


#2 HST



Harry S. Truman: Upon FDR's death, vice-president Truman moved into the oval office. Membership in the communist dominated United Nations, started by FDR, was finalized during Truman's administration, and the U.S. became bound by the massive changes required and yet to come via the demands within the U.N. Charter . A world government with an upcoming world army was being built which expected to lay hold of our U.S. armed forces and commandeer them for use in world

government command and control. The people of the United States were never asked if they wanted to give up their Constitutional government, or their military, or their Bill of Rights. The decision was made by the international socialists on the federal level, although they did consult the states, *but there never was a vote taken of the people*. Secretary of State Stettinius signed the U. N. Charter with Harry Truman standing nearby on June 26, 1945. The Senate ratified it on July 28, 1945 as a treaty but it did not qualify as a treaty. This Charter is a complete reversal of what our Founding Fathers stood for. Sold as a way to stop wars, it has never reached that goal after 68 years of its existence. Instead, its plan for a world government has been the cause of many of our unnecessary wars. The Charter is responsible for many of the alterations in the U.S. form of government. Can there be any peace when we are denied a national military and every individual person is prohibited from owning a gun? The United Nations Human Rights Treaties are formulas for the communist lifestyle. The 1791 Bill of Rights drafted by the founding fathers will be outlawed some day, replaced with a communist Bill of Rights document. Entry into the U.N. meant an end to the Declaration of Independence. Funded by tax-exempt foundations, the merger of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union began in 1953. Truman continued FDR's New Deal, but he re-named it the "Fair Deal". Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 which gave birth to the CIA. In 1948 he closed the files on communists with the "Truman Directive".

Note: This article is in no way comprehensive. Due to the condition of the political situation in the United States, this short report is being provided because of expediency.

## Truman's 1948 Directive

AM. BN.  
8-14-70

Editor: On July 30, 1953, the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate issued a report, entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments." For those who would understand what is going on in the United States today, this report is mandatory reading. After intensive investigation, the committee listed twelve conclusions, four of which are as follows:

1. The Soviet international organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the United States Government and this penetration has not been fully exposed.

2. In general, the Communists who infiltrated our Government worked behind the scenes—guiding research and preparing memoranda on which basic American policies were set, writing speeches for Cabinet officers, influencing congressional investigations, drafting laws, manipulating administrative reorganizations—always serving the interest of their Soviet superiors.

3. Despite the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security agencies had reported extensive information about this Communist penetration, little was done by the executive branch to interrupt

the Soviet operatives in their ascent in Government until congressional committees brought forth to public light the facts of the conspiracy.

4. Policies and programs laid down by members of this Soviet conspiracy are still in effect within our Government and constitute a continuing hazard to our national security.

When these conclusions are studied, along with President Truman's directive of 1948 (which in effect closed all files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees of the U.S. Government to everyone except the executive branch of the government), a clear perspective of what is happening in our country today is gained. What is frightening today, however, is the fact that no president since 1948 has seen fit to rescind President Truman's directive.

Communist subversion cannot be eliminated anywhere in the United States until it is completely routed from Washington, D.C. Only President Nixon can insure that this is done. Only he can rescind President Truman's directive, which seals all executive activity from the public's attention.—Richard E. Woodin, [redacted] San Gabriel

8-14-70

# LIFE


JULY 16, 1945 **10** CENTS  
BY SUBSCRIPTION: TWO YEARS \$8.50

(This photographic reproduction is for the benefit of those who insist Alger Hiss only played a minor role in the founding of the United Nations and the authoring of its charter. Note his title: Conference Secretary General.)

THIS WAS  
ADDED BY  
THE GROUP  
THAT PUT OUT  
THIS FLYER—

## PICTURE OF THE WEEK: ➔

At the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference the Charter of the United Nations was huddled off to a waiting plane and gingerly placed in a 75-pound fireproof safe equipped with a small parachute. Attached to the safe was a stern inscription: "Finder—do not open! Notify the Department of State—Washington, D. C." Chief custodian was Conference Secretary-General Alger Hiss, shown here with the Charter at end of the cross-country trip. Three days after the Charter arrived safely in Washington, President Truman took it with him to the Senate and made his plea for Senate ratification. There the document was casually left on a clerk's desk, temporarily "lost" in the shuffle. Recovered after a flurry of panic, it was whisked away to a State Department vault where, by now well-thumbed, it rests under 24-hour guard.



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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

tory of every country when the people's 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 of 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.

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 Nason, a Rhodes scholar, president of Swarthmore, Pa., College, and Mrs. Borden Harriman. At the conclusion of his speech, Dr. Nason 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 wire their Senators to that effect.

At the question period I challenged Dr. Nason 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 CHARMAN. 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 caravan that moves to that mysterious realm where each shall take his chamber in the silent halls of death, thou go not like the quarry slave at night, scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed by an unflinching trust, approach thy grave like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Thank you.

The CHARMAN. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

The CHARMAN. Please be in order. You are not supposed to express your approval or disapproval or applaud or make any other demonstration. Next is Mrs. Gristel.

# The United Nations Charter

☆

JULY 1945 ✓

Testimony of Mrs. Helen V. Somers on the United Nations Charter before the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee

The CHARMAN. Give your name and your residence and whom you represent to the reporter.

Mrs. SOMERS. My name is Helen V. Somers, and my address is 2914 Cedar Street, Philadelphia, Pa., and I just represent myself, the organization of the United States Government, the people of the United States.

The CHARMAN. That is a good representation. Go right ahead.

Mrs. SOMERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to place upon the record that I am an American woman, a mother, that I am pro-America and pro-peace, anti-nothing; but I resent the propaganda from any foreign source that tries to interfere in our domestic affairs.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am before you today, July 11, 1945, to voice my opposition to the United Nations Charter, which is the betrayal of our constitutional Republic, and in doing so I am expressing the sentiments of thousands of other Americans who cannot be here to do likewise.

I definitely oppose the United Nations World Charter because it will change our form of government by setting up a world government and a World Court.

Article I, section 8, clause 9, of the Constitution specifically states that "Congress has the power to institute inferior tribunals only." If our people wish to change our form of government, it can be done only by amendment, by the vote of the people. Consequently, any ratification is illegal.

The United Nations Charter will set up a superstate because you cannot have a World Court without a world government and a world dictator. There will be no freedom, only slavery. George Washington warned against interfering our destiny with that of any other nation. How do I know of the plan to set up a world state? Well, I have been very fortunate in learning of the British-Israel World Federation movement, whose symbol, the unfinished pyramid of Giza, appears on our one dollar bills only, placed there in 1935.

In 1893, Andrew Carnegie wrote a book entitled "Triumphant Democracy", the last chapter A Book Ahead. In it he says:

Time may dispel many illusions, destroy many noble dreams, but I shall ever be of the opinion that the wound once caused by the separation of the child (America) from its Mother (England) will not bleed forever. Let men say what they will, I say as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it, one morning, to rise, to shine upon and greet again the Re-united State, the British-American Union.

10101

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 Hertzl plan to return 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't you see? Gone with the wind—No; not if 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, sunning herself on the beach at Nassau in the Bahamas, dreams of the day when the common people of the world will call on 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. Gentlemen, Edward, the Duke, is here surveying our land and looking forward to the day you ratify the United Nations Charter and he then will become king of the world. You will find the evidence right here in this folder.

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

Mrs. SOMERS. It says:

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

His world, I suppose—

and shall 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.

Mrs. 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 1,303 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 dupes, 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.

Mrs. SOMERS. On April 9, 1944, at the last meeting of the forum 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 Fineshriber spoke on the moral—he sanctioned all Professor Frazier said, and when questioned later as to his being a member of the World Fellowship, Inc., the special council 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 Judd, 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 would have to circumvent it.

On November 18, 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 Stars 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 tons of it throughout the Nation.

The September a year previous, Harold Rand, speaking to the same convention held there, he said:

Had anyone told you people here in Philadelphia, the birthplace of liberty, 25 years ago, that in Senate bill 666 you will witness the destruction of this Republic, the end of the gentle domination of the world and then Israel would come into her own, you would not believe it. But it is going to happen—

and then he quotes the Bible to prove it.

Did you *know* this?



## 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.*



# THE U.N. CHARTER NEVER WAS A TREATY!



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.

# 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

# 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 misconstruction of the treaty power.

Those who *deviously 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 *restrain* 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, law-makers 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.* Bergh 2:42 (1801)

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 socialistic 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.



## ILLEGALITY OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT!

### PART 2

By Albert Burns  
July 20, 2005  
NewsWithViews.com

In our previous article on this subject, we discussed the incredible manner through which the 14th Amendment was maneuvered into the Constitution. The **ostensible** reason why the Republican radicals worked so hard to get the 14th Amendment to the Constitution **DECLARED** as ratified (however spurious that ratification might be) was to guarantee the freedom and rights of former slaves. However, history has shown that to have been of negligible concern to those in power.

It is interesting to note that Alexis DeToqueville, in his book **"Democracy In America"**, published in 1835, wrote that racial prejudice was stronger in the North than in the South. He stated: **"The prejudice of race appears to be stronger in the states that have abolished slavery than in those where it still exists."**

Northern states enacted discriminatory "black codes" long before they came into being in ANY southern state. Illinois, in 1848, Oregon, in 1857, Indiana, in 1862, all had laws severely restricting the rights of

There was a clear intent in succeeding years to transform our "federal" system into a "centralized" government system by transferring all rights and powers of the individual States to Washington.

blacks and mulattos who were not allowed to enter into legal contracts, could not testify in court against whites, were not allowed to immigrate, legally, into these states or if they did come in had to post a \$1000 bond to guarantee that they would behave "properly."

Other northern states and cities had similar laws. Northern newspapers such as the *Philadelphia Daily News*, the *Daily Chicago Times*, and even the New York Times were printing blatantly racist editorials. Some of the radical legislators in Congress who forced through the 14th Amendment had previously supported the discriminatory laws in their own home states. **No**, Southern racism was **NOT** the primary reason for the 14th Amendment!

Almost as soon as the ink was dry on the document declaring that the 14th Amendment was officially a part of the Constitution, efforts began to be made to use Section 1, of the amendment, as a weapon to destroy the rights of the individual states or the citizens therein.

Section 1 of the 14th Amendment states: **"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."** (Emphasis added)

As previously stated, the Constitution was designed to regulate the power and activities of the **FEDERAL** government. The Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution to further spell out the activities which the **FEDERAL** government could **NOT DO!** Amendments 9 and 10 were deliberately added to **PROTECT** the States and their affairs

**FROM** interference by the federal government. For instance, it was universally recognized that while Congress could **NOT** make any law respecting the establishment of religion, several of the individual **STATES** which ratified the Constitution **AND** the Bill of Rights **DID** have established **STATE** religions.

With the addition of the 14th Amendment, groups and individuals began to file cases in federal courts claiming that this amendment **GAVE** the federal government **AUTHORITY** to supervise the activities of both state and local governments — **an exact reversal of the original intent of the Founding Fathers**. The first case which advanced this doctrine reached the Supreme Court in **1873**. That Supreme Court held that the 14th Amendment did **NOT** grant such authority to the federal government.

There was a clear intent in succeeding years to transform our “federal” system into a “centralized” government system by transferring all rights and powers of the individual States to Washington. Those who wanted to achieve this result kept bringing cases attacking states’ rights to the Supreme Court in an effort to get the Court to change its position on this vital point. According to a study called **“The Constitution of the United States of America: Analysis and Interpretation: Annotations of Cases Decided by the Supreme Court of the United States to June 30, 1952,”** also known as Senate Document No. 170, the position of the Court began to weaken at the beginning of the 1900s, and by the 1930s the Supreme Court had begun to, tentatively, assume jurisdiction under the 14th Amendment to act as **“censor upon...legislation of the States.”**

With the appointment of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court by Dwight Eisenhower, the Court began to simply **USURP** power under the “equal protection” phrase of the 14th Amendment, to

do **ANYTHING** desired by a majority of the Court. The “equal protection” doctrine has been used by the Court to impose **FEDERAL** mandates upon the States in such areas as education, voting rights, abortion, religious instruction, labor disputes, and the list goes on and on. Precisely the kind of judicial tyranny which Thomas Jefferson warned of when he described federal judges as those who would be **“constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric.”**

In our next article we will examine how previous Supreme Courts viewed such usurpation and some of the consequences of that usurpation to our current society.

*Albert Burns was born 1924 and brought up in Elizabeth, NJ. Enlisted in the Air Force in September, 1942. Sent to Boca Raton, Florida to begin Officer training. Graduated as a Second Lieutenant. Attended University of Arizona to study Civil Engineering.*

*Albert moved to Lima, Peru as Assistant Supervisor of Construction, with the U.S. Foreign Buildings Division of the State Department. Worked on the construction of the new U.S. Embassy Office Building in Lima. After completion, he was transferred to Mexico City to work on the construction of the new Embassy.*


*Joined the John Birch Society in 1967. Was a chapter leader, section leader and eventually served for several years as the Coordinator in Hawaii. Once he got on the Internet about ten years ago, he began writing articles in an effort to alert fellow Americans to what was taking place in America which the vast majority were unaware of. He has been studying*

# Thomas Jefferson

## ON TREATIES

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



PLEASE READ THESE QUOTES  
PRINTED IN BERGH'S MANUAL  
WHICH QUOTE OUR 3RD PRES-  
IDENT, THOMAS JEFFERSON ON  
THE SUBJECT OF TREATIES.

"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.