

THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS...

America's UNELECTED RULERS

By Kent and Phoebe Courtney



The CFR's Plan to:

- *Destroy America's National Sovereignty*
- *Subvert the U. S. Constitution via NATO and the ATLANTIC COMMUNITY*
- *Put the U. S. under Control of a Socialist-Dominated World Government*

America's UNELECTED RULERS

By Kent and Phoebe Courtney



**A Conservative Society of America Publication
New Orleans, La. - 1962**

Copyright by Kent H. Courtney, 1962
All Rights Reserved

Permission to reprint material from this book must be obtained in writing from the publisher except by reviewers for brief quotations in daily and weekly newspapers and magazines.

For permission write:
The Conservative Society of America
P. O. Box 4254
New Orleans 18, Louisiana

Library of Congress Catalog card No. 62-19716

Special Advance Printing July 2, 1962
First Edition July 27, 1962
Second Printing August 20, 1962

Manufactured in the United States of America

Also by the same authors:

The Case of General Edwin A. Walker

*The muzzling of the military who
warn of the Communist threat.*

(1961)

The CSA Voting Index

(1962)

The Conservative Political Action Handbook

(1962)

AUTHORS' NOTE

The purpose of this book is to present, by direct quotations, the views of the leading figures in the Council on Foreign Relations and how such views are now affecting the Foreign Policy of the United States.

The authors believe that the policies advocated by the Council on Foreign Relations, and being carried out by CFR members in high positions in the Government, are not in the best interests of this nation.

However, it should be remembered that the Council on Foreign Relations is composed of 1400 members, persons of high prominence in industry, education and communications. The authors do not mean to imply that the foreign policy views of the CFR are shared by all 1400 of its members.

Unfortunately, there have been instances when, for example, a busy industrialist will join an organization or permit his name to be used without first fully investigating the aims and purposes of such an organization.

Perhaps after reading the documented material contained in this book some members of the Council on Foreign Relations, who do not agree with the national-sovereignty-destroying aims of the CFR may wish to conduct their own investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An extensively documented book such as this would never have been possible without the assistance of a number of persons who furnished vital pieces of information enabling the authors to fit all the pieces-of-the-puzzle into one entity.

Our most sincere thanks to:

Mary Helen Brengel, Assistant Editor of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, for the use of her copies of Senate and House Investigating Committee reports of years past, some of which are now out of print; also for her locating, so that we could purchase, a complete set of Appendix IX, now out of print, which gives a voluminous listing of persons with Communist-front citations. (See Appendix II of this book as to how we utilized these governmental citations). In addition, Mrs. Brengel worked closely with the authors in every phase of the writing of this book, offering invaluable assistance.

Helen P. Lasell, Chairman, The United States Flag Committee, for photostatic copies of a number of documents regarding The Council on Foreign Relations.

Florence Fowler Lyons, for her documented newspaper columns showing the tie-in between the tax-free foundations and the One Worlders; also for her guidance as to where to obtain certain information which was necessary to complete our documentation proving the ultimate aims of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The Staff of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper, as well as our printing shop, without whose patience, loyalty and enthusiasm this book could never have been written.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
Chapter I – THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS	5
Its Views on Foreign Policy, 5; The Establishment's Foreign Policy Recommendations, 5; "Resisting" Communist Expansion, 7; Constitution – A Deterrent to Internationalist Aims, 8; Building a "New International Order," 9; Regional Arrangements, 10; U. S. Under World Court, 10; Atlantic Community, 12; Long-Term Foreign Aid, 12; Military Foreign Aid, 13; Undercover Dealing with Red China, 14; Disarmament, 15; Red Record of Broken Treaties, 15; "Fronts" of the Establishment, 16; The Establishment's Views on Nationalism, 16	
Chapter II – INTERLOCK BETWEEN GIANT TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS AND THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS	19
The Interlock in Internationalism, 20; Preparation for World Citizenship, 21; Subversive Influence in the Foundations, 22; Foundations Feed Personnel into Government, 24	
Chapter III – WHO'S WHO IN THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS	27
Big Names in the CFR, 28; Infiltration by Communists, 30; Strange Affiliations of Some CFR Members, 31; CFR Members Hold High Positions in Kennedy Administration, 32; Who Are the Other 96?, 33; Sidelights on CFR Members, 33	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter IV – THE BRAINWASHING DEPARTMENT OF THE CFR	37
What is Arden House ?, 38	
Chapter V – WORLD GOVERNMENT VIA ENTANGLING ALLIANCES	42
The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 43; NATO - A Shield Against Communism?, 44; NATO Under Control of U.N., 44; NATO Members Trade with Reds, 47; NATO - A "Paper Tiger," 48; NATO - Vehicle for World Government, 48; CFR Member Admits NATO a Step to World Government, 50	
Chapter VI – ATLANTIC COMMUNITY - THE MASTER TRAP	54
Clarence Streit - Mr. Atlantican, 56; The Atlantic Union Scheme, 57; Legislative Action on Atlantic Union, 58; Congress Authorizes NATO Parliamentarian Meetings, 63; NATO Parliamentarians Set Up Atlantic Convention, 63; Plans Laid for Atlantic Convention, 67; Interlocking Private Citizens Committees, 67	
Chapter VII – THE DECLARATION OF PARIS	70
What Does The Declaration of Paris Propose?, 71; Control of Communications Media, 74; Educating the Youth, 74; Council on Foreign Relations at Control Switch, 76; Editorial Press Reaction, 76; Two Years Warning, 77	
Chapter VIII – EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET	78
European Regional Arrangements, 81; Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), 81; The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), 81; Euro-	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

pean Defense Community (EDC), 83; The Treaties of Rome, 83; European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), 84; European Economic Community (EEC) - The Common Market, 85; The CFR, The CED, and The EEC, 85; Provisions of the Common Market Treaty, 86; Free Movement of Labor, 87; Subsidization and Control of Agriculture, 89; Expanding the Cartel System, 89; Organizational Setup of the EEC, 91; How Will the European Common Market Affect the U.S.?, 92	
Chapter IX - ECONOMIC INVOLVEMENT OF U. S. VIA OECD	94
Background of the OECD, 95; The Power of the OECD, 99	
Chapter X - WORLD COMMUNITY-GOAL OF THE CFR	102
Atlantic Community First Step to World Community, 104; Facilitating Soviet World Conquest, 105; One Worlders Fear an Informed America, 106	
WHAT YOU CAN DO	109
CFR Members Hold Key Positions in Both Democrat and GOP Administrations, 110; Investigate the State Department?, 112; The Responsibility of the Congress, 112; Bi-Partisan Coalition Promotes Socialism, 113; The CSA Voting Index, 113; How Congress Votes to Support CFR-Sponsored Legislation, 114; Conservatives Can Win, 115; The Conservative Society of America, 117	
Appendix I - 1960 MEMBERSHIP LIST OF THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS	119

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Appendix II – STRANGE AFFILIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN CFR MEMBERS	135
Appendix III – ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN CFR MEMBERS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION	160
INDEX	164

FOREWORD

On October 18, 1961, the NEWS & COURIER, of Charleston, South Carolina, stated in an editorial:

To understand the United States today it is necessary to know something about the Establishment Most citizens don't realize it exists, yet the Establishment makes its influence felt from the President's Cabinet to the professional life of a young college teacher who wants to obtain a foundation grant for research. It affects the nation's policies in almost every area. . . . The Establishment is a general term for those people in finance, business, and the professions, largely from the Northeast, who hold the principal measure of power and influence in this country irrespective of what administration occupies the White House.

The syndicated columnist, Edith Kermit Roosevelt described the policies of the Establishment as follows:

What is the Establishment's viewpoint? Through the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy Administrations, its ideology is constant: that the best way to fight Communism is by a One-World, Socialist State governed by "experts" like themselves. The result has been policies which favor the growth of the super-state, gradual surrender of U.S. sovereignty to the United Nations, and a steady retreat in the face of Communist aggression.

On February 23, 1954, Senator William Jenner stated:

Today the path to total dictatorship in the United States can be laid by strictly legal means, unseen and unheard by the Congress, the President, or the people Outwardly we have a Constitutional government. We have operating WITHIN our government and political system, ANOTHER body representing another form of government, a bureaucratic elite which believes our Constitution is outmoded and is sure that it is the winning side. . . . All the strange developments in foreign policy agreements may be traced to this group who are going to make us over to suit their pleasure.

We must consider our danger not only in the terms of the treaties or agreements which have been completed, but in terms of those still in the pipelines, or already in effect, but still invisible to Congress or to the people This political action group has its

own local political support organizations, its own pressure groups, its own vested interests, its foothold within our government, and its own propaganda apparatus Someone, somewhere, conceived the brilliant strategy of revolution by the assembly line. The pattern for total revolution was divided into separate parts, each of them as innocent, safe, and familiar-looking as possible.

The men who made the blueprints know exactly WHAT the final product is to be. They have planned the final assembly years ahead.
(Emphasis ours)

Garet Garrett, in his book "The Revolution Was," published in 1944, referred to the Establishment as "the revolutionary elite." Mr. Garrett listed the aims of the revolutionary elite as follows:

- (a) To ramify the authority and power of executive government -- its power, that is, to rule by decrees and rules and regulations of its own making;
- (b) To strengthen its hold upon the economic life of the nation;
- (c) To extend its power over the individual;
- (d) To degrade the parliamentary principle;
- (e) To impair the great American tradition of an independent, Constitutional judicial power;
- (f) To weaken all other powers -- the power of private enterprise, the power of private finance, the power of state and local government.
- (g) To exalt the leader principle.

In an article appearing in the May, 1962, issue of ESQUIRE, entitled "The American Establishment," Richard H. Rovere states:

It is interesting to observe the workings of the Establishment in presidential politics. As I have pointed out, it rarely fails to get one of its members, or at least one of its allies, into the White House. In fact, it generally is able to see to it that both nominees are men acceptable to it.

Mr. Rovere was apparently echoing a similar statement made by Senator William E. Jenner in February, 1956, when Jenner stated:

Every president since 1933 has been the captive of the governmental elite.

The domestic policy of the Establishment is the ultimate socialization of the United States, with its resultant destruction of the U.S.

Constitution and its guarantees of individual liberty and freedom.

High in the ranks of Establishment members is Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., former professor of history at Harvard University, now a special assistant to President John F. Kennedy.

In a periodical entitled *PARTISAN REVIEW*, dated May-June, 1947, there appears an article by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. In describing the *PARTISAN REVIEW*, Congressman John Roussetot of California stated that it "is actually read only by professional intellectual Socialists of all shades, from the out-and-out pro-Communist to the Fabian-Keynesian Socialist.... It is almost unknown outside the professional Leftist group. They use it to inform each other of their plans and projects."

Congressman Roussetot then inserted into the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of September 26, 1961, an article written in 1947 by Schlesinger, which Mr. Roussetot termed "a blueprint of the plan for turning the people of the United States over to a monolithic Socialist-Fascist-Marxist type of tyranny."

Below are only a few excerpts from the Schlesinger article of 1947 which clearly reflect the thinking of the man who today holds the position of Special Advisor to President Kennedy.

Socialism appears quite practicable. . . as a long-term proposition. Its gradual advance might well preserve order and law, keep enough internal checks and discontinuities to guarantee a measure of freedom, and evolve new and real forms for the expression of democracy. The active agents in effecting the transition will probably be, not the working class, but some combination of lawyers, business and labor managers, politicians, and intellectuals, in the manner of the first New Deal, or of the Labor Government in Britain.

Discussing how the Socialists intend to take over the United States, Schlesinger, in the same article, stated:

If Socialism (i.e., the ownership by the State of all significant means of production) is to preserve democracy, it must be brought about step by step, in a way which will not disrupt the fabric of custom, law, and mutual confidence... That is, the transition must be piecemeal; it must be parliamentary; it must respect civil liberties and due process of law. Socialism by such means used to seem fantastic to the hard-eyed melodramatists of the Leninist persuasion; but even Stalin is reported to have told Harold Laski

recently that it might be possible.

Mr. Schlesinger's concern regarding legalities is ominously reminiscent of Hitler's regard for "legalities" as he took over Germany in the '30s. In this connection it is also noteworthy that the 1961 edition of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines Hitler's National Socialism as "the body of political and economic doctrines held and put into effect by the National Socialist German Workers' Party in the Third German Reich, including the totalitarian principle of government and state control of all industry. . . ."

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK

(1) What "fronts" are used by the Establishment to carry out its goals of turning the United States into a Socialist state, and subjecting the United States to the control of a Socialist world order?

(2) Who are the individuals carrying out the Establishment's programs?

(3) Who finances the activities of the Establishment?

(4) How have members of the Establishment infiltrated key policy positions of the U.S. Government?

The purpose of this book is to give documented answers to the above questions. In addition we will show the giant interlock between:

(a) The Foreign Aid program

(b) The Foreign Trade program

(c) The Common Market program

(d) Organizations promoting various stages of World Government
(under which the U.S. would lose its national sovereignty)

All of the Establishment's anti-American plans, proposals and programs can be defeated if the American people are informed and aware of this threat to the survival of this nation as a Constitutional Republic.

CHAPTER I

THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Its Views On Foreign Policy

The most prominent and most powerful of the organizations composing the Establishment is the Council on Foreign Relations. According to THE DAN SMOOT REPORT* of July 17, 1961:

The Council on Foreign Relations is the invisible government of the United States by virtue of the fact that members of the Council occupy key posts in the Executive branch of Government from the presidency downward. By its own efforts, and through many interlocking organizations, the Council on Foreign Relations also virtually controls public opinion in the United States.

Richard H. Rovere, writing in the May, 1962, issue of ESQUIRE, corroborates Mr. Smoot's statement, as follows:

The directors of the Council on Foreign Relations make up a sort of Presidium for that part of the Establishment that guides our destiny as a nation.

So dominant has become the influence of the Council on Foreign Relations that it has almost taken over the prescribed activities of the U.S. State Department. By managing to place its members in key positions in the State Department, the CFR has, in essence, become a super-governing hierarchy, not subject to the control of Congress or the American people.

What are the views being advocated by the Council on Foreign Relations which exerts such a Machiavellian influence on the policies of the government of the United States?

THE ESTABLISHMENT'S FOREIGN POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In 1959, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United

* THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a weekly newsletter, P. O. Box 9538, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas. \$10.00 per year.

States Senate commissioned a series of foreign policy studies to be prepared by so-called foreign policy research centers throughout the country. These foreign policy recommendations totaled 1431 fine-print pages. The Foreign Policy Clearing House, a "non-partisan" private organization, made a summary of these foreign policy recommendations which were published by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., under the title of "Strategy for the 60's."* The book carries the imprimatur of Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and apparently Senate spokesmen for the Council on Foreign Relations. Senator Fulbright, it will be recalled, gained notoriety in 1961 because of his semi-secret document, the so-called Fulbright Memorandum, which urged the muzzling of the military who warn of the Communist threat.

An indication of the views of the CFR's Fulbright is the following statement which was contained in the Fulbright Memorandum:

In the long run it is quite possible that the principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the (American) people to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laoses. Pride in victory and frustration in restraint, during the Korean War, led to MacArthur's revolt and McCarthyism.

In the internationalism-promoting book, "Strategy for the 60's," are found a number of foreign policy recommendations, some of which are already in effect; some soon to be carried out; with Council on Foreign Relations members or aides in the State Department quietly working out final details for the all-out thrust of the United States Government into a Socialist, One-World order.

Page 91 of "Strategy for the 60's" is entitled "Study No. 7, Basic Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy." This study was published by the Council on Foreign Relations, November 25, 1959. Following are excerpts from the CFR recommendations to the U.S. Senate

* "Strategy for the 60's, A Summary and Analysis of Studies Prepared by 13 Foreign Policy Research Centers for the United States Senate." Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., Publisher, 64 University Place, New York 3, N.Y.

Foreign Relations Committee, as summarized in "Strategy for the 60's", together with our comments.

"RESISTING" COMMUNIST EXPANSION

States the Council on Foreign Relations study:

(The) U.S. has been largely successful in resisting Communist expansion.

The inaccuracy of the above statement is incredible. It follows the Orwellian brainwashing technique of "black is white; peace is war; slavery is freedom, etc." Further, the foregoing statement clearly shows the contempt in which members of the Establishment hold the intelligence of the American people. Today, thanks to the efforts of the growing anti-Communist movement within the United States, the showing of such films as "Operation Abolition," "Communism on the Map," and "Communist Encirclement - 1961" to thousands of groups throughout the country, many high school students are apparently more aware of the extent of Communist aggression than are the so-called foreign policy experts of the Council on Foreign Relations!

The truth of the matter is, however, that the CFR is well aware of Communist gains since 1945. The only reason for their totally erroneous statement regarding "successfully resisting Communist expansion" is to attempt to hide the true facts from the American people.

In further refutation of the statement in the CFR's Study No. 7, consider the fact that at the time of the signing of the United Nations Charter in 1945, during the Truman Administration, 200 million people were behind the Iron Curtain. Today, 17 years later, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, more than 900 million people have been taken over by the Soviet Union.

When the Eisenhower Administration took office in 1953, the following nations were controlled by the Soviet Union:

Albania, Bulgaria, Red China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, North Korea, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia.

By 1961 the following additional nations had been completely taken over, or are now ruled by Soviet-directed dictators:

Cuba, Hungary, North Vietnam and Tibet.

Further, either by way of Communist sympathizers who run the government, or highly successful Communist agitation, the Communists have acquired almost complete control in the following countries:

Afghanistan, British Guiana, Cambodia, the Congo, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Laos, South Korea, Syria, Tunisia, Venezuela, and Yemen.

CONSTITUTION: A DETERRENT TO INTERNATIONALIST AIMS

The Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7 complains that U.S. policy is "deficient in long-range planning." They blame this "deficiency" on the "U.S. Constitution's division of foreign policy responsibility between the Executive and Legislative branches of government, and the resultant tendency to tie policies and programs to the Procrustean inflexibility of the fiscal year."

For the benefit of those readers who may not have a dictionary handy, and may not be (or wish to be) too familiar with "eggheadese," we have just consulted Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary and find that the word "Procrustean" means "harsh or inflexible in fitting (someone or something) to a pre-conceived idea, system, etc."

The CFR study is correct in its use of the word "Procrustean" in describing the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Constitution was intended to be "inflexible" in preserving the individual rights of the citizens of this nation. The Divinely-inspired Constitution of the United States of America was conceived and ratified by men who had long suffered under tyranny. The purpose of the Constitution was to protect the people from tyrannical practices and policies of their own government. In the famous preamble to our Constitution "We, the People of the United States" proclaimed to the world that our government belongs to the people and is run by the people.

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution contains possibly its most restrictive sentence, which is as follows:

All legislative powers herein shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Note the use of the word "all." It is this portion of the Consti-

tution which is hampering the efforts of the Internationalists in the State Department to take over legislative processes in order to implement their programs and concentrate all power in the Executive branch. Such a political philosophy is contrary to the spirit and wording of the United States Constitution.

Beginning with Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and ending with the final clause in Article I, the Constitution devotes itself to outlining the powers and functions of Congress, beginning with the phrase "The Congress shall have power to. . ."

In order to prevent a power-grab by the Executive Department, headed by the President, the framers of the Constitution laid out and clearly defined in Article II the limited power of the Executive branch. Tyrannical dictatorship can never fasten itself upon the United States as long as the U.S. Constitution stands intact. That is why those who would subvert our Constitution, complain, as the CFR study puts it, about "the Constitution's division of foreign policy responsibility between the Executive and Legislative branches of government."

BUILDING A "NEW INTERNATIONAL ORDER"

Under the section entitled "The Foreign Policy Tasks Which Lie Ahead," the Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7 lists as the first task:

Building a new international order.

The CFR Study No. 7 then states that freedom of nations is recognized as "interdependent," and adds that such a new international order should also include states "labeling themselves as Socialist."

In all international organizations to which the United States presently belongs, such as the United Nations and NATO, the United States has only one vote. The CFR's proposal to "build a new international order" would therefore place the United States in an international World Government with Socialist states which would, of course, outnumber the United States. Thus governmental policy

of the United States would be determined by Socialist nations overseas.

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The second and third points which the Council on Foreign Relations study recommends are:

Safeguard U.S. security through . . . regional arrangements . . .
Maintain and gradually increase the authority of the United Nations.

The American people have been deliberately deceived regarding these so-called regional arrangements. For example, we are told that NATO is a "shield" against Communist aggression. This, however, is refuted by the fact that although NATO is supposed to be a regional organization composed of Free World nations opposed to Communism, NATO is actually under the control of the Soviet-dominated United Nations. Article 53 of the U.N. Charter states that no regional organization can take any enforcement action (as a deterrent against aggression) "without the authorization of the (U.N.) Security Council . . ."

Article 54 of the U.N. Charter states that the U.N. Security Council "shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken . . . by regional agencies . . ." (such as NATO). The Soviet Union, a member of the all powerful Security Council, exercises veto power.

The simple question then arises - - how could it be possible to "safeguard U.S. security" through "regional arrangements," such as the CFR study proposes, when the regional arrangements themselves are under the domination of the only force that threatens American security -- namely, the Soviet Union? (Regional arrangements such as NATO, and also United States involvement in the United Nations, will be discussed at length in a later chapter).

U.S. UNDER WORLD COURT

Point four of the Council on Foreign Relation Study No. 7 is:

Make more effective use of the International Court of Justice, jurisdiction of which should be increased by withdrawal of reservations by member nations on matters judged to be domestic.

What this seemingly innocuous proposal urges is the repeal of the Connally Amendment, which states that the International Court of Justice, or World Court, shall not have jurisdiction in "matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, as determined by the United States."

What is the World Court? All World Court judges are nominated by governments which are members of the United Nations. There are no uniform United Nations qualifications for World Court judges. Not even a legal degree is required. The World Court is composed of 15 judges. No nation may have more than one judge. Thus the United States is outnumbered 14 to 1 on the World Court, with the Court being composed of a representative of the Soviet Union plus one or more judges from Soviet satellite nations. Nine of these 15 judges make up a quorum, and the majority of a quorum (only 5) is enough for a decision from which there is no appeal. If the Connally reservation is repealed, as the Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7 urges, it would be possible for the Soviet Union, one of its satellites, and judges from three Soviet-leaning countries to get together, form a quorum, and render judgments affecting domestic issues in the United States.

In April, 1961, a Polish Communist by the name of Bohdan Stefan Winiarski was elected president of the U.N.'s International Court of Justice (World Court) by his fellow U.N. judges, including the U.S. representative, Philip C. Jessup, member of the Council on Foreign Relations. The term of office for this Communist president of the World Court ends in 1967. As president of the World Court, Communist Winiarski wields great power. For example, all hearings are under the control of the president. All minutes of the hearings must be signed by this Communist president and a court registrar. A juggled word here and there, a few placed, or misplaced, commas or periods -- since these court "minutes" set legal precedents -- could play havoc with the laws of the United States and other non-Communist countries.

If the U.N. court deadlocks on a vote, its present Communist president, Mr. Winiarski, will have two votes. In addition to his regular vote, he will have an extra vote, called a "casting vote," in order to break the tie.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

The Council on Foreign Relations study states:

Promote the solidarity of the Atlantic Community.

The name "Atlantic Community," chosen apparently to connote a union of Free Western nations, is a misnomer, because the Council on Foreign Relations study also states:

Prevent Atlantic Community solidarity from becoming (or seeming to become) a front against non-Western nations.

Supposedly, the internationalists would wish to include Japan and certain African nations in the Atlantic Community, which would account for the above recommendation. Tremendous efforts have gone into the establishment of the Atlantic Community with its high-sounding name, as a stepping-stone for dragging the United States into a "new international order"; (which means a Socialist One-World government). It would seem, therefore, that the Atlantic Community is an integral part of this set-up, and will therefore be maintained and implemented even though the name of the organization appears to be slightly restrictive. (The Atlantic Community will be discussed at length in a later chapter.)

LONG-TERM FOREIGN AID

Another recommendation made by the Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7, is:

U.S. economic aid programs must be more ambitious, longer-term, and aimed at specific areas and tasks.

Originally the Foreign Aid program was sold to the American people under the pretext of "preserving the Free World against World Communism." However, this phony line was exposed when it was revealed that during the period from July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1957, over \$2-1/2 billion U.S. taxpayer dollars were sent to Communist or Communist-dominated countries, such as Albania, Czecho-

slovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.*

Further, more than \$300 million in U.S. Foreign Aid was used to defeat the anti-Communist forces in Indonesia. Tito of Yugoslavia, who frequently pledges his loyalty to the Soviet Union, now has the fifth largest air force in the world, an air force that can be used against the Free World -- an air force that was financed by U.S. Foreign Aid.

Now that the deception of Foreign Aid being used to fight Communism has been exposed, the Foreign Aid promoters have switched to a new line, which is, according to the Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7, to "assist the less-developed areas throughout the world." This new foreign policy switch, strangely, follows an instruction from the late Joseph Stalin, dictator of the Soviet Union, who stated in "Marxism and The National Colonial Question," (pages 115-116):

It is essential that the advanced countries should render aid -- real and prolonged aid -- to the backward countries in their cultural and economic development. Otherwise it will be impossible to bring about peaceful coexistence of the various nations and peoples -- within a single economic system, which is so essential for the final triumph of Socialism.

It should be noted that when Stalin used the word "Socialism" he actually means Communism, inasmuch as in Communist jargon, the words "Socialism" and "Communism" are interchangeable.

MILITARY FOREIGN AID

In an attempt to lead the American people to think that their tax dollars are being used to arm friendly nations, the Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7 recommends:

A long-range global military aid program to strengthen U.S. and allied defenses.

* Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

This sounds fine; however, in another section of the same CFR study, it is recommended that U.S. economic aid programs should:

AVOID making aid contingent upon political commitments to the West. (Emphasis theirs)

In other words, the CFR recommends that U.S. tax dollars be used in Foreign Aid to help and arm both friendly and unfriendly nations, without requiring any pledge of support from the recipient nations.

UNDERCOVER DEALING WITH RED CHINA

Another example of the devious policies promoted by the Council on Foreign Relations is its recommendation regarding Communist China, as follows:

Channels must exist to communicate with the Communist regimes, including that of Communist China. "In general the most promising channels for communication with the Soviet Union and Communist China will be regular or ad hoc contacts maintaining the necessary conditions of true negotiation, which may at times be at the highest level, but not public performances of ministers or heads of government."*

In other words, the Council on Foreign Relations recommends that "regular or ad hoc contacts," such as experts furnished by the Council on Foreign Relations, or citizen committees made up of CFR members, or CFR members in high places in the State Department should "maintain the necessary conditions of true negotiation." This could mean a recommendation to acquiesce to Soviet demands. Another sinister aspect of this CFR recommendation is the phrase "not public performances of ministers or heads of government." In simple language this means the CFR recommends secret agreements, secretly arrived at.

Constitutional experts are, for the most part, agreed that one loophole in the U.S. Constitution is Article VI, Clause 2, which states:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be

* The quoted matter is taken from the original, lengthy CFR report.

made, under authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land . . .

The framers of the Constitution never envisaged that the day would come when men in high places would wish to negotiate away the rights and privileges of the people of the United States. It is obvious that in recommending such secret negotiations, the Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7 recognizes this Constitutional loophole, and plans to exploit it to the ultimate destruction of the U.S. Constitution itself.

DISARMAMENT

The Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7 recommends that the U.S.:

- (a) Fully explore Soviet proposals for complete or partial disarmament;
- (b) Concentrate more on developing our own disarmament proposals;
- (c) Negotiate on these proposals, perhaps directly with the USSR in secret. . .
- (d) Negotiate in the framework of the United Nations.

Here, indeed, is proof positive that the Council on Foreign Relations proposes to conduct negotiations "in secret" with the USSR. As for negotiating within the framework of the U.N., which the CFR recommends, this would put all negotiations directly under the control of the Soviet Union, which now not only controls the United Nations, but also exercises veto power in the Security Council.

RED RECORD OF BROKEN TREATIES

Of what value would any disarmament treaty with the Soviet Union be when Khrushchev has stated that promises are "like pie crusts -- made to be broken"? Regarding the Soviet Union's record of treaty-breaking, Senate Document No. 85 (1955), entitled "Soviet Political Treaties and Violations" states:

The staff (of the Subcommittee on Internal Security) studied nearly a thousand treaties and agreements. . . both bilateral and multi-lateral, which the Soviets have entered into, not only with the United

States, but with countries all over the world. The staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence, its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise.

The Council on Foreign Relations is well aware of the Soviet record of treaty-breaking. They know that in view of this record, the Soviet Union could not be expected to live up to any disarmament program; and yet the Council on Foreign Relations insists on promoting disarmament of the United States in the face of Soviet aggression, the latest example of which is the establishment of a Soviet satellite, Cuba, only 90 miles from America's shores.

“FRONTS” OF THE ESTABLISHMENT

In his article in the May, 1962, issue of *ESQUIRE*, Richard H. Rovere states that the Establishment “is a coalition of forces, the leaders of which form the top directorate, or Executive Committee, referred to sometimes as ‘Central.’ At the lower level organization is quite loose, almost primitive in some cases. . . .”

Both the DAN SMOOT REPORT and Richard Rovere are agreed that the Council on Foreign Relations furnishes the top leadership for the Establishment.

One of the organizations in the “coalition of forces” is the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University. In the book previously mentioned, entitled “Strategy for the 60’s,” with an introduction by Senator Fulbright, appears Study No. 10 which is based on a report by the Center for International Affairs at Harvard.

Several noteworthy points, which can be assumed to represent Establishment thinking, emerge from Study No. 10 by the Center for International Affairs at Harvard.

THE ESTABLISHMENT'S VIEWS ON NATIONALISM

Here is the definition of nationalism as contained in Study No. 10:

Nationalism is the assertion by a people of its claim to a distinctive national identity, entitling it to live its own life in its own fashion.

To the above statement we have no disagreement. Study No. 10, further discussing Nationalism, then states:

Nationalism seldom yields positive doctrine, beyond the demand for a sovereign state, independent of alien overlords.

The question immediately comes to mind -- what more "positive" doctrine is needed than that of a sovereign state independent of alien overlords?

And then Study No. 10 makes two interesting admissions. The Harvard Study laments that Nationalism "tends to be 'anti' in character," and goes on to say that:

While based on mass support, it is not necessarily democratic.

How these two puerile statements ever found their way into a supposedly learned Harvard study is hard to understand. Of course, Nationalism is "anti" anything and anybody who menaces the national sovereignty of its state! Of course, it is "anti" alien overlords or alien dictators over its native land!

And then that amazing contradiction that Nationalism, though based on mass support, is not democratic! Comment would appear to be unnecessary.

But the dichotomy continues, because two sections later, the Harvard study admits:

Nationalism does, however, have much to contribute to the development of new countries, by (a) providing a sense of social and political solidarity; and (b) injecting dynamism and political activism into the society.

In other words, the intellectual pundits of Harvard are perfectly willing to foster and permit nationalism among cannibals in Africa, but would deny and downgrade the spirit of Nationalism among the citizens of the United States of America!

Study No. 10 of the Center for International Affairs of Harvard University states:

The West's primary interest is NOT in maintaining the status quo and supporting entrenched domestic interests which oppose necessary social change. (Emphasis theirs)

Thus it would appear that the Harvard experts feel no compunction in recommending programs and policies which would disastrously affect the domestic economy of the United States. The Kennedy Administration's Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which admits that a

number of U.S. industries will be grievously hurt by wiping out tariffs, is an example of this anti-U.S. industry attitude on the part of the Internationalist experts.

“The necessary social change” referred to in Study No. 10 is for the purpose of furthering “the psychological unification of the world.”

The Harvard Study also states:

Internationalism today is a corrective. . . for nation-states. It is a remedy against the dangers arising when states are left to their own devices, and a cure for the deficiencies states experience when isolated.

When the United States of America was “left to its own devices,” and operated with strict adherence to the spirit and law of the U.S. Constitution, the United States became the most powerful and most respected nation on earth. Today, after several decades of internationalist-oriented foreign policy, and the squandering of over \$100 billion in Foreign Aid overseas, the United States has a national debt higher than the combined national debts of all other nations in the world.

Further, the billions wasted overseas in Foreign Aid have not guaranteed that a single ally would stand by our side in the case of Soviet aggression.

The United States flag is burned and spat upon in foreign capitals of the world. Americans overseas are assaulted or murdered with little or no protest from our government.

The Establishment -- notably, the Council on Foreign Relations -- through effective infiltration by its members into the U.S. State Department, has played a key role in reducing the United States to its present situation.

CHAPTER II

INTERLOCK BETWEEN GIANT TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS AND THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The documentation contained in this chapter is based on the report entitled "Tax Exempt Foundations" of the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, which was submitted to the Committee of the Whole House on December 16, 1954. The abbreviated name for this investigating committee, which was headed by the late Congressman Carroll B. Reece of Tennessee, is the "Reece Committee."

As stated before, the top leadership and policy-making functions of the Establishment are furnished by the Council on Foreign Relations. Who finances the Council on Foreign Relations? With what other organizations and foundations is the Council on Foreign Relations affiliated? What is "the interlock," and what accounts for the Socialist-Internationalist bias of the interlock?

The term "foundation" is a broad one. In the Reece Committee report this term is used to denote "foundations" as it is ordinarily used by the layman -- indicating such foundations as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Ford Foundation, etc. In investigating these tax-free foundations, the Reece Committee decided to confine their inquiry chiefly to the activities of the foundations in what are known as the "social sciences."

The power of the individual large foundation is enormous. It can exercise various forms of patronage which carry with them elements of thought control. It can materially predetermine the development of social and political concepts with their resultant courses of action. This power to influence national policy is amplified tremendously when foundations act in concert.

The far-reaching power of the large foundations and of "the interlock" (or working arrangements) between them, has so influenced

the press, the radio, and even the government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism of foundation practices to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and, at times, ridiculed.

The hearings and report of the Reece Committee on Tax-Exempt Foundations are now out of print. Because the documented testimony in the 1954 hearings have such an acute bearing on the foreign policy practices of the U.S. Government today, considerable space in this chapter will be given to a re-statement of the Committee findings, in order to bring this information to the widest number of present-day readers.

House Resolution 217, adopted July 27, 1953, which created the Reece Committee, authorized an investigation to determine which foundations and organizations, exempt from Federal income taxation, “. . .are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes; propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation.”

THE INTERLOCK IN INTERNATIONALISM

The Reece Committee Report states:

Substantial evidence indicates there is more than a mere close working-together among some foundations operating in the international field. There is here a close interlock. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation, and recently the Ford Foundation, joined by some others, have commonly cross-financed to the tune of many millions various intermediate and agency organizations concerned with internationalism, among them

The Institute of Pacific Relations
 The Foreign Policy Association
 The Council on Foreign Relations and others

That it (the interlock) happened by sheer coincidence stretches credulity. That such unity of purpose, effort, and direction resulted from chance or happenstance seems unlikely.

Some of the larger foundations have had a significant impact upon our foreign policy, and have done much to condition the thinking of our people along “Internationalist” lines. What is this In-

ternationalism which meets with such hearty foundation support? Professor Kenneth Colegrove, in his testimony before the Reece Committee, stated:

In my opinion, a great many of the staffs of the foundations have gone way beyond Wendell Willkie with reference to Internationalism and globalism. * * * There is undoubtedly too much money put into studies which support globalism and Internationalism.

Former Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden stated in a letter to the Counsel for the Reece Committee, after he had testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee:

I have a very definite feeling that these various foundations very definitely do exercise both overt and covert influences on our foreign relations, and that their influences are counter to the fundamental principles on which this nation was founded and which made it great.

The Rockefeller Foundation minced no words in its 1946 report (p.934, Reece Committee Hearings):

The challenge of the future is to make this world one world -- a world truly free to engage in common and constructive intellectual efforts that will serve the welfare of mankind everywhere.

In commenting on the above statement of the Rockefeller Foundation Report, the Reece Committee Report said:

However well-meaning the advocates of complete Internationalism may be, they often play into the hands of the Communists. Communists recognize that a breakdown of Nationalism is a prerequisite to the introduction of Communism.

PREPARATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

During the years 1925-1952, the Rockefeller Foundation gave \$11,069,770 to the American Council of Learned Societies. In 1947, President Harry Truman appointed the Commission on Higher Education. The President of the American Council of Learned Societies was chairman of this Commission, which produced a report emphasizing that the domestic scene was to be changed by a concerted effort on the part of the intellectual leaders of the nation so that the American people would be led toward world citizenship.

The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education contained this statement:

In speed of transportation and communication, and in economic interdependence, the nations of the globe are already one world; the task is to secure recognition and acceptance of this oneness in the thinking of the people, so that the concept of one world may be realized psychologically, socially, and, in good time, politically.

It is this task in particular that challenges the scholars and teachers to lead the way toward a new way of thinking * * * * There is an urgent need for a program for world citizenship that can be made a part of every person's general education.

SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN THE FOUNDATIONS

Page 41 of the Reece Committee Report states:

It is a conclusion of this committee that the trustees of some of the major foundations have, on numerous important occasions, been beguiled by truly subversive influences. Without many of their trustees having the remotest idea of what has happened, these foundations have frequently been put substantially to uses which have adversely affected the best interests of the United States.

In discussing Communist infiltration of the foundations, the Reece Committee Report states:

The Cox Committee (which preceded the Reece Committee) record shows that a conscious plan by the Communists was inaugurated to infiltrate the foundations for the purpose of appropriating their funds to Communist uses. We know from the evidence that the Communists succeeded in the case of seven foundations: The Marshall Field Foundation; the Garland Fund; the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation; the Heckscher Foundation; the Robert Marshall Foundation; the Rosenwald Fund; and the Phelps-Stokes Fund; and we are aware of the tragic result to our nation and to the world of Communist infiltration into the Institute of Pacific Relations. We know also that (then undisclosed) Communists and their fellow travelers had been able to secure grants from other foundations, including Carnegie and Rockefeller. We know, further, what the Cox Committee referred to as "the ugly unalterable fact that Alger Hiss * became the President

* Alger Hiss was convicted and served a prison term for perjury for lying about his Communist affiliations and activities.

of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace." We do not know the full extent to which there has been penetration or use of foundations and their resources. It is too much to assume that Communist success was limited to the exposed instances. Indeed, where foundations are involved in so high a concentration of power, we may assume that some advantage may have been taken by Communists to use this interlock, directly or indirectly, for malign purposes. * * * * Whether the penetration is by outright Communists, or by some other variety of Socialists or collectivists, the danger of its occurrence is far greater when there exists a complex of inter-related and interlocked organizations. There are more opportunities for shifting both personnel and grants. . . . After they have poured these funds into the managerial hands of others, the detailed distribution is beyond their control.

In 1952, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary stated: *

The Institute of Pacific Relations was a vehicle used by the Communists to orient American Far Eastern policies toward Communist objectives. Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist . . . It was the continued practice of the IPR to place in government positions both persons associated with IPR, and other persons selected by the effective leadership of IPR. . . The net result of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States.

According to the McCarran Committee, the Rockefeller Foundation should have known as early as the 1930's that the Institute of Pacific Relations had ceased to be a proper or even safe recipient of Foundation funds. And yet, as late as December 31, 1952, the Rockefeller Foundation, with Dean Rusk's ** approval, donated \$50,000 to the IPR.

* Institute of Pacific Relations - Report of the Committee on the Judiciary, 82nd Congress, pertaining to hearings held July, 1951 - June, 1952, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

** Dean Rusk, who was then Chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation, was appointed by President Kennedy as Secretary of State in 1961.

FOUNDATIONS FEED PERSONNEL INTO GOVERNMENT

Mr. Thomas McNiece, Assistant Research Director for the Reece Committee, described a "central or mainstream of influence" running from the foundations and their centralized agencies into government. There was considerable evidence to show that the government had come to rely upon the foundation "clearing houses" for lists of men to assist the specialists in the "social sciences." In this connection, the Reece Committee Report stated:

The political slant of these individuals may seriously affect the character of government operations. We have seen many Communists and fellow-travelers recommended by foundation executives for government posts. In the case of the recommendations to the government made by the Institute of Pacific Relations and the American Council of Learned Societies for experts to be used by our occupation forces in Germany and Japan, the lists were heavily salted with Communists and their supporters.

And now, back to the Council on Foreign Relations, the power bloc of the Establishment, which by 1962 had, to all intents and purposes, taken over the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign policy.

According to the Hearings of the Reece Committee (page 894), the Rockefeller Foundation and its associated foundation, the Laura Spelman Fund, contributed \$1,320,700 to the Council on Foreign Relations during the years 1927-1952.

The Reece Committee Report, on page 177, states:

The Council on Foreign Relations came to be in essence an agency of the United States Government, no doubt carrying its internationalist bias with it. When World War II broke out, it offered its assistance to the Secretary of State. As a result, under the Council's Committee on Studies, the Rockefeller Foundation initiated and financed certain studies on: Security and Armaments Problems; Economic and Financial Problems; Political Problems; and Territorial Problems. These were actually known as the War and Peace Studies. Later this project was actually taken over by the State Department itself, engaging the secretaries who had been serving with the Council on Foreign Relations groups. A fifth subject was added in 1942 through the "Peace Aims Group."

There was a precedent for this. The Carnegie Endowment had offered its services to the Government in both World War I and

World War II. There was even an interlock in personnel in the person of Professor (James T.) Shotwell and many others, some of whom proceeded into executive and consultative office in the Government. There can be no doubt that much of the thinking in the State Department came from the personnel of the Carnegie Endowment and the Council on Foreign Relations. . . .

The Carnegie Endowment in its 1934 Yearbook, proudly asserts that it -- "is becoming an unofficial instrument of international policy, taking up here and there the ends and threads of international problems and questions which the Government finds it difficult to handle, and, through private initiative, reaching conclusions which are not of a formal nature, but which unofficially find their way into the policies of governments."

The report of Kathryn Casey, Legal Analyst for the Reece Committee, clearly shows the interlock between the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and some of their associated organizations, such as the Council on Foreign Relations, with the State Department. And then the Reece Committee report states:

Indeed, these foundations and organizations would not dream of denying this interlock. They proudly note it in reports. They have:

- (a) undertaken vital research projects for the Department;
- (b) virtually created minor departments or groups within the Department for it;
- (c) supplied advisors and executives from their ranks;
- (d) fed a constant stream of personnel into the State Department trained by themselves or under programs which they have financed; and
- (e) have had much to do with the formulation of foreign policy both in principle and detail.

They have, to a marked degree, acted as direct agents of the State Department. And they have engaged actively, and with the expenditure of enormous sums, in propagandizing ("educating"? -- public opinion) in support of the policies which they have helped to formulate.

What this Committee questions, however, is whether it is proper for the State Department to permit organizations to take over important parts of its research and policy-making functions when these

organizations consistently maintain a biased, one-tracked point of view. . . .

What we see here is a number of large foundations, primarily The Rockefeller Foundation, The Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, using their enormous public funds to finance a one-sided approach to foreign policy and to promote it actively, among the public by propaganda, and in the Government through infiltration.

CHAPTER III

WHO'S WHO

IN THE

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

In tracing the origin of the Council on Foreign Relations, THE DAN SMOOT REPORT of June 12, 1961 states that it was incorporated in 1921, and then goes on to say:

The Council did not amount to a great deal until 1927, when the Rockefeller family (through the various Rockefeller foundations and funds) began to pour money into it. Before long, the Carnegie Foundation (and later, Ford) began to finance the Council. In 1929 the Council (largely with Rockefeller gifts) acquired its present headquarters property, the Harold Pratt House, 58 E. 86th St., New York City.

In 1939 the Council began to take over the American State Department.

The membership of the Council on Foreign Relations is restricted to 700 resident members, those whose residence or place of business is within 50 miles of City Hall, New York City, and 700 non-resident members who reside or do business outside that 50-mile radius. For the purpose of this book, no differentiation will be made regarding "resident," or "non-resident" members, inasmuch as the two different designations relate to geography, and not to the influence or importance of the member.

The Council on Foreign Relations, representing "Central" of the Liberal Establishment, would not be able to exert the tremendous power it does over U.S. foreign policy and the Federal Government itself, did it not have the ability to pose as a responsible, respectable organization composed of famous and near-famous citizens.

Members of the Council on Foreign Relations not only represent all religious faiths, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, but also the

following fields:

Finance
 Government
 Business
 Labor
 Military
 Education
 Mass Media Communications.

In Chapter I, quoting directly from Study No. 7 of the Council on Foreign Relations, it was seen that the CFR is presently promoting the following:

- (1) Building a new international order;
- (2) Maintaining, and gradually increasing the authority of the (Communist-dominated) United Nations;
- (3) Repealing the Connally Amendment (which prevents the World Court from having jurisdiction over U.S. domestic matters);
- (4) Increasing and promoting longer-term Foreign Aid without making such aid contingent upon political commitments to the West;
- (5) Negotiating on disarmament proposals directly with the USSR, in secret.

It should be borne in mind, however, that these CFR recommendations were intended for the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and not for the American public. In literature prepared for public consumption, innocuous-sounding statements of a calculated non-controversial nature are employed. Consider this opening sentence from an official Council on Foreign Relations pamphlet entitled "Studies on Foreign Policy, 1959 - 1960":

A central purpose of the Council on Foreign Relations is the study of important problems which confront the United States on the planning and conduct of its foreign policy in the complex world of today. The Council's program of studies represents a continuing effort to explore and clarify these problems through group discussions and scholarly research.

BIG NAMES IN THE CFR

Carefully cloaking its real purpose, and attempting to add authenticity to both its existence and its recommendations, the Council on

Foreign Relations has managed to corral a stable of big names, well-known to the majority of the American people. For example, the Annual Report of the Council on Foreign Relations for 1960 lists among its members the following:

Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State;
Winthrop Aldrich, former head of Chase National Bank, presently a member of the Board of Directors, Rockefeller Center;
Roger M. Blough, Chairman of the Board, U.S. Steel Corp.;
Clifford P. Case, U.S. Senator from New Jersey;
Marquis Childs, syndicated columnist;
Charles Collingwood, news commentator;
James B. Conant, former President of Harvard University;
Norman Cousins, Editor in Chief, SATURDAY REVIEW OF LITERATURE;
David Dubinsky, President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union;
Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States;
Douglas Fairbanks, movie actor;
W. Averell Harriman, former Governor of New York; Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs;
Paul G. Hoffman, Managing Director, United Nations Special Fund;
Hubert H. Humphrey, U.S. Senator from Minnesota;
Jacob Javits, U.S. Senator from New York;
Herbert H. Lehman, former U.S. Senator from New York;
Walter Lippmann, syndicated columnist;
Gale McGee, U.S. Senator from Wyoming;
Stanley Marcus, President, Neiman-Marcus, Dallas, Texas;
Edward R. Murrow, Director of United States Information Agency (USIA);
Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr, author and theologian; teacher at Union Theological Seminary;
Ogden Reid, Chairman of the Board, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE;
David Rockefeller, Chairman, Chase International Investment Corp.;
John D. Rockefeller III, Trustee, Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Director, Rockefeller Center;
Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York State;
Elmo B. Roper, Jr., public opinion pollster;
William L. Shirer, author and news commentator;
Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Chairman of the Board, NEW YORK TIMES;
Stuart Symington, U.S. Senator from Missouri.

INFILTRATION BY COMMUNISTS

One of the greatest feats of the Council on Foreign Relations is that it has managed to weld patriotic, basically Conservative professional and military leaders together with cited Communist frontiers into one organization: It can only be assumed that naive non-Liberal members of the Council on Foreign Relations are unaware of the subversive backgrounds of some of their fellow CFR members.

In discussing the infiltration of the Council on Foreign Relations by Communists and Communist frontiers, THE DAN SMOOT REPORT of June 19, 1961, stated:

By 1941, the Council on Foreign Relations and the various foundations and other organizations interlocked with it had virtually taken over the American State Department, and had controlling influence over the Roosevelt Administration through powerful individuals strategically placed in many of the agencies. Some Council on Foreign Relations individuals were later identified as Soviet espionage agents: for example, Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Lauchlin Currie. Other Council on Foreign Relations members--Owen Lattimore, for instance -- with powerful influence in the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations, were subsequently identified, not as actual Communists, or Soviet espionage agents, but as "conscious, articulate instruments of the Soviet international conspiracy."

I do not intend to imply by these citations that the Council on Foreign Relations is, or ever was a Communist organization The fact, however, that Communists, Soviet espionage agents, and pro-Communists could work inconspicuously for many years as influential members of the Council indicates something very significant about the Council's objectives. The ultimate aim of the Council on Foreign Relations (however well-intentioned its prominent and powerful members may be) is the same as the ultimate aim of international Communism: to create a One-World Socialist system, and make America a part of it.

It is noteworthy that Owen Lattimore, although termed in 1952 "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet international conspiracy," * nevertheless is listed as a member of the Council on

* Senate Report No. 2050, 82d Congress, 2d session, Institute of Pacific Relations, hearings held July 25, 1951 - June 20, 1952, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (Report, pages 224, 225).

Foreign Relations in the CFR Annual Report of 1960.

STRANGE AFFILIATIONS OF SOME CFR MEMBERS

The 1960 Annual Report of the Council on Foreign Relations lists a total of 1304 members. An investigation by the authors reveals that some of these members have wittingly or unwittingly engaged in activities which in one way or another have aided the Communist cause.

Each of the following persons is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations according to the 1960 CFR report, and each has, at one time or another, been associated in some way, according to Congressional investigating committees, with two or more Communist-promoting activities, or activities sympathetic to the cause of Communism. Their names were especially selected because they are generally recognizable by the American public.

Ralph J. Bunche
Clark M. Eichelberger
Sam A. Jaffe
Philip C. Jessup
Owen Lattimore
Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr
J. Robert Oppenheimer
Whitney North Seymour
Vincent Sheean
Leland Stowe
Walter Wanger

The above list is by no means complete. For additional listings of CFR members, as well as a full explanation of questionable affiliations, including sources of documentation, see Appendix II. The findings contained in Appendix II were limited to the government documents and public records at our disposal for this investigation.

The listing on this page or in Appendix II of the strange affiliations of some members of the Council on Foreign Relations is not intended to imply that such individuals at present hold the views which account for their being listed. On the other hand, public records indicate continuing participation in similar activities by some CFR members.

CFR MEMBERS HOLD HIGH POSITIONS
IN KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Indicative of the ease with which the Council on Foreign Relations is able to place its members in high posts in government, regardless of which party is in power, is the fact that the following members of the Council on Foreign Relations were appointed by President Kennedy:

Secretary of State: Dean Rusk

Secretary of Treasury: Douglas Dillon

Secretary of Labor: Arthur J. Goldberg

Chief of U.S. Disarmament Administration: John J. McCloy

U.S. Representative to the United Nations: Adlai E. Stevenson

Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs: Averell
Harriman

Under Secretary of State: George W. Ball

Chief of Protocol: Angier Biddle Duke

Under Secretary of the Treasury: Henry H. Fowler

Deputy Secretary of Defense: Roswell L. Gilpatric

Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of International Security
Affairs: Paul Nitze

Special Advisor to the President: Chester Bowles

Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs:
Walt W. Rostow

Special Assistant to the President: Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.

Director of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA): John A. McCone

Director of U.S. Information Agency (USIA): Edward R. Murrow

Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs:
McGeorge Bundy

Special Assistant to the President: Jerome B. Wiesner

Ambassador to Nationalist China: Alan Goodrich Kirk

To head three-power nuclear disarmament negotiations in Geneva,
March 21, 1961: Arthur H. Dean

The above names, with the exception of Arthur Goldberg, are all listed as members of the CFR according to its 1960 Report. Mr.

Goldberg became a CFR member in 1961.

This list should not be considered complete, inasmuch as it can be assumed that other members of the Council on Foreign Relations occupy positions of lesser importance in the Kennedy Administration. However, the above list gives a graphic picture of the over-all control that the CFR has managed to exert over the functioning of the United States Government itself.

It will be noted that in the key areas of Foreign Policy, Foreign Aid, Disarmament, Defense, Treasury, Labor, and Intelligence, the CFR holds the reins of power because of the appointment of their members to the policy-making posts.

WHO ARE THE OTHER 96 ?

As stated previously, the membership of the Council on Foreign Relations is restricted to 1400. The 1960 Annual Report by the CFR, however, lists only 1304 members.

QUESTION: Who are the other 96 unlisted members ?

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, although not listed in the 1960 report, was invited to join the CFR in 1961. There is, however, conflicting evidence as to whether or not President Kennedy is presently a member of the CFR. In the case of Kennedy, whether he is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations is immaterial, inasmuch as his foreign policy mirrors that of the CFR.

The 1960 CFR Annual Report does not list Senator J.W. Fulbright. Again, as in the case of Kennedy, Fulbright possibly renders more yeoman service to the CFR than do some of the listed members.

SIDELIGHTS ON CFR MEMBERS

Below are random comments regarding background or public statements of certain CFR members in the Kennedy Administration, in order to give the reader an idea of the thinking of these individuals:

Dean Rusk, Secretary of State

During the Korean War Mr. Rusk is reported to have been in total agreement with President Truman that U.S. planes should not attack

Red Chinese supply bases across the Yalu River. Further, Mr. Rusk is said to have been in accord with the handcuffing and removal of one of the greatest Americans of all times, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, who desired to defeat the Red aggressors, insisting correctly that in war there is no substitute for victory.

Also see Chapter II, in which it is documented that Dean Rusk approved a Rockefeller Foundation contribution to the Institute of Pacific Relations after the IPR had been declared to be subversive.

Edward R. Murrow, Director of U.S. Information Agency

According to syndicated columnist Fulton Lewis, Jr.:

(Edward R.) Murrow went all out to whitewash Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer* who was denied security clearance by the Government after he admitted he had contributed financially to Communist causes, and that both his brother and wife were deeply involved in Communist associations. Murrow's record goes on and on. In his time he defended such persons as Harry Dexter White (who was identified as a Soviet agent).

In 1935, the Soviet Russian Government itself disclosed that Murrow was an active supporter of the Moscow State University Summer Session of 1935. The Soviet aim at that time was to lure American teachers to this Moscow Summer School and to indoctrinate them in Communism. However, the Hearst papers, on February 18, 1935, exposed this Communist propaganda project, resulting in its abandonment.

August Heckscher and Pendleton Herring

Two Council on Foreign Relations members wrote large segments of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report of 1960. They are August Heckscher, Director of the Twentieth Century Fund, and Pendleton Herring, President of the Social Science Research Council. According to syndicated columnist Alice Widener:

The report contains denunciation of the "excesses" in our nation's various loyalty programs, and actually asserts that the government's

* A fellow-member of the Council on Foreign Relations

employment requirement that "individuals prove their loyalty" is a violation of basic democratic principles"! *** This super-egghead Rockefeller Brothers Fund report states that the American Communist party is too insignificant to be a present danger. This is in flat contradiction to the considered and informed judgment of Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI.

Max F. Millikan and Walt W. Rostow

In 1957, Max F. Millikan and Walt W. Rostow, both members of the Council on Foreign Relations, wrote a book entitled "A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy." In editorializing on the book, the NEW YORK DAILY NEWS states:

Messrs. Millikan and Rostow are a pair of economics professors at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Their proposal is what you might call a plan for a watered-down SUNFED. SUNFED is the proposed special United Nations Fund for Economic Development -- to be managed mainly by Socialists and Communists from both sides of the Iron Curtain, and to deal out billions of dollars in helping underdeveloped countries. * * * * We're warned in the book that we must attach no strings to these loans or grants. We must give up any expectation of gratitude to begin with. There must be no objections voiced to loaning or giving money to Socialist, semi-Socialist, or Fascist countries.* We're even, according to Millikan and Rostow, to invite the Red slave empire to take part in the plan -- Soviet Russia by putting up capital, and backward countries like Red China by accepting some of the loans or grants.

Walter Millis

Walter Millis, Staff Director for the Ford Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions wrote a book in 1961 entitled "A World Without War." In that book, Walter Millis, a

* Noteworthy is that this book, written in 1957, by CFR members Millikan and Rostow, was apparently "a trial balloon" for CFR proposals to give Foreign Aid to friend and foe alike, as outlined in the Council on Foreign Relations Study No. 7, published in 1961 about which you have read in Chapter II of this book.

member of the Council on Foreign Relations, declares:

Many of the anti-Communist measures taken in the name of "internal security" during the "McCarthy Era" were really in the nature of tribal rights.

Commenting on the above, the syndicated columnist, Alice Widen-er, stated:

Heavens above! Our internal security measures -- all passed by Congress -- aren't tribal rights for us savages, they are our legitimate means of protection against the savage overthrow of our Republic by force and violence.

George Kennan

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed George Kennan as U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia. Mr. Kennan, who served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, 1952-1953, is also a CFR member. An idea of the thinking of Ambassador Kennan is given in the following statement he made before the Women's National Democratic Club in Washington only about a year before the Kennedy election, where he concluded that:

If you ask me whether such a country (the United States) has, over the long run, good chances of competing with a purposeful, serious and disciplined society such as that of the Soviet Union, I must say that the answer is no.

In an article in the ATLANTIC MONTHLY, George Kennan advocated "defending our homes" only "as well as we can in the direct sense" but not by warning of retaliation if our homes should be destroyed. And then Mr. Kennan concluded by stating in the ATLANTIC MONTHLY article:

It will be said to me: "This means defeat." To this I can only reply: "I am skeptical of the meaning of victory and defeat in relation to modern war between great countries."

CHAPTER IV

THE BRAINWASHING DEPARTMENT OF THE CFR

The CFR would not have achieved the pinnacle of power it now enjoys, and the increasing incorporation of its Liberal, Communist-appeasing recommendations into official U.S. Foreign Policy, had it not been for the fact that the CFR has been able to infiltrate the mass communications media of this nation. It is a strange quirk of human nature that if something appears in print, is heard on the radio, or is seen on television, it becomes, ipso facto, not only authentic, but readily credible to unthinking citizens.

Capitalizing on this mental laziness - this failure to question or do one's own thinking - the big guns of the CFR-manipulated communications media spout forth their propaganda barrage in support of the aims of the CFR. An indication of the extent of saturation in the field of communications is the following list of CFR members, according to the 1960 report of the Council. After each name is listed the position occupied in 1962 by these CFR members. Bearing in mind the tremendous circulation of the publications represented, and the audiences reached by radio and TV networks which number in the millions, the total impact of CFR propaganda can be easily understood.

Joseph Barnes, Editor, Simon and Schuster, Inc., publishers;
Marquis Childs, syndicated columnist;

Gardner Cowles, of Cowles Magazine Co., which controls LOOK Magazine, the MINNEAPOLIS STAR & TRIBUNE, and the DES MOINES REGISTER & TRIBUNE:

Mark Ethridge, Publisher and Vice President, LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL;

Philip Graham, Chairman of the Board, NEWSWEEK, Publisher and President, WASHINGTON POST & TIMES HERALD;

Allen Grover, Vice President, TIME, Inc., publishers;

Joseph C. Harsch, European Correspondent, National Broadcasting Company (NBC);

Palmer Hoyt, Publisher, DENVER POST;
Sam A. Jaffe, CBS News;
Walter Lippmann, syndicated columnist;
Henry R. Luce, Editor-in-Chief: TIME Magazine, LIFE Magazine;
Malcolm Muir, Chairman, Executive Committee, NEWSWEEK, Chairman of the Board and Editor-in-Chief, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.;
William S. Paley, Chairman and Director, Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS);
James Reston, editorial writer, NEW YORK TIMES;
Elmo Roper, public opinion pollster;
David Sarnoff, Director, NBC and Radio Corporation of America;
William L. Shirer, author and news commentator;
Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Publisher and Chairman of the Board, NEW YORK TIMES;
John Hay Whitney, President and Publisher, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE.

In summary, it is seen that the Council on Foreign Relations is able to exert partial or maximum control on the editorial policies of the following principal organs of communication in this country: Columbia Broadcasting System; National Broadcasting System; TIME Magazine; LIFE Magazine; LOOK Magazine; NEWSWEEK Magazine; THE NEW YORK TIMES; and NEW YORK HERALD-TRIBUNE; plus syndicated columnists controlled by the latter two newspapers.

And, when occasionally a situation arises where the news commentators of NBC and CBS, and the CFR-captive newspapers and weekly magazines fail to drum up enough public support for CFR-recommended legislation, CFR member Elmo Roper can always be counted on to take a poll and come up with his findings that the American people "support" the proposed legislation, which legislation has resulted from CFR recommendations to the Government.

WHAT IS ARDEN HOUSE ?

Another activity of the CFR is that of brainwashing businessmen. This is done under the auspices of an affiliation of the CFR known as

the American Assembly.

In the spring of 1962, the 21st American Assembly was held at Arden House according to an article by Sylvia Porter, syndicated financial columnist. The Executive Director of the American Assembly is Henry M. Wriston, who is President of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Arden House, a 50-room French Renaissance-style mansion located at Harriman, New York, was donated in 1951 to Columbia University by CFR member, W. Averell Harriman. With its luxurious interior furnishings, and its elaborate gardens and surrounding park, Arden House is calculated to impress even its wealthiest visitors.

Arden House is the scene of carefully planned six-week seminars for businessmen. At these seminars businessmen are "briefed" on the inner workings of government by so-called experts, particularly in the area of Foreign Policy. Impressed by the physical trappings at Arden House, the erudition of the lecturing experts, and flattered at having been selected to be a part of such august company, the businessmen are highly susceptible to the Internationalist theories propounded at these seminars.

For example, one lecturer, billed as "an authority on the real conditions inside Russia," will give an unchallenged report on market conditions expected within the next five years, provided the U.S. will "wake up" and do business with the Soviet Union and Red China. Another lecturer will moralize on the inevitability of Red China's admission to the U.N. and the necessity for U.S. cooperation to this end. Or, the subject may be the necessity for placing Foreign Aid on a permanent basis and under the control of the United Nations.

Because open debate is frowned upon, and because of the highly touted authority of the experts in their particular fields, the lectures are accepted as dogmatic truth by the businessmen "students" at these American Assembly seminars. Alumni of Arden House form the nucleus of businessmen's groups who, under the skilful manipulation of policy-makers in the Council on Foreign Relations, draw up resolutions and recommendations concerning governmental policy. In this way, by playing on the vanity of these businessmen, the master planners of the CFR associated with the American Assembly

are able to use these gullible U.S. businessmen for their own purposes.

The Council on Foreign Relations each year also holds a series of meetings of business executives. It is interesting to note whom their speakers have been in the past. Among those addressing CFR meetings in recent years have been Anastas I. Mikoyan, first deputy premier of the Soviet Union; Tom M'boya of Kenya, a follower of Jomo Kenyatta, leader of the murderous Mau Mau; and Fidel Castro, Communist dictator of Cuba.

According to the Annual Report of the Council on Foreign Relations, 1960, the seminar theme in the fall of 1959 was "The Soviet-America Balance: Trends and Prospects." Then, according to the Council's report:

At the final meetings, Robert R. Bowie, Director of Harvard University's Center for International Relations, and formerly Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning, evaluated the prospects for MEANINGFUL NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE COMMUNIST BLOC AND THE WEST. (Emphasis ours)

The theme chosen for the Spring, 1960, series of meetings was "Problems of United States Foreign Economic Policy," at which "United States relations with the European Common Market" were discussed. This is a clear indication of the amount of pressure that the Council on Foreign Relations intends to put behind the move to make the United States a member of the European Common Market. (The Common Market will be discussed in detail in a later chapter.)

It is perhaps noteworthy that Governor Nelson Rockefeller was a speaker at the May 24, 1960, dinner-meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Because of the emphasis the CFR places on "negotiation" and "trade" with Communist Russia, it is apparent that there are a large number of highly influential U.S. businessmen who are incapable of learning from experience. Just as, prior to World War II, certain businessmen and financial institutions believed that they could "do business with Hitler," and saw nothing wrong in exporting scrap iron to Japan (which was later "imported" as shrapnel in the bodies of American soldiers) so the present-day Inter-

nationalists, in their dangerous conceit, think that they can "do business" with representatives of the Soviet Union.

The U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, however, disagrees. In a study entitled "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda," this Senate Committee states:

Every form of exchange between Communist and other countries whether diplomatic, cultural, COMMERCIAL, technical or athletic, is conceived and worked out with propaganda in mind. . . . The notion prevalent in the West that contacts with them may "widen their horizons and humanize their views" is absurd, for these are not men who can give free rein to their inclinations, but docile tools of the apparatus. (Emphasis ours)

CHAPTER V

WORLD GOVERNMENT VIA ENTANGLING ALLIANCES

'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.

-- George Washington
First President of the
United States of America

In commenting on the above quotation from President Washington's Farewell Address to the people of the United States on September 17, 1796, THE DAN SMOOT REPORT of June 19, 1961 states that Washington "established a foreign policy which became traditional, and a main article of faith for the American people in their dealings with the rest of the world."

Mr. Smoot then continued:

Washington warned against foreign influence in the shaping of national affairs. He urged America to avoid permanent entangling alliances with other nations, recommending a national policy of benign neutrality toward the rest of the world. Washington did not want America to build a wall around herself, or to become, in any sense, a hermit nation. Washington's policy permitted freer exchange of travel, commerce, ideas, and culture between Americans and other people than Americans have ever enjoyed since the policy was abandoned. The Father of our Country wanted the American GOVERNMENT to be kept out of the wars and revolutions and political affairs of other nations.

In short, Washington told Americans that their nation had a high destiny, which it could not fulfil if they permitted their government to become entangled in the affairs of other nations.

This book is not intended to be a chronological history of foreign alliances into which the United States has entered contrary to the advice of George Washington. Rather, we are concerned with the steps taken in the past decade toward the destruction of U.S. national sovereignty in order to bring about a Socialist One World Govern-

ment, which steps have been spearheaded and master-minded by members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

We do not propose to discuss in detail the United Nations, where the United States, because of the admission of newly-created African nations, is now out-voted by the Communist bloc. The U.N. has not only failed to maintain peace, but has now become a smokescreen for Soviet aggression throughout the world. Also, the U.N. itself became the aggressor in the U.N. war against the independent nation of Katanga in the Congo.

Instead, let us turn our attention to NATO, an international organization about which a majority of the American people have been deliberately misinformed, or are dangerously uninformed, regarding its true purpose.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Propaganda put out by promoters of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, spreads the two following misconceptions:

- (1) They attempt to give the impression that although the Communists may dominate the United Nations, NATO is a separate organization, having no connection with the U.N., and
- (2) They claim that NATO is a military alliance of the Free World, the purpose of which is to defend the Free World against Soviet aggression.

Before refuting the above two claims by the NATO propagandists, here is some brief background on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The North Atlantic Treaty setting up NATO was signed in Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1949, by the United States, Canada, and ten nations of Western Europe: Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom. Greece and Turkey became members in February, 1952, and the Federal Republic of Germany joined in May, 1955, thus making a total of 15 nations as of 1962. Paris is the headquarters for NATO.

The North Atlantic Treaty itself mentioned only one permanent organ -- a council (the North Atlantic Council) -- and its powers

were unspecified. By purposely not specifying the powers of the North Atlantic Council, ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty by the U.S. Senate was facilitated. Had specific powers been delineated for the North Atlantic Council, sufficient suspicion might have been aroused to have prevented ratification.

NATO - A SHIELD AGAINST COMMUNISM?

The Nato Handbook, published in 1961, gives in its first chapter a reason for the establishment of NATO, as follows:

In view of the strength of the Soviet Union, the balance could only be restored in favor of the West by an alliance of the free countries of Europe with the two North American powers, the United States and Canada.

The Atlantic Congress, held in London June 5-10, 1959, was attended by 650 citizens from every NATO country except Iceland. A report adopted by the Atlantic Congress at the Plenary Session on June 9, states:

If we are to survive, we are faced by the necessity of opposing the Communist world.

Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them . . . will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking . . . such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force . . .

NATO UNDER CONTROL OF U.N.

The above examples of the so-called anti-Communist purpose of NATO are what is fed to the American public via the communications media controlled by the Council on Foreign Relations.

Below is what the American public is NOT told.

Article 51 of the United Nations Charter seemingly permits mem-

ber nations to defend themselves against aggression by stating:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense, if an armed attack occurs against a member of the organization . . .

But the UN Charter very carefully qualifies this permission to member nations to defend themselves against aggression by then stipulating, in Article 51, that an attacked nation may defend itself . . .

until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

In Article 51, the United Nations Charter further exercises its control over the national ability of any individual member nation:

Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council . . .

Article 53 of the UN Charter permits member nations to form regional arrangements, presumably for defense. But again the UN qualifies how such defense action may be taken because Article 53 of the UN Charter says:

. . . No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council . . .

Article 54 of the UN Charter then stipulates the conditions under which such regional arrangements may operate:

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of the activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

And what is this Security Council which is given the power in the UN Charter to decide whether or not a nation can defend itself against aggression? What is this Security Council to which all "regional arrangements," such as NATO, must report concerning their activities?

The Security Council is the United Nations Security Council. Its members include the United States, Great Britain, France, Nationalist China, and Communist Russia. Here, then, is the absurd situation where a NATO nation, attacked by Communist Russia or its satellites, would, under the UN Charter, be denied the right of self-

defense from Soviet aggression unless the Soviet member on the UN Security Council gave his permission for a NATO counter-offensive against the Soviet aggressor! In other words, a simple veto by the Soviet member of the UN Security Council could deny a NATO nation the right of self-defense.

Even though the Internationalists promote NATO as a "shield" against Communist aggression, those who drew up and signed the North Atlantic Treaty which established NATO did not actually intend NATO to be an effective counter-force to Soviet aggression, because the Preamble of the North Atlantic Treaty reads:

The parties to this treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations . . .

Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, in discussing action to be taken by members in the event of attack, states:

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the (UN) Security Council.

In other words, the framers of the NATO Treaty recognized that NATO is a mere "creature" of the Communist-dominated United Nations.

Article 7 of the NATO Treaty states:

This treaty does not affect. . . (the) obligations under the Charter of the parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Again it is seen that although NATO purports to have been established in order to defend the free world, it is admitted in the NATO Treaty that NATO is subservient to the Security Council of the United Nations, and that the UN Security Council has "the primary responsibility" for maintaining peace.

And who composes the staff of this Security Council to whom NATO must report? A list furnished by the U.S. Mission to the UN proves that the Assistant Secretary for Security Council Affairs since April, 1949 to the present time has always been a Communist.

Below are the names and terms of office of these Communists holding a key position on the UN Security Council which, in essence, holds the reins of control and power over any action taken by NATO:

- (1) Arkady A. Sobolev - April, 1949 to April 28, 1949 (resigned).
Assistant Secretary for Security Council Affairs;

- (2) Constantin E. Zinchenko - April, 1949, to May, 1953 (resigned). Assistant Secretary for Security Council Affairs;
- (3) Ilya S. Tchernychev - June 30, 1953 to January, 1955. Assistant Secretary for Security Council Affairs (appointed to serve the balance of Zinchenko's term which ran to February 1, 1954; Tchernychev apparently served in this post until January, 1955, when Protitch was appointed Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs (PSCA);
- (4) From January, 1955, to June, 1958, a Yugoslav, Dragoslav Protitch, served as Under-Secretary for PSCA;
- (5) Anatoly F. Dobrynin - July 1, 1958 to May, 1960. Under-Secretary for PSCA.
- (6) Georgy P. Arkadev - May, 1960 - . Under-Secretary for PSCA.

NATO MEMBERS TRADE WITH REDS

Another illustration of the hypocrisy of NATO is that while pretending to be anti-Communist, NATO members are actually engaging in a very lucrative trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites. A special House investigating committee headed by Representative Paul Kitchin, in a probe initiated in 1961, states:

Since January, 1960, and through June, 1961, massive procurements of plants and equipment embodying new Western technology have been made by the Soviet bloc.

For example, the Kitchin report reveals that Great Britain has shipped the following types of potential war materiel behind the Iron Curtain:

Electrical equipment for jet aircraft; 100 all-purpose digital computers used in automation and telemetering of missiles; a complete hydro-power station; 2 mass spectrometers for use in nuclear and electronic research; precision missile instruments; etc.

The Kitchin report also goes on to state how West Germany, Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, all members of NATO, have exported the following strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain:

Diesel engines; control instruments for chemical plants; 3 - 40,000-ton tankers; 6,000 - horsepower air-conditioning systems for

Russian missile plants.

The syndicated columnist Fulton Lewis, Jr., on June 5, 1962, stated that Communist dictator Tito of Yugoslavia will travel to Moscow in the summer of 1962 in a visit that will, in the words of the NEW YORK TIMES, mark his "rehabilitation as a formally-recognized leader in the Communist world." Mr. Lewis then points out that total U.S. Foreign Aid to Communist Tito "has now passed the \$2.3 billion mark, with the figures rising."

NATO - A "PAPER TIGER"

Major General C. A. Willoughby* in the October 28, 1960 issue of his FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE DIGEST, discussed views expressed by NATO chief General Lauris Norstad before the Appropriations Committee on the strategy of NATO forces. Stated General Willoughby:

Norstad blandly presented the astounding thesis that NATO forces -- and the 50 billions of Foreign Aid it has consumed since 1945 -- are not there to win a war, but to: (1) Give the enemy pause while SAC (the Strategic Air Command) retaliates; or (2) Interrupt the continuity of enemy action (when launched), and, (3) Force the enemy to reconsider a decision for total war.

Amplifying on the false front of defense that NATO presents, Senator Russell Long of Louisiana stated in addressing the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, December 15, 1960:

Many of you here probably do not realize that none of the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) countries are obligated to go to war if Russia should attack the United States. Actually, they are obligated in the Charter only to consult and "take necessary steps" as they see fit. It would be no surprise if any of these countries were to negotiate with Russia over conference tables while she was actually engaged in warfare with us.

NATO - VEHICLE FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

Because it has been seen that NATO is subservient to the United Nations, of which Communist Russia is a member, it could not ef-

* Major General C. A. Willoughby served as Chief of Intelligence for General Douglas MacArthur, 1939 - 1951. He is presently an author and lecturer.

fectively oppose Soviet aggression. What then was the real purpose in the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Dean Clarence Manion, in a speech before the Los Angeles Freedom Club May 6, 1958, in discussing the plans of the Internationalists and the purpose of international organizations, stated:

Their long-term international purpose is always the same; namely, to destroy the independence, the freedom, the sovereignty, and the Constitutional Government of this Republic. That is the purpose of this Internationalist cabal that has fashioned this foreign policy, the policy upon which all other policies depend.

Nevertheless, and I make this statement advisedly, the Internationalist cabal which fashions, or pretends to fashion, our foreign policy as a means of opposing Communism, is not interested in opposing Communism at all. These Internationalists are interested in preserving Communism as a convenient means for the destruction of American independence. I tell you deliberately, and after meticulous consideration, that this foreign policy which (Senator Robert A.) Taft said is the policy upon which all other policies depend, is not merely futile; it is not merely fatal, it is fraudulent.

“There is no disposition on the part of the Internationalists to destroy Communism. Far from it. They propose to contain and preserve Communism for the great leverage that it provides in inducing us to surrender the sovereignty and freedom of America. That is not the way to defeat Communism; that is the way to preserve it! And that is precisely what we have done for 15 years. Without our foreign policy containing it and preserving it, Communism would have been blown out of existence by anti-Communist revolution years ago.”*

* TWO-FACED NATO, booklet published by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 “D” St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Price - 50¢.

CFR MEMBER ADMITS NATO A STEP TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

The July 5, 1949 issue of THE INDIVIDUALIST* discussed a report put out by the Women's Investor's Research Institute, Inc., which contained an analysis of the testimony given before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on behalf of the North Atlantic Pact (Treaty). According to that report, William L. Clayton, listed in the 1960 Annual Report of the Council of Foreign Relations as a CFR member, stated that the North Atlantic Pact (Treaty) "is a natural and necessary step on the road to Federal Union (World Government)."

Also in 1949, right after the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified by the U.S. Senate, Elmo Roper, member of the Council on Foreign Relations, wrote in a pamphlet entitled "The Goal is Government of All the World":

But the Atlantic Pact (NATO) need not be our last effort toward greater unity. It can be converted into one more sound and important step working toward world peace. It can be one of the most positive moves in the direction of One World. . . . And it becomes clear that the first step toward World Government cannot be completed until we have advanced on four fronts: the economic, the military, the political, and the social.

During the next five years, the hierarchy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization worked feverishly on their plans to convert NATO, supposedly a military alliance, into a vehicle to govern the Western world by means of a select council, thereby eventually dispensing with the services of such institutions as the U.S. Congress.

In February, 1956, Senator William E. Jenner, in a speech** at a patriotic rally in Carnegie Hall, discussed this new metamorphosis of NATO, stating:

We now have political, economic, welfare, and propaganda organs in NATO above our government and our Constitution. . . . For ex-

* THE INDIVIDUALIST, formerly published in Lincoln, Nebraska, Charles W. Phillips, Editor.

** Excerpts of this speech by Senator William E. Jenner appeared in the February-March, 1956, issue of FREE MENSPEAK, the name of which was changed in 1957 to THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper.

ample, the NATO super-government is very interested in labor, especially the movement of immigrants from country to country. It has recommended that governments "facilitate labor mobility between their countries." . . . The One Worlders believe nations have no right to decide who may be admitted and denied admittance to their country . . . NATO is interested in uniform Social Security for member countries. . . Politically, NATO is the means by which the One World superstate is being "assembled" from above through the UN, and horizontally in NATO, SEATO, and the Organization of American States.

And then Senator Jenner made the amazing statement that

We cannot even find out what is going on. A five-year report on NATO was compiled in November, 1954. When, a few days ago, I asked for later information, I was told it was classified. That means -- for executive agencies only. NATO government agencies recommend policies on taxes, inflation, arms production and economics. What their recommendations are, we in Congress do not know -- they are "classified."

The greatest stumbling block, actually the only deterrent to the final establishment of a Socialist-dominated One World Government, is the desire of the individuals of each nation to retain and protect the national sovereignty of their own country. Only in this way can a nation continue to be ruled by a government of its own choosing, instead of by a council of "alien overlords." Although great secrecy was attached to the undercover planning operations of NATO during the period mentioned by Senator Jenner, in 1957 Republican President Dwight Eisenhower (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) gave the signal that NATO's real plans were reaching a first stage of completion, and therefore secrecy wraps could be removed. On October 26, 1957, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan of England issued a joint statement in which they declared:

The concept of national sovereignty is now out of date.

In an article by Ernest B. Haas, entitled "Changes At All Levels: NATO," * we find the type of monolithic dictatorial control with

* Reprinted in Senate Document No. 124, 86th Congress, 2nd Session, "Strengthening Free World Security, NATO and Atlantic Cooperation."

which NATO plans to operate a regional worldgovernment community of nation-states:

The central feature of NATO is the mushrooming of central institutions in response to newly felt common needs. The North Atlantic Council (the only permanent organ created by the North Atlantic Treaty) has remained the central policy organ, having jurisdiction over the political, economic, and military aspects of the alliance. Under it, however, an initially unplanned civilian central structure has arisen, with coordinating functions far exceeding those of any other regional or universal international organization. A Council of Permanent Representatives of the member governments is in continuous session to work out details of joint policy or submit suggestions to the Council. It is assisted by a series of technical committees, staffed in part by governmental delegates and in part by members of the NATO Secretariat WHO TAKE DIRECTIONS FROM NO SINGLE GOVERNMENT. Policy emerges as a result of discussion among governmental delegates and independent experts and ceases, therefore, to be exclusively an intergovernmental compromise. (Emphasis ours)

Thus it is seen that unbeknown to a majority of the American people, there is actually functioning today a World Government organization which is now so confident of its imminent emergence as a supra-national government in control of the United States and other Western nations that it is now proclaiming its detailed plans via the mass communications media. For example: The Good Reading Rack Service Division of Koster-Dana Corporation is distributing to factories and industries an attractively illustrated booklet entitled "Vigilance, the Price of Liberty," which is fulsome in its praise of NATO. In this pamphlet, obviously written with the full cooperation of NATO, we find that information formerly denied Senator William Jenner is now being blatantly promoted. In this pamphlet, for example, it is proudly admitted that "NATO is more than a military alliance. It is building a community of like-minded nations."

And then the pamphlet goes on to list the various functioning committees under the North Atlantic Council, such as "military, political, economic, scientific, and many other civil questions."

How have the promoters of a Socialist-dominated One World government reached such a stage of success with their plans that the national sovereignty of the United States is now in serious jeopardy? What individuals and what organizations have paved the way

for this policy which may mean the end of the United States as a Constitutional Republic? How do members of the Council on Foreign Relations fit into the picture?

CHAPTER VI

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY — THE MASTER TRAP

At the turn of the last century, the United States was arising as the most prosperous, most respected, and most powerful nation on earth, with other nations seeking our favor and trying to imitate our growing industrial capacity, generated by the American Free Enterprise system. How would the American people have reacted at that time if a group of citizens formed an organization which proposed that the United States voluntarily give up its national sovereignty and turn over to an international organization composed of foreign nations the right to govern the United States of America and its citizens?

The answer is simple. An organization advocating such a preposterous proposal would have been "run out of town" or laughed out of existence!

And yet, in May, 1961, an organization composed of nationally known individuals proposed

-granting power to the (United Nations) General Assembly to make laws binding on individuals and national governments which prohibit manufacture, possession, or use of armament;
-conferring upon an expanded UN judiciary compulsory jurisdiction to interpret world laws. . . ; to try individuals accused of violating world laws governing disarmament and prohibiting aggression;
-establishing a system of enforcement of such UN law over all nations and individuals through inspectors, civilian police, courts, and armed forces;
-establishing the (United Nations) Security Council, minus the veto, as the civilian executive authority responsible to the General Assembly for controlling inspection, police, and armed forces;
-granting authority to the General Assembly to raise dependable revenue under a . . . limited taxing power;
-providing for universal membership without right of secession.

The foregoing are excerpts from the official policy statement approved at Chicago, Illinois, May, 1961, by the 15th General Assembly of an organization known as the United World Federalists. What the

United World Federalists propose is, by amending the Charter of the United Nations, to place the United States under the control of the Communist-dominated UN. In other words, the UWF proposes to bypass the U.S. Constitution and allow the UN World Court to interpret laws and to accuse and bring U.S. individuals to trial. They also propose to grant the UN taxing power over U.S. citizens, as well as the power to organize and maintain United Nations armed forces. UN forces could be quartered in the United States at any time in order to quell any protest which may arise: the UWF proposals clearly specify that no nation may reserve the right of secession. It should also be borne in mind that because the United World Federalists seek World Government through amending the whole UN Charter that any UN armed forces would, of course, consist in whole or in part of Communist troops, because of the membership of the Soviet Union and her satellites in the United Nations.

The average uninformed American, upon reading the foregoing excerpts from the proposals of the United World Federalists might be prone to comment, "What kind of Left-Wing extremists belong to a group advocating such anti-American policies?"

Official literature of the United World Federalists lists as its honorary president Norman Cousins, who is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Another CFR member prominently associated with United World Federalists is Clark M. Eichelberger*, Executive Director of the American Association for the United Nations.

Other prominent members of the UWF are Walter P. Reuther, G. Mennen Williams, Harry Overstreet, and Dore Schary.

Walter Reuther, Vice President, AFL/CIO, is listed as an honorary Vice President of the UWF.

Harry Overstreet**, author and self-proclaimed expert on how to

* Clark M. Eichelberger has been associated with 10 or more Communist-front organizations, as shown in Appendix II.

** Harry A. Overstreet is shown in the Eleventh Report, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, published by the 1953 Regular Session of the California Legislature, as having been associated with seven or more organizations or activities which have been cited as Communist fronts, or which have aided the Communist cause.

fight Communism, is listed as a member of the National Advisory Board of UWF.

Despite the fact that some prominent names are connected with the United World Federalists, and despite the fact that two members of the powerful Council on Foreign Relations hold official positions, the UWF is, fortunately for the survival of this nation as a Constitutional Republic, not only a small organization, but an ineffective one. Despite fifteen years since its formation in 1947, the UWF was able to circulate only "115,000 pieces of information and education literature" in 1961, according to its own report. On the other hand, during the same year, patriotic organizations throughout the country printed and distributed millions of pieces of literature in defense of the U.S. Constitution and exposing the aims of the promoters of One World Government.

Although the Council on Foreign Relations permitted two of its members to be associated with the United World Federalists in order to maintain an observer position, it is apparent now that the full force, finances, and influence of the Council on Foreign Relations for some years have been behind the Atlantic Union idea, originally spearheaded by Clarence Streit.

CLARENCE STREIT - MR. ATLANTICAN

Mr. Streit is not content to be an American. He has devoted his life in yearning to be an "Atlantican," a word frequently used in his writings, and presumably coined by him. An Atlantican, according to Mr. Streit, is a citizen of an "Atlantic Community" of nations where all national boundaries, and pride and love of country are erased, and man becomes a mere cell in an amorphous mass ruled by an all-powerful council in the name of "union."

With an aging hand Clarence Streit thus brushes aside the pages of history which contain the record of the millions of Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Americans who, through the centuries, have shed their blood in the fight against tyrannies besetting their individual countries; who have died in order to bear the proud name of "Englishman," "Frenchman," or "American."

Mr. Streit's disdain for national sovereignty is revealed in an article by him entitled "King Nation or King Citizen," which appeared in the April, 1955, issue of his magazine, FREEDOM &

UNION. In the November, 1961, issue of the same magazine, Clarence Streit goes on at length on his thesis of "citizen sovereignty." States Mr. Streit:

Before a federation could be made by the people of the Atlantic nations in peacetime, there would have to be a profound moral revolution among them, particularly in the stronger ones. They must not merely overthrow the principle of unlimited national sovereignty, which now has such a stranglehold on them, but replace it with the opposite principle of citizen sovereignty. . . . (Atlantic) Union means that they have put the Rights of Man above the Rights of Nations. . . .

Mr. Streit then employs the weird logic that by placing the Rights of Man above the Rights of Nations, citizens would then, as he puts it, "increase their own power over their government and lessen its power to interfere with their individual lives."

The illogic of the above philosophy of Atlantic Union is appalling. Any so-called rights given by an all-powerful government to its citizens can be withdrawn in the instant it takes to sign a governmental edict!

Clarence Streit's psychotic desire to remake the world to suit his views would be unworthy of public notice had his proposals not fitted neatly into the recommendations of the Council on Foreign Relations "to build a new international order," and "promote the solidarity of the Atlantic Community."*

The creation of an Atlantic Community peopled by Atlanticans must indeed be taken seriously in view of the fact, as we have mentioned, that the Atlantic Community idea is backed up by the millions of dollars at the disposal of the Council on Foreign Relations, via the giant tax-free foundations.

THE ATLANTIC UNION SCHEME

The leading proponent of Atlantic Union is, of course, Clarence K. Streit, whose book, "Union Now," first appeared in March, 1939, at which time Mr. Streit resigned his position as a correspondent for

* These CFR recommendations are contained in CFR Study #7, submitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as referred to in Chapter I.

the NEW YORK TIMES. Clarence Streit, a Rhodes scholar, was imbued with the goals of Cecil Rhodes, to incorporate the United States into the British Empire. After resigning from the NEW YORK TIMES, Mr. Streit served as President of Federal Union, Inc., an organization devoted to achieving the goals defined in "Union Now."

The activities of Federal Union, Inc., have, for the most part, been taken over by the Atlantic Union Committee, with Federal Union, Inc., largely confining its activities to the publication of the magazine entitled FREEDOM & UNION, of which Clarence K. Streit is editor.

The North Atlantic Treaty establishing NATO was lobbied through the Senate in 1949 by the Atlantic Union Committee, which was granted tax-exempt status retroactive to its birth, even though it was admittedly established for the purpose of lobbying for Atlantic Union proposals.

In testimony before a Senatorial committee in 1955, Associate Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan, who denied that he was a member of the Atlantic Union Committee, summarized the declared objectives of Atlantic Union as follows:

. . .to drive the United States into a political union with a number of European and other foreign countries with common citizenship, common foreign policy and defense establishment, unified currency, economic integration, and unrestricted immigration.

The late John O'Donnell, columnist for the NEW YORK DAILY NEWS, in discussing the statement by Associate Justice Harlan, commented on May 19, 1955, in his column:

Even the shadow of an idea that the Republic of the United States ought to give up its identity as a nation -- its flag, its armed forces, its currency, its citizens, and everything else, and throw them into a common pot with the beggarly and degenerate tribes of Europe is fantastic. . .

LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON ATLANTIC UNION

A pamphlet distributed in 1949 by the Atlantic Union Committee entitled "The Goal is Government of All the World," by Elmo Roper, CFR member, stated:

Several of us who have been interested in World Government for several years now have come together to form the Atlantic Union

Committee. Our objective in the Atlantic Union Committee is to have the Congress pass a resolution supporting the calling of a Constitutional Convention of . . . the Atlantic Pact sponsors . . . Such a resolution has already been introduced in the House and Senate. The Convention for which it calls would explore the possibilities of a political, economic and military union among the democracies in the Atlantic area.

The first Atlantic Union resolution was introduced in Congress in 1949. It was reintroduced in succeeding years but failed to win Congressional approval. In 1955 and 1956, this resolution (Senate Concurrent Resolution 12) was discussed extensively in hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which hearings were published in two parts entitled "Relating to the Calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention."

The revised draft of S. Con. Res. 12, in part, is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring):

1. That the President is requested to transmit to the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty the proposal of the Congress that they name delegates to meet in a convention with delegates from the United States and from such other democracies, wherever situated, as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations . . . achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic, and political affairs . . .

2. At such convention there shall be _____ delegates from the United States, at least two-thirds of whom shall be drawn from private life.

Testifying in 1956 against S. Con. Res. 12, Myra C. Hacker, representing the National Association of Pro America, stated:

Note the word "explore" in the resolution. The title this year has a new terminology, but the basic idea of the resolution is the same. The word "explore" is an example of camouflage to deceive the people. Just how much sense does it make to call a convention to explore the possibility of destroying our sovereignty, our Constitutional rights, and our Republic? It would be the equivalent of calling a convention to see how we as a people could best commit suicide.

Also testifying at the same Senate hearings, but, of course, in favor of S. Con. Res. 12, was Clarence K. Streit, Board of Governors, Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., who brought out the fact that

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had a small objection to the Atlantic Exploratory Convention resolution. Stated Mr. Streit:

Secretary Dulles' chief objection to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 was that it requested the President to call the convention, whereas Secretary Dulles held that the responsibility for calling it lies entirely with Congress.

Streit was only too willing to accept any modification of the resolution, just as long as it was passed by Congress, and he emphasized the point that the Atlantic Union Committee would welcome any amendments which "assure that the convention shall be a convention of private citizens, rather than a diplomatic conference." And then Mr. Streit went on to say:

. . . The amended text (of S. Con. Res. 12) stipulates that the delegates "shall not be subject to government restrictions, but shall act in accordance with their individual convictions."

Note Mr. Streit's emphasis on "private citizens," and the fact that the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 states that these private citizens "shall not be subject to government restrictions." The private citizens who would be delegated to represent the United States would, of course, be persons sympathetic to the idea of Atlantic Union. Such persons could easily be recruited from the ranks of the Atlantic Union Committee and the Council on Foreign Relations.

We have selected, and list below certain members of Atlantic Union, Inc., (according to the Senate Hearings on S. Con. Res. 12, July 25 and 29, 1955, pp. 107-119), who are also members of the Council on Foreign Relations*. (The positions shown are those held by each individual at the time of the 1955 Senate hearings):

Herbert Agar, former editor, LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL
Norman Armour, former ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State

Robert Woods Bliss, former ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State

Chester Bowles, former Governor of Connecticut

* According to the 1960 Annual Report of the Council on Foreign Relations, which appears in Appendix I.

Sevellon Brown, editor and publisher, PROVIDENCE (R.I.) JOURNAL AND EVENING BULLETIN

Percival F. Brundage, senior partner, Price Waterhouse & Co.
Arthur H. Bunker, president, Climax Molybdenum Co.

Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State; vice president, Atlantic Union Committee, Inc.

Gardner Cowles, publisher, LOOK Magazine

Cornelius de Kiewiet, president, University of Rochester, former provost, Cornell University

Dr. J. Frederic Dewhurst, director, Twentieth Century Fund

Cleveland E. Dodge, vice president, Phelps-Dodge Corporation

Maj. Gen. William L. Draper, Jr., former Under Secretary of Army and United States Special Representative in Europe

Ferdinand Eberstadt, president, F. Eberstadt & Co., former vice chairman, War Production Board

Professor William Yandell Elliott, professor of Government, Harvard University

E. A. Emerson, president, Armco International Corporation

Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., writer, motion picture actor, producer
John Henry Ferguson II, president, Monumental Printing Co., Baltimore

George S. Franklin, Jr., Attorney General of Nevada

Carlton P. Fuller, vice president, Polaroid Corporation

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College

Allen Grover, vice president, TIME, Inc.

Chauncey J. Hamlin, president, International Council of Museums

E. Roland Harriman, chairman of the board, Union Pacific Railroad

George Watts Hill, chairman of the board, Durham (N.C.) Bank & Trust Co.

Dr. Frederick Hovde, president, Purdue University

Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher, DENVER POST

Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University

Admiral Alan Goodrich Kirk USN (ret.), former Ambassador to Russia, Belgium, Luxembourg

Dr. Hans Kohn, professor of history, City College of New York; author

Professor Edward H. Litchfield, dean, School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University

Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, former president, Bucknell University, New Jersey

Frederick C. McKee, former national treasurer, American Association for the United Nations, Pittsburgh

Col. Francis Pickens Miller, retired, member, board of governors, Mary F. Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.

Dr. Clark B. Millikan, director, Daniel Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratory, California Institute of Technology

Don G. Mitchell, chairman of the board, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.

Hugh Moore, chairman of the board, Dixie Cup Co.

Malcolm Muir, president and publisher, NEWSWEEK

Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of Kansas

Dr. John W. Nason, president, Foreign Policy Association; former president, Swarthmore College

Thomas S. Nichols, chairman of the board, Mathieson Chemical Co.

Lithgow Osborne, former ambassador to Norway; Secretary, Atlantic Union Committee, Inc.,

William Phillips, former ambassador and former Under Secretary of State

Elmo Roper, marketing consultant and public-opinion analyst; Treasurer, Atlantic Union Committee, Inc.

Harry Scherman, president, Book of the Month Club

A. W. Schmidt, vice president, T. Mellon & Sons

Professor James T. Shotwell, president emeritus, Carnegie Endowment of International Peace

Hans Christian Sonne, chairman, National Planning Association, New York

Dr. William E. Stevenson, president, Oberlin College

Robert B. Stewart, dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts College, Massachusetts

Wayne Chatfield Taylor, former Under Secretary of Commerce

Dr. Edward Teller, atomic physicist, Chicago

Dr. Arthur R. Upgren, professor, Dartmouth College

Walter F. Wanger, motion picture producer, Walter Wanger Productions

Dr. Herman B. Wells, president, Indiana University

Despite pressures exerted on the Senate by the Atlantic Union Committee and other Internationalist groups, S. Con. Res. 12 did not pass the Senate in 1956. The year 1956 could be considered the "high water mark" for specific pressure to pass an Atlantic Union resolution by the frontal method. Realizing the growing public opposition to the United Nations and One Worldism, the CFR and the AUC decided, in football parlance, to employ the "end run" technique in order to achieve the objective of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention.

CONGRESS AUTHORIZES NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN MEETINGS

On July 11, 1956, Public Law 84-689, as amended, was approved. This authorized a delegation of selected members of Congress to meet with parliamentary groups from other NATO countries "for a discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area."

Meanwhile, in the hearings on S. Con. Res. 12 relating to the calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention, Senator Hubert Humphrey, a member of the CFR, revealed that:

The President of the United States, through the Secretary of State, has authorized our participation in further exploratory meetings on NATO through executive officials.

Therefore it is seen that although Congress did not pass any legislation calling for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention, nevertheless exploratory talks were being carried on regarding an Atlantic Convention by NATO Parliamentarians' Conferences, as well as at the diplomatic, or State Department level.

One of the favorite stratagems of the Liberal-Socialist-Internationalists is to go ahead on a plan or program for which they have not previously received Congressional approval, or for which Congress has specifically refused to grant official approval, all the while asserting that they are acting "unofficially."

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS SET UP ATLANTIC CONVENTION

After receiving Congressional authority for a delegation of Members of Congress to meet with parliamentary groups of North Atlantic area countries, the NATO Parliamentarians held a series of conferences, all with an aim to eventually setting up an Atlantic Convention of private citizens even though Congress had given no such authorization.

The first move in this direction was made by the Third NATO Parliamentarians Conference. A resolution unanimously adopted on November 16, 1957, instructed the NATO Parliamentarians' Standing Committee and Political Committee to arrange for a conference to be known as the Atlantic Congress, which was scheduled to be held in London in June, 1959. This resolution recommended that the NATO

governments bring about "a conference composed of leading representative citizens . . . to convene as often as necessary . . . and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose . . . within the Atlantic Community may be best developed."

The resolution proposed that the "members of the conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed." Even though the U.S. Congress made no move to officially appoint any representatives to the proposed Atlantic Congress, nevertheless 650 citizens of NATO countries, including, of course, U.S. citizens, attended the Atlantic Congress which met in London June 5 - 10, 1959. This was a deliberate by-pass of the U.S. Congress. The bringing together of these private citizens in 1959, under the auspices of the Atlantic Congress, was to implement and add authenticity to the recommendation of the Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference of 1957 calling for a conference composed of leading representative citizens of NATO countries to seek greater "unity of purpose" within the Atlantic Community.

The 650 private citizens of NATO countries which assembled at the Atlantic Congress in London in 1959 also passed a unanimous resolution to bring about "not later than Spring of 1960, a special conference composed of not more than 100 leading representative citizens, directed to convene . . . and to recommend . . . the means by which greater cooperation and unity may best be developed within the Atlantic Community."

An indication of the control exerted on the Atlantic Congress by the Council on Foreign Relations is the fact that the following CFR members are listed* as members of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Committee for the Atlantic Congress, Inc.:

William Benton	Dr. Franklin D. Murphy
Maj. Gen. William H. Draper, Jr.	Dr. Alfred C. Neal
Thomas K. Finletter	Paul Nitze
Ernest Gross	Lithgow Osborne
Senator Jacob Javits	Elmo Roper
Adolph W. Schmidt	

* Hearing entitled "Greater Cooperation Among Atlantic Democracies," before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Jan. 19, 1960, (p. 13).

Stepping up the pressure on Congress to authorize private-citizen participation in an Atlantic Community conference, the Fifth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, meeting in Washington five months after the Atlantic Congress London meeting, endorsed the resolution of the recent Atlantic Congress calling for a special conference to be composed of not more than 100 leading representative citizens.

Thus it is seen that the NATO Parliamentarians arbitrarily set up a citizen group which rubber-stamped the NATO Parliamentarians' original resolution. The Parliamentarians then endorsed the resolution of the private citizen group. The net result of this complicated procedure was the fact that under the expert manipulation of the Atlantic Union and the Council on Foreign Relations, the U.S. Congress was presented with a "fait accompli," i.e., by 1960 there was actually functioning a private citizens' group, the Atlantic Congress, Inc., closely cooperating with the NATO Parliamentarians for the purpose of setting up an Atlantic Convention.

It will be recalled that the Atlantic Congress meeting in London in 1959 was composed of 650 private citizens. This was, of course, too large a group for practical purposes. This accounts for the fact that the recommendation of the Atlantic Congress urged that NATO countries officially appoint representatives to an Atlantic Community conference, the total number of private citizens not to exceed 100.

By early 1960, the CFR-Atlantic Union forces were ready for the final push for enabling legislation through both houses of Congress, in order to legalize their previous activities. Congressional members opposing Senate Joint Resolution 170, which called for the creation of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, were faced with the unhappy choice of going along with what was clearly unconstitutional, or voting to embarrass their Congressional colleagues who had participated in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conferences which had instigated this entire "private-citizen-participation-in-NATO-Conferences" activity without prior Congressional approval.

It is interesting to note that whereas the CFR-controlled press, radio, and television make their total facilities available for the purpose of informing the nation of the Socialist-Internationalist position on such legislation as Foreign Aid, repeal of the Connally

Amendment (which amendment prevents the Communist-dominated United Nations World Court from ruling on U.S. domestic issues), the mass communications media made no effort to acquaint the American people with the background, aims, and future implications of the establishment of a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. The reason is obvious: The resolution was a "sleeper," designed to make official the previous actions of CFR "private citizens." The Republican Administration, under CFR member President Eisenhower, had no wish to inform the American people lest the people express their disapproval of this proposed sell-out of U.S. national sovereignty.

An indication of the scorn with which the hierarchy of NATO regard national sovereignty is a statement from the Atlantic Congress Report of June 5 - 10, 1959, prepared by the International Secretariat of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, which, as you will remember, was attended by 650 citizens from every NATO country except Iceland. Here is what can be considered NATO's view on national sovereignty:

The traditional concept of the sovereignty of our countries must not be regarded as something unalterable, like Holy Writ Hence the need for us to accept limitations of the sovereignty of our states (nations), limitations which are urgently called for by the overriding needs of our . . . well-being and our unity.

Because of the powerful pressure mobilized behind this bill, on August 24, 1960, the House of Representatives adopted S.J. Res. 170, which the U.S. Senate had passed June 15. Thus was officially created the United States Citizens Commission on NATO to participate with their counterparts in other nations in an international convention of representative citizens to examine how "greater political and economic cooperation" among their peoples might be promoted.

On September 7, 1960, S.J. 170 became Public Law 86-719, when it was signed by President Eisenhower. Needless to say, the Atlantic Union Committee exulted over this victory in which their members had played such a prominent part. The ATLANTIC UNION NEWS, publication of the Atlantic Union Committee, in its September, 1960, issue, described the favorable vote as an "incredible victory," and said that "had it not been for the existence of this committee, this would never have come to pass."

PLANS LAID FOR ATLANTIC CONVENTION

On November 26, 1960, the Sixth Conference of the NATO Parliamentarians, meeting in Paris, unanimously welcomed the enactment by the United States of Public Law 86-719, and urged other member governments to appoint "commissions similar to the United States Citizens Commission on NATO as soon as possible in order that arrangements for this (Atlantic) Convention may proceed."

A pamphlet by the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, entitled "The Atlantic Convention," states:

The first task of the Commission, once its organization had been completed, was to set in motion arrangements for the Convention. Essential to these arrangements was the creation of similar commissions by other NATO nations. To this end the Co-Chairmen of the Commission first communicated with the presiding officers of the NATO Parliaments As a result of these contacts, an International Parliamentary Committee, composed of representatives of the national commissionsdecided that the Convention should meet in Paris on January 8, 1962 for a session of about two weeks.

Proving that the newly-constituted United States Citizens Commission on NATO is merely another "creature" of the Council on Foreign Relations, it is interesting to note that the Co-Chairmen of this Commission are CFR members William L. Clayton and Christian A. Herter. The Vice Chairman is CFR member Elmo Roper. Other CFR members on the United States Citizens Commission on NATO are: Donald G. Agger, William A. Burden, Hugh Moore, Sr., and Adolph W. Schmidt.

INTERLOCKING PRIVATE CITIZENS COMMITTEES

In the next chapter we will discuss the Declaration of Paris which was adopted by the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations in Paris on January 19, 1962. However, before getting into that area, it would perhaps be well at this point to briefly outline the composition, function, and status of the plethora of citizen committees, staffed and controlled by the Council on Foreign Relations which now, to an alarming degree, have taken over the formulation, negotiation, and carrying out of the foreign policy of the United States of America, in

complete disregard of the U.S. Constitution. These members of The Establishment are, in fact, America's unelected rulers.

Atlantic Institute

A letter from Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson dated December 14, 1961, states:

The Atlantic Institute is an international non-governmental, voluntary organization of leading citizens from Western Europe, Canada, and the United States which was instituted by the Atlantic Congress in London in 1959. The purpose of the Institute is to work toward coordination of the national economic policies of our governments; toward the lowering of barriers to the movement of men, capital, goods, and ideas between our nations; etc.

Funds for current operations of the Atlantic Institute have been provided by private individuals and FOUNDATIONS . . . Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Director General of the Atlantic Institute has been granted a leave of absence from his position at TIME, Inc., in order to devote full time to these duties. (Emphasis ours)

The 1961 Annual Report of the Council on Foreign Relations lists Henry Cabot Lodge as a member. The following members of the Board of Governors of the Atlantic Institute are also members of the Council on Foreign Relations:

Will Clayton	William C. Foster
Dr. James B. Conant	Christian A. Herter
Lewis W. Douglas	Adlai E. Stevenson

The Atlantic Council of the United States, Inc.

The Atlantic Council of the United States, Inc., according to a letter dated January 16, 1962, from CFR-member Christian A. Herter, Chairman, represents the Atlantic Institute and the Atlantic Treaty Association. Thus it is, in effect, the "local" U.S. office of the international Atlantic Institute.

A letter dated April 3, 1962, from the United States Citizens Commission on NATO states that "the Commission will cease to exist in

June." The letter then recommends that for any further information, the Atlantic Council of the United States, Inc., be contacted.

The Atlantic Union Committee, Inc.

A letter dated January 9, 1962, on stationery of Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., states that "the Atlantic Union Committee is presently in the process of liquidation, having accomplished its primary purpose."

* * * *

Thus, after all of the foregoing devices and maneuvers, and because of the interlocking cooperation between the various CFR-controlled groups, the way was finally paved for the Declaration of Paris of January 19, 1962.

CHAPTER VII

THE DECLARATION OF PARIS

The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations was held in the International Conference Center in Paris, France, from January 8 to 20, 1962. The United States, as a member of NATO, was represented by members of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO. An official pamphlet of the Atlantic Convention declared that

The purpose of the Convention was to explore and recommend ways by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means.

Alexander Warden, a member of the United States Commission on NATO, in a statement reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1962, revealed the following sidelight of the Atlantic Convention:

Who voiced an invocation? Nobody. Here was an unexpected impasse. Christians and Moslems were sitting shoulder to shoulder. A standing moment of silence was the simple and sensible solution.

Here, then, was a conference of men who had traveled thousands of miles to formulate a proposed policy which would affect the lives of millions of people, but who did not openly seek Divine guidance in their deliberations. In his statement, Mr. Warden also disclosed some behind-the-scenes activities at the Atlantic Convention:

After the opening plenary sessions of the Convention, it was quite clear that there was a wide gap between two schools of thought. One favored plunging at once into a full-fledged Atlantic Union, complete with Charter, Constitution, Parliament, Judiciary, common currency, and common foreign policy. The other wanted to go more slowly, fearing uproar at home over abandoning suddenly so much of the popular concept of national sovereignty. The target was the same; the difference was in the timing.

Mr. Warden then summed up the Declaration of Paris which re-

sulted from the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations. Stated Mr. Warden in his analysis:

It declared for a true Atlantic Community in ten years, with the pattern for it to be spelled out in the next two years. Its resolutions were a blueprint for: (1) establishment of the nucleus of an executive authority on political, economic, military, and cultural matters, (2) legislative participation on questions of concern to the Atlantic Community, and (3) a NATO High Court of Justice for settling legal differences therein.

Christian A. Herter, Co-Chairman of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, and a member of the CFR, in addressing the Atlantic Convention on January 8 referred to the "necessary compression of our sovereignty" and also scornfully referred to "excessive insistence on complete and uncoordinated national freedom." His closing remarks urged his listeners to "break this spell of the magic of unlimited national autonomy."

Possibly the most ominous statement in Herter's address was the following:

Our gathering here to prospect an international breakthrough evidences growing confidence in the effectiveness of private efforts to improve the governance of men.

Mr. Herter thereby admits that the purpose of the previous twelve years of activity by the Atlantic Union promoters which culminated in the Atlantic Convention is to by-pass the U.S. Congress; and to place into the hands of private-citizen "experts" the reins of control over the American people. These private-citizen experts, unelected by the people would be beyond the power of the people to remove from office for policies which seek to subvert our Republic. Such un-Constitutional proposals would not need to be considered seriously were they not backed up by the billions of tax-free dollars at the disposal of the giant foundations who, acting in concert, are the driving force behind the World Government scheme.

WHAT DOES THE DECLARATION OF PARIS PROPOSE ?

The Preamble to the Declaration of Paris "demands" the creation of a true Atlantic Community which "must extend to the political,

military, economic, moral, and cultural fields.”

Under the Summary of Recommendations, Item 2, is found a proposal to

create as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic Community a permanent High Council at the highest political level to concert and plan, and in agreed cases to decide, policy on matters of concern to the Community as a whole

Note carefully that this “permanent High Council” of the Atlantic Community would have the power to “decide policy” on matters affecting members of the community. Clearly this would set the High Council above both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives so that, in effect, the Atlantic Community High Council could negate any action taken by our Congress which did not conform to the policy of the Atlantic Community. Or, for example, should the U.S. Congress refuse to legislate in certain fields the High Council could then “decide policy” in that area, policy which would affect the lives of American citizens, because presumably the United States would be a member of the Atlantic Community. This High Council would allow the American people no recourse regarding destructive edicts.

Item 3 of Part 1 entitled “Political and Economic Questions” recommends:

the creation of a High Court of Justice, reserved to the Atlantic Community, in order to settle legal differences between members and between members and the organizations arising from the interpretation and application of treaties.

Because of the loophole in the U.S. Constitution regarding treaties, such an Atlantic High Court of Justice could, through legal maneuvers, insinuate itself into the very fabric of law within the United States, superimposing its rulings and decrees over the rulings of the United States Supreme Court as well as lower Federal and State Courts.

Section C, entitled “Policies,” under the heading “Political and Economic Questions,” states:

The institutions of the Atlantic Community should harmonize those policies of its members affecting the interests of the Community as a

whole and contribute to the development of community methods in planning, considering and executing such policies.

The word "harmonize" should be considered "the mailed fist in the velvet glove," because in this case it means reducing all NATO nations to a common level, which, of course, would be lower than the standard-of-living level now enjoyed by citizens of the United States. "Executing" such policies of "harmony" means that such harmony will be enforced. Any independent action by any nation in its own best interests could immediately be decreed as "inharmonious" with the "interests of the community as a whole." This, of course, could be applied particularly to domestic matters.

Worthy of note is a phrase appearing in Item 2 under "Political and Economic Questions," which proposes that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference which spearheaded the drive for the Atlantic Convention "be developed into a consultative Atlantic Assembly, to meet at stated intervals . . . a permanent secretariat and an annual budget should be provided for the Atlantic Assembly to insure continuity. Members of the Atlantic Assembly would be selected by member governments . . . They need not necessarily be parliamentarians."

In other words, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conferences formerly restricted only to members of legislative bodies of their respective nations will open the door to unelected private citizens to become members of the Atlantic Assembly.

In discussing foreign trade, the Declaration of Paris states:

The Convention welcomes the spirit of President Kennedy's recent statement that a trade partnership should be formed between the United States and the European Economic Community (the Common Market) * * * * with progressive reduction in tariffs and other barriers to trade.

The Common Market, because it is such an integral part of the over-all plan to submerge the national sovereignty of the United States in a Socialist-dominated One World Government, will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Item 9 in the Summary of Recommendations proposes:

That the Atlantic Community take steps to help improve all their economies so that the proportionate economic and social potential of all will be less unequal.

This recommendation bears an ominously close resemblance to

Marxist philosophy. Also, there is the thinly-veiled implication that the "steps to help improve (Atlantic Community) economies" would actually involve complete price control and regimentation of industry.

CONTROL OF COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

Aware that any suggestion of tampering with the U.S. Constitution-guaranteed freedom of the press would bring cries of outrage from the American people, the Declaration of Paris, in Part II entitled "Moral and Cultural Questions" states that the Atlantic Community

. . . invites member countries to defend and promote the values and principles of civilization by means of education, publications, lectures, radio, the cinema and television.

The polite phrase of "promoting the principles of civilization" thus hides the fact that the Atlantic Community considers education and mass communications as coming under its jurisdiction. Further, with the mass communication media in the United States under the control of the Council on Foreign Relations, which master-minded the Atlantic Convention, it could be supposed that any public disagreement with the aims of the Declaration of Paris could, by the phraseology of this recommendation, be considered as opposing "the values and principles of civilization." It is doubtful, however, that in the final analysis the American people will accept the interpretation of "values and principles of civilization" advocated by the Declaration of Paris.

EDUCATING THE YOUTH

Looking forward to a world peopled by Atlanticans, the Atlantic Convention turned its attention to the youth of its member countries. Section B of Part II of the Declaration of Paris

. . . invites the Governments of NATO Nations, and such other countries as may be inspired by the same ideal, to convene an Atlantic Council consisting of Ministers of Education, Ministers for Scientific Affairs, cultural and educational authorities and representatives of universities and scientific research organizations . . .

The United States Constitution nowhere gives authority to the Federal Government in matters of education. The Tenth Amendment

to the U.S. Constitution reserves this right to the States respectively or to the people thereof in matters of educating America's youth. State governments are responsive to the will of taxpaying parents who, in this way have traditionally been able to exercise a modicum of decision and choice as to how their children shall be educated. Despite frequent attempts by the Federal Government to take over total control of education within the United States, such attempts, as of 1962, have met with firm opposition.

The wording of the section in the Declaration of Paris regarding education clearly indicates that if the Atlantic Community is established, it will, through an Atlantic Council consisting of Ministers of Education from the member nations, exercise supreme control in the educational field, by-passing and/or negating any Constitutional protection for the citizens of the member nations.

Interesting to note in this recommendation of the Declaration of Paris is the phrase "educational authorities and representatives of universities." Bearing in mind the millions of dollars which the Internationalist-oriented foundations have poured into universities throughout the United States, no question exists as to the political bias of these "educational authorities" who will make policy for the Atlantic Council of Ministers of Education.

To facilitate the takeover of the education of the youth of member nations, the Declaration of Paris recommends "organizing a bold Atlantic Plan for Youth and Education."

The Declaration of Paris gives as its reason for organizing the Atlantic Plan for Youth and Education the aim of "furthering the study of languages and the widest possible exchange of students, teachers, and youth leaders, and of workers in industry and agriculture."

This particular section of the Declaration of Paris perhaps unwittingly gives an inkling of the speciousness of their "aim of furthering the study of languages" (with the implied furthering of culture) when it includes the phrase "workers in industry and agriculture." Why should factory workers and farmers, who in their respective capacities are supporting their families and enjoying the benefits of the Free Enterprise system in America, go junketing off to other countries to study foreign languages?

The answer is obvious. The "bold Atlantic Plan for Youth and Ed-

ucation" is simply a device to recruit for brainwashing purposes "students, teachers, youth leaders, workers in industry and agriculture," and fashion them in the image of Atlanticians, mindless inhabitants of the proposed Atlantic Community.

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AT CONTROL SWITCH

It is significant that just before the final "General Resolution" of the Declaration of Paris urging that all delegates report the same to their respective governments, occurs this paragraph:

The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations recommends that these proposals be studied further by the Atlantic Institute in order to assist in the accomplishment of these tasks . . .

It will be recalled, as pointed out in Chapter VI, that the Director General of the Atlantic Institute is Henry Cabot Lodge, who (according to the 1961 Annual Report of the Council on Foreign Relations) is a member of the CFR. Further, it will be recalled that the following members of the Atlantic Institute are also members of the CFR: Will Clayton, Dr. James B. Conant, Lewis W. Douglas, William C. Foster, Christian A. Herter, and Adlai E. Stevenson.

It can thus be seen that the circus called the Atlantic Convention was for the purpose of giving the trappings of supposed legality to these long-promoted plans of the Council on Foreign Relations, with actual control remaining in the hands of the CFR.

* * * * *

EDITORIAL PRESS REACTION

It is sad to note that editorial reaction by Conservative members of the nation's press shows a dangerous ignorance of the implications of this Paris Declaration which can, and will, if implemented, destroy the national sovereignty of the United States. Senatorial hearings have been and are available to these editors, as they were available to the authors of this book. But nowhere did we find an analysis, warning, or protest of the implications of the Declaration

of Paris in editorials of Conservative daily newspapers within this country.

On the other hand, the NEW YORK TIMES, which can be considered the official organ and "echo chamber" of the Council on Foreign Relations, was ecstatic regarding the results of the Atlantic Convention which culminated in the Declaration of Paris. The NEW YORK TIMES editorialized:

. . . The idea of Atlantic Union is on the march The goal is no longer Utopian and begins to look like a historic inevitability.
* * * * The Declaration of Paris is a starting point on which to build the reality of a NATO extended far beyond its present military emphasis . . . Atlantic Union . . . can no longer be dismissed as an idle dream.

TWO YEARS WARNING

Clarence Streit's FREEDOM & UNION magazine, sharing the exultation of the NEW YORK TIMES, stated in an editorial in its February-March, 1962, issue:

Most of all, we welcome the (Atlantic) Convention's recommendation that the NATO governments "promptly establish a Special Governmental Commission to draw up plans within two years for the creation of a true Atlantic Community, suitably organized to meet the political, military and economic challenges of this era." This could permit the Commission to draft a Federal Constitution for an Atlantic Union.

And there it is -- spelled out! The grandiose, megalomaniacal plans of the One Worlders to govern the United States via the system of "High Councils" and "private citizens" -- all under the control of members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government . . .

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible . . .

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or only a very little, relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities . . .

Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalries, interests . . . or caprice?

— George Washington
First President of the
United States of American

The policy advocated by George Washington became the official policy of the United States. As a result, America flourished and became the greatest nation on earth. To the exact degree of deviation from the political philosophy of George Washington has the prestige of the United States deteriorated. Even in the face of continuing proof of the failure of Internationalist policies, the One Worlders continue to push their schemes on many fronts.

Contrast George Washington's stern and sensible warning with the fulminations of George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State in the Kennedy Administration:

*In a world where we must all unite or perish, there is no place for inward-looking economic Nationalism. We can no more retire into an economic fortress America than we can retire into a political fortress America.**

* State Department FOREIGN POLICY BRIEFS, Nov. 10, 1961.

What is the background of George W. Ball, author of the foregoing statement? He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Also, according to a syndicated column by Holmes Alexander, Ball was a partner in the law firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Ball, which has offices in New York, Washington, Paris, and Brussels. Upon his appointment to the highly influential post of Under Secretary of State, George Ball resigned from this firm.

The column by Holmes Alexander also states:

The firm, now Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen, is listed at the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as being the agent for the Common Market, the European Coal and Steel Community (and) the European Atomic Energy Community . . .

Mr. Alexander in discussing the barrage of propaganda being aimed at the American people for the "eventual purpose of taking the United States of America into the European Common Market," commented:

When Alexander Hamilton wanted to bring the separate States of the American Confederation under a Federal Constitution, he first brought the representatives together in Annapolis for a trade conference. He rightly reasoned that economic unity would lead to political unity.

Then Holmes Alexander continued:

The matter will be best understood, and not at all exaggerated, if we ask: Is the U.S.A. prepared to take steps that must inevitably lead to a decision to surrender our national sovereignty, first economic, and finally, political, by becoming a part of another union?

When the United Nations was founded in 1945, its proponents hoped that it could eventually be turned into a World Government organization. For this reason, the organizational set-up of the UN contained sections dealing with military, economic and political matters. However, because the Soviet Union was a member of the United Nations, and possessed a veto, the UN was able to take only such action as was not displeasing to the Soviet Union and its bloc satellites. Under such conditions the interests of the Free World obviously were not being served. But more than that -- the One Worlders were becoming aware of a growing distrust, distaste and revulsion over the lack of UN action in some cases (the rape of Tibet, and the massacre of the Hungarian patriots by tanks of the Soviet Union), or by its action in other cases (among them, the UN brutal aggression against the

independent nation of Katanga in 1961).

The One Worlders realized that public protest within the United States could reach such a point that pressure would be brought by the voters on Members of Congress not to vote any more appropriations in support of the United Nations. Without financial support by the United States, the United Nations would be unable to continue functioning.

Not to be deterred from their driving compulsion to create a One World Government, the Socialist-Internationalists, operating through the experts of the Council of Foreign Relations, set about the task of fashioning a series of executive agreements, treaties, and regional organizations which would be unaffected should the Communist-dominated United Nations collapse.

This chapter deals with the economic policies and organizations formulated by the World Planners. It will be recalled that in the Foreword, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a Special Assistant to President Kennedy, wrote in a 1947 magazine article:

Socialism appears quite practical as a long-term proposition The active agents in effecting the transition will probably be, not the working class, but some combination of lawyers, business and labor managers, politicians and intellectuals * * * * Socialism . . . must be brought about step by step, in a way which will not disrupt the fabric of custom, law and mutual confidence . . . that is, the transition must be piecemeal; it must be parliamentary.

In commenting upon the ultimate aims of World Socialism, Senator Strom Thurmond stated on the floor of the Senate on August 10, 1961:

Since Marxist Socialists share the ultimate goal of the Communists, their opposition to Communism is limited They want World Socialism, controlled by themselves, not Russians, or Chinese The Socialists look forward to an international Socialist order, just as the Communists do, except that they, the Socialists, are dedicated to the evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, approach. The Socialists do not oppose subversion, for it can promote the evolutionary process toward a world Socialist order. The Socialists join with the Communists in discouraging the inculcation of patriotism, for patriotism is a form of nationalism which impedes the establishment of World Socialism.

The biggest stumbling block to World Socialism, from either evolutionary or revolutionary methods, is the political and economic

structure of the United States, diluted to some extent with Socialism as it is.

EUROPEAN REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Ever since the Confederation of the thirteen American colonies into the United States of America, there have been advocates of a similar such arrangement which would be known as the United States of Europe.

Only within recent years, however, have such advocates achieved a degree of success in their plans for a European unification along both economic and political lines. Although the organizations which will be discussed in this chapter are primarily European in character, because they are, for the most part, formed along economic lines, America's interests are affected in the matter of trade between the two continents. If the ultimate aim of these European economic associations were restricted solely to matters of trade, American citizens would need to feel no great cause for alarm. However, as will be shown, the matter of trade is the mere opening wedge, the real purpose being another gradual step toward the integration of the United States economy with that of Europe - as well as a first step toward a centralized international governing power.

ORGANIZATION FOR EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION (OEEC)

In 1948 the OEEC, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, was established to enable Western European countries to coordinate the economic policies of its members and to plan for the utilization of Marshall Plan aid. The OEEC had the responsibility for proposing a proper division of United States assistance funds in order to rebuild post-war Europe. Within the OEEC's framework a trade liberalization program was formulated whereby OEEC members undertook, more or less simultaneously, to relax their import restrictions on one another's goods.

THE EUROPEAN COAL AND STEEL COMMUNITY (ECSC)

In May, 1950, Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, proposed the creation of a Community to embrace the coal and steel re-

sources of France, Germany (and any other European country willing to participate) and the institution of a high authority whose decisions would be binding on the whole Community. The treaty instituting the European Coal and Steel Community was signed in Paris on April 18, 1951, and came into force for a period of 50 years on July 25, 1952, after the deposit of the instruments of ratification by the six member nations: Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

According to a pamphlet entitled "Towards European Integration," of November, 1961, published by British Information Services, an agency of the British Government:

The specific aims of the ECSC as defined in the body of the treaty are economic -- to promote industrial expansion by creating a common market in coal and steel, i.e., by doing away with the discriminatory and restrictive practices both between states (nations) and internally, which impeded their rational supply and distribution. The Preamble to the Treaty, however, stresses its political significance as a move toward European unity.

In order to implement the ECSC's program, a complex structure of institutions was set up. There is a nine-man executive body known as the High Authority, with over-all responsibility for the operation of the Community. Its members are appointed by the governments of its members, but once selected they are expected to act not as representatives of the member governments, but rather, as officials of a supranational organization. The High Authority possesses substantial powers. These include the power to finance the operations of the Community through taxes levied on coal and steel enterprises, the power to levy fines when treaty provisions are violated, and the right to inspect the books of all the enterprises of which the community is composed.

This, then, is what a "Community" really means -- over-all, completely centralized, Socialist control.

There is also a Court of Justice according to the treaty "to insure the rule of law in the interpretation and application of the . . . Treaty and of the regulations for its execution."

In addition there is a Council of Ministers, made up of members of the cabinets of the member nations, plus a Common Assembly,

composed of delegates from the parliaments of the six member countries.

As we shall see presently, the organizational set-up of the European Coal and Steel Community is of particular interest, since it serves as a model for, and in some cases is shared by, the European Economic Community (EEC), commonly known as the Common Market.

EUROPEAN DEFENSE COMMUNITY (EDC)

Over-enthusiastic about the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community, the six member nations negotiated a treaty to form a European Defense Community (EDC). This would have called for the surrender to a supranational agency of a considerable degree of political independence and national control of security policies.

However, sufficient political opposition to the EDC was developed, to the point that the French parliament in August, 1954, rejected this Treaty which would have seriously menaced the national sovereignty of France. This was quite a setback to the "European unity" advocates, who thereupon decided that the frontal approach of supranational organizations would have to be scrapped in favor of the more oblique approach of "economic unity," with political unity to come after the individual nations had been sufficiently entangled and embroiled in the net of economic unity.

In order to channel all unity efforts into the direction of economic integration, Paul-Henri Spaak, the Foreign Minister of Belgium, was put in charge of an intergovernmental group to make plans for the next step. In late 1955 and 1956, a detailed Spaak report was prepared in which proposals for a Common Market and an Atomic Energy Community were set forth. From this emerged the Treaties of Rome.

THE TREATIES OF ROME

On March 25, 1957, six nations (France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands) signed what are known as the Treaties of Rome. These two treaties, like the treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community, provide for appli-

cations from other European countries wishing to join the Community or to enter into an agreement of association with it.

The Rome treaties were ratified by the participating governments during the summer and fall of 1957, and entered into effect on January 1, 1958.

EUROPEAN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY (EURATOM)

One of the "communities" set up by the Rome Treaties was EURATOM, the European Atomic Energy Community, which like the European Coal and Steel Community established in 1952, is restricted to one segment of the economy - in this instance, nuclear energy. Under EURATOM, research on the atom will be carried on and technology will be developed for the "peaceful use of nuclear energy."

However, a scientist associated with the Brookhaven National Laboratory stated before a Congressional committee on March 8, 1956:

You cannot distinguish military from peacetime considerations when it is a matter of high-powered reactor producing plutonium.*

Even Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, CFR member, has admitted:

The manufacture of atomic energy for peace, in any plants that I have heard discussed, would make material latently, which could be used for war.*

The EURATOM Treaty established a common market in fissionable materials and in certain nuclear equipment.

Lawrence Griswold, now representing Kessings Contemporary Archives, a British documentary research service, discussed EURATOM in March 23, 1962, issue of FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE DIGEST**:

It is irrelevant that EURATOM is located in Brussels, although when it was set up as an international organization, the Belgian Congo was the greatest source of uranium in the world. EURATOM

* These two quotations are excerpts from a Resolution adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at its 66th Continental Congress, April 15 - 19, 1957.

** Editor, Maj. Gen. C. A. Willoughby.

would control the stockpiles of the Western World, not only for war, but also for the uses of peace. . .

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC) - THE COMMON MARKET

The second treaty signed in Rome March 25, 1957, established the European Economic Community, also known as the Common Market. The same nations signing the EURATOM Treaty also signed, and later ratified, the Treaty of Rome setting up the Common Market. These six nations are not only members of GATT, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, of which the United States is a member through Executive Agreement, but are also members of NATO.

The Common Market is a broad plan for the merging of the economies of its six member nations over the 12 to 15 year period beginning January 1, 1958. The fundamental process involved is the reduction, and finally abolition, of protective tariffs and trade quotas between the member nations, a process that, by stages, will make the six separate national economies into one large Common Market.

THE CFR, THE CED, AND THE EEC

The Council on Foreign Relations is, as could be expected, intensely concerned with the European Economic Community. While its members occupying high positions in the Kennedy Administration are actively promoting the idea of "European unity," the Committee for Economic Development, an appendage of the Council on Foreign Relations, is promoting the "European unity" theme from a U.S. domestic standpoint, directing its propaganda to U.S. businessmen. The 1960 Annual Report of the Committee for Economic Development states:

CED is an organization of 200 businessmen and educators whose primary function is to use objective research to determine private and public policies which will promote economic growth . . .

Here again is another organization made up of private citizens, but in this case blatantly admitting that one of their functions is to "determine . . . public policies." It is, of course, not surprising that

9 of the 14 members of the Executive Committee of the Committee for Economic Development are also members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

A booklet entitled "The European Common Market & Its Meaning to the United States," published by the Committee for Economic Development in 1959, in discussing the implications of the Common Market, states:

. . . It would be a serious mistake to regard the Market as only a commercial treaty among nations that are and intend to remain independent. The economic provisions go far beyond trade liberalization, and have profound political implications. A real surrender of sovereignty is required.

With an eye to what can be expected in the future from the Common Market, the CED booklet then goes on to say:

Common Market institutions, legislative, executive and judicial, will be established with authority to make and carry out policy in certain matters. They will operate, in part, by majority vote, not by unanimity. It is possible that they may, in the future, be partly directly elected by the people, not chosen by the governments of the member states (nations).

Again we see, spelled out in unequivocal language, the line of the CFR-CED Internationalists and their long-range plan of subverting national governments. This would appear to be in accord with the "citizen sovereignty instead of national sovereignty" scheme proposed by Clarence Streit.

With national governments being completely by-passed, their power would quickly atrophy and wither away, leaving a community of nation-less citizens.

Even the small sop to citizens put forth by the Committee on Economic Development that officials of the Common Market legislative, executive and judicial institutions would be "partly directly elected by the people," can be negated, inasmuch as the CED booklet, in discussing the Common Market Treaty further states that a "framework has been provided for amendments to the Treaty." In this way, by amendment, all officials of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the Common Market could be declared to be "appointive" posts only.

PROVISIONS OF THE COMMON MARKET TREATY

Following is a summary of some of the provisions of the Treaty of

Rome which established the Common Market:

- ... Removal of customs duties and import and export quotas by the member nations;
- ... Establishment of a common tariff and commercial policy for nations outside the Community;
- ... Abolition within the Community of obstacles to the free movement of persons, services and capital;
- ... Inauguration of common agricultural and transport policies;
- ... Establishment of a system "insuring" competition;
- ... Creation of a European Social Fund for education and training of displaced workers;
- ... Establishment of a European investment bank to facilitate economic expansion.
- ... Coordination of monetary and fiscal policies.

FREE MOVEMENT OF LABOR

In the Treaty of Rome which established the Common Market, Chapter I, entitled "The Workers" (Articles 48-51), provides (in summary):

The "free movement of workers" includes the right to:

- (a) Take a job that is actually offered;
- (b) Move freely throughout the Community for that purpose;
- (c) Stay in a country after having held a job there.

The Common Market Treaty goes on to say that these provisions will be implemented to "establish a clearinghouse for job offers and requests," and then states that the Council (of the EEC) will adopt social security measures so that "social security benefits will be cumulative no matter in which country the work is performed," and that "benefits will be payable anywhere in the Community."

Under the foregoing provisions of the Common Market Treaty, in addition to trade barriers being lowered, immigration barriers will be likewise lowered to such an extent that any member nation will be unable to protect itself against an invasion of foreign labor, competing for the jobs of the nation's citizens.

Note the provision of the "right" of workers to "stay in a country after having held a job there." This could be interpreted to mean

that large masses of unemployed workers could migrate to another country, hold a temporary job in that country, and then automatically become permanent residents. Under this set-up there would be no immigration restrictions regarding their individual moral backgrounds or health qualifications.

Nor would the ability of an immigrant to earn a living (and thus not become financially dependent upon the government of the host nation) be considered as a determining factor.

The latter point is anticipated in that portion of the Common Market treaty which provides for the creation of a European Social Fund for "training of displaced workers." Thus, member nations of the EEC will be saddled with their share of the EEC Social Fund for the support and training of displaced workers emigrating from one country to another; the cost of all such training, of course, to be ultimately borne by the taxpayers of all member nations of the Common Market.

Another ominous aspect of the provisions dealing with "free movement of workers" is that should the government of any of the member nations be infiltrated or taken over by a Communist coup d'etat, the "work force" sent by that nation to another member nation could be active Communist agents, bent upon overthrowing the government of the other EEC nation. The recipient nation, under the Common Market Treaty, would not only be powerless to protect itself in such a case, but would actually be assessed social security for such provocateurs.

Such implications regarding the potential threat of free movement of a working force cannot be considered an exaggeration in the light of increased Communist influence on the governments of Italy and France, both members of the European Economic Community.

As noted previously the Common Market would also "establish a clearinghouse for job offers and requests." Although this provision is intended to apply to the immigrant labor force only, once a member nation has the power to control any segment of labor, it would not be difficult to extend such control even to its native citizens. This could result in government issuance of work permits to all workers. The government would thereby assume the power of life or death over individual laborers. For example, should the political views of any individual member of a government-controlled

labor force not coincide with those of the government, his work permit could be withdrawn, thus denying him the right to earn a living for his family and put food in the mouths of his children.

SUBSIDIZATION AND CONTROL OF AGRICULTURE

The booklet by the Committee for Economic Development, in discussing the provision of the Common Market regarding agriculture, states:

A common agricultural policy is to be established. It is clearly intended that agriculture will continue to be controlled and subsidized.

The March, 1962, issue of ENCOUNTER, a British Left-Wing magazine, analyzes the agricultural provisions of the Common Market as follows:

The European Community is going to establish a completely managed system of production, distribution and pricing of food in which market forces will be kept under very strict control.

EXPANDING THE CARTEL SYSTEM

The CED booklet referred to heretofore summarizes the section of the Rome Treaty entitled "Rules Governing Competition" (Articles 85-94) as follows:

The general principle is that all agreements between enterprises and decisions by associations of enterprises . . . which prevent, restrict or distort competition . . . are forbidden.

At first glance this would appear to forbid the formation, continuation or expansion of trade monopolies or cartels in certain fields of industry. However, it is obvious that the above provision is "window dressing" for public consumption only, because the CED booklet then immediately qualifies the forgoing statement by continuing:

There is a large exception to this principle, however. Agreements which contribute to the improvement of production or distribution, or which promote technical or economic progress, are permitted.

Strange to say, the CED's booklet describes this guarantee of protection for the continuance and expansion of cartels and monopolies as "a system of insuring competition." It is easy to understand the

great interest that the Rockefeller financial enterprises with their world-wide holdings and cartel arrangements would have in the European Common Market, or any Common Market.

What does "monopoly" or "cartel" mean? Webster's "New Collegiate Dictionary" defines "cartel" as follows:

An association of private business organizations bound by contracts to cooperate in regulating production and marketing of products, thus tending to restrict world markets and fix prices.

Under the Treaty of Rome the European Economic Community will have the power to decide and allocate markets and areas of industry to favored producers. For example, in the interest of "improvement of production or distribution," one member nation may be assigned the exclusive right of manufacturing locomotives while another member nation would have the exclusive right to manufacture ships.

Another aspect of the over-all control over individual businesses which will be exercised by the EEC is that manufacturers could in some cases lose the right of decision as to what products they will be permitted to manufacture. The High Council of the EEC will make that decision, and will so inform the manufacturer who, if he wishes to continue in business, must conform.

The same system of assigning spheres of "competition" could likewise apply to the dividing up of the raw materials in the undeveloped areas. This accounts for the unseemly stress which the Internationalists put on the undeveloped areas of the world. It is simply a matter of which firms are to exercise control over certain specific raw materials.

In order to facilitate and increase the system of cartelization in Europe, it should be noted that the Rome Treaty establishes a European investment bank to facilitate economic expansion. The British Right-Wing newsletter, CANDOOR, in its December 1, 1961, issue, in discussing the implications of the Common Market, states:

All this will be done on the pretext of liberalizing trade. But the real motive behind the Common Market is the drive for political and economic monopolies.

Amplifying the above statement, the Right-Wing SOUTH AFRICAN OBSERVER of October, 1961, declares:

Centralized financial control is, of course, the main weapon being used to force economic and political centralization.

ORGANIZATIONAL SETUP OF THE EEC

The primary administrative institutions of the European Economic Community are:

- (a) A Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers is composed of one member from each of the Common Market countries. The function of the Council of Ministers is to coordinate economic policies of members and DECIDE important issues.
- (b) The Commission. The Commission is the administrative organ of the Community; it recommends action to the Council of Ministers and also makes decisions in some cases, as provided in the Treaty of Rome.
- (c) The Assembly. As of 1962, with 6 European nations comprising the EEC, the membership is set at 142 delegates chosen by the parliaments of the 6 member nations. Its function is to review and debate problems of the Community.

The Committee for Economic Development's booklet on the subject of Common Market, previously mentioned, brings out an interesting point regarding the Assembly, stating:

The Assembly will review (but cannot reject) Council and Commission proposals in cases where the Treaty so provides. It may censure the Commission by a two-thirds majority of those present and an absolute majority of the membership, and thereby force the Commission to resign.

Surely the above statement verifying the fact that the Assembly can review, but cannot reject, proposals of the all-powerful Council of Ministers and the Commission would indicate that again we have an example of "window-dressing" for public consumption, in order to hide the fact that all power is actually concentrated in the Council of Ministers.

- (d) A Court of Justice. As provided by the Treaty of Rome, the full court will consist of 7 judges. However, it may also sit in panels of 3 or 5 in certain instances.

It will be recalled that earlier in this chapter we discussed the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). For purposes of clarification, let us repeat that the same 6 European nations are members

of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), EURATOM, and the Common Market (EEC). Because they share the same membership and closely cooperate, the Treaty of Rome provided for a certain consolidation in order to eliminate duplicative organizations. For example, the European Coal and Steel Community, EURATOM, and the European Economic Community are all under the same Council of Ministers. Likewise, the Court of Justice serves as legal adjudicator for the three Communities. In the legislative field, all three communities share the same European Parliamentary Assembly. However, at the executive level, directly under the Council of Ministers, the three Communities have separate organs, i.e., the High Authority of the ECSC, the Commission of the European Atomic Energy Community, and the Commission of the European Economic Community, all functioning as distinct entities.

HOW WILL THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AFFECT THE U.S.?

In early 1962, leading spokesmen for the Council on Foreign Relations, both within and outside the government, as well as members of the CFR-controlled news media began a massive propaganda campaign urging that President Kennedy be given executive power to unilaterally reduce tariffs in order to compete with the European Common Market. An example of this propaganda line was voiced by a State Department spokesman in an address before the Texas Group of Investment Bankers on April 9, 1962, to wit:

As the tariffs among the members of the EEC move toward zero, and the external tariff becomes standardized, American companies selling in Italy, for example, will be at a disadvantage as compared with, say, German companies, because American imports into Italy will have to pay the tariff while German imports will not.

The State Department spokesman then went on to point out how Common Market tariffs will "discriminate against American exports in favor of internal EEC trade."

Those who propose wiping out U.S. tariffs in order to be able to compete with the European Common Market countries conveniently overlook the fact that during the last 28 years, when increasing numbers of American workingmen and American industries badly needed some form of protection, our government gradually reduced our im-

port duties by 77%. By 1962, U.S. import duties were the lowest of any major industrial nation. While advocating the reduction of trade barriers, Great Britain and others quietly increased their tariffs on many items. While U.S. tariffs were going down, theirs were going up.

During the years 1950 to 1960, U.S. imports from Europe increased by 300%, while U.S. exports rose by only 112%. It would appear there is no need to further reduce tariffs in the face of such statistics.

Foreign nations are eager to sign Reciprocal Trade agreements with the United States. However, as soon as American imports begin to hurt their local industries, or as soon as new factories (built by U.S. Foreign Aid funds) are ready to go into operation in their countries, foreign nations resort to such devices as tightening up on currency exchange, the issuance of import licenses, etc. Thus, while not actually breaking their Reciprocal Trade agreements with the U.S., such countries effectively manage to keep out U.S. goods which would compete with their own products.

Accordingly, any agreement made with Common Market countries to reduce tariffs against their products in order to facilitate the export of U.S. products to the EEC nations could immediately be "amended" by the Council of Ministers which governs the EEC whenever such U.S. exports cause injury to the economy of an EEC nation.

Actually, the reason behind the propaganda push in favor of wiping out U.S. tariffs has very little to do with the tariff question. The question at stake is: To what extent will the United States cooperate with or participate in the European Common Market?

On February 22, 1962, in an address made at Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, stated "It is not our intent to join the Common Market."

The statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk should be taken to mean exactly the opposite. In other words, as will be proven later, Secretary of State Rusk envisages a far deeper involvement with European nations than that which would be provided by merely joining with the European Common Market for trade purposes.

CHAPTER IX

ECONOMIC INVOLVEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES VIA OECD

In Chapter VI entitled "Atlantic Community - The Master Trap" we traced the various seemingly parallel organizations whose guiding hand, for the most part, was the Council on Foreign Relations. In that chapter, mention was made of the Atlantic Congress, composed of 650 citizens of NATO countries, which met in London during June, 1959, for the purpose of making arrangements to set up the Atlantic Convention which took place in Paris in January, 1962.

Not generally known is that fact that this same Atlantic Congress also unanimously urged the governments of NATO countries to give consideration to the possibility of "transforming the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) into an organization for Atlantic economic cooperation in which all the Atlantic countries would hold full membership."

The unanimous report of the Atlantic Congress then urged that this proposed organization should "give immediate and urgent attention to the closer unity of the European Economic Community (Common Market) with the other economies of Western Europe and the Free World." It also recommended that the proposed organization "coordinate national policies and develop cooperative policies for accelerating the economic progress of developing areas of the Atlantic Community and of the world."

Only 21 months were to pass before this proposal by the citizen-delegates of the Atlantic Congress reached the proportions of a treaty which the United States Senate was called upon to ratify. On March 16, 1961, the treaty setting up this new international organiza-

tion, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was ratified by the United States Senate by a vote of 72-18.

CFR member Senator Jacob Javits of New York, in the debate on the floor of the Senate prior to the ratification, termed the OECD:

. . . a tribute to bipartisanship because it was developed upon the initiative of Douglas Dillon* in the Eisenhower* Administration. The Convention is now being implemented during the administration of President Kennedy . . .

Senator Javits then went on to say that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development "was intended to be, and is essentially, a consultative body."

The following documentation on the OECD would indicate Javits was in error.

BACKGROUND OF THE OECD

Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, George C. McGhee*, according to the Department of State BULLETIN, January 22, 1962, in tracing the chronology of OECD, stated:

A decade after NATO was founded, another step was taken toward Atlantic-wide cooperation on an institutional basis. The OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), offspring of the Marshall Plan and embracing only European countries, was reorganized in 1960 as the OECD - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development - including 18 European states, the United States and Canada. With it is associated, for purposes of coordination of aid programs, the Government of Japan.**

John S. Stillman, Deputy to Under Secretary of State George Ball, described the purposes of the OECD in a speech January 20, 1962, as follows:

The OECD is designed for the tasks of the sixties by providing a forum for consultation, aimed at maximizing the member nations'

* Douglas Dillon, President Eisenhower and Under Secretary of State McGhee are CFR members.

** The entire membership list of the OECD, as of date of ratification by the Senate, March 16, 1961, was as follows: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Western Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Great Britain, Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

economic growth, at aiding the less developed countries to achieve sound economic expansion, and at contributing to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral, non-discriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations. OECD's Council of Ministers has stressed the need to reduce trade barriers between its member states and between the OECD countries and the rest of the world.

It is interesting to note the similarity between the European Common Market and the OECD. The European Coal and Steel Community, EURATOM and the European Common Market all operate under one Council of Ministers; the OECD likewise has a Council of Ministers. One purpose of both the European Common Market and the OECD is to reduce trade barriers.

One difference, however, between the European Communities and the OECD is that the United States belongs to the OECD, as does Canada, while neither belong to the EEC.

Another striking similarity between the OECD and the European Common Market is the OECD's apparent preoccupation with atomic energy. The OECD's Preparatory Committee recommended participation of the Commission of EURATOM in the work of the OECD's European Nuclear Energy Agency.

Another recommendation of the OECD Preparatory Committee urges the "liberalization of manpower movements" and "the abolition of entry visas for nationals of Member countries traveling to their place of work."

Both of the above recommendations of the Preparatory Committee of OECD parallel the functions of EURATOM and the European Economic Community. The reason for such duplication of functions and institutions within these organizations, or "communities," would appear to be twofold: (1) to guarantee that should either structure fail because of lack of public support, or awareness by the public of its ultimate aim, the counterpart organization would still be in existence; and (2) as stated earlier, this is one way of specifically involving the United States, without seeming to do so, directly in the activities of the European Economic Community.

Another aim of the OECD, according to the Convention, is to

. . . contribute to sound economic expansion in Member as well as non-member countries in the process of economic development.

What this means is that the OECD, composed of 19 foreign nations, would arrogate unto itself the power to decide what amount of U.S.

Foreign Aid was needed in order to promote "sound economic expansion" of "non-member countries in the process of economic development." These recommendations by Foreign Aid "experts" of the OECD would then be presented to the U.S. Congress to appropriate the necessary funds. Of course, there would be the implication that through the OECD Treaty the U.S. had already been "committed," and therefore the only detail lacking was an appropriation by Congress so that the U.S. could not be accused before the world of not living up to its "obligations." This accounts in some measure for the great emphasis on "long-term" Foreign Aid which has in the past few years been urged upon Congress.

Another reason for bringing Foreign Aid under the aegis of a treaty, duly ratified by the United States Senate, is to put Foreign Aid beyond the control of Congress, inasmuch as the treaty loophole in the U.S. Constitution provides that treaties shall be the "supreme law of the land."*

The establishment of the OECD thus can be seen as a maneuver to saddle the U.S. taxpayers permanently with assessments for Foreign Aid, even though Congress might wish to defeat a Foreign Aid bill in the future.

An indication of the fear of the Internationalists that the United Nations might founder was brought out in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate prior to the ratification of the OECD Treaty, when Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont, asked the question:

Is the base of this convention broad enough so that if the United Nations foundered, the OECD, with a compatible membership, could take over many of the economic functions now performed by the United Nations?

To this question, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, CFR member, replied, "Well, I think it is broad enough to do anything of that nature. . ."

Secretary Dillon's statement thus clarifies the actual scope of OECD, which was promoted as a "consultative" program only.

As of the date of ratification of the OECD, the United States, with one vote, was one of 20 members. However, Congressman James C.

* Article VI, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

Davis of Georgia brought out the point that under Article 16, the OECD could be enlarged to 100 members, and "our influence and voting power in it would be diluted just to whatever extent additional members were admitted."

A report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations states that one of the OECD's basic purposes is "to promote orderly economic growth within its 20-member Community."

Special note should be taken of the phrase "orderly economic growth," which could be understood to mean "regulated" economic growth - in contrast to the efficient economic growth of the United States under the Free Enterprise system.

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER (No. 515)* of November 15, 1961, in describing what "orderly economic growth" within underdeveloped nations can mean referred to a speech by George Ball, Under Secretary of State, and then commented:

He (George Ball) said that if we are going to give development capital to "underdeveloped nations" it will be necessary for us to help them market their produce. Their work will be mostly in the primary industries like textile, mining and like manufacture. Advanced nations, like the United States, should willingly abandon these industries to the underdeveloped nations, though textiles is our second largest employer. Of course our government would have to compensate our abandoned industries and help transfer them to new activities. The machinery for such Federal intervention in industrial growth has already been voted by Congress in the Area Re-development Bill. The Federal Government can now create depressed areas to its heart's content and buy off the opposition of industry, labor and local government officials with its "development assistance" for Americans. Under Secretary Ball's statement leaves no doubt of the goal - the United States is to give up its economic boundaries and let itself be merged with the world economy, without any ability to protect itself except through aid provided from Washington by the Planners.

In the token debate preceding the ratification of the OECD Treaty, a few Senators, apparently having been contacted by members of industries which would be grievously injured by the lowering of tariff

* ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER, published by National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Ave., Suite 1100, New York 10, N.Y.

barriers, complained that this treaty would encroach upon the right of Congress to regulate tariffs. Overlooked, however, was the fact that a large portion of the power of Congress to regulate tariffs had previously been delegated by Congress to the President.

The proponents of OECD, wishing to stifle any and all opposition to the ratification of the treaty, and being prepared for such objections after having heard testimony from businessmen's groups, inserted the following qualifying phrase into the OECD Treaty:

...that nothing in the Convention, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, confers any power upon the Executive to bind the United States in substantive matters beyond what the Executive now has, or to bind the United States without compliance with applicable procedures imposed by domestic law, . . . or limits Congress in the exercise of any power it now has.

Reading between the lines of the above so-called "protective" clause in the treaty clearly indicates that the OECD proponents are well aware that Congress has, in previous sessions, abdicated to the Executive large portions of its Constitutional control over tariffs.

There were, however, two active opponents of OECD in the Senate. One was Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who attempted to rally opposition to the OECD Convention among his constituents via his weekly newsletter, and who in his statements on the floor of the Senate referred to the "inherent dangers of this Convention."

The other was Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona, whose remarks will be discussed later in this chapter.

THE POWER OF THE OECD

The following are excerpts from the OECD Treaty which indicate the extent of power actually delegated to the OECD by the Senate when it ratified this Treaty:

In order to achieve its aims the Organization may:

- .. take decisions which, except as otherwise provided, shall be binding on all the Members
- .. enter into agreements with Members; non-member states and international organizations
- .. Each Member shall have one vote. If a Member abstains from voting on a decision or recommendation, such abstention shall not invalidate the decision or recommendation, which shall be

applicable to the other Members but not to the abstaining Members.

- .. No decision shall be binding on any Member until it has complied with the requirements of its own constitutional procedures. The other Members may agree that such a decision shall apply provisionally to them

Immediately, the question arises: Who will be the U.S. representative on the OECD whose vote can have a profound effect on the destiny of this nation?

Mr. H. B. McCoy, President, Trade Relations Council of the United States, Washington, D.C., in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, stated that "The U.S. representative on the OECD Council (who will be an official of the Department of State) . . ."

In the foregoing excerpts from the OECD Treaty, it was noted that no decision would be binding on any Member nation unless it "complied with the requirements of its own constitutional procedures." Mr. Enoch R. Rust, Vice President, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, in testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, brought out the following point in this connection:

The trouble with that is that the State Department would decide what was in line with our Constitution. If that department has no greater respect for our Constitution than is reflected by its proposal that we become full-fledged Members of the OECD, it is not difficult to guess what they would accept from the OECD as being in accord with our Constitution.

A memorandum from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for the purpose of clarifying the issues involved, states:

It may be noted that it is expected that most of the decisions taken by the OECD Council which will be binding on Member governments will not pertain to substantive matters, but will pertain to administrative matters . . .

It should be borne in mind that the State Department representative to the OECD will be a representative of the President, to whom the President will delegate his executive authority.

It was noted in the supposedly "protective" amendment to the OECD Treaty that the United States would not be bound "in substantive matters" beyond the powers the Executive now has. This statement can be refuted by the simple question: If the treaty does not confer additional powers on the Executive, why did the State Department seek its ratification? Why could not the President con-

tinue to operate as heretofore? The fact that the State Department urged ratification of the OECD Treaty proves that indeed the treaty did extend the powers of the President in substantive matters, which authority he then was able to delegate to the State Department representative of the OECD.

Because of the extent of powers delegated to the Presidency by Congress since the advent of the New Deal in 1933, a definition of what constitutes "substantive" matters would be difficult indeed. A legal definition of such "substantive matters" would require a Supreme Court review of every abdication of Constitutional authority by Congress to the Executive since 1933.

During the Senate debate on OECD Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona anticipated that a situation would arise in the future wherein the Senate would be called upon "to approve what the U.S. representative to the OECD has done." Senator Goldwater then elaborated:

It seems to me that such requirement would put Congress in the position of having to go along with the statement of agreement, or plan of action, which our representative to the OECD has made prior to the approval coming to the attention of Congress. As a result we shall go into this (OECD) Convention already obligated, if not in fact, at least by the word of our representative. How can Congress be free to act under those circumstances and withstand the terrific pressure which will be applied to back up agreements made by our representative to the OECD?

Even though only a reasonable time has elapsed since the ratification of the OECD Treaty, an indication of the State Department's intention to expand the functions of the OECD is a statement by Under Secretary of State George Ball appearing in the April 23, 1962 BULLETIN of the State Department:

We are prepared to go as far as any other Member of the OECD in concerting our economic policies . . .

In ratifying the OECD Treaty, the Senate implemented the overall plan of the Council on Foreign Relations to by-pass Congress and vest power over the economy of the United States in an organization composed of foreign nations; foreign nations are thereby enabled to make recommendations and take decisions which could have the power of law in the United States.

The OECD is, in fact, a vital step in the CFR's plan to create an Atlantic Community which will lead inevitably to a Socialist-dominated World Government.

CHAPTER X

WORLD COMMUNITY - GOAL OF THE CFR

The reason why NATO, the European Common Market and the OECD have been discussed at length is because each is a component part of the over-all plan, spearheaded by the Council on Foreign Relations, for first an Atlantic Community and then a Free World Community, which would actually mean a Socialist-controlled One World Government.

In a speech reprinted in the BULLETIN of the State Department, April 16, 1962, Under Secretary of State George Ball stated:

If the United Nations is an instrument of United States policy, it is only one of many instruments available to us It is therefore important to be clear not only about what the United Nations does, but what it does not do Clarity on this score helps solve the contradictions some people seem to find on American foreign policy, a contradiction between our reliance on the institutions of the Atlantic Community and our participation in the United Nations. No such contradiction, in fact, exists. The founders of the United Nations recognized the need for regional institutions and explicitly provided for them in the Charter

In practice we use the various institutions to which we belong for quite different purposes. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is the backbone of our military defense Through the OECD - the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development - we are developing means for close cooperation in economic matters with the larger industrialized powers on either side of the Atlantic.

The United States, through Senate ratification, is officially a member of both NATO and OECD. The OECD is, in fact, our official "bridge" with the European Common Market, inasmuch as members of the European Common Market are also members of NATO and OECD. This accounts for the repeated use by former President Ei-

senhower, President Kennedy, and official spokesmen of the word "interdependence."

This entwining of U.S. military and economic affairs with those of Europe has been deliberate. The goal of the Internationalists has always been total political involvement of the United States with other nations, under which system, of course, the national sovereignty of the United States would be sacrificed.

Although the OECD was purported to be concerned solely with integrating the economic policies of its member nations, the fact is that the U.S. national economy and foreign policy are not separable.

Fearing a public outcry should any overt moves be made to subvert the national sovereignty of the United States, the One Worlders have moved cautiously through first one regional or international organization and then another, many times in parallel lines, always working toward their ultimate goal.

Under Secretary of State George Ball, speaking before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 13, 1962, said:

In signing the Treaty of Rome in 1957 which created the (European) Economic Community, the present 6 nations . . . performed a solemn act of large political implications . . . to lay the groundwork for a United Europe.

Mr. Ball then went on to remark that

If the negotiations for British accession to the Community succeed, we shall have on either side of the Atlantic two enormous entities.

By early 1962, State Department spokesmen were employing the phrase "Atlantic partnership" with ever-increasing frequency. A partnership cannot consist of unequal entities; therefore, it is obvious that if the United States envisages a partnership with the European Common Market, the United States must build an economic bloc in the Western Hemisphere of equal proportions as to industrial capacity, markets, etc. The establishment of a working partnership between the European Common Market and a Western Hemisphere Common Market would mean that the Western Common Market would have to be fashioned along the same economic-political lines as outlined in the Treaty of Rome. The Treaty of Rome establishing the Common Market (described in detail in Chapter VIII) could well prove to be the prototype for a similar common market in the Western Hemisphere, complete with a High Council of Min-

isters, a Court of Justice, etc. over which the American people could exercise no control.

In an address at Davidson College February 22, 1962, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated:

Our interests and hopes run not merely to Europe, but also to Latin America and to the whole community of free nations. We look to a partnership between the United States and an increasingly unified Europe. The organs of Atlantic cooperation which are at hand in NATO and the OECD are the active instruments of that partnership.

On April 30, 1962, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs George C. McGhee, a CFR member, spoke of a "tightly knit partnership of equals, the United States and the European Community."

Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs (and a member of the CFR), in a speech on January 31, 1962, in discussing the Atlantic Community, stated:

The Atlantic Community was born first as a concept, but the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, have put institutional flesh on its bones. And the prospective partnership between the European Common Market and the great common market of North America, is for many of us the most exciting single job of institution-building now in progress.

American citizens who wish to defend the national sovereignty of this nation will not share the exuberance of Mr. Cleveland over his "exciting . . . job of institution-building."

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY FIRST STEP TO WORLD COMMUNITY

The CFR "institution builders" are not content with building a mere Atlantic Community because, in the speech on January 31, 1962, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, CFR member Harlan Cleveland declared:

Although the Atlantic Community is steadily strengthening, even this is, in itself, not enough. The interests of the Atlantic nations are global. Their vision demands a more universal goal - a world order in which all free nations can concert to achieve their common purposes - a community of free nations * * * Our broader and ul-

ultimate objective in all these efforts is a universal community of nations.

FACILITATING SOVIET WORLD CONQUEST

When certain members of the Council on Foreign Relations speak glowingly of a Free World community, they fail to inform the American people that because of the existence of the Soviet Union and its continuing aggression, the realization of such a dream is impossible for the following reason: All regional organizations such as NATO, EEC and OECD are actually under the control of the Soviet-dominated United Nations, as provided by the UN Charter. The Soviet Union, therefore, will permit the establishment and functioning of regional or so-called "Free World" communities only as long as it suits the purposes of the International Communist Conspiracy.

Rather than having to conquer each nation separately, which of course could provoke a third World War resulting in the defeat of the Soviet Union, the USSR would simply have to infiltrate the key positions of each Free World country. This would quickly result in Communist control of the policies of the country, with such nations being forced to appoint Communist-oriented representatives to the various regional groupings of the Free World community. Such a so-called Free World community would soon become a Soviet community.

It will be recalled that it was Lenin who stated:

A single world economic system is essential for the final triumph of Socialism.

In the March 6, 1961, issue of THE DAN SMOOT REPORT*, Mr. Smoot stated:

In 1936 the Communist International formally presented its three-stage plan for achieving World Government --

Stage 1: Socialize the economies of all nations, particularly the

* Readers wishing additional information on the Council on Foreign Relations may wish to purchase Dan Smoot's book entitled "The Invisible Government," which will be published July 15, 1962. Price: \$3.00, paperbound; \$5.00, hardback. Address: P. O. Box 9538, Dallas 14, Texas.

“Western capitalistic democracies” (most particularly the United States);

Stage 2: Bring about federal unions of various groupings of the socialized nations;

Stage 3: Amalgamate all of the federal unions into one world-wide union of Socialist states.

Dan Smoot then went on to quote the following passage from the official program of the 1936 Communist International:

... Dictatorship can be established only by a victory of Socialism in different countries or groups of countries, after which the proletarian republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence, and this system of federal unions would expand . . . at length forming the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

The authors of this book most assuredly do not mean to imply that certain members of the Council on Foreign Relations, former or present Presidents of the United States as well as State Department officials would consciously facilitate the Soviet drive for world conquest. Rather, it is believed that the promoters of One World government are grossly uninformed or misinformed of the inevitable consequences should they succeed in their plans.

ONE WORLDERS FEAR AN INFORMED AMERICA

There is, however, one aspect of the One World plan in which its advocates face up to hard reality, and that is their justifiable fear that they may not succeed in brainwashing the American people into docile surrender of the national sovereignty of the United States.

THE LONDON DAILY TELEGRAPH in December, 1961* carried a news story concerning a statement made by McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Bundy was discussing the partnership plan between the European Common Market and a Western Hemisphere common market. Stated THE DAILY TELEGRAPH:

He said that such a partnership made more sense than a full-blown Atlantic Union, which was still constitutionally and psychologically

* According to CANDOUR, a British Right-Wing Newspaper, December 15, 1961.

out of range for the people of the United States.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, editorializing on the Atlantic Convention in Paris, January, 1962, referred to a speech made by Christian A. Herter opening the Atlantic Convention in which Herter said that sound Atlantic unity must be built on a sound economic and military basis. Then THE NEW YORK TIMES went on to say:

This is, in effect, the same functional approach toward union which Europe has adopted after more ambitious plans had failed. It is all the more necessary because any suggestion of even a partial surrender of American sovereignty still meets the most determined opposition.

If the United States is to remain a free and independent nation; if American citizens wish to retain their Constitutional guarantees of individual freedom and liberty, then the "most determined opposition" to the surrender of national sovereignty about which THE NEW YORK TIMES complained must, of course, remain "most determined." In addition, if a sufficiently large number of American voters become informed as to the real meaning of the plans of the Council on Foreign Relations and the One Worlders, the American people can again take into their hands the reins of government, and "America's Unelected Rulers" will be deposed.

POSTSCRIPT

The reader may be interested to know that we commenced writing this book on May 16, 1962, and completed this chapter one month later, on June 15.

It will be recalled that on page 77, in Chapter VII, entitled "The Declaration of Paris, there occurs a paragraph which is headed "Two Years Warning." In this paragraph we quoted the February-March, 1962, issue of Clarence Streit's FREEDOM & UNION magazine, in which Mr. Streit stated:

We welcome the (Atlantic) Convention's recommendation that the NATO governments "promptly establish a Special Governmental Commission to draw up plans within two years for the creation of a true Atlantic Community...."

Only three days were to pass after the completion of Chapter X, before the NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE (June 18, 1962) carried on its front page an Associated Press news story by Lewis Hawkins entitled "Closer Unity of NATO Bloc is Called For - Immediate Steps Urged by Commission." Following are excerpts from the AP story:

WASHINGTON (AP) -- A congressionally appointed citizens' commission said Sunday steps must be taken to make the Atlantic community a reality and they must be taken soon -- even if this involves some yielding of national sovereignty.

Creation of a permanent high council and a high court of justice for the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were among the chief recommendations submitted to Congress by the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO. . . .

The Associated Press news story then goes on to give additional information. However, noticeably absent from this news dispatch are a number of sinister provisions of the Declaration of Paris, on which this AP story was based. Full documentation regarding the contents of the Declaration of Paris is contained in Chapter VII, beginning on Page 70.

The most important aspect of this latest development is the fact that the recommendations of the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO concerning the Declaration of Paris have now been submitted to the U.S. Congress for implementation. Congress is being asked to authorize the setting up of a Special Governmental Commission to draw up plans for the creation of an Atlantic Community.

If you wish to help defeat the anti-American plans of the Council on Foreign Relations for the ultimate establishment of a Socialist-dominated World Government, then write your Congressman and your two Senators today using background material contained in this book. Urge that they vote against any and all legislation which would facilitate or implement in any way the Internationalists' plans for an Atlantic Community, which would destroy the national sovereignty of the United States.

In the following chapter you will find an outline of practical political action which can bring about the downfall of "America's Unelected Rulers."

WHAT YOU CAN DO

by Kent Courtney,
National Chairman, The Conservative Society of America

ESQUIRE Magazine, in May, 1962, published an article entitled "The American Establishment," by Richard Rovere, who earned a certain amount of notoriety when he wrote a defamatory book about the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Rovere in this article combines an amazing amount of truth along with some misleading statements indicative of either planned confusion or alarming ignorance.

When Rovere says "There are times when Congress appears to be nothing more or less than a conspiracy to louse up the plans of the Establishment," he reveals his ignorance of the major goals of the CFR-directed Establishment, which are: continued Foreign Aid, increased Cultural Exchange, increasing the scope of International organizations, and Disarmament.

Looking at the legislative measures which carried out these four major goals of the CFR during the year 1961, we find that a majority of the members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate voted for bills which implemented these four major goals of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Rovere then makes the following statement: "It (the Establishment) is never quite powerful enough, though, to control a nominating convention or actually to dictate nominations."

Rovere qualifies this erroneous declaration by quoting another source who rightly claims that during the past thirty years the major political parties have almost always managed to nominate a member of the Establishment in either the presidential or vice-presidential slot. Rovere points out that in 1960 Kennedy was the CFR's boy on the Democrat slate, while Henry Cabot Lodge was their man on the Republican ticket.

Apparently Richard M. Nixon earned his newly-announced membership on the CFR when he scuttled the Conservative platform written by the delegates to the 1960 Republican Convention and substitu-

ted one written by the Establishment which was forced upon Nixon and the Republican Convention by CFR agent Nelson Rockefeller. The CFR, the Establishment, or the Invisible Government - as it is termed by Dan Smoot - was due to win the 1960 election regardless of whether the Democrats or the Republicans put their nominee in the White House. Richard Rovere rightly says that the re-written Rockefeller-Nixon GOP platform conformed in almost every respect to the 1960 Democrat Party platform hammered out under the direction of CFR-man Chester Bowles. Rovere then reveals that both platforms obtained their central ideas from studies made by the Rockefeller Panel for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and published as "Prospect for America." The Rockefeller Panel was composed of such extreme-Left Democrats as Dean Rusk, Chester Bowles, Jacob Potofsky, Anna Rosenberg, and Henry Kissinger. Internationalist Republicans on the panel were : Lucius D. Clay, Arthur F. Burns, Henry Luce, Oveta Culp Hobby, and David Sarnoff.

CFR MEMBERS HOLD KEY POSITIONS IN BOTH DEMOCRAT AND GOP ADMINISTRATIONS

We have previously (in Chapter III) given the names of key CFR members who hold most of the important administrative posts in the New Frontier Administration of the Kennedy dynasty.

Lest the impression be given that the Council on Foreign Relations operates solely through the Democrat Party, let us examine the extent of the CFR control of the Republican Party specifically during the Eisenhower Administration. Although the 1952 Republican platform and the campaign speeches of presidential candidate Dwight Eisenhower purported to be strongly anti-Communist, numerous members of the "soft-on-Communism" Council on Foreign Relations were appointed to key posts in the first Eisenhower Administration. The following names and positions were taken from the 1954 "Congressional Directory." All are members of the Council on Foreign Relations:

Secretary of State: John Foster Dulles

Deputy Under Secretary of State: Robert Murphy

Counselor of the State Department: Douglas MacArthur 2d

Director, Policy Planning Staff: Robert R. Bowie

Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs: Henry A. Byroade

Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs: John M. Cabot

Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs: Livingston T. Merchant

Director, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs: Walter M. Kotschnig

United States Representative to the United Nations and Representative in the Security Council: Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Deputy United States Representative to the United Nations and Deputy Representative in the Security Council: James J. Wadsworth

Secretary-General, United States Mission to the United Nations: Richard S. Winslow

Navy Representative, United Nations Military Staff Committee: Vice Adm. A. D. Struble, USN

Deputy to the Secretary, Department of the Treasury: W. Randolph Burgess

Secretary of the Navy: Robert B. Anderson

Secretary of Labor: James P. Mitchell

Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Nelson A. Rockefeller

Key Diplomatic Posts:

Ambassador to France and possessions: C. Douglas Dillon

Ambassador to Germany: James B. Conant

Ambassador to Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Winthrop W. Aldrich

Ambassador to Iran: Loy W. Henderson

Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Charles E. Bohlen

Upon the death of CFR member John Foster Dulles, Republican President Dwight Eisenhower appointed CFR member Christian A. Herter to succeed Mr. Dulles as Secretary of State. Christian Herter immediately gave CFR member Charles E. Bohlen the biggest

promotion of his career by making him Special Assistant to the Secretary of State in charge of Soviet Affairs. It will be remembered that Council on Foreign Relations member Bohlen gave his endorsement of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, also a CFR member, who was fired from the Atomic Energy Commission as a security risk.

Thus it is seen that regardless of whether a Republican or a Democrat administration occupies the White House, the Council on Foreign Relations still holds the reins of control.

INVESTIGATE THE STATE DEPARTMENT ?

Bryton Barron, formerly Chief of the Treaty Staff in the State Department, has just written a new book entitled "The Untouchable State Department*," in which he outlines the causes of the failure of our foreign policies for the last twenty years, and in which he names many of the persons largely responsible for those failures. It is a book that should be read by everyone who is concerned with his country's future. In the final chapter, Mr. Barron suggests that millions of aroused Americans should demand that the Congress investigate the State Department in order to correct the intolerable situation described in his revealing book.

Before any such investigation is possible, the anti-Communist Conservatives of the United States must change the present composition of the Congress. As the situation now exists, there are simply not enough members of Congress who believe that any investigation is necessary. This statement must be substantiated, and to properly do so, we will shortly refer specifically to the voting records of Congressmen and Senators who by their votes are implementing the anti-American policies of the Council on Foreign Relations.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONGRESS

The fact that the Congress has delegated so much of its Constitutional power to the Executive branch is the real reason why so

* "The Untouchable State Department," published by Crestwood Books, Box 301, Springfield, Virginia. Price: \$2.50.

many un-Constitutional actions and destructive policies have been followed since 1933. As each succeeding session of Congress has delegated its own power and authority to the President, it has in fact emasculated itself, and today is, in effect, a rubber stamp for Executive actions which accommodate the appeasers and support the Internal and External enemies of our Constitutional way of life.

Of course, all the crimes committed against the Constitution by previous sessions of Congress cannot be pinned on the present members of Congress. Yet there is one basic hope, one golden opportunity, one path of escape -- one method -- by which Americans can put on the brakes and prevent our continued slide into Socialism, Tyranny, and Communism.

The only legal means by which American patriots can hope to reverse this 30-year trend is by electing a Congress composed of men who will pledge "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to restore the Constitution as it was originally written and intended. A new Congress composed of anti-Communist Constitutionals need not be bound by the actions or mistakes of previous sessions of the Congress.

BI-PARTISAN COALITION PROMOTES SOCIALISM

A study of the voting records of recent Congressional sessions proves that it is the bi-partisan coalition of certain Republicans and Democrats which makes possible the passage of pro-Socialist and pro-Communist legislation.

A few years ago, the much-needed "Bricker Amendment" failed of passage by only one vote. Under the direction and manipulation of Lyndon Johnson, then Majority Leader, the Senate failed by one vote to pass a law restoring to the States their right to control subversion at the State level.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., the respected Conservative radio commentator and nationally-syndicated columnist, in reporting on the success of the first year of the Kennedy Administration, quoted voting records to prove that Liberal members of the Republican Party made possible the passage of 6 key pieces of Kennedy's New Frontier legislation.

THE CSA VOTING INDEX

In early 1962, the Conservative Society of America, a national

Conservative political action organization, published "The CSA Voting Index*." This index was based on 20 key issues voted upon by members of the House of Representatives and 14 important votes of the U.S. Senate during 1961, the first session of the Kennedy Administration. Based on the tabulation of these votes, each Member of Congress was then given a Conservative rating according to the number of times he cast votes in favor of Conservatism. Thus Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat of South Carolina, received a 100% Conservative rating while Senator Alexander Wiley, Republican of Wisconsin, received a 100% pro-Socialist, "soft-on-Communism" rating.

When considering the House of Representatives, it was found that 67% of the entire membership voted 50% or more of the time for Big Federal Spending, Foreign Aid to Communist countries, and Internationalism. In the Senate, the total figure revealed that 72% of that body voted more than 50% of the time for pro-Socialist and pro-Communist legislation.

HOW CONGRESS VOTES TO SUPPORT CFR-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

Let us now look at the voting record of the Congress in connection with the major goals of the Council on Foreign Relations. The aims of the CFR are:

1. Permanent and expanding Foreign Aid to friend and foe alike;
2. Increasing U.S. - Soviet Cultural Exchange;
3. Continuing negotiations with the Soviet Union for Disarmament;
4. Building supra-national organizations such as the Atlantic Community which will destroy U.S. national sovereignty and lead to a One-World Socialist government.

Analyzing votes in the Congress which facilitate the accomplishment of these goals, we find that 71 out of 100 Senators voted for (or expressed themselves in favor of) legislation supporting these four CFR aims during the 1961 session. Of these 71 Senators, 48

* "The CSA Voting Index" described above may be obtained from the Conservative Society of America, P. O. Box 4254, New Orleans 18, Louisiana. Price: \$4.00.

were Democrats and 23 were Republicans. Thus, in the Senate, of the total of 36 Republicans, 23, or 64%, voted for the CFR position. Of the Democrat Senators, 75% voted pro-CFR.

In the House of Representatives, 260 out of 436 members voted for (or expressed their intention to vote for) all four of the legislative measures supporting CFR goals. Thus 59.5% of the House members lined themselves up solidly with the pro-Internationalist and "soft-on-Communism" position of the Council on Foreign Relations. In the House, out of 174 Republicans, 80 GOP Congressmen, or 46%, voted pro-CFR on the four key issues. Of the Democrat Congressmen, 68% voted pro-CFR.

CONSERVATIVES CAN WIN

These summary figures would seem to indicate that changing the composition of the Congress through patriotic political action would be almost an impossible job. However, let us recall by what a narrow margin key pro-Socialist programs have been voted into law. Another fact that gives hope to Conservatives is that there are at least 24 Congressional Districts where the incumbent Liberal Congressman has achieved election by fewer than 10,000 votes. In several cases, the incumbent Liberal has squeaked through with fewer than 400 votes.*

An intelligently-directed, properly-financed program of political education within marginal Congressional districts can build an effective Conservative-oriented political action organization which can succeed in replacing ultra-Liberals with Constitutional Conservatives.

Some say that we should elect a man like Senator Barry Goldwater, or Senator Strom Thurmond to the office of the Presidency, and then we could "forget" all these troublesome problems. But let us consider for a moment how frustrated such a Conservative President would be if he were opposed by the kind of Congress we have in 1962!

* This information is based on statistics included in "The Conservative Political Action Handbook," published by the Conservative Society of America. Price: \$2.00.

How much better it would be to have a majority of anti-Communist Conservatives in the Congress; then it would not matter what kind of "New Frontyranny" was being practiced in the White House.

Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives has control of the nation's purse-strings. The White House and the Council on Foreign Relations could continue to urge the passage of increasing Foreign Aid, but if a Conservative-controlled Congress refused to appropriate funds for Foreign Aid, what difference would it make what the White House and the CFR advocated? Private citizen groups of "experts" could shuttle back and forth across the Atlantic setting up regional supra-national organizations and making grandiose plans to a "fare-thee-well." But such travel would have to be at their own expense, because a Conservative Congress would not pass any appropriations to finance such junkets. Further, any so-called "recommendations" or treaties that these citizen-delegates would draw up would be mere scraps of paper, because a Conservative-dominated Senate would refuse to ratify them.

The job of changing the present composition of the Congress is not as big as it would seem; whereas in a presidential campaign the anti-Communist Conservatives would first have to capture the nomination for their candidate in one of the major parties. The Internationalist Republicans denied the nomination to Senator Robert A. Taft on two occasions. The Council on Foreign Relations group, or the Establishment, if you will, have demonstrated that they control the nominating procedures of both major political parties in the national conventions.

Below is a list of policy-makers of the Republican Party who are also members of the Council on Foreign Relations. These are the men who, to one degree or another, hold the reins of control at Republican nominating conventions to guarantee that "one of their own" receives the presidential or vice-presidential nomination:

Winthrop W. Aldrich

Thomas E. Dewey

C. Douglas Dillon

Allen W. Dulles

Herbert Hoover

Jacob K. Javits

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Henry R. Luce

Richard M. Nixon

David Rockefeller

John D. Rockefeller, III

Nelson A. Rockefeller

Harold E. Stassen

On the other hand, a relatively easy job is to set up Conservative political-action committees and voter-education programs at the Congressional District level. Here patriotic study groups can cooperate in first seeing to it that the national issues are understood in their relation to the nature of the Internal and External Communist threat. At the local level, the supporters of the incumbent "soft-on-Communism" - voting Liberal Congressman can be individually approached and warned concerning the nature of the incumbent's voting record.

A presidential campaign costs literally millions of dollars, whereas only thousands of dollars need be raised to carry out a campaign for a sincere anti-Communist Conservative candidate for Congress. Local political-action clubs attract far more continuing enthusiasm by more people than do "once-every-four-years" presidential campaign committees. Local clubs will, in all likelihood, participate in other local campaigns. Members of patriotic study clubs can be urged to become active in support of Conservative Congressional candidates. All sincere Conservative candidates will welcome additional campaign workers. Three or more house-to-house canvassers are needed in every voting precinct to help get the vote out on election day. Don't work to get out all the vote -- just those people whom you know or believe will vote for your Conservative candidate. If you cannot contribute funds to your Conservative candidate, you can at least contribute several days' work which, in a close election, could provide the margin of victory for your candidate.

The removal of all pro-CFR, pro-Socialist members of Congress is absolutely necessary if the American people are to regain control of their government and insure the independence and national sovereignty of the United States of America.

THE CONSERVATIVE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

The Conservative Society of America is working to set up political action units in key Congressional districts in order to help defeat pro-Communist-voting members of the Congress and to elect alert, sincere anti-Communists in their places. The CSA has on its National Board of Advisors such well-known Conservatives and patriots as J. Bracken Lee, former Governor of Utah and now Mayor of Salt Lake City, General Charles A. Willoughby, USA (ret.), former

Intelligence Officer under General Douglas MacArthur, Bryton Barron, author of "The Untouchable State Department," and many others.

If you wish to do something practical about electing anti-Communist Conservatives to Congress; if you wish to guarantee that your children and grandchildren will grow up to enjoy the individual freedom and liberty guaranteed by the Divinely-inspired Constitution, then we invite you to write us a letter expressing your interest. You will then receive a plan of patriotic political action so that you and your friends and neighbors can participate in your own precinct, ward, and county in helping to depose "America's Unelected Rulers."

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kent Courtney". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "K" and a long, sweeping underline.

Kent Courtney
National Chairman,
The Conservative Society of America
Post Office Box 4254
New Orleans 18, Louisiana

Appendix I
Members Of
THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS:
As Listed In Its Annual Report
Dated 1960

This membership list is divided into two sections, both alphabetical. The first is composed of Resident Members, that is, members whose residence or place of business is within 50 miles of City Hall, New York. The second portion of this list is composed of Non-Resident Members, that is, those who reside or do business outside that 50-mile radius.

In using this list to check whether a certain person is a member of the CFR, be sure to check BOTH the Resident and Non-Resident sections.

This Membership List of the Council on Foreign Relations is reproduced by a photographic process from the membership list issued by:

*The Council on Foreign Relations
The Harold Pratt House
Fifty-Eight East Sixty-Eighth Street
New York, N.Y.*

(Author's Note: The Council on Foreign Relations Annual Report of 1961 additionally lists Arthur J. Goldberg, Richard M. Nixon, and Henry Cabot Lodge as members.)

- AKERS, ANTHONY B.
 ALDRICH, WINTHROP W.
 ALEXANDER, ARCHIBALD S.
 ALEXANDER, HENRY C.
 ALEXANDER, ROBERT J.
 ALLAN, F. ALEY
 ALLEN, CHARLES E.
 ALLEN, PHILIP E.
 ALLEY, JAMES B.
 ALLPORT, ALEXANDER W.
 ALPERN, ALAN N.
 ALTSCHUL, ARTHUR G.
 ALTSCHUL, FRANK
 ANDERSON, ARTHUR M.
 ANDERSON, HAROLD F.
 ANGELL, JAMES W.
 ARMOUR, NORMAN
 ARMSTRONG, HAMILTON FISH
 ASCOLI, MAX
 AULT, BROMWELL
 BACKER, GEORGE
 BADEAU, JOHN S.
 BAKER, EDGAR R.
 BALDWIN, HANSON W.
 BANCROFT, HARDING F.
 BARBER, CHARLES F.
 BARBER, JOSEPH
 BARKER, ROBERT R.
 BARNES, JOSEPH
 BARNETT, A. DOAK
 BARNETT, FRANK R.
 BARRETT, EDWARD W.
 BASTEDO, PHILIP
 BAUMER, WILLIAM H.
 BEAL, GERALD F.
 BECKHART, BENJAMIN F.
 BEDARD, PIERRE
 BEEBE, FREDERICK S.
 BELL, ELLIOTT V.
 BENNETT, JOHN C.
 BENTON, WILLIAM B.
 BERKNER, L. V.
 BERLE, ADOLF A., JR.
 BESSIE, SIMON MICHAEL
 BEVIS, HERMAN W.
 BIDWELL, PERCY W.
 BIENSTOCK, ABRAHAM L.
 BINGHAM, JONATHAN B.
 BLACK, PETER
 BLAIR, FLOYD G.
 BLOUGH, ROGER M.
 BLOUGH, ROY
 BOARDMAN, ARTHUR G., JR.
 BOGDAN, NORBERT A.
 BOLTE, CHARLES G.
 BONSAI, DUDLEY B.
 BOOMER, ROBERT DEFOREST
 BOORMAN, HOWARD L.
 BOYD, HUGH N.
 BRADEN, SPRUILLE
 BRADFORD, AMORY H.
 BRAMSTEDT, W. F.
 BRAXTON, CARTER M.
 BRECK, HENRY C.
 BRINCKERHOFF, CHARLES M.
 BRISTOL, WILLIAM M.
 BRITTENHAM, RAYMOND L.
 BRONK, DETLEV W.
 BROWN, COURTNEY C.
 BROWN, FRANCIS
 BROWN, H. CLIFFORD
 BROWN, JOHN MASON
 BROWN, WALTER L.
 BROWNELL, GEORGE A.
 BROWNELL, LINCOLN C.
 BRUCE, JAMES
 BULLOCK, HUGH
 BUNCHE, RALPH J.
 BUNKER, ARTHUR H.
 BUNNELL, C. STERLING
 BURGESS, CARTER L.
 BURKHARDT, FREDERICK
 BURNS, ARTHUR F.
 BUSH, DONALD F.
 BUTLER, WILLIAM F.
 BUTTENWIESER, BENJAMIN J.
 CAIN, CHARLES, JR.
 CALDER, ALEXANDER, JR.
 CALHOUN, ALEXANDER D.
 CAMPBELL, H. DONALD
 CAMPBELL, JOHN C.
 CANFIELD, CASS

- CAREY, ANDREW G.
CARPENTER, GEORGE W.
CARROLL, MITCHELL B.
CARSON, RALPH M.
CARUTHERS, FRANK D., JR.
CARY, WILLIAM L.
CASE, JOHN C.
CATTIER, JEAN
CHADBOURNE, WILLIAM M.
CHANLER, L. STUYVESANT, JR.
CHASE, W. HOWARD
CHENEY, WARD
CHILDS, THOMAS W.
CHRISTIE, LANSDELL K.
CHUBB, PERCY, 2ND
CHURCH, EDGAR M.
CLAPP, GORDON R.
CLARK, BRIG. GEN. EDWIN N.
CLARK, JAMES F.
CLAY, GEN. LUCIUS D.
CLINCHY, EVERETT R.
COFFIN, EDMUND
COHEN, JEROME B.
COLE, CHARLES W.
COLLADO, EMILIO G.
COLLINGS, L. V.
COLLINGWOOD, CHARLES P.
COLWELL, KENT G.
CONANT, JAMES B.
CONSIDINE, REV. JOHN J.
COOK, HOWARD A.
COOMBS, CHARLES A.
COOPER, FRANKLIN S.
CORDIER, ANDREW W.
COUSINS, NORMAN
COWAN, L. GRAY
COWLES, GARDNER
COX, CHARLES R.
CREEL, DANA S.
CUMMINGS, ROBERT L., JR.
CUSICK, PETER
DARLINGTON, CHARLES F.
DARRELL, NORRIS
DAVENPORT, JOHN
DAVIS, NORMAN P.
DAVISON, H. P.
DEAN, ARTHUR H.
DEBEVOISE, ELI WHITNEY
DE LIMA, OSCAR A.
DE VEGH, IMRIE
DE VRIES, HENRY P.
DEWEY, THOMAS E.
D'HARNONCOURT, RENE
DIEBOLD, WILLIAM, JR.
DILLON, CLARENCE
DILWORTH, J. RICHARDSON
DODGE, CLEVELAND E.
DONNER, FREDERICK G.
DONOVAN, HEDLEY
DORR, GOLDTHWAITE H.
DORR, JOHN VAN N.
DORWIN, OSCAR JOHN
DOUGLAS, LEWIS W.
DOUGLAS, PERCY L.
DRYFOOS, ORVIL E.
DUBINSKY, DAVID
DUBOIS, J. DELAFIELD
DUKE, ANGIER BIDDLE
EAGLE, VERNON A.
EATON, FREDRICK M.
EBERSTADT, FERDINAND
EDELMAN, ALBERT I.
EDER, PHANOR J.
EICHELBERGER, CLARK M.
ELLIOTT, L. W.
ELSON, ROBERT
EMMET, CHRISTOPHER
ERNST, ALBERT E.
ERPF, ARMAND G.
EVANS, ROGER F.
EVELETH, GEORGE S., JR.
EVERTON, JOHN SCOTT
EWING, SHERMAN
EWING, WILLIAM, JR.
EXTER, JOHN
FAHS, CHARLES B.
FEELY, EDWARD F.
FIELD, WILLIAM OSGOOD, JR.
FINKELSTEIN, LAWRENCE S.
FINLETTER, THOMAS K.
FISCHER, JOHN S.
FISHER, HENRY J.
FLECK, G. PETER
FLEISCHMANN, MANLY
FLORINSKY, MICHAEL T.
FORD, NEVIL

FORKNER, CLAUDE E.
 FOSDICK, RAYMOND B.
 FOX, JOSEPH C.
 FOX, WILLIAM T. R.
 FOYE, ARTHUR B.
 FRANKLIN, GEORGE S., JR.
 FRANKLIN, JOHN M.
 FREDERICKS, J. WAYNE
 FREEDMAN, EMANUEL R.
 FRENCH, JOHN
 FREUDENTHAL, DAVID M.
 FRIELE, BERENT
 FRIENDLY, HENRY J.
 FRY, VARIAN
 FUERBRINGER, OTTO
 FULLER, C. DALE
 FULLER, ROBERT G.
 GALANTIERE, LEWIS
 GALLATIN, JAMES P.
 GAMBLE, SIDNEY D.
 GARDNER, JOHN W.
 GARDNER, RICHARD N.
 GARRETSON, ALBERT H.
 GARRISON, LLOYD K.
 GASTON, GEORGE A.
 GATES, SAMUEL E.
 GAUD, WILLIAM S., JR.
 GAY, EDWARD R.
 GEVERS, MAX E.
 GIBNEY, FRANK B.
 GIDEONSE, HARRY D.
 GIFFORD, WALTER S.
 GILLESPIE, S. HAZARD, JR.
 GILPATRIC, CHADBOURNE
 GILPATRIC, ROSWELL L.
 GOLDEN, WILLIAM T.
 GOLDSMITH, ARTHUR
 GOLDSTONE, HARMON H.
 GOODRICH, CARTER
 GOODRICH, LELAND M.
 GORDON, ALBERT H.
 GOSS, JAMES H.
 GRACE, J. P., JR.
 GRAFF, ROBERT D.
 GRAY, WILLIAM LATIMER
 GRAY, WILLIAM STEELE
 GRAZIER, JOSEPH A.
 GRIFFITH, THOMAS
 GRIMM, PETER
 GRONDAHL, TEG C.
 GROSS, ERNEST A.
 GROVER, ALLEN
 GUGGENHEIM, HARRY F.
 GUINZBURG, HAROLD K.
 GUNTHER, JOHN
 GURFEIN, MURRAY I.
 HAIGHT, GEORGE W.
 HALL, PERRY E.
 HAMILTON, FOWLER
 HAMILTON, THOMAS J.
 HAMLIN, CHAUNCEY J.
 HAMMOND, CAPT. PAUL
 HANCE, WILLIAM A.
 HARRIMAN, W. AVERELL
 HARRIMAN, E. ROLAND
 HARTMAN, WILLIAM N.
 HASLER, FREDERICK E.
 HAUGE, GABRIEL
 HAYES, ALFRED
 HAZARD, JOHN N.
 HEALD, HENRY T.
 HECKSCHER, AUGUST
 HEINEMAN, DANNIE N.
 HENDERSON, ALEXANDER I.
 HENDERSON, WILLIAM
 HEROD, W. ROGERS
 HERRING, PENDLETON
 HERZOG, PAUL M.
 HESS, JEROME S.
 HILL, FORREST F.
 HILL, JAMES T., JR.
 HILL, JOHN A.
 HILLS, ROBERT C.
 HOCHSCHILD, HAROLD K.
 HOCHSCHILD, WALTER
 HOGLUND, ELIS S.
 HOGUET, ROBERT L., JR.
 HOHENBERG, JOHN
 HOLLAND, HENRY F.
 HOLLAND, KENNETH
 HOLLAND, WILLIAM L.
 HOLMAN, EUGENE
 HOLST, WILLEM
 HOLT, L. EMMETT, JR.
 HOMER, SIDNEY
 HOOPES, TOWNSEND

- HOOVER, LYMAN
HORN, GARFIELD H.
HORTON, PHILIP
HOTTELET, RICHARD C.
HOUGHTON, ARTHUR A., JR.
HOUSTON, FRANK K.
HOVEY, ALLAN, JR.
HOWARD, JOHN B.
HOWE, JOHN
HUGHES, JOHN CHAMBERS
HUMPHREYS, H. E., JR.
HUPPER, ROSCOE H.
HUREWITZ, J. C.
HYDE, HENRY B.
HYDE, JAMES N.
IDE, JOHN J.
INGLIS, JOHN B.
ISELIN, O'DONNELL
ISSAWI, CHARLES P.
JACKSON, C. D.
JACKSON, ELMORE
JACKSON, WILLIAM E.
JACKSON, WILLIAM H.
JAFFE, SAM A.
JAMES, GEORGE F.
JARETZKI, ALFRED, JR.
JAY, NELSON DEAN
JENNINGS, B. BREWSTER
JESSUP, ALPHEUS W.
JESSUP, JOHN K.
JESSUP, PHILIP C.
JOHNSON, EDWARD F.
JOHNSON, HOWARD C.
JOHNSON, JOSEPH E.
JONES, DAVID J.
JONES, W. ALTON
JOSEPHS, DEVEREUX C.
JOUBERT, RICHARD CHENEY
KAMINER, PETER H.
KANE, R. KEITH
KEEZER, DEXTER MERRIAM
KEISER, DAVID M.
KELLEY, NICHOLAS
KENNEY, F. DONALD
KERN, HARRY F.
KETTANEH, FRANCIS A.
KEYSER, PAUL V., JR.
KIAER, HERMAN S.
KING, FREDERIC R.
KIRK, ADM. ALAN G.
KIRK, GRAYSON L.
KLOTS, ALLEN T.
KNOKE, L. WERNER
KNOWLES, JOHN ELLIS
KNOX, WILLIAM E.
KOENIG, ROBERT P.
KOHN, HANS
KRAFT, JOSEPH
KROUT, JOHN A.
LADA-MOCARSKI, V.
LA FARGE, FRANCIS W.
LAMB, HORACE R.
LAMONT, PETER T.
LAMONT, THOMAS S.
LANDIS, JAMES M.
LANG, ROBERT E.
LARMON, SIGURD S.
LAROCHE, CHESTER J.
LAUKHUFF, PERRY
LEBARON, EUGENE
LEE, ELLIOTT H.
LEHMAN, HERBERT H.
LEHMAN, ORIN
LEHMAN, ROBERT
LEHRMAN, HAL
LEICH, JOHN F.
LEIPER, REV. HENRY SMITH
LEONARD, JAMES G.
LEROY, NORBERT G.
LESLIE, JOHN C.
LEVY, WALTER J.
LEWIS, ROGER
LEWISOHN, FRANK
LI, K. C.
LIEBERMAN, HENRY R.
LIGHTNER, M. C.
LILIENTHAL, DAVID E.
LINDER, HAROLD F.
LINDQUIST, WARREN T.
LINDSAY, FRANKLIN A.
LISSITZYN, OLIVER J.
LOCKWOOD, JOHN E.
LOCKWOOD, MANICE DEF., 3RD
LOCKWOOD, WILLIAM A.
LOEB, JOHN L.
LOGAN, SHERIDAN A.

- LOOMIS, ALFRED L.
 LOOS, REV. A. WILLIAM
 LOUCKS, HAROLD H.
 LOUNSBURY, ROBERT H.
 LUBIN, ISADOR
 ✓ LUCE, HENRY R.
 LUDT, R. E.
 LUITWEILER, J. C.
 LUNNING, JUST
 LYFORD, JOSEPH P.
 McCANCE, THOMAS
 MCCARTHY, JOHN G.
 McCLOY, JOHN J.
 McCORMICK, ROBERT E.
 McDANIEL, JOSEPH M., JR.
 McDONALD, JAMES G.
 McGRAW, JAMES H., JR.
 McKEEVER, PORTER
 McLEAN, DONALD H., JR.
 MacDUFFIE, MARSHALL
 MacEachron, DAVID W.
 MacINTYRE, MALCOLM A.
 MacIVER, MURDOCH
 MACVEAGH, EWEN CAMERON
 MAFFRY, AUGUST
 MAGUIRE, WALTER N.
 MALIN, PATRICK MURPHY
 MALLORY, WALTER H.
 MANSHIP, PAUL
 MARK, REV. JULIUS
 MARKEL, LESTER
 MARTINO, JOSEPH A.
 MARTS, ARNAUD C.
 MARVEL, WILLIAM W.
 MASTEN, JOHN E.
 MATHEWS, EDWARD J.
 MATTISON, GRAHAM D.
 MAY, A. WILFRED
 MAY, STACY
 MEAD, NELSON P.
 MERZ, CHARLES
 METZGER, HERMAN A.
 MICKELSON, SIG
 MIDTBO, HAROLD
 MILLAR, D. G.
 MILLARD, MARK J.
 MILLER, EDWARD G., JR.
 MILLER, PAUL R., JR.
- MILLER, WILLIAM J.
 MILLIS, WALTER
 MILLS, BRADFORD
 MINOR, CLARK H.
 MITCHELL, DON G.
 MITCHELL, SIDNEY A.
 MODEL, LEO
 MONAGHAN, THOMAS E.
 MONTAGUE, GILBERT H.
 MOORE, BEN T.
 MOORE, EDWARD F.
 MOORE, GEORGE S.
 MOORE, MAURICE T.
 MOORE, WILLIAM T.
 MORGAN, CECIL
 MORGAN, D. P.
 MORGAN, HENRY S.
 MORRIS, GRINNELL
 MOSELY, PHILIP E.
 MUIR, MALCOLM
 MUNROE, VERNON, JR.
 MUNSON, HENRY LEE
 MUNYAN, WINTHROP R.
 MURDEN, FORREST
 MURPHY, GRAYSON M.P.
 MURPHY, J. MORDEN
 MURROW, EDWARD R.
 NASON, JOHN W.
 NEAL, ALFRED C.
 NEBOLSINE, GEORGE
 NELSON, FRED M.
 NICELY, JAMES M.
 NICHOLS, THOMAS S.
 NICHOLS, WILLIAM I.
 NICKERSON, A. L.
 ✓ NIEBUHR, REV. REINHOLD
 NIELSEN, WALDEMAR A.
 NORTHROP, JOHNSTON F.
 NOYES, CHARLES PHELPS
 OAKES, JOHN B.
 O'BRIEN, JUSTIN
 O'CONNOR, RODERIC L.
 OGDEN, ALFRED
 OLDS, IRVING SANDS
 OPPENHEIMER, FRITZ E.
 ORCHARD, JOHN E.
 OSBORN, EARL D.
 OSBORN, FREDERICK H.

- OSBORN, WILLIAM H.
 OSBORNE, STANLEY DE J.
 OSTRANDER, F. TAYLOR, JR.
 OVERBY, ANDREW N.
 OVERTON, DOUGLAS W.
 PACE, FRANK, JR.
 PAGE, ROBERT G.
 PALEY, WILLIAM S.
 PARKER, PHILO W.
 PATTERSON, ELLMORE C.
 PATTERSON, FREDERICK D.
 PATTERSON, MOREHEAD
 PAYNE, FREDERICK B.
 PAYNE, SAMUEL B.
 PAYSON, CHARLES SHIPMAN
 PEARDON, THOMAS P.
 PEFFER, NATHANIEL
 PENNOYER, PAUL G.
 PERKINS, JAMES A.
 PERKINS, ROSWELL B.
 PETERS, C. BROOKS
 PHILLIPS, CHRISTOPHER H.
 PIERSON, WARREN LEE
 PIFER, ALAN
 PIKE, H. HARVEY
 PLIMPTON, FRANCIS T. P.
 POLETTI, CHARLES
 POLK, JUDD
 POOR, HENRY V.
 POPE, COL. FREDERICK
 POTTER, ROBERT S.
 POWERS, JOSHUA B.
 PRATT, H. IRVING, JR.
 PRIOLEAU, HARRY F.
 QUIGG, PHILIP W.
 RABI, ISIDOR I.
 RATHBONE, M. J.
 RAVENHOLT, ALBERT
 RAY, GEORGE W., JR.
 REBER, SAMUEL
 REDMOND, ROLAND L.
 REED, PHILIP D.
 REEVES, JAY B. L.
 REID, WHITELAW
 RHEINSTEIN, ALFRED
 RICHARDSON, ARTHUR BERRY
 RICHARDSON, DORSEY
 RICHARDSON, JOHN R., JR.
- RIEGELMAN, HAROLD
 RIPLEY, JOSEPH P.
 ROBERTS, GEORGE
 ROBERTS, HENRY L.
 ROBINSON, GEROLD T.
 ROBINSON, LELAND REX
 ✓ ROCKEFELLER, DAVID
 ✓ ROCKEFELLER, JOHN D., 3RD
 ROCKHILL, VICTOR E.
 RODRIGUEZ, VINCENT A.
 ROGERS, LINDSAY
 ROOSA, ROBERT V.
 ROOSEVELT, GEORGE EMLEN
 ROOT, ELIHU, JR.
 ROOT, OREN
 ROPER, ELMO B., JR.
 ROSENBERG, JAMES N.
 ROSENSTIEL, LEWIS
 ROSENWALD, WILLIAM
 ROSINSKI, HERBERT
 ROSS, EMORY
 ROSS, T. J.
 ROUSE, ROBERT G.
 ROYCE, ALEXANDER B.
 RUEBHAUSEN, OSCAR M.
 RUSH, KENNETH
 RUSK, DEAN
 RUSTOW, DANKWART A.
 SACHS, ALEXANDER
 SACHS, HOWARD J.
 SAMUELS, NATHANIEL
 SARGEANT, HOWLAND H.
 SARNOFF, BRIG. GEN. DAVID
 SAWIN, MELVIN E.
 SCHAFFNER, JOSEPH HALLE
 SCHAPIRO, J. SALWYN
 SCHERMAN, HARRY
 SCHIFF, JOHN M.
 SCHILTHUIS, WILLEM C.
 SCHMIDT, HERMAN J.
 SCHMOKER, J. BENJAMIN
 SCHWARTZ, HARRY
 SCHWARZ, FREDERICK A. O.
 SCOTT, JOHN
 SEDWITZ, WALTER J.
 SELIGMAN, EUSTACE
 SEYMOUR, WHITNEY NORTH
 SHARP, GEORGE C.

- SHARP, JAMES H.
 SHEA, ANDREW B.
 SHEPARD, DAVID A.
 SHEPARD, FRANK P.
 SHEPARDSON, WHITNEY H.
 SHEPERD, HOWARD C.
 SHERBERT, PAUL C.
 SHERMAN, IRVING H.
 SHIELDS, MURRAY
 SHIELDS, W. CLIFFORD
 SHIRER, WILLIAM L.
 SHOTWELL, JAMES T.
 SHUSTER, GEORGE N.
 SHUTE, BENJAMIN R.
 SIEGBERT, HENRY
 SIMS, ALBERT G.
 SLATER, JOSEPH E.
 SLAWSON, JOHN
 SLOAN, ALFRED P., JR.
 SMITH, CARLETON SPRAGUE
 SMITH, HAYDEN N.
 SMITH, W. MASON, JR.
 SMULL, J. BARSTOW
 SONNE, H. CHRISTIAN
 SOUBRY, E. E.
 SPANG, KENNETH M.
 SPENCER, PERCY C.
 SPOFFORD, CHARLES M.
 SPRAGUE, MANSFIELD D.
 STACKPOLE, STEPHEN H.
 STEBBINS, JAMES H.
 STEBBINS, RICHARD P.
 STERN, H. PETER
 STEVENSON, JOHN R.
 STEVENSON, T. KENNEDY
 STEWART, ROBERT MCLEAN
 STILLMAN, CHAUNCEY
 STILLMAN, RALPH S.
 STINEBOWER, LEROY D.
 STODDARD, GEORGE D.
 STOKES, ISAAC N. P.
 STONE, SHEPARD
 STRAKA, JEROME A.
 STRAUS, DONALD B.
 STRAUS, JACK I.
 STRAUS, OSCAR S.
 STRAUS, RALPH I.
 STRAUSS, SIMON D.
 STRONG, BENJAMIN
 SULZBERGER, ARTHUR HAYS
 SUTPHEN, H. A.
 SWATLAND, DONALD C.
 SWINGLE, WILLIAM S.
 SWOPE, GERARD, JR.
 TALBOT, PHILLIPS
 TANNENBAUM, FRANK
 TANNENWALD, THEODORE
 THOMAS, H. GREGORY
 THOMPSON, EARLE S.
 THOMPSON, KENNETH W.
 TIBBY, JOHN
 TINKER, EDWARD LAROQUE
 TOMLINSON, ROY E.
 TOWNSEND, EDWARD
 TOWNSEND, OLIVER
 TRAGER, FRANK N.
 TRAPHAGEN, J. C.
 TRIPPE, JUAN TERRY
 TWEEDY, GORDON B.
 UZIELLI, GIORGIO
 VAN DUSEN, REV. HENRY P.
 VOGELSTEIN, HANS A.
 VON MEHREN, ROBERT B.
 VOORHEES, TRACY S.
 WALKER, JOSEPH, JR.
 WALKOWICZ, T. F.
 WALLACE, SCHUYLER C.
 WARBURG, ERIC M.
 WARBURG, FREDERICK M.
 WARBURG, JAMES P.
 WARD, THOMAS E.
 WARFIELD, ETHELBERT
 WARREN, JOHN EDWIN
 WASSON, DONALD
 WASSON, R. GORDON
 WATSON, ARTHUR K.
 WAUCHOPE, REAR ADM. GEORGE
 WEAVER, SYLVESTER L., JR.
 WEBSTER, BETHUEL M.
 WELLBORN, VICE ADM. CHARLES, JR.
 WELCH, LEO D.
 WERNIMONT, KENNETH
 WHEELER, WALTER H., JR.
 WHIDDEN, HOWARD P.
 WHIPPLE, TAGGART
 WHIPPLE, BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM

WHITE, FRANK X.
WHITE, H. LEE
WHITE, THEODORE H.
WHITMAN, H. H.
WHITRIDGE, ARNOLD
WIESCHHOFF, H. A.
WIGHT, CHARLES A.
WILBUR, C. MARTIN
WILKINSON, COL. LAWRENCE
WILLCOX, WESTMORE
WILLIAMS, LANGBOURNE M.
WILLITS, JOSEPH H.
WILSON, JOHN D.

WILSON, ORME
WILSON, PHILIP D.
WINGATE, HENRY S.
WINSLOW, RICHARD S.
WOOD, BRYCE
WOODYATT, PHILIP
WOOLLEY, KNIGHT
WRIGHT, HARRY N.
WRISTON, HENRY M.
WRISTON, WALTER B.
YOUNG, JOHN M.
YOUNG, KENNETH T., JR.
ZURCHER, ARNOLD J.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

- ACHESON, DEAN
 ACHILLES, THEODORE C.
 ADAMS, ROGER
 AGAR, HERBERT
 ALBRECHT-CARRIE, RENE
 ALLEN, RAYMOND B.
 ALLYN, S. C.
 AMORY, ROBERT, JR.
 ANDERSON, DILLON
 ANDERSON, REAR ADM. GEORGE
 ANDERSON, ROBERT B.
 ANDERSON, ROGER E.
 ANDERSON, LT. GEN. SAMUEL E.
 ARMSTRONG, JOHN A.
 ATHERTON, J. BALLARD
 AULD, GEORGE P.
 AVIRETT, WILLIAM G.
 BABCOCK, MAJ. GEN. C. STANTON
 BAKER, GEORGE P.
 ✓ BALL, GEORGE W.
 BALLOU, GEORGE A.
 BARGHOORN, FREDERICK C.
 BARKER, JAMES M.
 BARTHOLOMEW, DANA T.
 BASS, ROBERT P., JR.
 BATES, MARSTON
 BATOR, FRANCIS M.
 BAXTER, JAMES P., 3RD
 BAYNE, EDWARD ASHLEY
 BECHTEL, S. D.
 BELIN, F. LAMMOT
 BELL, LAIRD
 BELL, HOLLEY MACK
 BENNETT, MARTIN TOSCAN
 BERGSON, ABRAM
 BERLINER, JOSEPH S.
 BETTS, BRIG. GEN. THOMAS J.
 BEUKEMA, BRIG. GEN. HERMAN
 BISSELL, RICHARD M., JR.
 BLACK, CYRIL E.
 BLACK, COL. EDWIN F.
 BLACK, EUGENE R.
 BLACKIE, WILLIAM B.
 BLISS, C. I.
 BLISS, ROBERT WOODS
 BLOOMFIELD, LINCOLN P.
 BLUM, ROBERT
 BOHLEN, CHARLES E.
 BONESTEEL, MAJ. GEN. C. H., 3RD
 BOOTHBY, ALBERT C.
 BORTON, HUGH
 BOWIE, ROBERT R.
 ✓ BOWLES, CHESTER
 BRADEN, THOMAS W.
 BRADFIELD, RICHARD
 BRAISTED, PAUL J.
 BRETT, GEORGE P., JR.
 BREWSTER, KINGMAN, JR.
 BRIGGS, ELLIS O.
 BRINTON, CRANE
 BRONWELL, ARTHUR
 BROPHY, GERALD B.
 BRORBY, MELVIN
 BROSS, JOHN A.
 BROWN, IRVING
 BROWN, SEVELLON, 3RD
 BROWN, WILLIAM O.
 BRUCE, DAVID K. E.
 BRUNDAGE, PERCIVAL F.
 BRUTON, HENRY J.
 BUNDY, HARVEY H.
 ✎ BUNDY, MCGEORGE
 BUNDY, WILLIAM P.
 BUNKER, ELLSWORTH
 BURDEN, WILLIAM A. M.
 BURGESS, W. RANDOLPH
 BYRNE, JAMES MACGREGOR
 BYRNES, ROBERT F.
 BYROADE, HENRY A.
 CABOT, JOHN M.
 CABOT, THOMAS D.
 CALDWELL, ROBERT G.
 CALKINS, HUGH
 CAMP, JACK L.
 CAMPBELL, KENNETH H.
 CANFIELD, FRANKLIN O.
 CARAWAY, MAJ. GEN. PAUL W.
 CARPENTER, W. SAMUEL, 3RD
 CARTER, WILLIAM D.
 ✓ CASE, CLIFFORD P.
 CASE, EVERETT N.
 CHAPIN, SELDEN

- CHAPMAN, JOHN F.
 CHEEVER, DANIEL S.
 CHERRINGTON, BEN M.
 CHILDS, MARQUIS
 CISLER, WALKER L.
 CLARK, RALPH L.
 CLAYTON, W. L.
 CLEVELAND, HARLAN
 CLOUGH, ERNEST T.
 COHEN, BENJAMIN V.
 COLLBOHM, F. R.
 COLLYER, JOHN L.
 COMMAGER, HENRY STEELE
 CONANT, MELVIN
 CONLON, RICHARD P.
 CONRAD, BRIG. GEN. BRYAN
 COONS, ARTHUR G.
 COPELAND, LAMMOT DU PONT
 CORSON, JOHN J.
 COSTELLO, WILLIAM A.
 COTTING, CHARLES E.
 COWEN, MYRON M.
 COWLES, JOHN
 CRANE, WINTHROP MURRAY, 3RD
 CREIGHTON, ALBERT M.
 CROSS, JAMES E.
 CROTTY, HOMER D.
 CROWE, PHILIP K.
 CULBERTSON, COL. WILLIAM S.
 CURRAN, JEAN A., JR.
 CURTIS, EDWARD P.
 DANGERFIELD, ROYDEN
 DAVID, DONALD K.
 DAVIDSON, ALFRED E.
 DAVIDSON, CARTER
 DAVIES, FRED A.
 DAVIS, NATHANAEAL V.
 DAVISON, W. PHILLIPS
 DEAN, EDGAR P.
 DECKER, WILLIAM C.
 DE KIEWIET, C. W.
 DE KRAFFT, WILLIAM
 DEMING, FREDERICK L.
 DENNETT, RAYMOND
 DESPRES, EMILE
 DEUEL, WALLACE R.
 DEUTCH, MICHAEL J.
 DEWHURST, J. FREDERIC
 DEXTER, BYRON
 DICKEY, JOHN S.
 DILLON, C. DOUGLAS
 DODDS, HAROLD WILLIS
 DODGE, JOSEPH M.
 DOLLARD, CHARLES
 DONKIN, MCKAY
 DONNELL, JAMES C., 2ND
 DONNELLY, MAJ. GEN. HAROLD C.
 DORR, RUSSELL H.
 DOUGLAS, DONALD W., JR.
 DRAPER, MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM H., JR.
 DUCAS, ROBERT
 DUCE, JAMES TERRY
 * DULLES, ALLEN W.
 DUNN, FREDERICK S.
 ECKSTEIN, ALEXANDER
 EDELSTEIN, JULIUS C. C.
 EDWARDS, A. R.
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM H.
 EINAUDI, MARIO
 EINSTEIN, LEWIS
 * EISENHOWER, DWIGHT D.
 ELLIOTT, BYRON K.
 ELLIOTT, RANDLE
 ELLIOTT, WILLIAM Y.
 ELSEY, GEORGE M.
 EMENY, BROOKS
 EMERSON, E. A.
 EMERSON, RUPERT
 EPPERT, RAY R.
 ESTABROOK, ROBERT H.
 ETHRIDGE, MARK
 EVANS, J. K.
 FAINSDOD, MERLE
 FAIRBANK, JOHN KING
 FAIRBANKS, DOUGLAS
 FARMER, THOMAS L.
 FAY, SIDNEY B.
 FEIS, HERBERT
 FERGUSON, JOHN H.
 FINLAY, LUKE W.
 FIRESTONE, HARVEY S., JR.
 FISHER, EDGAR J.
 FLANDERS, RALPH E.
 FLEISCHMANN, JULIUS
 FLEMING, LAMAR, JR.
 FOLLIS, R. G.

- FORD, GUY STANTON
 FORD, THOMAS K.
 FOSTER, AUSTIN T.
 ✓ FOSTER, WILLIAM C.
 FOWLER, HENRY H.
 ♀ FRANKFURTER, FELIX
 FREE, LLOYD A.
 FULLER, CARLTON P.
 FURBER, HOLDEN
 FURNISS, EDGAR S., JR.
 GAITHER, H. ROWAN, JR.
 ♀ GALBRAITH, J. KENNETH
 GALLAGHER, CHARLES F.
 GALLMAN, W. J.
 GANNETT, LEWIS S.
 GARDINER, ARTHUR Z.
 GARNER, ROBERT L.
 GARTHOFF, RAYMOND L.
 ~ GAVIN, LT. GEN. JAMES M.
 GEIER, FREDERICK V.
 GEIER, PAUL E.
 GIFFIN, BRIG. GEN. SIDNEY F.
 GILBERT, CARL J.
 GILBERT, H. N.
 GILCHRIST, HUNTINGTON
 GILLIN, JOHN P.
 GLEASON, S. EVERETT
 GLENNAN, T. KEITH
 ✦ GOHEEN, ROBERT F.
 GOODHART, ARTHUR L.
 GOODPASTER, BRIG. GEN. ANDREW J.
 GORDON, LINCOLN
 GORNICK, ALAN L.
 GORTER, WYTZE
 GOULD, LAURENCE M.
 GRAHAM, PHILIP L.
 GRANT, MAJ. GEN. U. S., 3RD
 GRAY, GORDON
 GREEN, JOSEPH C.
 GREENE, A. CRAWFORD
 GREENE, JAMES C.
 GREENWOOD, HEMAN
 GRISWOLD, A. WHITNEY
 GROVE, CURTISS C.
 ♀ GRUENTHER, GEN. ALFRED M.
 GULLION, EDMUND A.
 HAGGERTY, PATRICK E.
 HALLE, LOUIS J., JR.
 HAMILTON, MAJ. GEN. PIERPONT M.
 HAMMONDS, OLIVER W.
 HANES, JOHN W., JR.
 HANSELL, GEN. HAYWOOD S., JR.
 HARBISON, FREDERICK
 HARRIS, IRVING B.
 HARSCH, JOSEPH C.
 HART, AUGUSTIN S., JR.
 HARTLEY, ROBERT W.
 HASKELL, BRODERICK
 HASKINS, CARYL P.
 HAUCK, ARTHUR A.
 HAVILAND, H. FIELD, JR.
 HAYES, SAMUEL P.
 ♀ HAYS, BROOKS
 HAYS, JOHN T.
 HEILPERIN, MICHAEL A.
 HEINTZEN, HARRY L.
 HEINZ, H. J., 2ND
 HENDERSON, LOY W.
 HENKIN, LOUIS
 HENRY, DAVID DODDS
 HERMSDORF, HARRY K.
 HERTER, CHRISTIAN A.
 HILL, GEORGE WATTS
 HITCH, CHARLES J.
 HOFER, PHILIP
 HOFFMAN, MICHAEL L.
 ♀ HOFFMAN, PAUL G.
 HOLBORN, HAUJO
 HOLMES, JULIUS C.
 HOMER, ARTHUR B.
 HOOK, GEORGE V.
 HOOVER, CALVIN B.
 HOOVER, HERBERT
 HOOVER, HERBERT, JR.
 HOPKINS, D. LUKE
 HOPPER, BRUCE C.
 HORNBECK, STANLEY K.
 HOSKINS, HALFORD L.
 HOSKINS, HAROLD B.
 HOUGHTON, AMORY
 HOVDE, FREDERICK L.
 HOWARD, GRAEME K.
 HOWE, WALTER
 HOYT, EDWIN C., JR.
 HOYT, PALMER
 HUMPHREY, HUBERT H.

HUNSBERGER, WARREN S.
HUNT, BISHOP C.
HUNT, JAMES RAMSAY, JR.
HUNTER, CLARENCE E.
HUTCHINSON, B. E.
IRWIN, JOHN N., 2ND
IVERSON, KENNETH R.
JANSEN, MARIUS B.
JAVITS, JACOB K.
JENNEY, JOHN K.
JOHNSON, HERSCHEL V.
JOHNSON, LESTER B.
JOHNSON, ROBERT L.
JOHNSTON, HENRY R.
JOHNSTONE, W. H.
JORDAN, LT. COL. AMOS A.
JORDEN, WILLIAM J.
KAISER, PHILIP M.
KAMARCK, ANDREW M.
KATZ, MILTON
KATZENBACH, EDWARD L., JR.
KAUFFMAN, JAMES LEE
KELSO, A. DONALD
KEMPNER, FREDERICK C.
KENNAN, GEORGE F.
KESTNBAUM, MEYER
KILLIAN, JAMES R., JR.
KIMBERLY, JOHN R.
KING, JOHN A., JR.
KINKAID, ADM. THOMAS C.
KINTNER, COL. WILLIAM R.
KISSINGER, HENRY A.
KNIGHT, DOUGLAS
KNORR, KLAUS
KOHLER, FOY D.
KOHLER, WALTER J.
KORBEL, JOSEF
KOROL, ALEXANDER G.
KOTSCHNIG, WALTER
LABOUISSSE, HENRY R.
LAMSON, ROY, JR.
LANGER, PAUL F.
LANGER, WILLIAM L.
LANGSAM, WALTER CONSUELO
LANHAM, MAJ. GEN. CHARLES T.
LANSDALE, COL. EDWARD G.
LARSON, JENS FREDERICK
LASSWELL, HAROLD D.
LATOURETTE, KENNETH S.
LATTIMORE, OWEN
LAWRENCE, DAVID
LAWRENCE, W. H.
LAYBOURNE, LAWRENCE E.
LAYLIN, JOHN G.
LEE, CHARLES HENRY
LEE, DWIGHT E.
LEMNITZER, GEN. L. L.
LESLIE, DONALD S.
LESUEUR, LARRY
LEVINE, IRVING R.
LEVY, MARION J., JR.
LEWIS, HERBERT
LEWIS, WILMARTH S.
LICHTENSTEIN, WALTER
LINCOLN, COL. G. A.
LINDSAY, LT. GEN. RICHARD C.
LINEBARGER, PAUL M. A.
LINGELBACH, WILLIAM E.
LINGLE, WALTER L., JR.
LIPPMANN, WALTER
LITCHFIELD, EDWARD H.
LITTLE, HERBERT S.
LITTLE, L. K.
LOCKARD, DERWOOD W.
LOCKE, EDWIN A., JR.
LOCKWOOD, WILLIAM W.
LODGE, GEORGE CABOT
LOOMIS, ROBERT H.
LUNT, SAMUEL D.
LYON, E. WILSON
McCABE, THOMAS B.
McCLINTOCK, ROBERT M.
McCONE, JOHN ALEX
McCORMACK, MAJ. GEN. JAMES, JR.
MCCRACKEN, PAUL W.
McCUTCHEON, JOHN D.
McDOUGAL EDWARD D.
McDOUGAL, MYRES S.
McFARLAND, ROSS A.
McGEE, GALE W.
McGHEE, GEORGE C.
McKAY, VERNON
McKEE, FREDERICK C.
McKITTRICK, THOMAS H.
McLAUGHLIN, DONALD H.
MACARTHUR, DOUGLAS, 2ND

- MACCHESNEY, A. BRUNSON, 3RD
 MACDONALD, J. CARLISLE
 MACVEAGH, LINCOLN
 MACHOLD, WILLIAM F.
 MADDOX, WILLIAM P.
 MADDUX, MAJ. GEN. H. R.
 MALLINSON, HARRY
 MALLORY, GEORGE W.
 MARCUS, STANLEY
 MARSHALL, CHARLES B.
 MARTIN, WILLIAM MCC., JR.
 MASLAND, JOHN W.
 MASON, EDWARD S.
 MATHEWS, WILLIAM R.
 MAXIMOV, ANDRE
 MAY, GEORGE O.
 MAY, OLIVER
 MAYER, FERDINAND L.
 MAYER, GERALD M.
 MEAGHER, ROBERT F.
 MECK, JOHN F.
 MERCHANT, LIVINGSTON T.
 MERRIWETHER, DUNCAN
 METCALF, GEORGE R.
 MEYER, CHARLES A.
 MEYER, CLARENCE E.
 MEYER, CORD, JR.
 MILBANK, ROBBINS
 MILLER, DAVID HUNTER
 MILLER, FRANCIS P.
 MILLER, WILLIAM B.
 MILLIKAN, CLARK B.
 MILLIKAN, MAX F.
 MILLIS, JOHN S.
 MINOR, HAROLD B.
 MITCHELL, JAMES P.
 MOORE, HUGH
 MORGAN, GEORGE A.
 MORGAN, SHEPARD
 MORGENSTERN, OSKAR
 MORGENTHAU, HANS J.
 MOTT, JOHN L.
 MUDD, HENRY T.
 MUNOZ MARIN, LUIS
 MUNRO, DANA G.
 MURPHY, DONALD R.
 MURPHY, FRANKLIN D.
 MURPHY, ROBERT
 MYERS, DENYS P.
 NATHAN, ROBERT R.
 NEUMANN, SIGMUND
 NEWMAN, RICHARD T.
 NEWTON, QUIGG, JR.
 NICHOLS, CALVIN J.
 NITZE, PAUL H.
 NOVER, BARNET
 NOYES, W. ALBERT, JR.
 NUVEEN, JOHN
 OAKES, GEORGE W.
 OELMAN, R. S.
 OPPENHEIMER, J. ROBERT
 OSBORNE, LITHGOW
 OWEN, GARRY
 PAFFRATH, LESLIE
 PAGE, JOHN H.
 PAGNAMENTA, G.
 PALMER, NORMAN D.
 PANTZER, KURT F.
 PARK, RICHARD L.
 PARKER, BARRETT
 PARSONS, JOHN C.
 PATTERSON, GARDNER
 PAUL, NORMAN S.
 PEASLEE, AMOS J.
 PELZER, KARL J.
 PENFIELD, JAMES K.
 PERERA, GUIDO R.
 PERKINS, COURTLAND D.
 PERKINS, MILO
 PETERSEN, HOWARD C.
 PHILLIPS, WILLIAM
 PHLEGER, HERMAN
 PIQUET, HOWARD S.
 POGUE, L. WELCH
 POOL, ITHIEL DESOLA
 POWER, THOMAS F., JR.
 PRANCE, P. F. A.
 PRESTON, JEROME
 PRICE, DON K.
 PRITCHARD, ROSS J.
 PRIZER, JOHN B.
 PROCHNOW, HERBERT V.
 PROUDFIT, ARTHUR T.
 PULLING, EDWARD S.
 PUSEY, NATHAN M.
 PYE, LUCIAN W.

- REID, OGDEN
 REINHARDT, G. FREDERICK
 REISCHAUER, EDWIN O.
 REITZEL, WILLIAM
 RENNIE, WESLEY F.
 RESTON, JAMES B.
 RICH, JOHN H., JR.
 RICHARDSON, DAVID B.
 RIDGWAY, GEN. MATTHEW B.
 RIEFLER, WINFIELD W.
 RILEY, EDWARD C.
 RIPLEY, S. DILLON, 2ND
 RIVKIN, ARNOLD
 ROBINSON, DONALD H.
 * ROCKEFELLER, NELSON A.
 ROGERS, JAMES GRAFTON
 ROOSEVELT, KERMIT
 ROOSEVELT, NICHOLAS
 ROSENGARTEN, ADOLPH G., JR.
 ROSS, MICHAEL
 ROSTOW, EUGENE V.
 ROSTOW, WALT W.
 RUSSELL, DONALD S.
 RYAN, JOHN T., JR.
 SALOMON, IRVING
 SARGENT, NOEL
 SATTERTHWAITE, JOSEPH C.
 SAWYER, JOHN E.
 SCHAETZEL, J. ROBERT
 SCHELLING, T. C.
 SCHLESINGER, ARTHUR M., JR.
 SCHMIDT, ADOLPH W.
 SCHORR, DANIEL L.
 SCHUYLER, GEN. C. V. R.
 SCHWAB, WILLIAM B.
 SCHWEBEL, STEPHEN M.
 SCOTT, WILLIAM RYLAND
 SEYMOUR, CHARLES
 SEYMOUR, FORREST W.
 SHARP, WALTER R.
 SHARPE, HENRY D., JR.
 SHAW, G. HOWLAND
 SHEARER, WARREN W.
 SHEEAN, VINCENT
 SHISHKIN, BORIS
 SHULMAN, MARSHALL D.
 SIMONS, HANS
 SIMPSON, JOHN L.
 SLOCUM, JOHN J.
 SMITH, EVERETT R.
 SMITH, H. ALEXANDER
 SMITH, ADM. HAROLD PAGE
 SMITH, GEN. WALTER BEDELL
 SMITHIES, ARTHUR
 SMYTH, HENRY DEW.
 SONTAG, RAYMOND JAMES
 SOTH, LAUREN K.
 SOUTHARD, FRANK A., JR.
 SPAATZ, GEN. CARL
 SPEERS, REV. THEODORE C.
 SPIEGEL, HAROLD R.
 SPRAGUE, ROBERT G.
 SPROUL, ROBERT G.
 SPROUT, HAROLD
 STALEY, EUGENE
 STANTON, EDWIN F.
 STASON, E. BLYTHE
 STASSON, HAROLD E.
 STEIN, ERIC
 STEIN, HAROLD
 STEPHENS, CLAUDE O.
 STERLING, J. E. WALLACE
 STEVENSON, ADLAI E.
 STEVENSON, WILLIAM E.
 STEWART, COL. GEORGE
 STEWART, ROBERT BURGESS
 STILWELL, COL. RICHARD G.
 STONE, DONALD C.
 STOWE, LELAND
 STRATON, JULIUS A.
 STRAUS, ROBERT KENNETH
 STRAUSS, LEWIS L.
 STRAUSS-HUPE, ROBERT
 STRAYER, JOSEPH R.
 STRUBLE, ADM. A. D.
 * SULZBERGER, C. L.
 SURREY, WALTER STERLING
 SWEETSER, ARTHUR
 SWENSRUD, SIDNEY A.
 SWIHART, JAMES W.
 SYMINGTON, W. STUART
 TAPP, JESSE W.
 TAYLOR, GEORGE E.
 TAYLOR, GEN. MAXWELL D.
 TAYLOR, WAYNE CHATFIELD
 TELLER, EDWARD

- TEMPLETON, RICHARD H.
TENNYSON, LEONARD B.
THAYER, CHARLES W.
THAYER, ROBERT H.
THORNBURG, MAX W.
THORP, WILLARD L.
TRAVIS, MARTIN B., JR.
TRIFFIN, ROBERT
TROWBRIDGE, ALEXANDER B., JR.
TRUSCOTT, GEN. LUCIAN K., JR.
TUCK, WILLIAM HALTAM
UPGREN, ARTHUR R.
VALENTINE, ALAN
VAN CLEVE, THOMAS C.
VAN SLYCK, DEFOREST
VAN STIRUM, JOHN
VERNON, RAYMOND
VINER, JACOB
WAIT, RICHARD
WALLICH, HENRY C.
WALMSLEY, WALTER N.
WANGER, WALTER
WARD, REAR ADM. CHESTER
WARREN, SHIELDS
WASHBURN, ABBOTT
WATKINS, RALPH J.
WEEKS, EDWARD
WELLES, SUMNER
WELLS, HERMAN B.
WESTPHAL, ALBERT C. F.
WHEELER, OLIVER P.
WHITAKER, ARTHUR P.
WHITE, FRANCIS
WHITE, GILBERT F.
WHITE, JOHN CAMPBELL
WHITEFORD, WILLIAM K.
WHITNEY, JOHN HAY
WIESNER, JEROME B.
WILBUR, BRAYTON
WILD, PAYSON S., JR.
WILDE, FRAZAR B.
WILDS, WALTER W.
WILLIAMS, JOHN H.
WILLIAMS, ROBERT W.
WILMERDING, LUCIUS, JR.
WILSON, CARROLL L.
WILSON, HOWARD E.
WIMPFHEIMER, JACQUES
WINTON, DAVID J.
WISNER, FRANK G.
WOHL, ELMER P.
WOHLSTETTER, ALBERT
WOLFERS, ARNOLD
WRIGHT, ADM. JERAULD
WRIGHT, QUINCY
WRIGHT, THEODORE P.
WYZANSKI, CHARLES E., JR.
YNTEMA, THEODORE O.
YOST, CHARLES W.
YOUNG, T. CUYLER
ZELLERBACH, J. D.

Appendix II

STRANGE AFFILIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN CFR MEMBERS

By Mary Helen Brengel,
Assistant Editor and Research Director
THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper

In reading or analyzing the listings in this Appendix, it should be borne in mind that all activities and strange affiliations of CFR members recorded herein relate to specific cases in past years. This is not intended to mean that said CFR members, as of 1962, hold the same views. In some instances, a CFR member listed in this Appendix may have repudiated his former position and become a "friendly witness," furnishing valuable information to Congressional investigating committees.

The purpose of this compilation is to give the reader an insight into the views held by some CFR members during stated periods in their careers.

The organizations and activities in which certain CFR members have participated will be dealt with in two categories:

Section 1 - Activities which have aided Communist aims and goals, including those which have been cited by Federal or State investigating committees as Communist, Communist-controlled, or subversive, and those apparently "Communist-promoting" activities which have not been cited.

Section 2 - Activities relating to the Institute of Pacific Relations, regarding which the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concluded: "The net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States." (IPR Report, p. 225)

The listings which follow do not purport to be complete, inasmuch as they are limited to the Government documents at our disposal for this purpose.

Abbreviations and References Used in the Following Sections

- Appendix IX - Publication of the U. S. House of Representatives Special Committee on Un-American Activities (the Dies Committee), 1944, 78th Congress, 2nd Session.
- Cal. - Reports of the California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities.
- Cal. Ed. - Reports of the California Senate Investigating Committee on Education (popularly known as "the Dilworth Committee").
- Dies Committee - U. S. House of Representatives Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938-1944 (fore-runner of the present House Committee on Un-American Activities). Rep. Martin Dies - Chairman.
- Dilworth Committee - The California Senate Investigating Committee on Education. Sen. Nelson S. Dilworth, Chairman.
- ff. - following (i.e., "p. 568ff." - page 568 and following page or pages).
- GUIDE - Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, U. S. House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities, revised and published December 1, 1961.
- HCUA - U. S. House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities.
- ibid. - as shown in immediately preceding reference.
- IPR Hearings - Hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations Before the U. S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, 82nd Congress, July 25, 1951 - June 20, 1952.
- IPR Report - Report of the U. S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, relating to Hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations held July 25, 1951 - June 20, 1952 by the Internal Security Subcommittee.
- p. - page number
- pp. - pages numbered
- R/ - Report No. (i.e., "R/14" refers to "14th Report")
- Reece Hearings and Report - Hearings, and Report on Hearings, of the U. S. House of Representatives Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, 83rd Congress, 2nd Session, May 10 - Dec. 16, 1954.

Section 1

Affiliations of Some CFR Members with Cited Organizations

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in his book, "Masters of Deceit,"* defined a Communist front as "an organization which the Communists openly or secretly control." Mr. Hoover stated that "The Party has operated hundreds of major fronts in practically every field of party agitation; 'peace,' civil rights, protection of the foreign born, support for Smith Act 'victims,' abolition of H-bomb tests, exploitation of nationality and minority groups ... specific appeal to teachers, writers, lawyers, labor, women, youth."

Mr. Hoover went on to point out that those non-Communists who allow their names to be used as sponsors, who give testimonials, or appear at front rallies serve a very special purpose for actual Communists who control such front organizations. According to Mr. Hoover: "They serve as lightning rods, camouflaging the Communist interest."

The Internal Security Act of 1950 states that in most cases such "action organizations . . . are not free and independent organizations, but are sections of the world-wide Communist organization, and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of (a) . . . foreign country."

Following are some of the Communist-front organizations and activities with which certain CFR members have been affiliated:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

The 1948 Report of the California Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities (p. 107) states that the American Civil Liberties Union was cited in its 1943 Report as "definitely . . . a

* Published by Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1958.

Communist front or transmission belt organization." The 1948 report (p. 110) further states: "The Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities reiterates the findings of former legislative committees concerning the Communist character of the American Civil Liberties Union . . ."

CFR members who have been connected in one way or another with ACLU activities are:

Dave Dubinsky, a director (Cal. Ed. R/14, p. 24)

Lloyd K. Garrison, Vice Chairman, 1939 (Cal. Ed. R/11, p. 46)

Charles Poletti, a director (ibid., p. 45)

Whitney North Seymour, a director (Cal. '48, p. 109)

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN

This organization is termed "a Communist front" according to the HCUA Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, revised December 1, 1961.

CFR members who have been affiliated with its activities are:

Dave Dubinsky (Cal. Ed. R/14, p. 24)

Paul Manship (Appendix IX, pp. 349, 354)

Reinhold Niebuhr (ibid., p. 340)

James T. Shotwell (ibid., p. 348)

Rev. Henry P. Van Dusen (ibid.)

AMERICAN COMMITTEE TO SAVE REFUGEES

This is a Communist front, described in the Dec., 1961, GUIDE.

CFR members who have participated in its activities are:

Ward Cheney (Appendix IX, page 362)

Arthur G. Coons (ibid., p. 360)

Edgar J. Fisher (ibid., pp. 358-359)

Guy Stanton Ford (ibid.)

Rev. Henry Smith Leiper (ibid.)

Robert Nathan (ibid., p. 362)

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF SPANISH DEMOCRACY

The Communist character of this organization is cited on page 21, GUIDE. The following CFR members have been identified with its activities:

George Backer (Appendix IX, p. 381)

Crane Brinton (*ibid.*, p. 383)

Reinhold Niebuhr (*ibid.*, p. 380)

Leland Stowe (*ibid.*)

AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY

The Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (p. 23), under the heading "American League for Peace and Democracy," states: "Cited as subversive and Communist."

House Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on the CIO Political Action Committee (p. 37) states: "The American League for Peace and Democracy . . . had the distinction of having been the first of the Communist Party's fronts to attract to itself a large following An examination of the program of the American League will show that the organization was nothing more nor less than a bold advocate of treason. The words of the league's official program establish this fact beyond any possibility of doubt. Point 1 in the league's program (1933-1937) read as follows:

"To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions in time of peace or war, and in time of war the transport of all other materials essential to the conduct of war, through mass demonstrations, picketing and strikes."

The following members of the Council on Foreign Relations, according to its 1960 Annual Report have participated in, or been associated with, the above cited American League for Peace and Democracy:

Clarke M. Eichelberger (Reece Report, pp. 275-277)

Sam A. Jaffe (Appendix IX, p. 390)

Reinhold Niebuhr (*ibid.*, pp. 389-390, 404, 411)

Eugene Staley (*ibid.*, p. 396)

AMERICAN-RUSSIAN INSTITUTE

The American-Russian Institute is shown in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publication (p. 29) as: "1. Cited as Communist. 2. Cited as a 'Communist-controlled' organization which was intimately linked with the Institute of Pacific Relations."

CFR members who have been affiliated in one way or another

with this organization are:

- Joseph Barnes (Appendix IX, p. 1096)
- William O. Field, Jr. (*ibid.*, p. 1383)
- Edgar J. Fisher (*ibid.*, p. 1097)
- Lewis S. Gannett (Cal. '48, p. 170)
- Peter Grimm (Appendix IX, p. 1097)
- Philip C. Jessup (*ibid.*)
- William W. Lockwood (*ibid.*)
- E. Wilson Lyon (Cal. '48, pp. 170, 171)
- Geroid T. Robinson (*ibid.*)
- Eustace Seligman (Appendix IX, p. 1097)
- Whitney North Seymour (Cal. '48, p. 170)

AMERICAN YOUTH CONGRESS

This organization is shown in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (page 32) as "subversive and Communist." CFR members who have participated in activities of American Youth Congress are:

- David Dubinsky (Appendix IX, p. 548)
- Clark M. Eichelberger (*ibid.*, p. 535)
- Edgar J. Fisher (*ibid.*, p. 551)
- Leland Rex Robinson (*ibid.*, p. 550)
- George N. Shuster (*ibid.*, pp. 535, 537, 550)
- Rev. Theodore C. Speers (*ibid.*, p. 542)

CHINA AID COUNCIL

The China Aid Council is described as a "Communist-controlled organization" and a "subsidiary of American League for Peace and Democracy" (GUIDE, p. 42). CFR members who have lent their names and/or their efforts to this organization are as follows:

- John K. Fairbank (IPR Report, p. 145)
- Claude E. Forkner (Appendix IX, p. 1486)
- William L. Holland (IPR Report, p. 154)
- Reinhold Niebuhr (Appendix IX, p. 396)
- Eugene M. Staley (*ibid.*)

COORDINATING COMMITTEE TO LIFT THE (SPANISH) EMBARGO

Regarding this organization, the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (p. 64) states: "Cited as one of a number

of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation."

CFR members shown in Appendix IX (pp. 666-669) to have participated in the activities of this organization are:

Marquis Childs	Reinhold Niebuhr
John Gunther	Harold Riegelman
Rev. Henry Smith Leiper	Vincent Sheean
Leland Stowe	

INTERNATIONAL LABOR DEFENSE

This organization is shown as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" on pages 88-89 of the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (1961). The ILD established numerous "Spanish Defense" committees, as shown on pages 1606-1610, Appendix IX, including (1) Lawyer's Committee on American Relations with Spain (cited on p. 99, GUIDE), (2) the Medical Bureau and Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (GUIDE, p. 107), and (3) North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (GUIDE, p. 131).

CFR members associated with these activities are shown in the following list. Numbers preceding the names indicate the organization listed in the foregoing paragraph with which each person was affiliated:

- (3) Clark M. Eichelberger (Reece Report, p. 277)
- (2) Felix Frankfurter (Appendix IX, p. 1611)
- (1) Harold Riegelman (ibid., pp. 963, 966)

The following CFR members are listed as having belonged to the parent group, International Labor Defense (ILD):

- Whitney North Seymour (Appendix IX, pp. 470, 81)
- Vincent Sheean (ibid., p. 844)
- Leland Stowe (ibid., pp. 843, 844)
- Bethuel M. Webster (ibid., p. 811)

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, INC.

The Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (pp. 117ff.) describes this organization as follows:

1. Found to be a "Communist-front organization" within the meaning of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and ordered to regis-

ter as such with the Attorney General. "It was created by the (Communist) party in 1943 as the result of Party plans to establish a mass organization under the name of respondent (National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.) to carry out on a broadened scale functions and activities concerning various Party objectives ****." "Respondent invariably advances positions on matters of policy which do not deviate from positions of the Communist Party. The positions advanced by respondent are invariably and markedly pro-Soviet and, except during the war years, anti-United States Government***."

2. Cited as subversive and Communist.

CFR members who participated in the activities of this organization were:

Herbert H. Lehman (Appendix IX, p. 1202)

Paul Manship (*ibid.*, pp. 487, 1202, Cal. '48, p. 323)

Walter Millis (Appendix IX, p. 1201)

John W. Nason (*ibid.*, pp. 1199, 1202)

Frederick D. Patterson (*ibid.*, p. 1199)

Emory Ross (*ibid.*, p. 1201)

Leland Stowe (*ibid.*)

Alan Valentine (*ibid.*, pp. 1199, 1203)

NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONFERENCE

During the days of the Soviet-Nazi pact, according to the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (1961), page 119, the Communists built protective organizations known as the (1) National Emergency Conference, (2) The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in (3) the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. Also, the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications page 168, shows the (4) Washington Committee for Democratic Action as an "affiliate" or "local chapter" of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

CFR members who have been affiliated with these organizations are as follows:*

(1) James W. Angell (Appendix IX, p. 1206)

* Numbers before each name indicate organizations referred to in preceding paragraph, with which each CFR member has been affiliated.

- (3) John C. Bennett (*ibid.*, p 1241)
- (4) Ralph J. Bunche (*ibid.*, p. 1695)
- (1) Edgar J. Fisher (*ibid.*, p. 1206)
- (3) Guy Stanton Ford (*ibid.*, p. 1248)
- (1) Harry D. Gideonse (*ibid.*, p. 1206)
- (1) (2) Philip C. Jessup (*ibid.*, pp. 1206, 1210)
- (2) Rev. Henry Smith Leiper (*ibid.*, pp. 1212, 1215)
- (2) (3) Vincent Sheean (Appendix IX, p. 1212; Cal. '48, p. 201)
- (1) (2) Robert Kenneth Straus (Appendix IX, pp. 1207, 1210; Cal. '48, p. 327)
- (1) Walter Surrey (Appendix IX, p. 1207)
- (3) Quincy Wright (*ibid.*, p. 1259)

THE PUGWASH CONFERENCES

A staff analysis of the Pugwash Conferences by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1961 (pp. 93-94) concluded that these conferences were "initiated in part by individuals with significant records of support of Communist causes Served as an organic part of (Soviet). . . . cold war design to discredit American nuclear policy and accredit Soviet nuclear policy The general tenor . . . was to weaken the will of American scientists to resist Soviet aggression The Pugwash Conferences were utilized politically to open the doors to delegations from Communist countries which have not been recognized by the United States."

One of the CFR members who participated in the Pugwash Conferences, according to this Subcommittee report was Jerome B. Wiesner (who attended the 2d Pugwash Conference at Lac Beauport, Quebec, March 31-April 11, 1958, and who took the lead in organizing the American delegation to the 6th Pugwash Conference). T. C. Schelling and Walt W. Rostow, CFR members, attended the 6th Pugwash Conference, held in Moscow, Nov. 27-Dec. 5, 1960.

RUSSIAN WAR RELIEF, INC.

Russian War Relief, Inc., was, from its outset, "firmly in the hands of those who have a history of close cooperation with the Soviet Union." (Appendix IX, p. 469). CFR members included in the following list (whose names appear in Appendix IX, pp. 469-471, 474-477) were signers of an appeal for funds which was pub-

lished in the NEW YORK TIMES, Oct. 10, 1941: Clark M. Eichelberger, Lewis S. Gannett, Bruce C. Hopper, Herbert H. Lehman, Francis P. Miller, Clark H. Minor, Geroid T. Robinson, Alexander Sachs, John Scott, Charles Seymour, James T. Shotwell, Juan Trippe, and Walter Wanger.

Whitney North Seymour and Clark H. Minor are listed as members of the Board of Directors of Russian War Relief, Inc.

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare is "cited as a Communist-front organization which seeks to attract Southern Liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South although its professed interest in Southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States." (GUIDE, p. 154)

The CFR members listed below have been associated with this organization and/or its activities. All listings are taken from Appendix IX, with page references indicated:

Gordon R. Clapp, p. 1595

Mark Ethridge, pp. 1592, 1598

Brooks Hays, pp. 1584, 1590ff.

David E. Lilienthal, pp. 1585, 1596

Rev. Julius Mark, pp. 1585, 1589, 1594, 1596

Francis P. Miller, p. 1592

Frederick D. Patterson, p. 1037

On May 1, 1962, Congressman Gordon H. Scherer entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement entitled "An Analysis - Report on a Recent Smear Attack Against the House Committee on Un-American Activities." In this report the following statement is made:

Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. (SCEF), successor of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, was cited as a Communist front by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1956 Carl Braden, a SCEF Field Secretary, has been identified as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in sworn testimony before the HCUA (House Committee on Un-American Activities).

Congressman Scherer also reported that Braden has been "con-

victed of contempt of Congress and sentenced to a year in jail as a result of his testimony.”

THE DRIVE TO ABOLISH CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF COMMUNISM

The NEW YORK TIMES of February 22, 1962, carried a paid appeal by the “Ad Hoc Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.”

According to the resolution (House Resolution 5) establishing the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 79th Congress, 1st Session, 1945, its functions are:

. . . .The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation. . . .

CFR members who signed the anti-HCUA ad were: Joseph Barnes, John C. Bennett, William O. Brown, Walter Millis, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Benjamin J. Bittenwieser.

CFR members who have engaged in similar activities in years past are the following:

William D. Carter - signatory to ad, LOS ANGELES DAILY NEWS, May 15, 1950, by the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt-Nixon Bill (HCUA Annual Report, 1950) - (Cal. Ed. R/11, p. 53)

Guy Stanton Ford - signer of petition to Congress to discontinue Dies Committee sponsored by American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, 1/17/40 (Appendix IX, p. 331)

Lewis S. Gannett - signatory to petition in NEW MASSES 4/2/40 asking an end to “witch hunts” (ibid., pp. 1356, 1650)

Henry V. Poor - Signer of DAILY PEOPLE'S WORLD letter by National Institute of Arts and Letters denouncing the Thomas Committee of Congress investigating un-American activities (Cal. '48, p. 331)

William L. Shirer - Participant in activities of Freedom from

Fear Committee, March, 1948 (which used fund-raising drive for the legal defense of the ten Hollywood writers identified as Communists as a means to attack the Thomas Investigating Committee). (Cal. '48, pp. 239-241).

Theodore H. White - Participant in activities of Freedom from Fear Committee as shown under "William L. Shirer." (ibid.)

Background On Selected CFR Members

RALPH J. BUNCHE

Ralph J. Bunche has been affiliated with the following Communist or Communist-front organizations which are cited in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications:

Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR Hearings, p. 1220)

National Negro Congress (Appendix IX, p. 1293)

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY, contributing editor, 1936-1940 (ibid., p. 1456)

Washington Committee for Democratic Action (ibid., p. 1695)

Further activities of Ralph J. Bunche relating to the field of Education are described in Appendix III.

CLARK M. EICHELBERGER

Clark M. Eichelberger participated in the following Communist-front activities which are cited in the December, 1961, GUIDE.

American League for Peace and Democracy (Reece Report, pp. 275-277)

American Student Union (ibid.)

American Youth Congress (Appendix IX, p. 535)

Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts (Reece Report, pp. 275-277)

Committee for Peace Through World Cooperation (Appendix IX, p. 640)

North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (Reece Report, pp. 275-277)

World Youth Congress, 1938, sponsor. (ibid.)

Additionally, Clark M. Eichelberger is shown in Appendix IX to have been affiliated with the following organizations whose Communist character is cited in Appendix IX: American Council to Combat Nazi Invasion (p. 1086); Committee for a Boycott Against Japanese Aggression (p. 635); Russian War Relief, Inc., (p. 475).

Clark M. Eichelberger was a defense witness for Alger Hiss (Reece Report, pp. 275-277).

JOHN KING FAIRBANK

John King Fairbank was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Louis Budenz (Report on the Institute of Pacific Relations, p. 148). Fairbank participated in the following Communist-front activities which are cited in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications:

AMERASIA (IPR Report, p. 145)

American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives
(Indusco, Inc.) - (ibid.)

China Aid Council (ibid.)

Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR Hearings, p. 1147)

WILLIAM L. HOLLAND

William L. Holland has been identified with the following Communist-front organizations which are cited in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications:

AMERASIA (IPR Report, p. 154)

China Aid Council (ibid.)

Institute of Pacific Relations, 1929-1952 (IPR Report, pp. 13, 62)

IPR's present (1952) Secretary-General, Mr. Holland, was the official who first sought to put the institute into contact -- through one of his former IPR associates - with Borodin, who was the Comintern's "chief engineer" for the first Communist revolution in China **** The inner circle of officers and staff members, including . . . Lattimore . . . bound their organization to the Comintern in the 1930's. It is reasonable to assume that they did so with the full knowledge of their present Secretary-General, Mr. Holland. The foundations laid in the 1930's were built upon in the 1940's. . . (ibid., pp. 60, 62)

It is also noted that William L. Holland was a member, in 1959, of the Public Affairs Committee, publishers of Public Affairs Pam-

phlets. This committee has not been cited as a Communist front. However, Maxwell S. Stewart, Editor of Public Affairs Pamphlets, and Secretary of the Public Affairs Committee, was formerly editor of MOSCOW NEWS, and has been identified as a Communist by Louis Budenz, according to the Reece Hearings on Tax-Exempt Foundations, page 34, and the Reece Report, page 408. The Reece Hearings also describe the questionable nature of certain Public Affairs Pamphlets (*ibid.* and Reece Report p. 134).

SAM A. JAFFE

Sam A. Jaffe has been associated with the following Communist-front organizations or activities which are cited in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications:

American League for Peace and Democracy (Appendix IX, p. 390)

Artists' Front to Win the War (*ibid.* p. 575)

Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (Appendix IX, p. 1383)

Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee (*ibid.*, p. 1531)

Schappes Defense Committee (*ibid.*, p. 1560)

SOCIAL WORK TODAY (*ibid.*, p. 1786)

Workers' Alliance (*ibid.*, p. 1547)

World Peace Congress, 1949 (Review of Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1950, p. 11)

In addition, Sam A. Jaffe is shown as affiliated with the Julius Rosenthal Memorial Committee, the Communist character of which is cited in Appendix IX (p. 957).

PHILIP C. JESSUP

Philip C. Jessup has been affiliated with the following Communist-front organizations which are listed in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications:

American-Russian Institute (Appendix IX, p. 1097)

Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR Hearings, p. 1219)

National Emergency Conference, 1939 (Appendix IX, p. 1206)

National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, 1940 (*ibid.*, p. 1210)

In addition to the affiliations shown above, Jessup was a member of the Faculty Advisory Board of the American Law Students' Association, as shown in Appendix IX, p. 1093. The Communist character of this organization is shown in Appendix IX, p. 1067.

OWEN LATTIMORE

According to the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee covering the hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations (pp. 224-225), Lattimore ". . . was, for some time beginning in the 1930s a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy **** influential in bringing about a change in United States policy in 1945 favorable to the Chinese Communists." Lattimore, who was identified as a member of the Communist Party in sworn testimony by Louis Budenz before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, (IPR Report, p. 148), was appointed Director of the Pacific Division of War Information during World War II.

Lattimore has been affiliated with the following organizations which are cited in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications:

AMERASIA, Member of editorial board, 1937-1941 (Appendix IX, p. 1446)

Hollywood Writers Mobilization (ibid., p. 787)

Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR Hearings, p. 1147)

Washington Book Shop (Reece Report, p. 324)

Washington Committee for Aid to China (Appendix IX, pp. 1478, 1688)

Lattimore was also affiliated with the Maryland Association for Democratic Rights, as indicated in Appendix IX, p. 1136. This organization is cited as a Communist front on pages 1067-1068 of Appendix IX.

Further activities of Owen Lattimore are described in Section 2 of this Appendix, outlining his connection with the Institute of Pacific Relations, and in Appendix III, relating to Lattimore's activities in the field of Education.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Reinhold Niebuhr has been affiliated with the following Communist-

front organizations which are cited in the December, 1961, GUIDE:
 American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born
 (Appendix IX, p. 340)

American Friends of the Chinese People (ibid., p. 371)

American Friends of Spanish Democracy (ibid., pp. 380, 383)

American Labor Party (ibid., p. 1093)

American League for Peace and Democracy (ibid., p. 389)

American Student Union (ibid., p. 523)

China Aid Council (ibid., p. 396)

Consumers' National Federation (ibid., p. 658)

Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo (ibid., p. 666)

PROTESTANT DIGEST (ibid., p. 1455)

Reinhold Niebuhr has been affiliated with the following organizations or activities which are cited as Communist fronts in Appendix IX:

American Round Table on India (Appendix IX, p. 1772)

Citizens' Committee to Aid Striking Seamen (ibid., p. 1774)

Committee for a Boycott Against Japanese Aggression (ibid., p. 632)

National Citizens' Political Action Committee (Hillman Committee) - (ibid., p. 265)

He is also shown in the 1961 Report of the California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, p. 128, to have been associated with the Committee to Defend Simon Gerson, a Communist Functionary. The Communist character of this organization is cited in the 1961 California Report.

More recently, Reinhold Niebuhr has been a signer of an appeal in the NEW YORK TIMES, Feb. 22, 1962, by the Ad Hoc Committee, urging Congress to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER

J. Robert Oppenheimer, head of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J., was denied security clearance and access to classified security information by the Atomic Energy Commission in June, 1954, because of his imprudent and danger-

ous associations with known subversives.

CFR member Oppenheimer is shown, on page 336, Appendix IX, as a member of the National Committee of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which is cited as a Communist front in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, page 17.

In the Transcript of Hearings in the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer before the Personnel Security Board of the Atomic Energy Commission, page 9, Oppenheimer admits membership in the western council of the Consumers Union, which is cited as a Communist front in Appendix IX, p 663.

In his statement before the Personnel Security Board of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer also admitted contributing funds to questionable causes. Stated Dr. Oppenheimer (Transcript of Hearings, page 9): "He (Dr. Thomas Addis) was a distinguished medical scientist who became a friend. Addis asked me, perhaps in the winter of 1937-1938, to contribute through him to the Spanish cause. He made it clear that this money, unlike that which went to the relief organizations, would go straight to the fighting effort, and that it would go through Communist channels. I did so contribute; . . . I gave him sums in cash, probably never much less than \$100, and occasionally perhaps somewhat more than that, several times during the winter."

Further in his statement, Dr. Oppenheimer admitted the following (in his words): "It was in the summer of 1939 in Pasadena that I first met my wife I learned of her earlier marriage to Joe Dallet He had been a Communist Party official, and for a year or two during their brief marriage, my wife was a Communist Party member * * * * Steve Nelson came a few times with his family to visit; he had befriended my wife in Paris at the time of her husband's death in Spain in 1937."

Regarding the "Steve Nelson" referred to above, Appendix IX, p. 271, states: "Steve Nelson, a colonel in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, was a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, United States of America."

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR

Whitney North Seymour, a former president of the American Bar

Association, has been associated with the following Communist-front organizations or activities which are cited in the December, 1961, GUIDE:

American-Russian Institute, member, Board of Directors, 1938 (Cal. '48, p. 170)

International Juridical Association (Appendix IX, p. 811)

International Labor Defense, "legal arm of the Communist Party." (Seymour served as attorney for the ILD in defense of Angelo Herndon, Negro Communist, before the U. S. Supreme Court) (ibid., p. 470)

National Lawyer's Guild (ibid., p. 1270)

Whitney North Seymour has also served as a member of the Board of Directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, according to the 1948 Report of the California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities (p. 109). The American Civil Liberties Union is shown on page 107 of this report as having been cited in its 1943 Report as "definitely . . . a Communist front or transmission belt organization." The 1948 report, page 110, stated: "The Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities reiterates the findings of former legislative committees concerning the Communist character of the American Civil Liberties Union. . ."

Whitney North Seymour was also a member of the Board of Directors of Russian War Relief, Inc., as recorded on pages 469 and 474, Appendix IX. The Communist character of this organization is cited in Appendix IX.

VINCENT SHEEAN

Vincent Sheean has been affiliated with the following Communist-front organizations or activities which are cited in the December, 1961, GUIDE:

American Writers Congress (Appendix IX, p. 1340)

Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo (ibid., p. 668)

Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (ibid., p. 754)

Harry Bridges Defense Committee (ibid., p. 599)

International Labor Defense, ("legal arm of the Communist

Party") (ibid., p. 844)

National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (ibid., p. 1212)

North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (Appendix IX, p. 754)

Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (ibid., p. 1648)

He has also been affiliated with the following organizations which are cited in Appendix IX: National Right-to-Work Congress, cited as "an out-and-out Communist Party affair" (Appendix IX, p. 1308); and Washington Committee to Lift the Spanish Embargo, cited as a Communist front (Appendix IX, p. 1703).

JAMES T. SHOTWELL

James T. Shotwell participated in the following Communist-front organizations which are cited in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications:

American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born (Appendix IX, p. 348)

Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder (ibid., p. 620)

Committee for Peace Through World Cooperation (ibid., p. 640)

Conference on Pan-American Democracy (ibid., p. 673)

Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR Hearings, p. 1216)

James T. Shotwell has also been affiliated with Russian War Relief, Inc., which is described in Appendix IX (p. 469) as "firmly in the hands of those having a history of close cooperation with the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, or its satellite front organizations." (Appendix IX, p. 476)

Further activities of James T. Shotwell relating to the field of Education are described in Appendix III.

LELAND STOWE

Leland Stowe has been associated with the following organizations or activities which are cited as Communist fronts in the December, 1961, GUIDE:

American Friends of Spanish Democracy (Appendix IX, p. 380)

American Relief Ship for Spain (ibid., p. 489)

Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo (ibid.,

p. 668)

Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (*ibid.*, p. 754)

International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party") - (*ibid.*, 843, 844)

League of American Writers (*ibid.*, p. 978)

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., (*ibid.*, p. 1201)

North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (*ibid.*, p. 754)

Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy (*ibid.*, p. 1710)

Further activities of Leland Stowe are described in Appendix III relating to the field of Education.

WALTER WANGER

Walter Wanger has been affiliated with the following Communist-front organizations or activities cited in the December, 1961, GUIDE:

American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Inc., (Cal. '48, p. 132)

Hollywood Writers Mobilization (Appendix IX, pp. 787, 790)

Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, Hollywood (Cal. '48, p. 255)

Mobilization for Democracy (Cal. '48, p. 309)

Walter Wanger has also been affiliated with Russian War Relief, Inc., which is shown as a Communist front in Appendix IX, p. 469. (Appendix IX, p. 477)

Section 2

CFR "Interlock" With the Institute of Pacific Relations

The Senate Internal Subcommittee concluded in 1951, after a thorough study and exhaustive investigation, that "The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives," and that "Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist." The American Communist Party and Soviet officials considered the organization "an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence." (GUIDE, p. 87)

(Attendance at IPR Conferences is recorded in the following list since these conferences served as a preface to the 1945 United Nations Conference in San Francisco. The ninth IPR Conference at Hot Springs, Va., in January, 1945, was described by Raymond Dennett, who was at the time Secretary of IPR's American Council, "as a trial balloon for the U.N. Conference at San Francisco." (IPR Report pp. 193-195). Many of the delegates to the 9th IPR Conference, from countries other than the United States, flocked out to San Francisco to attend the founding conference of the United Nations.)

The following CFR members have served in various executive capacities in the IPR between the periods shown. The highest office held during period of service is indicated.*

Raymond B. Allen, 1946-51, Vice Chairman

J. Ballard Atherton, 1951, Trustee

Hugh Borton, 1938-51, Executive Committee Member

H. Clifford Brown, 1951, Trustee

* This information is extracted from the following pages in the Hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee July 25, 1951 - July 2, 1952, and the 1952 Report on these Hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee: Hearings, pp. 568, 1147ff., 1219ff., 1313ff.; 4987-4999; Report, p. 4, 133.

- Lincoln C. Brownell, 1947-51, Executive Committee Member
Ralph J. Bunche, Delegate to 8th and 9th IPR Conferences
Everett N. Case, 1932-34, Treasurer
Gordon R. Clapp, 1951, Trustee
Arthur G. Coons, 1947-1951, Trustee; attended IPR Conference, 1947
Arthur H. Dean, 1946-50, Vice Chairman; major individual contributor
Raymond Dennett, 1944-46, Secretary
Brooks Emeny, 1938-1951, Vice Chairman; Delegate to 6th, 7th, and 8th IPR Conferences
Rupert Emerson, 1951, Trustee
John K. Fairbank, 1944-1952, Trustee; attended 1945 and 1947 IPR Conferences
Sidney D. Gamble, 1951, Trustee
Huntington Gilchrist, 1946-1948, Executive Committee Member
W. R. Herod, 1940-51, Vice Chairman; attended 1939 IPR Conference
Paul G. Hoffman, 1946, Trustee
William L. Holland, 1929-1952, Secretary General
Philip C. Jessup, 1936-1946, Chairman; responsible for recommending delegates to 1945 IPR Conference; presided at caucus of American delegation preceding conference
Joseph E. Johnson, 1951, Trustee
Grayson Kirk, 1944-1948, Chairman; delegate to San Francisco United Nations Conference, 1945, and to 9th IPR Conference
Owen Lattimore, 1933-1951, Executive Committee Member; Editor, PACIFIC AFFAIRS, 1936-1941
Herbert S. Little, 1946-1951, Trustee
William W. Lockwood, 1938-1951, Secretary
Henry R. Luce, 1933-1947, Vice Chairman; delegate to 5th IPR Conference; major individual contributor
James G. McDonald, 1929-1940, Trustee; delegate to 3rd and 6th IPR Conferences
J. Morden Murphy, 1950-1951, Executive Committee Member; attended 1949 IPR Conference
Philo W. Parker, 1937-1942, Vice Chairman
William Phillips, 1951, Trustee

James T. Shotwell, 1927-1936, Executive Committee Member
Robert Gordon Sproul, 1943-1951, Chairman

Eugene Staley, 1941-1948, Chairman; attended 1939 and 1949
IPR Conferences

J. Wallace Sterling, 1951, Trustee

Donald B. Straus, 1946-1951, Treasurer; attended 1939 IPR
Conference

George E. Taylor, 1946-1951, Trustee

Juan Trippe, 1946, Trustee; major individual contributor

Sumner Welles, 1946-1951, Vice Chairman

Brayton Wilbur, 1943-1951, Trustee; Member, nominating com-
mittee; delegate to 8th IPR Conference

Quincy Wright, 1928-1940, Trustee; delegate to 1st, 2d, 5th,
6th, and 7th IPR Conferences.

The writings of CFR members were responsible for filling over
1100 pages in the periodicals of the Institute of Pacific Relations,
PACIFIC AFFAIRS and FAR EASTERN SURVEY, in the years 1931-
1950.* Identified as having written articles, books, or other mater-
ial for IPR are the following 53 CFR members:

Joseph Barber, Martin Toscan Bennett, William D. Carter, Harlan
Cleveland, Jerome B. Cohen, Jean A. Curran, Jr., Edgar P. Dean,
Raymond Dennett, Brooks Emeny, Rupert Emerson, Charles B.
Fahs, John K. Fairbank, Lawrence S. Finkelstein, Holden Furber,
Sidney D. Gamble, Huntington Gilchrist, Carter Goodrich, A.
Whitney Griswold, John N. Hazard, William L. Holland, Warren S.
Hunsberger, Philip C. Jessup, Grayson L. Kirk, Klaus Knorr,
Paul F. Langer, Kenneth S. Latourette, Owen Lattimore, Marion J.
Levy, Jr., Paul M. A. Linebarger, William W. Lockwood, Vernon
McKay, John W. Masland, Walter Millis, Philip E. Mosely, John
E. Orchard, Richard L. Park, Nathaniel Peffer, Karl J. Pelzer,
Col. Frederick Pope, Edwin O. Reischauer, Nicholas Roosevelt,
Herbert Rosinski, James T. Shotwell, Harold Sprout, Eugene Staley,
George E. Taylor, James P. Warburg, Albert C. Westphal, Theo-
dore H. White, C. Martin Wilbur, Arnold Wolfers, Quincy Wright,
and Bryce Wood.

* IPR Hearings, pages 1222, 5506-5633, IPR Report, pp. 60, 62, 170, 193ff.

CFR-IPR INFLUENCE IN WORLD WAR II

The 1954 Report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (p. 50) concluded that "during the latter part of World War II, the Information and Education Division of the United States Army had powers of compulsory indoctrination over 8 million American soldiers A group of Communists or pro-Communists infiltrated into controlling positions in the I. and E. program and brought it about that 8 million American soldiers were taught the wrong things about Communism, the wrong things about the USSR, the wrong things about Communist China, and the wrong things about Americans who oppose Communism."

A part of the I. and E. story relating to the members of the Council on Foreign Relations is set forth in the Transcript of Hearings "In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer" (page 342). Frederick H. Osborn, who appeared as a witness for Oppenheimer, disclosed that as a civilian he had been appointed by Secretary of War Stimson to the post of chairman of the Joint Army-Navy Committee of Welfare and Recreation in March, 1941. General George C. Marshall commissioned Osborn as a Brigadier General, and in 1943 he was promoted to Major General. General Osborn served as Director of the Information and Education Division of the U. S. Army until his retirement in 1945 (at which time he was appointed Deputy Representative of the United States on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, 1947-1950).

The hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1954 on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments"* indicate that Major General F. H. Osborn, Director of the I. and E. Division, requested the transfer to Headquarters, I. and E. Division, of Lt. Colonel Julius Schreiber, a neuropsychiatrist who was serving at Stockton State Hospital in California. Under questioning by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Dr. Schreiber took the fifth amendment regarding his Communist Party affiliations for all periods of his life prior to 1941.

* "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Part 20, pp. 1532ff., 1553ff., 1578.

The 1954 Report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee* described Dr. Julius Schreiber as the most important of the "Communists and pro-Communists who seized key positions in the Information and Education branch of the United States Army during World War II." This report reveals that 22 of the 39 books recommended to the troops as basic reading were IPR publications, of which 230,000 were purchased by the Army for distribution at installations throughout the world. The 1954 report further states: "All this establishes the open and visible connection between I. and E. and IPR. There is a possibility that there may also have been a connecton beneath the surface * * * * When the IPR Communists combined with the I. and E. Communists, the minds of 8 million young Americans also came under the lash, since the entire I. and E. program, whose leader was also a psychiatrist, was compulsory for every man who wore an Army uniform."

It is shown** that a committee of three was responsible for selecting the basic orientation reference library. At least two of these three committee members were CFR members - Hamilton Fish Armstrong and General John J. McCloy. The third member is identified only as "Dr. Brown." Dr. Julius Schreiber was asked during the questioning what part he played in the initiation, drafting and approval of Army Talks 1-100. Certain of these talks had been advertised, reprinted, and sold by the Communist DAILY WORKER and the Communist NEW MASSES. Dr. Schreiber replied that after an Army Talk was written and edited, it went to Colonel Watrous. From that point, said Dr. Schreiber, "finally he would send it to General Osborn, who did the final editing and approval before we could publish it."

In additon to the influence exercised by members of the Council on Foreign Relations on the Army Information and Education program during World War II, Owen Lattimore was Director of the Pacific Division of the Office of War Information, and John K. Fairbank headed OWI's Chinese delegation.***

* 1954 Report, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, pp. 37, 47-51.

** "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Part 20, pp. 1553, 1556, 1578.

*** 1954 Report Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, p. 52.

Appendix III

ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN CFR MEMBERS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

For some years, certain members of the Council on Foreign Relations have been actively guiding, implementing, and directing the re-writing of the textbooks in American schools.

The introduction to the 11th Report (1953) of the California Senate Investigating Committee on Education (the Dilworth Committee) states: "The committee has observed the organization and growth of several organizations that succeed in materially influencing public sentiment in regard to educational policy There are among them . . . organizations made up to a large extent of writers, professional lecturers, left-wing clerics and active agitators some of whom are financially supported by the various funds or foundations for semi-political purposes."

In view of the known bias of the foremost tax-exempt foundations, it is not surprising to find the following sentence on page 144 of this Dilworth Committee Report: "The committee is . . . deeply concerned that too often advocates of surrendering our national sovereignty or independence to a super-world government get a hearing in our texts and our schools. Any World Government would place control in the great mass populations of backward and totalitarian countries . . . We must retain our national independence unimpaired."

This Dilworth Committee Report describes a Committee on International Education and Cultural Relations which was appointed by the American Council on Education. Chairman of this committee was Howard E. Wilson, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. CFR member Wilson's committee sponsored, and the American Council on Education published, a booklet entitled "Textbook Improvement and International Understanding," which contains the following quotation by Dr. George F. Zook: "The inability of our Federal Government to bring about needed revisions in history textbooks in this country is no reason at all why this matter should not be given serious consideration."

Dr. Zook then recommended that there be "set up an official and comprehensive committee of history scholars and teachers who will attempt to secure in American school textbooks adequate recognition of these principles emphasized in the Declaration on Teaching of History in 1937, namely, 'the interdependence of nations' and 'against all such allegations and interpretations as might arouse unjust prejudices against all other nations'."

Further activities of CFR member Howard E. Wilson* are outlined in this 11th Report of the Dilworth Committee in connection with a study prepared under his direction on the "Treatment of Asia in American Textbooks." Working in this same area of endeavor was CFR member George Stoddard* of the State University of Iowa, who found that "Many of the texts seemed to sustain imperialistic tendencies and American nationalistic pride at sacrifice of the truthful presentation of the Filipino viewpoint."

In 1958, the Dilworth Committee, in its 16th Report, makes a thorough exploration of a teachers' handbook entitled "Education for International Understanding in American Schools,"** authored by the Committee on International Relations of the National Education Association and published by the NEA in 1948. In this NEA handbook acknowledgment is given to the following CFR members: Ben M. Cherrington, Howard E. Wilson, and James T. Shotwell.

Before this NEA committee undertook arrangements for the teachers' handbook, 16 "scholars, journalists and public officials" met with the NEA committee at Pocono Manor, Pennsylvania, in January, 1947, for a three-day discussion of the question "What should be the specific objectives of school programs for international understanding?" The suggestions of this committee set the pattern for the teachers' handbook.

Of the total of 16 consultants at the Pocono Conference, 6 were CFR members: Ralph J. Bunche, C. W. de Kiewiet, Harold Sprout (Margaret Sprout was also one of the 16), Donald C. Stone, Howard

* 11th Report, California Senate Investigating Committee on Education, pp. 144ff.

** 16th Report, California Senate Investigating Committee on Education, pp. 173ff.

E. Wilson, and Quincy Wright.

In evaluating this NEA handbook, the California Report stated: ". . . This book is strictly UNESCO One World propaganda." The Dilworth Committee then goes on to quote Public Law 471, HR 8067, 83rd Congress, 2d Session, which reads, in substance:

"This provision of Law enacted by Congress and signed by the President is a specific direction against the teaching of One World Citizenship or One World Government in the schools of this Country."

Public Law 603, 84th Congress, 2d Session, HR 10721, is also cited, as follows:

"Sec. 109: None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used (1) to pay the United States Contribution to any international organization which engages in the direct or indirect promotion of the principle or doctrine of one world government, or one world citizenship (2) for the promotion, direct or indirect, of the principle or doctrine of one world government or one world citizenship."

Following a thorough review of the NEA teachers' handbook, "Education for International Understanding in American Schools," the Dilworth Committee asks ". . . By what right (do) the organized teachers (National Education Association) presume to decide what the future political concepts of our nation's children should be By what right do they ask the American school teachers to ignore State laws that require them to teach American principles and history and American citizenship rights and responsibilities, and in place teach World Citizenship?"

The writings of CFR members Norman Cousins and Allen W. Dulles are recommended in this NEA teachers' handbook.

The 4th Report of the California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, 1948 (p. 199) states: "Among the Communists and Communist fellow travelers who have been writing textbooks for use in public schools are the following: . . . Owen Lattimore . . . Eugene Staley . . . Leland Stowe . . ." (All three are listed as members of the Council on Foreign Relations in its 1960 Annual Report.)

* * * * *

The final page of the 11th Report of the California Senate Investigating Committee on Education, in a section entitled "Appraisal of Value of Non-Communists to Soviet Conspiracy," discusses the substance of discussions which took place at the Soviet Comintern meeting of 1938 by referring to an account of Eudocio Ravines, a former Comintern agent, which appears on pages 265-268 of his book, "The Yen-an Way."* Describing what took place at the Comintern meeting, Ravines stated:

"Then Dimitrov began to discuss the tactics and type of work that lay before us (Communists). Our program must be to gain ends through our friends, sympathizers and allies, while keeping ourselves in the background: '. . . Never appear in the foreground. Let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police The writer who without being a party member defends the Soviet Union . . . is worth more than a thousand party members Those who are not party members or marked as Communists enjoy greater freedom of action. This dissimulated activity which awakes no resistance is much more effective than a frontal attack by the Communists. The Communist Party of the whole world must learn the lesson of the Spanish War, where the efficacy of the fifth column was proved'."

* * * * *

This book, "America's Unelected Rulers," accuses no one. We have merely documented the background, activities, and viewpoints of members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Let the reader be the judge.

--M.H.B.

* Charles Scribner Sons, New York, 1951

INDEX

- A -

- Acheson, Dean, 29
AEC (See Atomic Energy Commission)
AFL/CIO, 55
Agar, Herbert, 60
Agger, Donald G., 67
Agricultural policy, common, 89, 89
Agricultural subsidization and control of, 89
Aiken, Sen. George D., 97
Aldrich, Winthrop, 29, 111, 116
Alexander, Holmes, 79
American Assembly, 39
American Association for the U.N., 55
American Communist Party, 35
American Confederation, 79
American Council of Learned Societies, 21, 24
American Establishment, The, 68, 109 - 110, 116
"America's Unelected Rulers," 107, 118
Anderson, Robert B., 111
Arden House, 39
Arkadev, Georgy P., 47
Armour, Norman, 60
Atlanticans, 56, 74, 76
Atlantic Assembly, 73
Atlantic Community, 12, 56-57, 64, 71-73, 75-77, 94, 101-102, 104, 114
Atlantic Community, High Council of (See High Council of the Atlantic Community)
Atlantic Community, High Court of Justice (See High Court of Justice, Atlantic Community)
Atlantic Congress, Inc., 44, 63-66, 68, 94
Atlantic Council of the U.S., Inc., 68-69, 74-75
Atlantic Exploratory Convention, 59, 62-63, 65, 67, 70-71, 73-74, 76-77, 94, 107
Atlantic Institute, 68, 76
ATLANTIC MONTHLY, 36
Atlantic Pact, 59
"Atlantic partnership," 103
Atlantic Plan for Youth and Education, 75
Atlantic Treaty Association, 68
Atlantic Union, 56-57, 60, 65, 70-71, 77, 106
Atlantic Union Committee, 58-60, 62, 66
ATLANTIC UNION NEWS, 66
Atlantic unity, 107
Atomic energy, 84, 96
Atomic Energy Commission, 83, 112

- B -

- Ball, George, 32, 78-79, 95, 98, 101-103
Barnes, Joseph, 37

- Barron, Bryton, 112, 118
 "Basic Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy," 6
 Belgium, 43, 83
 Benton, William, 64
 Bi-partisanship, 95
 Bliss, Robert Woods, 60
 Blough, Roger M., 29
 Bohlen, Charles E., 111-112
 Bowie, Robert R., 40, 110
 Bowles, Chester, 32, 60, 110
 Braden, Spruille, Former Assistant Secretary of State, 21
 Bricker Amendment, 113
 British Information Services, 82
 Broken treaties, 15
 Brookhaven National Laboratory, 84
 Brown, Sevellon, 61
 Brundage, Percival F., 61
 Brussels, 84
 Bunche, Ralph J., 31
 Bundy, McGeorge, 106
 Bunker, Arthur, 61
 Burden, William A., 67
 Burgess, W. Randolph, 111
 Burns, Arthur F., 110
 Byroade, Henry A. 111
- C -
- Cabot, John M., III
 Canada, 43, 68
 Carnegie Corporation of New York, 26
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 19-20, 23-26
 Carnegie Foundation, 22, 27
 Cartel, 90
 Cartelization in Europe (See Cartel System)
 Cartel System, 89-90
 Case, Sen. Clifford P., 29
 Casey, Kathryn, 25
 Castro, Fidel, 40
 CBS (See Columbia Broadcasting System)
 CED (See Committee for Economic Development)
 Center for International Affairs, Harvard, 16-17
 Center for International Relations, Harvard, 40
 CFR (See Council on Foreign Relations)
 Childs, Marquis, 29, 37
 "Citizen sovereignty," 56
 Clay, Lucius D., 110
 Clayton, William L., 50, 61, 67-68, 76
 Clearinghouse (EEC) for job offers and requests, 88
 Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Ball, 79
 Coexistence, peaceful, 13
 Colegrove, Prof. Kenneth, 21
 Collingwood, Charles, 29
 Columbia Broadcasting System, 38
 Columbia University, 39
 Commercial exchange, 41
 Commission on Higher Education, 21
 Committee for Economic Development (CED), 85, 86, 89, 91
 Committee on Atlantic Union (See Atlantic Union Committee)

- Common Assembly, ECSC, 82
 Common Market (See also European Economic Community), 4, 40, 73, 79, 82-87, 89-91, 93, 102, 104, 106
 Common market of North America, 104
 Common Market Treaty, 86-88
 Common market, Western Hemisphere, 103, 106
 "Communism on the Map," 7
 Communism, World (See World Communism)
 Communist Conspiracy, International, 105
 "Communist Encirclement - 1961," 7
 Communist International, 105-106
 "Competition," assigning spheres of, 90
 Conant, Dr. James B., 29, 68, 76, 111
 Congress (See United States Congress)
 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3
 Congressmen, voting records of, 112
 Connally Amendment, 11, 65-66
 Conservative political-action committees, 117
 "Conservative Political Action Handbook" note, 115
 Conservative Society of America, 109, 113-115, 117-118
 Constitution (See United States Constitution)
 Continental Congress, DAR, 84
 Council of Ministers, ECSC, 82, 92-93, 96
 Council on Foreign Relations, 5, 20, 27, 29, 31, 79-80, 84-86, 92-95, 97, 101-102, 105-107, 109-112, 114-117
 Council on Foreign Relations "institution builders," 104
 Court of Justice, ECSC, 82, 91-92, 104
 Courtney, Kent, 109, 118
 Cousins, Norman, 29, 55
 Cowles, Gardner, 37, 61
 Cox Committee, 22
 CSA (See Conservative Society of America)
 "CSA Voting Index," 113, note, 114
 Cultural exchange, 41, 109, 114
 Currie, Lauchlin, 30
 Customs duties, 87
- D -
- DAILY TELEGRAPH, THE, 106
 DAN SMOOT REPORT, THE, 5, 16, 27, 30, 42, 105
 DAR (See Daughters of the American Revolution)
 Daughters of the American Revolution, note, p. 49
 Daughters of the American Revolution, Continental Congress of (See Continental Congress, DAR)
 Daughters of the American Revolution, National Society, 84
 Davis, Congressman James C., 98

- Dean, Arthur H., 32
 Declaration of Paris, 67, 69-71, 73-77
 deKiewiet, Cornelius, 61
 Democratic party, 109-110, 113, 115
 Denmark, 43
 Dewey, Thomas E., 116
 Dewhurst, Dr. J. Frederic, 61
 Dillon, Douglas, Secretary of the Treasury, 32, 95, 97, 111, 116
 Disarmament, 4, 15-16, 33, 36, 109, 114
 Dobrynin, Anatoly F., 47
 Dodge, Cleveland E., 61
 Douglas, Lewis W., 68, 76
 Draper, Maj. Gen. William, Jr., 61, 64
 Dubinsky, David, 29
 Duke, Angier Biddle, 32
 Dulles, Allen W., 116
 Dulles, John Foster, 60, 110-111
- . [.
- Eberstadt, Ferdinand, 61
 ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER, 98
 ECSC (See European Coal and Steel Community)
 EDC (See European Defense Community)
 Education, 74, 75
 EEC (See European Economic Community)
 Eichelberger, Clark M., 31, 55
 Eisenhower Administration, 95, 110
 Eisenhower, Dwight D., 1, 7, 29, 51, 66, 95, 102, 110-111
 Elliott, Prof. William Yandell, 61
 Emerson, E. A., 61
 England (See Great Britain)
 ESQUIRE, 2, 16, 109
 Establishment, The (See American Establishment, The)
 Ethridge, Mark, 37
 EURATOM (See European Atomic Energy Community)
 European Atomic Energy Community, 79, 84, 92, 96
 European Atomic Energy Community, Commission of, 92
 European Atomic Energy Community, Treaty, 84-85
 European Coal and Steel Community, 79, 81-84, 91-92, 96
 European Coal and Steel Community Common Assembly (See Common Assembly, ECSC)
 European Coal and Steel Community Council of Ministers (See Council of Ministers, ECSC)
 European Coal and Steel Community Court of Justice (See Court of Justice, ECSC)
 European Coal and Steel Community, High Authority of, 92
 "European Common Market and its Meaning to the United States, The," 86
 European Communities, 96
 European Defense Community, 83

- European Economic Community, 73, 83, 85, 88, 90, 92-94, 103, 105
- European Economic Community, administrative institutions of, 91
- European Economic Community, The Assembly of, 91
- European Economic Community, British accession to, 103
- European Economic Community, clearinghouse for job offers and requests (See clearinghouse (EEC) for joboffers and requests)
- European Economic Community, Commission of, 91-92
- European Economic Community, Council of Ministers, 90-91
- European Economic Community, Organizational setup of, 91
- European Economic Community, similarity to OECD, 96
- European Investment Bank, 87, 90
- European Nuclear Energy Agency, 96
- European Parliamentary Assembly, 92
- European Social Fund, 87-88
- European unification, 81
- "European unity," 82-83, 85
- Europe, United States of, 81
- Europe Western (See Western Europe)
- Executive Committee, 16
- . F .
- Fairbanks, Douglas, Jr., 29, 61
- FBI (See Federal Bureau of Investigation)
- Federal Bureau of Investigation, 35
- Federal Union, Inc., 58
- Ferguson, John Henry, II, 61
- Finletter, Thomas K., 64
- Fiscal policy, 87
- Ford Foundation, 19-20, 27
- Ford Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 35
- Foreign Agents Registration Act, 79
- Foreign Aid, 13-14, 18, 33, 39, 48, 65, 93, 97, 109, 114, 116
- Foreign Aid, beyond control of Congress, 97
- Foreign Aid, long-term, 12
- Foreign Aid, military, 13
- Foreign Aid program, 4
- FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE DIGEST, 48, 84
- Foreign Policy Association, The, 20
- Foreign Policy Clearing House, 6
- Foreign Trade program, 4
- Foster, William C., 68, 76
- Foundations, 68
- Foundations, Communist infiltration of, 22
- Foundations, Federal income tax exemption, 20
- Foundations, personnel for government, 24

Foundations, subversive influence of, 22
 Foundations, uses of resources of, 20
 Fowler, Henry H., 32
 France, 43, 45, 82-83, 111
 Franklin, George S., Jr., 61
 FREEDOM & UNION, 56, 58, 77
 Free enterprise, 75
 Free Men Speak, Inc., note, p.50
 "Free movement of workers," 88
 Free World Community, 102, 105
 Free World nations, 10
 French government, Communist influence on, 88
 French parliament, 83
 Fulbright, Sen. J.W., 5, 16, 33
 Fulbright Memorandum, 6
 Fuller, Carlton P., 61

- G -

Garland Fund, 22
 Garrett, Garet, 2
 GATT (See General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade)
 General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, 85
 Germany, Federal Republic of, 43, 82
 Gideonse, Dr. Harry D., 61
 Gilpatric, Roswell L., 32
 "Goal is Government of All the World, The," 58
 Goldberg Arthur J., 32-33
 Goldwater, Sen. Barry, 99, 101, 115

Government, One World, 106
 Graham, Philip, 37
 Great Britain, 45, 47, 51, 93, 111
 Greece, 43, 47
 Gross, Ernest, 64
 Grover, Allen, 37, 61

- H -

Haas, Earnest B., 51
 Hamilton, Alexander, 79
 Hamlin, Chauncey J., 61
 Harlan, John Marshall, Associate Supreme Court Justice, 58
 Harriman, Averell, 29, 32
 Harriman, E. Ronald, 61
 Harsch, Joseph C., 37
 Harvard Center for International Affairs (See Center for International Affairs, Harvard)
 Harvard University, 3, 16-17, 40
 Harvard Study No. 10, 17-18
 Heckscher, August, 34
 Heckscher Foundation, 22
 Henderson, Loy W., 111
 Herring, Pendleton, 34
 Herter, Christian A., 67-68, 71, 76, 107, 111
 High Council of the Atlantic Community, 72, 103
 High Court of Justice, Atlantic Community, 72
 Hill, George Watts, 61
 Hiss, Alger, 22, 30
 Hitler, Adolph, 4, 40
 Hobby, Oveta Culp, 110

Hoffman, Paul G., 29
 Hoover, Herbert, 116
 Hoover, J. Edgar, 35
 House of Representatives (See United States House of Representatives)
 House Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, 19
 House Ways and Means Committee, 103
 Hovde, Dr. Frederick, 61
 Hoyt, Palmer, 38, 61
 Humphrey, Sen. Hubert H., 29, 63
 Hungary, 7, 13

- | -

Iceland, 43-44, 66
 Immigration, 87-88
 Import duties, U.S., 93
 INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, THE, note, p. 50
 INDIVIDUALIST, THE, 50
 Institute of Pacific Relations, 20, 22-24, note, p. 30, 34
 Intelligence, 33
 "Interdependence," 103
 "Interlock," 4, 19, 25
 International Conference Center, 70
 International Court of Justice (See United Nations World Court)
 Internationalism, 21, 114
 Internationalism, interlock in, 20

Internationalist Republicans, 116
 Internationalists, 103
 International Parliamentary Committee, 67
 Invisible Government, 110
 "Invisible Government, The," note, p. 105
 IPR (See Institute of Pacific Relations)
 Italian government, Communist influence on, 88
 Italy, 43, 47, 82-83

- J -

Jaffe, Sam A., 31, 38
 Japan, 12, 24, 40
 Japan, government of, 95
 Javits, Sen. Jacob, 29, 64, 95, 114, 116
 Jenner, Sen. William E., 1, 50-52
 Jessup, Philip C., 11, 31
 John Birch Society, back cover
 John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, 22
 Johnson, Lyndon B., 68, 113
 Johnson, Dr. Robert L., 61

- K -

Keenan, George, 36
 Kennedy Administration, 17, 95, 113
 Kennedy, President John F., 1, 3, 32-33, 73, 80, 103, 109-110
 Kenyatta, Jomo, 40
 Khrushchev, Nikita, 15

Kirk, Adm. Alan Goodrich, USN
(ret.), 32, 61
Kissinger, Henry, 110
Kitchin, Rep. Paul, 47
Kohn, Dr. Hans, 61
Kotschnig, Walter M., 111

. L .

Labor force, immigrant, 88
Labor, free movement of, 87
Labor Government, 3
Laski, Harold, 3
Lattimore, Owen, 30, 31
Laura Spelman Fund, 24
Lee, J. Bracken, 117
Lehman, Herbert H., 29
Lenin, 105
Lewis, Fulton, Jr., 34, 48, 113
LIFE Magazine, 38
Lippman, Walter, 29, 38
Litchfield, Prof. Edward H., 61
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr., 68,
76, 109, 116
London, 63
LONDON DAILY TELEGRAPH,
106
Long, Sen. Russell, 48
LOOK Magazine, 38
Los Angeles Freedom Club, 49
Luce, Henry R., 38, 110, 116
Luxembourg, 43, 82-83

. M .

McCarran Committee, 23
"McCarthy Era," 36
McCarthy, Sen. Joseph R., 6,
109

McCloy, John J., 32
McCone, John A., 32
McCoy, H.B., President, Trade
Relations Council of U.S., 100
McGee, Sen. Gale, 29
McGhee, George C., Under Se-
cretary of State for Interna-
tional Organization Affairs,
95, 104
McKee, Frederick C., 61
McNiece, Thomas, 24
MacArthur, Gen. Douglas, 6, 34,
note, p. 48, 110, 118
Machiavelli, 5
Macmillan, Prime Minister, 51
Manion, Dean Clarence, 49
Marcus, Stanley, 29
Marshall Field Foundation, 22
Marshall Plan, 81, 95, 104
Marts, Dr. Arnaud C., 61
"Marxism and the National Co-
lonial Question," 13
Mau Mau, 40
M'boya, Tom, 40
Merchant, Livingston T., 111
Mikoyan, Anastas, 40
Miller, Col. Francis Pickins, 61
Millikan, Dr. Clark B., 62
Millikan, Max F., 35
Millis, Walter, 35
Mitchell, Don G., 62
Mitchell, James P., 111
Monetary policy, 87
Monopoly (See cartel system)
Monopoly, continuance and ex-
pansion of (See cartel system)
Monopoly, political and econo-
mic (See cartel system)
Moore, Hugh, Sr., 62, 67

Moscow, 48
 Moscow State University, 34
 Muir, Malcolm, 38, 62
 Murphy, Dr. Franklin D., 62, 64
 Murphy, Robert, 110
 Murrow, Edward R., 32, 34

- N -

Nason, Dr. John W., 62
 National Association of Pro-America, 59
 National Broadcasting System, 38
 National governments, subverting of, 86
 Nationalism, 17, 21, 78, 86
 Nationalism, as defined by CFR, 16
 Nationalist China, 45
 Nationalist Socialism, 4
 National Socialist German Worker's Party, 4
 National sovereignty, 17, 103, 106-107
 NATO (See North Atlantic Treaty Organization)
 Neal, Dr. Alfred C., 64
 "Necessary social change," 18
 Netherlands, 43, 47, 82-83
 New Frontier legislation, 113
 "New International Order," 9, 12
 News media, CFR-controlled, 92
 NEWSWEEK Magazine, 38
 NEW YORK DAILY NEWS, THE, 35, 58

NEW YORK HERALD-TRIBUNE, THE, 38
 NEW YORK TIMES, THE, 38, 48, 58, 77, 107
 Nichols, Thomas S., 62
 Niebuhr, Rev. Reinhold, 29, 31
 Nitze, Paul, 32, 64
 Nixon, Richard M., 33, 109-110, 116
 Norstad, Gen. Lauris, 48
 North Atlantic Council, 43-44, 52
 North Atlantic Pact, 50
 North Atlantic Treaty, 46, 52, 59
 North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 9-10, 43-44, 46-52, 62, 64, 66, 70, 74, 77, 85, 94-95, 102, 104-105
 North Atlantic Treaty Organization High Court of Justice, 71
 North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarians Conferences, 63-67, 73
 North Atlantic Union, 58
 Nuclear Energy, 84

- O -

OAS (See Organization of American States)
 O'Donnell, John, 58
 OECD (See Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development)
 OEEC (See Organization for European Economic Co-operation)

One World, 1, 6, 22, 50, 62, 77, 103, 107, 114

One World Government, 73

"Operation Abolition," 7

Oppenheimer, J. Robert, 31, 34, 84, 112

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 94-100, 102-105

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, as "bridge" with European Common Market, 102

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Convention, 101

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, membership list of, 95

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Preparatory Committee (See Preparatory Committee of OECD)

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Treaty, 97, 99-101

Organization for European Economic Co-operation, 81, 94-95

Organization of American States, 51

Osborne, Lithgow, 62, 64

Overstreet, Harry, 55

. P .

Paley, William S., 38

Paris, 43, 70

Phelps-Stokes Fund, 22

Philip, William, 62

"Pie crusts" role (treaties), 15

Plutonium, 84

Potofsky, Jacob, 110

Preparatory Committee of OECD, 96

"Prospect for America," 110

. Q .

Quotas, export, 87

Quotas, import, 87

Quotas, trade, 85

. R .

Raw materials, dividing up of, 90

Reciprocal Trade Agreements, 93

Red China, 7, 34-35, 39

Reece, Congressman Carroll B., 19

Reece Committee on Tax-Exempt Foundations, 19-21, 24-25

Reece Committee Report, 22

Reid, Ogden, 29

Republican Administration, 112

Republican Convention, 1960, 109-110

Republican Party, 109-110, 113, 115-116

Republicans, Internationalist (See Internationalist Republicans)

- Reston, James, 38
 Reuther, Walter P., 55
 Rhodes, Cecil, 58
 Rhodes scholar, 58
 "Rights of Man," 57
 "Rights of Nations," 57
 Robert Marshall Foundation, 22
 Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 35, 110
 Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report of 1960, 34
 Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Rockefeller Panel for, 110
 Rockefeller, David, 29, 116
 Rockefeller financial enterprises, 90
 Rockefeller Foundation, 19-27, 34
 Rockefeller, John D., III, 29, 116
 Rockefeller, Gov. Nelson A., 29, 40, 110-111, 116
 Rockefeller-Nixon GOP platform, 110
 Roosevelt, Edith Kermit, 1
 Roper, Elmo B., Jr., 29, 38, 50, 58, 62, 64, 67
 Rosenberg, Anna, 110
 Rosenwald Fund, The, 22
 Rostow, Walt W., 32, 35
 Rousselot, Congressman John, 3
 Rovere, Richard H., 2, 5, 16, 109-110
 Rusk, Dean, Secretary of State, 23, 32-34, 93, 104, 110
 Russia (See Soviet Union)
 Rust, Enoch R., 100
- . § .
- SAC (See Strategic Air Command)
 Sarnoff, David, 38, 110
 Schary, Dore, 55
 Scherman, Harry, 62
 Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., 3-4, 32, 80
 Schmidt, Adolph W., 62, 64, 67
 Schuman, Robert, 81
 SEATO (See Southeast Asia Treaty Organization)
 Secret agreements, 14
 Secretary of State, note, p. 23, 24
 Secret negotiations, 15
 Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 23, 41
 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 6-7, 27, 50, 59, 64, 100
 Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 15, 21, note p. 30
 Senators, voting records of, 112
 Seymour, Whitney North, 31
 Sheean, Vincent, 31
 Shirer, William L., 29, 38
 Shotwell, Prof. James T., 25, 62
 Smoot, Dan, 105-106, 110
 Sobolev, Arkady A., 46
 Socialism, 13, 80, 101, 105-106, 114
 Socialism, Fabian-Keynesian, 3
 Socialist One-World government, 12
 Socialist States, world-wide union of, 106

- Social Science Research Council, 34
- Social security, 51, 87-88
- Sonne, Hans Christian, 62
- Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, 51
- Soviet aggression, 16, 18
- "Soviet Political Treaties and Violations," 15
- Soviet satellite nations, 11
- Soviet Union, 7, 10-11, 13-16, 45, 79, 105, 111, 114
- Soviet world conquest, 105
- Spaak, Paul-Henri, 83
- Stalin, Joseph, 3, 13
- Stassen, Harold E., 116
- State Department (See United States Department)
- State Department BULLETIN (See United States Department BULLETIN)
- Stevenson, Adlai E., 32, 68, 76
- Stevenson, Dr. William E., 62
- Stewart, Robert B., 62
- Stillman, John S., Deputy to Under Secretary of State, 95
- Stockpiles, 85
- Stowe, Leland, 31
- Strategic Air Command, 48
- Streit, Clarence, 56-57, 59-60, 77, 86
- Struble, Vice Adm. A.D., USN, 111
- Sulzberger, Arthur H., 29, 38
- SUNFED, 35
- Supreme Court (See United States Supreme Court)
- "Supreme law of the land," 15
- Symington, Stuart, 29
- I -
- Taft, Sen. Robert A., 49, 116
- Tariff, common, 87
- Tariff, external to EEC, 92
- Tariff, protective, 85
- Tariff, reduction of, 93
- Tariff, unilateral reduction of by President Kennedy, 92
- Taylor, Wayne Chatfield, 62
- Tchernychev, Ilya S., 47
- Teller, Dr. Edward, 62
- Thurmond, Sen. Strom, 80, 99, 114-115
- TIME, Inc., 68
- TIME Magazine, 38
- Tito, 13, 48
- Tito's Air Force, 13
- "Towards European Integration," 82
- Trade, America with Europe, 81
- Trade barriers, 87
- Trade barriers, reduction of, 93, 96
- Trade Expansion Act of 1962, 17
- Trade liberalization of, 81
- Trade, World (See World Trade)
- Transport policies, common, 87
- Treasury Department (See United States Treasury Department)
- Treaties of Rome, 83-85, 87, 89-92, 103
- Truman, Harry, 1, 7, 21, 33
- Twentieth Century Fund, 34

- U -

UN (See United Nations)
 Underdeveloped areas, 90, 98
 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (See Soviet Union)
 "Union Now," 57
 United Europe, 103
 United Kingdom, 43
 United Nations, 1, 9-11, 15, 39, 43, 48, 51, 54-55, 59, 62, 79-80, 97, 102, 111
 United Nations Charter, 7, 10, 44-46, 102, 105
 United Nations Fund for Economic Development, 35
 United Nations General Assembly, 54
 United Nations Security Council, 10, 15, 45-46, 54, 111
 United Nations, Soviet-dominated, 105
 United Nations World Court, 10-11, 55, 66
 United Nations World Court, President of, 11
 United States Citizens Commission on NATO, 65-68, 70-71
 United States Committee for the Atlantic Congress, 64
 United States Congress, Constitutional power of, 112
 United States Constitution, 14, 18, 79, 97, 100, 107, 116, 118
 United States State Department, 5-6, 9, 14, 18, 24-25, 27, 30, 63, 100-101, 103, 106, 110, 112

United States State Department BULLETIN, 101-102
 United States State Department FOREIGN POLICY BRIEFS, note, p. 78
 United States Supreme Court, 72
 United States Treasury Department, 111
 United World Federalists, 54, 56
 "Untouchable State Department, The," 112, 118
 Uppgren, Dr. Arthur R., 62
 Uranium, 84
 U.S. (See United States)
 U.S.S.R. (See Soviet Union)

- W -

Wadsworth, James J., 111
 Walker, Gen. Edwin A., back cover
 Wanger, Walter F., 31, 62
 War and Peace Studies, 24
 Warden, Alexander, 70
 Washington, George, 42, 78
 Welch, Robert, back cover
 Wells, Dr. Herman B., 62
 Western Europe, 43, 68
 Western Hemisphere, 103
 White, Harry Dexter, 30, 34
 Whitney, John Hay, 38
 Widener, Alice, 34, 36
 Wiesner, Jerome B., 32
 Williams, G. Mennen, 55
 Willkie, Wendell, 21
 Willoughby, Gen. Charles A., USA (ret.), 48, note, p.84,117

- Winiarski, Bohdan Stefan, 11
Winslow, Richard S., 111
Women's Investor's Research
Institute, Inc., 50
Workers, free movement of, 87
96
Workers, migration of, 88
"Work force," as Communist
agents, 88
Work permits, 89
Work permits, government is-
suanace of, 88
World citizenship, 21-22
World Communism, 12
World Community, 102, 104
World Court (See United Na-
tions World Court)
World Government, 4, 9, 50, 52,
58, 71, 101, 105
World Planners, 80
World trade, expansion of, 96
World Union of Soviet Social-
ist Republics, 106
World War I, 24
Wriston, Henry M., 39

- Y -

Yugoslavia, 48

- Z -

Zinchenko, Constantin E., 47

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Kent and Phoebe Courtney, a husband-and-wife team, are publisher and editor, respectively, of *THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN*, a national Conservative Political Action Newspaper, which they founded in January, 1955. *THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN* Newspaper has subscribers in all 50 States.

Other activities of Kent and Phoebe Courtney include the publishing of TAX FAX pamphlets advocating the Conservative position on such national issues as Foreign Aid, Federal Aid to Education, Socialized Medicine, Federal Urban Renewal, etc. More than 3,000,000 copies of these TAX FAX pamphlets have been published and distributed during the past five years.

The Courtneys' first book *THE CASE OF GENERAL EDWIN A. WALKER - How the Appeasers Propose to Substitute Surrender for Victory*, was published in August, 1961.

The second book by Kent and Phoebe Courtney, *THE CSA VOTING INDEX*, which contained a tabulation and analysis of the key votes in the 1961 Session of Congress, was published in early 1962.

Kent Courtney is the commentator of The Radio Edition of the Independent American, a weekly broadcast of "the Conservative side of the news," which is heard over an ever-increasing number of stations from coast to coast.

Courtney, born in Minnesota, moved to New Orleans in 1929. He is a graduate of the School of Business Administration of Tulane University in New Orleans, having majored in economics and later serving as an instructor in economics in Tulane's University College. His wife, Phoebe Courtney, attended Newcomb College in New Orleans.

Both Kent and Phoebe Courtney are members of the anti-Communist John Birch Society founded by Robert Welch.

Kent Courtney is also the National Chairman of The Conservative Society of America.