

Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Resolution 94, which would repeal the Connally Reservation to the World Court Treaty. This reservation provides, in essence, that the United States Government reserves the right to determine, with respect to any dispute with another nation, whether the question involved is one international in nature, or is domestic. In my opinion, there is no question but that the reservation should be continued.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is increasingly obvious that some officials of our country, and particularly those of the State Department, are becoming less and less able to discern what is a domestic question. The latest indication of hopeless ignorance on the difference between international and domestic matters stems from no less personage than Assistant Secretary of State Roy R. Rubottom, Jr. I am sure the Senate is by now aware of the fact that Mr. Rubottom presumed to exert his influence on the Governor of a sovereign State by injecting his opinion of foreign reaction to a purely and simply domestic matter. I refer, of course, to the Caryl Chessman clemency plea to the Governor of California.

Nothing could be more domestic in character than the consideration of a clemency plea by the Governor from a man convicted under the laws of one of our sovereign States.

The laws of the several States of the United States provide for the protection of individual liberty to an extent unknown and unapproached in foreign countries. It is immaterial and inconsequential to the proper design and execution of these laws that the opinion of foreign nations may be one way or the other. These laws were designed to protect individual liberty of citizens of the United States, and not to gain the approval of those people in other countries.

Mr. Rubottom should be severely condemned. His actions in the Chessman case, which was, and is, a matter for the California authorities, raises a strong presumption of his lack of qualification to hold any position of prominence in the national government.

Mr. President, grave damage can be done to the internal structure of our great country by continued efforts to kow-tow to world opinion. Unfortunately, there has been an increasing tendency to use foreign opinion as a wedge for subverting the best interests of the United States on domestic questions. For instance, our reciprocal trade program, originally designed for the purpose of promoting the economic interest of United States citizens, has increasingly become a tool of so-called "international diplomacy" and, as such, utilized in such a way as to almost invariably damage the interests of American citizens.

Another field in which world opinion has been injected into domestic matters is in the field of so-called civil rights. As I stated earlier, individual liberty is enjoyed and protected in the United States of America to a far greater extent than in any other nation of the world. In the United States, minorities, as well as majorities, enjoy not only individual liberty, but freedom from physical want. This is as it should be. Our laws have been proven by experience to be superior for these purposes to any others yet devised by men.

Cries for changes in these laws to meet the approval of peoples who have yet to prove their own ability to protect even the most essential elements of individual liberty in their own countries are absurd. The laws of these United States are for the benefit of the people of the United States. It is only incidentally that they may also set an admirable example for people of other nations, for this was not the principal purpose for which they were designed.

Practical solutions for our own problems do not lie in trying to adapt the laws of the United States to meet the criticisms of foreigners. If we are lacking a position of strength in international relations, it stems from a lack of maintaining our national dignity by appeasement efforts in meeting the criticisms and complaints of foreign nations, rather than displaying with pride the domestic institutions which have fostered human dignity and individual liberty in the greatest degree history has ever recorded.

Those Americans who feel they must apologize to foreign nations for the design and enforcement of our domestic laws and policies show an abysmal ignorance and lack of appreciation for their heritage of liberty. They do a disservice to their own country and to foreign nations, who have so much to gain from patterning their own institutions after those of ours which have proven themselves.