

William Bradford Huie

# SEVEN WAYS TO SAVE THE UN

ONE OF THE FIRST TASKS of the new American administration will be to salvage the United Nations. For the world's "last best hope for peace" is foundering. Even as its sandwich-like home along New York's East River is completed, the UN is drifting helplessly, and it can be relieved only by stern and intelligent measures.

Both a grand jury and a Senate committee have shown the UN to be a refuge for many of the old Communist hands who have been driven from our own government. In the new "international civil service," these people, together with their comrades from the Soviet bloc, form a hard-core minority that is frustrating the efforts of a big, freedom-supporting majority.

The American people, who furnish almost half the money and employees, are losing both confidence and interest in the UN. The radio networks, newspapers, and magazines now give it scant coverage; and the semiofficial magazine, *United Nations*

*World*, estimated in July, 1952, that only 39 per cent of the American people are now favorably inclined toward the UN.

The majority of Americans simply do not want to think about the UN. A small minority on the extreme right would like to torpedo it; and an equally small minority on the left blame its failures on the United States. Of the rest of us who maintain any interest, perhaps a majority have reached the shrug-and-sigh stage. If the UN asked for a vote of confidence this year, it would fall for lack of support.

And this, *really*, would be a pity. For the UN is a potentially powerful device in freedom's battle to disarm Communism. It is an opportunity waiting to be exploited by wise and realistic men on our side. It is a base from which able Americans can wage the superior brand of political warfare by which we can hope to disarm our enemies without actual war. The UN should be saved; and here's how our new government can save it.

1. *Change the United States representatives.*

THE AMERICANS who have been responsible for our ineffective representation at UN include, most prominently, President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, Philip Jessup, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The President, of course, is in the process of being replaced, and it is assumed that all the others will be replaced.

The United States delegation, generally, has been ineffective. Most of the members have lifetime records of having misjudged the nature of the Communist conspiracy. Either they were for Soviet recognition in 1933 as a measure to promote peace; or they favored the imposition of coalition governments on Poland and China in 1946 as a measure to promote peace; or they aided Alger Hiss in drawing up the UN charter: the charter which brands totalitarian fascists as enemies of peace and freedom but welcomes totalitarian Communists as friends.

That this delegation would be inept was foreseen by Senator William J. Fulbright on December 20, 1945, when he complained that the nominations had been rushed through the Foreign Relations Committee in "a few minutes in the presence of only three senators."

"The President is using this delegation," Senator Fulbright charged, "to reward individuals who have no

special qualifications, and this may give the impression to other nations that we don't have any better men or else we don't take the UN seriously."

Mr. Acheson's replacement at the UN, if he is to be successful, must be a tough-minded politician who understands the nature of the enemy. The Soviets are not humanitarians; they are politicians. They don't want to feed the world; they want to dominate it. They don't want to give land to peasants; they want to rob them. They don't want to use the UN to promote peace; they want to promote tension and discord. They are the hand-tooled instruments of totalitarian tyranny, and we must oppose them with abler and more resolute politicians.

2. *Accept the fact that the UN, as presently constituted, contains the enemy within it.*

THE UN was erected on a false assumption; that it was a society of friends, each of whom wanted to promote a free and peaceful world. Much of the disillusionment has derived from this false assumption.

Why do our Communist enemies participate in the UN? Because they want peace? Of course not. They are there on orders to disrupt. Here is a resolution adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International:

The Communist Party enters a bourgeois parliament [like the UN]

not to participate organically in its activities, but to undermine the parliament from within. . . . Every Communist representative in a parliament is required to realize that he is not a "legislator" searching for agreement with other legislators, but an agitator of the party sent to the camp of the enemy in order to carry out the decisions of the party.

That is Communist doctrine. That is why Vishinsky is always "dashing the hopes for peace." That is why he makes three-hour orations laughing at disarmament proposals and "increasing tensions." He is not sent there to co-operate, but to agitate.

Why then do the free nations tolerate the Communist agitators in the UN? Why not force them out?

The answer is that this is exactly what may happen, but for the present it may be wise strategy to leave them in the UN and try to damage them there politically with superior *diplomatic maneuver*.

The United States has suffered so long from inferior diplomacy that many of us are apt to assume that it will always be so. During the past twenty years our diplomats, employed to hinder the cause of the enemy, have actually *aided* his cause. But it need not always be so. If we can now rear up a few real statesmen to maneuver for the cause of freedom, the UN may be the arena in which they can inflict real damage on the enemy.

But if the UN is disappointing,

why doesn't the United States withdraw from it?

This is the most unrealistic suggestion of all. The United States shouldn't desert any more arenas of conflict with Communism. We should use the UN to damage the cause of Communism, and if anyone is to be driven out it should be the Communists.

But at present the enemy is within the UN; and since the UN is housed in New York, the enemy is within our own national gates. And this means risk. But the risk can be minimized if we understand what we are doing, if we choose proper representatives to engage the enemy, and if we impose the indicated restrictions on the movements and activities of the enemy.

### 3. *Identify all UN representatives and employees.*

THE UN is now a burgeoning bureaucracy of about 4,500 persons, in all capacities, spending about \$600,000,000 a year. Of this, the American contribution is about 2,000 persons and \$266,000,000.

Once we have recognized that the enemy is within the UN, then it follows that all the Americans in it must be clearly dissociated from the enemy. Our new delegation will insist on the discharge of all Americans in any capacity at the UN whose previous political activities and/or associations make them properly suspect.

Then, as long as the UN meets inside the boundaries of the United States, it is proper that our government be furnished by the UN a complete file containing the names, numbers, and records of all personnel.

We will not be violating any legitimate hopes for peace by insisting on *identification* at the UN. If this necessitates some change in the UN regulations, particularly the unrealistic Rule 56, then our delegation should press for such a change.

4. *Restrict the movements of all Communists connected with the UN.*

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE will lose patience with the UN if it continues to be a haven for unidentified enemy agents. Maintaining the UN in New York is a calculated risk on the part of this country, and prudence dictates that the risk be minimized.

No American, not even our ambassador, enjoys the privilege of unrestricted movement in a Communist nation. Therefore, once all UN personnel have been correctly identified, then the government of the United States should carefully define the conditions under which the enemy agents and sympathizers can remain in the United States.

These agents are now free to travel as they choose.

This must be changed; our new administration, undoubtedly, will move to change it; and it is difficult

to believe our friends, the smaller nations in the UN, will not support us.

5. *Insist that some UN meetings be held behind the Iron Curtain.*

OUR OLD and futile UN delegation has eschewed the best of all the propaganda gambits: why haven't we insisted that UN meetings be held in Moscow and Prague? That would be a good move.

Insistence on meetings in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia would cause consternation among the Communists. They value their seats in the UN; they can't withdraw very easily; so how can they explain to their people a refusal to entertain the UN? If the Soviet Union is the great advocate of peace, how can it deny its hospitality to the organization seeking peace?

6. *Require that the Reds and all other member nations pay their fair share of UN expense.*

THE UN propagandists like to claim that the UN costs the American people "only ten cents a head." This refers to our assessment of about \$15,000,000 a year for the *regular UN budget*, of which we pay 36.9 per cent and the Soviet Union pays 9.85 per cent.

But this refers only to the regular budget. It does not take into account the proliferating Specialized Agencies, where the amounts get much larger, as do the percentages contributed by the United States.

And the amount contributed by the Soviet Union is usually nothing.

This situation led to the remark by Senator Alexander Wiley that it looked to him as if the \$47,000,000 UN rabbit was fathering a \$300,000,000 litter, because the proposed United States contribution to the UN for 1953 is about \$340,000,000.

In the UN's Expanded Program of Technical Assistance the United States puts up 60 per cent of the money, while the Soviet Union spends nothing.

The UN's International Children's Emergency Fund, known as UNICEF, is generally regarded as the soundest and most worth while of the Specialized Agencies. Of the total of about \$130,000,000 which it has spent, the United States has contributed about \$81,000,000.

To illustrate how the propaganda works, in her column on November 17, 1951, Mrs. Roosevelt reproached Congress and the American people for not having made a special gift to UNICEF.

On the date that Mrs. Roosevelt complained of our stinginess, the United States was bearing 60 per cent of all the costs of UNICEF, and Mrs. Roosevelt made no mention of the fact that the Soviet Union was contributing not a nickel.

All agencies of the UN cost the United States at least \$266,000,000 in 1952. Proponents of the UN hope to raise this to more than \$340,000,000 in 1953, which would likely

be more than half of total UN expenditures.

We can purchase neither respect nor hope for peace by allowing the UN to be an American gravy train. Purely in the interest of UN effectiveness, our new government and our new UN delegation must insist that every member nation pay its fair share of the *total cost*.

7. *Resist the UN's tendency to concern itself with economics rather than politics.*

THE SECURITY COUNCIL was designed to be the most important agency of the UN. This is the 11-member body which is charged with responsibility for the maintenance of international peace. Any one of the great powers can veto any action by this council. Because the Russians were not present in the council at the beginning of the Korean war, the aggression was formally resisted by UN action. The Russians returned a month later, and since then they have vetoed all consideration of Korea.

With the Security Council ineffective, the General Assembly has become a futile debating society; and, therefore, the third of UN's six principal organs now plays the most important role. This is the Economic and Social Council known as ECOSOC.

The program for ECOSOC is vast and utopian, designed to promote higher standards of living, full em-

ployment, solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems.

In short, as the UN has failed as a *political* instrument, its propagandists have rushed its development as an *economic* instrument. This is done under the theory of "stomach Communism" — that the way to defeat Communism is to "raise living standards"; that the path to political victory lies through economics.

This theory was demolished in the *MERCURY'S* November, 1952, issue by James Burnham:

Communism comes to a nation not spontaneously, but through the activities of a trained, centralized enterprise with headquarters located in the Soviet Union and agents operating everywhere on earth, in the best and worst economic conditions, among the poorest and the most wealthy.

Communism does not mysteriously "arise" in this or that nation, class, or individual. It is *brought* by the agents and influence of this dynamic enterprise.

That the UN is infiltrated with Communists, American and otherwise, has now been revealed. Two American members of the UN Secretariat and concerned with ECOSOC, Alfred Van Tassel and Irving Kaplan, have refused to state whether they are now members of the Communist Party; Mr. Kaplan even refused to state whether he is currently engaged in espionage.

In March, 1950, an American, David Weintraub, the present director of UN Economic Development and Stability, recommended that Owen Lattimore head the UN Technical Assistance Mission to Afghanistan. Mr. Lattimore, described in a unanimous report from a Congressional committee as "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy," delivered several thousand scythes to Afghan herdsmen, but it is not recorded whether he urged them to stand fast either for or against Communism.

**H**ERE'S THE POINT Americans must understand: the nature of bureaucracy is the same, whether national or international, and this new "international civil service" at the UN wants desperately to grow. Therefore, it wants to spend more and more money, and particularly it covets the spending of United States Point Four funds — the money we are spending for humanitarian purposes throughout the world.

If the UN can be kept small and primarily political; if the United States will spend only its fair share in all the UN agencies; if all American Communist sympathizers can be forced out of it; if all UN personnel can be identified and the movements of our enemies can be restricted; and if the United States can be represented by wise and vigorous men — then the UN can be made to serve the cause of peace and freedom.

# A Policy For Asia

Edward Hunter

IT is pretty generally admitted that our Asia policy — if one can call it that — has failed. We allowed the agents of international Communism to bamboozle and confuse us, while Mao and his men strangled the Chinese republic. We allowed a brazen conspiracy to weave a web of falsehoods and propaganda around the true nature and purposes of the Chinese Reds: their hatred of the United States and their determination to assist Soviet Russia in bringing about its defeat. This is now obvious to almost all. Knowledge of it was a major factor in General Eisenhower's victory at the polls.

The sins and errors of the past have been told over and spelled out in some detail. But post-mortems

---

*Last month Senator Styles Bridges proposed a positive policy for Korea. Here Edward Hunter points out the necessary elements of an all-Asian policy. Mr. Hunter is a noted Far Eastern correspondent; his book, Brainwashing in Red China, was published earlier this year.*

are enlightening only up to a point. With the election of a new President, the time has clearly come to turn away from the past and its defeats, and look to the future with all its possibilities. Now, certainly, is the time to forge a positive and effective policy for United States action in Asia.

Asians constantly ask their American friends what the United States is trying to do, what it really wants. "What is your country's policy? Do you have a policy?" are the questions heard oftenest. We say we are against Communism, but this isn't at all how it looks to them. True, we took up the gage in Korea without a moment's hesitation; but Asians feel that there need never have been a war in Korea in the first place if we had been the least bit aware of the true situation. Often it seemed as if we quite frankly favored the Communists. But whether the Reds conquered the Chinese mainland with our help or in spite of ourselves is an academic question to the