

The following editorial from the July 12, 1966, Richmond (Virginia) News Leader, calls attention to the complete perversion of the United Nations generally, with the assistance of fifth columnists supposed to represent the United States in its councils, into an agency for the destruction of freedom. Under the guise of implementing what is loftily called the UN Declaration on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the United Nations will extinguish what liberty survives in the world by raising a mongrelized totalitarian system in America.

The deadly character of this conspiracy should be publicized by every American.

Civilized Liberty Eliminated

When UN Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg coolly announced in Geneva last week that the U. S. was going to sign the UN Declaration on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, he raised hardly a ripple. Since the text came out of the UN's Social Committee in October of 1963, it has received virtually no public discussion. Who would dare to be against it? We think most thoughtful Americans would oppose it, if they knew what it contains. Possibly it might eliminate discrimination, but it also would eliminate many of the basic rights and privileges of our legal system.

The conflict between the UN Racial Declaration and the U. S. Constitution is so clear-cut that even the U. S. delegation to the UN Social Committee had to argue against it in 1963. Naturally, the protest went unheeded. The text was adopted 89-0. For some unfathomable reason, the U. S. *abstained* from voting, along with 16 other of the most advanced Western nations, who saw a clear contradiction of the most cherished principles of liberty under law. It was outrageous that we did not reject the offending text with a clear resounding "Nay," but our abstention did seem to indicate that the U. S. would abstain also from signing the document. Ambassador Goldberg now emphasizes that the U. S. will sign it as soon as an appropriate ceremony can be arranged.

Legally speaking, such a declaration is a convention, or treaty; and of course treaties must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate. But the mere signing will indicate that the Johnson Administration has adopted the UN Racial Declaration as a policy plank of

high priority, to be slipped into the Senate when the moment of least resistance is at hand. Because of the complicated and abstract legal standing of international treaties, few citizens may be expected to grasp immediately the significance of this unfamiliar issue. Under Article V of the Constitution, all treaties become part of "the supreme law of the land," and "the judges in every State shall be bound thereby."

This newspaper published the complete text of the Racial Declaration in 1963. It may be well here to review some of the traps hidden in the text:

- The UN Racial Declaration holds that racial injustice—the internal problem of sovereign nations—is an obstacle to international peace.

- It forbids discrimination by State, institution, group, or individual; the Constitution rightly forbids discrimination only by the Federal or State governments.

- It forbids police action to "support" discrimination, a provision which could easily be interpreted to paralyze the protection of citizens during racial rioting of the sort that occurred in Watts.

- It forbids discrimination in "access to citizenship," nullifying Congressional control over immigration and naturalization laws.

- It controls private decisions in religion, employment, occupation, housing, and "every place or facility intended for use by the general public," whether this place is private property or not.

- It directs governments to revise

public policies, laws, and regulations "which have the effect of creating and perpetuating racial discrimination."

- It grants "the right to participate in elections through universal and equal suffrage," a right which exists nowhere in the world today. If the Senate accepts this treaty, the Senate will outlaw itself.

Other provisions would set up a new category of "offenses against society"—a revolutionary concept in Anglo-Saxon traditions of criminal law—and institute "independent national tribunals" to try them. Each country would take upon itself the duty of "educating" its people on racial matters; conversely each nation would also assume the duty of prosecuting any one who who published "propaganda . . . justifying or promoting racial discrimination in any form." This open attack on freedom of the press was one of the issues which the U. S. delegation criticized in 1963; but worse than the attack on the absolute right was the catch-all definition which might be construed to punish nearly any discussion of social controversy.

Finally, the UN Racial Declaration, in its concluding article, pledges the signers to observe the provisions of the notorious Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For over fifteen years this other covenant has languished without the slightest support from the U. S., since it would practically abrogate the Constitution all by itself. Under the guise of eliminating "racial discrimination," Ambassador Goldberg has announced a plan to eliminate the legal protections painfully developed by two thousand years of Western civilization.