

974.90
I 60
1951
w/42

PUBLIC HEARING

On

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 9

Before

N.J. Legislature. ASSEMBLY, STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY.

Members present:

Honorable Lawrence A. Cavinato, Chairman
Honorable Cyrus H. Loutrel
Honorable Elvin R. Simmill
Honorable Nathaniel C. Smith
Honorable Paul M. Salsburg
Honorable Donald D. Mackey

Honorable T. James Tumulty, co-sponsor of
A.C.R. 9

Assembly Chamber, State House
Trenton, New Jersey
March 9, 1951

New Jersey State Library

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Joseph G. Carty, American Legion, Department of New Jersey	2
Mr. C. Conrad Schneider, New Jersey State Commander, American Legion	2
Mr. Halsey W. Stickel, Past State Commander, American Legion	5
Mr. Charles Peterson, Legislative Chairman, New Jersey Veterans of Foreign Wars	10
Mr. August Hanniball, Jr., State Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of New Jersey	12
Mr. Joseph D. Lintott, Legislative Chairman, Catholic War Veterans of New Jersey	17
Mr. John W. Bill, Legislative Chairman, Disabled American Veterans	18
Mrs. Anne Todarelli, New Jersey State Chairman of National Defense, D. A. R.	21
Mr. John W. Finger, President, American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic and Fraternal Societies	24
Mr. Daniel H. Mahar, Past Commander, Army and Navy Legion of Valor	25
Mrs. Wetherill, Daughters of American Revolution	26
Mrs. Amondson, Saddle River Chapter, D. A. R.	26
Honorable Irene Griffin, President, New Jersey Council of Patriotic Women of America	27
Mrs. Reim, Legion of American Patriots	29
Honorable Edgar Williamson, President, New Jersey Coalition	29
Honorable Frederick Bethke, New Jersey Coalition	30
Honorable Thomas Doughty, Chancellor, Sons of American Revolution	32
Mrs. Gertrude Flynn, New Jersey State President, American Gold Star Mothers	34
Mrs. Ralph Hacker, New Jersey Coalition	34
Mrs. Tully, Gold Star Mothers	34
Mrs. A. Jordan, Society for Constitutional Security	42

Index continued.	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Louis B. Dailey, United World Federalists, Inc.	43
Reverend Heinbuck	49
Mr. A. J. G. Priest, Chairman, National Executive Committee, United World Federalists, Inc.	51
Mrs. Marie Wilcox	56
Mr. Harry B. Hollins, President, United World Federalists, Inc., of New Jersey	60-66 74
Mr. James Kerney, Jr.	61
Reverend William Emery	63
Reverend William L. Tucker	65
Mr. Shaun Bemrose Copithorne, Executive Secretary, Religious Society of Friends, Moorestown, N.J.	67
Reverend Ralph Bassett	68
Reverend James Hutchinson	68
Dr. James Morse	69
Mr. James Burns	70
Mr. Bertram Polow, New Jersey C. I. O.	77
Mrs. Niese	78
Mrs. M. Judson	78
Mrs. Charles Coolidge	79
Mr. Ernest W. Spink.	79
Mr. Myron Kronisch	80
Mr. Charles E. Johnson, Jr.	81
Mrs. M. A. Vreeland	81
Mrs. Van Heertum	82
Mrs. Fred Bowes	82
Mr. Robert F. Moss	82
Mr. F. G. Wegel	83

Index continued.	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Samuel Caplan	85
Mrs. Chester Baxter	86
Mrs. Mary C. Keenan, Catholic Daughters of America	87
Mr. George Warwick, Spanish War Veterans	89
Statement of Enid H. Griswold, Legislative Chairman, N. J. Chapter Pro-America, and Eagle Rock Chapter of D. A. R.	91
Mr. Frederick Cartwright, Englewood Anti-Communist League	93
Mrs. Rudolph Emmel, Legislative Chairman, State Federation of Women's Clubs	94
Mr. William Dowd, Past National Commander, Disabled American Veterans	94
Mr. Karl M. Mann, Sons of American Revolution	96
Mr. Benjamin F. Tillson	97
Mrs. Rosa A. Livingston	98
Mrs. Ruth M. Bryant, Ramapo Valley Chapter, D. A. R.	99
Resolution adopted by 25th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense	100

MR. CAVINATO: I now call to order the public hearing on Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9. Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9 reads as follows:

"A Concurrent Resolution withdrawing the application, to the Congress of the United States, to call a convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the United States to join in a World Federal Government, made in Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 17 of the One Hundred and Seventy-third Legislature of the State of New Jersey."

So that this issue will be clearly put, I will reiterate that Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9 is a resolution to repeal Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 17 adopted by the Legislature in 1949. Those who wish that Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 17 remain, and that it still be the policy of this State to call this convention for a World Federal Government will naturally oppose A.C.R. 9. Those who wish a change will favor Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9. Is that clear?

I also want all the speakers to know that they may avail themselves of these loudspeakers attached to the several desks.

Now, at the outset, we realize that this is one of the most important things before us in this session of the Legislature. It is a policy of the great State of New Jersey on a matter of world import. It concerns the future policy of this State and of this nation.

I know that we are here assembled with very sincere hopes, and in keeping with this sincerity, I certainly beg that there be no personalities attacked. I think this thing is so big that it calls for very serious treatment. I know we, the legislators, are very anxious to hear all that can be said about this policy. Therefore, we welcome the proponents and the opponents. This will be a great help to the legislators who finally have to decide this important issue. It also will be a great help to the citizens of this great State in knowing more about this very important subject.

I have here the sponsors of this resolution, and I want them to rise as their names are called.

(Assemblyman Mackey, Union County, and Assemblyman Tumulty, Hudson County, are introduced by Mr. Cavinato)

I want the members of the Judiciary Committee to rise as I call their names.

(Members of the Assembly Judiciary Committee are introduced by Mr. Cavinato)

Now, at the outset, we want a spirit of fair play, a spirit of giving everyone full opportunity to express his or her views, or the group that they represent. I want to give everyone an opportunity to speak on this very important subject. I note here that there are at least 50

who desire to speak in opposition to the resolution, and there are upwards of 25 or more who want to speak in favor of it. Such a large number makes it imperative that we all show the spirit of fair play. We all believe in freedom of speech; therefore, let's not impose upon the other's record. I ask all of you, before I am forced to do it, to make your speech as telling as possible, and also to make it as brief as possible. I am told by the opponents that there are 6 principal speakers, and the other 44 will be speaking but a few minutes, so that number 50 is not as frightful as it appears at first. I do not think that anyone, either a proponent or an opponent, should speak more than 10 minutes, and I will be very happy if they speak but five minutes.

The public hearing is on, and I now call Joseph Carty, legislative representative of the American Legion.

JOSEPH G. CARTY, American Legion, Department of New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to say that the American Legion of the Department of New Jersey, and its Auxiliary, are very happy for this opportunity to present their case, and we are very happy for this opportunity for all concerned. However, since you have put a limit to the time of each speaker, and there are so many speakers, I would like to speak, for the Department of New Jersey American Legion, our Department Commander, Mr. C. Conrad Schneider, who will present our case, and I will allot my ten minutes to Mr. Schneider. After that, Mr. Stickel will also present our side.

C. CONRAD SCHNEIDER, New Jersey State Commander, American Legion.

Mr. Cavinato and members of the legislative committee:

The American Legion is a proponent of A.C.R. 9. We feel that A.C.R. 17, passed in 1949, should be repealed. We feel that the one hundred thousand members of our Legion and its Auxiliary are calling to the attention of the Legislature the need for this repeal. We do so with no appeal to the emotions, because we think it is the democratic way to give it to you on a very plain, common-sense and factual basis.

The American Legion, whose views I reflect, believes in and supports the United Nations. We recognize that United Nations has limitations and that it is struggling with grave problems of international discord seeking answer thereto. We are glad our country is an influence and a power in United Nations. We believe much good will come of continued support to United Nations. But, we cannot agree that we must dissolve the United States and be of any good service to United Nations. We think that the basic reconciliations of differences between various nations must come as an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary process. What is most needed is more thorough understanding of the differences of races and their ancient customs. Such understanding cannot be well acquired by force. It must come from faith and confidence in each other and from sincerity in working in common purpose.

We are strong in our conviction that this is not the time to plunge into such a profound commitment without much more knowledge of it and the implications that affect our people. We, therefore, oppose any tampering with our constitution which would only serve to add confusion to an overly confused world. We should leave good enough alone for the moment and concentrate on the very pressing problems that now beset us. We should complete one job of great magnitude before we take on an even greater one.

United Nations is only five years old. This is only the tick of a clock in the life span of nations and governments. It is in a major effort to live and justify its birth and to become effective among the nations of the world. We should strive to make it work as planned and from the experience, learn what is next best to do. The theory of World Government has intrigued statesmen, politicians, intellectuals and students in their various assemblies. All of these have struggled to evolve that Utopia which has defied philosophers from Plato to the present day.

Most World Government theories can be laid down on a drafting board in convincing perspective. But the plans do not yield to practical construction because of a false promise. They all presuppose that the world is made up of theoretic perfect men responsive to theoretically common and identical emotions. Furthermore the Great State is to be administered by a ruling aristocracy possessed only of virtue and devoid of all vices and cupidities of man in power.

Despite these shortcomings, there is no reason to abandon the experiment. To do so would be abandonment of the search for truth and end endeavor to develop the perfection so necessary to a successful unity of nations. We should keep the laboratory until theories have been tested and proven practical and workable before we artlessly begin construction of an edifice that may collapse upon us, destroying not only the half built job, but the laboratory out of which must come the precise engineering to direct the craftsmen.

From various literature distributed by and the speeches of World Government proponents, it appears that United Nations is to be displaced by a more authoritative and positive World State. In order to accomplish this, it will be necessary for all member nations to surrender many of their sovereignties. Among these are their armaments, their treaty making prerogatives and (more subtly suggested) much of their control over economic, political and social determinations. Religion, which is of great import to all peoples and has caused many wars, is touched upon but very lightly. There have been some indications, however, that this subject could be a violent matter and there is no assurance that the proposed World Government might not become mandatory on the subject.

The Super State would have taxing powers over its members, a most potent power of any government. Each member nation would be permitted to have certain military police forces ostensibly for maintenance of internal law and order but otherwise they would have to rely upon a form of collective security or an International Police

Force as a defense against external aggression. The composition and command of such force is of course unknown.

The establishment of international law would rest in a World Congress or Parliament with essential administrative and judicial functions to carry out its legislative mandates. Just how this World Congress is to be organized and the manner of its composition is extremely abstract. From what can be understood of the elective system and the proportion of representation each member nation is to have, no clear idea is available. Such explanation as has been elicited is reduced to a befuddled formula so complex that only a speculative mathematician can comprehend it.

As to the head of this World Government and the subordinate officers, there is no definition or description of them or their duties and powers.

What the United States is asked to do by Congressional authority and some form of constitutional convention is to alter its present constitution so that any and all of our constitutional limitations which would prohibit entrance into such a World State be removed therefrom.

Only now are American citizens becoming aware of the full significance of this proposal and the threat it holds to our liberties and political philosophy. Under World Government, our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and the whole of our system of equity and justice would be abrogated and irretrievably lost. There could be no turning back because once a nation joins the World State, it cannot secede.

Experience with United Nations reveals very great conflict in principles of government between member nations. Certain of these principles are irreconcilable and can only co-exist in a loose confederation. In an absolute World State, they could not exist side by side because they would be a continuous source of strife.

In the light of the present day, the proposal to surrender our "war making" powers should be emphasized. This would strip us of our armor as a first step to stripping us of our wealth. Thereafter, this Great Nation as we know it would retire into history as a fond memory.

At present, we strive to share our wealth, which is the product of our own hands, with other nations less fortunate. Under World Government, this sharing would disappear for that government with its World Police Force would take what it wanted and distribute it where it will. So too, with our liberties that fail to conform with World Government supercedures.

Thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: I will now call on Mr. Stickle who also represents the American Legion.

HALSEY W. STICKEL, Past State Commander of the American Legion.

Mr. Cavinato and members of the Judiciary, ladies and gentlemen:

I have no prepared speech. However, I have some information which I think would be of interest to the Judiciary Committee so that they can determine what action they should take on A.C.R. 9. Since we are the first two speakers on this subject, I think the plan of the World Federalists should be put into the record, and I read from the Principles and Powers upon which a world federal government must be based, according to the United World Federalists, Inc.

"Principles:

- "1. Membership: Participation in the world federal government should be open at all time to all nations without the right of secession.
- "2. Reservation of Powers: All powers not delegated to the world federal government should be reserved to the nations and their peoples in order to guarantee to each nation its right to maintain its own domestic, political, economic, social and religious institution.
- "3. Enforcement of World Law: World Law should be enforceable directly upon individuals.
- "4. Balanced Representation: Representation in the legislative body should be determined upon a just formula recognizing population, economic development, educational level and other relevant factors; each representative to vote as an individual.
- "5. Bill of Rights: The world constitution should include a bill of rights assuring equal and adequate protection to persons affected by the constitution and laws of the world federal government.
- "6. Revenue: The world federal government should have authority to raise dependable revenue under a carefully defined and limited but direct taxing power independent of national taxation.
- "7. Amendments: Reasonable provisions should be made for amendment of the constitution.

"Powers:

"Such legislative, executive and judicial powers as may be found necessary to the preservation of peace should be delegated to the world federal government. These should certainly include at least the following provisions which should be incorporated into the world constitution itself:

- "1. Provisions prohibiting the possession by any nation of armaments and forces beyond an approved level required for internal policing.
- "2. Provisions requiring control by the world federal government of the dangerous aspects of atomic energy development and of other scientific developments easily diverted to mass destruction.
- "3. Provision requiring such world inspection, police and armed forces as may be necessary to enforce world law and provide world security.
- "4. Other powers: We recognize that although some world federalists believe that such limited powers would be sufficient as a beginning, others are convinced that any world organization to be effective, even at the start, must have broader powers to bring about peaceful change in the direction of a free and prosperous world community. Such differences as exist among world federalists on this point are mainly questions of timing. There is full agreement that we should move as rapidly as possible to world federal government with authority and power to legislate on other basic causes of international conflict."

Now, in order to also keep the record straight, I would like to read what is called the Humber Resolution, which you will find referred to later on in the day. It is a resolution passed by some States and directed to their Congressmen. It reads as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) that it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

Now, A.C.R. 17, that resolution which was passed in 1949 reads as follows:

"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 amendments to the Constitution, which are appropriate, to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations subject to later ratification, a constitution of a world federal government open to all nations with limited powers adequate to assure peace, or amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to ratify any world constitution which is presented to the United States by the United Nations by a world constitutional convention or otherwise."

Now, those are the basic documents on this question of world federalism. There are any number of plans, but the only ones that I will refer to at all will be the so-called Atlantic Union Plan and the World Federalist Plan, and I would also refer to a World Constitution which was prepared.

I first want to state that, as our State Commander said, we are wholeheartedly in back of the United Nations, and we feel that this legislation is harmful to the United Nations. The United Nations has only been in business five short years. A study of their charter shows that everything that the World Federalists want to do can be done in the United Nations if the countries are ready to cooperate. Now, these United States have always been ready to cooperate. She has shown many times in the past that she was ready to disarm. As a matter of fact, I believe about twenty years back we had a naval conference and we disarmed. I think we got rid of the battleships, and some other countries got rid of blueprints, but we did it. We are always ready to cooperate on any plan. As a matter of fact, right now in the United Nations they are discussing the question of elimination of armaments, control of the atom bomb, and such kindred matters. So all that is needed in the United Nations is the will for peace, and if all of the sixty nations that are in the United Nations will cooperate, it can be done there.

As to the timing, I have before me, and I am going to refer to it quite often, a plan for peace. It is the only plan I have seen outside of the World Constitution prepared by Mr. Hutchins, a former Chancellor of the University of Chicago. This is a plan for peace prepared by Mr. Grenville Clark, which is headed, "A Statement for a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate". Mr. Clark is a National Vice-President of the national organization of the United World Federalists, and I assume this plan has their support. He says, "I propose, therefore, proportionate disarmament by all nations." He further says, "It is therefore proposed that for fifteen years (a reasonable period to obtain experience) no amendments whatever shall be made without the consent of all the nations which have more than one representative in the assembly".

I say, gentlemen, if he wants it, he should certainly give the United Nations more than five years to see if the countries are ready for peace.

Now, in this plan he has set up the minimum requests of the United World Federalists. He has based his whole plan on the fact that we must have total disarmament; that the world government must have the right of direct taxation. I am not going beyond those two things, because those are the two things he refers to, and I want to read what Mr. Clark suggests as to how this disarmament should be handled, and I read from page 21.

"I propose, therefore, proportionate disarmament by all nations in three stages of four years each. During the first stage all A-bombs (and H-bombs if any) would first be impounded and then destroyed; and all other weapons and forces would be reduced by one-third. When this result had been certified by United Nations inspectors, a further one-third reduction would be made in each of two succeeding four-year periods. At the end of 12 years all

military forces and weapons would be eliminated, save only certain lightly armed local and national police forces for the sole purpose of internal order.

"The manufacture of all war weapons would be prohibited to the member nations. Such manufacture would be confined to those arms required by a world police force and would be conducted solely in arsenals owned and operated by the United Nations.

"At every stage the process would be meticulously verified by inspection. All would disarm in proportion and no nation would be wholly disarmed until all were."

Now, gentlemen, under this plan, at the end of four years we are to have no A-boms, which is our main protection now. We disarm proportionately all our other arms. Now, Russia has a much larger army than we have. Where, at the end of four years, will the free countries be? He also says, talking on the war side:

"Similar detailed provision must be made for restricting the weapons of such forces to small arms suitable to police work only. They would have no tanks, no military planes, no bombs, no cannon, no war ships; nothing that would enable them to make serious war."

Later on Mr. Clark says:

"It is hard to conceive of a situation where the peace force could not promptly deal with any defiance of the world authority. But in the remote event that more force were needed, the nations could be called upon to recruit contingents of a World Reserve Force and place them at the disposal of the United Nations."

Then, when all we have left us is a few small arms, how could we give them any contingents? That is a carefully prepared plan of the World Federalists. Do you want to go into a deal of that sort? Then I refer to his question on taxation. He says, "We must have direct taxation". I will come back to that taxation in a minute.

The Legion, as you know, made a study of this plan, and after that study our State organization, as was said before, one hundred thousand strong, went on record as against all forms of World Federation government at this time. Our national organization, last year, went on record the same way.

Now, I think the main difference between the World Federalists and ourselves is that they look at the world as they would like to have it, and we look at the world as it is.

Now, you have got to go back to your old geography and look at all the different countries. I have a chart here, for your information, setting up the whole world population, and I am using that chart to show the recent vote in the United Nations on the resolution declaring Communist China an aggressor nation. That vote was 44 votes, including Nationalist China, to declare Communist China an agressor; 7 votes against, and 9

abstaining. That sounds pretty good, but printed down population-wise you will find that the 7 countries who voted against declaring Communist China an aggressor represented 32% of the population represented in the United Nations. Communist China, of course, was not represented, but naturally they would not declare themselves communists aggressors. They would represent 25%. The abstainees represent 13%. So the 43 nations, excluding Nationalist China, who voted to declare Communist China an aggressor nation represented only 30%. In other words, it was really 70% against 30% on a situation that everybody concedes is true, namely, that Communist China was an aggressor nation.

Now, do you want to go into that type of an organization as the world is now constituted, and have those countries have the right to tell you what you can do, even from a limited standpoint? When you look at the world from the population standpoint you will find that one country has a population no greater than Jersey City. Another country is about like Paterson, and there are about 13 that are smaller than New Jersey. There are about 16 or 17 that are smaller than New York State. As a matter of fact, there are only 19 countries out of the 60 countries that are larger than New York State. The population is divided into areas something like this: About 10% of the population is North American; about the same is South American; about 3% or 4% in Africa, and about 10% in Europe and, I think, 69% in Asia.

Now, that is the type of world that the World Federalists want us to go into. We are willing and are in with the United Nations, and we are willing to cooperate. But I liken the United Nations to a partnership where you put all of your money into it - let's assume we are talking about money. But a partnership gives us the right to withdraw, or when one dies normally the partnership ends, or you can make a new partnership. That is the United Nations. We have had a sad experience in the United Nations since it was started. Naturally we were seeing that we got as many friendly countries as possible, and I believe our administration insisted upon China being one of the permanent nations. Whoever thought China would change from a Nationalist China to a Communist China?

Now, the World Federalists I liken to a corporation, a corporation where we all put our money in equally. The stockholders get some stock, but there is nothing to prevent the stockholders from selling to somebody else. But there is no way of getting out of the corporation. They are the two distinctions. I am willing to go along with an agreement where we know the type of country that we are doing business with, and if we don't like the type of country we do not have to do business with them. However, in a corporation, we cannot help ourselves.

For your information, I wrote to all of the legislators in the United States to find out what they have done on this question of World Federation, and I have received answers from all but eleven. And the result is that there are 19 who have passed resolutions similar to the Humber or the New Jersey resolution. Most of those were passed prior to 1943, 1944, 1945 and 1946. In 1950 and 1951 nine of those States rescinded their resolutions; two States have gone on record against World Federation or World Government, and seven have either refused to pass legislation favorable to World Government, or they have voted it down.

Now, can I have about five minutes more, Mr. Cavinato?

MR. CAVINATO: I am standing up just to remind you that time is precious. If you could make your remarks more brief, we would all appreciate it. You understand, Mr. Stickel, that you can file your complete papers with the secretary.

MR. STICKEL: I just wanted to speak on the question of voting in the World Federation. The World Federalists say they want a weighting system of voting. Mr. Hutchins, former Chancellor of the University of Chicago, in his plan finally comes to the conclusion that the only basis to determine vote is at the rate of one vote for each million population. Mr. Grenville Clark now has come to the conclusion that the only just and practical basis is that of population, but with a maximum and minimum limit. He starts out with giving one vote to each five million, and then he says there must be a limitation, so he stops when he gets up to 150 million, which is the population of the United States, and which is actually a limit of 30 votes. On that basis he takes away 62 votes from China; he takes away 38 votes from India; 9 votes from Russia, and then with the United Kingdom, normally having a vote of 10, having a 50 million population, he includes all their colonies to bring it up to 131 million, so they could get 26 votes. He does the same thing with Belgium, rating it from 2 to 5. He does the same thing with France. Now, do you think any of those countries are going to be disfranchised on that basis?

Now, on direct taxation - and this is my final statement - he says you must be able to collect taxes direct from the people.

I have a number of other things here, but in closing I would like to say again that the American Legion wholeheartedly backs the United Nations, and we believe that the people of the United States are willing to cooperate with other countries under the charter of the United Nations, but they are not willing to turn over, at this time, any of the nation's sovereignty which has made our American way of life what it is. We have had one expression of the electorate of one of our great States, the State of Oklahoma, on this question, when on November 7, 1950 they voted 77% against World Federation, and 23% for.

I thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: I will now call upon Mr. Peterson, the Legislative Chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of New Jersey.

CHARLES PETERSON, Legislative Chairman, N. J. Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Salsburg, Mr. Mackey, and Mr. Loutrel of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Assembly:

We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and your Committee for calling this hearing on A.C.R. 9, introduced by Assemblyman Tumulty from Hudson and Assemblyman Mackey from Union.

This resolution was sponsored by the American Legion in conjunction with the Veterans of Foreign Wars and supported by all of the other veterans' organization and their ladies auxiliary in New Jersey.

At this time I want to introduce to this hearing a man who served in World War I and II. He represents some 90,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars who served on land, and sea, and in the air. I present for your kind attention the State Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of New Jersey, August Hanniball, Jr., of West Englewood, New Jersey.

AUGUST HANNIBALL, JR., State Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Department of New Jersey.

Mr. Cavinato, members of the Judiciary Committee, my
fellow veterans, ladies of the Auxiliary, ladies and gentlemen:

In presenting the viewpoint of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I would first like to call the attention of our legislators to the very important fact that of the 22 original States who had adopted resolutions or memorials on considering some kind of super State or World Government, of which New Jersey was one, ten States have rescinded their action; they are Georgia, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, California, Alabama, Tennessee, Colorado, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Missouri. Besides the Maryland House and the New Hampshire House rescinded prior resolutions last week with action still pending in the Senates of both States with concurring action by the Senates anticipated. Efforts by the World Federalists to get Bills thru the legislatures in Nebraska, Iowa and Michigan have been defeated by large votes. The Delaware State Senate only last week passed a Bill stating that "Delaware is unalterably opposed to any and all plans, programs and proposals which tend toward the development of any form of World Government". I think the above facts are important, Mr. Chairman, and I respectfully request your Committee to take cognizance of them. More than half of the original 22 States have rescinded or initiated such action, to remove World Government resolutions from the books. Surely the legislators of these twelve States must have had good reason for their action.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States take exception to, and do not agree with the Hon. Governor Alfred E. Driscoll that "No matter which way we may turn in our search for permanent world peace, we must inevitably come back to the proposition that without World Government there can be no world peace". The Veterans of Foreign Wars are in fact in complete and total disagreement with his statement.

Since we have divergent views on the question of world government--we are only able to say that we do, because that right is guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. Free speech is still one of our great prerogatives in this country. That Constitution of ours was once proclaimed by Gladstone, the great English statesman, as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

It is our complete conviction that these Constitutional guarantees must be preserved. Composed as we are, of men who have tasted the bitter dregs of war on foreign shores, in the air and on the sea we are in full accord that every step must be taken to avert such a tragedy to befall humanity again. Every mind must be used to its fullest to devise ways and means to bring about an orderly and peaceful world. We believe that this is wholly possible and that it can be done without the loss of individual rights--national rights--our National Sovereignty--if you please.

Today we hear much about the "Battle for the Mind of

America". In fact there are battles for the minds of men thruout the world--each group trying, thru devious means to influence citizens to see their way of life--their method of government. Here at home we must be sure that American minds are given an opportunity to hear every side of a question to be discussed. We must make sure that in simple and explicit terms, the people of America will be able to understand what is about to be undertaken.

In this whole matter we merely present a case for the Defense. The World Federalists have brought to the Court of Public Opinion the question as to whether we should remain true to the principles of our founding fathers or whether we should relegate all they gave us for something new and different--something untried, and something that in our opinion cannot be guaranteed as successful.

There seems to be the assumption that should a limited form of world government be organized, that it should be done along democratic lines--along the lines of the government which not only we, but the entire world has come to respect and hold up as an example of democracy at work. We do not see how this would be possible.

Certainly all the participating nations, owing loyalty to their present regimes, and having been reared and educated under individual codes of laws, mannerisms and religions would attempt to inculcate something of their own into such a world organization. We can only see that this would lead to a hodge podge of ideas that would cause long debate and probably never a final agreement.

Let us consider for a moment the question of Sovereignty.

Only in recent years there have been established new republics and nations. We have Eire, Israel, Pakistan and the New United States of Indonesia to mention a few. Would these new countries be ready so soon to give up any portion of their newly won rights--the national sovereignty--in favor of a world organization? We believe they would not concur.

Russia, as a consistent user of the veto power in the United Nations has given the same answer. Has Russia agreed to the International Control of Atomic Energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons, all participating nations would have been opened to inspection and we probably would have been on the way to a partial settlement of the problem of maintaining world peace. However, in Appendix II, part of the Third Report of the Atomic Energy Commission we find these words, translated from the original French text and I quote--"The difficulties which confront the Commission were first evidenced when the plan under consideration by most of the Governments' members of the Commission was rejected by the Soviet Union, either as a whole or in its separate parts, on the ground that such a plan constituted an unwarranted infringement of national sovereignty." For its part, the Soviet Union insisted that a convention outlawing atomic weapons and providing for the destruction of existing weapons must precede any control

agreement.

That, among other things, leads us to believe that Russia would never considering entering a world government body--and without her in it, there is just no point in trying to form it. Only on September 20th, on a television broadcast from New York City, United World Federalists leader--Cord Meyer--acknowledged that without Russia no successful attempt at forming a world government is possible and that in lieu of that, the United States would have to carry on its program of full armament to meet any eventuality.

Consider what Warren Austin, U. S. Representative to the United Nations wrote on July 13th, 1950, to the Sovereignty Campaign Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Addressed to Rear Admiral Harley F. Cope, U.S.N. Retired, Mr. Austin said: "I dare say many people who formerly embraced world government ideas because of a feeling that the United Nations could not act effectively, have been reassured by the United Nations actions in the Korea incident. In any case, practical minded people undoubtedly recognize that this is no time to start a world argument over constitutional clauses."

Our State Department has concurred in this when it stated that the United Nations is not and never was intended to be a superstate. Speaking for the State Department before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Ass't Sec'y of State, John D. Hickerson, had this to say; quote--"Among the predominant characteristics of the world today are still hunger and ignorance--two thirds of the world's people live on less than an adequate diet; one half are illiterate and only a minority live under a truly democratic governments. How would a world federation based on democratic principles prosper in such a setting? We should recall from our own history that it takes more than a constitution, more than a framework to construct a federation. We must also keep in mind that there exist profound traditional differences among nations based on history, differing political institutions, economies and geographical conditions." Unquote.

May I refer once more to the fact that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is composed of men who have been the world over--who have lived in foreign climes for long periods of years in their capacity as military men--either as members of the armed services or as administrators for their government. Men who have been in frequent and direct contact with Red China's leader, Mao Tse-tung and his chief lieutenants and other opposition group leaders. Men such as they have had the opportunity to study at first hand the existing philosophies, geographical differentials and other conditions which lead them to the conclusion that world government is not feasible.

Further all of us have been charged when entering the armed services with protecting and defending the Constitution of the United States from all its enemies, whomsoever. All national legislators, judges and officers, and all state legislators are bound by oath or affirmation to "support the Constitution." The

President himself, upon his inauguration takes the oath which says "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." When immigrants become citizens, they are obliged to swear allegiance to their adopted land. All of us as citizens are bound by the same oath.

That is why we maintain stoutly, that any deviation from these principles, means the destruction of our constitutional form of government as we know it today.

Now may I be specific in our reason for opposing the Beliefs and Principles as propounded by the United World Federalists and all the World Government theorists.

We are opposed to them--Because--the creation of "World Government" would at the same time create a world law enforcing body, with command of the only existing powerful military force on earth--this agency would possess dangerous dictatorial powers over all people.

Because--the existence of a world dictatorship can produce only one form of peace--the peace that slaves are forced to endure.

Because--ever since 1776, millions of Americans have risked their lives to defend the same individual rights and liberties we would be required to surrender to a world governing body.

Because--there is no guarantee that any one nation, within a world government, can be protected against an evil alliance of enemy countries anxious to destroy its social, economic and political advantages.

Because--American citizens would be forced to pay any taxes that a world government agency would arbitrarily choose to impose upon the individual citizens of the various members nations.

Because--there is no guarantee under world government that the United States would never be forced to adopt economic policies wholly in conflict with our established principles of free enterprise--policies that would reduce the standard of living in the U.S.A. to the low levels of less progressive countries.

Because--the people of the United States would have no direct voice in electing the officials of any world government agency. We refuse to give up the right to choose our own rulers--and the persons to whom we wish to entrust our own welfare and the welfare of our country.

Because--World Government would abolish immigration laws and the U.S.A. would subsequently be flooded with an overwhelming population tide, far beyond the limits of our capacity to absorb and assimilate as self-supporting, tax paying citizens.

Because--lifting of immigration bars, under a world

government could bring into the U.S.A. millions of aliens from countries that have always resented the racial distinctions contained in our immigration laws--our country would be threatened with the bloodiest civil war in the history of the world.

Because--Russia spurns every effort on the United Nations to build for World peace. There are no reasons to believe that Russia would join a world federation.

Because--current agitation within the U.S.A. for a world government agency is breeding the type of chaos and confusion which all communists in our midst are striving to foster and encourage--with the hope that our attention will be diverted from Soviet Russia's unrelenting efforts to dominate Asia and other democratic area.

That Mr. Chairman, is essence is why the Veterans of Foreign Wars oppose any and all types of World Government. They are presented in all conviction and in sincerity believing that we are acting in the best interests of our Nation and for free people everywhere.

As President Theodore Roosevelt once said--"We have room in this country for but one flag, the Stars and Stripes; we have room for but one loyalty; loyalty to the United States.

And in closing we would like to say with Henry Cabot Lodge; "We can do all that can be done to solve the social problems and fulfill the hopes of mankind. Failure would be disaster unequalled in history. The first step to success is pride of country, simple, honest, frank and ever present, and this is the Americanism that I would have. If we have this pride and faith, we shall appreciate our might responsibilities. Then, is we live up to them, we shall keep the words "an American Citizen" what they now are--the noblest title any man can bear."

The individual freedoms in our Bill of Rights are the supreme benediction of American democracy; they must be uncompromisingly defended to the death.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is the State Legislative Chairman of the Catholic War Veterans of New Jersey, Joseph D. Lintott.

JOSEPH D. LINTOTT, Legislative Chairman, Catholic War Veterans of New Jersey.

Mr. Cavinato, members of the Assembly and Judiciary Committee, ladies and gentlemen:

We extend to you our great thanks for having been permitted to come here today to be heard on behalf of the Catholic War Veterans of the State of New Jersey on this A.C.R. 9. Our reasons for supporting the adoption of A.C.R. 9 are very basic, and I will state them very briefly.

As veterans, and as Americans, we have fought two wars, and we are on the threshold of a third for the purpose of preserving the sovereignty and the liberty that we know is ours under the Constitution of the United States. We feel that the proposal of the United World Government would destroy our national sovereignty, and the liberties and freedoms which are guaranteed to us under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. We feel too that the adoption of a world government would reduce the United States to the level of one of the smaller and insignificant nations of the world.

Now, it has been said, in support of this proposition of a world government, that it would be comparable to the situation that was at hand in the early days of this country when the 13 Colonies were being forged into the country that is now ours. Recently there appeared in the Journal-American an editorial, on February 28, which I would like to call to the attention of all of you here present, which I think deals very adequately with the subject. The title of this editorial is "A Dishonest Parallel", and it goes on to say:

"George Washington, who held as one of his deepest convictions that the United States could survive only by avoiding foreign entanglements, is now quoted by the advocates of world government in support of their strange proposal. In the course of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 General Washington wrote to a friend complaining that the reluctance of the individual States to surrender their sovereignty to a federal government was keeping the nation weak, inefficient, and disgraceful. The letter has been cited by Lawrence Dawson, Executive Director of the United World Federalists of Illinois, as an argument in favor of his organization's proposal that this nation yield its sovereignty to a world government."

Mr. Dawson claims that the principle of delegating the sovereignty to which he referred is precisely the same principle which the United World Federalists hope to see applied through the United Nations to the entire world. They believe that the world should be governed by the same system of carefully delegated central authority which has worked so magnificently in our country. This is a monstrous argument. It rests on

the pretense that the United States would yield no more of its sovereignty to a world government than did each of the States in yielding to a central government created by themselves. But the utter dishonesty of that pretense is evident at a glance. The inhabitants of the 13 States were all Americans. They had local differences, but they shared all of them with the basic idea that individual liberty was the most important thing on earth, and that the only way it could be preserved was through self-government by the people. Only if that same ideal were passionately shared by all of the peoples of the world would the parallel which they tried to draw between the 13 States in 1787 and the nations of the earth today be accurate or honest. But actually the idea of individual liberty prevails only on a small segment of the human race. The greater part of the earth is inhabited by backward masses who have no understanding of liberty, or so much as even a dream of liberty. And among many of the more advanced peoples the ideal of freedom, where it survives at all, is greatly diluted. Some have permitted themselves to be enslaved to dictatorships; others have traded off their liberty for socialisms, false promises of security, and the like. When the messiahs of the one world with a dream suggest that America could submit to the control of nations that do not know freedom, without sacrificing its own freedom, they are saying something that simply is not true.

In addition to that, we would respectfully submit for consideration on this problem the remarks of Frank Holman, the past President of the American Bar Association, who said, "We will surely give America away and give up our basic rights as free men and women if we change our form of government for some hodgepodge international confederation or so-called republic".

We Catholic War Veterans and Americans want peace, but we do not want peace at any price, and we feel that the price of a world government is too high a price to pay.

MR. CAVINATO: I am now going to call upon the Legislative Chairman of the Disabled Veterans of New Jersey, John W. Bill.

JOHN W. BILL, Legislative Chairman, Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Judiciary Committee, and friends that are gathered here to protect America:

We of the Disabled American Veterans naturally would be for the repeal of Resolution 17 and favor Concurrent Resolution 9. You certainly could not expect the man who paid the price on the battlefields of any war, or on ships or in planes, or tanks, to want to get entangled in any world federation. I think that we have been taught a lesson. I believe that we who have fought the wars understand what federalism means.

Now, we know that it is all a lot of talk. If the federalists, who are so sincere in giving the American people liberty, really meant that sincerity, they would back universal training and make America so strong that no one would dare to talk roughly to America.

No, they don't want that. They cannot waste their time and efforts for anything like that. Certainly not. They believe that we will sell America. For what? Power? Who will have power? Not the Americans.

I believe that no American in his right mind could support a world federalist government. We were told in 1917 that we were fighting a war to end all wars and to bring peace to America and to the world. We were told that when we came back to civilian life that we could guarantee our offspring that they would never again have to fight a war. And what happened?

Many of our people traveled to Washington, at their own expense, to protect America from foreign entanglements. Did they listen to us? No, surely not. We still say today, as Washington so forcefully stated -- stay out of foreign entanglements; protect yourself; be ready to defend yourself, and they will respect you.

When Teddy Roosevelt took a trip around the world -- some of you don't remember it; I do, I was only a kid -- he told one nation, "You get tough with us, and I will just show you what I can do with you, and there will be no conflicts and there will be no complications." Was there? No. You have got to back up everything you say. You have got to be ready to back up everything you say.

I do not think that the World Federalists should ever dare ask this of veterans who have paid the price on the battlefields. See it today. Take Korea. You talk about federalists. You talk about giving something to the nations. Who is paying the price? America. Fifty-four thousand young men today are victims of war. The hearts of mothers, and wives, and children are broken. Why? Because of such nonsense as world federalism. Take the budget today - 17 billion dollars. That is ruining the nation.

If these World Federalists were true Americans they would say that the only way America is going to protect itself, to defend itself, is to be ready. And the only thing that the World Federalists ought to do to straighten themselves out and clear themselves with the American people, is to use their force, and energy, and money, to convince Congress that some sort of universal military training, as sponsored by all the Veterans' organizations, be adopted forthwith, and that we be strong, and that we have the weapons, if so need be, to make America strong. That is what you call defending America, and worrying about America.

We have over 80,000 battle casualties of World War I and World War II in New Jersey. How do you think the boys who have not yet been let out of hospitals from World War II feel about world federation? They do not want it. I talked to some of them last Sunday, and they said, "You better get down there and tell these people that all we want is peace". We want it, and a world federalist government will never bring it to you.

So we ask you, Mr. Cavinato, and your Committee, to report favorably on Concurrent Resolution 9, and let's pass it so rapidly that they won't know what happened to them. Don't let's be confused. Do not let us be told that it is the only thing for America. It is not. We know it is not, and we know it will never succeed. Thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: I am now going to call upon the representative of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. Todarelli.

MRS. ANNE TODARELLI, New Jersey State Chairman of National Defense, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

It is kind of you to afford me the privilege of appearing before you to record the support of the organization I represent for the pending resolution A. C. R. #9. I am the State Chairman of National Defense of the Daughters of the American Revolution. All of the 85 chapters of our Society in this state and almost all the individual members oppose world government, whether it be in the form advocated by the United World Federalists or in the form suggested by any other of the several groups that have proposed a world government.

When the State Legislature passed A. C. R. 17 two years ago, I am frank to say I was quite unaware of it. I doubt that more than a handful of the citizens of this state knew of the action of the legislature or, if they did know, appreciated its implications. The progress made by the proponents of world government, however, has been short of phenomenal. In a remarkably short time, 22 states were persuaded to pass resolutions requesting the Congress to call a convention for a world government. It was only then that we who oppose it woke up and looked into this business of world government. What we found out is why we are here today, asking our legislature to rescind its action of two years ago. There is, indeed, precedent for repeal. Of the 22 states which have passed resolutions for world government, 7 have rescinded them. They include California, Georgia, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Alabama, Massachusetts and Oklahoma. We hope New Jersey will make the 8th to join the group.

The United World Federalists claim the credit for having persuaded the legislature to pass A. C. R. 17. I suspect they are probably right. I should like, therefore, to point out a change of tactics on the part of the United World Federalists that is of some significance.

A. C. R. 17 provides "that application is hereby made to the Congress of the U. S. pursuant to Act V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations, subject to later ratification, a Constitution of a World Federal Government, open to all nations, with limited powers to assure peace, or amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to ratify any World Constitution which is presented to the United States by the United Nations, by a world constitutional convention or otherwise."

Shortly thereafter, the United World Federalists were instrumental in having introduced into the Senate of the United States a resolution calling for World Government. That resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution #56, was introduced by Senator Tobey and is known as the "World Federalist" Resolution. It is quite different from that passed by the State Legislature. It declares it to be the sense of Congress that a fundamental objective of U. S. foreign policy should be (1) "to support and strengthen the United Nations." and (2) "to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law."

You will note, I am sure, the vast difference between the two resolutions, both springing from United World Federalist brains. A. C. R. 17 says nothing about supporting or strengthening the U.N. The Tobey Resolution, on the other hand, would strengthen UN and develop it into a world federation.

What happened, we can only surmise. The United World Federalists were unable to sell the U.S. Senate the same bill of goods they sold the State Legislature, and had to be content with the Tobey resolution as it stands.

In February 1950 a sub-committee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on several resolutions proposing World Government. In its report, issued last September, the Committee said of the Tobey resolution, and I quote:

"This is either a relatively simple proposal with limited implications or one with vast implications. Whether it is one or the other depends upon the meaning given the words." End of quote.

Senator Tobey testified before the Committee that his resolution was a policy statement, a general statement of purpose. The details of implementation, he said, are left "to the wisdom of the minds of Congress and the United Nations." Senator Pepper testified that he was committed only to the exact words of the resolution. Senator Magnuson inserted a statement in the record that the World Federalist proposal "contemplates a very limited deposit of sovereignty in the United Nations....it means that the internal functions of member states would remain untouched." Senator Morse testified that the resolution "would give assurance that the American people are in favor of the United Nations proceeding in the direction of seeking to enact international law that will be fair and just and usable."

In other words, these U.S. Senators took the resolution at face value and considered it as one designed to strengthen the United Nations.

However, I should like to emphasize as strongly as I can, that the Tobey resolution does not reflect the program contemplated by the United World Federalists for their world government. This was fully recognized by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because at pages 28 and 29 of their report they say: "The committee is aware, of course, that the United World Federalists do have a fairly concrete program covering such matters as representation in a legislative body, an executive body responsible to the legislative, a judiciary with jurisdiction over individuals as well as states, etc. The Committee did not feel that this program was a part of the pending resolution so did not examine in detail the way the UFW would propose the resolution would be implemented if passed."

What I say is this: That the World Federalists realized that they could not persuade the U.S. Senate to pass any legislation embodying their extensive program of a super-world government, a government of which every individual in the world would be a member, a government which would make our own government a subordinate part, a government which would deprive us of the right to govern ourselves and would impair, if indeed not destroy, the freedoms which we today enjoy. They did not hide their aims in A.C.R. 17; they were forced to cloak them in the Tobey Resolutions.

The United World Federalists do not want a United Nations; they want an entirely different thing. To that extent, therefore, the Tobey Resolution is a dishonest statement of their intentions and was accepted by them on a "better-half-a-loaf-than-none-basis."

It stands to reason, gentlemen, that a world government and a United Nations cannot co-exist. Some of the proponents of world government rather naively, I think, suggest Russia may join their world government. I doubt that any of you can contemplate such a possibility. If Russia were that co-operative we would have no need of a world government. It is only because world government alists feel UN has failed that they want another federation of nations. Has UN failed? Is it ready for the scrap heap? We do not think so. We do not think that the 50 world nations who stood by the side of the United States in branding Chinese Communists as aggressors are prepared to admit UN has failed. In the six short years of its existance, UN has accomplished many things. It has solved or has helped to solve many situations which might well have brought on World War III. It found solutions for crises that arose in Greece, Iran, Indonesia, Kashmir, Palestine, Libya, Somaliland, and Eritrea. Very great progress throughout the world has been made by UN's specialized agencies, for example. The Food and Agricultural Organization, The International Bank and Monetary Fund, the field of communications, the expansion of air traffic over land and sea, the solution of the refugee problem, aid to undernourished children, the World Health Organization and the International Labor Organization. These gains are a great step in the direction of world peace. Establish world government, I repeat, and you destroy U.N. They cannot co-exist. Let us continue to establish a national defense against Communism but let us do it within the framework of the United Nations.

We cannot have peace so long as there is a divided world. A world government whose basic design necessarily excludes Russia and its satellites cannot give us peace. World government, as proposed, might give us a defense against a Communist aggressor. But if that is what we want, we can enter into as strong a military alliance as we wish and do it within the framework of U. N. Article 51 of the UN Charter grants member nations the "inherent right of individual or collective self-defense." Let us enter into such a military alliance with all the nations who earnestly want peace, and protect ourselves as adequately as we can against the enemy.

But let us not delude ourselves. There are only two ways to achieve peace. One is by crushing Russia in an all out war. It may be that we cannot avoid war. But neither will a world government avoid a war. If Russia decides for war, war there will be. The other path to peace is that taken by the United Nations. This forum of discussion at least focuses the light of public opinion on Russia and her tactics. It was formed in the hope that debated in the open and the social and economic work of U. N.'s agencies might bring about a better understanding and respect among nations. Let us not be of little faith. Let us be strong in our armies, prepared to resist and crush an aggressor, but let us, at the same time, cling to what is the hope for peace without war.

MR. CAVINATO: We are going to recess at one o'clock for lunch and come back at two. We have about three more minutes, if anyone can speak in that time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, may I break in for a moment. I would like to ask, sir, if you could at this time, for three minutes only,

allow John W. Finger, President of the American Colation, and former President-General of the Sons of the American Revolution, to make his speech. He has to make a train to New York.

MR. CAVINATO: If he can do it in three minutes, he may go ahead.

JOHN W. FINGER, President, American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic and Fraternal Societies.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Judiciary Committee:

There are many reasons why Americans should be against WORLD GOVERNMENT but I wish to devote the time allotted to me today to a few realistic facts as to what we might expect in case of the establishment of a World Government.

First, the United States has approximately 6% of the world's population so that in any representative form of World Government based upon population, we would stand a chance of being out-voted 94 to 6, principally by Asiatics and Africans. Second, our Country enjoys approximately 36% of the World's income and if we were to share this with the rest of the world, it would reduce the living standard of every American to one-sixth of what it is at present. Third, in order for a World Government effectively to enforce its laws, it would require a world police force or army which would enforce laws of a World Government against us. Also, to operate successfully, it would be necessary to establish a world currency and our gold reserves would be swallowed up in the backing of such currency. The World Federalists have obtained considerable sympathy for their movement on the argument that a World Government would insure peace; yet, when I asked one of the foremost proponents of World Government what would be done in case the USSR refused to abide by the edicts of World Government, he replied that we would declare war on them. As a native born Georgian, I did not need to see "Gone With the Wind" to be reminded of the havoc of our American Civil War, even though we were governed in 1861 under the Constitution of the United States. It is my conclusion that no form of World Government can give absolute assurance of peace. I am further at a loss to reconcile the view-point of many members of the clergy with the acts of the Christian martyrs who were unwilling to give up their ideals and principals simply for the sake of peace.

Many State legislatures adopted resolutions in support of World Government because of certain idealistic arguments presented by the World Federalists. It is a great satisfaction to know that so many States have now rescinded the resolution after giving due consideration to the detrimental effects it would have on American citizens. I am gratified to give you an up-to-the-minute report from Compatriot Harry E. Sherwin of the New Hampshire Legislature. In his letter to me of March 5 he reported that the New Hampshire State Legislature had voted to rescind the World Government resolution by a vote of 50 - 1, after he had presented the facts which I have outlined above.

This is a further proof that we can always count on legislative representation of the American people to do the right thing.

(RECESS)

AFTERNOON SESSION

MR. CAVINATO: I must apologize for the lack of punctuality on my part, but we are trying to save time by rearranging some of the speakers. We are trying to give everyone time to make their presentation, and still leave here at a reasonable hour.

Now, the next speaker is a Past Commander of the Legion of Valor, Daniel H. Mahar.

DANIEL H. MAHAR, Past Commander, Army and Navy Legion of Valor:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Permit me to say a few words against Assembly Concurrent Resolution 17 and urge this Act to be rescinded at this session of the New Jersey Legislature. No one can speak, no one should speak, and, no one dare speak with the priority of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor when it comes to the simple question of the survival of this American Republic. I call your attention to the cold fact that ten of the seventeen Congressional Medals of Honor, awarded to citizens of New Jersey in W. W. II were posthumous. These men, together with the large number of posthumous awards of the Distinguished Service Cross and Navy Cross, who made the supreme sacrifice in establishing their eligibility to our august ranks, bid us, in silent communion, to summon you legislators to pause and consider before their hallowed tombs.

In so doing you must hear their clarion message which says, "We are here because we cherished our American heritage above life itself. As freemen we lived and freemen we fought above and beyond the call of duty. Refresh yourselves on the inspired leadership of the indomitable Washington and brilliant Jefferson whose unshakeable belief in Almighty God enabled them to bequeath to you the rare dignity of a nobleman in life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If you would perpetuate this principle we died for, heed the message of the Father of our Country."

Misguided liberals, pacifists, some outstanding educators of undoubted loyalty but highly questionable foresight are vociferous advocates of the United World Federalists. But in their ranks are also many cravens who would strike the American Colors rather than defend and preserve this bulwark of freedom and justice for all. Today we offer an asylum to the downtrodden as no other land. We also spend lavishly to aid the sick and unfortunate, to repair the ravages of war and to avert bankruptcy amongst most of the nations of the World and reap more than our share of ingratitude. Reduce this bastion of World freedom to an impotent minority vote and surrender your sovereignty to this Super State fantasy and how long will we be permitted to enjoy our ideals?

Today we have a preview of this disasterous wishful thinking in the operation of the United Nations Organization. The two most powerful Nations besides us in the U. N. : Russia and Britain are at this very moment giving aid and comfort to the Reds in Korea. Russia for power; Britain for trade with the Chinese Communists. Meanwhile our American troops are fighting and dying for this very United Nations principle. How gullible can we Americans become? Let's stop theorizing and keep our faith with these noble men who fought and died for the only ism they recognized: God-fearing Americanism!

MR. CAVINATO: I will now call on Mrs. Wetherill representing the Daughters of the American Revolution, if she will speak now.

MRS. WETHERILL, Daughters of the American Revolution

Thank you, Mr. Cavinato. I simply want to recall to you the fact that the Daughters of the American Revolution have a tradition of many, many years standing, which they have faithfully upheld, to protect the sovereignty of the United States. Our ancestors have fought for that; they fought for the Bill of Rights, and they fought for all of our individual rights held in the Constitution of our country.

We are convinced that the proponents of world government now have not submitted anything which will be practical as a world organization, and we are definitely opposed to any form of world government at the present time.

Thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: We are now going to hear from Mrs. Amundson, representing the Daughters of the American Revolution, Saddle River Chapter.

MRS. AMUNDSON, Saddle River Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. Cavinato, I would simply like to express the feeling of the Saddle River Chapter as agreeing with the national chapter. We are all very much in favor of the U.N., and hope that the U.N. will stand, and that we will not have to give up our sovereignty and the things that have been fought for by our forefathers and sons to a world government.

MR. CAVINATO: I am now going to call upon the Honorable Irene Griffin, a former member of the House of Assembly, who is President of the New Jersey Council of Patriotic Women of America.

HONORABLE IRENE GRIFFIN, President, New Jersey Council of Patriotic Women of America.

Mr. Cavinato, members of the Judiciary, and ladies and gentlemen:

The New Jersey Council of Patriotic Women of America, a branch of the National Society of Patriotic Women of America wishes to make the following statement.

We are not in favor of any plan of World Government. We are in favor of World co-operation through National Government. We feel that the co-operation of the United States of America should be extended through our duly elected representatives; to wit, the executive head of our government and the legislative branch of our government, acting jointly.

The United States of America is a Republic.

A Republic is that form of government in which the power is vested in the people. The people vest their power for short periods of time in their chosen representative. Thus, change and replacement of political leadership is constantly within the power of the people.

In any plan of world government the people of the United States of America would be out-voted. We have approximately 150 million people in our country, about 1/6 of the world's population. How could we have much of a voice in the selection of world political leadership on an elective basis? We would be as voices crying in the wilderness if such world leadership became tyrannical; the power of change and replacement would be out of our hands.

Our Nation was founded under God.

We believe that man is a creation of God.

We believe in right as might.

We believe in the dignity and value of the individual and in the importance of his spiritual, cultural and material progress.

We believe in the freedom of religion, of political expression, of speech, of the press and of education.

Under our constitution we are protected from unreasonable search and seizure, from excessive fines or cruel and unreasonable punishment.

We as individuals have the right to choose our own means of livelihood within the law. As consumers we have the right to choose goods and services as we desire.

We have the rights of security of the home, peaceable assembly, the right of petition and Habeas Corpus.

We have the right of speedy trial by jury, of confronting our

accusers.

We have the right of private property under the due process of law.

And in our nation the rights of minorities are held to be inviolate.

Under the rule of Communism and Fascism government is founded upon the peoples fear of and submission to the State. Might as right.

The individual is unimportant as to his progress except as an instrument of the State.

The State limits toleration of religious teachings.

There is ruthless suppression of political expression.

There is ruthless suppression of free speech and use of radio. Press is strictly controlled. Education is controlled. There is no protection against search and seizure, no matter how unreasonable by petty bureaucrats. Excessive fines and cruel and unreasonable punishment are the rule. The individual must work where he is ordered by the State.

With the great conflict of ideologies and principles of conduct of government amongst the peoples of the world today, how could we possibly select world political leadership dedicated to peace and the pursuit of happiness.

Peace is a moral issue. The minute force is applied we have a battle ground.

The New Jersey Council of Patriotic Women of America believes that our Nation is not yet ready to enter a scheme of government whose blue-print is so blurred and which portrays so many pitfalls for the loss of our freedom.

We earnestly urge the Judiciary Committee to bring A. C. R. 9 out of Committee for favorable vote.

MR. CAVINATO: I am now calling a member of the State Board of Education to speak, representing the Legion of American Patriots, Mrs. Reim.

MRS. REIM, Legion of American Patriots.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, and friends:

The hour is getting quite late. I feel that the best service I can give to this cause is to say that I am representing the Legion of American Patriots, an organization composed of more than 30 organizations incorporated in the State of New Jersey.

I will relinquish my time to Mrs. Hacker. But at this time I would like to say that the Honorable Irene Griffin, a former member of this House, is going to introduce to you the group of the American Coalition of the New Jersey branch.

MRS. GRIFFIN: Thank you. It is my privilege to present to you first the Honorable Edgar Williamson.

HONORABLE EDGAR WILLIAMSON, President, New Jersey Coalition.

Everybody was deferring here, so I thought maybe I would be deferred.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Judiciary Committee, and fellow Americans:

I am very happy to be here today as the newly elected President of the New Jersey Coalition, which is a branch of the American Coalition. I too might say that I am past President of the New Jersey Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, whose organization will be represented officially today by Judge Doughty, another former Assemblyman. Also I am Secretary-General of the national society.

On behalf of the national society, I might state that we have gone on record against any form of world federalism, and I have been instructed today to state that they are doing all they can to help in New Jersey to put across Resolution #9. To be sure we will not be misquoted in any way, although we are a baby organization, we have prepared a statement which tells exactly how we stand in this matter. At this time I am going to call on another Assemblyman, Major Fred Bethke, whom I will ask, as one of our trustees of this newly born coalition, solely to read our statement so everyone will know where we stand.

Thank you.

HONORABLE FREDERICK BETHKE, New Jersey Coalition.

Mr. Cavinato, members of the Judiciary Committee, members of the Legislature, ladies and gentlemen:

I think I should first correct Mr. Williamson. I am not at the present time a member of the Legislature. I am, however, a former member, the last year being 1929. It is rather difficult to give your age at this time. Mr. Chairman. I also appear, apparently, in a dual capacity, or I might even say in a triple capacity. In addition to being a former member of the Legislature, I am the State Legislative Chairman of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the State of New Jersey who, with their members, represent approximately 45,000 taxpayers and citizens of this state. In addition to that I am, as Mr. Williamson said, a trustee of the New Jersey Coalition. And in presenting their statement, I am also bringing to your mind and attention the fact that the Junior O.U.A.M. is affiliated with the New Jersey Coalition, and we definitely believe in the statement that is being presented under the name of the New Jersey Coalition and coincide with it thoroughly.

The New Jersey Coalition would respectfully urge that the members of the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Legislature of New Jersey, vote for Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9, which will rescind former Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 17, which resolution memorialized the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose amendments to the Constitution to authorized the United States to join in a World Federal Government and was passed by the One Hundred and Seventy-third Legislature of New Jersey in March of 1949.

At the time Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 17 was passed, very little publicity was given same - there was no hearing held and we do not know of any debate upon the said Resolution. The vast majority of our citizens did not have any knowledge that this legislation had been presented or passed, therefore, they had no voice in the matter whatsoever. Peace, which is the millennium that we all sincerely hope and strive for, was the bait used to advocate this World Government move. Little emphasis was placed upon the kind of Government about to be created, nor was thought given to the dangers and pitfalls which would be caused by the abrogation of any portion of those liberties, safeguards and protections we have enjoyed under our United States Constitution and national sovereignty.

It has been openly admitted by advocates of such a World Government by whatever name it be called, that no secession would be permitted to any nation which joined such a Federation and which later wanted to withdraw.

The voting strength of the United States of America in any such World Government would be overwhelmingly outnumbered by the vast populations and geographical areas of Asia, and by the uncounted millions of Africa. For example, take Asia and its ideologies, vast population of 1,250,000,000 and its great geographical size compared to us, and yes, even to the world. The United States has a population of approximately 130,000,000 - about one-tenth of

the Asias. The world's population is approximately 2,145,000,000, so therefore, Asia with its ideologies can outvote the world.

We, the United States have about 6% of the world's population. Who would control the Worlds Armies or Police Force? Surely not us with a minority of 6% in the face of 94% of the world population.

We, the United States have 30% of the World's wealth and approximately 34 to 36% of the World's income. How long do you think a World Government would allow this disparity of wealth to continue? Some quarters have already suggested plans for a so-called equalization of wealth throughout the world. If we share our wealth with 94% of the world's population, the average American citizen will of necessity sacrifice five-sixths of his standard of living.

World Government Law would be enforced directly upon individuals in our country. World Government taxing power would directly tax our citizens independently and in addition to our own National taxation. We would be ordered by the same World Tribunal to fight for the peace that is so glibly used as bait for its formation.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and if the United States of America should join such a World Government, it would cease to be a free nation, its people would lose their precious liberties and become the slaves of a World Superstate founded on the philosophy that the individual is not the master of his government, but its servant.

The New Jersey Coalition, is an incorporate organization of 20 of the leading Patriotic Societies within our State and we with our families represent approximately 150,000 voters and taxpayers of the State of New Jersey. We believe in a government of the people and by the people, as set forth by Lincoln in his Gettysburg address, we can not contemplate, therefore, with equanimity the submergence of our system in a world government composed of people who by traditions, customs and habits of life belong, or are subject to the control of wholly different ideologies, and, above all, of widely divergent interests. It is our belief that the United States can render a greater service to humanity by upholding the torch of liberty, as an example to the world, than in burying our sovereignty in a world government.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is a former Assemblyman who served in this House representing Bergen County years ago. He was a colleague of mine. It certainly brings back days too numerous to mention -- too far away to mention too -- but it is a pleasure, certainly, to introduce my friend, the Honorable Thomas Doughty, Chancellor of the Sons of the American Revolution.

HONORABLE THOMAS DOUGHTY, Chancellor of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Larry - as I must call you that - and members of the Judiciary Committee:

It does bring back recollections to be here. I sat in this very seat for four or five years in days too long ago to mention. I had prepared a speech today, but in fairness to those who follow, and because it would, in some respects, be repetitious, I am going to confine my remarks, if I possibly can, to about five minutes.

As you stated in introducing me, Mr. Chairman, I am the Chancellor of the New Jersey State Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. We number some 22 chapters, and well over one thousand members, and include in our midst such distinguished citizens as Governor Driscoll, former United States Senator Hawkes, and many others too numerous to mention.

We all know that the United States of America, in a period of about 160 years, has grown to be the greatest nation in force and influence in the world. Now that is not just a happenstance. It has come about because our forefathers, the forefathers of the people whom I represent in my Society, fought for a principle and gained it from a government then partly totalitarianism in its nature. And the founding fathers, with great care and with marvelous foresight, framed a form of government under which we, in the short space of 160 years, have come forward with this supremacy, not only in wealth but in thought. What has it been founded on? We use the word "liberty", but more particularly it has been the liberty of thought; the liberty of religion; the liberty of initiative; the reward for self-effort. Are we going to forego that because the rule of communism, the rule of totalitarianism, is adverse to all of these principles?

We do not have to fear Communism. We have it well under control here, both out in the open, and more during the past year where it has been underground through our efficient Un-American Activities Committee, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But we do have to fear another thing, and that is groups of people who, well-thinking, well-wishing, have formed certain ideologies that are inimicable to our present form of government. I won't dwell on that. We will hear from them on the other side. They are well-meaning, but it seems to me that in our short span we have seen what happens with these ideologies.

Let us go back for just a moment to the First World War, when out of that sprang the League of Nations. Nothing could have been more idealistic than that. We thought then that was going to bring world peace. It did not. Why? Because certain of the nations who entered into that coalition entered into it with the avowed purpose of seizing power, and within a short space of time the League of Nations disbanded, and became entirely ineffective.

After the Second World War, five and a half years ago, on our Pacific shores was formed a new idea - the idea of the United Nations - equally as sincere; equally as idealistic as the League of Nations. We have yet to learn whether that noble experiment will be a success. Certainly we are being tried sorely, at the present time, in experiences that we are going through with the United Nations.

So I say to you that we must go cautiously on these ideologies for fear that we will destroy and bring down everything that has made us a nation such as we are today.

Now, I happen to come from the village of Ridgewood, a small suburban community in the northern part of the State, nestled in the foothills of the Ramapos. Now, we in Ridgewood like to feel that we are conservative, yet we are not reactionary. We like to feel that we want to learn. So some three weeks ago, through our local newspaper, there was arranged a forum so that the viewpoints of the World Federalists could be presented. The doors of one of our churches were thrown open for that purpose. No restrictions were placed upon it, other than there would be a reasonable question period following the address by the speaker that they selected. The speaker was an able one, a well-known author, Rex Stout whose brother, oddly enough, happens to be one of our substantial citizens at present in one of our larger financial institutions. I went there openminded. Frankly I wanted to hear the other side. But from Mr. Stout's speech I got nothing. He, in the question period, quite frankly admitted, in effect, that this was a noble experiment.

Now, members of the Committee, I know the problem that you are up against, and I am not going to impose any longer on your time. I am going to say this, though, that I feel that when the then members of the House of Assembly and of the Legislature passed Concurrent Resolution #17 two years ago, they had not made a study of its purport or its effect. Certainly the least you can do today is to make a thorough study of its purport and effect, and having done so, I feel that you will unanimously support Concurrent Resolution #9, and appeal the previous resolution.

Thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: Our next speaker is the President of the Gold Star Mothers of New Jersey, Mrs. Gertrude Flynn.

MRS. GERTRUDE FLYNN, New Jersey State President, American Gold Star Mothers.

I am deeply opposed and against the adoption of World Government and the purposes for which it is being founded.

I firmly believe it would be disloyal and a betrayal to my son and all the brave and heroic men and women who have given their lives for their beloved America and its freedom. Are we to betray their trust in us, to carry on the torch that they let fall in death for their love and devotion to the flag they loved from birth to boy scout days, then to manhood and war.

Are we to trade our sacred heritage of freedom and independence, given us by Washington and the other heroic founders of our Country? We Gold Star Mothers should be bitter with the killing of our sons and all the good man and youth of our Nation, without apparent accomplishments of any worthwhile goal, but we are not. We are humble and human and while we cannot undo the past, we can share experience and responsibility and fight for that which our sons loved and we love too our dear Stars and Stripes and our beloved America. Freedom in its full understanding is important to all human beings. We must keep our Freedom and keep our Flag supreme and flying above any other flag.

MR. CAVINATO: I am now going to call upon another officer of the Gold Star Mothers, Mrs. J. C. Tully.

MRS. JOSEPH C. TULLY, President, Rahway Chapter, Gold Star Mothers.

I am opposed to United World Government, because my son, at the age of eighteen years, fought and died for the Four Freedoms, and the American Flag.

I have a large investment in the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, it is of my opinion that we, as Americans, are being betrayed, and those who are betraying us, perhaps innocently, are all the proponents of World Government.

My son, Joseph Edward Tully, thought he was going into battle to preserve his and our American way of free life.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker will be the last of the New Jersey Coalition, and I understand that some of the other speakers have conceded some of their time to her, and therefore she will take a little longer. However, I do want to advise her that it is now 12 minutes of 3, and we still have several more speakers for the resolution. So, without further ado, and without taking too much time myself, I will call upon Mrs. Ralph Hacker.

MRS. RALPH HACKER, The New Jersey Coalition:

Mr. Cavinato, distinguished members of the Judiciary, and ladies and gentlemen: I realize how fortunate I am to have the time of three of my colleagues. This is a statement in support of Assembly Concurrent Resolution #9, on behalf of the New Jersey Coalition.

When the great wooden horse of the familiar Trojan legend was erected before the gate of the ancient city, that horse bore no label announcing that it contained enemies, who if admitted within the walls would destroy the nation.

Instead, word insidiously was passed around that the thing was a miraculous gift of the gods bearing great benefits that since it could not enter through the established gates, it was only necessary to break down part of the wall in order that this marvelous good might be brought in to dwell among the people. Undoubtedly, they too, were promised peace and the more abundant life.

You will recall that those citizens, greedy for the nebulous benefits thus promised them, broke down the barriers which had held back the foe and with their own hands brought in through the demolished walls the enemies who emerged from the wooden horse to slay them.

The trick has continued to meet with success throughout the ages. All that is needed is a crafty foe and a gullible citizenry which inquires no further than the exterior label on the measures planned for their destruction.

In World Government movements we have an IMMEASURABLE EVIL REPRESENTED AS AN IMMEASURABLE GOOD.

The hysteria for World Government is the product of confused thinking, unlimited propaganda and over-simplification of complex national and international problems. Like many of our foreign policies it is the product of paper planners who try to lift an imaginary citizenry, to a visionary Utopia. Korea is a grim reminder of that type of planning.

The existence of a desire to design an ideal blue print for a post-war world is obvious - but planning for the future at best is difficult and when planning proceeds without relation to understanding, it becomes not merely difficult but DANGEROUS TO WHAT IS BEST IN OUR ESTABLISHED ORDER.

This planning without understanding was evidenced in Concurrent Resolution 17 of New Jersey Legislature of 1949. This resolution requests the Congress of the United States to take up a plan to form a World Federal Government. That the New Jersey Legislature passed this resolution involving basic constitutional changes without extensive and adequate debate was a cause of grave concern and deep alarm to the electorate but that it passed this measure without affording the electorate an opportunity to have the fullest and widest amount of information and discussion on the subject amounted to a State and National tragedy.

Assembly Resolution No. 9 seeks to rescind Resolution 17 of 1949 which, if consummated, would DESTROY OUR REPUBLIC AND INVOLVE US IN ENDLESS WARS.

World Government advocates are asking us to give up our priceless heritage of liberty and our way of life in exchange for a FALSE PROMISE OF PEACE. People, generally, and Americans in particular, want peace. From this obvious premise they ask us to jump to the FALSE CONCLUSION that to secure Peace we must create a super-colossal World Government.

First, let us look at the sacrifices World Government asks us to make: -

World Government is in reality a proposal to abolish the United States. It is a child of neurotic post-war psychology; the result of the greatest psychological defects of our time - escapism and giantism. A local problem is difficult but instead of solving it we call in the Federal Government. Losing faith in the Federal Government, we look for a still bigger power - a World Government. Being non-existent we try to create one. This is the ultimate of escapism, of fleeing from real problems to unreality.

To Americans, World Government means economic disaster. Federation means all for one and one for all. Federation means a complete abrogation of our tariff laws, our immigration quota, a lowering of our standard of living beyond all contemplation and taxation of astronomical proportions. World Government would drag our laboring classes to a low standard of living that they could not and would not accept, creating unending labor strife.

Cheap foreign competition was creating the spectre of ghost towns in Waltham of watch fame, in Danbury of hat fame, our own Passaic of textile fame, and in the pottery and ceramic industries. For tomorrow's children shall we shut the door on America's great contribution to living - the door to opportunity?

Numerically we are insignificant. Unfortunately 90% of the people of the world really live under slave states. Every government takes its form from the conditions which create it. What kind of government would be created when 90% of the people already live under slave states? If, as alleged, the fantasy of democracy would govern the system of representation in a super-state as proposed, how would you like to have 6 or 7 votes for the United States out of 100 votes in a super world government? What chance would one of the few people professing Freedom have under such conditions? President Hoover said: "In a world federation our voting strength would only be 6% of the total. We will be outvoted by Russia, China and India. The idea of a super state is fantastic."

Voting combinations would inevitably occur. Old jealousies and old hates would involve us endlessly. We can draw a horrible example from Russia which calls itself the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. What basic freedoms have the people in this Union? Who can guarantee the same will not happen to us?

WORLD GOVERNMENT REPUDIATES OUR CONSTITUTION.

World Government means the complete disintegration of our system of Law and Government. It will destroy our American Way of Life and our basic liberties.

It will mean the repudiation of the three great corner-stones of our American heritage - The Declaration of Independence, our Constitution and our immortal Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is the proudest possession of our Anglo-Saxon heritage and protects us not only from the tyranny of our neighbor but from our government. These three great corner-stones are the Magna Carta of our American liberties and are the great principles which as a people we have lived by and which as a people we have been willing to die for. For their perpetuation a million casualties were the price of their defense in World War II.

World Government would mean our surrender as an independent nation and the complete liquidation of our constitutional system.

To what purpose would we give up all our material well-being and our priceless liberty? To what purpose would we give up the power to make our own laws, to levy our own taxes and to live under our own standards of justice and become slaves to a super-state in a World Government?

World Government would mean: -

1. A terrific lowering of our Standard of Living.
2. An unbelievable watering down of our strength as voters.
3. The complete liquidation of our Constitutional System.

What do the World Governmenters offer us in return? Nothing but a mirage of peace which vanishes when we examine it closely.

World Government advocates promise an illusory peace.

WORLD GOVERNMENT ANALOGY TO UNITED STATES MISLEADING.

Our Government is a federation, but not formed under similar circumstances. The argument of a world state based on the experience of the United States in forming its Constitution is highly misleading. Our federal union founded in 1789 was composed of thirteen contiguous states with a total population of only three million people. The inhabitants generally had the same moral concept, spoke the same language and the people had lived under English Common Law that possessed the same standards of justice.

Our Constitution organized the liberty reaped on the bloody fields of the Revolution. The Constitution gave shape to existing institutions. Liberty had a natural growth. It was not imposed from above. The Colonies were organized as a republic with definite qualifications for voting. Our experience in Government dated back 500 years to Magna Carta - the thirteen colonies had common growth and similar government.

We had all the necessary qualifications for federation which are, that the parts must be numerous, equal and have a background of common culture. Recall careful system of checks and balances to secure equality for our states and constitutional guarantees to protect natural rights of man from Governmental encroachment. Even with all these safeguards, our Constitution was not firmly established until after the Civil War.

Remember that wars come not only between nations, but within nations, and that the longest, bitterest, most devastating periods of warfare, have always followed upon the disintegration of attempts at world empire. Witness the Dark Ages, with their almost universal warfare, that followed after the Roman Empire; the troubles that followed the breaking up of Charlemagne's Empire and later of the Holy Roman Empire, which left in its wake the rise of ruthless dictators culminating in two World Wars; of our own wars which has left bitterer consequences than the Civil War and, without this war and the military defeat which it brought to the South, how could our Union have affirmed its validity?

No; bigness in Government does not insure peace. When it tries to hold together parts that can not adhere except by submitting themselves to a central source, it invites a centrifical reaction which, in the name of Liberty, will eventually shatter the world into anarchy.

World Government advocates promise peace. There is no actual or historical justification that an imposed World Government would bring world peace. Rather an invitation to endless wars and civil strife on a scale never before contemplated. National wars would be displaced by Civil Wars. We would have half the world in total war against the other half. If one of the groups was compelled to come in or stay in, you would have endless war against the ruling authority. Today most of Latin America, much of Africa, Europe and Asia have had little experience in self-government. Free institutions could not be thrust upon them. Historic liberties are best preserved when the individual is not lost in such a vast entity as a World Federation. Rights of individuals seem less important when distance from seat of Government lengthens.

UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS AT WORLD FEDERATION IN THE PAST.

First: The Roman Empire.

Second: The Holy Roman Empire.

Third: The French Revolution and conquests of Napoleon (Napoleon's idea to establish republics and unify them.)

In each case the conquering nation imposed its way of life on a number of smaller nations. All advocated the so-called higher culture for their less favored brethren. All fell apart from lack of agreement from within and without. The strongest state dominated the rest - result: intrigue, civil war, enslavement of a less favored people.

History of federation in our own day has not been so happy and has resulted in tyranny of large groups over the smaller ones: -

1. Unification of Germany led to domination of Prussia over the rest of the federation and led to two past wars.
2. Unification of Italy led to dreams of revival of the old Roman Empire.
3. The federation of Jugo-Slavia consisted of Serbs, Croats, Montenegrans, and a small slice of Hungary. All cherished

ideals of liberty for many hundreds of years, yet when federated the Serbs tyrannized over the rest. The country not only lacked unity but certain minorities looked to the arrival of the Germans as bringing freedom.

Our mistaken idealism led us after World War I to impose our way of doing things on Europe. As a result in each federation of Jugo-Slavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, minorities were imposed on. If we impose our will, be it ever so idealistic - if the people are unwilling - we tend to enslave them.

WORLD GOVERNMENT IMPOSSIBLE WITH CONFLICTING MORAL CODES OF STANDARDS OF JUSTICE.

Any World Government must be based on truth and eternal verities. The whole validity must be based on fundamentals. The only sanction of law lies in its basic morality and basic notion of justice. The law and morality of Western civilization is in the Hebraic-Christian tradition. A World Government would have to include conflicting moral codes - Moslem, Brahman, Voodoo, Shinto, Hebrews, Christians, etc. With Super-State we would have to have super-religion and would be back to union of Church and State. World understanding is only possible through religion and education which would make for greater harmony among all people. Today, as it was nineteen hundred years ago, it is the conquest of the soul rather than the earth that is important. The living forces of religion can make material forces immaterial. There are new frontiers of the spirit in America where Americans can spread democratic doctrine by example rather than forcing conformity upon those to whom democracy is still a new experience.

World Government represents a retreat from reality. Sound construction is from the bottom up. Schemes for World Government essentially represent efforts to build from the top down. It probably would take several hundred years of education to establish a minimum position even if we could begin with agreement in principles.

WORLD GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS - BETRAYAL OF YOUTH AND HUMANITY.

Do not proposals for dangerous castles in the air represent an inescapable betrayal of youth and of humanity in general? The effects of holding forth ideal goals, which obviously are impossible of attainment, can be disastrous, particularly so when young people are involved. Frustration follows inescapably in the wake of pursuit of objectives that were never attainable or desirable or workable or enforceable. With this frustration we find a great wave of mordant disillusionment which shatters youth's future constructive efforts. It will cost them precious time diverted from desirable objectives which might have built for them real progress and sound character.

The British Empire should be an example to us with its Twentieth Century Pax Romana (Roman peace). This represents a natural outcome of the idealism behind the British Law - an unwillingness to rule by force persons of disparate background; it is not

because Britain was weak, but because she would not morally support any longer the imperialism that makes her rich, that her Empire has been liquidated. Should we then, co-inheritors of the British tradition of freedom, embark now on a policy which can only end in a surrender of our own freedoms and the imposition on weaker nations of the will of an alien ruling clique. How could such a federal union differ from the Soviet Union and how could it be viewed by the Soviet as anything but a dangerous attempt on the part of America to organize the world against her? (An attack perhaps to be stopped by Moscow through atomic warfare before it becomes well established.) Certainly, Moscow could not and would not come into such a union unless she could gain the control and dominate the World State. As Lincoln has said: "No nation can endure half slave and half free," and we of the United States do not want to be enslaved or be a part in enslaving other small nations.

The World Governmenters who promise us an illusory peace in return for surrender of our national integrity are themselves aware of the impossibility of securing by peaceful means, the surrender of the national identity of other countries - witness division in ranks of world planners as to how world union could be achieved. Do they not realize that Peace is a moral concept and does not come by observation or legislation? Do they not also realize that the average American has no desire to surrender his dearly won rights and his way of life by a stroke of the pen to a foreign power whose sanction would not be justice but world force?

There are sincere people who are believers in World Government. Their intentions are good, but they are on the way to an impossible Utopia that disregards all the laws of nature and economics. With these starry-eyed people, however, are going a lot of people who are not starry-eyed. They know where they are going. They know that all great nations fall from within and the destruction of the United States would be accomplished under World Government by the stroke of a pen; thus serving the aims of the Communists.

The World Government movement is founded on a fallacy common to all its adherents, the supposition that a world organization of governments with conflicting principles and interest becomes by the mere fact of organization a means of securing international harmony and peace.

The World Government movement does not spring from faith in God, the respect for the individual man, the belief in truth and justice on which our American Republic was built.

The promised peace of World Government propagandists is just an illusion. This salient fact must be recognized before our beloved nation plunges blindly into disaster and anarchy. Inevitable world chaos would result if America destroyed itself in pursuit of this fantastic scheme.

The fundamental issue for us now is to establish peace, security, freedom and justice at home. Our enemies in the cold war would like nothing better than to have us chasing mirages of world union while our domestic liberties are withering away and our economic system undermined.

Let us stop jousting with wind-mills and look to our own domestic affairs. We can not create ideal institutions for mankind but have to make mankind more ideal for the institutions. It is only from the mental, moral and spiritual improvement of the individual that a better world can come.

WHY CREATE A FRANKENSTEIN?

The American colonies had unity of purpose against a common tyrant, they had a common language and a common heritage; their leaders had the same tradition in English Law and in English and French political philosophy. They all believed in God and in the natural law beyond the laws of man to which the state was bound to conform. Our unity and strength as a free people have come not from the positive powers conferred by our Constitution, so much as from restrictions imposed by that Constitution (namely, Bill of Rights), which have made it possible for individuals to live in freedom and justice. (Why create a Frankenstein which none can control?)

We are not going to compose the differences of the world now by imposing from above on nationalistic nations, without a common heritage of Law and Justice, a Super-State armed with powers to force them into submission.

It was in 1783 that America won her first great War and that she also won the Peace which followed it, achieving the greatest Constitution ever devised by man, with God's help, for his own Government. In the aftermath of later wars we have not been so fortunate.

Under our Federal Constitution liberty for the first time became an actuality. Liberty is the chief jewel of civilization and the one most easily lost. Liberty made no firm progress in the ancient states. The only real advance modern Europe made was in England where Constitutional Government was never annihilated.

History is not without her examples of hard fought fields where the banner of liberty has floated in triumph but she has few examples of a people whose dear bought treasure has been wisely employed and safely handed down.

Today the heart breaking tragedy of Korea forces upon us the realization that no longer can we enjoy the primrose path of Utopian dreams or the delights of unreality in a very real world.

As a nation we have and will practice world cooperation through Constitutional means. We have always been ready to care for the stricken and unfortunate in every corner of the world. Gladly will we bind the world's wounds through constitutional means.

We will not freely and easily surrender our sovereignty when many of our associates will never surrender theirs. This has been illustrated all too frequently in recent years, i.e., the failure to form a federation of Europe and the problems inherent in the Schuman plan.

You members of the New Jersey Legislature have the great responsibility and high privilege to see that our liberty is wisely employed and safely handed down in this generation. Support Concurrent Resolution No. 9.

My associates represent the banded intelligence and responsibility of a free group. Against us in action nothing can prevail. Nothing this time, I am sure, will permit you to disturb the love you bear our Republic or mitigate your consecration to its service. For those American principles of government that are above party and personality I am sure we can count on your determined support (on these principles we shall never surrender.) so that the liberty that was yours, was mine and must be our childrens, will be preserved in this generation.

Preserve our Constitution, our citadel of liberty, so that we may share it with the ages and coming generations may rise up and call you blessed.

MR. CAVINATO: Now, in all fairness to those who want to speak in opposition to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 9, the Chairman would appreciate it if you would make your talks somewhat brief. I feel very uncomfortable now because we have passed the hour of three, and with our idea of fair play, we want the other side to have their say. I do hope you will not be repetitious in your remarks. This Committee of well-balanced men have gotten the points, I am sure, and there is no need of repetition. Be sincere and to the point.

The next speaker is a representative of the Society for Constitutional Security, Mrs. A. Jordan.

MRS. A. JORDAN, Society for Constitutional Security.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee:

I wish to thank you for this opportunity to appear before you and your honorable body on behalf of the Society of Constitutional Security in support of Assembly Concurrent Resolution #9.

The State of New Jersey and the United States face the grave plan of the United World Federalists, which would give up the independence of our nation. The United World Federalists mistakenly claim that world government would bring peace and brotherhood to the world. Their plan, in reality, would be a sacrifice of our country to a world federation. We would then no longer be governed by our own people, but would be controlled by an all-powerful international government composed of the nations of the world.

MR. CAVINATO: Mrs. Jordan, I do feel it necessary, at this time, to call an end to the speakers who favor A.C.R. 9. In all fairness, I do feel that we must hear from the opposition. However, you know that you can file your statement, and it will be in the record as part of this hearing, and the Judiciary Committee will study your speech

in toto. However, if you still desire to speak, I will call you after we hear from the other side. That is the fair American way of doing things. The first speaker in opposition to Assembly Concurrent Resolution #9, Mr. Louis B. Dailey.

LOUIS B. DAILEY, United World Federalists, Inc.

Mr. Chairman:

My name you have already given. I am an attorney and counsellor at law of this State. I am a member of the National Executive Council, C.I.O. of the United World Federalists, and I happen to be a son of a D.A.R.

I wish to commend this committee for having public hearings on this matter. It was unfortunate that when the resolution was passed in 1949, we did not have public hearings then. If we had, I think the public educational processes would be farther along. At any rate we are doing it now in a democratic way. I have heard a lot of talk here today about world government and world federalism. What we are concerned with in our movement, and it is the only thing, is world peace. I think we are all sincerely and genuinely interested in trying to find a better way to world peace. I felt sad to hear the Gold Star Mothers speak about the loss of their boys, and it is our hope that some way may be found to prevent a recurrence of just that.

Now the nature of our problem is to prevent aggression by people who know no moral law, who do not like our Bill of Rights, and who have no respect for it. These difficulties standing in the way of peace are manifold. I am not going to take the time to go into that. All I want to say is that anybody sincerely considering this problem is immediately confronted with a maze of difficulties. We do not underestimate them one bit. That is no reason, however, why we should not proceed in determined fashion to find some solution. The facts of life, the creation of the atom bomb, the other means of mass destruction which man has recently created are impelling us to a solution of this problem, therefore, we must work hard and we must stick to it.

A.C.R. 17 is merely a first tentative step. Now, a great deal has been said in all the testimony so far about the fact that if we must get into some world government -- Mrs. Hacker has best described what kind of government is thought of when she mentioned a super-colossal world government. Let's first summarize what has been said about it.

We are to lose all the freedoms in our Bill of Rights; we are to lose all our national sovereignty; our immigration barriers are going to be down, and we are going to have hordes of Hottentots from all over the world come into our country; we are going to have our tariff barriers down, and our standard of living will go to pot; our currency will have to be given up, and Fort Knox will be raided; we will be subjected to unlimited taxation. These are just a few of the highlights of this super-colossal world government.

Now gentlemen, that is a straw man, and I hope you give credit to the many people that are working in the United World Federalists, that if it faintly resembled such a straw man we would be the first to kick it in the ash can.

Now A.C.R. 17 is the point that this Committee will have to discuss. Read it carefully. It speaks of a world federation, of the world federal government with limited powers. Now, what are those limited powers which the federalists suggest? Mind you, you miss the whole point in spirit of the world federalists, if you think they have a program which will guarantee peace, and in exchange for this, a promise to give you peace. This seems so childish to me to think that anybody would consider that any such arrangement could be made. The Federalists have no control over this difficult world, and we realize, in our humility, that we are struggling to try to come up with something a little more constructive than what we have, so please do not take what I say about the specific things that the world federalists stand for as meaning that it is a blue-print, or that it is a guarantee of peace. Unfortunately, Mr. Stickel quoted from an out-of-date Statement of Purposes this morning, for the record. He should have gotten the Statement of Purposes and Policies, which was passed last October. The world federalist is an evolving organization, it is a democratic organization. Those things are changed to suit the times and circumstances, but we do not change the fundamental concept, of course. I think that it is only fair to state, for the record, that what was quoted this morning was not accurate. Now, what is the real issue today? The real issue today is if we can be nationally sufficient, as the disabled veteran said this morning. Can we, by arming to the teeth, and being ready with all our men, our resources, and our money, can we achieve peace? If we can, I think that is a fine way to do it, and I think we better kick all the world federalists into the ash can, but I think there is an increasing appreciation that in order to achieve peace, we must work with other people, even though we don't want to.

The U.N., as has been stated this morning by Mrs. Todarelli, has done an excellent job within its powers. The U.N. has really done a remarkable job, and I think we would be stupid to go to any extreme national isolationism, and withdraw from the U.N. Mr. Bill, the disabled veteran, told me after his talk on the floor this morning, that he thinks we are making a mistake to be in the U.N., and we should get out. We do not believe that. There is a difference of opinion, and I think that is quite democratic, but the federalists at least believe that the U.N. has done a remarkable job with the powers it has been given, and we believe it should be strengthened. Now, in what respects? First, it should have a separation of powers between the executive, judicial, and the enforcement agencies. In other words, the same thing as we have in the New Jersey Constitution, and the same as we have in the United States Federal Constitution. The world federalists believe that the assembly might be transformed into a legislature.

The system of voting is ridiculous -- one vote in the assembly. Certainly we should have a bigger vote than Guatemala or some other small nation. We do not know the answer to representation. It is undoubtedly the toughest question that must be faced in the assembly. We cannot do it now, and if you expect anybody to print a blue-print now, you are going to be disappointed. Certainly it must be more equitable than it is.

As to jurisdiction concerning aggression, we believe it should have the power to define aggression so that if the United States wants to live by decent standards, it will isolate the Russians and make them show before all the world that they do not want to live by a law which properly and carefully defines what shall constitute aggression.

As for the Security Council, the executive branch should be given only executive powers in the U.N. Now it has judicial and enforcement powers. It should be strictly an executive agency without any veto power. The U.N. should have compulsory jurisdiction within that small area in which you give it jurisdiction. It has been said here that we as individuals are going to lose all our rights, but that is not so. It should be limited to compulsory jurisdiction and to enforcement of only the laws that it is given the power to act upon.

As far as taxing powers are concerned, our Statement of Purposes says -- and it is obvious -- that it must be carefully limited and defined. You could work out a percentage system, or some other means that would equitably do it. We, as individual citizens here in the United States are subjected to taxing power, but I take it, on the whole it is an equitable system, and certainly there are ways of devising an equitable system. We are not smart enough to know the answer, but there must be some other way than this raiding of Fort Knox, which certainly no one would stand for.

Now the main point that has been made in the testimony so far is that we must lose all our national sovereignty, and we must lose all the freedoms guaranteed in our Bill of Rights. Perhaps I should best read from the Statement of Purposes of the U.N. on just exactly what we mean when we talk about the Bill of Rights and a reservation of powers. This is the suggestion as to revising the U.N. and how it can be strengthened. "A bill of rights protecting individuals against arbitrary or unjust action by the United Nations, and prohibiting interference by the United Nations with the rights and liberties guaranteed to persons by their own national and state constitutions." Now, what can be clearer than that? Section 6 has the same clause we have in our State and Federal Constitutions. "A reservation to the nations and their peoples of all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, thus guaranteeing to each nation complete internal sovereignty in its domestic affairs, and freedom to choose its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions." Now, that is what the World Federalists are standing for, not what you have heard for most of the day today.

Now, let's speak a bit about sovereignty. We talk about it as though it were a billiard ball, as though now you have it and now you don't have it. It is more like an orange -- when you pry beneath the surface, you realize that sovereignty is in our people. We want it to stay there. And, like an orange, you can break it apart. One bit of sovereignty that we have is that the town shall have the right to make traffic laws; the county shall have the right to have county institutions; the state shall have the right to make State highways; the nation shall have the right to maintain a defense force, and to have common currency. Now there is another bit of sovereignty that we must consider, and not consider it from the viewpoint of any Hottentots, or any Utopian, or idealistic dream, and that is whether or not it would not be to our advantage to create a larger

jurisdiction in order to achieve what we want, namely, peace.

Now, it is an illusion, absolutely, to think at the present moment that we have sovereignty in connection with external affairs not involving our domestic affairs. Let me cite to you just a few simple examples. A sovereign is one who rules and controls. Do we have any control over the foreign situation? No, we are on the defensive to the Communists. They do what the men in the Kremlin tell them to do, and we react to it. We have no control over the foreign situation. We have been dragged into two world wars, and these Gold Star Mothers know what it means.

We are now forced, by a very substantial vote in our Congress, to join the North Atlantic Treaty, which is certainly involving our sovereignty. We have agreed to go help some other people if some other country is attacked. There is an entangling alliance for you which Washington never considered. Our declaration of war is outmoded and meaningless; it comes afterward. Look what happened at Pearl Harbor.

We are now forced to rearm. Does anybody in this room think we want to rearm, that we want to take our boys and have what happens to them happen to them? The Federalists say, however, when you live in a jungle, the only way to protect yourself is to rearm. The question is, how long are we going to say in a garrison state and spend our money in rearmament. We say it is necessary; let's not make any mistake about that. The Disabled Veterans do not need to worry about that; the Federalists know we have to do it, but certainly there is a better way than what we are now doing.

Now, as to the question of freedom and peace, and the relationship of the two. They are like Siamese twins - freedom and peace. When one dies, the other dies. We are now losing peace. Let's be honest with ourselves. We are losing our freedoms. Now, if we could separate those two; if one could stay alive, and the other die, it would be fine, but freedom and peace are Siamese twins. Just look at the effect -- it isn't the threat of war; we don't have all-out war yet -- on our freedoms. Let me briefly mention a couple.

In the field of government, you State legislators are having a fine time with the federal government concentrating all the power in Washington. If ever states' rights were getting a beating, they are getting a beating now, in housing and all kinds of fields. In the field of taxation, it seems to me you legislators are like Old Mother Hubbard -- when you go to the cupboard to get poor Governor Driscoll a bone, the thing is bare - Uncle Sam got there first. Eighty-three cents out of every federal dollar goes toward war, past or future; prevention of war, and rearmament. Just make that stick in your mind. So we are losing our rights in the field of government.

In our personal lives, just think what is happening. Our boys have to go to war; they have to go to Korea and slosh around in the mud and get killed in a foreign land. Education is disrupted; our families are disrupted; freedom of speech curtailed. Soon we will have rationing. We will have a lot more rules and regulations on our necks very shortly than we ever had in World War II, through the federal government.

In the field of economic life, somebody mentioned the free enterprise system this morning. The free enterprise system is being wrecked by these confiscatory taxes. If they could be given to laborers so that laborers would get a higher wage; if they could be plowed back to strengthen each corporation and our whole economy, so as to make for continuous employment and create a big purchasing power, we would do it. But war is wrecking our system. If we want to get Communism, just have another war and wreck our capitalist system still more. I do not want to press the point, but there it is. The impact of war on our lives is terrific in whatever way you want to consider it.

Now, every effort toward peace is an effort toward freedom. Let's not forget that. So when you are working for peace, and struggling hard with these difficult problem, realize that at the same time you are working for these valued freedoms which have been discussed here all day. Now, if the time should ever come when we had to choose between freedom or peace - that has been mentioned - we must choose freedom. The

Federalists certainly will choose freedom. They are not a pacifist organization, and they value those freedoms that have been discussed just as much as the people who have stood up before me today. These two go together as Siamese twins, but if there ever came a time when there should be some divergence, we favor freedom.

Our Declaration of Independence has one statement in it that government is made to create and secure certain inalienable rights of man. There is an individual right which I, as a citizen of this country and State, demand. I want to be free of war. I do not feel that freedom at the present moment. Now we are engaged in that difficult task of trying to create a new freedom, a freedom which man has never known. I say to you gentlemen, do not be confused. We want to keep our freedoms that we have, but we must struggle to create a new freedom.

Now, when we look about the world and look at history, what is the panorama. Here in our United States, in our domestic affairs we have government on different levels; there are certain sovereignties delegated to certain levels of government. I say it works out pretty well. We have a lot of religious tensions, economic tensions, and others, that succeed in getting along without civil war within our State and our country. I say it is a success. It may not be perfect, but it is certainly a success. We have peace within our domestic affairs. We had one Civil War, but since then, in spite of the F.E.P.C. and other things within our country, we still do not fight about it.

Now, that is the point that the U.W.F. is directed to, that we shall maintain our differences, tolerate our differences. And we submit to you that the only way that it has ever been solved is to permit those differences to be tolerated through some form of government. Contrast that with the world level. We have alliances; we have treaties; we have, as Mr. Stickel says, a U. N. partnership of nations. We do not have any government on the world level with all the essential attributes of making a law defining its jurisdiction within which you can make a law; a judicial system that must interpret it, and an enforcement agency that says, "By George, the law will be enforced". All we have is power politics and conferences. The Big Four are meeting now, and supposing they agree. So what? Where have you got anything that can enforce what Russia says she will do? What is the use of going around the conference table and making concessions if we have no means of enforcing whatever is agreed on? It is like making a deal with some fellow who is judgment proof, and you are not judgment proof. Sure, you can make a fine agreement; you can sue him and get a judgment, but what good does it do you?

Now, A.C.R. 17 is the evidence of the continuing ingenuity of our Yankee ancestors in striving to create a new political instrument to solve a new need. That is something that we must not forget. So that in these efforts, realize that we are struggling with a most desperate problem. We need all the sympathy and help which decent citizens of this State and the United States can give us.

In closing, gentlemen, let me just draw the parallel of a tree. The seed of world government has been planted in the minds of man for many a long year. It is now beginning to bud. The evidence that you hear of all

these resolutions passed without the State shows that sort of vague groping of our people for some affirmative answer to the problem of war. It is beginning to bud, and I venture to predict that the chill winds of national isolationism, of national sufficiency, all that, cannot kill this plant. They may retard its growth temporarily until a true understanding of the problem is had by our people. We may not have had enough education yet to see the point of our efforts. We are now getting to the point where our tree is gaining more strength. And I say to you that if this tree brings forth the evil fruit which has been set forth today in the form of the loss of our freedoms and those things, we will be the first, like George Washington, to get out our little ax and chop the tree down.

I wish to thank you for your kindness. I, perhaps, have talked too long, but we have our program outlined so that we hope we will not repeat. In closing may I say that I hope God will give us all here, as patriotic Americans, the insight and the fullness of heart to realize that we have a common love of freedom, and that we must unite in our best efforts to try and achieve it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAVINATO: Not to interfere with your strategy, but I did promise this pastor that I would have him on before, and in the large list of names, he escaped me. He is going to speak for one minute. If he wants to speak more than that, he will be permitted to. Father Heimbeck.

REVEREND HEIMBUCK.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen: I would just like to take a few minutes to read an editorial from the Elizabeth Daily Journal; it is dated March 7, 1951. I feel that it is more eloquent than any words of mine might be.

"Two years ago the New Jersey Legislature adopted a resolution requesting the Congress to call a convention. Out of this convention it was hoped would come an amendment which would permit the United States to negotiate with other countries for a world federal government. Friday there will be a public hearing in the State House on a joint proposal by Republican Assemblyman Mackey of Union, and Democratic Assemblyman Tumulty of Hudson, to rescind the first resolution.

"It seems unbelievable that even as the smoke of a smoldering world smarts our eye, men of unquestioned loyalty and of even brilliant attainment, would have us believe that there is no fire except one that would extinguish quickly under a blanket of world federalism. They appear to forget the clanging gates of Eden, and the sins which have nurtured the legacy under which the world suffers. They would cancel the legacy with one word, but forget to tell us that to cancel the sins, we must first bow to one God. It reminds us of the United States, but forgets the Tower of Babel. They talk to us of a united world and overlook the United Nations, rather the experiences of the United Nations which have not been encouraging to the

hope for having a united world at any foreseeable future date.

"Why not take first things first. Why not see first what threats to American sovereignty exist within the findings of the U.N. What can be done about them before hunting further for a new Garden of Eden.

"In California, a Japanese went to court to test the validity of a California law which barred him from owning land. He contended that the United Nations law superseded the California Law, and the Appellate Court of California ruled as follows: 'The United Nations Charter has become the supreme law of the land.'"

It is impossible to grasp in a moment the far-reaching surrender of a constitutional provision in that decision. If there is no reversal by the Supreme Court of the United States, then the United States will indeed have problem enough to untangle that which we tackle first. After that it will be early enough to see what further reliance we can put in a neighbor nation which starves millions of its people, which murders more millions, and holds even more millions in slavery. What reliance may we repose in such a neighbor? What reliance has that neighbor encouraged by its absolute rejection of United Nations agreements?

There is much to admire in the courage that makes a world federalist. There is hope in the goal that drives them forward. But again, first things first. Let's see what we can make out of the United Nations before venturing any deeper into the waters of international obligation. World Federalism can wait.

It is my humble belief that World Federalism has been sponsored and nurtured by men and women of very high ideals and good will, but I fear that they are laboring under the illusion that we are living in a Utopia, and not in a world that is torn asunder by strife, trickery, and treachery. We must first raise the moral standards of our people; teach them respect for the laws of God and the laws of man. Unless and until we can do this, I am against any covenant that would tamper with our Constitution or endanger our precious Bill of Rights.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker will be A. J. G. Priest.

MR. A. J. G. PRIEST, United World Federalists, Inc.

Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee:

Let me begin by calling attention to one inadvertence on the part of my good friend and colleague, Mr. Dailey. He said, in the course of one of his earlier statements, that we have got to disarm. He meant, I am sure -- correct me if I am wrong -- that we have got to stay armed in an anarchic world. Is that right?

MR. DAILEY: That is right.

MR. PRIEST: Let me refer, before turning to my statement, to the case which was referred to in the editorial from the Elizabeth Journal which has just been read by the good Father. It is true that an Appellate Court in California did uphold that decision, as that editorial indicated. But I assure the members of the Committee that an appeal from that decision has been taken, and that it is the opinion of most outstanding constitutional lawyers -- and this field has been widely canvassed -- that that decision is unsound, and that in such a field as this -- that is the field of land tenure in a particular State -- that the United Nations Treaty is not the supreme law of the land in this country. And I believe, a very strong amicus curiae, an outstanding federalist lawyer in California, argued against the soundness of that decision, and we have every reason to believe that that decision will be reversed when it reaches the Supreme Court of California.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving the time of this Committee, I have prepared a written statement.

Mr. name is A. J. G. Priest, as the Chairman stated, and for the past 18 years I have resided in Summit, Union County, New Jersey, having been a home-owner in Summit for the past 16 years. I am a member of the law firm of Reid & Priest with offices at Two Rector Street in New York City. I was one of the founders of United World Federalists, Incorporated and, since its organization, have served as a member of its National Executive Council. From 1948 to 1950 I served as Chairman of the National Executive Council of United World Federalists and I am presently Chairman of the National Executive Committee. I have long been a member of such highly "subversive" organizations as the American Legion, the Union League Club of New York and the Metropolitan Club of Washington, D. C.

I have been asked by my associates to deal briefly with the timeliness, the present appropriateness, of the proposal of United World Federalists that the United Nations be strengthened into a world federation open to all nations and possessing defined and limited powers necessary to preserve the peace.

What if Russia refuses to go along? Is there a chance that the Russian rulers would have any inclination to enter a limited world government established for the purpose of preserving peace? Of course I don't know. I have not discussed that question with the blood-stained gentlemen of the Kremlin, but neither has anyone else, because the offer of limited world government has not been made either

to the Russian people or to their rulers. And until it has been made, no one can be certain what their answer will be.

However, if I were asked to speculate, my guess would have to be that the chances are overwhelmingly against acceptance by the Kremlin, but even if the odds against the Kremlin's approval were 1,000-to-1 or 10,000-to-1, the offer should be made for it holds out what well may be, in Lincoln's phrase, "the last best hope of earth."

Of course, the question is not what will Russia do, but rather what will the United States do? If a world government having limited but adequate powers for the prevention of war is sound as a matter of ethics and natural law and common decency, why should we allow the reluctance of the Kremlin to prevent us from joining with other nations in the presentation of a proposal which will send a surge of hope up and down the world? As Pierce Butler, Jr. has said, "If we believe that law and order is desirable, the Kremlin's preference for chaos may not be permitted to make us renounce our desire. The question is one of international policy and morality and we may not permit any objection from Russia, or any other nation, to make our moral choices for us."

Thus far our American policy has been depressingly negative. We have said that it is our purpose to halt communistic imperialism, and we are spending our blood and treasure to that end. But a negative policy of containment is not enough. What comes next if we succeed in stopping Communist aggression in Korea? Will we have the same job to do again in Iran? In Indo-China? In Yugoslavia? In Turkey? The prospect of recurring and unending small wars inevitably will have a destructive effect upon the morale of our fighting forces and of our people here at home. We must have, and must have now, something more than a policy of desperate, eternal, exhausting defense. We must declare our high moral purposes affirmatively and positively and such a declaration could not take better form than that of an announcement that we Americans seek law and order in the world, that we are wholly without imperialistic aims, that we are eager to apply throughout the earth those peaceful techniques of negotiation and adjudication through international tribunals which have enabled us to maintain 5,000 miles of unfortified frontiers with Canada and Mexico and that we wish to extend our historic use of these same peaceful means of settlement and to establish rules of law for settling future controversies.

The adoption by our government of this great proposal for strengthening the United Nations into a world federation which can prevent war will hold out to all peoples everywhere the hope of ending the fear of atomic bombs and even more hideous weapons of mass destruction not yet disclosed; it would declare that we expect to deny to ourselves, and to all nations, the power to commit acts of aggression against other peaceful peoples and thus would make possible the realization in fact of the high aspirations stated in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations.

What are we fighting for? To quote Pierce Butler again, "When our troops are in battle, when the Nation is at war and allies

are being sought, the time is ripe to state the purpose for which we are fighting. If we are not fighting in order to prevent future wars, then the particular advantage for which we are fighting should be stated by someone who knows it. If we are fighting to prevent future wars, why keep it a secret? And why not say how we propose to prevent them?"

When my son was in France last summer, he heard recurrently from farmers and clerks and little people generally the sentiment that the United States and Russia are the same thing. That, of course, is an infamous and scandalous lie. In all history Russia has never willingly surrendered so much as a square mile of conquered territory and it has invariably imposed upon its subject peoples the brutal tyranny either of the Czars or of Russia's more recent and even more savage dictators, while the United States has made abundant demonstration, through its course of conduct in the Philippines, in Cuba and elsewhere that its genuinely humanitarian purpose is to make law and order and all the great freedoms follow our flag.

But how can we best deal with these lies which Russian propaganda has planted in the minds of other men? How can we best hearten and strengthen our present allies and bring new allies to our side? We can achieve that purpose by declaring now through appropriate Congressional action that the United States is fighting to achieve order and law and decency in the world and that we will join with others in setting up a world federation which will make future war impossible.

I submit that there could not conceivably be a more effective weapon in the psychological warfare which we are now carrying on with the Kremlin. If the satellite peoples and the Russians themselves could only be told insistently, persistently, day in and day out, that they can have butter instead of guns, that their standards of living can rise like water in a lock if only their rulers can be made to accept America's offer of a world made free from war, then the internal stresses and strains which are already apparent throughout the Soviet Empire may well be increased to such a point that even the gentlemen of the Kremlin will realize that, in the interest of their own survival, they must accept the ordered world we offer them.

The time to declare ourselves is now. If America leads, peoples outside the Soviet orbit will surely follow and we may get a decent world. But if despite our efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement, war does come, then the formation of a limited world federation capable of preventing future conflict must become a primary war aim and the statement of that objective may well be vastly effective in striking at the morale of the enemy and accomplishing his early collapse.

What the New Jersey Legislature did when it enacted A.C.R. # 17 was to declare that the people of New Jersey are willing to provide the mechanics by means of which a proposed world federation can be considered and acted upon when the time is ripe. For New Jersey to rescind that action, to cancel even that small measure of progress, would be to damage the State's reputation, to commit us to what may seem to be a policy of isolationism and to depress and discourage

those who have been struggling to achieve a better world. I cannot believe that you gentlemen will place New Jersey in the ranks of the Hearsts, and the McCormicks, and the Kamps, and the Gerald L. K. Smiths, and the Merwin K. Harts, and the Ku Klux Klan and the Communist party, all of whom oppose the world government concept with every grim device at their command. New Jersey does not belong in that shoddy company and neither do the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Daughters of the American Revolution, as I am sure time will ultimately demonstrate to the leadership of those great organizations.

I am grateful for your attention, and I shall be glad to be subjected to such questions as the members of the Committee may wish to ask.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Mr. Richard Cowen.

RICHARD COWEN, United World Federalists, Inc.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

I would like to first read an article that appeared in the Bergen Evening Record in Hackensack, Bergen County, on Wednesday, March 7. It refers to an action that the Mayor and Council of the Township of Teaneck took preceding the evening of the action that was taken to oppose World Federalism and to urge the rescinding of A.C.R. 17. May I quote from the paper.

"Mayor Brett admitted that the Township was only in receipt of the bill yesterday and had not had time to read it, but he added that if it meant removal of local control of welfare, then he is against it."

I quote that because it highlights the tremendous amount of misunderstanding that exists regarding the purposes and the wording of A.C.R. 17, and I shall attempt, very briefly, to clarify that. Mr. Anderson Fowler, one of the Assemblyman of New Jersey, wrote to the Attorney General of New Jersey on November 3, 1950, and asked for a clarification of A.C.R. 17. Mr. Fowler asked these questions: "Has the passage of A.C.R. No. 17 committed the people of the State of New Jersey to participation in a world government?" Mr. Parsons' answer was, "No".

The second question was: "Has the passage of A.C.R. No. 17 committed the members of the State Legislature, who voted for it, to acceptance of any constitutional amendment that may result from their petition to the Congress of the United States as embodied in A.C.R. No. 17?" And the Attorney General's answer to that was, "No".

His third question was: "It is my understanding that, if the required number of 32 States pass resolutions similar to A.C.R. No. 17, the people of the State of New Jersey will then twice have an

opportunity to express approval or disapproval of the participation of the United States in a limited world government as set forth in A.C.R. No. 17. Their first opportunity would be when they elected delegates to the Convention that would be called by the Congress of the United States. Their second opportunity would be when any amendment that might be proposed by the Convention was submitted to the States for ratification. Is my understanding of this a correct one?"

I will not attempt to read the Attorney General's answer to that question because it is very long, and cites Supreme Court decisions. However, it is open for anyone who wants to see it, and the Attorney General's answer to that, in substance, was "Yes, that is a correct understanding".

In other words, the United World Federalists feel that perhaps the proponents of A.C.R. 9, and perhaps even our own arguments down here today are not completely pertinent, because world government is not the issue before the Judiciary Committee. The issue is solely whether the people of New Jersey are going to have an opportunity to examine some other possible path toward peace, and evaluate it, and then accept it or reject it, as they shall so desire, at that future date. A.C.R. 17 in no way or form commits the people of New Jersey, or the State of New Jersey, to world government, or any form of international cooperation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Mrs. Marie Wilcox.

MRS. MARIE WILCOX:

I am a housewife from the Village of Ridgewood, New Jersey. I am going to present to you various statements from people to show you the broad support that federal world government enjoys.

Winston Churchill has asked, "What hope can there be for the future of the world unless there is some form of world government which can make its effort to prevent a renewal of the awful struggle through which we have just passed?"

Now, I have several statements from various persons and organizations to submit to you.

(Mrs. Wilcox, speaking in opposition to A. C. R. #9 placed on file, with the Judiciary Committee, letters, telegrams, resolutions, and various statements from the following persons and organizations to support her views.)

American Veterans Committee resolution adopted by the National Planning Committee on February 28, 1948.

Resolution passed by New Jersey Americans for Democratic Action on March, 1949, and at the National Americans for Democratic Action Convention on April, 1949.

Statement of the United Automobile Workers of America at the 12th National Convention on July 14, 1949.

Kiwanis Resolution acted upon at 34th Annual Convention of Kiwanis International on June 22, 1949.

Amendment to the United Nations Charter presented by the Junior Chamber of Commerce on June 5, 1948 at the National Convention.

C. I. O. Foreign Policy Resolution adopted at the Convention in January, 1950 at Cleveland, Ohio.

Copy of a letter from President Harold W. Dodds of Princeton University to Governor Alfred E. Driscoll of New Jersey dated February 6, 1951.

Statement submitted by Senator Robert C. Hendrickson in February, 1951.

Resolution passed by the Young Democratic Clubs of America at their biennial Convention, Chattanooga, Tennessee on November 17-19, 1949.

Resolution passed by the Young Republican Nation Federation on June 23-26, 1949 at Salt Lake City, Utah.

Resolution passed at the annual meeting of the National Education Association of the United States on July 7, 1950 at St. Louis, Missouri.

Statement from the Social Pronouncements of the 162nd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, USA as adopted from the report of Standing Committee on Social Education and Action on May 23, 1950 in Cincinnati.

Statement of the American War Dads on the Organization for World Peace, October 1948.

Resolution passed on June 5, 1948 by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce National Convention.

Resolution adopted at the Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association, May 25, 1950.

Statement of the Catholic Association for International Peace, 1947.

Resolution adopted at the United Automobile Workers CIO Convention, July, 1949.

Joint statement by AAUN, AUC and UWF in California issued February 10, 1951.

Resolution adopted by Essex County Trades Council, September, 1949.

Resolution adopted at 47th Annual Conference of the New Jersey Welfare Council on December 1, 1948.

Resolution adopted by the Biennial General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church - October 1950.

Resolution adopted on October 25, 1950 by the Five Years Meeting of Friends, Richmond, Indiana.

Statement of the Methodist Church General Conference, May 7, 1948.

Resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in Convention assembled May, 1948.

Resolution adopted by the Church Peace Union at their semiannual meeting in Atlantic City, May 11, 1950.

Resolution adopted by the Cooperative League Biennial Congress on November of 1948.

Resolution adopted by the Amvets Annual Convention of 1950.

Resolution passed by the Annual Convention of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, October, 1950.

Statement of James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union, March, 1949.

Resolution adopted by the Congregational Christian Churches at the National General Council assembled in Cleveland, Ohio on June 22-26, 1950.

Copy of a letter submitted on March 7, 1951 by Mrs. Rudolph G. Emmel, Chairman of Legislation and Citizenship Department, New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs.

Copy of a letter submitted by Louis M. Levitsky, Rabbi, Oheb Shalom Congregation, Newark on March 6, 1951.

Telegram from Grover C. Walters, Pastor, Pitman Baptist Church.

Letter from John E. Bates, Minister, Middletown Baptist Church.

Telegram from Winston Paul, Former Chairman of Commission to revise New Jersey Constitution.

Letter from Mr. John D. Clark, Newark Businessman.

Letter from Mrs. Harrison Tate, member of the National Council of Negro Women, writing only for herself and not for the Council.

Letter from Mr. Karl M. Mann, member of the SAR.

Copy of a telegram from Louis P. Marciante, President, and Vincent J. Murphy, Secretary-Treasurer, New Jersey State Federation of Labor.

Telegram from Julius L. Brasher, Pastor, Denville Community Church and Chairman, World Peace Commission of the Newark Annual Conference of the Methodist Church.

Telegram from Richard Weil, Jr., President of R. H. Macy.

Letter from William Emery of the Presbyterian Church, Mays Landing.

Telegram from Dr. F. M. Potter, Trustee of Rutgers University, Head of Board of Foreign Missions, Reformed Church.

Telegram from Grace W. Barnes, President, Englewood Council of Church Women.

Resolution adopted by Camden County Bar Association, November 30, 1949.

Letter from Paul Vogel, National Executive Board Member, American Federation of Hosiery Workers.

Telegram from Conrad Shadlen, former President, Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Letter from Robert J. Lau, State Chairman, New Jersey American Veterans Committee.

Statement submitted by Edward K. Mills, Jr., the former Mayor of Morristown.

Statement submitted by Worrall F. Mountain, Jr., lawyer in Morristown.

Statement of Ralph W. Wescott, Attorney and Counsellor at law, Camden.

Other persons in favor of A. C. R. 17.

Archibald S. Alexander, Under Secretary of the Army.
Governor Alfred E. Driscoll
Major General Claire Lee Chennault
Henry L. Stimson
William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of U.S. Supreme Court.
Ambassador Ernest A. Gross
Representative Case
Representative Towe
Representative Howell
Representative Rodino
Senator Robert A. Taft
Harold Stassen
Alcide De Gasperi, Premier of Italy
Anthony Eden
Paul-Henri Spaak, former Prime Minister of Belgium
Vincent Auriol, President of France
Lester B. Pearson, of Canada
Rev. Philip S. Moore, C.S.C., Dean of the University of Notre Dame
Owen D. Young, formerly head of General Electric Co.
Harold A. Bullis, Chairman, General Mills, Inc.
Walter Reuther, President, United Auto Workers, C.I.O.
Mr. George W. Merck, President, Merck Chemical Company
Mr. Jacob C. Baer, ex-President, Essex County Trades Council
Mr. S. A. Williams, President, Bates Manufacturing Company
Mr. Brian P. Leeb, Vice-President, Bankers Trust Company
Mr. Russell B. Kingman, Chairman of the Board of Metal Textile Corp.
Mr. L. A. Keyes, Vice President, J. P. Morgan & Co.
Mr. Alfred R. Nathan, Vice President, Ronson Metal Arts Works, Inc.
Mr. Joseph Roebling of the Roebling Steel Company.
Mr. Hugh Chace, Vice President of Bank of New York and Fifth Avenue Bank

MR. CAVINATO: A member of our Committee, Mr. Tumulty, wants to ask a question.

MR. TUMULTY: Would the proponents of A.C.R. 17, those who call themselves the World Federalists, specify just what is their program? You mentioned an October 15th revision of the program. Was that your only program?

MR. CAVINATO: Will you address the Chair in response to that question.

MR. HOLLINS: I am the President of the United World Federalists of New Jersey. In reply to that, Mr. Tumulty, we have brought here today 500 copies of the United World Federalists official statement of beliefs, policies, and purposes. That is a document that was adopted last October in Washington at our annual convention. It is a document by which we must all be bound until the next convention. These copies are here; we brought them here to make them available, not only to the Committee, but to all the people in this room.

MR. TUMULTY: Is that the only document you recognize?

MR. HOLLINS: Yes, that is the only document of our official statement.

MR. TUMULTY: I just wanted to be sure, because I do not want to use material that is not a reflection of your views.

MR. CAVINATO: I want to correct a mistake I made. Mr. Tumulty is not a member of the Judiciary Committee. He is co-sponsor of the bill.

MR. TUMULTY: Now I ask you to identify this document.
(indicating)

MR. HOLLINS: That is a document put out by somebody in our organization. The other one is the only official statement.

MR. TUMULTY: You mean to say that the whole program is just in that one pamphlet, and no place else?

MR. HOLLINS: That is right, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a correction for the record. Mrs. Wilcox inadvertently said that Congressmen Case, Rodino, Towe, Hand, and there may have been others, were supporting A.C.R. 17. I do not know personally whether they are or not, nor, with due apologies to Mrs. Wilcox, do I believe she knows. I think what she was trying to say was that last year a majority of the Republican Congressmen and of the Democratic Congressmen from the State of New Jersey were official sponsors of the World Federation Resolution in Congress, H.C.R. 64. What their stand is on A.C.R. 9, I don't know, because I have never asked them.

MR. CAVINATO: The sponsor requests the privilege of another question.

MR. TUMULTY: Does that contain the same material that A.C.R. 17 does, and does it contain the same material that this official program of yours does?

MR. HOLLINS: No sir. It was a bill drawn up by a number of Congressmen and Senators. It had 116 sponsors in the House of Representatives, and it was an attempt to state the fundamental question of American policy.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Mr. James Kerney, Jr.

MR. JAMES KERNEY, JR.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:

I was asked this morning by Mr. Wayne B. MacMurray, Editor and Publisher of the Asbury Park Press, and a member of the Constitutional Convention if, in his absence, I would state for him that he opposes A.C.R. 9 and favors A.C.R. 17, because limited world federation, through A.C.R. 17, is one step which New Jersey has taken to help find that peace we all want so much.

I make that statement in behalf of Mr. MacMurray. For myself, I hope to take no more than two minutes. I should like to leave several quotes in the record which state my own position as a citizen of New Jersey. The quotes are first from Pope Pius XII, in his Encyclical Summic Pontificatus, in which he says:

"The human race is bound together by reciprocal ties, moral and juridical, into a great commonwealth directed to the good of all nations and ruled by special laws which protect its unity and promote its prosperity."

Also I should like to leave with you two other quotations almost as brief. One is from the International Union of Social Studies, which was founded by the late Cardinal Mercier, and when this was adopted was presided over by Cardinal Van Roey of Belgium in recommending a world federation. That organization said:

"Such an authority would have power to govern with full sovereignty; would direct the collaboration of nations to a higher goal of human community to summon to its supreme tribunal the disputes which might arise between nations and use necessary constraint against any state which would dare to disturb order and international peace. This would not affect their own rights. Under the rule of such an international authority each state would continue to provide the full autonomy for the good of its subjects; make its own laws; govern its territory, and establish useful relations with its neighbors."

This last quotation is a quotation by seven committees of the Catholic Association for International Peace. It is a report drawn up last year in part by Bishop Wright of Worcester, Massachusetts; Father Parsons, the distinguished Jesuit Editor, and Monsignore Driscoll, a distinguished Dominican Priest.

"Something more than the mere elimination of the veto is essential. The development of the United Nations into an effective organization for the maintenance of international peace and security means the amendment of the charter to provide for expressly limited but adequate legislative, judicial, and executive authority to compel submission of all international, justifiable disputes to adjudication by law, and to maintain international peace and security."

On these grounds I support A.C.R. 17 and oppose A.C.R. 9.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAVINATO: The bill's sponsor, Mr. Tumulty, would like to ask you a question. Will you submit to a question?

MR. KERNEY: I will be glad to.

MR. TUMULTY: Are you trying to tell us, Mr. Kerney, that Pope Pius XII has endorsed this program of the United World Federalists?

MR. KERNEY: I am not competent to tell you that, as you know, Mr. Assemblyman.

MR. TUMULTY: Do you know?

MR. KERNEY: Of course I do not know.

REVEREND TROWBRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, may I claim the indulgence of the Committee granted a few moments ago to a fellow clergyman to make a statement?

MR. CAVINATO: Surely, for the Clergy.

(Rev. Carney Trowbridge, director of St. Peter's Church, Morristown, read a resolution, but did not file it with the Committee)

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Reverend William Emery.

REVEREND WILLIAM EMERY.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee:

I am a member of the American Legion. The fact that I am in my second year as the Chaplain of the Atlantic County Committee does not entitle me to speak for my post or for the County.

The statement was made by Past State Commander, Halsey Stickel, that the American Legion studied the plan for world government. Having been an active member for three years, since his incumbency as Commander, I was unaware, although I am vitally interested in this, of any study such as this. I am thoroughly convinced, on the basis of these hearings, that when department officers come to county or post meetings, they speak; they do not listen, and everyone present knows that the Chaplain's job is to have everyone tell it to him.

I think I can speak as Chaplain, from having listened to some of the Legionnaires I know what they feel, but I am speaking as an individual stating that the American Legion has not studied this. Perhaps a few salaried employees of the American Legion have studied it, but they never disseminated to the posts any information. I have the first letter in my hand which was received regarding this, and I have been on the official correspondence list for several months. It is dated February 19. It states only that the State Department and the national organization are opposed to world federation. On the basis of that it proposes and urges

members of the Legion, without telling them what A.C.R. 17 and 9 are about, to write letters to you gentlemen. I do not think you would appreciate receiving letters of that kind.

I am a veteran of the European Theatre, and the father of children, one of them born while I was overseas. I have studied the history of the United States and of the United Nations.

I am interested to note also that Mr. Stickel remarked that the United World Federalists look at the world as they like it to be, whereas the proponents of A.C.R. 9 look at the world as it is. I am reminded of the remark of Gilbert Chesterton about Omar Khayyam -- he sat in the cellar of the house and thought it was the only room in the house. As a minister of four churches in southern New Jersey, it is my duty to look beyond the world as it is to the world as it should be, as you and I would like to have it made. Again I speak in response to Mr. Stickel's remark that we will share the wealth of America with other people; we will give them of our wealth when they are destitute. I think it is ridiculous to continue to pour down a rat hole our wealth when we could share, not only our wealth with them as a matter of relief, but our wonderful system of constitutional government; our system of law which makes it impossible for one State in America to attack another State and make war upon it.

During the brief intermission for lunch, I heard two ladies wearing these "Be Alert" signs say, "I think it should go to a referendum of the people". That is exactly why I am here. I believe it is the duty of this Legislature to permit a constitutional convention so that it will be in all of the newspapers, and all of the people will be discussing world government. Everyone has a right to know what are the ideals; what are the various viewpoints on this situation, rather than bottle it up and close it up in New Jersey as of Monday.

I happen to be an Army Reserve Officer. Within the next few weeks, I very well may receive my call to active duty. I have transferred from the infantry to the chaplaincy because I am now qualified to serve in that capacity. I am prepared, if necessary, to leave my civilian vocation, my wife and children, and go fight, as I believe most of my friends in U.W.F. are prepared to fight to maintain all that we have. My question is: Are we going to simply be ready to cooperate with other nations in the world, or are we, as American people, going to lead the way to world government? There is quite a difference of opinion - and I am not a member of the U.W.F.; I have only known the actual proponents for a few weeks. I am not a member of it, but I already know there is much difference among them as to just exactly what steps must be taken. They are, however, all agreed that the first step is to let more and more people know more and more about it. If I go into service in the next few months, I hope to feel that that flag that is dear to you and me will be preserved, but I hope also that my boys at home will be getting some kind of backing, by public discussion and public opinion, so that if I don't happen to come back, there will be some kind of law and order in this world which will make it impossible for one nation to attack another nation when they are eighteen

or eighteen and a half. I know they would be glad to fight, and I would be proud to see them fight, but I would be much happier to see it unnecessary.

Therefore, as an American and as a member of the American Legion, I vigorously oppose the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution #9. I join Governor Driscoll who stated in the spring of 1949, "Without world government there can be no peace".

MR. CAVINATO: Now the scales are beginning to balance, and the time is being used up by the opponents, which is what I like to see. However, there is still a long list of speakers here, and I want to hear from all of you, but I do feel, as I look at this list of speakers, that you must make your time very limited or this meeting will close without everyone having had a chance to speak, and I want everyone to have that opportunity. I will now call on the Reverends who are here. Reverend William Nieman.

(Reverend Nieman not present)

Reverend Gordon Lyalle or Reverend Ralph Bassett.

(Reverends Lyalle and Bassett not present)

Reverend Tucker.

REVEREND WILLIAM L. TUCKER.

It is a great privilege, Mr. Chairman, to address your Committee. I think the big question is whether the Legislature has any option except the option between taking a step forward, which has been done, or a step backward. I do not think there is any middle ground. We cannot, as a legislature, obliterate the fact that once you went on record for 17, if you rescind 17, the record will stand that once you went forward, according to my opinion, and then you stepped backward.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while I happen to be a member of the American Legion and Chaplain of our post, I do not speak for the Legion. While I happen to be past president of the Lions Club, I do not speak for the Lions Club. Unfortunately I speak only for myself, and for an increasingly large group of people which are the terror of all political leaders, because they remain silent, and every two years vent their vengeance upon those people who have not carried out their desires. I pity any legislature in the nation today, for an increasing number of people with whom I associate insist that our political leaders take two steps forward and three steps backward. I think they are unfair.

Therefore from your standpoint, if you permit me to assume your point of view, is rescinding 17 a step backward, or can you rescind 17 and still go forward? You sought to grant the American people a great privilege to meet as a people and discuss some possibilities other than these constant recurring years of war. And now is rescinding 17 a step

backward, or is it some alternative position. I think it is a step backward. It is a retreat, first of all, because it is an encouragement to nationalism. You remember yesterday in the papers a fanatic nationalist in Iran, Persia, shot the Premier because he wished to stress nationalism in his language. -- Down with America. Down with Russia. Down with the British. Down with all except Persia. And I don't know whether we are entering a great era of resurgent nationalism when new nations will spring up and stress nationalism and bring about universal anarchy in nations. I believe to rescind 17 and to deny the people of the United States the opportunity to fully discuss the possibilities of a world government will encourage resurgent nationalism. I also believe that it will create and permit to exist two Frankensteins instead of one. Our attention has been called to one Frankenstein. We now have two -- the western world and the eastern world with its countless millions. We live under the threat of the fear of two Frankensteins. Well, if the United Nations reduces it to one, I must say, gentlemen, that we are going forward.

Last of all, we are grateful, but you have not done much for us as a legislature when you give us the chance, as a nation, to meet to discuss this possibility for a different kind of world. It is the least that you can do, and will you take it away from us, and do less than the least? It seems to me, therefore, that to rescind 17 and to anchor your political hopes on 9, is a retreat which may be disastrous to all of us.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Mr. Robert Lau.

MR. HOLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Robert Lau, the State Chairman of the A.V.C. cannot be here today. I will, however, file his letter, with your permission, for the record. I would like to read, if I may, just two other telegrams that I have here. For the benefit of those here, I am, as I said, the President of the United World Federalists of New Jersey. I myself was in the Navy for four years. I took part in four amphibious invasions in the Pacific. I am still a member of the Naval Reserve. I believe my situation in regard to the armed forces is identical to the vast majority of those who are in the United World Federalist organization. I would like to put on record a telegram from the former President of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the young man who received the medal for being the outstanding young man in the State of New Jersey here two weeks ago. His telegram reads: "Fervently hope New Jersey, which helped bring unity, law, order, to American Colonies will not turn back on hopes of mankind for world unity and peace. Urge defeat of A.C.R. 9."

I would also like to put on record a letter from the American Federation of Hosiery Workers. This reads: "Two years ago the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, numbering approximately 40,000 members, adopted at their New York City Convention a resolution favoring the principle of world law and world government as the best road to peace. The New Jersey membership of this union numbers about 1500 men and women. The above action was taken at a time when the national government was holding hearings on the various proposals to change the United Nations, and also when the New Jersey Legislature was approving A.C.R. 17. We were

glad to have some part in so shaping our foreign policy, and were gratified at the stand taken by our legislature. The laboring man is concerned about the problem of war and peace. He has sought out laws to protect his own interests at home, and has adopted the principle of arbitration and mediation in this problem. In a similar way, he looks for better methods of solving international frictions not offered by war. Personally this writer sees no reason to rescind A.C.R. 17 and confidentially feels that he speaks for thousands more in urging more study on this method which might prevent war. Very truly yours, Paul Vogel".

MR. CAVINATO: For the record, will you give me your name, because I did not announce you.

MR. HOLLINS: My name is Harry B. Hollins.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Shaun Copithorne.

SHAUN BEMROSE COPITHORNE, Executive Secretary, Religious Society of Friends, Moorestown, New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I am here officially representing the Society of Friends in South Jersey. I have with me a letter passed at their regular meeting last Tuesday night. It is addressed to your Committee, sir.

"Members of Moorestown Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, at their business session on Third Month 6th, learned with regret of the proposed repeal of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 17. At the time this was passed we felt it was a sincere expression of the people of their wish for constructive measure towards the establishment of peace and justice, and it seems to us that its repeal would be a backward step, away from the achievement of peace and world good will.

"We hope that you will support this feeling by keeping the Resolution."

Then I have a letter signed this morning by the President of the Ministers of Moorestown which says as follows:

"The Ministerium of Moorestown, composed of the Protestant Ministers of the Town feel that it would be a grave mistake to repeal A.C.R. 17, and that such a repeal would be a blow to world peace and world government.

"We sincerely hope that you will support the feeling that this resolution should be kept on the books."

The Society of Friends, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, has been on record in favor of limited world government since 1947. I have here the official proceedings of the yearly meeting in which that was stated. It has been stated every year since then.

I shall not take up more of your time except to say we hope you will see fit to not pass A.C.R. 9, and thereby uphold A.C.R. 17. Thank you, sir.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Mr. Franklin Nixon.

(Mr. Nixon not present)

The next speaker is Reverend Ralph Bassett.

REVEREND RALPH BASSETT, Riverside, New Jersey

Mr. Chairman, I am from Riverside, New Jersey, Burlington County, and a member of the Riverside Kiwanis Club. I am also a member of a church which is the oldest Protestant Church, having been founded in 1457.

I have a good friend, who is a friend of the American Legion. He says the only reason they oppose A.C.R. 17 is that it is inopportune. That is a sad thing, because it may well take fifty years of discussion and education to fully understand it. What if it is fifty years ahead of its time? I think it should not be inopportune if we are on the right track and moving in the right direction.

For myself, I would like to say that I am opposed to A.C.R. 9 and for A.C.R. 17. A.C.R. 9 is a backward step which would have the effect of denying to the American people the right to debate the constitutional question involved in limited national sovereignty. It might well take fifty years, but let A.C.R. 17 stand to the everlasting credit of New Jersey, and let the people have a chance to know the issues, and then permit all the people to decide. Thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Reverend James Hutchinson.

REVEREND JAMES HUTCHINSON.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee:

I think that my colleagues of the clergy have stated the case for A.C.R. 17 admirably, and have also spoken admirably in opposition of A.C.R. 9. Therefore, I shan't take the time to make any comments, but I would like to leave with the Committee, for its reference, a resolution adopted by the Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association on May 25, 1950, and I shall file that with the secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION, MAY 25, 1950.

WHEREAS: In the hope that war with Russia is not inevitable and the American and Soviet systems must co-exist without armed conflict, and

WHEREAS: The United Nations is the one organization which transcends national differences and provides a framework within which differences may be solved,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the American Unitarian Association at its 125th Annual Meeting calls upon President Truman and the State Department to continue to remain open to peaceful negotiations with Russia within the framework of the United Nations, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the United States should work through the United Nations and seek its development into a world federation, open to all nations, based upon law sustained by protective force.

MR. CAVINATO: I would appreciate it if you would all file all these communications, resolutions, and briefs or statements with the secretary.

The next speaker is Mr. Conrad Shadlon.

MR. HOLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I read the telegram from Mr. Shadlon.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Dr. James Morse.

DR. JAMES MORSE

Mr. Cavinato and members of the Judiciary Committee:

May I add to this growing testimony a statement from the General Assembly of Presbyterian Churches of the United States of America. I was a voting commissioner on that body in Cincinnati last May, representing $2\frac{1}{2}$ million Presbyterians in the United States, and they voted this statement:

"We believe that the United Nations at the present time provides the main constitutional hope for attaining a lasting peace; that therefore the United States should consistently use its machinery and work through it in order that it may be strengthened. To this end the United States should abstain from unilateral actions which tend to sidestep the United Nations. Our country should even be willing to surrender some part of its national sovereignty in order that the sovereignty of the world community may come into being."

This was not a new stand for the Presbyterian Church. Two years prior to that it said:

"Our ultimate goal doubtless should be some form of genuine working government with unified legislative, executive, and judicial powers developed to meet the needs of our modern world. To this end the United States should take the initiative."

So you can see that we are committed to the principle of a world community. It is our conviction that under the sovereignty of the One God that is the Father of us all, that we hope New Jersey will take the lead, that we will uphold A.C.R. 17 and vote down A.C.R. 9.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Reverend Harry R. Pine.

(Reverend Pine not present)

The next speaker is Mr. James Burns.

MR. JAMES BURNS.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, ladies and gentlemen:

Since 1945 I have been an active member of the American Legion, and since 1947 I have been an active member of the United World Federalists. I am a student at Princeton University in my senior year. I am speaking today for two organizations. A friend of mine asked me the other day, considering the American Legion had passed a resolution opposed to world government, how could I be a member of both those organizations, one which is for world government, and the other which is opposed to it. Well, that might seem like a very logical question. Actually, I had no difficulty in answering it. I was able to answer the question on several levels.

I might say beforehand that, as a member of the American Legion, I am a veteran of World War II. I served in the submarine service in Japanese waters during 1945. I served with the Naval Air Intelligence unit in Tokyo following the cessation of hostilities. I saw a number of my friends killed in that war, as you did your friends. I felt a need, therefore, that in the future, if the United States was to live in a world of sovereign states, that is, a world in which each state must take its own protection into its own hands, the United States must be strong. You must have a strong military establishment. If you did not have such strength, it would simply open itself to attack from all sides.

One of the reasons I belong to the American Legion is because I believe in a strong United States today. The second reason is because I have seen, in my own community and in others, the great work which the nation has been able to do as far as community and national betterment and strength are concerned. So much for the Legion.

How do I reconcile that with the Federalist stand? Simply this: The United World Federalists, despite what may have been said at various times, is not opposed to a strong United States. The United World Federalists, in its statement of policies, believes in a strong United States. It believes that as long as there is world anarchy; as long as there is no world rule of law which can protect one nation from attack by another, we must have strength - military strength. That is just one barrel of the gun that we are loading to protect ourselves today. We need

a second barrel. Any hunter knows you will have more luck in shooting your game if you have two barrels to fire. And this second one is very, very important.

We can arm to the teeth, but our mere arming to the teeth can only deter aggression; it can only hold it off for a time. It cannot prevent it once and for all. The only way you can prevent one country from attacking another is to remove that country's military power. As long as one nation has strong military power, it will be in a position to attack another country, no matter how strong the second country may be.

Therefore, I am in favor of the proposal of a world federation. I advocate that the United States take the lead now among the nations of the world in making come about a final defeat to Soviet Communism and aggression by proposing to the peoples of the world -- to the free peoples of the world -- that they join together in this great idea -- an idea which can effect a world rule of law, not laws which will interfere with our political, economic, religious, and social systems, but simply laws that prevent one nation from attacking another.

I further propose that the same proposition be made to the totalitarian countries as well, in the mere hope that a free world will be strong enough to force them into something which they won't otherwise agree to. I feel that the time is now for the United States to take the stand. I would not be in favor of any sort of world government that offered. I could probably list for you now fifty types of world government that I would be opposed to, and almost every type of world government that I heard described this morning, I would be unutterably opposed to. There is only one type of world government I would favor, and that would be a world government that would protect and secure, for once and for all, the basic institutions of the United States of America and its liberties. I believe the United States can advocate that kind of a world government, and I do not believe, for one moment, that the American government, or the government of New Jersey, or the people in this room, would be fool enough to settle for any other kind of world government.

It is for those reasons that I speak in support of A.C.R. 17, and oppose A.C.R. 9. Disregarding the legal side of it, A.C.R. 17 says in effect that the American people, through their legislative bodies, shall have a chance to negotiate some sort of world government. It does not sell us any kind of world government. It does not commit us to any sort of world government which is proposed. It says we shall have the right to negotiate, and when that negotiated document comes back, it says we shall have the right to reject it or accept it. Well, friends, this is a democracy. If we like it, we will accept it. If we don't, we will reject it, won't we? But there might be something we would like, something that would keep our freedom strong, and at the same time, assure peace.

I believe that human beings are decent enough and intelligent enough, despite our many follies and many sins, to be able to work out a document which could both assure our freedoms and preserve peace. I want us, as Americans, to be given that chance today.

There is just one more thing I would like to say. Returning to the original question of how could I be a member of the Legion and a Federalist at the same time, I would like to read to you three short paragraphs of a statement which the American Legion passed at its last convention on October 12, 1950 at Los Angeles. This is what the American Legion stands for. You have heard what the Federalists stand for.

"We believe that the United Nations can be made an effective world authority which can prevent aggression if the Charter is strengthened to include the suggestions made by the American Legion in November of 1946 and in every year since then to accomplish the following:

"a. Removal of the veto power in the two specific instances of matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression.

"b. The adoption of effective international control of atomic energy and the establishment of arms quotas, both to be guaranteed through a system of positive international inspection.

"c. Establishment of an effective tyranny-proof international police force. This force would consist of two parts, an independent active force to be under the direct control of a United Nations Police Authority acting under the direction of the General Assembly, and a reserve force made up of the national contingents of the major powers and capable of asking up the active forces when necessary. The result would be that the United Nations, through such an effective Police Force, could enforce its decisions, prevent aggression and the preparation of aggression, and so maintain the peace.

" "We believe that the American Legion plan for strengthening the United Nations provides the essential basic requirements of, and the first steps toward, true world-wide enforcement of law and order, which is the immediate necessity."

I say the World Federalists agree with the Legion on every word I have read. I support that implicitly because that is the policy, in essence, of United World Federalists. What thoroughly confused me was the statement following that: "The American Legion is opposed to any form of world federation or world government."

Friends, what I just read is one form of world federation or world government, and that is the form I believe in; that is the form, as a Federalist I believe in; that is the form I want to see our federal government agree to, if we ever have a chance to follow through on A.C.R. 17. I thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: The co-sponsor of the bill would like to ask you a question.

MR. TUMULTY: Under this official dogmatic program that you have here, assuming it could be adopted, what would happen to the United States Army, the United States Navy, and to the atom bomb?

MR. BURNS: What would happen to the United States Army, Navy, and atom bomb, if our proposal were adopted?

MR. TUMULTY: Where would they be transferred?

MR. BURNS: Nothing would happen to the United States Army, Navy, or the atomic bomb, unless at the same time we could be absolutely sure, beyond any shadow of a doubt, under international inspection, that the Soviet military power could be controlled at the same time. If we were absolutely certain that Russia's arms could be controlled at the same time as ours, then all U. S. military force would be dwindled down to the actual number we need for our own internal policing, and we would institute an international police force with control of atomic energy. We would undoubtedly, because of our powerful position, have one of the major positions on our police force.

MR. TUMULTY: If world government is adopted do you, in your plan, have any way of setting forth what body of your government would have control of atomic energy and of the armed forces that we now have? Would they be given to the world government, or would they remain in the United States, or what? Where would they go?

MR. BURNS: We cannot predict exactly what agency in the world government would be used. That is one of the things, if I may say, that we want to have this conference for, so that our government and the people of New Jersey, and the people of other States can negotiate on how we want that power to be used. All I offer to you is the general plan of world law. Let's give it a try. Let's investigate all the plans, and throw away completely those we do not like.

MR. TUMULTY: Then you mean it must not necessarily be your own plan?

MR. BURNS: Not necessarily, no. That represents a consensus of opinion.

MR. TUMULTY: If the Soviet Union, Argentina, Brazil, and Spain, participate, what guarantee can you give us that the world bill of rights they will adopt will be better or as good as our present Bill of Rights?

MR. BURNS: I can only say this: I would not want the United States to go into any world federation which did not have as good a bill of rights as the one we have.

MR. TUMULTY: All right, but if you are going to sit down with the Soviet Union, and with Franco, and Peron, and with Vargas, and with Tito, and with Mao Tse Tung, how can you be certain that with these men you will get a bill of rights equal to the present Bill of Rights we now have in our own Constitution?

MR. BURNS: I cannot be certain. I would like us to try and see if we can do it. But now, I think Mr. Hollins would like to say something on it.

MR. HOLLINS: Mr. Chairman, could I answer that?

MR. CAVINATO: Yes, all right, but remember we have speakers here still to be heard, and I want to be able to hear them all.

MR. HOLLINS: The bill of rights we are talking about on the world level is not one that would supplant the Bill of Rights in this country. That would remain exactly the same.

MR. TUMULTY: How do you know that?

MR. HOLLINS: May I finish what I was going to say. The bill of rights we are talking about is a bill of rights which would guarantee the people of this country, and all other countries, that there would be no infringement of their internal rights by the world government.

MR. TUMULTY: Referring to these dictators I mentioned, after we adopt this world government, what assurance or guarantee do we have that they will not deprive us of the rights we now have under our Constitution? You do not know what they will do, do you?

MR. HOLLINS: Mr. Tumulty, all I can say is that I believe that there would be directly in the amendment to the Constitution that there would be no power in world government to interfere with our rights in this country whatsoever.

MR. TUMULTY: Do you think that Stalin, Franco, Peron, and the Chinese dictator have the same concept of rights that we do?

MR. HOLLINS: No sir.

MR. TUMULTY: Then do you expect that when you send our delegates to sit down with these men to work out a constitution that they are thinking of the same kind of constitution we are?

MR. HOLLINS: No.

MR. TUMULTY: How do you know that these men, by the mere fact that they are going to sit down with our delegates, will give us a better constitution than we now have?

MR. HOLLINS: I do not know. We would not interfere with our own Constitution. There would be a bill of rights to protect us against any aggressions by world government.

MR. TUMULTY: In other words, your position is that we should not rescind the resolution setting forth the machinery to bring about a constitutional amendment for the purpose of a world convention, because you have a hope that if this convention meets that it might possibly give us a better system than the Bill of Rights and a better measure of peace than we now presently enjoy?

MR. HOLLINS: No sir. I think the case has been covered by us as to why we are in favor of this.

MR. TUMULTY: I just cannot get it. I am trying to find out what reality there is in the world today that leads you to believe that the men who are presently working in the United Nations, and who will not now comply with their treaty obligations, who will not now observe our law, will observe it merely because we give them the atom bomb and more power than they have at present.

MR. HOLLINS: No sir, I don't think that is the way I see it.

MR. TUMULTY: How do you see it? I don't understand you.

MR. HOLLINS: I don't know whether the Chairman will want us to go any further. We are going right back into the heart of the whole proposition again, but I would be very glad to go on.

MR. TUMULTY: You say here in your official bible that you will make laws binding on individuals. Now, what law can the world government make that would be binding on us as individuals that would not threaten our liberties under our own Constitution?

MR. HOLLINS: The only laws, in my opinion, that I will agree to --

MR. TUMULTY: What laws do you contemplate making?

MR. HOLLINS: This is what the World Federalists contemplate - laws binding on individuals which would prohibit any individual, whether it were a government, or whether it were you or myself, or anybody else, from building armaments beyond a certain approved level. Any individual that broke that world law would be subject to arrest. And that is the only right that we, as American citizens, are giving up.

MR. TUMULTY: Under the world armaments, how much do you include? Do you include tanks?

MR. HOLLINS: Yes sir. But I would hate to go into the details of the blueprint of this thing. I don't think it is in my province to do so.

MR. CAVINATO: Mr. Tumulty, I do not want to stop you from this cross examination, but --

MR. TUMULTY: I want to find out what these people want done.

MR. CAVINATO: Let us try to keep this orderly. Now, Mr. Tumulty, do you have another question to ask?

MR. TUMULTY: I want to ask this one question, and I do not do this to confuse you. I am trying to arrive at your position. You say you want this world government to have the authority to raise revenue under a carefully defined, limited, but direct taxing power. That means that the world government will be able to tax us here in New Jersey -- you and me too.

What type of tax, in addition to the state and federal taxes we now have, do you contemplate the world government will impose for the purpose of maintaining world armanent?

MR. HOLLINS: Mr. Tumulty, I would hate to blueprint, again, what kind of a taxation system we would have, but I suggest it would be possibly something like this. It has been estimated that to maintain a world government of the kind we are talking about in a disarmed world -- that is, to maintain disarmament -- the total cost would run somewhere between 6 and 7 billion dollars, which is a small fraction of what we are today spending for our security.

When the amendment to the Constitution was made, I would be strongly in favor, myself, of putting in the amendment clause of the Constitution that no tax imposed by the world government could exceed, we'll say, 1% or 2% of the national income. A suggestion has been made, which I think sounds very reasonable, that there would be a tax just on international transactions between nations, and that such a tax would actually pay for the entire cost of this government. As I say, I could not write that tax bill, even if I had the will to do so.

MR. TUMULTY: What proportion of the world government expenses would be borne by the United States?

MR. HOLLINS: Sir, again I cannot answer that. The only thing I can say is that if the entire cost -- which it would not be -- were 7 billion dollars, and that 7 billion dollars gave us peace, it would be a very cheap price to pay. But naturally, the cost would have to be allocated to the various nations of the world.

MR. TUMULTY: Thank you very much.

MR. HOLLINS: The organization that we are talking about would give the United Nations only one power, and that is the power to prevent the settling of disputes by mass slaughter, which we call war. It would not have the power to legislate on matters that are internal affairs of the nations, or even on such matters -- as we have been accused of -- as immigration, tariff which might be considered as international matters. I would oppose that just as strongly as I am fighting for this thing. It would, therefore, be a peculiar kind of government in that it would have that one power only, the power to prevent use of force in the settlement of international disputes.

MR. TUMULTY: Thank you very much.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Mr. Harry Kranz.

MR. POLOW: Mr. Chairman, I have been authorized to speak for Mr. Kranz, as the official representative of the CIO was here but had to leave. I have a short statement he asked me to read.

BERTRAM POLOW, New Jersey State CIO Council

My name is Bertram Polow, and I am appearing here today in opposition to ACR 9, as the representative of some 250,000 members affiliated with the New Jersey State CIO Council.

The arguments propounded by the supporters of ACR this morning indicate one thing very plainly, namely, that what this morning's speakers need more than anything else is a good, stiff course in elementary high school civics.

Under the Constitution of the United States, which every schoolboy knows, there are two methods of proposing amendments to the Constitution and there are two methods of ratifying amendments to the Constitution. ACR 17 has committed the people of New Jersey to nothing more than a willingness to explore additional means of preserving peace throughout the world. Any individual who states otherwise is either blissfully ignorant of our Constitution, or is wilfully distorting our Constitution.

The CIO does not sign blank checks. We do not conform. Before our organization assumes a position on any issue of importance, we discuss it, we weigh it, we appraise it, and then, after full and complete intelligent discussion, we take a position and formulate action in support of that position.

That is precisely the method open to the American people in the procedures outlined under ACR 17. To state otherwise is to distort the truth. That is precisely the method that is recommended to all people who are capable of thinking for themselves.

Let me quote to you a statement made by our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, upon his inaugural in 1945.

"We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations -- far away. We have learned that we must live as men, not as ostriches, nor as dogs in the manger.

"We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community."

The State CIO Council, comprised of 250,000 members in New Jersey -- many of who served in the defense of America on the battle line during the last two world wars, and who are still defending America today on the production line -- are opposed to ACR 9 and in enthusiastic support of any movement which will bring to all people of the world, freedom and security in a world at peace.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Mr. Worrall Mountain.

MR. HOLLINS: Mr. Chairman, he has left a statement with me that I will file with the Committee.

MR. CAVINATO: Next is Mrs. Niese.

MRS. NIESE, Daughter of the American Revolution.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen:

I am a D.A.R. and have been for over 20 years, but I must protest the official stand taken by the D.A.R. favoring A.C.R. 9. This stand does not represent the opinion of the entire membership. A large number of members support world government as I do. I feel that the adoption of A.C.R. 9 will be closing the door on free and open discussion. Free and open discussion is one of the privileges our forefathers won in the American Revolution.

I thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: Mrs. M. Judson.

MRS. M. JUDSON, Daughter of the American Revolution.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly:

I also speak as a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I joined in 1908 before many of you were born, and an ancestor of mine read the Declaration of Independence at the Court House in Newark, so I give way to no one when it comes to patriotism.

People have failed today, in answer to all this talk about sovereignty to say that the United States has already given up its sovereignty when, as, and where, last September in the United Nations, we were ordered not to pass the North Korean boundary line; when our Army was told not to bomb beyond the North Korean boundary line; when the President and the people accepted that order from the United Nations. When that happened, we gave up our sovereignty just as plainly as anything. It was a world-shaking and epoch-making event. I simply mention it in passing.

Last summer I was in Norway and I saw the Marshall Plan developing a copper mine five miles from the Russian border. It was a challenge. It was a very American thing to do, and a very Norwegian thing to do. I saw the two nations working hand in hand like brothers. To say that this world cannot eventually be brought to working in peace and amity is rather insulting, I think, to the human race.

I protest against A.C.R. 9.

MR. CAVINATO: Mrs. Charles Coolidge.

MRS. CHARLES COOLIDGE

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen:

I too am a D.A.R. I am also a member of the A.A.U.W., which is the American Association of University Women. I also am a member of the League of Women Voters.

I believe that the only way to have peace is to enforce international law, and the only way to enforce international law is through a system of limited world government with powers to preserve peace. The only way to achieve a satisfactory system of world law and government is to work on it, and to work hard. A.C.R. 17 provides the means and the machinery to do this through our constitutional, democratic processes. I therefore believe that A.C.R. 17 should be retained.

MR. CAVINATO: Brave soldiers and ladies who have stayed here, the Committee has been very, very conscientious, but you know these reports could be filed just as readily as reading them. We are now reaching the stage where it is just repetition. I find that there is a list of something like 15 more speakers that I am advised only want to take one minute. It is now 25 minutes after 5. I feel that we have been very, very patient and fair. Now addressing myself to you who are in charge of the opposition, can't we somehow simplify this?

MR. COWEN: We dislike trying the patience of the Committee, but we still have not split the time by about three-quarters of an hour. These people have come down, and they have been very patient, and they would like to identify themselves briefly.

MR. CAVINATO: Very well, sir. Everyone is going to leave here happy, I hope. The next speaker is Mr. Edward K. Mills.

MR. HOLLINS: I will file Mr. Mills' statement with the Committee.

(Mr. Vogel and Mr. Hogan were called but did not respond)

MR. ERNEST W. SPINK.

I am speaking as a member of the Legion, but not a very active member, because I have not been able to go along with some of its national policies.

I joined the Air Corps of the United States Army in the first World War as a pilot, when we were building ships of wood covered with fabric, and when the Air Corps was but a small branch of the Army Signal Corps. I hoped at that time that in fighting for the preservation

of democracy something might have been done to make the second World War unnecessary. Being a little older than some of the people here, I saw some of these super-patriotic organizations do to the League of Nations just what they are attempting to do to the United Nations now, and as a consequence we had the second World War. Again I found myself in uniform, this time in the Army Air Corps Intelligence Section.

The reason that I cannot go along with some of the policies of these patriotic organizations is that I think it is thoroughly inconsistent for organizations to endorse the principle of our furnishing billions of American dollars, and countless thousands of gallons of good American blood, to fight international wars for the United Nations, and at the same time refuse to give that United Nations the authority to settle those questions peacefully over an assembly table. If our manpower, and our money, and blood is good enough to be shed in wars, certainly we ought to be in favor of sitting down and discussing those subjects and bringing them to a conclusion in a legally authorized manner beforehand.

I am firmly opposed to the Resolution as it stands.

MR. CAVINATO: The next speaker is Myron Kronisch.

MYRON KRONISCH.

Mr. Chairman, I am a veteran of the last war. My home is in Haplewood, New Jersey. I am presently a student at Rutgers University School of Law. I am also at the present time an officer in the organized Reserve. I speak for myself at the present time, and for 130 of my colleagues at the law school and ten professors, including the Acting Dean of the Law School, who signed the following statement.

"We, the undersigned members of the faculty and the students of Rutgers University School of Law, favor the retention of A.C.R. 17. Today's world situation requires that all honorable attempts be made which can result in an effective world organization. The steps outlined in A.C.R. 17 are no less necessary today than they were in 1949."

That is signed by 130 of my colleagues, and 10 professors of the School of Law.

I would like to state just one thing. If Mr. Tumulty, or any other person here today, expects predictability, foresight, palm reading, or the like, into the future, I am afraid he will have to be disappointed. What we can state though, and in my mind the whole basis of this discussion boils down to this -- whether or not we believe government is necessary for the regulation of the affairs of man. If Mr. Tumulty feels that we should do better with anarchy in the world, then I suggest he vote for A.C.R. 9 -- and I imagine he will, as he introduced it. If he feels that government is necessary for the regulation of the

affairs of men, then I would suggest that he change his vote and vote to retain A.C.R. 17.

MR. CAVINATO: Next is Charles E. Johnson, Jr.

CHARLES E. JOHNSON, JR.,

I am a school teacher, and my blood doesn't go up very much anymore. I teach high school English. You learn to control your blood pressure, or you give up.

One reason I have been with the United World Federalists is because their arguments are not highly emotional. They are rational. It has convinced me of the necessity of world government. They do not proclaim, and never have proclaimed to have all the answers to it. We are merely working in that direction. A.C.R. 17 is one step in exploring the situation further. For that reason I support A.C.R. 17, and am opposed to A.C.R. 9.

While sitting here, however, I have become somewhat annoyed by a sort of smug arrogance on the part of some people that they are the only patriots around. What do they think we are exactly? We are Americans. We do not carry the American flag around, but we are still Americans. I do not think the military caps and flags are necessary to prove you are American.

MR. CAVINATO: Mrs. M. A. Vreeland.

MRS. M. A. VREELAND.

Mr. Cavinato, members of the Committee:

I am here as a member of no organization advocating any specific program of world government. I speak only for myself. I am thinking of the time when my sons, who are now 7 and 14, are grown up. How can I face them unless I can say to them that I have done everything in my power to bring about the establishment of law and order among nations, so that nations can work out their conflicts in peace instead of calling for the sacrifices of all the generations of young men to come.

I believe firmly in the power of the democratic process to come to right decisions. I think the American people should have the chance to decide whether they want to enter a world government. Let us have the courage and the patriotism here to trust the good sense of our people. Let us open the door for the consideration of possible ways to handle the conflicts of our time and day, as our forefathers opened the way to the country we now inhabit. I ask you to vote against A.C.R. 9.

(Mr. John Strahan was called but did not respond).

MRS. VAN HEERTUM

I am only a housewife, but the mother of five, and I am opposed to A.C.R. 9. I would like a world law for peace so that our children will have this negative attitude removed, and can live in a world of good.

(Mr. Frank J. Osborn was called but did not respond)

MRS. FRED BOWES.

I live in Oldwick, New Jersey. I am married and have four children. My oldest son is a Lieutenant in the Marines and on his way to Korea. As a mother I feel I have as much right as anyone to insist that all roads to peace and the abolishment of war be fully explored. Therefore, I strongly oppose the repeal of A.C.R. 17.

(Mrs. Wilfred Campbell was called but did not respond)

ROBERT F. MOSS

Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislative Committee, ladies and gentlemen:

I shall not be over one minute. I would like to say first that my interest in world government is a great deal older than the United World Federalist movement. I first came to this conclusion -- which in my case is a very deep conviction -- about 20 years ago when the old League of Nations started falling apart. At that time I decided in my own mind, after a good deal of thinking, that some form of world government was the only possible way of avoiding war. And I can say that the events of the past 20 years have not served to change that opinion one iota.

Now, there is just one other very brief point. I listened carefully to all of the speeches this morning of those who want to repeal A.C.R. 17, and if I had been hoping for some alternate suggestions of a better way of doing this than we propose, I would have hoped in vain. No alternate program has been suggested.

We do have a program, and we suggest that this program be put before the people of the United States where it can be debated in every barber shop, in every church, in every service club, every place where people meet to talk. If that can be done, I believe that we will come up with some kind of a good answer.

(Mattey Feldman and William Stevenson were called but did not respond)

MR. F. G. WEGEL.

Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens: I am the father of four children. I work for the Federal Government in the War Department, now called the Department of National Defense. Therefore, I must caution you not to put any political construction on anything that I say. However, I come down here with firm convictions, and through no fault of anyone else except myself.

My father and mother came over here from Europe about 40 or 50 years ago. They came over here because there was more freedom here than there was in Europe, along with millions of others.

We have said many things here today, and we will probably say more. However, let us not forget a few things. We are wondering -- Mr. Tumulty in particular -- how we are going to implement this thing. Let me ask you, if they were to have asked Phineas Fogg, when he started on his journey around the world in 80 days, how he was going to get around; how many elephants, donkeys, jackasses, or what have you, he was going to use before he got around, how would he have answered that? We don't know. But he did get around.

We do not know the answers to all these questions. We do not presume to know. Let us not assume that we, as men and women, are going to be self-sufficient unto ourselves. Let us remember there is a Divine Providence in this world, and that only as we rely upon God and remember the motto, "In God We Trust", will we make progress.

There is considerable confusion, of course, in the minds of many in the opposition. There was confusion in the mind of James P. Forrestal when he was placed in the position to which he was put, but he later recognized the folly of his feelings, and today unification must proceed. I would remind you also of the statement, "Where there is no vision the people perish". Those who sponsored 17 had vision. Those who are sponsoring 9 apparently do not have it. America is great because of the greatness of the vision of the founding fathers, and those who have helped develop it since that time. Let us not forget that the material greatness follows that of the spirit.

In concluding may I remind you of the thought of Cardinal Newman written 118 years ago, when he wrote the first stanza of "Lead Kindly Light. "Lead Kindly Light.....the night is dark and I am far from home. Lead Thou me on. Help Thou my feet. I do not ask to see the distant scene. One step enough for me."

A.C.R. 17 is the first step which we citizens of America can take to lead the world and keep up with the progressive thoughts of leaders everywhere, including Nehru of India, and Churchill whom I consider the greatest living statesmen today. We have the track started. Let us put it down, and let us keep it down. Thank you.

MR. CAVINATO: Will you submit to a question from Mr. Tumulty?

MR. WEGEL: Certainly.

MR. TUMULTY: Assuming that the world government is established, and the Soviet Union participates in it, what assurance do you have that the world government will be based on a belief in God?

MR. WEGEL: I have no belief that anything associated with the Soviet Union can be associated with God. I do not believe the world government can be founded upon anything associated with Communism. But let us not forget that 180 million people in Russia today are Communists because they have to be, not because they want to be.

MR. TUMULTY: After what you just said about those millions of people who are Communists because they cannot help it, would you enter a world government with the tyrants who are keeping these people in subjection and making them Communists?

MR. WEGEL: I do not believe that I could enter into any association with people who are diametrically opposed to my philosophy of life. However, that is not the question before us here today.

MR. TUMULTY: It is the question.

MR. CAVINATO: We have had a wonderful meeting. Now let's not become argumentative. We are here for information. Of course, Mr. Tumulty, you asked the question, and he gave you his answer.

MR. WEGEL: I am sorry.

MR. CAVINATO: You are doing all right, and so is he, but let us not become argumentative. Are you through with the question?

MR. TUMULTY: Do I understand that you believe that the Soviet Union, as presently constituted, should participate in this world government?

MR. WEGEL: I believe that the Soviet Union could participate, provided that it was of such a nature that it would accept the standards of life which we have.

MR. TUMULTY: Well, they do not do it now, do they?

MR. WEGEL: No sir, I do not believe the leaders of the Kremlin do it now.

MR. TUMULTY: How can you expect them to do it in the future?

MR. WEGEL: I do not believe that things as they are today will necessarily remain so.

MR. TUMULTY: You hope for a revolution in Russia?

MR. WEGEL: I believe every tyranny ultimately disintegrates, and I do not believe the tyranny of Russia is an exception.

MR. CAVINATO: Let us proceed now.

(Mrs. F. M. Hoffman, Dr. S. C. Schuman, and Mrs. Van Arsdal were called, but did not respond)

SAMUEL CAPLAN.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

I am President of the Republican Club of Lake Hiawatha, and a member of the Board of Directors of Lake Hiawatha, however I am here speaking for myself.

I am opposed to A.C.R. 9, and in favor of the retention of A.C.R. 17, for the reason that the repeal of A.C.R. 17 would shut off debate in an area where it is sorely needed. Some of the speeches I have heard today have clearly demonstrated that much more knowledge and information is needed on this subject. Therefore, I ask you to retain A.C.R. 17.

MR. CAVINATO: Mr. Tumulty would like to ask you a question.

MR. TUMULTY: You, sir, and a number of speakers today have stated that the resolution that Mr. Mackey and I are sponsoring would stop any debating on the subject. We are debating it now, aren't we?

MR. CAPLAN: You are debating it now because there is another resolution. If there would be no amending processes in the offing, there would be no reason to debate it, because we are trying to establish something to obtain some method of insuring peace in the world, and the only way we can debate the question is to have a definite program. And we have a right to debate the issues. If you do not have a program, what are you going to debate? Then it is academic.

MR. TUMULTY: It was debated two years ago before A.C.R. 17 was passed.

MR. CAPLAN: Right, and the debate was purely educational in its import for the simple reason that the people did not become acquainted with it and see that the governmental bodies took the necessary steps. And in my opinion that is what will happen again.

MR. TUMULTY: Now, I ask this of all of you. Would you want to see this resolution which we are trying to pass submitted to a referendum of the people?

MR. CAPLAN: I certainly would.

MR. TUMULTY: I would go along with you on that.

(Mrs. Austin LaVigne and Mr. Joel Jacobson were called, but did not respond)

MR. COWEN: You missed Mrs. Chester Baxter.

MR. CAVINATO: All right, we will hear from Mrs. Baxter.

MRS. CHESTER BAXTER:

Mr. Chairman and honorable gentlemen:

I am a D.A.R., an Episcopalian; a mother of sons who have served in the Army, and a descendent of George Washington and perhaps fourteen or fifteen other men who helped save the nation, or make the nation. I don't know that it has anything to do with the situation right now, but it is interesting to me.

There were several persons from the D.A.R. this morning who expressed opinions that I did not agree with, so I thought I would get in my two cents worth. I have two sons in the Army. I feel that some sort of limited world government might be worked out that would prevent war. I feel that the best leaders of all nations can, with God's help, work out a solution. I wish A.C.R. 17 to remain.

MR. CAVINATO: Now we are through with the speakers opposing this resolution, and there are three more persons, I understand, who want to speak. I am now calling upon the representative of the Catholic Daughters of America, and the name, I understand, is Mary C. Keenan.

MRS. MARY C. KEENAN, Catholic Daughters of America.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen:

It is my privilege today to represent 12,000 women in the State of New Jersey who are especially proud of their name and their priceless heritage as Catholic Daughters of America. One of the fundamental aims of our great national organization is the intensification of patriotism and certainly as daughters of the greatest land under God, we are happy to take our place with those who ask you to favorably consider the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution #9.

At our State Convention held in April of 1950 by resolution we opposed World Government.

Americans on the whole are most practical and certainly will not favor World Government because it is impractical. Let me tell you why.

First of all, the case for federal world government rests on unproved and wholly unjustified assumptions. The conditions essential to a federal type of government are wholly lacking on a world-wide scale. Experience has shown that certain unities are essential to a federal government, as no government of this type has ever succeeded without them. These are geographic and economic unity, which combine to create the sense of political unity that is essential. The land occupied by the United States represents a single, natural, geographic and economic unit. This fact, together with a common political inheritance gave us the conditions necessary for the success of a federal type government. There are certainly no such unities existing on a world-wide scale. Without these unities, a federal type government could not succeed. This is shown in our own experience; for here in the United States we had conditions uniquely favorable to a federal government, economic and geographic unity, plus a common language, common political beliefs, and a commonly shared form of government. Yet under the most favorable conditions that could be imagined, our federal union almost broke asunder and only one of the bloodied wars in all history, our Civil War, prevented its dissolution.

There is no politically-intelligent, world wide electorate on which a world government could be built. The people in nations which have proved their capacity for self government are outnumbered five to one by those who have never shown a sustained ability to govern themselves. In the United States, France, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, Irish Free State, Britain and the British Dominions, are found the only nations that have revealed any long-term ability to govern themselves; and their combined population totals only about 275 million persons. On the other hand, Russia with 192 million people, China with 450 million people, India with 368 million people, to which may be added Germany, Poland, Italy and all the rest; none of which has shown any sustained capacity for self-government, and which with their 1,650,000,000 people outnumber 5 to 1 the nations where the people do possess the capacity

for self-government. I have not included the South American countries, not because I believe they do not have the capacity or ability to govern themselves but rather because of the fact that in fairly recent times they have suffered from internal revolutionary troubles, many of which can be traced to the interference of outside economic disturbances - - in fact they may have been fomented by such disturbances.

Unless the proposed world government is to be a tyranny, existing only because of its overwhelming police power, it must be a representative government, based on an electorate capable of making the decisions involved; but on a world-wide scale, such an electorate simply does not exist.

It would not be possible to work out a satisfactory formula for representation. It would not be acceptable if based only on population. This would mean that the great masses of India, Asia and Africa would dominate representation in the world government. The less populous but more advanced nations of Europe and America would not accept this. Certainly it would not be acceptable if based partially on a nation's resources and economic strength. A thousand Solomons would not be wise enough to work out a formula of this kind, that would please all nations concerned. Even if it could be worked out, it would not be accepted by the more populous but less wealthy nations, which would naturally fear it as a device for their exploitation by the wealthier nations. Of course, the minute you have to depend on some complicated arrangement such as this, the last vestige of any parallel to our own experience immediately disappears. Our federal system had no such formula, and surely no one believes that it would ever have succeeded if New Jersey had been given representation on one basis and Virginia on another.

Most important of all? There exists no universal will to make it succeed. The establishment of some particular form of government does not insure success. In order to succeed, it must be backed by an effective desire to make it succeed. No such effective will is evident on a world wide basis. This is shown by the failure to take advantage of the United Nations - - if the nations wanted the United Nations to succeed, they could make it succeed. However, they are not willing to sacrifice even a small, specific measure of sovereignty for this purpose. It is nothing less than fantastic, then, to think they will give a blank-check on a larger degree of sovereignty, to a world government. To expect this just doesn't make sense.

Finally there are practical political reasons why at best it would not be more than a "World Government" in name only. It is clear that Russia would not join. The argument that we don't know whether or not Russia would join because she has never been asked, is sheer sophistry. In every action Russia has made it abundantly clear that she would not tolerate the slightest restriction on her full sovereign rights. So long as the present government of Russia stands, and pursues its present basic policies, there is not the slightest chance of Russia joining a world government. It is possible the Scandanavian nations would not join because they are so near Russia. They would hesitate to risk her dis-

pleasure in order to join a new organization that had yet to prove that it could protect them from Russia.

Certainly not all the British Commonwealth nations would join. South Africa has already threatened to leave the United Nations because that body has considered investigating South Africa's treatment of her Indian population, a "touchy" subject so far as the South Africans are concerned. (N. Y. Times Sept. 25, 1948 - "South Africa Warns - - She May Reconsider Membership"). South Africa can not be expected to join a government that would have general powers over this subject. And then it is possibly that Great Britain would not join. The British government's present policy is to strengthen her ties with the member nations of the British Commonwealth, at all hazards. The projected Western European Union, where Britain has a chance to show her acceptance of federal principles has received only lip-service from the British instead of the real leadership that was expected, because Britain has feared that her tie-up with a Union of this sort might endanger her relations with her own Commonwealth nations. Hence it becomes obvious that, as a matter of policy, if important Commonwealth nations keep out of the so-called "world government", Great Britain would stay out, too. So, it becomes obvious that the proposed "world government could be so only in name". You might give it the title of "world government" but it could not possibly be so in fact.

In his farewell address, among other things Washington left us this prophetic admonition - quote - it is our policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world - end of quote. We have the greatest nation in all history. Do we Americans want to give up our sovereignty and our priceless heritage? I think not.

Let our case against Federal World Government rest on the words of the immortal Lincoln who told us that this nation under God shall be a government of our people, for our people, and by our people. Only then can we hope that it will not perish from the earth.

(Mrs. Heget, of the Catholic Daughters of America; Mrs. William McGinnis, and Miss R. W. Lewis, representing the Daughters of Colonial Wars, were called but did not respond)

GEORGE WARWICK, Spanish War Veterans.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Judiciary Committee, members of the Legislature, ladies and gentlemen:

It is mighty nice to have sat here today and to have seen so many Americans concerned about the job at hand. It is too bad, if I may make a side remark, that when this A.C.R. 17 was proposed in 1949 we did not have a hearing such as this upon it. If we had, I am sure that it never would have passed. It is interesting to note that

resolutions similar to A.C.R. 17 were passed in 23 States, and that 12 of those States have since rescinded the action they took, and 3 States have definitely come out against world government, the State of Michigan being the first one. And when A.C.R. 9 is passed, and we rescind A.C.R. 17, it will be the 13th State rescinding such a resolution.

Now, I am probably the oldest of the veterans in this Chamber, but it is mighty nice to look back over 52 years and to know that I served back in the days of 1898, and served out of the country. I also served 14 months overseas in World War I -- five months on the Western Front -- and was young enough to sign up in the selective draft for World War II, but they got along without me very nicely. However, in 1898 we were a third rate nation, and we went to war over the welfare and the future of the peoples of Cuba who we did not know personally, but we knew something of the cruelties and misrule that were being practiced upon them. Italy, Germany, England, and France were almost united in prophesying, if not lending aid, that our country would fail in its conflict with the Kingdom of Spain, but we won out.

We cannot begin to study the progress of our country in the last 50 years without realizing that it began with the service of those men who, as a man, volunteered for service, and who later became First World War veterans, and we spread out, not only into the Phillipines, but we put down the China rebellion. We gave the island of Cuba and its people their independence. We gave to the Phillipine Islands inhabitants their independence, and we are now in Korea today rendering a service, not for mere gain to our nation, but gain to the world itself.

I think it would be a great mistake to continue A.C.R. 17. I believe that your Committee should recommend the adoption of A.C.R. 9. We are strong. In 50 years we have built ourselves into a nation that has supplied the world with food and with everything that is needed in the way of standing for right and justice. Let us continue that way, and let us be the 13th State to rescind the resolution that was passed in 1949.

(Mrs. Enid Griswold was called, but did not respond. Her statement, however, filed with the Committee, follows)

STATEMENT of Enid H. Griswold, Montclair, New Jersey, Legislative Chairman,
New Jersey Chapter Pro-America - also Eagle Rock Chapter,
Daughters of the American Revolution.

I speak in support of ACR Number 9.

Assembly Resolution #17 which was adopted by the New Jersey Legislature in the spring of 1949 was the expression of a very small minority of the people of this state. It was introduced and accepted with such haste as to deny the majority of the citizens of this state the opportunity of expressing their convictions concerning it. It seems strange that any who are sincerely concerned with the welfare of this country and its people should wish to have a proposal for so revolutionary a concept of government accepted by our elected representatives without adequate publicity, discussion, or debate. That Representatives in this state should have been willing to do the bidding of an organized pressure group without regard to the opinion of the majority is even more alarming.

The members of this Committee should carefully examine the objectives of all world government groups. They should probe deeply into the sinister implications of the schemes of these social reformers, the consummation of which would completely destroy our form of Constitutional government. They should also recognize the un-American philosophies underlying them.

Others speaking here today have dwelt upon the proposed delegation of powers to a super-government. I wish to emphasize, however, that with the authority over all armaments, a world police and military force, the power to make laws, an executive branch to administer them, a judiciary department to interpret them, world courts to convict and punish individuals and nations, and the authority to tax, it is evident that any authority reserved to the individual nations would be insignificant. It is inaccurate to state, as do the proponents of world government, that this would involve the transfer of only some sovereignty or authority, which would in no way interfere with the domestic affairs of nations. Any kind of world government that could maintain law and order, and govern on so vast a scale, peoples of different races with varied political, historical, religious, ideological and geographical backgrounds would require dictatorial powers. To envision a world order bearing any relation to the American Republic is unrealistic. It could only be absolutism, world socialism or communism.

The advocates of world government admit that many serious questions would have to be settled by conference and discussion, yet they advocate that the United States be merged into a world alliance in which we, six per cent of the world's people, would be a hopeless minority and in which many of the other nations have shown little or no capacity for self government and whose natural and industrial resources are unknown and incalculable.

While certain groups favor the adoption of a world constitution and a world assembly based upon population, others advocate strengthening of the United Nations Organization and the amending of its Charter to constitute a world governing body. The United Nations Organization has clearly demonstrated on many occasions the power of international political intrigue. Its commissions have shown the unwillingness of other nations to

accept weighted representation based upon national resources, education and other relevant factors which would give the United States authority commensurate with its responsibilities and contributions to this organization. Consideration should also be given to the fact that although the United Nations Charter states that it is to be composed of sovereign states, pledged to international cooperation, its committees have already produced several documents which we are being asked to ratify as treaties, any one of which would destroy our Federal Constitution and our liberties as guaranteed in our Bill of Rights.

The International Charter of Human Rights, the basic philosophy of the "One Worlders", is a complete negation of our entire American concept of life and government. Our own Bill of Rights reserves to the peoples of our nation certain inalienable rights. The World Order would revert to a concept which has long been discarded by the more advanced nations of the world and which was never even considered by our Founding Fathers. Under the United Nations Human Rights Charter citizens would be granted such freedoms as the super-government saw fit to offer. This would mean constant and minute interference by government in the internal affairs of all nations. Instead of recognizing that human standards have developed as a natural expression of the population, a system would thus be imposed regardless of desires and capabilities - and a code which would guarantee to peoples of the world social and economic rights from government, implying no obligations or duties on the part of individuals.

Although many sincere and enthusiastic Americans whose desire for peace has blinded them to hidden motives behind the world government movement are included, there have been, and are many among them with numerous communist front affiliations. This statement can readily be substantiated by referring to the Reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Tenney Report and other dependable documentary sources. In the January 8th issue of NEWSWEEK is an article dealing with communist plans for sabotage in basic American industries. In this article is included the percentage of infiltration in each essential industry which the Communist Party deems sufficient for the destruction of that industry. It would be enlightening to learn the percentage of infiltration in world government groups.

The Communist Party has clearly outlined its goals of world conquest - "smashing the civil, judiciary and military apparatus of all states" - "wiping out American independence" - "imposing a world dictatorship" - which would result in slavery - physical, intellectual and spiritual for all mankind. Why should we Americans play directly into the hands of those whose object is to destroy us? How can any Americans have so little pride in their nation, so little understanding of their government and the principles upon which it was founded as to be willing to abandon their liberties, their rights to private property and to self government for an illusory hope of world peace?

Are not the tragic confused and involved issues of the Korean War sufficient to warn the American people of the fallacies of world entanglements, and the dangerous consequences of subordinating ourselves under any form of world government?

During the past year the Legislatures of several states have rescinded world government resolutions which had previously been adopted

without thorough understanding and without regard for the convictions of the citizens. I urge that this committee, in reporting out ACR #9, afford the Representatives in the New Jersey Legislature the opportunity to join these other states in refusing to accept any form of world government and by so doing to reaffirm their loyalty to and their faith in the United States of America as a sovereign power.

FREDERICK CARTWRIGHT, Englewood Anti-Communist League.

Mr. Cavinato, ladies and gentlemen:

I know you are all just as tired as I am and want to go home, so I will confine my remarks to relating an experience that I had this past summer that made me dead set against a world government.

In the evening of July 21, 1950, I attended a meeting at the Royal Albert Hall in London. That particular meeting was devoted to the United Europe movement. Now, while I am not a proponent of world government, by a fortuitous circumstance, I sat on the same platform with Mr. Winston Churchill, Paul Reynaud, former Prime Minister of France, and the former Socialist Prime Minister of France also. Now, I have here the program of the evening of the United Europe Movement. I would like to read one of the pledges of that organization. "We desire a charter of human rights guaranteeing liberty of thought, assembly, and expression, as well as the right to form a political opposition."

Now, take note of that, because one of the principal speakers that was supposed to speak at the Albert Hall on July 21, 1950 was Paul-Henri Spaak. Who, you may ask, is Paul-Henri Spaak? Paul-Henri Spaak, in 1948 and 1949, was Chairman of the Belgian delegation to the United Nations. According to this program of the United Europe Movement, Paul-Henri Spaak is Chairman of the International Council. As I said before, Paul-Henri Spaak was scheduled to speak on that particular evening. He was not there, and you know why? Because shirt-sleeved, that very day, Paul-Henri Spaak was leading his revolutionists to the palace gates of King Leopold, and in the heat and excitement of civil war, he demanded the abdication of King Leopold.

Here we have an example of minority rule by force and violence. Can you imagine America entering a world government that would be dominated by such men as Paul-Henri Spaak? For that reason I urge the rescinding of Resolution #17.

MR. CAVINATO: We will now hear from the representative of the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs.

MRS. RUDOLPH EMMEL, Legislative Chairman, State Federation of Women's Clubs.

I am sorry I had to hang on to the end, but I came here instructed to speak, and as the name of the Federation was mentioned here this afternoon, I am very grateful to you for a chance to clarify the position of the State Federation of Women's Clubs. I represent the Federation as its Legislative Chairman. The Federation has 297 Senior Clubs and 122 Junior Clubs in all counties of New Jersey, with a total of 43,978 members.

Among these thousands there are many who enthusiastically endorse the idea of World Government and who supported the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 17 by the Legislature last year.

However, there are also many more who feel that there are other and better ways to achieve the objectives which we all so earnestly desire, namely, peace and security for all the peoples of the world, which of course includes America first.

It has never been the policy of the Federation to approve or disapprove any Legislation without the full consent of its membership, expressed through a vote, or the vote of their representatives on its State Board. So far no such vote has been taken.

The Federation can well sympathize with the members of this Judiciary Committee and appreciate the reasons for their decision to hold this hearing. It is interested, as they are, to hear the views of other organizations and will await with full confidence their decisions and actions.

WILLIAM DOWD, Past National Commander, Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

I have spent this whole day to see if I could gain some knowledge that would change my views on the repeal of A.C.R. 17 and the adoption of A.C.R. 9.

First, let me congratulate those distinguished organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans, and other groups for the distinguished manner in which they presented their case here today. I am sorry some of the opponents see fit to criticize those men and women, and call them super-patriots because they could not see their views. These men and women who were criticized for wearing caps are the people who are ready when America needs them. Those are the men who will fight again, and the women who will help them, if we get in a third world war. Millions of our men and some of our women have given their lives for American democracy. Did they do it to share it with

other parts of the world? I think we should all be convinced by this time that the vast majority of the people in the world are interested in only two things -- American fighting men and American dollars. And if we go over and offer them American democracy, they will very quickly tell us where to get off.

I represent an organization of countless thousands of men with hooks, with crutches, in wheel chairs, and they got that way fighting for the preservation of this nation and the American government. And I am sure they will resent it if they are told now that they were sold a phoney bill of goods, that they fought for a world federation.

Because we live in a democracy, everyone here today is entitled to their say, and they can be more or less respected for their views. We have a great democracy here in New Jersey, so let's preserve it. Mr. Chairman, I hope you and your Committee will go along with the proposals of the great organizations who have never let you down and never led you wrong, and repeal A.C.R. 17.

MR. CAVINATO: I want to thank you all for your sincerity, your patience, and your contributions today. The Judiciary Committee will take under advisement all that has been said. I thank you very much. The public hearing is now concluded.

* * * *

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY KARL M. MANN, Sons of the American Revolution.

As a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, I regret that so many of our members have overlooked the fact that patriots who drew up our own Federal constitution were beset with severe criticism and strong opposition. In the beginning many states were unwilling to grant sovereignty to a federal form of government. Yet, these states finally consented to yield a limited amount of sovereignty in order to enjoy the great advantages going with mutual security.

I believe that a large number of Sons of the American Revolution members opposing world government are either misinformed as to the facts and logic of the case for World Federation.

There are many members of the Sons of the American Revolution who understand this issue and do not endorse the negative stand taken by the National and State Sons of the American Revolution.

I am definitely opposed to the adoption of A. C. R. Number 9. To rescind A. C. R. Number 17 would be a step backward, away from the goal of world security and peace.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY BENJAMIN F. TILLSON, Montclair, New Jersey.

The Judiciary Committee of the New Jersey Assmebly.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I address you as one of that great group of unorganized citizens, but one who has given serious and extensive study for several years to the various proposals for World Government and the resolutions promoting the participation of the United States therein, instead of rejecting entirely that impractical idea of so limiting the sovereignty of our people, State, and Nation.

I believe that I speak for the great mass of people who have not been emotionally swayed by the extensive and expensive propaganda of Fear and Hope, spread jointly by the enthusiasts and the subversive forces for World Government.

I believe that a referendum to the voters would show their rejection of any consideration of constitutional amendments or treaties for a World Government, and its corresponding loss of that United States sovereignty for which our people have shed their blood and devoted their wealth to maintain.

I believe that the secretive and hasty manner in which the proponents for World Government have manoeuvred through various state legislatures show that they would be afraid of public sentiment against them, and that their recission in eight states demonstrates that their legislators finally appreciated that fact. I trust that you will have the wisdom to join them in a similar recission.

The evidence which will be presented to you by others must be convincing that such high ideals as are involved in a world government have been proven impractical in the past and in the present. They are matters for further consideration in the far distant future, many generations from now. Those who are obsessed with impractical idealism often become a public menace, and we have county and state institutions for the insane to keep them from mischief to themselves and to others.

You hold your high office of trust and responsibility because of your loyalty to Nation and State, and because of your practical ability to reason and judge between truth and falsity in the issues placed before you.

It is human to err, but a repetition of the same error is less excusable, and may be disgraceful. When one learns that he has followed mistaken leadership it is honorable to disagree with it and to rectify any mistakes which have been made.

I hope, therefore, that you will recommend to the Legislature of New Jersey the recission of Assembly Resolution No. 17 of 1949; and that any further support of A World Government movement be contingent upon a referendum to the public, and its majority vote in favor of it.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY ROSA A. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. Chairman, Judiciary Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Any government in order to function must possess certain basic powers: the right to make and enforce laws; the right to levy taxes; the right to establish courts of law and justice; the right to maintain a police and defense force; the right to make treaties.

A world government in order to function would have these basic powers.

The member nations of a world government would be subjected to a super-state.

Therefore the United States would cease to exist.

Today the world is not ready for any world government plan when the majority of nations place the state above the rights, welfare and dignity of the individual.

Wide spread and continuous educational, religious and humanitarian teachings that raise the individual above the State are the only solutions toward world peace and brotherhood.

I urge you to lift Number 9 out of Committee and pass and save our country.

STATEMENT OF RUTH M. BRYANT, 1st VICE-REGENT, RAMAPO VALLEY
CHAPTER, 66 Heights Road, Ridgewood, New Jersey.

The Ramapo Valley Chapter, Daughters of the Revolution, Bergen County, New Jersey, has asked me as First Vice-Regent to speak in favor of the passage of A.C.R. No. 9.

The chief reason for advocating the passage of this bill is to insure that the United States will continue to be a free country. If this bill is not passed, and a convention is held endorsing World Government, the United States will find itself completely dominated by the countries now under the control of Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia today has an approximate population, including itself and its satellite countries, of 800 million people. The United States could not continue to be a nation at all if it is to be dominated by communist countries and this would be the result, as conditions are in the world today, if a World Government such as is proposed by the United World Federalists, Inc. and similar organizations were formed and the United States joined such a federation.

Resolution Adopted by The 25th Womens' Patriotic Conference on
National Defense, Washington, D. C. - Jan. 25,
26, 27, 1951.

37 Organizations with a combined membership of about three million women.

No. 17

WORLD GOVERNMENT

WHEREAS a resolution approving World Government has been presented by the United World Federalists or by similar groups to all State Legislatures, and

WHEREAS twenty-three State Legislatures adopted such a Resolution, and

WHEREAS due largely to the activities of women's organizations who explained evils of this plan to our State Legislators, the Resolution approving World Government has been rescinded in 1950 in Georgia, California, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Alabama, Massachusetts, Tennessee and Oklahoma by popular referendum voted it down something like 4 to 1.

WHEREAS our acceptance of a World Government and the consequent relinquishment of our National Sovereignty would mean World Citizenship and, thus, an end to all of our immigration laws; World Money with the dollar on a par with all the other monies in the world and controlled by the World Government and not by the United States Treasury; World Law with Americans tried by World Courts anywhere in the world instead of in our American Courts; a World Army with our troops quartered anywhere in the world under command of World Government Generals quartered in our country, possibly in Washington or in any other town in the land, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 25th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge most strongly that every delegate at this Conference upon her return home should write to her senator and representative in her own state Legislature asking them to oppose any form of world government or partial world government such as the Atlantic Union which would in any way impair the sovereignty of the United States of America; and if her State Legislature should be one which has rejected the resolution approving world government, the Conference recommends that each delegate from such a wide awake and well-informed state should write to her state legislators to congratulate and to thank them. Special commendation is given to Michigan for being the first state to adopt a resolution in opposition to world government.

