dynamic instrument of growth essential to rapid economic and social development, in particular of developing countries, to the improvement of the living standards and the quality of life of the peoples in all countries, and to the introduction of an equitable economic and social order.

It is the sovereign right of all countries to achieve their industrialization, and any process of such industrialization must conform to the broad objectives of self-sustaining and integrated socio-economic development, and should include the appropriate changes which would ensure the just and effective participation of all peoples in the industrialization of their countries.

An international co-operation for development is the shared goal and common obligation of all countries. It is essential to promote industrialization through all possible concerted measures including the development, transfer and adaptation of technology on global, regional and national, as well as on sectoral levels.

All countries, irrespective of their social and economic systems, are determined to promote the common welfare of their peoples by individual and collective actions aimed at expanding international economic cooperation on the basis of sovereign equality, strengthening the economic independence of the developing countries, securing their equitable share in total world industrial production and contributing to international peace and security and the prosperity of all nations, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

In 1945 the UN Charter was acclaimed by the Lord.
MINDFUL of these guidelines,

Desiring to establish, within the terms of Chapter IX of the Charter of the United Nations, a specialized agency to be known as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization"), which shall play the central role in and be responsible for reviewing and promoting the co-ordination of all activities of the United Nations system in the field of industrial development, in conformity with the responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council under the Charter of the United Nations and with the applicable relationship agreements,

Hereby agree to the present Constitution.

**Article 1**

**Chapter I—Objectives and Functions**

*Objectives*

The primary objective of the Organization shall be the promotion and acceleration of industrial development in the developing countries with a view to assisting in the establishment of a new international economic order. The Organization shall also promote industrial development and co-operation on global, regional and national as well as on sectoral levels.

*Functions*

In fulfillment of its foregoing objectives, the Organization shall generally take all necessary and appropriate action, and in particular shall:

(a) Encourage and extend, as appropriate, assistance to the developing countries in the promotion and acceleration of their industrialization, in particular in the development, expansion and modernization of their industries;

(b) In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, initiate, coordinate and follow up the activities of the United Nations system with a view to enabling the Organization to play the central co-ordinating role in the field of industrial development;

(c) Create new and develop existing concepts and approaches in respect of industrial development on global, regional and national as well as on sectoral levels, and carry out studies and surveys with a view to formulating new lines of action directed towards harmonious and balanced industrial development, with due consideration for the methods employed by countries with different socio-economic systems for solving industrialization problems;

(d) Promote and encourage the development and use of planning techniques, and assist in the formulation of development, scientific and technological programmes and plans for industrialization in the public, co-operative and private sectors;

(e) Encourage and assist in the development of an integrated and interdisciplinary approach towards the accelerated industrialization of the developing countries;

(f) Provide a forum and act as an instrument to serve the developing countries and the industrialized countries in their contacts, consultations and, at the request of the countries concerned, negotiations directed towards the industrialization of the developing countries;

(g) Assist the developing countries in the establishment and operation of industries, including agro-related as well as basic industries, to achieve the full utilization of locally available natural and human resources and the production of goods for domestic and export markets, as well as contribute to the self-reliance of these countries;

(h) Serve as a clearing-house for industrial information and accordingly collect and monitor on a selective basis, analyse and generate for the purpose of dissemination information on all aspects of industrial development on global, regional and national as well as on sectoral levels including the exchange of experiences and technological achievements of the industrially developed and the developing countries with different social and economic systems;

(i) Devote particular attention to the adoption of special measures aimed at assisting the least-developed, land-locked, and island developing countries, as well as those developing countries most seriously affected by economic crises and natural calamities, without losing sight of the interest of the other developing countries;

(j) Promote, encourage and assist in the development, selection, adaptation, transfer and use of industrial technology, with due regard for the socioeconomic conditions and the specific requirements of the industry concerned, with special reference to the transfer of technology from the industrialized to the developing countries as well as among the developing countries themselves;

(k) Organize and support industrial training programmes aimed at assisting the developing countries in the training of technical and other appropriate categories of personnel needed at various phases for their accelerated industrial development;

(l) Advise on and assist, in close co-operation with the appropriate bodies of the United Nations, specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the developing countries in the exploitation, conservation and local transformation of their natural resources for the purpose of furthering the industrialization of developing countries;

(m) Provide pilot and demonstration plans for accelerating industrialization in particular sectors;

(n) Develop special measures designed to promote co-operation in the industrial field among developing countries and between the developed and developing countries;

(o) Assist in co-operation with other appropriate bodies, the regional planning of industrial development of the developing countries within the framework of regional and subregional groupings among three countries;

(p) Encourage and promote the establishment and strengthening of industrial, business and professional associations, and similar organizations which would contribute to the full utilization of the industrial potential of the developing countries with a view to developing their national industries;

(q) Assist in the establishment and operation of institutional infrastructure for the provision of regulatory, advisory and developmental services to industry;
(r) Assist, at the request of Governments of the developing countries, in obtaining external financing for specific industrial projects on fair, equitable and mutually acceptable terms.

CHAPTER II—PARTICIPATION

Article 3

Members

Membership in the Organization is open to all States which associate themselves with the objectives and principles of the Organization:

(a) States members of the United Nations or of a specialized agency or of the International Atomic Energy Agency may become Members of the Organization by becoming parties to this Constitution in accordance with Article 24 and paragraph 2 of Article 23;

(b) States other than those referred to in subparagraph (a) may become Members of the Organization by becoming parties to this Constitution in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 24 and subparagraph 2(c) of Article 25, after their membership has been approved by the Conference, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, upon the recommendation of the Board.

Article 4

Observers

1. Observer status in the Organization shall be open, upon request, to those enjoying such status in the General Assembly of the United Nations, unless the Conference decides otherwise.

2. Without prejudice to paragraph 1, the Conference has the authority to invite other observers to participate in the work of the Organization.

3. Observers shall be permitted to participate in the work of the Organization in accordance with the relevant rules of procedure and the provisions of this Constitution.

Article 5

Suspension

1. Any Member of the Organization that is suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership of the United Nations shall automatically be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership of the Organization.

2. Any Member that is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the Organization if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the assessed contributions due from it for the preceding two fiscal years. Any organ may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote in that organ if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member.

Article 6

Withdrawal

1. A Member may withdraw from the Organization by depositing an instrument of denunciation of this Constitution with the Depositary.

2. Such withdrawal shall take effect on the last day of the fiscal year following that during which such instrument was deposited.

3. The contributions to be paid by the withdrawing Member for the fiscal year following that during which such instrument was deposited shall be the same as the assessed contributions for the fiscal year during which such deposit was effected. The withdrawing Member shall in addition fulfill any unconditional pledges it made prior to such deposit.

CHAPTER III—ORGANS

Article 7

Principal and subsidiary organs

1. The principal organs of the Organization shall be:

(a) The General Conference (referred to as the “Conference”);

(b) The Industrial Development Board (referred to as the “Board”);

(c) The Secretariat.

2. There shall be established a Programme and Budget Committee to assist the Board in the preparation and examination of the programme of work, the regular budget and the operational budget of the Organization and other financial matters pertaining to the Organization.

3. Other subsidiary organs, including technical committees, may be established by the Conference or the Board, which shall give due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation.

Article 8

General Conference

1. The Conference shall consist of representatives of all Members.

2. (a) The Conference shall hold a regular session every two years, unless it decides otherwise. Special sessions shall be convened by the Director-General at the request of the Board or of a majority of all Members.

(b) Regular sessions shall be held at the seat of the Organization, unless otherwise determined by the Conference. The Board shall determine the place where a special session is to be held.

3. In addition to exercising other functions specified in this Constitution, the Conference shall:

(a) Determine the guiding principles and the policies of the Organization;

(b) Consider reports of the Board, of the Director-General and of the subsidiary organs of the Conference;

(c) Approve the programme of work, the regular budget and the operational budget of the Organization in accordance with Article 14, establish the scale of assessments in accordance with Article 15, approve the financial regulations of the Organization and supervise the effective utilization of the financial resources of the Organization;

(d) Have the authority to adopt, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, conventions or agreements with respect to any matter within the competence of the Organization and to make recommendations to the Members concerning such conventions or agreements;
(e) Make recommendations to Members and to international organizations with respect to matters within the competence of the Organization;

(f) Take any other appropriate action to enable the Organization to further its objectives and carry out its functions.

4. The Conference may delegate to the Board such of its powers and functions as it may consider desirable, except for those provided for in: Article 3, subparagraph (i); Article 4; Article 8, subparagraphs 3(a), (b), (c) and (d); Article 9, paragraph 1; Article 10, paragraph 1; Article 11, paragraph 1; Article 14, paragraphs 4 and 6; Article 15; Article 18; Article 23, subparagraphs 2(a) and 3(b); and Annex I.

5. The Conference shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

6. Each Member shall have one vote in the Conference. Decisions shall be made by a majority of the Members present and voting unless otherwise specified in this Constitution or in the rules of procedure of the Conference.

Article 9

Industrial Development Board

1. The Board shall consist of 53 Members of the Organization elected by the Conference, which shall give due regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution. In electing the Members of the Board the Conference shall observe the following distribution of seats: 33 members of the Board shall be elected from the States listed in Parts A and C, 15 from the States listed in Part II, and 5 from the States listed in Part D of Annex I to this Constitution.

2. Members of the Board shall hold office from the close of the regular session of the Conference at which they were elected until the close of the regular session of the Conference four years thereafter, except that the members elected at the first session shall hold office from the time of such election and one-half shall hold office only until the close of the regular session two years thereafter. Members of the Board may be re-elected.

3. (a) The Board shall hold at least one regular session each year at such times as it may determine. Special sessions shall be convened by the Director-General at the request of a majority of all members of the Board.

(b) Sessions shall be held at the seat of the Organization, unless otherwise determined by the Board.

4. In addition to exercising other functions specified in this Constitution or delegated to it by the Conference, the Board shall:

(a) Act under the authority of the Conference, review the implementation of the approved programme of work and of the corresponding regular budget and operational budget, as well as of other decisions of the Conference;

(b) Recommend to the Conference a scale of assessments for regular budget expenditures;

(c) Report to the Conference at each regular session on the activities of the Board;

(d) Request Members to furnish information on their activities related to the work of the Organization;

(e) In accordance with the decisions of the Conference and having regard to circumstances arising between sessions of the Board or the

Conference, authorize the Director-General to take such measures as the Board deems necessary to meet unforeseen events with due regard to the functions and financial resources of the Organization;

(f) If the office of Director-General becomes vacant between sessions of the Conference, appoint an Acting Director-General to serve until the next regular or special session of the Conference;

(g) Prepare the provisional agenda for the Conference;

(h) Undertake such other functions as may be required to further the objectives of the Organization subject to the limitations stipulated in this Constitution.

5. The Board shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

6. Each member of the Board shall have one vote. Decisions shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting unless otherwise specified in this Constitution or in the rules of procedure of the Board.

7. The Board shall invite any Member not represented on the Board to participate without vote in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that Member.

Article 10

Programme and Budget Committee

1. The Programme and Budget Committee shall consist of 27 Members of the Organization elected by the Conference, which shall give due regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution. In electing the Members of the Committee the Conference shall observe the following distribution of seats: 15 members of the Committee shall be elected from the States listed in Parts A and C, 9 from the States listed in Part B, and 3 from the States listed in Part D of Annex I to this Constitution. In designating their representatives to serve on the Committee, States shall take into account their personal qualifications and experience.

2. Members of the Committee shall hold office from the close of the regular session of the Conference at which they were elected until the close of the regular session of the Conference two years thereafter. Members of the Committee may be re-elected.

3. (a) The Committee shall hold at least one session each year. Additional sessions shall be convened by the Director-General at the request of the Board or the Committee.

(b) Sessions shall be held at the seat of the Organization, unless otherwise determined by the Board.

4. The Committee shall:

(a) Perform the functions assigned to it in Article 14;

(b) Prepare the draft scale of assessments for regular budget expenditures, for submission to the Board;

(c) Exercise such other functions with respect to financial matters as may be assigned to it by the Conference or the Board;

(d) Report to the Board at each regular session on all activities of the Committee and submit advice or proposals on financial matters to the Board on its own initiative.

5. The Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

6. Each member of the Committee shall have one vote. Decisions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.
Article 11

Secretariat

1. The Secretariat shall comprise a Director-General, as well as such Deputy Director-General and other staff as the Organization may require.

2. The Director-General shall be appointed by the Conference upon recommendation of the Board for a period of four years. He may be reappointed for a further term of four years, after which he shall not be eligible for reappointment.

3. The Director-General shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organization. Subject to general or specific directives of the Conference or the Board, the Director-General shall have the duty to direct the work of the Organization. Under the authority of and subject to control of the Board, the Director-General shall be responsible for the appointment, organization, and functioning of the staff.

4. In the performance of their duties, the Director-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action that might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization. Each Member undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Director-General and the staff and not to seek influence through them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

5. The staff shall be appointed by the Director-General under regulations to be established by the Conference upon recommendation of the Board. Appointments at the level of Deputy Director-General shall be subject to approval by the Board. The qualifications of service staff shall conform as far as possible to those of the United Nations system. The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff is to determine the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting staff on a wide and equitable geographical basis.

6. The Director-General shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the Conference, of the Board, and of the Programme and Budget Committee, and shall perform such other functions as are entrusted to him by these organs. He shall prepare an annual report on the activities of the Organization. In addition, he shall submit to the Conference or to the Board, as appropriate, such other reports as may be required.

CHAPTER IV—PROGRAMME OF WORK AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

Article 12

Expenses of delegations

Each Member and observer shall bear the expenses of its own delegation to the Conference, to the Board or to any other organ in which it may participate.
6. No resolution, decision or amendment involving expenditure, which has not already been considered in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3, shall be approved by the Conference unless it is accompanied by an estimate of expenditures prepared by the Director-General. No resolution, decision or amendment in respect of which expenditures are anticipated by the Director-General shall be approved by the Conference until the Programme and Budget Committee has considered it. The Board, meeting concurrently with the Conference, may have an opportunity to act in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3. The Board shall submit its decisions to the Conference. The approval by the Conference of such resolutions, decisions and amendments shall require a two-thirds majority of all Members.

Article 15
Assessed contributions

1. Regular budget expenditures shall be borne by the Members, as apportioned in accordance with a scale of assessment established by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, upon the recommendation of the Board adopted by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, on the basis of a draft prepared by the Programme and Budget Committee.

2. The scale of assessments shall be based to the extent possible on the scale most recently considered by the United Nations. No Member shall be assessed more than twenty-five percent of the regular budget of the Organization.

Article 16
Voluntary contributions to the Organization

Subject to the financial regulations of the Organization, the Director-General, on behalf of the Organization, may accept voluntary contributions to the Organization, including gifts, bequests and subscriptions, on the basis of the resources of the Organization and of the United Nations system and with other intergovernmental and governmental organizations.

Article 17
Industrial Development Fund

In order to increase the resources of the Organization and to enhance its ability to meet promptly and efficiently the needs of the developing countries, the Organization shall have an Industrial Development Fund, which shall be financed through voluntary contributions to the Organization provided for in Article 10, and other income as may be provided for in the financial regulations of the Organization. The Director-General shall administer the Industrial Development Fund in accordance with the general policy guidelines governing the operations of the Fund that are established by the Conference, or by the Board acting on behalf of the Conference, and in accordance with the financial regulations of the Organization.

CHAPTER V.—CO-OPERATION AND CO-ORDINATION

Article 18
Relations with the United Nations

The Organization shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations, as one of the specialized agencies referred to in Article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations. Any agreement concluded in accordance with Article 63 of the Charter shall require the approval of the Conference, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, upon the recommendation of the Board.

Article 19
Relations with other organizations

1. The Director-General may, with the approval of the Board and subject to guidelines established by the Conference:
   (a) Enter into agreements establishing appropriate relationships with other organizations of the United Nations system and with other intergovernmental and governmental organizations.
   (b) Establish appropriate relations with non-governmental and other organizations the work of which is related to that of the Organization. When establishing such relations with national organizations the Director-General shall consult with the governments concerned.

2. Subject to such agreements and relations, the Director-General may establish working arrangements with such organizations.

CHAPTER VI.—LEGAL MATTERS

Article 20
Seat

1. The seat of the Organization shall be Vienna. The Conference may change the seat by a two-thirds majority of all Members.

2. The Organization shall conclude a headquarters agreement with the Government of Austria.

Article 21
Legal capacity, privileges and immunities

1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such legal capacity and such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the exercise of its functions and for the fulfilment of its objectives. Representatives of Members and officials of the Organization shall enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization.

2. The legal capacity, privileges and immunities referred to in paragraph 1 shall:
   (a) In the territory of any Member that has acceded to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, be as defined in the standard clauses of that Convention as modified by an annex thereto approved by the Board;
(b) In the territory of any Member that has not acceded to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies in respect of the Organization but has acceded to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, as defined in the latter Convention, unless such State notifies the Depository on depositing its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession that it will not apply this Convention to the Organization; the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations shall cease to apply to the Organization thirty days after such State has so notified the Depository;

c) Be as defined in other agreements entered into by the Organization.

Article 22

Settlement of disputes and requests for advisory opinions

1. (a) Any dispute among two or more Members concerning the interpretation or application of this Constitution, including its annexes, that is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the Board unless the parties concerned agree on another mode of settlement. If the dispute is of particular concern to a Member not represented on the Board, that Member shall be entitled to be represented in accordance with rules to be adopted by the Board.

(b) If the dispute is not settled pursuant to paragraph 1(a) to the satisfaction of any party to the dispute, that party may refer the matter: either, (i) if the parties so agree:

(A) to the International Court of Justice; or

(B) to an arbitral tribunal

or, (ii) otherwise, to a conciliation commission.

The rule concerning the procedures and operation of the arbitral tribunal and of the conciliation commission are laid down in Annex III to this Constitution.

2. The Conference and the Board shall be separately empowered, subject to authorization from the General Assembly of the United Nations, to request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question arising within the scope of the Organization's activities.

Article 23

Amendments

1. At any time after the second regular session of the Conference and Members shall be empowered to propose amendments to this Constitution. Notices of proposed amendments shall be promptly communicated by the Director-General to all Members and shall not be considered by the Conference until ninety days after the dispatch of such communication.

2. Except as specified in paragraph 3, an amendment shall come into force and be binding on all Members when:

(a) It is recommended by the Board to the Conference;

(b) It is approved by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of all Members; and

(c) Two-thirds of the Members have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the amendment with the Depository.

3. An amendment relating to Article 6, 9, 10, 13, 14 or 23 or to Annex II shall come into force and be binding on all Members when:

(a) It is recommended by the Board to the Conference by a two-thirds majority of all Members of the Board;

(b) It is approved by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of all Members; and

(c) Three-fourths of the Members have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the amendment with the Depository.

Article 24

Signature, ratification, acceptance, approval and accession

1. This Constitution shall be open for signature by all States specified in subparagraph (a) of Article 23, until 8 October 1972 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria and subsequently at United Nations Headquarters in New York until the date this Constitution enters into force.

2. This Constitution shall be subject to ratification, acceptance, approval or accession by the States. Instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession of such States shall be deposited with the Depository.

3. After the entry into force of this Constitution in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 25, States specified in subparagraph (a) of Article 23 that have not signed this Constitution, as well as States approved for membership pursuant to subparagraph (b) of that Article, may accede to this Constitution by depositing instruments of accession.

Article 26

Entry into force

1. This Constitution shall enter into force when at least thirty States that have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession notify the Depository that they have agreed, after consultations among themselves, that this Constitution shall enter into force.

2. This Constitution shall enter into force:

(a) For States that participated in the notification referred to in paragraph 1, on the date of the entry into force of this Constitution;

(b) For States that have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval before the entry into force of this Constitution but did not participate in the notification referred to in paragraph 1, on such later date on which they notify the Depository that this Constitution shall enter into force for them;

(c) For States that deposit instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession subsequent to the entry into force of this Constitution on the date of such deposit.
Article 26

Transitional arrangements

1. The Depositary shall convene the first session of the Conference, to be held within three months following the entry into force of this Constitution.

2. The rules and regulations governing the organization established by United Nations General Assembly resolution 2182 (XXI) shall govern the Organization and its organs until such time as the latter may adopt new provisions.

Article 27

Reservations

No reservations may be made in respect of this Constitution.

Article 28

Depository

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall be the Depositary of this Constitution.

2. In addition to notifying the States concerned, the Depositary shall notify the Director-General of all matters affecting this Constitution.

Article 29

Authentic texts

This Constitution shall be authentic in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

Annex I

Lists of States

1. If a State that is not listed in any of the lists below becomes a Member, the Conference shall decide, after appropriate consultations, in which of these lists it is to be included.

2. The Conference may at any time, after appropriate consultations, change the classification of a Member as listed below.

3. Changes in the lists below that are made in accordance with paragraph 1 or 2 shall not be considered amendments within the meaning of Article 28.

Lists

[The lists of States to be included by the Depositary in this Annex are the lists determined by the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purpose of paragraph 4 of section II of its resolution 2182 (XXI), as in force on the date this Constitution enters into force.]

Annex II

The regular budget

A. 1. Administration, research and other regular expenses of the Organization shall be deemed to include:

(a) National and regional advisors;

(b) Short-term advisory services provided by the staff of the Organization;

(c) Meetings, including technical meetings, provided for in the programme of work financed from the regular budget of the Organization;

(d) Programme support costs arising from technical assistance projects, to the extent that these costs are not reimbursed to the Organization by the source of financing of such projects.

2. Concrete proposals conforming to the above provisions shall be implemented after consideration by the Programme and Budget Committee, adoption by the Board and approval by the Conference, in accordance with Article 14.

B. In order to improve the effectiveness of the Organization’s programme of work in the field of industrial development, the regular budget shall also finance other activities heretofore financed out of Section 15 of the United Nations Regular Budget, in the amount of 6 per cent of the total of the regular budget. These activities shall strengthen the Organization’s contribution to the United Nations development system taking into account the importance of utilizing the United Nations Development Programme country programming process, which is subject to the consent of the countries concerned, as a frame of reference for these activities.

Annex III

Rules concerning arbitral tribunals and conciliation commissions

Unless otherwise agreed by all the Members parties to a dispute that has not been settled pursuant to paragraph 1(a) of Article 22 and that has been referred to an arbitral tribunal pursuant to subparagraph 1(b)(i) (B) of Article 22 or to a conciliation commission pursuant to subparagraph 1(b)(ii), the following rules shall govern the procedures and operation of such tribunals and commissions:

1. Initiation

Within three months of the conclusion by the Board of its consideration of a dispute referred to it pursuant to paragraph 1(a) of Article 22 or, if it does not conclude its consideration within eighteen months of such referral, then within twenty-one months of such referral, all the parties to the dispute may notify the Director-General that they wish to refer the dispute to an arbitral tribunal or any such party may notify the Director-General that it wishes to refer the dispute to a conciliation commission. If the parties had agreed on another mode of settlement, then such notification may be made within three months of the conclusion of that special procedure.

2. Establishment

(a) The parties to the dispute shall, by their unanimous decision, appoint, as appropriate, one or three arbitrators or three conciliators, and shall designate one of these as President of the tribunal or commission.

(b) If within three months of the notification referred to in paragraph 1 above one or more members of the tribunal or commission have not been so appointed, the Secretary-General of the United Nations
shall, at the request of any party, within three months of such request designate any members, including the President, then still required to be appointed.

(c) If a vacancy arises on the tribunal or commission, it shall be filled within one month in accordance with paragraph (a) or thereafter in accordance with paragraph (b).

3. Procedures and Operation

(a) The tribunal or commission shall determine its own rules of procedure. All decisions on any question of procedure or substance may be reached by a majority of the members.

(b) The members of the tribunal or commission shall receive remuneration as provided in the financial regulations of the Organization. The Director-General shall provide any necessary secretariat, in consultation with the President of the tribunal or commission. All expenses of the tribunal or commission and its members, but not of the parties to the dispute, shall be borne by the Organization.

4. Awards and Reports

(a) The arbitral tribunal shall conclude its proceedings by an award, which shall be binding on all the parties.

(b) The conciliation commission shall conclude its proceedings by a report addressed to all the parties to the dispute, which shall contain recommendations to which these parties shall give serious consideration.

I hereby certify that the foregoing text is a true copy of the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, adopted at Vienna on 8 April 1978, the original of which is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

For the Secretary-General: The Legal Counsel


The printed + hand-set notes in the margins were done to aid the readers of this document to better understand the attachments also.

Bernadine Smith
10-29-90
TREATIES, Power to Make, Limited.—By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaty and cannot be otherwise regulated.... It must have meant to except out of these the rights reserved to the states, for surely the President and Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole government is interdicted from doing in any way. —Manual of Parliamentary Practice, Bergh 2:442. (1801.)

Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction. I say the same as to the opinion of those who consider the grant of the treaty-making power as boundless. If it is, then we have no Constitution. If it has bounds, they can be no others than the definitions of the powers which that instrument gives.

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

"The opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide which laws are constitutional, and what not, would make the judiciary a despotic branch."

......September 1804 - Thomas Jefferson

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric."

......Thomas Jefferson

"The government of the United States...is one of limited powers. It can exercise authority over no subjects except those that have been delegated to it. Congress cannot, by legislation, enlarge the federal jurisdiction, nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power."

......Supreme Court Opinion of 1836.
“Let Mr. Madison tell me when did liberty ever exist when the sword and the purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle shall interpose, no nation ever did, nor ever can retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse.”

Patrick Henry

“Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force and whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined.”

Patrick Henry

According to Section 236 of Volume Sixteen of American Jurisprudence, Second: “The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow: that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and sustains no acts performed under it... No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it.”

Friends of Patrick Henry
P. O. Box 1776
Hesford, CA 93232

10. The usefulness and permanency of this Government and the happiness of the millions over whom it spreads its protection will be best promoted by carefully abstaining from the exercise of all powers not clearly granted by the Constitution.

James K. Polk
Veto Message, Dec. 15, 1847; Ibid., p. 2476

“Our liberty depends upon freedom of the press... so long as it continues to exist...” Thomas Jefferson

“The entire and absolute freedom of the press is essential to the preservation of government on the basis of a free constitution.”

—Daniel Webster

(Today the press denies us the publication of what the government is doing in P.L. 87-2971)

9. I am determined to uphold the Constitution... to the utmost of my ability and in defense of all personal consequences. What may happen to an individual is of little importance, but the Constitution of the country, or any of its great and clear principles and provisions, is too sacred to be surrendered under any circumstances whatever by those who are charged with its protection and defense.

John Tyler
Protest, Aug. 30, 1842; Messages and Papers, p. 2046

Patriotism And Presidents

Patriotism means to stand by the country.

It does not mean to stand by the President or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country.

It is patriotic to support him in so far as he efficiently serves the country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the country.

In either event, it is unpatriotic not to tell the truth—whether about the President or anyone else—save in the rare cases where this would make known to the enemy information of military value which would otherwise be unknown to him.

—Theodore Roosevelt

Note: If you have no armed forces, you have no Constitution. The latter depends upon the people's ability to support and maintain armed forces.
"The advice nearest to my heart and deepest in my convictions is, that the Union of the states be cherished and perpetuated."

.....James Madison, Advice to My Country: Conclusion.

"Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution which is the work of your hands may be sacredly maintained;....."

.....Geo. Washington, Farewell Address September 17, 1796

"It is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned........"

.....Geo. Washington, Farewell Address September 17, 1796

"Whatever follies we may be led into as to foreign nations, we shall never give up our Union..."

.....Thomas Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, May 13, 1797

"....and the Union shall be perpetual......"

....."Articles of Confederation" of the 13 original states. Perpetual is said six times in the text.

"When any one State in the American Union refuses obedience to the Confederation by which they have bound themselves, the rest have a natural right to compel them to obedience."

.....Thomas Jefferson, Jan. 24. 1786

"The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indissoluble Union composed of indestructible states..."

.....Salmon P. Chase, U.S. Supreme Court 1864 - 1873 Decision, in Texas v. White 7 Wallace 725

"I appeal to all loyal citizens to favor, facilitate, and aid this effort to maintain the honor, the integrity, and the existence of our National Union, and the perpetuity of popular government; and to redress wrongs already long enough endured."

.....Abraham Lincoln April 15, 1861

"A house divided against itself cannot stand...it will become all one thing or all the other."

.....Abraham Lincoln June 1858
"That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

November 19, 1863 Address by Abraham Lincoln in Gettysburg

"At every hazard and every sacrifice this Union must be preserved."

March 4, 1837

Andrew Jackson, Farewell Address

"It is hereby ordained and declared, by the authority aforesaid, That the following articles shall be considered as articles of compact between the original States, and the people and States in the said territory, and forever remain unalterable......"

An act to provide for the Government of the Territory Northwest of the River Ohio Aug. 7, 1789

"If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801

"We the people of the State of California, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure and perpetuate its blessings, do establish this Constitution."

California Constitution of 1849

"The governments of the past could fairly be characterized as devices for maintaining in perpetuity the place and position of certain privileged classes.... The Government of the United States is a device for maintaining in perpetuity the rights of the people, with the ultimate extinction of all privileged classes."

Calvin Coolidge, Speech Philadelphia September 25, 1924

"At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."

Abraham Lincoln, Perpetuation of our Political Institutions.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!

Daniel Webster, Speech on Foote's Resolution, Jan 26, 1830

"The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them from invasion; and on application of the Legislature, or of the executive against domestic violence."

Art. IV Section 4 U.S. Constitution

"...to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity......"

Preamble to the United States Constitution, September 17, 1787

"...to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;......"

Article I Section 8 Paragraph 15 United States Constitution

"I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Article II Section 1, Paragraph 8 of U.S. Constitution - Oath of office to be taken by the U.S. President. (Written expressly by the Founding Fathers for all future presidents.)
This California law repeatedly refers to the "enrolled militia."

CHAP. CCXCVII.—An Act in relation to the Militia of the State.

[Approved April 24, 1852.]

The People of the State of California, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF.

SECTION 1. The Governor, as Commander-in-Chief of the militia of the State, shall issue commissions to all officers appointed or elected, under the provisions of this Act. The military staff of the Commander-in-Chief shall consist of one Adjutant-General, with the rank of Brigadier-General; six Aides-de-Camp, with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel; one Chief Engineer; one Paymaster-General; one Judge-Advocate-General, and one Surgeon-General, each with the rank of Colonel.

ADJUTANT-GENERAL.

SECTION 2. The Adjutant-General shall be appointed by the Commander-in-Chief, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall hold his office for the term of two years. He shall be, ex officio, Chief of Staff, Quartermaster-General, Commissary-General, Inspector-General, and Chief of Ordnance. He shall receive a salary of three thousand dollars annually, to be paid out of moneys appropriated for that purpose. He shall reside at the seat of government, and shall keep his office open, for the transaction of business, every day, (Sundays excepted,) from ten o'clock, A. M., to three o'clock, P. M.

OTHER OFFICERS OF GENERAL STAFF.

SECTION 3. Other officers of the general staff, and all other officers of the staff of the Commander-in-Chief, shall be appointed by the Governor, and shall continue in office for the same term as the Governor, or at his pleasure, except as hereinafter provided for officers called into active service.

STAFF OF DIVISION, BRIGADES, REGIMENTS, AND BATTALIONS.

SECTION 4. There shall also be appointed by the Commander-in-Chief, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one Major-General of Division, and one Brigadier-General to each brigade, who shall be citizens of the United States, and severally resident in the division or brigade for which they shall be appointed. They shall hold their offices for the term of four years, and until their successors are appointed and qualified.

SECTION 5. The staff of the Major-General of Division shall consist of one Assistant Adjutant-General, with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel; two Aides-de-Camp, with the rank of Major; one Engineer Officer; one Ordnance Officer; one Quartermaster; one Paymaster; one Division Inspector; one Judge-Advocate, and one Surgeon, with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel; and four Staff Ordinaries, with the rank of Major-General. The staff of the Adjutant-General shall consist of one Aide-de-Camp, with the rank of Captain; one Engineer Officer; one Ordnance Officer; one Quartermaster; one Paymaster; one Brigade Inspector; one Judge-Advocate; and one Surgeon, with the rank of Major; and two Staff Ordinaries, with the rank of Sergeant-Major. The staff of a Colonel of a regiment, and of a Lieutenant-Colonel, or a Major, commanding a battalion, as hereinafter provided, shall consist of one Adjutant and one Assistant Surgeon, each with the rank of First Lieutenant; and one Sergeant-Major, to be appointed by the commanding officer, the Adjutant being selected from the line, as in the United States Army.

HOW APPOINTED.

SECTION 6. The General of Division, the Generals of Brigade, and the Adjutant-General, shall appoint the officers of their respective staffs, who must be residents of their respective division and brigades. Any officer of a regiment, battalion, or company, receiving and accepting any staff appointment, except that of Adjutant, shall be considered as commissioned therein, by organizing his commission in such regiment, battalion, or company. All such staff officers will continue to hold their office until their successors shall have been appointed and commissioned, except as herein otherwise provided for troops called into active service.

COMMISSIONS.

SECTION 7. All military officers appointed or elected under the laws of this State, shall be commissioned by the Governor, and such commission shall be countersigned by the Secretary of State, and attested by the Adjutant-General, or officer acting in his place, and the officer so commissioned shall take the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, before some officer authorized by law to administer oaths, a copy of which oath shall be inclosed on, or attached to, each commission, and a
certified copy of the same shall be made out by the officer administering it, and delivered to the officer taking it, and by him transmitted to the Adjutant-General, and the commission shall be deemed as taking effect on the day of the incumbrance and transmission of the certificate of the oath, as herein provided. In case of promotion, the commission shall take effect from its date. Commissions shall run at the pleasure of the Commander-in-Chief, except as herein otherwise provided.

DUTIES OF ADJUTANT-GENERAL.

Sec. 8. It shall be the duty of the Adjutant-General to take charge of, and to carefully guard and preserve, and to account for, all arms, accouterments, ammunition, ordnance stores, and other military property belonging to this State, or granted to it by the Congress of the United States. He shall keep and file, in his office, all returns, reports, and military correspondence, made by him, in accordance with the provisions of this Act. He shall also keep an account of all moneys received and expended by him. The manner of keeping these accounts and papers, where not otherwise provided by law, shall be directed by the Commander-in-Chief, and they shall be always subject to his inspection. He shall, on or before the second Monday in December, of each year, make to the Governor, to be by him laid before the Legislature, a report of all the transactions of his department since his last annual report, containing—

First—An account of all moneys received and expended.

Second—An account of all arms, accouterments, ammunition, ordnance stores, and military property of every description, belonging to the State, from what source received, to whom issued, or expended, and by whose order.

Third—A statement of the present condition of all such property under his charge, and if any such property shall not be under his charge, he shall state in whose possession the same may be.

Fourth—The number, strength, and condition of the organized militia, and the strength of the enrolled militia of the State. He shall also make and transmit an annual return of the militia of this State, pursuant to the requirements of the Act of Congress, of March second, eighteen hundred and thirty-four. The President of the United States, a copy of which shall lay before the President of the State. He shall also perform all other duties appertaining to his office, or which may be enjoined upon him by law. He shall be the medium of military correspondence with the Commander-in-Chief.

BONDS.

Sec. 9. Before entering upon the duties of his office he shall give bonds, to The People of the State of California, with good and sufficient sureties, to be approved by the Governor, in the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars, conditioned that he shall faithfully perform all the duties enjoined upon him by law. If at any time the Governor shall deem the sureties so given to be insufficient, he shall require the Adjutant-General to give new

surrenders, to be approved by him; and if the Adjutant-General shall refuse or neglect to do so, the Governor shall suspend him from office, and immediately report his proceedings to the Senate, if the Legislature be in session, and if not, then at the beginning of the next session; and if the Senate disapprove such suspension, it shall be regarded as a removal from office, but if the Senate disapprove of the suspension, the Adjutant-General shall resume the duties of his office. During the time of his suspension from office he shall receive no portion of his salary; but if such suspension be disapproved, he shall receive his back pay.

ADJUTANT-GENERAL AD INTERIM.

Sec. 10. During the suspension of the Adjutant-General from office, or his absence, or inability, from any cause, to perform his duties, the Governor may appoint some competent person to perform the duties of Adjutant-General ad interim.

TO TURN OVER PROPERTY.

Sec. 11. On the expiration of the term of office, the Adjutant-General, or the person performing his duties ad interim, shall turn over to his successor, in good order, all arms, ordnance, ordnance stores, and other property, belonging to the State, and all books, papers, bonds, and money, in his charge, and pertaining to his office.

WHO SUBJECT TO MILITARY DUTY.

Sec. 12. Every able-bodied, white male inhabitant, of this State, between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years, not exempt by law, shall be subject to military duty, and shall be organized and enrolled as hereinafter directed.

Sec. 13. The following persons are exempted from military duty and enrollment: All ministers of religion, having a license, or written evidence, according to the rules of the particular persuasion or organization, that they are such ministers; all civil and military officers of the United States; all officers of foreign governments; all civil officers (including members of the Legislature) of the State of California; all persons who have been wounded in the service of the State, or of the United States, and all persons exempted from military duty by the laws of the United States.

ENROLLMENTS AND ASSESSMENTS.

Sec. 14. The District, or County, Assessor, of each and every district, or county, in this State, shall, at the same time in each year, when he prepares a roll containing the taxable inhabitants of his district, or county, enroll all the inhabitants of his district, or county, subject to military duty, which list, or roll, shall be sworn to by him, and delivered to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, in the same manner, and at the same time, as is provided by law for the civil tax list, or assessment roll, and
the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall keep the same open for inspection, as is provided by law for the civil assessment roll.

Sec. 15. The Board of Equalization shall correct the said military assessment roll, at the same time and in the same manner as prescribed by law for the correction of the civil assessment roll; and it shall be the duty of the said Clerk, to deliver to the Brigadier-General of the brigade to which his county belongs, a triplicate of said list, certified by him, within ten days after the Board of Equalization shall have completed their correspondence; and the compensation allowed for making out said military list shall be the same, or be determined and fixed in the same manner as for making out the assessment list.

NEGLIGENCE OF ASSESSOR AND CLERK OF BOARD OF EQUALIZATION.

Sec. 16. If any Assessor shall neglect, or refuse, to perform any of the duties required of him by this Act, he shall be subject to the same penalties, liabilities, and punishments, as is provided by law for a neglect, or refusal, to perform any of the duties required of him for the assessment of the civil taxes; and, moreover, he shall forfeit and pay the sum of not less than three hundred and not more than one thousand dollars, to be sued for in the name of the People of the State, by the District Attorney of the respective county, and recovered in the name of the People of the State, and paid into the General Fund of the State; and if the Clerk of the Board of Equalization shall neglect, or refuse, to perform any of the duties required of him by this Act, he shall forfeit and pay the sum of not less than two hundred and not more than five hundred dollars, to be sued for and recovered in the same manner as is provided in this section with respect to the Assessor.

ORGANIZATION OF VOLUNTEER COMPANIES.

Sec. 17. Whenever a sufficient number of persons, by the provisions of this Act, residents of any county of this State, subject to military duty, shall subscribe to a call for the organization of a volunteer company, the County Judge of said county, upon due application of the persons who have subscribed, as above, shall appoint some suitable person, resident of the county, to open a book, in which he shall enter the names of the persons so volunteering, and shall fix a time and place of meeting for the purpose of organization, by giving ten days notice thereof, by publication in some newspaper, or by posting notices in at least three public places in the county.

Sec. 18. The person so appointed shall preside at such meeting, and organize the same; he shall superintend the election of the officers of said company, which election shall be by ballot; he shall make out, after said election shall have been determined, a list of persons so volunteering, a certificate of each officer so elected, and transmit them to the Brigadier-General commanding the brigade in which such company shall be organized; who shall, if found correct, transmit the same, with his approval, to the Adjutant-General of the State, together with a copy of the proceedings of said meeting, and a copy of his appointments, and of the notice of said meeting, duly certified by him. And if it shall be found that such company has been organized, and such officers elected, in conformity with the provisions of this Act, the said company shall be listed in the office of the Adjutant- General as a company of the organized militia of this State, and the officers so elected shall be commissioned by the Commander-in-Chief.

Sec. 19. The volunteer or independent companies shall be armed and equipped in the same manner as similar corps in the United States Army, and shall consist of the following officers, warrant officers, and privates, viz: to each company of infantry, one Captain, one First Lieutenant, one Second Lieutenant, one Sergeant, two Corporals, two Drummers, one Musician, and not less than forty nor more than eighty Privates; to each company of cavalry, one Captain, one First Lieutenant, one Second Lieutenant, one Sergeant, one Corporal, one Drummer, one Musician, and not less than forty nor more than eighty Privates; excepting light batteries, which shall be allowed one hundred active members each, and such officers as are allowed in the United States service.

Sec. 20. Volunteer companies and battalions may adopt a constitution and form by-laws, rules, and regulations, not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States, or of this State, for the government of their members, and for their improvement in military science. It shall be the duty of the Adjutant- General, whenever such company or battalion shall be organized, to keep a perfect and complete record of the constitution, by-laws, rules, and regulations, of his company, or battalion, which shall be signed by the Captain, or Commander, and countersigned by the Adjutant, or Sergeant-Major; and said record shall at all times be subject to the inspection of any member of the company, or battalion, and all military officers, or persons interested therein; and if any member of such volunteer company, or battalion, shall fail to comply with the provisions of such constitution, by-laws, rules, and regulations, as may be expunged from such company, or battalion, and his name erased from its roll.

Sec. 21. When any volunteer company shall be organized according to law, the commanding officer thereof may apply to the Commander-in-Chief, through the proper military authorities, for such arms and accoutrements, or stores, as may be required, such application being first submitted to the County Judge, who shall approve, or disapprove, which shall be signed, and countersigned by the Adjutant-General, or Sergeant-Major, or any other person authorized by law to grant such arms and accoutrements, or stores, mentioned in such application, or any portion thereof, and all applications, or any portion thereof, are ready for issue; and thereupon it shall be the duty of such officer to give such arms and accoutrements, or stores, mentioned in such application, or any portion thereof, and all applications, or any portion thereof, are ready for issue; and thereupon it shall be the duty of such officer to give such arms and accoutrements, as may be deemed requisite by the County Judge, to secure the county.
from loss on account of use or misapplication of such arms, equipments, or other stores. And on due notification from any
Chief Judge, that such bonds have been given, to his satisfaction, and on receiving triplicate receipts from such Chief, the
Adjutant-General shall make the issue. He shall file one copy of such receipts in his office, and transmit the other two
to the Controller of State, and the other to the Clerk of the county to which such volunteer company belongs.

Sec. 22. It shall be the duty of the Board of Supervisors of each county in which there shall be one or more organized
volunteer companies, on application of the Captain or commanding officer of the same, to provide for such company in said
county, an armory, safe and suitable for the drill of squads in the School of the Soldier, and an Armorer, to take charge of
the same, and said Board shall also, at each of its sessions, and at the cause to be paid, the necessary incidental ex-

penses of said company previously incurred; provided, that the total amount for all the purposes above mentioned shall not
exceed fifty dollars in money, per month, for each company.

Sec. 23. The Commander-in-Chief shall have authority to demand and receive from any county, or from any posses-
tion of the military forces of any State, any arms, equipments, military stores, or other property, belonging to the State, which
may be in possession of any such counties, in military storehouses.

And when such arms, equipments, military stores, or other property, shall again come into the possession of the Adjutant-
General, or other officer designated by the Governor to receive them from such counties, or military forces, to which they have
been loaned, as above provided, it shall be the duty of the Adjutant-General, or officer so appointed, to receive
such, and the same, which receive shall be in triplicate, and a copy to be filed in the office of the County Clerk, one in the office of the
Adjutant-General, and the third in the office of the Controller of State.

Sec. 24. All arms, equipments, and military stores, issued as above provided, shall at all times be subject to exami-
nation by the Inspector and as an ordinance officer of the State, and of any other officer designated by the Commander-in-
Chief for that purpose; and if such officer shall find any such public property out of repair, injured, or defective, he shall
immediately notify the facts to the Board of Supervisors of the county, and report the same, through the proper channels, to
the Commander-in-Chief, who, if the damage shall not be repaired, and the defects or losses supplied, within a reasonable
time, shall order the same to be done under the direction of such officer, and the costs and expenses for the expense thereof shall be
duly examined and audited by the State Board of Military Auditors, and paid, on the draft of the Controller of State, out of the
General Fund.

Sec. 25. It shall be the duty of the Controller of State to charge the value of all arms, equipments, and military stores,
issued as above provided, provided in the counties in which such public property shall be issued, and all expenses of repairs, of damage
and defects, as provided in the foregoing section, and double the

Bay of any arms, equipments, and military property, which
the county, or such military companies, shall have to re-

duced by act of the Controller of State, be assessed, at the time of the next annual assessment, and the same shall be charged to
the county in the same manner as the ordinary taxes, and shall be paid into the State Treasury, as a part of the General Fund of the

Sec. 26. The transportation of all arms, equipments, and military stores, issued or received by the State, under
the provisions of this Act, shall be conducted by the Chief of the Commander-in-Chief, by the Adjutant-General,
and by the Board of Military Auditors, when audited by the
Board of Auditors of the State, by the warrant of the Controller of State.

Sec. 27. No public arms, equipments, or military stores, of any kind, shall thereafter be issued to any person not a member
of the organized volunteer militia, or of the enrolled militia, unless he shall, in writing, make oath to the public safety requires him to make such oath, and in which case an accurate account shall be taken, of such
arms, and to whom they are made.

Sec. 28. Within ninety days from the passage of this Act, and of every volunteer company now organized,
under the provisions of the said act, as above provided, it shall be the duty of the Commander-in-Chief, or officer so
appointed, to receive such, and the same, which shall be in triplicate, to be filed in the office of the County Clerk, one in the office of the
Adjutant-General, and the third in the office of the Controller of State.
and equipments so used, without process of law, and he shall account to the Adjutant-General for the same.

ORGANIZATION OF BATTALIONS AND REGIMENTS.

SEC. 27. Any number of organized volunteer companies, not less than three, nor more than eight, may form themselves into a volunteer battalion, by giving notice of such intention through their commanding officer to the General of the brigade, who will appoint some suitable officer to hold an election of the officers of such battalion; and the officer so appointed shall fix a time and place for the same, by giving ten days' notice thereof, by publication in some newspaper, or by posting notices in at least three public places in the county. Such election shall be by ballot, and the commissioned officers of the volunteer companies calling for the organization of the battalion. The officer so appointed to hold the election shall preside over and supervise such elections, and as soon as they shall have been determined, he shall make out certificates of election of the officers so elected, and a certified copy of the proceedings of said meeting, with a certified copy of the minutes of said meeting, all of which he shall transmit to the Brigadier-General of the brigade, who shall transmit them, with a certified copy of the appointment of such officer to hold the election, to the Adjutant-General of the State, through the ordinary channels of military correspondence.

SEC. 28. A battalion of eight companies shall be deemed a regiment, and shall elect one Colonel, one Lieutenant-Colonel, and one Major; a battalion of more than eight companies, shall elect one Lieutenant-Colonel, who shall be the commanding officer, and one Major; and a battalion of three, or four companies, shall elect one Major, who shall be the commanding officer. Each regiment shall be allowed, in addition, a detachment of Engineers, consisting of ten, including a Junior Second Lieutenant and one Sergeant.

MASTER ROLLS.

SEC. 29. It shall be the duty of each and every commanding officer of any volunteer company in this State, on or before the last Mondays of March and September of each year, to make out, in triplicate, master rolls, setting forth the names and number of the members of his company, the officers, in the order of their rank, and the privates, in alphabetical order, and stating at the foot of each master roll a list of all arms, accouterments, ordnance and ordnance stores, and other property belonging to the State, in his possession; one of which master rolls, duly certified, he shall transmit, through his commanding officer, to the Adjutant-General of the State; he shall keep the other as a voucher for himself. If such company shall form a part of any organized battalion or regiment, the commanding officer thereof shall transmit the same, with a master roll of the field and staff officers of his regiment, or battalion, to the Adjutant-General of the State, through the proper channels of military correspondence.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE MILITIA.

SEC. 22. All commissioned officers of the organized volunteer regiments, battalions, and companies, shall take rank according to the date assigned to them by their commissions; and when two of the same grade be of the same date, their rank shall be determined by length of service in the militia; and if of equal service, then by lot. Officers of organized volunteer regiments, battalions, and companies, shall in all cases be deemed senior to officers of the unorganized militia of the same grade, irrespective of the date of their commissions.

SEC. 24. It shall be the duty of each and every Brigadier-General, to make, from the assessment rolls received by him from the commanders of counties, and the officers of counties, battalions, and companies, as prescribed in this Act, or before the first Monday in October of each year, two master rolls, one to be entitled "Master roll of the organized militia of the brigades," and the other to be entitled "Master roll of the unorganized militia of the brigades," in the first of which he shall include the names of all the officers of his district, and all the officers, non-commissioned officers, musicians, artists, and privates, of the organized volunteer regiments, battalions, and companies, in his brigades, in the order of their organization; and in the second, he shall include, in alphabetical order, the names of all other persons subject to military duty. The originals of these master rolls, signed by the General of Brigades, shall be filed in his office, and duly certified copies thereof shall be furnished by him to the General of Division, and to the Adjutant-General of the State.

SEC. 25. And it shall be the duty of the Major-General of Division, on or before the fourth Monday in October of each year, to make, from the rolls received by him from the Brigadier-Generals of his division, two master rolls, one to be entitled "Master roll of the organized militia of the division," and the other to be entitled "Master roll of the unorganized militia of the division," the first to be made up of the names of the officers of the division, and the master rolls of the organized militia of the brigades of the division, according to their organization; and the other to be made up of the master rolls of the unorganized militia of these brigades, as provided in the foregoing section. The originals of these master rolls, signed by the Major-General, shall be filed in his office, and duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted to the Adjutant-General of the State.
STATUTES OF CALIFORNIA,

Chapter 31.

Volunteer Militia.

Sec. 28. In case of war, insurrection, or rebellion, or of resistance to the execution of the laws of this State, or upon the call or requisition of the President of the United States, upon the call of any officer of the United States Army, commanding a division, department, or district, in any county, or upon the call of any United States Marshall in California, or of any county, or of President of the Board of Supervisors of the Cities and Counties of Tacoma and San Francisco, or of any sheriff, the Commander-in-Chief is authorized to call into active service any portion of the organized or enrolled militia of this State. In case of the absence of this Commander-in-Chief from the State, or if he be unable to immediately communicate with him, the civil or military officer making the requisition for troops shall, if he deem the danger imminent and not admitting of delay, serve a copy of such requisition, together with a statement of the Governor's absence, or the impossibility of immediately communicating with him, to the nearest officer, or to the nearest military officer commanding the nearest division of the United States Army in California, upon which call has been made by the Governor; and if such call be not complied with by the Governor, the said troops so called into service shall be immediately disbanded. Such call for any portion of the organized militia shall be made by an officer in the State, and directed to the commanding officer of the company, battalion, regiment, brigade, or division, which is so called into service, designating in such order the particular troops called, the time at which rendezvous, and the officer to whom they shall report. If such order be directed to the Major-General of Division, it will be immediately communicated to the Brigadier-Generals, and by them, to all the officers of the respective brigades; and any officer receiving such order will be required to report to the Governor, and any other commanding officer or company, or battalion, or receiving such order, will immediately proceed to notify the same to each individual of his command, by personal notice, or by publication in some newspaper, or by the usual posting in public places of the county or counties from which the call is made, and such officer shall attend in person, or by deputing an officer of the organized militia in his place, at the place of rendezvous, and take the names of all volunteers for service under such call; and if the number of such volunteers shall be sufficient to form one or more companies or battalions, according to the provisions of this Act, he shall immediately call and superintend the election of the officers of such companies or battalions, which election shall be conducted in the manner prescribed in this Act for the election of officers of volunteer companies and battalions, except as to the publication of notice of such election; a pecul-
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Sec. 29. The Governor may continue the state guard by drafting not more than twenty-five men from each of the enrolled militia.

Sec. 30. Any company, or companies, of the enrolled militia as drafted by the Governor, or by direction of the Commander-in-Chief, shall be enrolled and mustered into the state guard, and the enrolment of the enrolled militia having more than eight companies; and if the number of such volunteers shall be sufficient to form one or more companies or battalions, according to the provisions of this Act, he shall immediately call and superintend the election of the officers of such companies or battalions, which election shall be conducted in the manner prescribed in this Act for the election of officers of volunteer companies and battalions, except as to the publication of notice of such election; a pecul-
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any office designated in such call for an election, in the manner
and at the time appointed, as provided in this Act, such
vacancy or vacancies shall be filled by appointments made by the
Commander-in-Chief, and any company, or companies, of drafted
militia not assigned to, and mustered in, any incomplete
battalion of the organized volunteer militia, shall be organized into
battalions, or regiments, the field officers of which shall be ap-
pointed by the Commander-in-Chief, and the appointments being
made in all cases where, in the opinion of the Commander-in-
Chief, suitable persons can be obtained from the officers of the
organized volunteer militia of this State.

Sec. 82. Where troops are called into active service from
different brigades, and the number so called into active service
shall not be more than sufficient to constitute one complete
brigade, the Commander-in-Chief shall so organize them, and
shall designate the particular Brigadier-General for the com-
mand of the brigade so organized.

OF OFFICERS IN ACTIVE SERVICE.

Sec. 40. The commission of any officer called into active
service shall continue until he shall be discharged by the order
of the Commander-in-Chief, provided, that such commission shall
not be vacated by resignation, dismissal, or removal, as
provided in this Act. All vacancies of officers and
commissioned officers, in active service, shall be filled by appoint-
ment, or promotion; the first by the Commander-in-Chief, and
the second by the commanding officer of the battalion, or of the
company, in case such company forms no part of any
battalion.

In filling such vacancies of commissioned officers, the
Commander-in-Chief shall, as a general rule, promote by senior-
ity, or appoint, on the recommendation of the, acting or
commanding officers, those in active service, and in any case of departure from
this rule, the Commander-in-Chief shall report his reasons for such
departure, to the Senate. The commanding officer of troops in
active service may nominate to any vacancy, for personal
 heaviness, cowardice, or any other offense in which the one so nominated
shall report his reasons to the Senate; and if the Governor shall com-
mission some other person than the one so nominated, he shall
be tried and punished by a Court-martial; and any person of the enlisted militia
who shall refuse, or neglect, in reconstructions and campaigns, when
drafted as provided in this Act, shall be subject to a fine of
not less than fifty nor more than five hundred dollars, to be

recovered by an action to be brought by the District
Attorney, in the name of The People of the State, upon the certificate
of the officer appointed to make the draft, before any Court of
competent jurisdiction in the county from which such person
was drafted, and the fine so recovered shall be paid into the
Treasury, as belonging to the General Fund of the State.

SUBSTITUTES AND ALIENS.

Sec. 42. Any private of the organized militia, and any
person who has been drafted into service, under
the provisions of this Act, may, at any time before the expiration
of the term for which he was drafted, resign, and
be exempt from service; and any person fit for military duty, who has not been called, or drafted,

into service, No alien drafted into service shall be obliged to
serve and bear arms against any foreign enemy to whom he
swears allegiance.

Sec. 43. The Commander-in-Chief shall order a public parade
of all the organized militia of the State on at least two days of
each year; such parades to be held within the limits of the
brigade to which such troops respectively belong; and such pub-
lic parades shall be reviewed by the Commander-in-Chief, or, in
his absence, by the Major-General, or by the officer of the brigade
of the highest rank present. Immediately after such troops
have been reviewed, they shall be inspected by the Inspector-
General, in the presence of the, or, in his absence, by the Division or Brig-
ader-General; and such inspecting officer, after a minute inspection of disci-
pline and military bearing, of the officers and commissioned
officers, and the officers of companies, and arms, accoutrements and
dress of each soldier, will report the result of such inspection
to his commanding officer; provided, that in the City and County
of San Francisco the organized militia shall parade at least six
times during the year; two parades as herein has been provided,
two by regiments or battalions, and two parades by company,
and, of which company parades shall be for target practice, the
result of which target practice shall be reported to the
commanding officer of the brigade; and, provided, further, that upon
occasions of reception, or upon the celebration of any event
of public importance, the commanding officer of the brigade shall
have authority to order out the organized militia, to join such
parade, and, the parade so ordered be hereby constituted a legal
parade; and, provided, further, that such and every company of
the organized militia of the City and County of San Francisco
shall be required to assemble at least once in each week for military instruction.
In other parts of the State, such companies shall assemble at
least once a month for such instruction, and all members who
absent themselves from such meetings for instruction, during
four consecutive meetings, unless properly excused by the
commanding officer of each company, or through absence from
the company, or bodily disability, shall be deemed from the ex-
ception of jury duty and poll tax and road tax, and subject to expul-
sion from their company.

Sec. 44. All members of the organized militia of this State,
who are served or mustered under the provisions of this
Act, shall be exempt from jury duty, and from the payment of
poll tax of every description, and from serving on any posse
have the same power to compel the attendance of witnesses, which duly summoned by the Judge-Advocate, to preserve order in and about the Court-room during the session, and to punish contempt, as the Judges of the District Courts have, under the laws of this State.

REMOVALS AND ABSENCE FROM THE STATE.

Sec. 47. Any commissioned officer of a brigade, or division, General or otherwise, who shall remove his residence from the limits of his brigade, or division, will be deemed to have resigned his commission, and the Major-General, or any Brigadier-General, who shall absent himself from the State for more than three months, without the permission of the Commander-in-Chief, shall be deemed to have resigned his office.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MILITIA IN ACTIVE SERVICE.

Sec. 48. Whenever any of the militia of this State shall be or shall be called into active service for the space of more than one week, they shall receive the same pay and allowances as United States troops serving in California. Any general or field officer being called into active service, such call shall be deemed to include all the officers of their respective staffs. In case a division, or part of a division, is called into active service, the Commander-in-Chief shall be authorized to put upon active service one of his aides-de-camp.

RETURN OF ARMS, ETC.

Sec. 49. When the Commander-in-Chief shall order the return of arms, etc., to the State of any arms, equipments, military stores, or other military property, belonging to the State, such arms and military property shall be immediately delivered to the officers authorized in such order to receive it, and to keep possession thereof, and to have it described in such order, and to make and deliver receipts for the same, and describing their condition in such receipts; and if the property mentioned in such order shall not be promptly delivered, as directed, the officer named in such order is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of the same, in the name of The People of the State; and any person resisting such officer in the performance of this duty, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for not more than six months in the county jail, and shall be subject to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, to be recovered by action brought by the District Attorney, in the name of The People of the State, and to be paid into the Treasury as a part of the General Fund.

Sec. 50. The Commander-in-Chief, Adjutant-General, and the Secretary of the State, shall constitute a State Board of Military Auditors. The Commander-in-Chief shall be President, and the Adjutant-General shall be Secretary, of said Board.

Sec. 51. The Board of Military Auditors shall have a seal, and an impression of which shall be deposited by the Secretary of
the Board in the office of the State Treasurer, and be attached 
as required by law.

Sec. 52. It shall be the duty of said Board of Military Auditors to audit all reasonable expenses incurred by volunteer companies in the service of this State, and officers attached to the same, and all other claims required under the provisions of this Act. It shall be the duty of the Controller of State to draw his warrants for the amount thus audited, and the Treasurer of State is hereby required to pay the same out of any moneys in the General Fund not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 53. The Adjutant-General shall, under the direction of the Governor, prepare and keep in his charge all blank military commissions, and such other blanks as may be required for the service.

OFFICERS AND TROOPS ALREADY COMMISSIONED AND ORGANIZED.

Sec. 54. All volunteer companies, battalions, and regiments, organized prior to the passage of this Act, shall be deemed to have been organized in compliance with its provisions, and to be entitled to its benefits; but such companies, battalions, and regiments, shall be required to comply with all the remaining provisions of this Act.

Sec. 55. The organized and unorganized militia of this State shall be composed of the following divisions and regiments: The first division, consisting of five brigades, as follows: First Brigade—San Diego, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and Monterey Counties; Second Brigade—Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo, San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Sonoma, Solano, Napa, and Lake Counties; Third Brigade—San Joaquin, Madera, Tulare, Fresno, Stanislaus, Calaveras, Merced, Mariposa, Tuolumne, and Sierra Counties; Fourth Brigade—Mariposa, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Merced, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, and Calaveras Counties; Fifth Brigade—Butte, Plumas, Colusa, Tehama, Shasta, and Siskiyou Counties; Sixth Brigade—Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, and Klamath Counties.

Sec. 56. Any and all new counties, which may hereafter be organized in this State, shall be attached to the respective brigades in which the larger portion of said new county is now located.

Sec. 57. Whenever any portion of the organized or unorganized militia shall have been called into active service, to suppress an insurrection or rebellion, to disperse a mob, or to enforce the execution of the laws of this State, or of the United States, it shall be competent for the Commander-in-Chief, or the General acting in his place, as provided in section thirty-nine, to place such troops under the temporary direction of the Mayor of any city in which they may be stationed, or the Mayor of the County of Sacramento and San Francisco, or person having in that capacity, of the Sheriff of any county, or of any Marshal of the United States. And if, in the opinion of such civil officer, it shall become necessary that the troops so called out shall fire or charge upon any mob or body of persons assembled to break or resist the laws, such civil officer shall give a written order to that effect, to the superior officer present in the command, who will at once proceed to carry out the order, and shall direct the firing and attack to cease only when such mob or unlawful assembly shall have been dispersed, or when ordered to do so by the proper civil authority. No officer, who has been called out to sustain the civil authorities, shall, under any pretense, or in compliance with any order, fire blank cartridges upon any mob or unlawful assembly, under penalty of being liable to the same penalty of a Court-martial, provided, that nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting any such troops from firing or charging upon such mob or assembly, without the orders of such civil officers, in case they shall first be attacked or fired upon, or forcibly resisted in discharge of their duty. When the Commander-in-Chief, or General acting in his place, shall call troops into active service, for the purposes mentioned in this section, and shall not place them under the temporary direction of any civil officer, the commanding officer shall use his own discretion with respect to the propriety of attacking or firing upon any mob or unlawful assembly.

Sec. 58. All fines, legally imposed by a Court-martial lawfully constituted, after the proceedings and findings of said Court in the premises have been approved, as prescribed by this Act, shall be and the same are hereby made collectible by law. And any person failing to pay the same, shall be proceeded against by the District Attorney, in the name of the People of the State, as the plaintiff, in any Court of competent jurisdiction of the county. And a copy of so much of the finding and approval as relates to imposition and approval of such fines, as shall be made by the officer authorized by law to approve the same, shall be received as evidence in the case. And if judgment be obtained, it shall be collected as in ordinary cases, and shall be paid into the County Treasury, as belonging to the General Fund of the State, and to be accounted for as such.

Sec. 59. The Commander-in-Chief may, from time to time, publish rules, regulations, and orders, for the government of the militia of this State, in accordance with the provisions and spirit of this Act.

Sec. 60. Any volunteer company may, on its organization, or thereafter, adopt a distinctive name, but shall be known by a particular letter, or number, in the battalion or regiment to which it belongs.

Sec. 61. No person shall be a member of two companies at the same time, and any member of a company who removes beyond the limits of the county, shall be considered as having been discharged from such company.

Sec. 62. In the case of military taxes and fines assessed and charged against a minor, the parent or guardian shall be held responsible. In case of minors who are orphans, the Commander-in-Chief shall have power to remit any military taxes or fines.

Sec. 63. In the absence of any appropriate commander, the next in rank in the command of troops, where not otherwise provided in this Act, shall succeed to his authority.

Sec. 64. Every senior in his appropriate command, shall have authority to control the actions of his junior, in accordance with the principles of military subordination, under the laws and usages that govern the United States Army.
Sec. 66. Any officer cashiered by sentence of a Court-martial, shall be precluded thereby from holding any commission in the military service of the State, except the sentence be reversed by the Commander-in-Chief.

Sec. 67. No non-commissioned officer, artificer, musician, or private, expelled from service, or dismissed from service, for any disgraceful cause, shall be permitted to again enter any volunteer company, except the sentence be reversed by the Commander-in-Chief.

Sec. 68. No officer, inferior in grade to a regimental or battalion Commander, shall have power to grant discharges to non-commissioned officers, artificers, musicians, or privates, in active service; but Commanders of companies of the organized militia, when not in active service, may issue certificates of service and discharges. All discharges shall be in writing, and shall set forth fully the cause of the discharge, and shall be signed by the officer granting the same.

Sec. 69. Any officer resigning his commission shall do so in writing, and transmit the same, through his immediate commanding officer, who will make his indorsements thereon, and the resignation shall go into effect when accepted by the Commander-in-Chief, and not before. Vacancies of commissioned officers of organized companies and battalions, not in active service, caused by resignation, death, dismissal, or removals, or by the expiration of the term fixed by the rules and regulations of such company, or battalion, or by any other cause, shall be filled by election. Such elections of companies and battalions shall be presided over by an officer appointed for the purpose by the Brigadier-General; and such presiding officer shall report to the Commanding officer the result of such election to the officer appointing him, which report shall be transmitted to the Commander-in-Chief, who shall issue commissions in accordance therewith; provided, however, that when the same officer shall be re-elected, no new commission shall be issued, but the officer so re-elected shall continue to hold under his original commission.

Sec. 70. The commission of any staff officer, whose term of office depends upon the pleasure of the officer by whom he is appointed, shall, when such officer is not on active service, be considered as vacated, upon the qualification of his successor, and shall be so noted upon the proper books, or rolls, kept in the office of the Adjutant-General of the State.

Sec. 71. The Commander-in-Chief is authorized, at any time, by issuing his orders to that effect, to disband any portion of the organized volunteer forces, or of the so-called militia, then on active service, which may prove unnecessary, disorderly, or disorderly in discipline, or to deprive them of arms; and that any officer commanding in the Clerks of the County Courts or Courts of the county or counties in which such force was raised; and that, in such cases, it shall be a misdemeanor in any person so disarmed, to appear with State arms in his possession, or any part of the organized volunteer militia, or of the so-called militia, in active service, until again drafted or regularly mustered into service, under the penalty of not less than ten nor more than one hundred dollars for each offense, and such person shall be proceeded against by the District Attorney, in the name of the People of the State, before any competent Court of the county where such person may happen to be; and all fines so recovered and collected shall be paid into the Treasury, as a part of the General Fund.

Sec. 72. Every company, battalion, or regiment of organized militia of the State, may adopt a uniform for itself, which shall be subject, however, to the approval of the Commander-in-Chief, or report of the inspection officers, made through the proper channels of communication; and no uniform which is not thus approved shall be worn when on duty.

Sec. 73. The uniform of all general officers, and members of their staff, and all other officers not required to wear the distinctive uniform of their regiment or corps, shall be similar to that of the corresponding grades and corps in the United States Army, with such modifications as may be directed by the Commander-in-Chief for adapting it to State troops.

Sec. 74. The systems of instruction in tactics, prescribed for the different arms and corps in the United States Army, shall be followed in the military instruction and practice of the militia of this State, and the use of any other system is forbidden.

Sec. 75. The President of any general Court-martial, assembled in pursuance of the provisions of this Act, may make a requisition upon the Sheriff of the county in which the session is held, for a Deputy Sheriff to attend upon such Court as Provost-Marshal, and such Deputy Sheriff shall receive for his attendance the same pay and fees, and be subject to the same responsibilities, when attending upon the same as the District Court. And the President of any regimental, battalion, or company Court-martial, may make a requisition upon any Constable of the county, to act as Provost-Marshal of such Court; and such Constable shall receive the same pay and fees as in a Justice's Court; and the pay and fees of such Deputy Sheriff, or Constable, shall be paid, on the certificate of the Judge-Avocate and warrant of the Controller of State, by the State Treasurer, from the General Fund, each account being first audited by the Board of Military Auditors.
Sec. 70. When bands of music shall not have been organized for any regiment, battalion, or isolated company, in the manner provided in the regulations of the Army of the United States, it shall be lawful for such regiment, battalion, or isolated company, through its commanding officer, to hire the services of any band of musicians, at their own expense, and the persons so employed shall, during the term of their engagement, be subject to the same laws and regulations that govern the military body with which they may serve.

Sec. 77. When any person, drafted for service, shall offer, at or after the time of rendering a substitute, of the age of twenty-five years, or over, shall, in such a substitute, as shall be necessary to the principal, all the duties, fines, forfeitures, and punishments, to which he or his substitute shall be subject, he shall be accepted by the officer making such draft. And the same rule shall apply to substitutes offered by members of organized volunteer companies called into active service, the commanding officer of such company being the judge of the suitableness of the substitute offered. And the person whose substitute shall be so accepted, shall be exempted from draft during the term of service of his substitute.

Sec. 78. No action shall be maintained against any member of a Court-martial, or officer, or agent, acting under his authority, on account of the imposition of a fine, or the imposition of a sentence on a convicted person, not liable to military duty, or if such person should have been duly summoned, and shall have neglected to appear and show his excuse before the Court.

Sec. 79. Courts of Inquiry may be ordered by the Commander-in-Chief, Major-General, or any Brigadier-General. Such Courts of Inquiry shall be governed by the same rules as Courts in the United States Army, and shall have the power to preserve order, punish contempts, and compel the attendance of witnesses, as Courts-martial have.

Sec. 80. For all services under this Act, Sheriffs, Constables, and Jailer shall receive like fees as for similar services in other cases, and shall be subject to the same penalties for any neglect of duty.

Sec. 81. The Adjutant-General shall have a seal of office, to be approved by the Commander-in-Chief, and endorsed on all records of his office, under the said seal, shall be evidence in all cases in like manner as if the original were produced.

Sec. 82. On the days of military parade appointed by the Commander-in-Chief, the militia so called out and doing military duty, shall be considered to be under military discipline from the rising to the setting of the sun; and no officer, non-commissioned officer, musician, artist, or private, belonging to the same, during the time aforesaid, shall be subject to be arrested on any civil process.

Sec. 83. The commanding officer of any parade, review, or drill, and the officer in charge of any rendezvous, may cause the ground selected for that purpose to be marked, or designated, in such a manner as not to obstruct the passage of travellers on any public highway; and if any person, during the occupation of such ground for such military purpose, shall encroach upon such bounds, or enter upon such ground, without the permission of the officer commanding, or in charge, he may be put and kept under guard, by the order of such Commander, until the setting of the sun of the same day, and, moreover, shall be subject to arrest and punishment, by any Court of competent jurisdiction, for a breach of the peace.

Sec. 84. If any person shall intercept, molest, or insult, by abusive words or behavior, any officer, non-commissioned officer, or soldier, while in the performance of his military duty, he shall be immediately put under guard, and kept under guard until the officer engaged in the performance of such military duty, until the setting of the sun of the same day on which the offense shall have been committed; and moreover, shall be subject to arrest and punishment, by any Court of competent jurisdiction, for a breach of the peace.

Sec. 85. Any officer, non-commissioned officer, or soldier, on military duty, who shall disobey the legal orders of his superior, use any reproachful or abusive language to his superior, or misbehave, or demean himself in an officer, or unsoldierlike manner, shall be immediately arrested, if an officer; and if a non-commissioned officer, or soldier, shall be disarmed and put under guard, and shall be tried and punished by a Court-martial, according to law and military usage.

Sec. 86. In case of parades, reviews, inspections, or musters, of the troops of any brigade, any companies not organized into battalions shall be temporarily organized in battalions, for the duties of the day, and the battalion so temporarily organized shall be commanded by the officer senior in rank of the companies composing it. It shall be optional with any such unattached companies to attach themselves for the day to any organized battalion, or battalions, or to organize a temporary battalion; but no such temporary battalion shall be organized of less than three companies, if there be any organized battalion, or battalions, present on duty, to which they may attach themselves without exceeding the complement fixed by this Act. If such unattached companies shall not attach, or organize, themselves, in accordance with the provisions of this section, the officer commanding the brigade for the day shall order such assignment or organization.

Sec. 87. Horses, arms, equipment, and uniforms, of all officers, non-commissioned officers, and privates, used for military purposes in the organized or enrolled militia of the State, shall be exempt from execution.

Sec. 88. The Act, approved May ninth, eighteen hundred sixty-one, entitled an Act in relation to the Militia of the State, and all other Acts, or parts of Acts, in conflict with the provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 89. This Act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.