



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on October 21, 2019

Published in the October 21, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 20

Perpetual Peace Through Perpetual War

Tacitus wrote mostly of the Roman Empire of the first century into the early years of the second century, and his cynical reference meant that what the Romans called their *Pax Romana* (or “Peace of Rome”) was in reality just a ruthless imposition of Roman rule. He just as easily could have been describing the desire of many globalists for the United Nations of our day.



The UN Charter was adopted on October 24, 1945, promising to bring peace to a world weary of two world wars that had brought death to millions of human beings. But, as the Romans deemed their ravaging and slaughtering to be in the name of “peace,” so the UN Charter set the stage for a series of wars led by the UN since that time — all supposedly in the cause of peace.

From the days of the Tower of Babel through the wars of Alexander the Great and the Roman Empire to the League of Nations, and even President George Herbert Walker Bush’s call for a New World Order in the aftermath of the First Persian Gulf War, there have been continued efforts in our world’s history for world government. In a 1961 document entitled “Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World,” the U.S. State Department called for “complete disarmament” of all nations of the world, including the United States, which could “only be achieved through the progressive strengthening of international institutions under the United Nations and by creating a United Nations Peace Force to enforce the peace.”

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

This Orwellian-sounding “Peace Force” would “enforce the peace” by making war on any power that dared to oppose its rule.

From its inception, the United Nations Charter was never about creating peace in a form in which the average person would recognize — with sovereign nations, complete with limited constitutional governments, all at peace with one another. Instead, the UN Charter envisioned a world government, using war to enforce its version of peace.

J. Reuben Clark, who served as an undersecretary of state and as U.S. ambassador to Mexico, reviewed the UN Charter even before its final adoption in October of 1945, and concluded, “There is no provision in the Charter itself that contemplates ending war. It is true the Charter provides for force to bring peace, but such use of force is itself war.... The Charter is built to prepare for war, not to promote



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on October 21, 2019

Published in the October 21, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 20

peace.... The Charter is a war document not a peace document.”

Clark predicted, “Not only does the Charter Organization not prevent future war, but it makes it practically certain that we shall have future wars.”

And Clark added that these wars will not be wars of our own choosing, arguing that “as to such wars it takes from us the power to declare them, to choose the side on which we shall fight, to determine what forces and military equipment we shall use in the war, and to control and command our sons who do the fighting.” And sure enough, since the United States agreed to the UN Charter, Congress has never declared war once, even though U.S. military personnel have died in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, and Lebanon.

Clark was not the only American political leader who understood this. During the mere six days of deliberations the U.S. Senate devoted to discussing whether to ratify the UN Charter, Senator Burton Wheeler of Montana warned, “If we enter into this treaty, we take the power away from the Congress, and the President can send troops all over the world to fight battles everywhere.”

Charles Malik, a Lebanese delegate to the founding conference of the UN in 1945, who served as president of the General Assembly in 1959, wrote a book in 1963, *Man in the Struggle for Peace*, in which he explained, “When responsible representatives deliberated the United Nations Charter at San Francisco in 1945, nobody thought for one moment that the new world organization was going to abolish war for all time.... The whole organization is predicated on the distinct possibility of war.”

American Military as Part of the UN

And Americans have donned UN insignia multiple times after WWII in places as diverse as the Western Sahara and Haiti. Many Americans first became aware that American soldiers were relegated to UN command in 1995 when Specialist Michael New, a medic, was disciplined for refusing to wear UN insignia during his deployment to Macedonia during the administration of President Bill Clinton. As his father, Daniel New, explained, “If the armed forces of any country can be forced to serve another power against their will, that country is not a free country anymore. In any definition you use, the UN is another power.”

Probably many Americans object to placing American military personnel under the command of the United Nations, but the same principle is involved in the use of the U.S. armed forces as part of the more popular North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), formed in 1949, ostensibly to provide a collective defense for the United States, Canada, and Western Europe against possible attack by the Soviet Union and the eastern bloc countries.

With the end of communist rule in many of these eastern bloc nations, such as Poland and Hungary, some Americans are curious as to why the United States continues its membership in NATO, or for that matter, why NATO even still exists. But when one considers that NATO is actually part of the “collective security” concept that supposedly justifies the UN, that mystery is explained. In the founding charter of NATO, the UN is mentioned five times. When Secretary of State Dean Acheson urged the U.S. Senate to approve the treaty that created NATO, he said that the treaty was “an essential measure for strengthening the United Nations.” The very right of NATO to even exist is justified by reference to Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, which provides for such “regional arrangements.”

So despite the understandable opposition to Americans serving in UN uniforms, or even to wearing UN



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on October 21, 2019

Published in the October 21, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 20

insignia, the truth is that any soldier serving under NATO command has also been serving under UN command.

Writing in his book *Marxism and the National Question* in 1942, Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin called for an eventual world government, and considered regional governmental structures to be a transitional stage to that eventual world government. This should set off alarm bells among those who sincerely oppose world government, yet support the continued push for regional economic blocs, as well as military agreements, such as the European Union and the USMCA trade deal the United States is trying to work out with Canada and Mexico.

The Myth That the UN Charter Respects National Sovereignty

Some argue that the UN Charter promises to honor the sovereignty of its members, citing wording in Article I: “Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state, or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter.”

Unfortunately, the sentence continues, “but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.” Chapter VII of the Charter proclaims, in Article 39, “The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of peace, or act of aggression ... and shall decide what measures shall be taken.” In short, the UN itself will determine what is “essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state,” and can therefore take military action, ignoring any respect for national sovereignty. Article 42 makes this even clearer, authorizing the UN Security Council to “take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such actions may include demonstrations, blockade, and operations by land, sea, or air forces of Members of the United Nations.”

As John F. McManus, president emeritus of The John Birch Society, said in a speech in 2001 in Switzerland, “That’s no guarantee of peace, it’s a blueprint for war. Clearly, a nation that balks at being controlled by the UN will be deemed to be a threat to the UN’s definition of peace. And the UN has authority under this section of its Charter to wage war to accomplish its idea of peace.”

Harry Truman, who was president at the time of the adoption of the UN Charter, seemed to understand that any “restrictions” on the UN found in the Charter would eventually be overcome to make the UN a true world government. In his *Memoirs*, Truman wrote, “I always kept in mind our own history and experience in the evolution of our Constitution. It took many years and a number of amendments and compromises to make our Constitution work.... It would take much more time and patience to work out a world constitution.” In 1950, Truman even argued that “there is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.”

One shudders at such a statement, when considering how far beyond the intent of the Founders our present U.S. Constitution has been stretched, and how the federal government has grown considerably at the expense of the states, all despite the 10th Amendment, which states that all powers not given to the U.S. government are reserved to the states, or the people themselves. Clearly, the founders of the UN intended for it to evolve into a world government, with nations reduced to mere administrative units, much like counties in U.S. states.

As our Constitution has been perverted in the hands of the U.S. Supreme Court, giving more and more



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on October 21, 2019

Published in the October 21, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 20

powers to the federal government, the UN World Court declared in a 1952 case, “Under international law, the organization [the United Nations] must be deemed to have those powers, which, though not expressly provided in the Charter, are conferred upon it by necessary implication as being essential to the performance of its duties.”

These duties extend beyond the power to make war for a UN-defined “peace.” Other matters, supposedly domestic concerns, are also expected to fall under the UN. John Foster Dulles, secretary of state for President Dwight Eisenhower, and a protégé of President Woodrow Wilson — who led the earlier effort, after World War I, for a world government known as the League of Nations — was an advocate of world government. He said, “I have never seen any proposal made for ... world government ... which could not be carried out by the United Nations or under the United Nations Charter.”

The UN Charter Promotes Socialism

As such, it is not surprising that the UN Charter addresses many matters that have little or nothing to do with world peace. Article 56 states, “All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.” The purposes set forth in Article 55 include the following: “The United Nations shall promote: (a) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; (b) solutions of international, economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation....”

Exactly what is meant by promoting the health of the world’s populations? The constitution of the UN’s World Health Organization states, “Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.... Governments have a responsibility for the health of their peoples which can be fulfilled only by the provisions of adequate health and social measures.”

According to the UN Charter, “Everyone has the right to ... medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, and other lack of livelihood.” This internationalization of the welfare state would, of course, mean that the American taxpayer would pick up the tab for such needs of people all over the world.

If one thinks this wording opens the door for socialism, others thought so, too. The principal authors of the UN Charter included Vyacheslav Molotov of the Soviet Union, and the American Alger Hiss, a Soviet spy. In fact, Hiss even said that these provisions would include “not only the more conventional fields of activity but also mental health, housing, nutrition, economic or working conditions and administrative and social techniques affecting public health.”

Of course, nothing was said at the time by those advocating American entry into the United Nations regarding the fact that the Charter was written by a couple of communists. Instead, Americans were fed a steady diet of pro-UN propaganda, with some even arguing that the UN somehow protected us from communist aggression. As author John T. Flynn said at the time of this massive propaganda effort, “It has been a grand job. As one who has been watching propaganda for a great many years, I take off my hat. You cannot turn on the radio at any hour of the day — morning, noon or night — whether you listen to the Metropolitan Opera or to a horse opera, a hillbilly band, a commentator or a newscaster, that you do not hear a plug for this great instrument of peace.”

Even Secretary of State Dean Acheson later admitted that the propaganda effort (which he participated



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on October 21, 2019

Published in the October 21, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 20

in) for the UN Charter was over the top: “Moreover, its presentation to the American people as almost holy writ and with the evangelical enthusiasm of a major advertising campaign seemed to me to raise popular hopes which could only lead to bitter disappointment.”

The UN and American Failure in the Korean War

“Bitter disappointment” would be an understatement for those American military personnel who died in the Korean “conflict,” fought under the flag of the United Nations. General Douglas MacArthur, writing in his memoir, *Reminiscences*, recalled how the United States became involved in the Korean War, under the control of the UN: “I could not help being amazed at the manner in which this great decision was being made. With no submission to Congress, whose duty it is to declare war, and without even consulting the field commander involved, the members of the executive branch of the government agreed to enter the Korean War.”

In his book about the threat of the UN to America’s national sovereignty and each American’s individual liberty, *The Fearful Master*, G. Edward Griffin noted the negative role the UN played in the conduct of that indecisive conflict, writing, “Until the United States became a member of the United Nations, of course, we had never fought a war that ended in anything except victory.”

The course of the Korean War is well known. By the late fall of 1950, the United Nations (in reality the United States under General MacArthur) had essentially won the war in Korea. Then, the Communist Chinese invaded in force across the Yalu River, which separated China from North Korea. Although the United States provided about 90 percent of the battlefield forces of the UN, General George Marshall later admitted that the policy of “hot pursuit” — allowing our pilots to pursue attacking enemy aircraft back into their own territory — was abandoned because the UN opposed it.

MacArthur had ordered 90 B-29 bombers to destroy the bridges across the Yalu, in order to keep the Communist Chinese from sending any more soldiers into North Korea. Almost immediately, Secretary of Defense George Marshall countermanded MacArthur’s orders. After MacArthur protested, he received permission to bomb the “Korean end of the Yalu bridge,” an order that MacArthur denounced as the most idiotic order he had received during his 52 years of military service. He said that he had never been taught how to bomb “half a bridge.”

Writing in *Reminiscences*, MacArthur told of one bomber pilot, “wounded unto death, the stump of an arm dangling by his side,” who asked him, “General, which side are Washington and the United Nations on?”

It was a good question then, and it remains an important question today for all Americans who love their country to consider.

UN Charter Is a Threat to American National Sovereignty

Whether it be UN control over our foreign policy, or interference in our domestic affairs, America’s continued membership in the UN is a threat to the lives, the property, and the liberty of every American. While the UN Charter asserts no desire to interfere in the domestic affairs of member nations, such interference has happened time and again, often with the full support of U.S. presidents, of both the Democratic and Republican parties.

In one such case in 2004, the UN’s International Court of Justice ordered the United States to reopen



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on October 21, 2019

Published in the October 21, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 20

the murder and rape conviction of Jose Medellin, who was sitting on death row in Texas. If this UN dictate had been followed, it would have been the first time that American courts had altered their decisions to please an international body, and would seem to be a clear violation of the UN Charter's pledge not to interfere in the domestic affairs of member nations.

Unfortunately, the U.S. State Department agreed with the UN's order and convinced President George W. Bush to sign a two-paragraph executive order to Texas to comply with the World Court. No previous president had attempted such a thing, but Bush said that his inherent authority as commander in chief gave him the power to promote "international comity," and make such an "order."

Fortunately, Texas decided to defy the president's order, and the Supreme Court of the United States ultimately sided with Texas against President Bush in a 6-3 -decision.

While the UN did not prevail in this particular case, who is to say that a future Supreme Court might not decide that agencies of the United Nations supersede the laws of the United States and the states of the United States?

As long as the United States remains a part of the United Nations, our national sovereignty is in jeopardy. As John Foster Dulles said years ago, the Charter of the United Nations provides the framework for a world government. Such a world government would threaten the lives, the property, and the liberty of every single American citizen.

What Ted Galen Carpenter wrote in a piece for the Cato Institute in 1997 still holds true today: "The United Nations as an embryonic world government with an independent taxing authority and the other powers of a political state would pose a threat to individual liberty wherever it exists. Most UN members are ruled by authoritarian regimes.... The culture of governance at the United Nations itself is hardly sympathetic to the values of individual rights."

The only certain way to extricate ourselves from this threat created by the UN Charter on October 24, 1945 is for Congress to vote to leave the United Nations, and to evict the UN from its headquarters located near the East River in New York City.

Photo credit: flickr/UN



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on October 21, 2019

Published in the October 21, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 20

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.