

IN SEARCH OF A CAPITALIST PEACE

by

Richard R. Biondi

Copyright © April 6, 2022 by Richard R. Biondi
All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this book, other
than material in the public domain, is strictly prohibited. Readers
are encouraged to share this PDF version others.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter 1 – Out of Many, One	5
Chapter 2 – Kant’s Perpetual Peace	12
Chapter 3 – The Peace Movement	29
Chapter 4 – The World-Federation League	39
Chapter 5 – Almost a League of Their Own	42
Clarence K. Streit and the Atlantic Union Idea	45
Chapter 6 – The Roosevelt Years	48
Chapter 7 – The Truman Years	56
Chapter 8 – The Eisenhower Years	78
Chapter 9 – The Kennedy Years	100
Chapter 10 – The Johnson Years	122
Chapter 11 – The Nixon/Ford Years	135
Chapter 12 – The Carter Years	162
Chapter 13 – The Reagan Years	168
Chapter 14 – The Globalist Years	171
Chapter 15 – The Trump Years	183
Chapter 16 – The Biden Years	188
Conclusion	199
Exhibit 1 - Senator Borah on the League	200
Exhibit 2 – The World Constitution Resolution	215
Exhibit 3 – The World Federalist Resolution	241
Exhibit 4 – The Atlantic Union Resolution	272
Exhibit 5 – The European Federation Resolution	331
Exhibit 6 – Statement of Mrs. Agnes Waters	335
Exhibit 7 – Statement of Omar B. Ketchum	339
Exhibit 8 – The Bricker Amendment: Limiting the Treaty Power by Constitutional Amendment	345
Exhibit 9 – Roster, Atlantic Union Committee	353

Exhibit 10 – Atlantic Convention: Vote in the Senate, 1960	381
Exhibit 11 – Atlantic Convention: Vote in the House, 1960	382
Exhibit 12 – To Enhance the Strength and Unity of the Atlantic Community through The Atlantic Convention	385
Exhibit 13 – The Declaration of Paris	394
Exhibit 14 – Report of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO	405
Exhibit 15 – Atlantic Union: Vote in the House, 1973	415
Exhibit 16 – Atlantic Union: Vote in the House, 1976	418
Exhibit 17 – Vladimir Putin at Davos Online Forum – Transcript	422
About the Author	437

Introduction

In Search of a Capitalist Peace documents the history of the world government movement in the U.S. Congress and beyond. It is a living reference book for readers who are no longer waiting for the world to change. It introduces readers to conveniently forgotten history that shatters traditional narratives underpinning American foreign policy. While written with a political bias, advocacy is reserved for other publications.

Readers are encouraged to submit corrections, comments, questions, and collaboration requests to capitalistpeace@gmail.com. Those who are interested in advocacy should consider joining the Capitalist Peace Committee at capitalistpeace.com. The author is available for speaking engagements and media appearances on a case-by-case basis.

Chapter 1—Out of Many, One

E Pluribus Unum, out of many, one, is the rallying cry of proponents of world federation. The evolution of thirteen British colonies into one American nation using federalist principles was an inspiration to political entrepreneurs like Immanuel Kant, Andrew Carnegie, Clarence Streit, Grenville Clark, and others seeking to end war and maximize trade between nations. This chapter provides a basic overview of how the United States of America came to be. Subsequent chapters will document how progressives attempted to apply American federalist principles on a world scale.

* * *

At the outset of the French and Indian War in 1754, Benjamin Franklin proposed the Albany Plan of Union to unify the British colonies under the consent of the Crown. He called on the colonies to “JOIN, OR DIE.” King George III and the colonies rejected his union plan, but they nevertheless fought together against France during the Seven Years’ War. After the war ended in 1763, Anglo-American relations soured.

In response to a series of Intolerable Acts passed by the British Parliament in 1774, a group of influential American leaders established the First Continental Congress to represent the political and economic interests of the British colonies and address their common grievances with the Crown. Delegates appointed by the colonies included British Loyalists who favored an Anglo-American union, and American Patriots who favored emancipation. The two factions met in the middle and signed The Declaration of Rights and Grievances on October 4, 1774.

After demanding their fundamental rights as Englishmen, delegates representing the colonies agreed to “enter into a nonimportation, nonconsumption, and nonexportation agreement or association” to pressure Parliament to accept their reasonable demands. They established the Continental Association and coordinated a boycott on British trade. Great Britain reciprocated.

The Crown viewed American colonists as subjects, and American Patriots as separatists. King George III vowed to crush the colonial rebellion rather than seek a political resolution.

The American Revolutionary War started on April 19, 1775, after the British miscalculated and marched on Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts. Paul Revere and others warned the militia in advance that the Red Coats were coming to disarm them. There was no turning back for the colonies after American Patriots fired shots heard around the world.

After the war started, Patriots enjoyed a political advantage over Loyalists at the Second Continental Congress established in May of 1775. This time, on July 4, 1776, an American Declaration of Independence pronounced to the world—

That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do.

Inspired by the Age of Enlightenment, the signers felt obligated to advance a new social contract to guide the United States of America—

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the

People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

Thomas Jefferson wrote the above words to justify the right of the British colonists to “dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them.” Jefferson did not have the authority, nor the audacity, to speak for indigenous peoples, slaves, or inhabitants of neighboring territories. He was writing on behalf of one united people that John Jay later described in the *Federalist Papers* as—

a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs, and who, by their joint counsels, arms, and efforts, fighting side by side throughout a long and bloody war, have nobly established general liberty and independence.

Members of the Continental Congress turned to Benjamin Franklin to propose a new union government for the free and independent states of America. Franklin had called for a unification of the states long before the American Revolution arrived and was known as a jack of all political trades. He helped shape the Articles of Confederation they later adopted.

Under the Articles, each state retained its “sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every Power, Jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.” The unicameral (one house) Congress represented states rather than the American people. The states primarily authorized Congress to manage the foreign affairs

of the United States, such as levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, and establish commerce with foreign nations.

It was impractical for the Union government to project power and protect American ships on the high seas under the Articles. The post-war American economy was in dire straits. The states were either unable or unwilling to finance foreign endeavors or the economic pursuits of commercial elites. The United States opted to rely on unenforceable treaties of amity and commerce as an alternative to gun boat diplomacy.

Without a large standing army, the Union government was forced to rely on citizen militias for its national defense once the Continental Army disbanded after the Revolutionary War ended and the Treaty of Paris was signed in 1783. States were forbidden under the Articles from maintaining standing armies in times of peace. They were, however, required to maintain well-regulated militias and enough powder and ball for their self, and collective, defense.

Lacking an executive and judicial branch, the Union government could not interpret or enforce its own laws nor impose taxes on the states. Passing laws required nine of thirteen states, and unanimity to amend the Articles. This was not seen as an impediment at the time as states guarded their sovereignty, freedom, and independence. Agrarian-based economies do not need a strong central government to flourish.

The Articles fell short of establishing an inclusive American citizenship. Paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives of justice were not “entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States.” This opened the door to various rebellions as debtors, many of whom fought for independence, were treated like second class citizens or servants of elite.

While the Article were suitable for an agrarian nation, the states were unwilling to accommodate the special needs of the commercial sector driven by the industrial revolution. Commercial elites wanted to maximize trade between the states, pursue continental expansion, and protect their interests abroad. They believed that the Articles of the Confederation stood in the way of

commercial progress. With the help of James Madison, Federalists representing the commercial faction, convinced the states to hold an exploratory convention.

Shortly after the Shay's Rebellion erupted, in September of 1786, Commissioners appointed by their respective states gathered at the Annapolis Convention, or the Meeting of Commissioners to Remedy the Defects of the Federal Government, to discuss ways to improve trade between the states. Among the twelve commissioners in attendance were future framers James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. In their report to Congress, the Commissioners called on the states to hold a future Convention with enlarged powers.

At the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, the predominantly Federalist Framers intentionally scrapped the Articles and drafted the Constitution of the United States instead. They proposed the establishment of an American Republic with adequate checks and balances to satisfy Anti-Federalists representing the interests of the agrarian faction. The new Union government would have the power to enact, interpret, and enforce federal law.

The Framers proposed establishing a bicameral legislature with a House of Representatives chosen by the people, and a Senate chosen by the states. Along with the power to enact legislation with the consent of the President, the new Congress would also gain the power to tax, exclusively coin money, borrow money, establish immigration policy, and regulate commerce among the several states. Under their scheme, legislative power was shared by the people and the states.

Legislation enacted by the Union government would become the supreme law of the land. If challenged, a proposed Supreme Court could interpret its constitutionality. The Court could also rule on disputes between the legislative and executive branches of government. At the time it was proposed, the Framers did not anticipate the Supreme Court interpreting the unalienable rights of the American people.

The Framers proposed that the President of the United States would be responsible for serving as Commander in Chief, executing the laws of the land, and negotiating treaties with the

advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate. Their original intent was to limit the power of the executive branch as Anti-Federalists feared that a Union president would eventually become a monarch.

The proposed Constitution was then sent to the states for ratification. During the ratification process, Federalists and Anti-Federalists engaged in a literary duel. The Federalist Papers and the Anti-Federalist Papers explored the pros and cons of ratifying the Constitution. At the behest of Anti-Federalists, the Constitution was amended to include the Bill of Rights. Alexander Hamilton argued against the amendments in Federalist No. 84—

I go further, and affirm, that Bills of Rights, in the sense and to the extent in which they are contended for, are not only unnecessary in the proposed Constitution, but would even be dangerous. They would contain various exceptions to powers not granted; and on this very account, would afford a colorable pretext to claim more than were granted. For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do? Why, for instance, should it be said, that the liberty of the press shall not be restrained, when no power is given by which restrictions may be imposed? I will not contend that such a provision would confer a regulating power; but it is evident that it would furnish, to men disposed to usurp, a plausible pretence for claiming that power. They might urge with a semblance of reason, that the Constitution ought not to be charged with the absurdity of providing against the abuse of an authority, which was not given, and that the provision against restraining the liberty of the press afforded a clear implication, that a power to prescribe proper regulations concerning it was intended to be vested in the National Government. This may serve as a specimen of the numerous handles which would be given to the doctrine of constructive powers, by the indulgence of an injudicious zeal for Bills of Rights.

The Constitution was ratified in 1789. The transformation of many British colonies into one American nation set an example for others to follow. It would not take long for peace activists—and free trade imperialists—to seek “mastery of the world for the good of the whole world.” They would soon discover that uniting peoples like you is not the same as uniting peoples unlike you.

* * *

The coming chapters and exhibits explore two iterations of the world federalist movement in the United States Congress and beyond. The first iteration was advanced in 1910 by the World Federation League of the New York Peace Society before the First World War. The second iteration emerged after World War Two by a plethora of world government advocacy groups such as Federal Union and the United World Federalists. Both iterations were inspired by Immanuel Kant’s Perpetual Peace proposal below.

Chapter 2—Kant's Perpetual Peace

Six years after the Constitution of the United States was ratified, German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, proposed applying confederal principles on a world scale. Kant was a republican (rather the democratic) peace advocate. He proposed that every nation in the world should eventually adopt a republican constitution, disband their standing armies in favor of citizen militias, and participate in a world federation to secure a perpetual peace. Like the framers of the Articles of Confederation, he refrained from proposing a centralized government and limited world citizenship to reciprocal rights.

In his treaties on *Perpetual Peace* (1795), German philosopher Immanuel Kant called for a "Federation of Free States." While there are numerous translations, this publication will rely on an 1897 translation by Benjamin Franklin Trueblood of the American Peace Society (public domain). His translation is fitting as he would later publish a book in 1899 called *The Federation of the World* and inspire the first iteration of the world federalist movement in the U.S. Congress. Below are Kant's preliminary and definitive articles for the establishment of a perpetual peace—

First Section

Which contains the preliminary articles of a perpetual peace between states.

1. *No conclusion of peace shall be held to be such, which is made with the secret reservation for a future war.*

For in that event, it would be a mere truce, a postponement of hostilities, and to attach to the adjective of "perpetual" is a pleonasm which at once arouses suspicion. The causes of a future war, which are present though perhaps not at the time know even to the powers which are making peace with each other,

are entirely removed through a treaty of peace, even those which a keen and dexterous search might discover in documents laid away in the public archives. True mental reservation of old claims, to be brought forward in the future, of which neither party dares at the time to make mention, because both are too much exhausted to continue the war, with the base intention of taking advantage of the first favorable opportunity to assert them, is genuine Jesuitic casuistry. Such a procedure, when looked at in its true character, must be considered beneath the dignity of rulers, and so must the disposition to pursue such deductions be held unworthy of a minister of state. But if, in accordance with certain "enlightened" notions of political wisdom, the true honor of state is held to consist in continual increase of power by any and every means, of course the judgment just given will be looked upon as visionary and pedantic.

2. *No state having an independent existence, whether it be small or great, may be acquired by another state, through inheritance, exchange, purchase or gift.*

A state is not a possession or patrimony, like the soil on which it has to seat. It is a society of men, subject to the authority and disposition of none but itself. Since, like a stem, it has its own roots, to incorporate it as a graft into another state is to take away its existence as a moral person and to make of it a thing. This contradicts the idea of the original compact, without which no authority over a people can be conceived. Everybody knows into what danger, even in the most recent times the supposed right of thus acquiring states has brought Europe. Other parts of the world have known nothing of it. But in Europe it has been held that states can marry each other. This has

been looked upon in part as a new kind of industry, a way of making oneself powerful through family connections without putting forth personnel effort, in part also the only way of extending one's landed possessions. In the same category must be reckoned also the letting out of troops of one state to another, against an enemy not common to the two. This the subjects of the state are used and abused to be handled at will.

3. *Standing armies shall after a time be entirely abolished.*

For they incessantly threaten other states with war, through their appearing always to be in armed readiness for it. States are thus provoked to outdo one another in number of armed men without limit. Through the expense thus occasioned peace finally becomes more burdensome than a brief war. These armies are thus the cause of way of aggression, undertaken in order that this burden may be thrown off. In addition to this, the hiring out of men to kill and be killed, an employment of them as mere machines and tools in the hands of another (the state), cannot be reconciled with the rights of humanity as we feel them in our own person. The case is entirely different where the citizens of a state voluntarily drill themselves at stated times in the practice of arms with a view of defending themselves and their fatherland against attacks from without. It would be exactly the same with the accumulation of a war fund. Looked upon by other states as a threat of war, it would lead to their anticipating such a war by making an attack themselves. Because, of the three powers, the power of the army, the power of alliance, and the power of money, the last might be well be considered the most

reliable instrument of war. The difficulty of ascertaining the amount of fund accumulation might, however, possibly work a counter effect.

4. *No national debts shall be contracted in connection with the foreign affairs of the state.*

The obtaining of money, either from without or from within the state, for purposes of internal improvement—the improvement of highways, the planting of new colonies, the storing of supplies for years of crop failure, etc.—need create no suspicion. Foreign debts may be contracted for this purpose. But, as an instrument of opposition between powers, a credit system of debts endlessly growing though always safe against immediate demand (the demand for payment not being made by all the creditors at the same time),--such a system, the ingenious invention of a trading people in this century, is a dangerous money power. It is a resource for carrying on war which surpasses the resources of other states taken together. It can only be exhausted through a possible deficit of taxes, which may be long kept off through the revival of commerce brought about by the reflex of influence of the loans on industry and trade. The facility thus afforded of making war, coupled with the seemingly innate inclination thereto to those possessing power, is a great obstacle in the way of perpetual peace. This obstacle must be made impossible by a preliminary article,--all the more because the finally unavoidable bankruptcy of the state must involve many other states innocently of the disaster, thus inflicting upon them a public injury. Consequently, other states are at least justified in entering into an alliance against such a state and its pretensions.

5. *No state shall interfere by force in the constitution and government of the other state.*

For what could justify it in taking such action? Could, forsooth, some offense that the state gives to the subject of the other state? Such a state ought rather to serve as a warning, because of the examples of the evils which a state brings upon itself by its lawlessness. In general, the bad example given by one free person to another (as a *scandalum acceptum*) is not lesion of his rights. But the case would be different if a state because of internal dissension should be divided into two parts, each of which, while claiming to constitute a special state, should lay claim to the whole. An outside state, if it should render assistance to one of these, could not be charged with interfering in the constitution of another state, as that state would then be in a condition of anarchy. But as long as this inner strife was not decided, the interference of outside powers would be a trespass on the rights of independent people struggling only with its own inner weakness. The interference would be an actual offense which would so far tend to render the autonomy of all states insecure.

6. *No state at war with another shall permit such kinds of hostility as will make mutual confidence impossible in time of future peace; such as employment of assassins, of poisoners, the violation of capitulation, the instigation of treason, in the state against which it is making war.*

These are dishonorable stratagems. Some sort of confidence in an enemy's mental honesty must remain even in time of war, for otherwise no peace could be concluded, and the conflict would become a war of extermination. For war is only the dire necessity of asserting one's right by force in a primitive state of

society where there is no court at hand to decide in accordance with right. In this state neither party can be declared an unjust enemy, for this presupposes a judicial decision. The issue of the conflict, as in the case of a so-called "judgement of God," decides whose side the right is. But between states no war of punishment can be conceived, because between them there is no relation of superior or subordinate. Whence it follows that a war of extermination, in which destruction may come to both parties at the same time, and to all right also, would result in perpetual peace only when the whole human race was dead and buried. Such a war, therefore, as well as the use of the means which might bring it about, is wholly unallowable. But that the means mentioned above inevitably lead to such a result is clear from the fact that such hellish arts, which are in themselves degrading, when once brought into use, do not continue long within the limits of war. The employment of spies, for example, in which only the dishonorableness of others (which cannot be exterminated all at once) is employed, goes over and is continued in time of peace and thus the purpose of peace is quite frustrated.

Second Section

Which contains the definite articles for a perpetual peace between states.

The state of peace between men who live near one is not the state of nature. The natural state is rather one of war. In this state, if there are not always actual hostilities, they at least continually threaten. The state of peace must therefore be created, for it is not necessarily secured by the mere absence of hostilities. Even if hostile acts are not committed by one neighbor

against another (a state which only the existence of law can bring about), the one can always treat the other as an enemy when he pleases to challenge him to hostilities.

1. *The first definitive article for the securing of perpetual peace.—The civil constitution in every state shall be republican.*

In the first place, a constitution founded in accordance with principles of freedom of a society of men is necessarily republican. In the second place, this is true of one constructed according to the fundamental idea of the dependence of all as subjects upon a common legislation. It is true, thirdly, of one formed according to the principle of equality of the citizens of the state. The republican constitution is the only one springing out of the idea of the original compact, on which all legitimate legislation of the people must be based. As far as right is concerned, the republican principle in fact lies originally at the basis of all forms of the civil constitution. The only question therefore is whether it is the only one which will lead to perpetual peace

In reality, then, the republican constitution, in addition to the fact that it springs out of the pure concept of right, gives promise of realizing the desired end, namely perpetual peace. The reason of this may be stated as follows:

Where the consent of the citizens of the state is required to determine whether there shall be war or not, as must necessarily be the case where the republican constitution is in force, nothing is more natural than that they should hesitate much before entering on so perilous a game. If they do so, they must take upon themselves all the burdens of war, that is,

the fighting, the defraying of the expenses of the war out of their own possessions, the reparation of the destruction which it causes, and, greatest of all, the burden of the debts incurred, an endless burden because of the continued prospect of new wars and one which therefore in embitters piece itself. On the contrary, in a state where the government is not republican and the subject not a voting citizen, war is the easiest thing in the world to enter upon, because the ruler is not a fellow citizen of the state but its owner. War does not therefore interfere the least with his table enjoyments, his hunting, his pleasure castles, his court feasts, and the like. He decides lightly to enter upon it, as if it were a sort of pleasure party, and as to its propriety he without concern leaves a justification of it to the diplomatic core who are always ready to find him excuses.

That the republican constitution be not confounded with the democratic, as is generally done, the following must be noticed. The forms of the state (*civitas*) may be divided either according to the differences of the persons holding the governing power or according to the mode of government of the people through their ruler, who he may be. The first is properly called the form of the *sovereignty* (*forma imperii*). Only three forms of this kind are possible, according as either *one* only, or *some* allied together, or *all* who make up the body of citizens possess the governing power. Here we have autocracy, aristocracy and democracy. The second is the form of the *government* (*forma regiminis*) and has regard to the mode in which the state makes use of its supreme power, the mode of course being conformable to the constitution as an act of the general will whereby the mass of individuals becomes a people. Under this aspect the government is either republican or despotic.

Republicanism is that form of government in which the executive power is separated from the legislative. Despotism is the irresponsible administration of the state by laws which the ruler himself has enacted. Here the public will is regarded by the ruler as his own private will.

Of the three forms of the state that of democracy, in the proper sense of the word, is necessarily a despotism, because it establishes an executive power in which All decide about and, it possibly also, against One who may not be in accord with it. Hence the All are not really all. This is a contradiction of the general will with itself and with liberty.

Every form of government which is not representative is, properly speaking, not a form of government at all, because one and the same person can no more be lawgiver and at the same time executive administrator of the lawgiver's will than the major premise of a syllogism can be at least the same time the conclusion under the minor. Although the other two forms of state constitution are so far erroneous that they give room for such a form of government, yet with them it is at least possible to have a form of government in harmony with the spirit of a representative system. Frederick the Second, for example, was accustomed to say that "he was simply the highest servant of the state." On the contrary, the democratic constitution makes it impossible to have a representative government, because everyone wishes to be lord. We may say, therefore, that the smaller the number of the personal administrators of the state, and the greater the constituency represented by them, the more possible it is to have republicanism under the constitution, at least finally, through a process of gradual reform. For this reason it is more difficult in an

aristocracy than in a monarchy to reach this only perfect form of constitution according to the principles of right. In a democracy it is impossible to do so except by means of a violent revolution. The mode of government is however of incomparably more importance to the people than the form of the state, though upon the constitution also very much depends the state's capacity of reaching the end of its existence. But the mode of government, if it is to conform to the idea of right, must necessarily be in accordance with the representative system. In this system alone is a republican form of government possible. Without it, whatever be the nature of the constitution, the form of government is despotic and violent. None of the ancient so-called republics had this system. Hence they could not help ending in despotism, of the different kinds of which that is the most endurable in which the supreme power is lodged in a single individual.

2. *The second definitive article for the establishment of perpetual peace.—International right shall be founded on a federation of free states.*

Peoples considered as states may be regarded as individual men. In their natural state, that is, without the restraint of outward laws, they are liable to do one another injury because of their proximity one to another. Every one of them, therefore, for the sake of its own safety, can and ought to demand of the others to enter with it into a constitution, like that of the citizens of a state, in which each of them can be secured in its right. This would be a federation of peoples, but not necessarily an international state. For this would involve a contradiction; because each state contains the relation of a superior, or lawgiver, to an inferior or subject, while a number of peoples brought together in

a single state would form but a single people. This would contradict the principle laid down, since we are here considering the rights of peoples in reference to one another, insofar as they are to be regarded as so many different States and not as fused into one.

We now look with deep to stain on the attachment of the savages to their lawless freedom, their preference to be engaged in incessant strife rather than submit themselves to a self-imposed restraint of law, their preference of wild freedom to rational freedom. All this we regard as savagery, coarseness, and beastly degradation of human nature. One would think that civilized peoples, each constituted into a state, would eagerly hasten to get out of a similar detestable condition in their relations to one another, as speedily as possible. Instead of this, however, every state considers its majesty (majesty of a *people* would be an absurd term) to consist in submitting itself to no external compulsion of law whatever, and the glory of the ruler is held to consist in his being free from danger himself and having at his command thousands ready to sacrifice themselves for him in a cause in which they have not the slightest interest. The difference between the European savages and the American consists chiefly in the fact that while many tribes of the latter are entirely eaten up by their enemies, the former know how to make a better use of their captors than two roast and eat them. They use them to increase the number of their subjects and thereby the number of instruments for still more extensive wars.

The baseness of human nature is openly exhibited in the unrestrained relations of peoples to one another, whereas it is much concealed, through the restraint of government, in the civil life of each people, where law is enforced. It is matter of wonder therefore that the word "right" has not yet been wholly excluded

from the policy of war as pedantic, and that no state has yet been bold enough openly to declare itself in favor of such exclusion. For Hugo Grotius, Puffendorf, Vattel and others—all miserable comforters, unfortunately—although their philosophically or diplomatically conceived codes have not, and cannot have, the least legal force, because states as such are not under any common outward restraint, and nevertheless always sincerely quoted to justify any outbreak of war. No example, however, is to be found on the other hand where a state has been induced by arguments supported by the theories of these influential men to desist from any warlike undertaking. This attachment shown by every state, at least professedly, to the idea of right shows that there is to be found in man, though at the time dormant, a moral principle of superior force which leads him to strive for the mastery over the evil principle which is undeniably in him, and to expect such a mastery from others. For otherwise states which wish to go to war with one another would never utter the word “right,” not even to make a jest of it, like the Gallic Prince who said: “it is the prerogative which nature has given to the strong over the weak, that the latter should obey him.”

The method by which states prosecute their rights cannot under present conditions be a process of law, since no court exists having jurisdiction over them, but only war. But through war, even if it result in victory, the question of right is not decided. The Treaty of peace puts an end to the present war, not to the condition out of which a new pretext for war may arise. Nor can this pretext be declared out and out unjust, since in this condition every state is judge in its own case. It is now true of states, according to the law of nations, as of men in a lawless state, according to the law of nature, that the “ought to get out of this state,

because as state," because as states they already have an internal constitution founded on right and thus have outgrown the coercive right of others to bring them under a wider legal constitution, in accordance with their conception of right. Yet reason, from its supreme throne of moral, lawgiving power, condemns war absolutely as a means of establishing right, and on another hand makes the state of peace an immediate duty. This state, however, cannot be secured without a compact of the nations with each other. There must therefore be a compact of a peculiar kind, which may be called a *pacific federation* (*foedus pacificum*), which differs from a *treaty of peace* (*pactum pacis*) in that the latter aims to put an end to *one* war simply, while the former seeks to abolish *all* wars forever. This federation would not be invested with a single power of a constituted state, but would secure simply the preservation and security of the freedom of a particular state and of others federated with it, without any of them having to submit themselves to public laws and to compulsion under them, as men do in a state of nature. The practicability, or capability of objective realization, of this idea of federation, which ought gradually to be extended to all states and in this way lead to perpetual peace, is capable of being demonstrated. For if it should happen that a powerful and enlightened people should form itself into a republic, a form of government naturally tending to perpetual peace, this would furnish a nucleus of federative union for other states to connect themselves with. Thus the states would secure the conditions of freedom according to the idea of international right, and this federation through the adhesion of other peoples might be extended more and more.

It is easy to understand that a people should say to itself, "we will have no war among ourselves;

but we will form ourselves into a state, that is, set ourselves up as a supreme lawgiving, governing and directing authority which shall peacefully dispose of our strifes." But if this state should say, "There shall be no war between me and other states, although I recognize no supreme legislative authority which secures to me my right and to which I secure its rights, it is impossible to understand on what ground confidence in the securing of right would be based, except it be on something similar to the union of men in civil society, that is, a voluntary federation, which reason necessarily associates with the concept of the right of nations. Otherwise nothing more can be said of the subject at all.

The right to go to war is inconceivable as an element in the concept of international right, for that would be a right based, not an universally valid external laws which limit the freedom of every individual, but on the one-sided principle of determining by force what is right. By the right of war, then, we must mean that men who are so minded do perfectly right when they destroy one another and thus find perpetual peace only in the wide tomb which conceals all the horrible deeds of violence along with their perpetrators. For states in their relations to one another there can be, according to reason, no other way out of the lawless condition which inevitably results in war than they give up their lawless freedom, just as individual men do, accommodate themselves to public constraining laws and so form an international state (*civitas gentium*) which will grow and at least embrace all the peoples of the earth. But insomuch as the nations according to their ideas of international right do not wish this, and consequently reject in practice what is right in principle, if all is not to be lost, there can be, in place of the positive idea of a

world=republic, only the negative substitute of a permanent and ever-growing federation, as a preventative of war. Such a federation would hold in check the lawless and hostile passions of men, which however would always be liable to burst forth anew. As Virgil says:

“Furor
Impius intus fremit horridus ore cruento.”

3. *The third definitive article for the establishment of perpetual peace—The rights of men as citizens of the world shall be restricted to conditions of universal hospitality*

Here, as in the former articles, the question is not one of philanthropy but of right. Hospitality here signifies the right of a foreigner, in consequence of his arrival on the soil of another, not to be treated by him as an enemy. He may be expelled, if that can be done without his destruction; but so long as he keeps his place and conducts himself peacefully, he must not be treated in a hostile way. He cannot let claim to be treated thus because of any *right as a guest*, for this would require a special friendly agreement to consider him for a time as a member of some household. His claim is based on a *right of visitation*, common to all men, by virtue of which he may join any society of men, on account of the right of the common possession of the surface of the earth, over which people cannot spread abroad indefinitely, but must finally endure living near one another. Originally, however, no one had any more right than another to occupy any particular portion of the earth's surface. The communities of men are separated by uninhabitable portions of this surface, the seas and the deserts, but in

such a way that the ship and the camel, "the ship of the desert," make it possible for men to visit one another across these unclaimed regions, and to use the right to the surface, which men possess in common, for the purposes of social intercourse. The inhospitable practice involved on some sea coasts, as of the Barbary States, of robbing ships in the neighboring seas, or of making slaves of shipwrecked people, or that of the inhabitants of deserts, such as the Bedouins, of regarding their proximity to nomadic tribes as a right to a plunder them is thus contrary to the right of nature. The right to hospitality which naturally belongs to foreign visitors extends no further than that degree of social intercourse with the old inhabitants determined by the limits of possibility. In this way remote portions of the world may come into friendly relations with one another which at last come to be regulated by public law, and thus bring the human race finally nearer and nearer to a state of world-citizenship.

If the inhospitable behavior of the civilized, commercial states of our portion of the world be compared with this barbarian inhospitality, the injustice which they show when they go to foreign lands and peoples (for they consider their arrival the same as conquest) become simply horrible. America, the Negro lands, the Spice Islands, the Cape, etc, were considered by them, when they discovered them, as belonging to nobody. For the inhabitants they counted as nothing. Into East India, under the pretext of simply establishing trading posts, they introduced men of war, and with them oppression of the natives, instigation of the different states of the country to widespread wars, famine, insurrection, treachery, and so on through the whole category of evils which afflict the human race.

China and Japan, which had had experience

with such guests, have done wisely in limiting their intercourse, the former permitting access to her coast but not entrance into the interior, the latter granting access only to a single European people, the Dutch, whom, however, like prisoners, they shut out from intercourse with the natives. The worst of the matter (or rather, from the standpoint of the moral judge, the best), is, that they get no satisfaction out of this violence, that all these commercial societies are on the point of going to pieces, that the Sugar Islands, the seed of the most shocking and complete slavery, yield no real profit, but only an indirect and at the same time undesirable one, namely the furnishing of sailors for war-fleets, through whom they assist in carrying on wars in Europe. Thus these powers, which make a great show of piety, drink injustice like water and at the same time wish themselves to be considered as the very elect of the Orthodox faith.

Since the community of the nations of the earth, in a narrower or broader way, has advanced so far that an injustice in one part of the world is felt in all parts, the idea of a cosmopolitical right is no fantastic and strained form of the conception of right, but necessary to complete the unwritten code, not only of the rights of states but of peoples as well, so as to make it coextensive with the rights of men in general, through the establishment of which perpetual peace will come. It is useless to flatter oneself that perpetual peace can be brought nearer and nearer under any other conditions.

Kant's *Perpetual Peace* proposal proved untimely. Too many nations, the United States included, opted to expand their territorial footprint. Citizen militias would later prove unreliable for those seeking to acquire living room through conquest rather than consent.

Chapter 3—The Peace Movement

This chapter explores the basic evolution of the peace movement using a thematic format. It is far more complex than it is presented here. Readers are encouraged to look up political anthologies edited by the World Federation League, namely—The Peace Movement: The Federation of the World and The Peace Movement: American Peace Commission.

One thing to consider when reading this chapter is that the first iteration of the world federalist movement was advanced before World War One. It evolved while the United States of America embraced the gold standard and laissez-faire capitalism. World federation was seen by many of its proponents as a path toward improving capitalism by ending militarism and war.

--Editor

Early American Foundations

Lead With Trade Not Ideology

The first President of the United States decided to lead with trade rather than ideology. America was not yet positioned to project its values and political power overseas. In his 1796 farewell address, President George Washington declared that 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.” He went on to counsel us—

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be, that good policy does not equally enjoin it - It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such

a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another a habitual hatred or a habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill-will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations, has been the victim.

Like Washington, President Thomas Jefferson favored “peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none” (1801). Facing pirates and state-

sponsored corsairs around the Muslim ports of Tunis, Tripoli, and Algiers, however, Jefferson turned to war. The Treaty with Morocco he helped secure in 1786 failed to protect American merchants sailing in the Mediterranean. Jefferson unleashed the United States Navy to blockade the Barbary ports and tasked some Marines to lead a mercenary force to the shores of Tripoli.

Continentalism

The United States of America expanded its territorial footprint using the ripening approach. Under Article IV of the Constitution, "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union" as long as they have a "Republican Form of Government." As territories were acquired, whether by conquest or consent, their peoples were required to form states mirroring American principles to join the Union.

Continentalism was destined to put the principles of the American Declaration of Independence to test. Could Americans of British descent share sovereignty with settlers hailing from other European nations like France and Spain? The United States would soon find out after Napoleon Bonaparte of France sold the Louisiana Territory to the United States in 1802.

Lessons of the War of 1812

Trade disputes between Great Britain and the United States triggered the War of 1812. President Madison proclaimed in 1813 that "the issue of the war staked our national sovereignty on the high seas and the security of an important class of citizens, whose occupations give the proper value to those of every other class." America was at war with the British to advance the commercial interests and territorial ambitions of the Union.

Liberation War

Under the Articles of Confederation, the United States offered

to annex Canada into the American Union. After Canadians rejected their offer, the United States opted for conquest during the War of 1812. President James Madison proclaimed that America invaded Canada to liberate its citizens from British “tyranny and oppression.” The War of 1812 was a liberation war.

Inadequacy of the Militia

During the War of 1812, hundreds of Ohio militiamen refused to invade British Canada. Other militias who fought in the war were relatively untrained and poorly led. It became clear to American continentalists that the United States needed a professional army after the British captured Washington and subsequently burned the Capitol and the White House down. The war ultimately ended in a stalemate after the Treaty of Ghent was signed in 1814.

The Early Peace Movement

The New York Peace Society

After the War of 1812, theologian David L. Dodge established The New York Peace Society in 1815 to expose the horrors of war and to advance the principles of pacifism. Dodge believed that war was inconsistent with the religion of Jesus Christ. He previously wrote *The Mediator's Kingdom not of this World* (1809), and *War is Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ* (1812). Dodge laid the foundations of a capitalist peace in the latter—

War actually generates a spirit of anarchy and rebellion which is destructive to liberty. When the inhabitants of a country are engaged in the peaceable employments of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, anarchy and rebellion seldom happen. When these useful employments flourish, abundance flows in on every side, gentleness and humanity cast a smile over the land, and pleasure beams in almost every countenance.

To turn the attention of a nation from these honest employments to *that of war* is an evil of unspeakable magnitude.

The American Peace Society

In 1828, The New York Peace Society merged with other peace societies in the northeast and formed the American Peace Society (APS). Under the leadership of William Ladd, the APS championed pacifism, disarmament, and international arbitration as prerequisites for perpetual peace and progress. Arbitration was seen as a progressive step toward world federation. In 1838, the APS wrote the following in their periodical, "Advocate for Peace" —

For it cannot be doubted that the Creator formed men to dwell in brotherhood together. War exhibits mankind in a most unnatural and revolting aspect. It is utterly at variance with the spirit of Christianity. As a mode of deciding national differences, it is barbarous and absurd, without equity in principle and never insuring a just decision. It combines sources of crime and misery incalculably beyond every other scourge of the earth. Its perpetual abolition would not only dry up these sources of evil, but would remove the greatest obstacle to human advancement; would quicken all the springs of social welfare, physical and moral, and open the road to indefinite progress and perfection.

World Congress and Court of Nations

In *An Essay on a Congress of Nations* (1840), William Ladd tried to pick up where Kant left off. He called on "the most civilized, enlightened, and Christian nations" of the world to form a World Congress and Court of Nations. His proposal placed its emphasis on replacing war as an instrument of foreign policy with arbitration. Ladd and the APS petitioned the Commonwealth of

Massachusetts, the U.S. Congress, the British Parliament, and other bodies, to plan for peace. Their plea was ignored by world powers.

Motives and Intentions

Communist Manifesto

In 1848, Karl Marx and Frederik Engels published the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* which challenged capitalism as a theory of peace. Marx divided capitalism into two hostile camps, the Bourgeoisie, the owners of the means of social production and employers of wage labor, and the Proletariat, the class of modern wage laborers who sell their labor power because they lack means of production. It would not take long for communists to capture the minds of progressive peace activists.

American Civil War

The Civil War (1861-1865) undermined early arguments that world federalism was a recipe for peace. How could a world federation end war if a union of American states could no longer exist short of a bloody war? The Civil War exposed the truth that there is something many peace activists want more than peace, and that is progress. Even the American Peace Society embraced the War of Northern Aggression on the grounds that abolishing slavery was more important than advancing the principles of peace.

Competing Economic Doctrines

By 1884, there were multiple economic doctrines competing to master the world: capitalism, socialism, and communism. Socialism and communism both seek the elimination of private property rights making them incompatible with capitalism. It soon became hard to differentiate the true motives and intentions of proponents of world federation.

British Imperial Federation

Across the Atlantic, in 1884, ruling class elites in Great Britain proposed transforming the British Empire into an Imperial Federation. They yearned to replace colonialism with free trade imperialism using federalist principles. In *Triumphant Democracy* (1886, p. 112), American industrialist Andrew Carnegie referred to their idea as an “amusing Imperial Federation fad (which, happily, is impossible).” As he predicted, the aspirations of the Imperial Federation League failed to resonate at the First Colonial Conference in 1877.

Racial Mastery of the World

Andrew Carnegie later critiqued the vision of the Imperial Federation League in 1891 on the grounds that they failed to include America in their grand design. Carnegie preferred to “lay the foundation for a true federation of the whole race, as far as possible to combine sovereign powers; and how far that is possible is for future generations, not for this, to learn” (*Twentieth Century*, p. 503). He longed “to secure first the unity of our race, and through that, for it, the mastery of the world, for the good of the whole world” (p. 502). His viewpoint was inspired by the eugenics movement.

The Road to a New World Order

International Parliamentary Union

Fredric Passey (France) and Randal Cremer (UK) are credited with inspiring the creation of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) in 1889. It was established to provide a world forum for diplomacy. Peace activists viewed it as a stepping-stone toward world federation. Passey was a peace activist and “ardent free trader, believing that free trade would draw nations together as partners in a common enterprise, result in disarmament, and lead to

the abandonment of war.”¹ Cremer, on the other hand, was a reformed Marxist and early advocate of arbitration as an alternative to war.² Both earned the Nobel Peace Prize for their work.

The Spanish-American War

The description of the Spanish-American War by the U.S. Office of the Historian speaks for itself—

The Spanish-American War of 1898 ended Spain’s colonial empire in the Western Hemisphere and secured the position of the United States as a Pacific power. U.S. victory in the war produced a peace treaty that compelled the Spanish to relinquish claims on Cuba, and to cede sovereignty over Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines to the United States. The United States also annexed the independent state of Hawaii during the conflict. Thus, the war enabled the United States to establish its predominance in the Caribbean region and to pursue its strategic and economic interests in Asia.

The Hague Convention of 1899

While Tsar Nicholas II of Russia gets the political credit, the behind the scenes work of the IPU inspired The Hague Convention of 1899. The IPU gave the peace movement a voice on the world stage. Instead of outlawing war and convincing nations to disarm, core conventions established the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) and codified laws of war. Peace activists hoped world leaders would pursue arbitration before war and make it more humane if justified in the end.

¹ <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/1901/passy/biographical/>

² <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/1903/cremer/biographical/>

Philippine-American War

After Spain ceded the colony of the Philippines to the United States at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War, Filipino nationalists demanded their independence. From 1899 to 1901, the United States waged a brutal war against insurgents which resulted in the death of around 4,200 Americans and 20,000 Filipinos—all in the name of a colonial experiment.

Anglo-American Rapprochement

In 1901, W.T. Stead of Great Britain, a noted journalist, called for the unification of the English-speaking race in his book, *The Americanization of the World*.³ Like Andrew Carnegie, Stead's world view was guided by the eugenics movement, and influenced by Cecil Rhodes, a well-known British imperialist. Many credit his book for contributing to the Anglo-American Rapprochement at the dawn of the 20th Century. During this period, the socioeconomic interests of the United States and the British Empire converged.

Preparing for World Federation

President Theodore Roosevelt initially called for a second peace conference at The Hague in 1904, but it was delayed by the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). During the 1904 Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) held in St. Louis, Missouri, U.S. Representative Richard Bartholdt (R, MO) was elected President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. The stage was set for the first iteration of the world federalist movement.

Anticipating another peace conference, Andrew Carnegie resurrected the New York Peace Society in 1906 which spawned the World Federation League. A year later, Benjamin Franklin Trueblood of the American Peace Society penned *The Federation of*

³ Available through Google Books

the World in 1907. Both were convinced the Hague Convention of 1907 did not go far enough, so Carnegie decided to take their case to the U.S. Congress—with the help of U.S. Representative Richard Bartholdt of course.

Chapter 4—The World-Federation League

Under the leadership of Oscar T. Crosby, Hamilton Holt, and U.S. Representative Richard Bartholdt the World-Federation League of the New York Peace Society called for the federation of the world. In 1910 they declared their official intentions in their publication, *The Peace Movement: The Federation of the World*⁴—

It is not the intent of this organization to urge changes in the existing forms of national governments or the formation of one government which should attempt to regulate the domestic affairs of all lands. The contemplated Federation of the Nations is designed only to lessen the occasions of war and to diminish the constantly increasing burdens on all states of maintaining armies and navies beyond those required for necessary internal policing of the several nations.

With a mighty industrialist like Carnegie behind him, in April of 1910, Representative Bartholdt launched the first iteration of the world federalist movement in the U.S. Congress by introducing the following resolution—

Proposed Joint Resolution of the Congress of the United States of America

WHEREAS modern means of communication now afford to the people of all nations a better understanding of their common interests than the people heretofore and

WHEREAS such mutual understanding and its resultant sympathy between the people of all countries provide the moral basis for a citizenship of the world;

⁴ Available through Google Books.

and

WHEREAS this universal citizenship requires an organ of expression and of action to the end that it may bear proper fruit in diminishing the desolations of war and in promoting human happiness through peaceful co-operation of states;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that the Government of the United States give public expression to a form of articles of International Federation which, in substance, may be recommended to other Governments as a fitting instrument for realizing world-wide aspirations toward the amelioration of harsh conditions now suffered by multitudes, and which, in part, are due to an ever-present fear of international war

Now THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States; the duties of such commission to be as follows: —

FIRST: To urge upon the attention of other Governments the fact that relief from the heavy burden of military expenditures and from the disasters of war can best be obtained by the establishment of an International Federation;

SECONDLY: To report to Congress, as soon as practicable, a draft of articles of a Federation limited to the maintenance of peace, through the establishment of an international Court having power to determine by decree all controversies between nations and to enforce execution of its decrees by the arms of the Federation, such arms to be provided to the Federation and controlled solely by it.

THIRDLY: To consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenses of Government

for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

In October of 1910, the World-Federation League published *The Peace Movement: The American Peace Commission*,⁵ to update their followers on the outcome of their campaign. They reported that on May 7, 1910, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on international federation—days after former President Roosevelt endorsed the idea. Members of the World Federation League and the New York Peace Society, like Oscar Crosby, Hamilton Holt, and George Nelson, testified before the Committee.

Rather than report favorably on Representative Bartholdt's world federalist resolution, the U.S. Congress passed a revised resolution inspired by Representative William S. Bennett (later signed by President Taft) calling for a—

Commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and the lessen the probabilities of war.

The history books have little to say, if anything, about the work of the “Commission” to promote the maintenance of international peace. One can only imagine what could have been avoided if the U.S. Congress passed Representative Bartholdt's resolution. Progressive internationalists had other plans.

⁵ Available through Google Books.

Chapter 5—Almost a League of Their Own

A month after the U.S. Congress passed the Commission to promote the maintenance of international peace resolution, six men met in November of 1910 to plot the establishment of the Federal Reserve System. They knew that a new order of nations was on the horizon. Just in time for the war, by 1913, the U.S. Congress established the Federal Reserve System and the states ratified the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution which states—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived. without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

The addition of the Fed and the individual income tax allowed Congress to pass the Revenue Act of 1913 which substantially lowered tariffs. Now realigned with its historical nemesis, Great Britain, America was ready to embrace free trade imperialism. World War I, however, broke out before the Anglo-American establishment could implement their free trade agenda.

Alarmed by the war, Goldsworthy Lowes Dickenson proposed the establishment of a “League of Nations” in 1914. Dickenson, a British political scientist, then founded the League of Nations Union to promote the idea in England. The League was somewhat of a departure from the vision of the Round Table Movement which placed its emphasis on federating the remaining colonies of the British Empire.

Across the Atlantic, former President William Taft took the lead in establishing the League to Enforce Peace on June 17, 1915. Lawrence A. Lowell, President of Harvard University, edited a book, *The League to Enforce Peace*,⁶ documenting their organizational conference at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. It candidly outlined their world government agenda.

⁶ <https://archive.org/details/leaguetoenforcep00loweuoft/page/n5/mode/2up>

Among those organizing the League was the former Vice President of the World Federation League, Hamilton Holt. His views were published in *The League to Enforce Peace* and a subsequent weekly publication called *The League Bulletin*. For Holt, the end game of the new League should be as follows—

when we get our League of Peace, it will not be perfect until we go developing it to the point where the legislature has power to make international law, the court has jurisdiction over international disputes, and the executive has power to carry out the decrees of the courts and conferences. Then we shall have, in very truth, that final world government which the historian Freeman has said, when it comes into existence, will constitute “the most finished and the most artificial production of political ingenuity.”

Months after the United States entered World War One in April of 1917, President Wilson established “The Inquiry” to help the U.S. Department of State prepare for a new order of nations after hostilities ended. The Inquiry was an academic exercise under the direction of Colonel Edward M. House. Their research helped shape Wilson’s world order strategy based on Fourteen Points for the maintenance of peace released in January of 2018. Among them were—

3 The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of equality of trade conditions among all nations consenting to the peace

4 Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

14 A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of

affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike.

The U.S. Census estimates there were 9,721,937 military and 6,821,248 civilian deaths during the First World War. Of these, America's share accounted for around 116,708 military and 757 civilian deaths. According to Nicholas Mulder, the United States loaned out around \$7 billion dollars to its allies during the war.⁷ Practically the last power still standing, the United States had a lot of leverage at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. The Anglo-American establishment dictated the terms of the Treaty of Versailles which established the Covenant of the League of Nations. The United States failed to ratify the Treaty of Versailles after Senator William E. Borah of Idaho made his historic speech. See Exhibit 1.

Senator Borah's critics argue the Second World War would never have happened if the United States ratified the Treaty of Versailles and joined the League of Nations. This is debatable. One could also argue another world war could have been averted if world leaders listened to Clarence K. Streit.

⁷ https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/war_finance

Clarence K. Streit and the Atlantic Union Idea

Before Clarence K. Streit penned *Union Now* he was a journalist by education and trade. He covered the failing League of Nations for *The New York Times* in the 1930s after studying at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. Streit was no stranger to war and peace issues. He put his college studies at the State University of Montana on hold and volunteered for service with the 8th Railway Engineers in France at the start of World War I. He later transferred to the U.S. Army intelligence service at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. Streit wrote in *Union Now* that he was uniquely positioned to see the politics behind the Treaty of Versailles and the formation of the League of Nations—

I had access there to many highly secretive official documents, not only the daily record of the secret meetings of Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, etc., but daily dispatches between the President and American generals on all fronts, our diplomats, and Washington (on the home and Senate situation). I was in an unusual position to see daily what was really happening, and how little the press or public knew of this, and to see, too, from the inside how propaganda was being handled abroad and at home.

Over time, Streit grew tired of reporting on the failure of the League to contain Nazi Germany. Unwilling to wait for the world to change, he decided to hang up his journalism career and become a political activist. In 1939, Streit proposed the Atlantic Union idea in *Union Now* to defend and extend the blessings of individual liberty as the sine qua non of world peace—

The way through is Union now of the democracies that the North Atlantic and a thousand other things already unite—Union of these few peoples in a great federal republic built on and for the thing they share most, their common

democratic principle of government for the sake of individual freedom.

This Union would be designed (a) to provide effective common government in our democratic world in those fields where such common government will clearly serve man's freedom better than separate governments, (b) to maintain independent national governments in all other fields where such government will best serve man's freedom, and (c) to create by its constitution a nucleus world government capable of growing into universal world government peacefully and as rapidly as such growth will best serve man's freedom.

By (a) I mean the Union of the North Atlantic democracies in these five fields:

- a union government and citizenship
- a union defense force
- a union customs-free economy
- a union money
- a union postal and communications system.

By (b) I mean the Union government shall guarantee against all enemies, foreign and domestic, not only those rights of man that are common to all democracies, but every existing national or local right that is not clearly incompatible with effective union government in the five named fields. The Union would guarantee the right of each democracy in it to govern independently all its home affairs and practice democracy at home in its own tongue, according to its own customs and in its own way, whether by republic or kingdom, presidential, cabinet or other form of government, capitalist, socialist or other economic system.

By (c) I mean the founder democracies shall so

constitute The Union as to encourage the nations outside it and the colonies inside it to seek to unite with it instead of against it. Admission to The Union and to all its tremendous advantages for the individual man and woman would from the outset be open equally to every democracy, now or to come, that guarantees its citizens The Union's minimum Bill of Rights.

The Great Republic would be organized with a view to its spreading peacefully round the earth as nations grow ripe for it. Its Constitution would aim clearly at achieving eventually by this peaceful, ripening, natural method the goal millions have dreamed of individually, but never sought to get by deliberately planning and patiently working together to achieve it. That goal would be achieved by The Union when every individual of our species would be a citizen of it, a citizen of a disarmed world enjoying world free trade, a world money and a world communications system. Then Man's vast future would begin.

Chapter 6—The Roosevelt Years

After *Union Now* was published by Harper & Brothers in March of 1939, Streit set up a nonprofit organization called Federal Union, Inc., and launched the *Atlantic Union Bulletin*—which later evolved into *Freedom & Union: Magazine of the Democratic World*. He initially focused on educating the American establishment on the principles of individual freedom and federal union. At this stage of the Atlantic Union movement, Streit placed his faith in the President of the United States—

For the condition of the whole human species to change immensely for the better, the American President need only invite the fourteen other leaders of democracy to join him in declaring the undeniable: That their common supreme unit of government is the individual free man, that their common supreme end of government is the freedom of individual man, and their common means to their common end is the union of the free men as equals; that Democracy and Union are one and the same; that the responsibility facing 300,000,000 free men today is the one that faced 30,000,000 in 1861 and 3,000,000 in 1787—the responsibility of choosing for themselves and their children whether to slip backward with the misery-making absolutist principle of the sovereignty of nations, or to continue forward with the richest political principle men have ever found, the principle of free union through equal sovereignty of man. The American President need only ask the others to join him in making this Declaration of Dependence of free men on themselves and on each other, and in convoking then our Union's constituent assembly.

Streit believed that the federal convention approach used by

America's Founding Fathers was the best way to establish an Atlantic Union. He suggested that the President of the United States invite other civil liberty democracies to send representatives to an Atlantic convention to draft a constitution based on federalist principles. Participating nations would then ratify it in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures. Critics argued his approach was unconstitutional on its face.

Streit argued that the American people needed to exercise their sovereignty rather than surrender it. He interpreted the American Declaration of Independence to mean that all individuals were sovereign, regardless of where they were born. He argued that nations were no more sovereign than kings, or the free and independent States predating the Constitution of the United States. Streit believed that individuals were the basic unit of federalism, not states.

A sense of urgency inspired Streit to call on the President to take the lead rather than amending the Constitution first. He hoped that an Atlantic Union could be established in time to contain Nazi Germany—but he was obviously too late. World War Two started months after *Union Now* was first published. There was still time to save Great Britain, and Streit had access to the President's ear. Convincing the President to act, however, proved to be a bureaucratic obstacle course.

Months after *Union Now* was published, the U.S. Department of State partnered with the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in September of 1939 to launch its War and Peace Studies program. Like President Woodrow Wilson's Inquiry, this post-war planning initiative invited members of the academic community to conduct research. Academics and activists, including Streit, viewed this program as a backdoor to the State Department—and ultimately the President.

On October 3, 1940, Senator Rush Holt of West Virginia attempted to expose Streit on the floor of the Senate as a member of a Rhodesian conspiracy to save the British Empire. The Atlantic Union idea, after all, was popular among Rhodes Scholars seeking Anglo-American reunification. Senator Holt cited media reports

that Streit enjoyed private conversations with President Roosevelt about an eventual alliance with Great Britain. Streit would later reveal that Roosevelt expressed interest in the Atlantic Union idea during these conversations.

Other British elites favored the Atlantic Union idea as well. Phillip Kerr (Lord Lothian), for example, endorsed *Union Now* in 1939. He was a Secretary of the Rhodes Trust and an advocate of British Imperial Federation. When Lothian endorsed Streit's book, he was the British Ambassador to the United States (June of 1939 until his death in December of 1940). The British, of course, desperately needed the United States to either enter the war, or sell, lend, or lease them military hardware, arms and ammunition.

Roosevelt opted for lend-lease rather than Atlantic Union. It was far easier to convince Congress to reverse neutrality laws than betray the parting wisdom of President George Washington. He was likely pressured by American companies anxiously waiting for an opportunity to sell war goods and services to the British—and to the Soviets as well for that matter.

Across the Atlantic, British elites were already familiar with the concept of international federalism. From the late 1800s to the early 1900s, British Imperial Federalists called for the consolidation of the British Empire into a superstate based on federalist principles. They would later embrace the vision of Benjamin Franklin Trueblood and the World Federation League of the New York Peace Society in 1910. Thirty years later, British elites hoped that a European union of sorts could save Britain from Nazi Germany.

Union Now inspired the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Winston Churchill, to propose Anglo-French Union in June of 1940 at the suggestion of Jean Monnet. With the full endorsement of the French Undersecretary of War, Charles de Gaulle, Churchill proposed the following idea to the Prime Minister of France, Paul Reynaud—

At this most fateful moment in the history of the modern world the Governments of the United Kingdom and the French Republic make this

declaration of indissoluble union and unyielding resolution in their common defence of justice and freedom, against subjection to a system which reduces mankind to a life of robots and slaves.

The two Governments declare that France and Great Britain shall no longer be two nations but one Franco-British Union. The constitution of the Union will provide for joint organs of defence, foreign, financial, and economic policies. Every citizen of France will enjoy immediately citizenship of Great Britain, every British subject will become a citizen of France.

Both countries will share responsibility for the repair the devastation of war, wherever it occurs in their territories, and the resources of both shall be equally, and as one, applied to that purpose.

During the war there shall be a single war Cabinet, and all the forces of Britain and France, whether on land, sea, or in the air, will be placed under its direction. It will govern from wherever it best can. The two Parliaments will be formally associated.

The nations of the British Empire are already forming new armies. France will keep her available forces in the field, on the sea, and in the air.

The Union appeals to the United States to fortify the economic resources of the Allies and to bring her powerful material aid to the common cause.

The Union will concentrate its whole energy against the power of the enemy no matter where the battle may be. And thus we shall conquer.

General de Gaulle delivered Churchill's proposal to Prime Minister Reynaud who then presented it to the French cabinet. They refused to federate with a pending corpse. Anglo-French Union was rejected with prejudice. General de Gaulle would later become the leader of the Free French Forces during the Nazi occupation of

France—after he was court-martialed for treason!

After France fell, Streit released another version of his book entitled *Union Now with Britain* in 1941. Great Britain, the mother of America, had to be saved. His book helped President Roosevelt overcome the patriotic lore of the American Revolution and the War of 1812 in preparation for an emerging Anglo-American rapprochement.

President Roosevelt finally convinced the U.S. Congress to pass the Lend-Lease Act in 1941. They reversed America's neutrality laws at the behest of Churchill and Stalin. Conservative anti-interventionists, such as Senator Robert A. Taft, opposed lend-lease. They suspected it was only a matter of time before the United States would be forced to enter the war. This is, after all, how the United States got sucked into the First World War.

The Lend-Lease Act was quickly followed by the signing of the Atlantic Charter in August of 1941. President Roosevelt sent a clear message that if the United States entered the war, an Anglo-American world order would follow Allied victory. Churchill and Roosevelt agreed to the following eight principles—

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measure which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

The Atlantic Charter translated into free trade, world economic development, the disarmament of all nations, and the establishment of a new security architecture to keep the peace. The race was on to shape the new world order. It would either be formed by Nazi or Soviet conquest or Western consent. The United States needed to enter the war as to the victor goes the spoils.

After the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, it was up to Streit to make his case that the Atlantic Union idea could deliver on the goals set forth in the Atlantic Charter. Unfortunately, he had to share the stage with other proponents of world federation who were willing to work

with the Soviet Union. Their agenda was driven by general and complete disarmament augmented by enforceable world law. Streit, on the other hand, placed his emphasis on advancing individual freedom and democracy.

To advance their cause, Streit and company advertised the Atlantic Union idea in leading newspapers. For example, in January of 1942, former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts joined Streit in cosigning a petition published in the *Washington Evening Star* calling on President Roosevelt to establish a “World United States.” Notable cosigners included Robert Woods Bliss, Grenville Clark, Russell W. Davenport, John Foster Dulles, Harold L. Ickes, and Donald C. Roper.

With these politically connected elites in his corner, Streit was uniquely positioned to influence American foreign policy after the war. The Atlantic Union idea, however, was inconsistent with President Roosevelt’s decision to work with Stalin. Allied victory, after all, was ultimately dependent on Soviet contributions to the war effort. This did not stop Western elites from reshaping the monetary and economic dynamics of the Western world.

In 1944, President Roosevelt pursued the Bretton Woods and United Nations (UN) systems. Atlantic Union was too risky given the circumstances of the war and the emergence of weapons of mass destruction. The last thing he wanted to do was antagonize Stalin. Ultimately, the nation state system proved to be extremely resilient.

At Bretton Woods in July, Britain and the United States fell way short of establishing a sound world currency. They opted for the International Monetary Fund (IMF) instead. An International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (IRBD) and an International Development Association (IDA) was set up to help reconstruct Europe and provide economic assistance to developing nations. Together they are now known as the World Bank.

Moving on to Dumbarton Oaks held in August and September of 1944, a charter for a collective security organization was drafted. The proposed charter would establish a Security Council (SC) and a General Assembly (GC). In theory, the Security Council would keep and maintain the peace after all nations

disarmed, and the General Assembly would serve as a world forum. Proponents of world federation were not impressed because it lacked adequate representation, checks, and balances.

President Roosevelt passed away on April 12, 1945, months before the United Nations (UN) was realized. Power was now in the hands of Harry S. Truman. It was now President Truman's responsibility to oversee the conclusion of the Second World War, and the ratification and implementation of the UN Charter. Standing in his way were anti-interventionists in the Senate.

Chapter 7—The Truman Years

In August of 1945, President Truman decided to drop two atomic bombs on Imperial Japan. The horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki finally ended the war. The level of destruction, suffering, and fear caused by the Second World War is hard for Americans to imagine today. It was estimated that over 60 million people were killed—many of them were civilians. During the war, Nazi Germany exterminated millions of Jews as if they were subhuman. Imperial Japan tortured and raped its way through parts of China, Korea, and South-East Asia. The Soviet Union systematically murdered millions who opposed them. Back in the United States, Americans simply wanted their warriors to return home safely.

Truman's decision to publicly display the horrific power of atomic warfare made the ratification of the United Nations Charter a *fait accompli*. Nationalists and anti-interventionists in the Senate were unable to stop it. The American people were terrified of the prospect of another world war. They believed it was only a matter of time before the Soviet Union would develop its own weapons of mass destruction. The United States Congress was ripe for the world government movement.

On the day the United Nations was established, October 24, 1945, Senator Glenn Taylor of Idaho introduced a world government resolution at the behest of the Committee to Frame a World Constitution (CFWC). See Exhibit 2. The CFWC was led by Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago. Other members included G.A. Borgese, Mortimer J. Adler, Stringfellow Bar, Robert Redfield, and Rexford G. Tugwell. These naive and presumptuous intellectuals set out to draft a sample constitution for the world. They later published monthly articles on world government in their magazine—*Common Cause: Journal of One World*.

The CFWC was known for their comprehensive, or maximalist, approach to world government. They were out of touch with political reality. Grenville Clark and Robert Lee Humber suggested that the United States pursue a more limited, or

minimalist, world federation instead. Clark previously called for a “World United States” with Clarence Streit in 1942, and Humber was known for his campaign to convince state legislatures to adopt world federalist resolutions with considerable success.⁸ As an implementation strategy, world federalists favored transforming the UN into a world federation with defined and limited powers in the field of war prevention.

The world federalist idea was a non-starter because the United States had to work with the Soviet Union to achieve it. Ironically, Stalin was unwilling to play along because he refused to share power with anyone. The Soviets knew that only a handful of world federalists in the United States were communist sympathizers—the rest were Keynesian capitalists. Like Lenin, Stalin was not a fan of so-called “fellow travelers” in the peace movement. He likely viewed them as “false friends of the people, namely moderate-socialist or social democratic leaders (in other words, non-Communist left-wing).”⁹ Of course, Stalin despised the Atlantic Union idea as well.

The Atlantica strain of the world federalist movement had a much easier path to follow. The Soviet Union could not veto the establishment of an Atlantic Union, and Stalin was in no position to use preemptive war to prevent Atlantic unification. The United States, after all, held an atomic monopoly at the time, and the Soviet Union was too weak to wage war.

Two parallel paths toward world federation thus emerged in 1945. Grenville Clark placed his emphasis on strengthening the United Nations into a world federation, and Streit continued to advance the Atlantic Union idea as a liberating approach to democratic world federation. Stalin viewed both movements as fig leaves of American imperialism.

In February of 1946, George Kennan made it clear in his famous “long telegram” that the Soviet Union was not going to cooperate with the Anglo-American design of the Bretton Woods

⁸ See Baratta, Preston. *The Politics of World Federation*

⁹ George Kennan, *The Long-Telegram*, 1946

and United Nations systems. Stalin had a world order strategy of his own. He feared capitalist encirclement as much as the United States feared the spread of communism. The Anglo-American establishment believed that Stalin would eventually take over Western Europe if Atlantic unification was not pursued.

To prevent another European war and the spread of communism, Winston Churchill called for the establishment of a United States of Europe in September of 1946. Now there were three international federalist proposals to contend with: United States of Europe, Atlantic Union, and World Federation. On March 21, 1947, Senators John W. Fulbright and Elbert D. Thomas endorsed Churchill's call for a federal Europe—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations.

The Senate did not pass the above resolution, but it eventually became a guiding principle of American foreign policy.

Demand for a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and an International Trade Organization (ITO) to oversee it, intensified as a result of the Cold War. Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs William L. Clayton was actively involved in negotiating the GATT. He also spearheaded the ITO project inspired by the UN Economic and Social Committee in 1946. After the GATT was signed in October of 1947, Clayton would later shape the Marshall Plan which was designed to encourage Europe to federate.

While President Truman was advancing free trade, proponents of world federation were trying to prevent another world war. In February of 1947, Grenville Clark and Robert Lee Humber consolidated world federalist groups around the country into the United World Federalists (UWF). In November of 1947, the UWF proposed that a world federation should have the following principles and powers—

St. Louis, Mo., November 1-2, 1947

Resolved, That a world federal government must initially be based upon the following principles and include the following powers:

PRINCIPLES

1. Membership: Participation in the world federal government should be open at all times to all nations without the right of secession.

2. Reservation of powers: All powers not delegated to the world federal government should be reserved to the nations and their peoples in order to guarantee to each nation its right to maintain its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions.

3. Enforcement of world law: World law should be enforceable directly upon individuals.

4. Balanced representation: Representation in the legislative body should be determined upon a just formula recognizing population, economic development, educational level and other relevant factors; each representative to vote as an individual.

5. Bill of rights: The world constitution should include a bill of rights assuring equal and adequate protection to persons affected by the constitution and laws of the world federal government.

6. Revenue: The world federal government should have authority to raise dependable revenue under a carefully defined and limited but direct taxing power independent of national taxation.

7. Amendments: Reasonable provisions should be made for amendment of the Constitution.

-continued-

POWERS

Such legislative, executive, and judicial powers as may be found necessary to the preservation of peace should be delegated to the world federal government. These should certainly include at least the following provisions which should be incorporated in the world constitution itself:

1. Provisions prohibiting the possession by any nation of armaments and forces beyond an approved level required for internal policing.

2. Provisions requiring control by the world federal government of the dangerous aspects of atomic energy development and of other scientific developments easily diverted to mass destruction.

3. Provisions requiring such world inspection, police and armed forces as may be necessary to enforce world law and provide world security.

4. Other powers: We recognize that although some world federalists believe that such limited powers would be sufficient as a beginning, others are convinced that any world organization to be effective, even at the start, must have broader powers to bring about peaceful change in the direction of a free and prosperous world community. Such differences as exist among world federalists on this point are mainly questions of timing. There is full agreement that we should move as rapidly as possible to a world federal government with authority and power to legislate on other basic causes of international conflict.

The UWF later convinced the U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct hearings on the *Structure of the United Nations* in May of 1948. The purpose of the hearing was to explore—

how to the strengthen the United Nations so that it can

become what the war-weary, disillusioned and apprehensive peoples of the world believed it was and want it to be, namely, a mechanism whereby disputes between nations can be settled equitably, with sufficient moral and military force to prevent aggression and maintain peace.

The committee invited Cord Meyer, Jr., Thomas K. Finletter, and W.T. Holliday to testify on behalf of the UWF. Although focus was placed on the United Nations, Streit and company were invited to present the Atlantic Union idea as well.

During the hearings, Streit made his first jaw-dropping speech before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He argued that the Atlantic Union idea was more aligned with the realities of the Cold War than the World Federalist approach. He also made sure the committee understood that the eagle does not nibble and gnaw—

None of us would take the mouse as our national emblem. Why, then, do so many Americans tackle momentous matters as a mouse does a piece of cheese, beginning with a nibble, and when that proves too little, taking another nibble, and another—until the trap springs shut?

Cash-and-carry, selective service, 47 destroyers, lend-lease—never a measure bold enough to achieve the difficult feat of winning by measures short of war. Fulbright resolution, United Nations, British loan, Cabinet members testifying in January we must spend billions either on European recovery or on a restored draft, and already the draft is up for resurrection, and we are asked to double defense expenditure, prop up the Charter with amendments and alliances, prepare for military lend-lease. Again the policy of nibble and gnaw, when the only possible way to win without war is to be bold.

The American emblem, after all, is the eagle.

The eagle sees from afar, lives by strokes that are bold. We are not mice; we are men. We have made ourselves jaws that grind mountains to powder; we measure out bites in tons. What we have done mechanically we can do morally, and by so doing add greater glory to the meaning of man. I propose that we rise to this occasion.

Streit further stressed that the purpose of world organization should be to safeguard freedom—

At first glance, peace seems to be the main objective, but, I submit, this will not bear second thought. Peace we all desire, but we shall not get peace by deluding ourselves and the rest of the world into believing that peace is our main objective. There is something—as Mr. Dulles said earlier today in answering this question—that Americans desire more even than that and that is equal individual freedom.

Of course, Streit concluded that Atlantic Union was the best way to ensure that freedom came first—

If we have the courage of our convictions, our problems come down to this threefold how: (1) How to develop more freedom in the world? (2) How to make sure the bulk of the world's armed power is governed by freedom? (3) How to put more power, particularly productive power, behind freedom? To each of these questions I find this one answer:

Federate the freest fraction of mankind in a great union of the free, and thereafter extend this federal relationship to other nations as rapidly as this proves practicable until the whole world is thus governed by freedom.

After his testimony, Streit and company submitted the following outline of the federal union plan—

The federal union plan would secure freedom, recovery, and peace by uniting the United States and other civil liberty democracies in a federal union of the free, modeled on the United States Constitution. This new republic would be the nucleus for a world government. That is, it would be designed to grow by federating with other nations as this became practicable, much as the United States grew from 13 to 48 States. Pending its growth into a government of, by, and for all people on earth, it would be a member of the UN.

Civil liberty democracies are those nations that have proved most capable of assuring the individual freedom of speech, press, and other basic liberties covered by our term, bill of rights. They include the United States, Canada, Britain, Eire, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, New Zealand, Australia, the Union of South Africa. You might add a few more. As the free peoples center mainly on the Atlantic, their union is often called a trans-Atlantic union.

A federal union of the free is an interstate government so made as to keep you, the citizen, free and sovereign. In the union, as in your nation or state, you elect the lawmakers, and their laws are enforced on you individually. Power is divided between the union and your national government with a view to advancing thereby your liberty, prosperity, peace. The division of powers between the union and the national governments, and the character of the union's executive, legislative, and judicial departments, would be decided by a constitutional convention, subject to ratification by each democracy.

The union's powers should include the sole right to conduct foreign relations, maintain armed forces, issue currency, regulate commerce and communications between member nations, grant union citizenship. It should, of course, have the power to tax, and to uphold the bill of rights.

The first federal union of the free was formed by the United States. The Swiss, Canadians, and South Africans have made successful multilanguage federal unions. Freedom for all men equally through an ever-growing federal union of the free—that, in short, is the federal-union plan.

The State Department was skeptical of the Atlantic Union idea because it could (a) undermine their efforts to inspire a federal Europe, and (b) destroy the United Nations. At the time, the United Nations was the only organization keeping the peace. Secretary of State George C. Marshall stressed the continued importance of working with the Soviet Union—

The suggestion that a revised United Nations, or some form of world government, should be achieved, if necessary, without those nations which would be unwilling to join, deserves special attention. Such a procedure would likely destroy the present United Nations organization.

After the hearing, Streit and company decided to pursue a more effective political strategy. Their new goal was to convince the U.S. Congress to convince the President to call an Atlantic constitutional convention. Their plan was suspect considering that the American people never granted Congress nor the President the power to establish an Atlantic Union. Such power is naturally reserved to the people under the 10th Amendment.

Streit was now sailing in uncharted waters as Federal Union was not structured to lobby Congress. A new skipper was

needed to advance this political initiative. Will Clayton volunteered after the Senate rejected his International Trade Organization (ITO) initiative in 1948.

After leaving government service, Clayton endorsed the Atlantic Union idea. He wanted to create a fair international economic order. For example, Article 7, Section 1 of the proposed ITO Charter was designed to address potential regulatory bottom feeding—

The Members recognize that measures relating to employment must take fully into account the rights of workers under inter-governmental declarations, conventions and agreements. They recognize that all countries have a common interest in the achievement and maintenance of fair labour standards related to productivity, and thus in the improvement of wages and working conditions as productivity may permit. The Members recognize that unfair labour conditions, particularly in production for export, create difficulties in international trade, and, accordingly, in each Member shall take whatever action may be appropriate and feasible to eliminate such conditions within its territory.

Clayton likely endorsed Atlantic federal trade because free trade between free and unfree people was unfair. Under the federal union plan, a Texan could eventually trade with a German the same way he would trade with a Californian. The Atlantic Union idea promised free and fair trade for all—not just for MNCs.

In January of 1949, Clayton teamed up with Streit, Justice Roberts, and former Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson to form the Atlantic Union Committee (AUC). They rattled the State Department by announcing their agenda months before the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was formed. Inspired by *Union Now*, the AUC set out to enlist public support—

for a resolution to be introduced in Congress inviting other democracies with whom the U.S. is contemplating an alliance, to meet with American delegates in a federal convention to explore the possibilities of uniting them in a Federal Union of the Free.

On February 11, Clayton and Justice Roberts met privately with President Truman. He was sympathetic to the Atlantic Union idea but refused to instruct Secretary of State Acheson to give them the green light. State favored the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) followed by a united Europe augmented by an Atlantic partnership. The Atlantic Union Committee (AUC) set out to change their minds.

The AUC recruited Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee to introduce an Atlantic Union resolution in the Senate. Representative James Wadsworth of New York volunteered to introduce it in the House of Representatives. The resolution offered an alternative to the world federalist resolution already circulating in the halls of Congress. The Atlantic Union Committee had a series of hurdles in its way.

The establishment of NATO was its first major hurdle. AUC had no choice but to support it on the condition that it would serve as a steppingstone toward Atlantic Union. Senator Kefauver validated this approach on July 11, 1949 when he told his fellow Senators—

I shall vote for its ratification, without reservation, but I consent only because I see it as a necessary interim measure, a measure that will gain the time needed to explore in peace a far more promising prospect—the possibility of eventually uniting the democracies of the North Atlantic by our own basic Federal principles into a great Atlantic Union of the Free.

Days after the Atlantic Pact was ratified, Kefauver introduced the first Atlantic Union resolution in the Senate on behalf of 20 other Senators—

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law," and "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security"; and

Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them" and

Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of the thirteen sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the North Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

Whereas these federal union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the

United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

Whereas the United States, together with the other signatories to the treaty, has promised to bring about a better understanding of these federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

Whereas the United States and the other six democracies which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principle political parties, to meet with delegates of the United States in a Federal Convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of federal union.

Notable cosponsors included Senators J. William Fulbright of Arkansas and Guy M. Gillette of Ohio. Senator Fulbright's endorsement softened up the federal Europe first crowd, and Senator Gillette and others would later inspire the creation of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference—now known as the NATO Parliamentarians Assembly (NATO PA). Regardless of its bipartisan support, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations failed to hold hearings on the Atlantic Union resolution in 1949. Too much focus was placed on world federation.

A new sense of urgency to strengthen the UN emerged after

the Soviet Union successfully detonated its first atomic bomb in August of 1949. Alan Cranston and the United World Federalists seized the moment. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs opted to hold hearings in October on a resolution designed *To Seek Transformation of the United Nations into a World Federation*. The World Federalist resolution read—

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate Concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be the fundamental objective of the United States to support and to strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law.

Over 100 members of Congress, including Representatives Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts, Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, and John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts cosponsored the above resolution. Streit would later convince many of these politicians to endorse the Atlantic Union idea after the Soviet Union blocked UN Charter revision as predicted. Think about it; roughly a fourth of the House was willing to work with the Soviet Union to establish a world government.

A few months later, in January of 1950, the Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings exclusively on resolutions relating to *Atlantic Union*. Will Clayton used this opportunity to warn members of the committee that “the United States could not long exist as an island of democracy and free enterprise, surrounded by a sea of socialism and communism.” He advanced the Atlantic Union idea as a capitalist alternative to European socialism and Soviet communism.

Clayton argued that free enterprise would crush European socialism if a transatlantic free trade area was established. Critics argued, however, that an Atlantic Union could also be used to

impose socialist policies, even communism, on the United States. A so-called union of the free could easily transform into a union of tyranny if Fabian socialists exploited its federalist structure. Of course, this logic applied to the World Federalist approach as well.

Streit used some of his time before the subcommittee to clarify the similarities between the Atlantic Union and World Federalist resolutions. He wanted to reassure members of Congress that the Atlantic Union idea was a liberating approach to world federation. He went as far as proposing the following addition to the Atlantic Union resolution—

2. That the Atlantic Federal Convention be called as the next step in strengthening the United Nations and in attaining a more distant goal which in the Congress, should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States—namely, the development of a free world federation open to all nations willing and able to maintain its principles of free, representative government, and capable of effectively safeguarding individual liberty, preventing aggression and preserving peace by its defined and limited powers to enact, interpret, amend and enforce world law.

By February of 1950, world government resolutions of all types were introduced in the U.S. Senate and hearings were scheduled. All eyes were on the influential Committee on Foreign Relations. At the *Revision of the United Nations Charter* hearings, the committee heard testimony, for and against, resolutions relating to World Federation, Atlantic Union, and other world order strategies. Senator Claude Pepper of Florida opened the hearings with the following statement—

Due largely to the excessive use of the veto and to the general unwillingness of the Soviet Union to cooperate except on its own terms, the United Nations

has not functioned as satisfactorily as we had hoped it would. As a result of this fact, a great national debate is now taking place with respect to various proposals ranging all the way from strengthening the United Nations to the establishment of a world government. The issues involved in this debate are manifested in a number of specific resolutions which have been introduced into the Senate. The occurrence of this debate represents the working of the great American democracy in its best traditional form ... It is my intention, through the work of this subcommittee, to prepare an authoritative report showing exactly where we stand with respect to this matter of international organization and just what is involved for the American people in the various suggestions that have been made for the further development of international organization. At the conclusion of the hearings, such a report will be available for every interested citizen who might wish to use it as an authoritative reference volume.

A plethora of proponents of world government testified. Enjoying pole position was Alan Cranston of the United World Federalists (see Exhibit 3) with Clarence Streit of the Atlantic Union Committee beside him (see Exhibit 4). Both delivered signature testimony outlining their cases. Congress also invited the executive branch to make their case for or against the proposals under consideration.

The State Department sent over Assistant Secretary of State John D. Hickerson to dampen the mood in the Senate. They were unwilling to endorse any world order strategies that conflicted with their own. Hickerson rejected both the World Federalist and Atlantic Union proposals. The only resolution State showed some level of interest in was the Fulbright-Thomas resolution that simply declared that Congress favored the political federation of Europe. See Exhibit 5. The unification of Europe, after all, was already

declared a goal of the Marshall Plan.

Further complicating the matter, the Atlantic Union Committee had to contend with another hurdle—nationalism. The American Coalition, Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) voiced their opposition to world government schemes. Mrs. Agnes Waters warned that the punishment for treason was death. See Exhibit 6. Omar Ketchum, advised Senators that the VFW was “unalterably opposed to any program which would entail the surrender of any part of the sovereignty of the United States of America in favor of a world government.” See Exhibit 7.

Only months after the hearings ended, the VFW had an opportunity to recruit new members once the Korean War started in June of 1950. Americans discovered that Streit was right when he questioned the ability of the UN to prevent war. Curiously, William Stuek argued in *Rethinking the Korean War* (Princeton, 2002) that Stalin lured the United States into the conflict to entangle America in the Koreans.

In July of 1950, the Committee on Foreign Relations released its *Revision of the United Nations Report on Resolutions Relative to the United Nations Charter, Atlantic Union, World Federation, and Similar Proposals*. For each resolution considered, the report offered arguments for and against world federation, as presented by the witnesses. In the end, the Committee on Foreign Relations was unwilling to release a favorable report based on the following reasoning—

The committee would have liked to report out a resolution which would give a clear expression of the views of the American people and the Senate toward the proposals before the committee. Such a resolution would undoubtedly be of assistance to the Department of State in formulating a policy with respect to the United Nations and the strengthening of that organization.

This is not possible at this time. For the most

part the proposals before the committee involved serious constitutional questions. It would not be proper for the committee to take a position on propositions as fundamental as proposals for world federation or a more limited federation which would involve extensive amendments of the United States Constitution until the issues have been debated, discussed, and understood the length and the breadth of this land. The committee hopes this report and the hearings that have been held will encourage that debate. But the report and the hearings cannot be a substitute for that debate.

Another aspect of the resolutions that the committee cannot overlook is the fact that fundamentally these constitutional questions are raised by the conduct of the Soviet Union. While the committee realizes this statement tends to oversimplify a situation in a world of atomic power, colonial unrest, and the robot man the committee questions whether the proposals pending before it would receive serious and extensive support if the east-west conflict were to abate. If the United Nations were able to function as it was intended to do or as it functioned in the early days of the Korean crisis, it is doubtful whether there would be any extensive demands at this time to strengthen that organization.

The fundamental issue of the day is the east-west conflict, not the question of the nature and extent of international organization. The result is that any serious proposals to strengthen the United Nations, to create a world federation, or to create an Atlantic union soon become inextricably related to the effect the proposals will have on the east-west conflict. This, of course, is no excuse for ignoring proposals to strengthen international organization. But the existence of the east-west conflict must be recognized and

considered in connection with any proposals for strengthening international organizations. Proponents of the various resolutions should consider, for example, not only what effect their proposals might have on the east-west conflict, but also whether if the east-west conflict were settled in some way other than that envisaged by their proposals they would have created an organization in which the United States would still wish to participate.

The committee was partly influenced in its decision not to submit a resolution at this time by the great divergence of views that prevailed among the witnesses. On such fundamental questions as to who should be members of an international organization, what powers should be delegated to it, whether it should be within or without the United Nations, whether it should be open or closed to the Soviet Union, there was no general consensus of opinion.

There was no evidence that one proposal rather than another had such extensive support as to warrant the committee in concluding that a particular course of action should be advocated.

Finally, the committee felt that the Korean crisis and the reaction of the United Nations to that crisis showed that the United Nations had a life and vitality that many witnesses did not think existed. It is still too early, however, to evaluate the effect of the Korean situation on the thinking of the American people about international organization.

The Korean situation does not mean that the people of the United States can now forget about proposals to strengthen international organization. If anything, it makes that problem more real. It poses more acutely than ever problems of international organization such as whether threats to the peace are now so serious that a collective self-defense pact, under

article 51 is essential or whether the United Nations should seek to reorganize itself without the Soviet Union as a member.

It is the hope of the committee that this report has set forth objectively the elements of the various proposals¹⁰ and that it may serve to inform the American people and Congress of some of the fundamental issues involved. It hopes that the Executive will encourage the discussion of these issues and that as more and more of the American people become familiar with the proposals, that there may develop a consensus of opinion that will make it possible for the Executive or the Congress to propose a course of action that will be generally acceptable to the American people as the one most likely to lead to peace and freedom.

Although the Committee on Foreign Relations failed to report favorably on the Atlantic Union resolution, they did encourage further exploration. In January of the 1951, Senator Kefauver reintroduced the Atlantic Union resolution in the Senate with 27 cosponsors—including Senators Richard M. Nixon of California and Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Representative Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts led the Atlantic Union charge in the House with over 50 promising supporters.

To overcome the State Department hurdle, Senator Kefauver and the Atlantic Union Committee decided to generate international pressure. For example, Dirk U. Stikker of the Netherlands and Lester B. Pearson of Canada advanced the Atlantic Union idea at the Ottawa meeting of the NATO Council of Ministers. Senator Gillette then capitalized on their endorsement by calling for the creation of a North Atlantic Assembly (NATO Parliamentarians Conference) in November of 1951.

¹⁰ See Exhibits 1 and 2 for the pros and cons of the Atlantic Union and World Federalist resolutions.

The Atlantic Union and World Federalist movements were picking up steam until Senator Bricker and Frank Holman of the American Bar Association sounded the alarm. They warned American patriots that proponents of world government could potentially use the treaty-making power to achieve their subversive aims. In February of 1952, Senator Bricker introduced a constitutional amendment to curb the treaty-making power. The Bricker controversy was fueled in April when John Foster Dulles told an assembly of the American Bar Association that—

The treaty-making power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the State and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

A presidential election year, the introduction of the Bricker amendment electrified patriotic organizations who later passed resolutions favoring its adoption. Many of them rallied behind the presidential candidacy of Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio. He was a nationalistic conservative who opposed Roosevelt's New Deal, U.S. entry into the Second World War, the United Nations, and NATO. Taft was the Donald Trump of his time.

Republican internationalists recruited General Dwight D. Eisenhower to run against him in the primaries. Eisenhower narrowly secured the Republican nomination. Some feel that Eisenhower used parliamentary trickery to win. During the convention the Eisenhower campaign accused Taft of stealing

delegates and then convinced the convention to implement a so-called "Fair Play" rule that ultimately favored Eisenhower. The convention later selected Senator Richard M. Nixon, a former cosponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, as his running mate. Nationalists and noninterventionists were furious.

Shenanigans affected the outcome of the Democratic Party nomination as well. The leading proponent of the Atlantic Union idea, Senator Kefauver, almost secured the nomination after decisively defeating Adlai Stevenson in the primaries. Rather than listen to the will of their base, Democrat party bosses nominated Adlai Stevenson, and then selected Senator John Sparkman of Alabama, a cosponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, as his running mate. They apparently disliked Senator Kefauver because of his past investigations into organized crime.

Eisenhower later crushed Governor Stevenson in the presidential election. A known cosponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, Richard Nixon, was elected Vice President of the United States. Nationalists were convinced that the sovereignty of the United States was in jeopardy. Senator Bricker readied his amendment to make sure progressive internationalists would not use treaties and executive agreements to undermine the Bill of Rights. See Exhibit 8.

Chapter 8—The Eisenhower Years

Clarence K. Streit was elated that General Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected President of the United States. It was only fitting that the first Supreme Commander of NATO forces would soon have an opportunity to sign an Atlantic Union resolution. American patriots believed Eisenhower was specially selected by the establishment to haul down Old Glory.

Just before Eisenhower was sworn in, Senator Bricker reintroduced the Bricker Amendment on January 7, 1953. It read as follows—

1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.
2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in absence of a treaty.
3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

Frank Holman described the Bricker amendment as—

a symbol or a line of demarcation dividing those who believe that the American concept of government and individual rights should not be sacrificed to international plans and purposes, and those who believe that such a sacrifice should be made in the interest of so-called international cooperation.

Veterans and patriotic groups continued to rally behind the amendment. It was already known that the Soviet Union was using the UN General Assembly and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to facilitate

communist propaganda. Now a known proponent of the Atlantic Union idea (Richard M. Nixon) had the President's ear, and a General Conference of the Members of the United Nations was on the table per Article 109 of the Charter—

1. A General Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council. Each Member of the United Nations shall have one vote in the conference.

2. Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the Members of the United Nations including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

3. If such a conference has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming into force of the present Charter, the proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

The Bricker movement failed to discourage President Eisenhower from pursuing his internationalist agenda. After ending the Korean War by threatening to use nuclear weapons in 1953, Eisenhower signaled his support for UN reform efforts. The U.S. Senate then passed Senate Resolution 126, originally introduced by Senator Gillette, which authorized a senatorial “study of proposals for a modification of existing international peace and security organizations.”

In anticipation of a Charter Review Conference, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations launched a series of public hearings around the country in January of 1954 on the *Review of the United Nations Charter*. The Committee on Foreign Relations invited proponents—and opponents—of world government to testify in the following cities—

1954

(Jan)—Part I—Washington, D.C.
(Feb)—Part II—Akron, OH
(Apr)—Part III—Madison, WI
(May)—Part IV—Greensboro, NC
(Jun)—Part V—Louisville, KY
(Jun)—Part VI—Des Moines, IA
(Jul)—Part VII—Minneapolis, MN

1955

(Mar)—Part VIII—Atlanta, GA
(Mar)—Part IV—Miami, FL
(Apr)—Part X—San Francisco, CA
(Apr)—Part XI—Denver, CO
(Apr-May)—Part XII—Washington

While the Subcommittee on the UN Charter of the Committee on Foreign Relations was on its world order tour, the Bricker amendment almost passed in February of 1954. Senator Bricker blamed Eisenhower for its 42 to 50 defeat. Bricker reintroduced it in January of 1955, and additional hearings were held, but it failed to reach the floor for another vote. Senator Bricker anxiously awaited the Subcommittee on the UN Charter's recommendation on holding a general review conference. In August of 1955, the subcommittee issued its *Second Interim Report on UN Charter Review*—

The requirement that the Assembly consider
this fall the calling of a review conference does not

mean that the conference must be scheduled to meet in 1955, or even in 1956. The subcommittee has received little evidence that other governments have given as much attention to the problem of charter review as has the United States Government. It would caution, therefore, against the convening of a review conference until the most thoroughgoing preparations have been undertaken by member states as well as by the Secretariat of the United Nations.

Later in November, the UN General Assembly passed Resolution 992(x) declaring "that a General Conference to review the Charter shall be held at an appropriate time." Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Syria, Ukrainian SSR, and the USSR voted against the resolution. In December, the UN Security Council concurred with the General Assembly by a vote of 9 to 1. The Soviet Union voted against holding a general review conference—and curiously, France abstained. Ironically, Senator Bricker and his followers were saved by the Soviet Union.

Backing up a bit, while the Senate was exploring ways to strengthen the UN between 1954 and 1955, Streit and company broadened their support after European integration efforts started to unravel. In August of 1954, ratification efforts for the European Defense Community were defeated, and European leaders abandoned their quest to create a European Political Community. A renewed sense of urgency emerged to enhance and strengthen Atlantic unity. The Atlantic Union Committee (AUC) seized the opportunity.

The AUC continued to push for the creation of a transatlantic, representative body as another steppingstone toward Atlantic Union. Their efforts were aided in October of 1954 by the Declaration of Atlantic Unity (DAU) group composed of 169 eminent citizens from eight NATO nations. Within their declaration was a call for "an advisory Atlantic Assembly." By November, high-level discussions within NATO circles were ongoing.

The challenge presented to Streit and company by the DAU

group was displayed in its name. These Atlanticists declared a need for Atlantic “unity” rather than “federal union.” Streit disliked the gradualist, or functionalist, approach to Atlantic unification. Gradualists, he believed, behave like mice; they nibble and gnaw their way to imperfect unions, confederations, alliances, and agreements. Americans like to sit down at the table and get the job done—and they demand checks and balances.

In the end, the AUC decided to appease the members of the DAU group. On February 9, 1955, Senator Kefauver introduced a watered-down version of the original Atlantic Union resolution called the Resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention. Gone was Streit’s insistence on federal union as the end goal. The AUC significantly broadened its support by downplaying federalism. Their mission essentially changed to inspiring an Atlantic Convention of NATO nations to promote Atlantic unity, federal or otherwise, to contain communism.

Later in May, former Secretary of State General Marshall joined Clayton on the Atlantic Union Committee. Marshall had huge shoes to fill after Justice Roberts passed away during the same month. Perhaps the reality of mortality inspired another sense of urgency within the AUC to get the process of Atlantic integration moving forward.

In July of 1955, the AUC and the DAU group finally convinced NATO leaders to establish the NATO Parliamentarians Conference (NATO PC). It was set up as an annual meeting where legislators from NATO nations could discuss and make policy recommendations on transatlantic relations. A few days after the NATO PC was established, the Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings *Relating to the Calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention*. Senator Kefauver was ready to make a deal—

I believe that my fellow sponsors would also join me in urging the committee to make any changes in the language of the resolution which you deem necessary in order to better define and make more precise its purposes. For instance, it is my

understanding that the executive departments concerned may propose that the language be changed to have the invitation of the President issued on behalf of the Congress. Such a change would certainly be satisfactory with me and is, in fact, in keeping with our constitutional history.

Below is the submitted text of the Atlantic Exploratory Convention resolution as introduced and considered by the committee in 1955—

Whereas the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere demands united action by the world's leading democracies; and

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty has already committed its members to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions," and to "encourage economic collaboration between any of them"; and

Whereas it is essential to determine by what means the democracies can further unify their efforts in the military, political and economic fields to achieve these objectives; and

Whereas the Nine Power agreement to extend the North Atlantic Treaty and defense system to include the German Federal Republic makes such exploration still more timely; and

Whereas it is desirable that this problem be considered by delegates who would act in accordance with their individual convictions and make a public report of their joint findings and recommendations; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the President is requested to invite the other democracies which

sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from such other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union.

During the hearings, Senator Kefauver quoted Robert Schuman, French Minister of Justice, to prove that exploring Atlantic federation would not derail efforts to unite Europe. He quoted him as saying—

I have long been an ardent partisan of a European Federation to be integrated itself in the Atlantic Community. But certain European nations have hesitated to advance far in this direction as long as the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were not disposed to explore in common with them an eventual political, economic, and military union.

After citing support from other European leaders in NATO circles, Senator Kefauver brought up the NATO PC —

And I would call your attention also that in Paris just a few days ago at the NATO parliamentary meeting, which a number of our House Members attended, but unfortunately because of the great work here in the Senate I believe no Senators had the opportunity of attending, they passed a resolution calling upon members of NATO countries to try to find other means of bringing about better working arrangements, unity, looking toward unified action.

To further pressure members of the committee, the Atlantic Union Committee submitted its impressive membership roster. It included influential members of the mainstream media, academia, civil society, and industry. Exhibit 9 lists them all by name. Keep in mind that a list of establishment elites interested in exploring Atlantic unity and resolve, rather than an Atlantic federation, would be much larger. Regardless of their impressive support, a green light from the State Department was still elusive.

To put even more pressure on State to reverse its position on the Atlantic Union idea, former President Truman joined General Marshall on the Advisory Council of the Atlantic Union Committee. Truman and Marshall inspired the federal Europe first policy and had since changed their minds on the benefits of holding an Atlantic Convention. With Truman on board, the Atlantic Union Committee began tightening the political screws.

The Atlantic Union movement resumed in the Senate in July of 1956 when the Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings *Relating to the Calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention, Part II*. Even with NATO's Committee of Three—Halvard Lange of Norway, Lester Pearson of Canada, and Gaetano Martino of Italy—endorsing the Atlantic Union idea, Secretary Dulles refused to support the Atlantic Convention resolution. Overcoming State's objections remained a formidable hurdle—until a transatlantic crisis occurred the Middle East.

After the President of Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser, nationalized the Suez Canal in July of 1956, France teamed up with Britain and Israel to retake it and remove him from power. The Suez Crisis weakened the Atlantic Alliance when President Eisenhower sided with the Soviet Union and then used political and economic pressure to force Britain and France to withdraw their troops under UN auspices. American intervention in the Suez Crisis had a chilling effect on transatlantic relations.

President de Gaulle was furious at Great Britain for caving to the Americans. It became clear to him that France could not rely on the United States to protect its regional interests. He was unwilling to play the role of a pawn in an Anglo-American grand

design. France would later opt to pursue a foreign policy of independence and grandeur.

In 1957, Senator Kefauver and others convinced the 3rd NATO Parliamentarians to call for an Atlantic Congress to be held in 1959 in preparation for the tenth anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty. The fate of the Atlantic Alliance was on the line. Article 12 of Treaty states—

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

According to the NATO Committee on Information and Cultural Relations in August of 1958—

The purpose and intention of the Atlantic Congress was to bring together the most distinguished and able citizens representative of the principal aspects of the NATO countries – Industry, Commerce, Finance, Labour, Politics, Education, Mass Media – to consider ways and means of developing, in the fields of political, economic and cultural as well as military affairs: (a) close co-operation between North American and European member countries of NATO; (b) close co-operation between member countries of NATO and those countries lying outside the area of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Streit and company capitalized on the proposed Atlantic Congress. He organized the International Movement for Atlantic

Union (IMAU) on its heels. In September of 1958, the IMAU was launched with impressive leadership: General Pierre Billotte, former Defense Minister of France, was elected Chairman; Sir Hartley Shawcross was elected Vice Chairman; Clarence K. Streit was elected President; Franz Van Cauwelaert and Senator Wishart McL. Robertson were elected Vice Presidents; Count Robert De Dempierre was elected Secretary-Treasurer; and Mrs. Chase Osborn was elected Secretary of North America. Other members of the board included: Herbert Agar; Maurice Allais; P.F. Brundage; Air Marshall Sir Lawrance Darvall; Augusto De Castro Sampaio Corte Real; Dr. Alexander Johannesson; Baron W. Michiels Van Kessenich; Alfred Max; Walden Moore; Patrick Nicholson; H.A. Van Nierop; Melvin Ryder; A. W. Schmidt; Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe; Maitre Lucile Tinayre-Grenaudier; and Dr. Rudolf Wagner.

While Streit organized the IMAU, Grenville Clark re-energized world federalists by coauthoring *World Peace through World Law* with Louis B. Sohn in 1958. Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania later set up the Members of Congress for Peace through Law (MCPL) in 1959. The MCPL was primarily composed of proponents of world federation. By this time, proponents of Atlantic Union and world federation were practically working in concert.

Well organized and positioned, Streit and company launched a full court press on Congress. On March 17, 1959, Senators Kefauver and Humphrey reintroduced the Atlantic Convention resolution. The new purpose of the Atlantic Convention was changed—

to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might, within the framework of the United Nations and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective unity in advancing their common economic and political affairs, their joint defense and the aims of world peace and individual freedom.

The resolution also stressed its nonbinding, unofficial nature—

That the Convention should be composed of leading representative citizens officially appointed on a non-partisan basis but free to explore the problem fully as individuals without being officially instructed or able to commit their governments.

On April 22, 1959, President Eisenhower gave the Atlantic Union Committee a huge gift. After Secretary Dulles resigned for health reasons, Eisenhower replaced him with a former cosponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution—former Representative Christian A. Herter. With Herter as Secretary of State, the prospects for passing the Atlantic Union resolution dramatically increased. Next up was the Atlantic Congress.

In June of 1959, the Atlantic Congress, composed of 650 eminent citizens representing NATO nations, endorsed the idea of holding a “Special Conference” to explore Atlantic unification. By August, Secretary Herter endorsed the Atlantic Convention resolution subject to Congress, rather than the President, selecting the members of the U.S. delegation. Senator Kefauver and the Atlantic Union Committee finally secured the green light to proceed.

With the Atlantic Convention resolution set for passage, in January of 1960, Senator Kefauver joined with Senators Church, Clark, Javits, Kennedy, and McCarthy to strengthen the authority of the United Nations to prevent war by introducing the following resolution—

Whereas the basic purpose of the foreign policy of the United States is to achieve a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas there can be no such peace without the development of the rule of law in the limited field of war prevention; and

Whereas peace does not rest on law today but

on the delicate balance of terror of armed force; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly at Its fourteenth session unanimously adopted "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" and called upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem"; and

Whereas a just and lasting peace would not be assured even if nations lay down their arms unless international institutions for preventing war were strengthened; and

Whereas the United Nations constitutes an important influence for peace but needs to be strengthened to achieve the rule of law in the world community; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly at its tenth session resolved that "a general conference to review the charter shall be held at an appropriate time"; and appointed a "Committee consisting of all the members of the United Nations to consider, in consultation with the Secretary-General, the question of fixing a time and place for the conference, and its organization and procedures"; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly at its fourteenth session resolved "to keep in being the Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter, and to request the Committee to report, with recommendations, to the General Assembly not later than at Its sixteenth session";

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the position at the next meeting of the Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter should be that the

Committee recommends to the United Nations General Assembly that a charter review conference be held not later than December 31, 1962, and that member governments be requested to prepare recommendations and to exchange views with respect to United Nations Charter review and revision in order to facilitate the organization of the said conference and to further the chances of its success.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to initiate high-level studies in the executive branch of the Government to determine what changes should be made in the Charter of the United Nations to promote a just and lasting peace through the development of the rule of law in the limited field of war prevention. The President is further requested to report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within twelve months after the date of approval to this resolution, the results of such studies.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the United States should present specific proposals to strengthen the authority of the United Nations to prevent war, at future international conferences concerning general disarmament and to the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Senator Kefauver endorsed the above resolution because he wanted to remind left-wing Senators that he shared their end goal—a disarmed world. General and complete disarmament under a strengthened UN system would allow an Atlantic Union to enlarge its membership without the threat of war. Capitalism, however, would eventually have to confront communism under such a strategy—and the Soviets knew it.

Regardless of the risks, in February of 1960, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations approved the Atlantic Convention resolution, but it was later repackaged as the “U.S. Citizens

Commission on NATO" resolution. Its preamble was shortened and simplified—

JOINT RESOLUTION To authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of United States delegates to such convention and for other purposes.

In May of 1960, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing on the *Atlantic Convention Resolution*. After overcoming the State Department hurdle, the final hurdle remained—the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Daughters of the American Revolution. In order to ensure passage, members of Congress had to convince themselves, and the public, that the Atlantic Convention was not a conspiracy to establish an Atlantic Union based on federalist principles. During the hearing, Clarence K. Streit graciously distanced himself from the Atlantic Convention—

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I support the Atlantic Convention resolution before you. This may lead to some misunderstandings because of my long identification with proposals for Atlantic Union or federation. To be fair to many supporters of this resolution who do not—yet—agree with me in those regards, and to prevent any misunderstanding, let me make two things clear at once:

My support of this convention resolution does not mean that it involves any endorsement of Atlantic federation (as did the so-called "Atlantic Union" resolution endorsed in Congress in 1940). Nor does it mean that I no longer urge federation of the free. It means simply this: I find that the security of the United

States and of freedom has gone down so much since 1949 that any measure that promises, as does this resolution, to assure early consideration at least of how to unite the Atlantic allies more strongly deserves support, however short it falls of what I think is necessary.

With Streit out of the way, the next step was for State to formerly endorse the Atlantic Convention resolution before the committee. Deputy Assistant of State for European Affairs, Ivan B. White, finally gave the official green light—

The Department considers that meetings such as this resolution might well serve a good purpose. We would be in favor of any useful meetings in which the future of the Atlantic Community can be discussed realistically by thoughtful and responsible people. We in the Department of State would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas which might emerge from the proposed convention.

We particularly welcome the thought expressed in the resolution that the delegates to the proposed convention should be free to explore the problem fully as individuals. It appears to us that the cause of frank and constructive discussions at the proposed convention can be best served if it is clear that no government commitment is involved.

On May 24, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson cleared the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO resolution for floor debate. Senators debated the bill on June 15 for two hours as if Streit never existed. Senator Kefauver implied that the NATO Parliamentarians Conference and the Atlantic Congress inspired the Atlantic Convention—

Most of us 'have long been engaged in seeking

out ways to strengthen our NATO alliance. Along with a number of other Senators I sponsored the resolution which made the U.S. a member of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference. I have served as chairman of one of the major committees of the Conference.

I joined in writing and working for the resolution in the NATO Parliamentarians Association which brought about the Atlantic Congress in London last year.

Both the NATO Parliamentarians and the Atlantic Congress have strongly recommended the establishment of a smaller body which can meet for longer periods of time, and which can give intensive study to the possible means of strengthening our NATO ties.

At least Senator Thomas Dodd admitted that there was more to the story—

I have no hesitancy in saying to my colleagues that I am a world federalist. World federation at the right time and on the right basis is the answer to peace or war. I do not think world federation is now attainable because of Communist deceit and treachery and because of uncompromising Communist hostility to the free world and its institutions. But I think it is ultimately the only sensible solution to the problem of peace and war in the world.

The resolution we are considering seeks to take another step forward in that direction by at least getting people together, by getting private citizens of the NATO countries to get together to talk about common problems and to find out how we can strengthen the alliances we now have, which are not worldwide but which are really regional and founded

on free world principles. We can succeed here because we start out with a broad area of shared common principles. That is all we are trying to do.

Senator Prescott Bush, George H. W. Bush's father, also admitted to knowing more about the true origins of the resolution—

The subject is one I have discussed on and off over a period of 10 years with a very distinguished citizen of my own State, Mr. Elmo Roper, who testified in support of the joint resolution before the Foreign Relations Committee. I believe that it would be well for us to pass this joint resolution today. I believe that a good case has been made for it.

The U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO resolution was approved by the United States Senate 51 to 44 with 5 not voting. See Exhibit 10. Notables voting in favor included Senators Prescott Bush, Albert Gore, Sr., Hubert H. Humphrey, and John F. Kennedy. Bush would spawn a future President and Gore a Vice President. Humphrey later served as Vice President under Lyndon Johnson. Kennedy, of course, was soon destined to become President of the United States. Notables voting against the Atlantic Convention included Senators Barry M. Goldwater and Strom Thurmond. Goldwater paid the political price when he later ran for President. On to the House of Representatives.

On June 20, the resolution passed the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as written. On August 24, Representatives Brooks Hays, Walter Judd, and Clement Zablocki led the debate on the House floor with limited discussion of Streit and the Atlantic Union idea. Members of the House, however, were assured that the Atlantic Convention had nothing to do with Atlantic Union—

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman for the very general explanation and the general statement, but, specifically, does this contemplate a political

union—one government of the Atlantic nations? Is that the purpose of this resolution—to formulate a base for that type of government? Could the gentleman answer me specifically and particularly with reference to that?

Mr. FULTON. This arose originally in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in 1957 not in connection with the Atlantic Union organization or the so-called union now. They unanimously recommended a conference with leading representative citizens from the NATO countries be convoked to examine this matter and make recommendations how greater cooperation and unity of purpose may best be developed.

In June 1959 the Atlantic Congress met for a week in London. I believe that various Members from this body were there. Its 650 delegates discussed a wide range of activities that could appropriately contribute to the end about which we are speaking. The Fifth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in 1959 reaffirmed its proposal for a citizens' meeting. So, you see, the basis of the initiation of this Commission, as well as the proposed Conference, is much broader than any particular organization or any special sponsorship. I would say to you that the goals of this Commission and Conference are not set. The proposal contains the idea that the Commission be organized for citizens to be appointed so that they will be of an advisory and not of a compelling nature to the U.S. Government, nor shall there be power to commit the United States or any other participating nation to any or all recommendations of the Commission or the Conference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think in all fairness the gentleman is entitled to an answer to his question. As chairman of the U.S. delegation, I thought I had made it clear in the Atlantic Congress resolution that that was not the purpose of it; that this commission was not to favor a union now, or anything of that kind. It was merely to explore how foreign nations could closer cooperate under article II of the NATO Charter. How they could have closer economic and cultural cooperation, as well as military cooperation. So a definitive answer to the gentleman's question is "No."

With members of Congress assured that voting for the resolution did not imply an official endorsement of the Atlantic Union idea, it passed by a vote of 289 to 103 with 39 not voting. See Exhibit 11. Notable Representatives voting in favor of holding the Atlantic Convention included Thomas Foley, Gerald Ford, Thomas "Tip" O'Neil, and James Wright. Representatives Foley, O'Neil, and Wright would later become Speakers of the House, and Ford would later serve as President of the United States after Nixon was forced to resign.

On September 7, President Eisenhower signed the U.S. Citizens Commission bill, making it Public Law 86-719—

U.S. P.L. 86-719: To authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of United States delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that

a) the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives acting jointly are hereby authorized, after consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to appoint a United States Citizens Commission on NATO, hereafter referred to as the Commission. Said Commission shall consist of not to exceed twenty United States citizens, not more than one-half of whom may be from any one political party, and who shall be appointed from private life.

(b) Vacancies in the Commission shall not effect its powers. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman amongst its members.

SEC. 2. a) It shall be the duty of such Commission, to endeavor to arrange for and to participate in such meetings and conferences with similar citizens commissions in the NATO countries as it may deem necessary in order to explore means 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.

b) The United States Citizens Commission on NATO is not in any way to speak for or to represent the United States Government.

SEC. 3. To promote the purposes set forth in section 2, the Commission is hereby authorized

(1) to communicate informally the sense of this resolution to parliamentary bodies in NATO countries;

(2) to seek to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary;

(3) to employ and fix the compensation of such temporary professional and clerical staff as it deems

necessary; Provided, That the number shall not exceed ten: And provided further, That compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of the Congress.

(4) to submit such reports as it deems appropriate; and

(5) to pay its share of such expenses as may be involved as a consequence of holding any meetings or conferences authorized by subparagraph b) above, but not in excess of \$100,000.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission, who shall serve without compensation, shall be reimbursed for, or shall be furnished, travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties under this joint resolution, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of said Committee.

SEC. 5. Not to exceed \$300,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State to carry out the purposes of this resolution, payments to be made by voucher approved by the Chairman of the Commission subject to the laws, rules and regulations applicable to the obligation and expenditure of appropriate funds. The Commission shall make semi-annual reports to Congress accounting for all expenditures.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall cease to exist on January 31, 1962. Congress in 1961 extended the deadline to June 30, 1962.

In the 1960 presidential election, Senator Kennedy defeated Vice President Nixon. It was a huge blow to proponents of Atlantic Union hoping for a federalist revival at the Atlantic Convention. Kennedy, after all, favored transforming the UN into a world federation; he was more inclined to pursue an Atlantic partnership than federal union.

Chapter 9—The Kennedy Years

Elections have consequences. In 1961, the Democratic Party had full control over the composition of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. The Kennedy administration would also set the tone for the Atlantic Convention of 1962.

During his inaugural address in January of 1961, President Kennedy signaled his potential support for the Atlantic Union idea, federal or otherwise—

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

He further called on his “fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.” This is the essence of the Atlantic Union idea.

Soon after Kennedy assumed office, Speaker Sam Rayburn and Vice President Johnson appointed the members of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. During their first meeting on April 8, 1961, the Commission appointed Will Clayton and Christian Herter as Co-Chairman; Elmo Roper was appointed vice chairman; and Richard Wallace, Jr., was appointed as executive director. They were all affiliated with Atlantic Union movement.

David Rockefeller was originally appointed but resigned due to prior commitments. Other members of the Commission included Donald Agger, William A. M. Burden, Charles W.

Engelhard, Jr., George Feldman, Morris Forgash, Francis S. Hutchins, Eric Johnston, William F. Knowland, Hugh Moore, Ralph D. Pittman, Ben Regan, Edith S. Sampson, Adolph W. Schmidt, Oliver C. Schroeder, Burr S. Swezey, Alex Warden, and Douglas Wynn. Clearly missing from the Commission was the man who deserved to be on the Commission the most—Clarence K. Streit.

The Commission decided that the conference should have 98 representatives from the U.S. (20), Canada (7), Britain (10), France (10), Germany (10), Italy (10), Turkey (6) Belgium (4), Greece (4), Netherlands (4), Denmark, (3), Norway (3), Portugal (3), Iceland (2), and Luxemburg (2). They moved to send “official letters to the appropriate officers of the various NATO parliaments notifying them that the United States Commissioners had been appointed and they now constitute an organized body.” Finally, they agreed to urge other NATO nations to form an international preparatory committee composed of two commissioners from each nation.

At the April 22, 1961 meeting, the Commission established (1) Committee on Studies, (2) Committee on Public Affairs, (3) Committee on Legal Procedures and Policies, (4) Committee on Relations with Other NATO Nations; and (5) the Committee on Organization of the Atlantic Convention. One of the goals of the Committee on Studies was to “propose fields to be explored further and to help enlist experts and institutions in such exploration.” Former Senator William F. Knowland was put in charge of the Committee on Public Affairs charged with enlarging “the area of public understanding of the Commission’s work as related to the problems facing the free world.”

The work of the Commission was initially undermined when President Kennedy visited President de Gaulle in May of 1961. He had a huge opportunity to forge a “special relationship” with France by discussing the promise of the upcoming Atlantic Convention that he in fact voted for as a Senator. Kennedy failed to even bring it up, and then flew off to meet with Khrushchev.

Streit argued that Kennedy’s decision to meet Khrushchev soon after meeting with General de Gaulle was a major blunder. His meeting with the Soviet dictator, after all, was followed by the

Berlin Crisis. Streit believed Kennedy would have been better off restoring Atlantic unity and resolve before sharing the stage with Khrushchev. Truth be told, President Kennedy had his heart set on general and complete disarmament under a strengthened UN system.

During the June 16, 1961 meeting of the Commission, Co-Chairmen Herter and Clayton announced that the congressional Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee requested that the Commission “sponsor a study regarding free world economic policy.” After consulting with other members, the Commission decided to sponsor it. It was clear that the committee preferred free, over federal, trade with our Atlantic partners.

The Commission also met with Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council. Finletter, as you know, was a founding member of the United World Federalists. He wanted to transform the UN into a world federation. He provided the Commission with “off-the-record discussions of NATO problems and personalities.”

Co-Chairmen Herter and Clayton were concerned that the European Common Market would soon emerge as a competitor, rather than a partner, of the United States. At their August 14, 1961 meeting, the Commission discussed the prospect of the United Kingdom joining the Common Market. Mr. Forgas then suggested that the Commission study the political unity of Europe as he believed it was a prerequisite for Atlantic political unity.

Herter and Clayton were also concerned that communism would spread throughout the developing world. To counter this threat, Mr. Forgas suggested that the United States forge a common market with South American countries as a means of securing raw materials. He also proposed a World Bank for Economic Acceleration to help the free world improve economic conditions in the developing world. He suggested all NATO nations should participate in it. Some of the Commission’s members viewed this proposed bank as a steppingstone toward an Atlantic Union—

Mr. Feldman agrees with the basic need for such a bank. Our own history has on the best precedents—with 13 sovereign states one of our first requirements was a central bank, the need for banking institutions, the need to establish a credit for the nations. European experience in the Common Market and the other steps they have taken to become integrated economically and politically reminds him somewhat of our early history. That federation may become a federation such as we have, so possibly evolving from this will be the U.S. of Europe, that is the kind of thing to which he thinks Mr. Forgas's plan adapts itself.

After discussing Mr. Forgas's banking proposal, the Commission defined the purpose of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO—

It is the desire of the U.S. delegation that the agenda of the Convention be broad enough to include discussion of and possible recommendation about anything that would bear on greater economic and political unity of the Atlantic Community and the free world for the strengthening of NATO.

During the meeting on August 15, 1961, Elmo Roper, a former member of the Atlantic Union Committee, led a discussion on sovereignty. It was a clear attempt to push for an Atlantic Union based on federalist principles. He observed the following—

The American Revolution helped put the nails in the coffin of the absolute king concept. It held sovereignty rests in the people. The final power is in we, the people. We have a right to decide what laws and government we want for all of us. There have been some exceptions. The sovereignty of the state as

opposed to the sovereignty of the individual still exists. Russia is still a sovereign state. The power there rests in a small group at the top. That is a return to the absolute monarch. They talk of their sovereignty as the only kind of sovereignty that exists. In this country a few of our forefathers very clearly understood this difference between the sovereignty of the state and the sovereignty of the people—this is shown all the way through the Constitution. It was embedded in the Constitution and stated over and over again in the Federalist papers.

Mr. Roper also cited Justice Roberts as saying—

If we are right that sovereignty in our political scheme rests in the citizen alone, the United States as an entity cannot give up part of its sovereignty. This, because it has none to give; the people have it all. For the sake of internal order and national security, they exercise it through their own agents—the members of Congress . . . a democratic government has no sovereignty to give up. Only its members can delegate their sovereign power to their chosen agent. Such delegation is not a surrender of anything. It is an exercise of the sovereignty, the power, that rests in the individual.

A month after the Commission explored the intellectual depths of sovereignty, on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy called for general complete disarmament under a strengthened UN system before the General Assembly. The State Department later issued its publication, *Freedom from War: The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament*. Although Khrushchev rejected his proposal with prejudice, the Soviet Union was officially advised that the United States would explore world peace through world law and disarmament when the time was right.

The Atlantic Convention was scheduled to be held roughly three months after Kennedy proposed *Freedom from War*. The citizens of NATO nations would soon discover how far their eminent citizens would be willing to go to unite the free world. They would have an opportunity to recommend a “host of cooperative ventures” for their respective governments to consider. Would the U.S. Citizens Commission propose Atlantic Union?

According to the Commission’s October 12, 1961 meeting notes—

Mr. Moore said he was under the impression that this Commission was not limited in any respect to solutions or how the Commission should operate. He thought the time was so short that we must recommend a federal union and promptly. This was his way of saying that the Commission is not limited as to the recommendations it could formulate.

Mr. Roper then clarified the scope of the Commission—

. . . the final bill that passed the U.S. Senate was about the 48th version, of a bill introduced some 12 years ago. The final bill was written by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Mr. Roper was asked by Senator Fulbright to talk with Senator Church concerning the Commission. The Commission was thought to have been conceived with the prerogative of being as flexible as to do as little as to pass a resolution praising NATO or to do as much as recommending an outright federation.

He also plugged the Atlantic Union idea—

Mr. Roper thought the question of what areas we are going to select to try to find better answers is the right track. Going back to what Mr. Pittman said

about not having closed minds on anything; that is also important. He thought there was a way of satisfying the gradual versus the “do it all at once approach”. The real question is whether we are going to adopt the slow typical European approach or the typical American approach of getting things done promptly. He threw out for discussion the idea that the sovereign state has broken down most, in the area of foreign policy. Is the mind of man up to creating a new kind of government which could handle the rather tremendous job of coordinating the foreign policies of the free world?

Another member of the Commission opposed Atlantic federalism—

Mr. Engelhard disagreed with two items. First, the attempt to set up a broad scale body with such prerogatives as to how to develop a common military decision. Second, a common foreign policy and power to tax filled him with dread that we would be setting up a type of totalitarian system, of the type, we are trying to defend ourselves against, and he didn’t think any of us would live long enough or wanted to live long enough to see this accomplished.

He thought the main hope of the free world is a practical approach, bearing in mind the differences of backgrounds, religion and languages, and that if you attempt to accomplish something of an utopian concept, either you do it by some form of dictatorship or you would never get the agreement of all these people. He felt you must try to lead these people to a greater common understanding, try to find things that are non-controversial, such as higher education, broader medical concepts, economic concepts, etc.

Although the Commission was stacked with proponents of

Atlantic Union, federalism was not its focus. Chairmen Clayton and Herter hinted at their real agenda when they released their treatise called *A New Look at Foreign Economic Policy*. It was nothing more than a free trade manifesto. They called for a formal Atlantic partnership; the elimination of all tariffs to boost exports from the developing world; and “fast track” trade authority for President Kennedy. Managed trade for the one percent, rather than Atlantic federal trade, was their goal.

Ultimately, eminent citizens from NATO nations agreed to explore the parameters of their proposed Atlantic partnership. In January of 1962, the Atlantic Convention was held in Paris, France. See Exhibit 12. Delegates drafted the Declaration of Paris which called for the creation of a “true Atlantic Community.” See Exhibit 13. The U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO later summed up the Atlantic Convention in their *Report* to Congress dated June 18, 1962. See Exhibit 14. Their report, however, did not tell the entire story.

Some of the proposals introduced during the Atlantic Convention were revealing and thought provoking. For example, the only national delegation to decisively propose Atlantic federation was the Turkish delegation—an Islamic nation. They submitted the following resolution for consideration—

Speaking as Turks, whose country has the longest land frontier with Russia of any NATO nation, is most directly exposed to invasion, and has special ties with Asia and Africa that make our people sympathise deeply with the aspirations of the new nations in that area;

Noting that immediate federal union of the Atlantic Community offers:

1. The most effective protection against war;
2. The surest safeguard against the divisions among the Atlantic democracies on which the Communist danger, both military and otherwise, has grown and will grow even greater; and
3. The best way of building up the moral,

political and economic foundations of freedom in the underdeveloped countries, both inside and outside NATO;

Considering that half measures and continued postponement of adequate action have led to a long series of disasters since this century began, and that we should learn from the costly experiences we have already suffered;

Convinced that since an Atlantic union would be formed immediately if war began, we can and should form it now in time to prevent war;

WE THEREFORE PROPOSE that the Atlantic Convention recommend urgently to the NATO Council and governments of the NATO nations that they call without delay a Constituent Assembly to work out a Federal Constitution and submit it to the NATO peoples for ratification.

The Canadian delegation declared no globalization without representation. For all intents and purposes, they endorsed the Atlantic Union idea—

RESOLVED, that this Convention recommend to its Governments:

1. that they together negotiate forthwith the terms upon which they may move progressively towards a mutual expanding trade over the next ten years;

2. that they together create a democratically elected legislative and executive apparatus to supervise that trading area;

3. that they invite every like-minded democratic country to adhere to that trading area upon agreed terms;

4. that they together create a democratically elected legislative and executive apparatus to co-

ordinate the defense policies of the North Atlantic Alliance.

The British delegation also proved eager to work toward an eventual Atlantic Union based on federalist principles—

The Atlantic Citizens Convention

A. 1. Convinced that

a) our survival in freedom demands the creation of a real Atlantic Community within the next decade,

b) our people are tired of more expressions of the need for Atlantic Unity and would welcome action instead of words, and

c) they would to this end accept a substantial transfer of National Sovereignty to a common Atlantic Authority.

2. Believing that

a) such a Community holds out the: not only of increased military security, but also of great advances in the material prosperity of the Atlantic Powers and of those developing nations who look to them for economic co-operation, and

b) those material advantages will, in the not so long term, far outweigh any initial sacrifices.

3. Recognizing that

a) the Atlantic Nations have during the past twelve years made great advances in the right direction by the establishment of many functional and consultative institutions—notably NATO, the OECD, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and EEC.

b) the course most likely to be fruitful is, not to create great new institutions, but to build upon these foundations, adapting and developing them where necessary and appropriate.

c) to try to go too far too quickly may defeat the

end we have in mind, and that the task of our governments must be to steer a practical common course between inertia and Utopia,

d) anything in the form of complete Atlantic Federation is not practicable in the near future, but

e) we must be prepared to go at once beyond the concept of mere consultative association and must concede to some Atlantic Authority some of our existing national powers.

5. Feeling that, for psychological reasons, such a step towards closer integration may—however paradoxically—in fact be more likely to succeed and become permanent if membership is not irrevocable and if member states retain the right of withdrawal, on due notice, after a stated period.

B. Recommends to the NATO Governments

I. a) that they create within five years an Atlantic Economic and Political Community (hereafter referred to as "the Community") modelled on the European Economic Community.

b) to this end they appoint within six months an Atlantic Preparatory Commission (APC) to draw up a Treaty modelled on the Treaty of Rome.

c) meanwhile a first stage in the evolution of the Community should be in operation by the end of 1963 (see Section III).

II. a) the Community should initially comprise the 15 member nations of NATO.

But it must be an enduring association that must ultimately be open to the adherence of all qualified nations.

b) during the process of evolution of the Community the fullest use must be made of the institutions of NATO.

c) the ultimate aim should be to merge the E.E.C. in the Community.

d) the relations of the Community with existing institutions, notably OEDC and EMA, must be a subject of recommendations by the AFC.

e) on the establishment of the Community, NATO must continue as a Military Alliance for as long as may be necessary, its institutions being modified as appropriate.

III. that the APC be instructed to report to NATO Governments not later than the end of 1962 of recommendations for the first stage in the evolution of the Community, to be in operation by the end of 1963.

Such recommendations to include:

a) whether to set up in advance of the establishment of the Community an interim Political Directorate, or Commission or Council on the lines of those of EEC or ECSC; or whether the functions of such a Commission or Council could temporarily be performed by the North Atlantic Council.

b) the application of the principle of a weighted majority vote in the Council.

c) the nature and functions of some form of political Assembly for the Community; whether such an Assembly should be a development of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference with some responsibility—and if so what responsibility; or whether for practical reasons it could better consist of some other form of Assembly, composed of specially qualified persons appointed by their Parliaments.

IV. that meanwhile the North Atlantic Council, or a special sub-committee of the APC, should be instructed to examine and submit recommendations on the evolution of NATO, with special reference to

a) the closer co-ordination of political and military planning, and

b) the special question of political "contrôle"¹¹ of strategy, and the need for all NATO partners to have a share in the formulation of policy for the use of nuclear weapons.

Will Clayton, William Burden, and Elmo Roper offered the following draft Declaration text—

The Atlantic Convention of the NATO nations,
Viewing its duties as those of a constituent
assembly of citizens, not of nations;

Taking into consideration the successes and
failures, the trials and errors, of the Atlantic nations in
their efforts to assure a spacious environment of
freedom and progress for themselves and for all
peoples aspiring to liberty;

Realizing that the Atlantic nations remain the
principal force available to resist Communist
aggression throughout the world, as well as the
growing Communist pressure to weaken, divide and
destroy the Atlantic Alliance itself;

Gladly accepting their human responsibility to
provide technical, educational, moral and economic aid
to the many countries, and especially to the new
nations of Africa and Asia, which are seeking to gain
command of the secrets of modern wealth in
circumstances of dignity and freedom;

Welcoming the heartening progress towards
integration made in Europe by the six original nations
of the European Economic Community, and by the
important decisions of other European governments to
seek membership or association in that community;

¹¹ "Contrôle" in the French sense means 'examination, verification and the right to criticize, as against control in the British sense meaning the physical grasp of levers and buttons.

Being convinced that in the modern world, more dangerous and more interdependent than has ever before been the case in history, the safety of our peoples, and the possibility of progress for all peoples, require a much greater degree of cohesion in the foreign policies of the Atlantic nations than has yet been achieved through the various postwar institutions of western cooperation;

CALLS UPON the peoples governments of the NATO countries to plan and to take prompt action, utilizing existing institutions, and new ones where necessary, directed to the creation of a true Atlantic Community, whose benefits should be an advantage not only to ourselves, but to all mankind. Only through the gradual course of building the democratic institutions of an Atlantic Community can we hope to achieve for the peoples of the free world a destiny worthy of the highest ideals of their common tradition.

TO THIS END, the Convention, having considered the proposals submitted to it, in the light of its debates, and the reports of its committees, recommends the following programs of immediate and long-range action:

1. The establishment of a Standing Political Commission of the Atlantic Community at the highest political level. Pursuant to appropriate procedures of consultation and decision, the Commission would anticipate, plan and concert common policies on matters of common concern to the entire Community.

2. The establishment of an Atlantic Assembly, selected in accordance with the respective constitutional processes of each nation, through which the working of Atlantic institutions can be debated and reviewed by the historic procedures of parliamentary practice, whose wisdom centuries of experience have confirmed as the best means to develop an informed

public opinion on public questions.

3. The establishment, through existing or new procedures of collaboration, of an economic partnership between the United States and the European Economic Community. This partnership, the basis of an Atlantic Economic Community, should be open to all OECD countries and other qualified nations. Among the fruits of this Economic Community would be rapid increases in economic growth, with generalized and progressive reductions of tariffs and other barriers to trade until all such barriers have been eliminated; programs to help stabilize the free world's monetary system, which is gravely threatened by growing shortages of liquidity and of reserves; and ample and concerted plans to assist those non-industrialized nations of the free world which wish our help, in developing and carrying out well-conceived plans of economic development.

4. The development, through the Atlantic Institute, and through governmental and private action, of plans for the enlargement of cultural and educational exchanges, and of cooperative programs in studies of science, the humanities and society.

5. In order further to implement the recommendation of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference of Nov. 17, 1961, that "an adequately integrated Atlantic Community be created, the Convention calls upon the governments of the NATO countries, within the earliest practicable period, to appoint representatives to a Preparatory Commission on Atlantic unity. The duty of the Commission will be to study the organization of the Atlantic Community, in the light of the recommendations of this convention and other proposals for change. Such a body should examine the adequacy of existing institutions and

practices to the task of assuring that the Atlantic Community is suitably organized to meet the political, economic and military challenges of this era. It should be instructed to propose such reforms and simplifications of existing institutions, and such new institutions, as may be required to achieve that goal.

Each member of the Convention reaffirms his intention to assist in all practicable ways to carry forward the purposes of this Declaration within his own country.

Finally, Elmo Roper and Ben Regan offered a resolution that exposed their hope that the Atlantic Convention would eventually inspire a “new government” —

RESOLVED, That this Convention recommend to their respective governments that representatives be appointed to meet at length with representatives of such other NATO nations as choose to appoint such Committees, for the purpose of developing a new form of government which will be responsible for the foreign policy of the constituent states and of the military necessary for its support and of aid to the lesser developed countries of the world, with the power to tax for those three purposes and for those three purposes alone.

The Atlantic Convention was a missed opportunity. Gradualism prevailed over federal union—now. Senator Bricker was right all along, the U.S. Citizens Commission proposed using the treaty-making power to establish an Atlantic Union. The Commission challenged President Kennedy to take concrete steps to forge a true Atlantic Community. They challenged President Charles de Gaulle to put the lessons of the Suez Crisis behind him. Finally, they challenged the citizens of NATO nations to address common transatlantic problems using common transatlantic

institutions. Did they rise to the occasion?

President Kennedy signaled his willingness to accept the challenge during his Declaration of Interdependence speech on July 4, 1962. Speaking at Independence Hall, he declared—

The theory of independence is as old as man himself, and it was not invented in this hall. But it was in this hall that the theory became a practice; that the word went out to all, in Thomas Jefferson's phrase, that the God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time. And today this Nation—conceived in revolution, nurtured in liberty, maturing in independence—has no intention of abdicating its leadership in that worldwide movement for independence to any nation or society committed to systematic human oppression.

As apt and applicable as the Declaration of Independence is today, we would do well to honor that other historic document drafted in this hall—the Constitution of the United States. For it stressed not independence but interdependence—not the individual liberty of one but the indivisible liberty of all.

In most of the old colonial world, the struggle for independence is coming to an end. Even in areas behind the Curtain, that which Jefferson called the disease of liberty still appears to be infectious. With the passing of ancient empires, today less than 2 percent of the world's population lives in territories officially termed dependent. As this effort for independence, inspired by the American Declaration of Independence, now approaches a successful close, a great new effort—for interdependence—is transforming the world about us. And the spirit of that new effort is the same spirit which gave birth to the American Constitution.

That spirit is today most clearly seen across the Atlantic Ocean. The nations of Western Europe, long

divided by feuds far more bitter than any which existed among the 13 colonies, are today joining together, seeking, as our forefathers sought, to find freedom in diversity and in unity, strength.

The United States looks on this vast new enterprise with hope and admiration. We do not regard a strong and united Europe as a rival but as a partner. To aid its progress has been the basic object of our foreign policy for 17 years. We believe that a united Europe will be capable of playing a greater role in the common defense, of responding more generously to the needs of poorer nations, of joining with the United States and others in lowering trade barriers, resolving problems of commerce, commodities, and currency, and developing coordinated policies in all economic, political, and diplomatic areas. We see in such a Europe a partner with whom we can deal on a basis of full equality in all the great and burdensome tasks of building and defending a community of free nations.

It would be premature at this time to do more than indicate the high regard with which we view the formation of this partnership. The first order of business is for our European friends to go forward in forming the more perfect union which will someday make this partnership possible.

A great new edifice is not built overnight. It was 11 years from the Declaration of Independence to the writing of the Constitution. The construction of workable federal institutions required still another generation. The greatest works of our Nation's founders lay not in documents and in declarations, but in creative, determined action. The building of the new house of Europe has followed the same practical, purposeful course. Building the Atlantic partnership now will not be easily or cheaply finished.

But I will say here and now, on this Day of Independence, that the United States will be ready for a Declaration of Interdependence, that we will be prepared to discuss with a united Europe the ways and means of forming a concrete Atlantic partnership, a mutually beneficial partnership between the new union now emerging in Europe and the old American Union founded here 175 years ago.

All this will not be completed in a year, but let the world know it is our goal.

In urging the adoption of the United States Constitution, Alexander Hamilton told his fellow New Yorkers to think continentally. Today Americans must learn to think intercontinentally.

Acting on our own, by ourselves, we cannot establish justice throughout the world; we cannot insure its domestic tranquility, or provide for its common defense, or promote its general welfare, or secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. But joined with other free nations, we can do all this and more. We can assist the developing nations to throw off the yoke of poverty. We can balance our worldwide trade and payments at the highest possible level of growth. We can mount a deterrent powerful enough to deter any aggression. And ultimately we can help to achieve a world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion.

For the Atlantic partnership of which I speak would not look inward only, preoccupied with its own welfare and advancement. It must look outward to cooperate with all nations in meeting their common concern. It would serve as a nucleus for the eventual union of all free men--those who are now free and those who are vowing that some day they will be free.

A couple of months after President Kennedy's speech, the

United States was knee deep in the Cuban Missile Crisis in October of 1962. The Atlantic Convention may have played a role in Khrushchev's decision to place missiles in Cuba. Perhaps the Soviets were intimidated by the level of support for Atlantic unification? For example, in October of 1962, *Freedom & Union* boasted that the International Movement for Atlantic Union had 578 advisory members—

The 578 Advisory Council members come from these fields: 128 business executives, including 35 active or retired heads of corporations; 25 Catholic, Jewish and Protestant churchmen, including 10 archbishops and bishops; 39 from cultural activities (artists, authors, film directors, etc.); 126 educators, including 44 college and university presidents; eight heads of farm and labor organizations, such as National Grange, National Farmers Union, International Association of Machinists, 50 government officials, including 14 retired high State Department officers; eight Governors of States or Provincial Premiers; 40 judges and lawyers; 18 retired military officers, including four admirals and 11 generals; 67 organization executives; 40 members of the Press and TV (publishers, editors, columnists, etc.); 32 active or former Parliament members in various nations; 10 scientists and 34 women leaders. All are members of the Council only in their private capacity.

The Soviet Union viewed the establishment of an Atlantic Union as a major threat to their grand design for a world state. Their savior was President de Gaulle who improved Franco-Soviet relations in the 1960s at the expense of Atlantic unity. The Soviets did their best to exploit his vision of a united Europe free from Anglo-American influence.

Even with General Billotte and Robert Schumann, the so-called Father of Europe, on record as favoring the Atlantic Union

idea, President de Gaulle responded to President Kennedy's call for an Atlantic partnership by vetoing British membership in the European Economic Community in January of 1963. General de Gaulle was not sold by President Kennedy's lofty, noncommittal rhetoric. Kennedy was forced to soften his tone. Speaking to a crowd of Germans in Frankfurt later in June, President Kennedy lowered his expectations—

As we look steadily eastward in the hope and purpose of new freedom, we must also look—and evermore closely—to our trans-Atlantic ties. The Atlantic Community will not soon become a single overarching superstate. But practical steps toward stronger common purpose are well within our means. As we widen our common effort in defense, and our threefold cooperation in economics, we shall inevitably strengthen our political ties as well. Just as your current efforts for unity in Europe will produce a stronger voice in the dialog between us, so in America our current battle for the liberty and prosperity of all of our citizens can only deepen the meaning of our common historic purposes. In the far future there may be a great new union for us all. But for the present, there is plenty for all to do in building new and enduring connections.

A few months after President Kennedy embraced universal union of the free as a distant goal, Senator Estes Kefauver unexpectedly passed away on August 10, 1963. Senator Frank Carlson of Kansas took over his role in the Senate, and Representative Paul Findley of Illinois volunteered to serve as the new champion of the Atlantic Union idea in the House of Representatives. Carlson and Findley both served on the Federal Union Board of Directors while they advanced the Atlantic Union idea in Congress. Findley was no stranger to the cause; he served on the editorial board of *Freedom & Union* in the late 1940s.

The Kennedy years were tragically cut short after he was assassinated on November 22, 1963. Conspiracy theorists can add President Kennedy's pursuit of an Atlantic partnership as the nucleus of an eventual union of all free men to the list of potential motives behind his assassination. In the end, Kennedy's death opened the door for an Atlantic federalist revival in the U.S. Congress.

Chapter 10—The Johnson Years

Clarence K. Streit's Atlantic Union approach survived the untimely death of Senator Kefauver, President Kennedy's pursuit of an Atlantic partnership, and President de Gaulle's pursuit of independence and grandeur for France. It was time for an Atlantic federalist revival. To the dismay of Streit and company, President Johnson remained loyal to Operation Dumbbell—the federal Europe first doctrine. This did not deter Representative Findley and Senator Carlson from reintroducing the Atlantic Union resolution in its original federalist form. Streit was back, but the Atlantic Union Committee was gone.

After the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO resolution became law in 1960, the Atlantic Union Committee (AUC) disbanded and evolved into the Atlantic Council of the United States (ACUS). The ACUS favored a more gradual approach to Atlantic unity rather than federalism. The International Movement for Atlantic Union now served as the federalist successor of the AUC.

After Senator Frank Carlson joined Representative Findley on the Federal Union Board in June of 1965, he reintroduced the Atlantic Union resolution in the Senate. His goal was to call an Atlantic Convention to establish an Atlantic federation of the free—

Whereas in 1969 any party may withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified in 1949 as a first rather than a last step toward unity;

Whereas since 1949 revolutionizing scientific, technological and other advance has outstripped it and made practical union of these allies imperative for prosperity, peace, and freedom;

Whereas the fragmentation of the world in new nations, now when the strongest democracies cannot live alone, also requires them to build the pilot plant needed to spread liberty and union both by example, and by admitting to their union other nations desiring

this and able to uphold its principles;

Whereas they need but unite effectively their gold and other resources behind a common currency now to assure their citizens, and the developing nations, enduring monetary stability and liquidity, and prevent their disunion from ending, as in 1931, in dictator-serving crash;

Whereas our Original States, when beset by disunion's dangers under their Confederal structure and invented federal union, which has enduringly safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns—and the benefits and burdens of union—assured each State of independent government of State affairs, met other challenges facing the Atlantic allies now, and not merely worked but provided that free peoples can thus work wonders;

Whereas distant though the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's transformation into a federation of the free may seem, these allies can greatly speed it now by officially declaring that federal union, within the framework of the United Nations, is their eventual goal, setting a timetable—as we did for our moon target—and providing democratic means for achieving the transition in safe time; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representative concurring), That (1) The Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibilities of agreement on: a. A Declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a Federal Union;

b. A tentative timetable for the transition to this goal; and

c. Democratic institutions to expedite the necessary stages and achieve them and the final objective in time to save their citizens from another war, depression or other man-made catastrophe, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and the higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought the free in the past. * * *

Senator Frank Church introduced another resolution designed to explore greater Atlantic unity—without referencing federalism directly—using the commission approach—

Whereas freedom, enduring peace with justice, and enhanced prosperity require progressive development of greater unity in the free world; and

Whereas the interests of the United States require the development of greater unity of other free nations with it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the policy of the United States should be to achieve such unity with other nations as will best serve to safeguard the individual freedom and national values of our various peoples, and, at the same time, enable us to deal effectively with those problems with which no nation, today, can deal effectively alone, and that the President be advise of the sense of the Senate that this Government, by constitutional means, should particularly pursue the following objectives:

(1) Development by exploration and agreement with our allies, of an Atlantic Community adequate to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era.

(2) Such a Community to be composed of nations which share our basic ideals of freedom,

democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law and as we are willing to accept the benefits and responsibilities of close political, military, and economic ties.

(3) Such a Community to be conceived and developed in the interest not only of its own peoples but of all free peoples and to be open to the admission of others as and when their governments become willing and able to assume the benefits and responsibilities of the membership.

To this end it is the sense of the Senate that the President should promptly establish a special governmental commission composed, in the first instance, of representatives of North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations to study and recommend concrete steps toward the attainment of the forgoing objectives.

In March of 1966, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations explored both proposals during their hearings on *Atlantic Union Resolutions*. Streit argued that the Atlantic Union resolution introduced by Senator Carlson was the answer to the “real Red strategy in Vietnam—that of winning not by atomic war but by bringing on another great depression through the crash of the international monetary system.” He then argued that the Atlantic unity resolution (Senate Resolution 128) introduced by Senator Church was inherently flawed—

A difficulty with Senate Resolution 128 is that it speaks of an Atlantic “community”—a term that is not music likely to soothe the French President. For the Senate to choose this term instead of “federal union,” when faced as it is now with a choice would tend to strengthen rather than allay suspicions that the United States aims to disguise—though I know it is not so intended—“subordination as integration.” This is the

more to be feared since this resolution does not touch otherwise on the basic problem of an equitable balance between the United States and its allies.

Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs John M. Leddy disagreed with both resolutions. He restored the Department of State's original opposition to the Atlantic Union idea—

The simple, but decisive, fact is that our Atlantic allies do not wish to move forward with any type of federal political relationship with the United States, even as an objective.

The fundamental reason why there is little European interest in federal union with us at this time is, I think, self evident. It is that Europe fears that it would be swallowed by a more powerful United States.

Around three months after the hearings, the State Department had another transatlantic crisis on its hands. In June of 1966, President de Gaulle pulled French forces out of NATO's military command. He apparently was concerned that NATO's nuclear umbrella lacked credibility and wanted France to pursue its own nuclear capability—an expression of their *force de frappe*. After the United States resisted his approach, President de Gaulle sent a clear message that France would continue to resist Anglo-American influence in continental Europe.

President Johnson's failure to keep NATO together inspired a renewed sense of urgency to restore Atlantic unity and resolve against communism. In preparation for an upcoming hearing on Atlantic Union in the House, Representative Findley reached out to likely 1968 presidential contenders to see where they stood on Atlantic federation. All Republican hopefuls at the time—Richard M. Nixon, Barry M. Goldwater, Nelson A. Rockefeller, and George S. Romney—advised Findley in March of 1966 that they supported the exploration of Atlantic federation. Former President Eisenhower

signaled his support in April.

Later in August and September of 1966, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held its hearings on *Atlantic Union*. Streit reiterated his previous testimony that Atlantic federation was necessary to avert a monetary crisis. Such a crisis could spawn a major depression and lead to war. According to Streit—

The danger to the dollar lies only partially in financial and economic factors. It lies even more in the political factor of absolute national sovereignty, which divides the Atlantic community. The currency of each nation is, like its military force and trade barriers, an arm of national sovereignty, a major means by which each government seeks to serve its national interest. It was this factor of national sovereignty among the democracies of the Atlantic that caused the 1931 crash. Communism can hope that this factor will soon bring another such disaster, notably through the growing Franco-American divergence all along the line.

Communism lacks the financial power to bring down the dollar; freedom can lose through a monetary crash only by the free continuing to allow the dogma of absolute national sovereignty to divide the Atlantic community, even as regards the medium for international trade.

The solution, according to Streit, was a transatlantic currency—

Once the NATO nations establish an Atlantic Federal Union with a common currency, no country or group of countries, Communist or non-Communist, could conceivably cause this Atlantic world money to crash. An Atlantic Union's currency would be in an infinitely strong position.

Streit later contended with the federal Europe first crowd by quoting Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada—

Finally, I believe that only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity. That is the price, the privilege, and the responsibility of great power. Without the active participation and support of the United States, nothing in my view, can be done on the broad front which is essential. Without her leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and for progress.

Representative Findley testified at the hearings that a broad, bipartisan coalition of Representatives and Senators continued to support the Atlantic Union resolution in its various forms—

Through several communications, Mr. Udall and I, together with others, have invited our colleagues to introduce or pledge support to this Atlantic Union delegation resolution, and the results have been very gratifying. At last count, 102, almost one-fourth of the total membership of the House of Representatives, had either introduced the resolution or publicly pledged their support.

Thirty-three Republicans and forty-six Democrats have introduced a resolution. Seven Republicans and sixteen Democrats have pledged support. Among these are both Republicans and Democrats on the Foreign Affairs Committee. The earliest among these were Representatives Zablocki and Fraser, both Democrats, who joined with Representatives Quie, Ellsworth, and myself last October 18 in introducing the first of the resolutions.

In the Senate, Senator Carlson, a Republican, and McCarthy of Minnesota, a Democrat, both

members of the Foreign Relations Committee, introduced the resolution the same day. Since then a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has held 2 days of hearings.

In all, 16 Senators—12 Democrats, and 4 Republicans—have cosponsored the resolution.

Findley would later introduce into the record letters he received from presidential candidates endorsing his efforts. Most notable was the response he received from Senator Goldwater—

Dear Paul:

The resolution that you introduced relative to the establishment of an Atlantic Union delegation is a good idea in my opinion. While I don't believe the North Atlantic unity is right around the corner, I do believe it is coming, in fact, I believe it will be a must before we can present a solid front to our communist enemies. I have been very disturbed with the lack of attention given NATO by the President and by the unfortunate remarks made about that organization by high officials in the administration.

I wish you the very best of luck in your efforts; I think you are doing a great job.

With best wishes,

BARRY GOLDWATER

Firing for effect, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Thomas Morgan of Pennsylvania, then submitted a statement into the record from former Vice President Nixon on the Atlantic Union idea—

It is fitting that the United States, the world's

first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations.

Although the accomplishment of the ultimate goal of the Resolution may well be impossible to attain for many years, recent events of history and the numerous scientific and technological advances of the last twenty years post the way in this direction. It would be foolish for us to ignore the fact that science and history are even now fatefully combining to accomplish the same goal. Perhaps, by anticipating the further shrinking of the world, the dialogue which this Resolution contemplates will provide a resourceful tool for coping with the problems of a world which in twenty years will have undergone even more drastic changes that have occurred since World War II.

I have been deeply disturbed as of late by the trend of events in Europe. The renewed nationalism of France has for the moment halted the pace at which the nations of Western Europe were moving toward becoming a unified and federated community. By adopting a measure such as the Atlantic Union Resolution we could give new impetus to the spirit of federalism in Western Europe.

To be sure the concept of an "Atlantica" is at present only a dream, but in the age of the rocket, dreams become reality with a speed which is difficult to imagine. The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption.

Of course, Secretary of State George Ball opposed the Atlantic Union Delegation resolution—

We believe that so long as Europe remains

merely a continent of medium- and small-sized states there are definite limits to the degree of political unity we can achieve across the ocean. We believe, however, that if Europeans get on with the pressing business of constructing political unity in Europe, a coalescence in the relations of Europe and the United States can take place at a much more rapid pace.

Even with high-level political support, the Atlantic Union resolution failed to advance in 1966. President Johnson ignored President de Gaulle's 1965 warning of a coming monetary crisis. He ignored his call for the United States to withdraw from Vietnam and seek a political solution. Instead, President Johnson decided to maintain the monetary status quo and escalate the Vietnam War at the expense of Atlantic unity and resolve—and thousands of American lives.

In 1967, Representatives Findley and Zablocki reintroduced the Atlantic Union resolution in the House, and Senators Carlson and McCarthy reintroduced it in the Senate. They failed to gain traction in either chamber. That same year, *Time* conceded that a "river of aid" was flowing from the Soviet Union to North Vietnam. Streit was right. The Soviet Union was waging a proxy war of attrition against the United States hoping America would eventually borrow and spend itself to death.

After the Tet Offensive intensified the Vietnam War in 1968, Representative Findley and friends attempted once again to provide an alternative to perpetual foreign wars and interventions. Without holding hearings, on July 9, 1968, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs issued a favorable report on creating an *Atlantic Union Delegation* with supporting and dissenting views for the following reason—

During the years which have elapsed since the Declaration of Paris, very little has been done to implement its recommendations. Concurrently, the Atlantic partnership has been undergoing subtle but

profound transformation. Solidarity rooted in the requirements of mutual security and common progress has been giving way to diversity and separatist tendencies in many fields of endeavor. Western Europe and North American have been drifting apart.

The committee notes these developments with considerable regret. We continue to believe that the best interests of the North Atlantic nations would be served by increased cooperation among them, and by gradual progress toward a viable, democratic, and formally constituted community.

House Concurrent Resolution 48 aims at those objectives. The resolution does not presume to offer solutions to the issues that presently confront, and frequently divide, the countries of the North Atlantic area. It simply proposes that the exploratory dialogue begun in 1963 be continued at the level of citizens' commissions.

Representative Peter H. Frelinghuysen voiced his opposition to federal union—now—in support of the gradualist approach—

The countries of Western Europe, the United States, and Canada are presently in the process of adapting the Atlantic partnership to the realities of today and the requirements of tomorrow.

During the past 18 months, a variety of undertakings aimed at that goal have been initiated in such organizations such as the Economic Commission for Europe, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; the European Economic Communities, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and in NATO itself.

Many of these initiatives involve new forms of cultural, economic, military, or political cooperation with Europe. They must have time to be tested, to

mature and to bear fruit.

In view of these developments, and for other cogent reasons, we believe the Atlantic Convention proposal should not be revived. The United States may well be advised to start playing a less active role in reshaping the Atlantic partnership.

Even with 114 bipartisan cosponsors in the House and a favorable committee report, the Atlantic Union Delegation resolution failed to reach the floor for a vote. By 1968, Streit and company longed for new presidential leadership. Fortunately, all presidential candidates—other than Ronald Reagan—endorsed the Atlantic Union resolution. Hubert Humphrey, Eugene McCarthy, Richard Nixon, Nelson Rockefeller, and Robert Kennedy were all willing to put Atlantica first. The odds were in Streit's favor.

While Nixon easily secured the Republican nomination, there was a tight race between Humphrey, McCarthy, and Kennedy to see who would face him in November. Overall, it looked good for Streit and company. Senators Humphrey and McCarthy were consistent sponsors and cosponsors of the Atlantic Union resolution, and Kennedy professed his support on April 8, 1968—

The fulfillment of which I then spoke could well take the form of a federal union of the Atlantic Nations. The Atlantic Union Resolution affords us the opportunity to study this intriguing concept. I urge the proposal's adoption.

On May 7, 1968, Vice President Humphrey reaffirmed his support for the Atlantic Union idea as well—

While a Senator, I was among the sponsors, from 1949 on, of all the resolutions for an Atlantic Convention to explore with NATO allies a federal union answer to the challenge of how to unite effectively and democratically the great moral and

material strength of these free peoples. And so I heartily welcome the impressive support the pending resolutions to do this have gained.

Robert Kennedy was moving closer to securing the Democratic nomination until he was assassinated on June 5, 1968. Senator Hubert Humphrey eventually secured the nomination and faced former Vice President Richard M. Nixon in November. Streit and company were guaranteed a federalist victory as both presidential candidates were willing to forge an Atlantic Union based on federalist principles—now rather than later. Nixon won in a landslide.

Most Americans at the time did not have a clue that they were voting for men willing to explore and forge a more perfect Atlantic Union based on federalist principles. The establishment media did not go out of its way to make sure Americans knew that the next President of the United States might try to place an Atlantic Union flag above Old Glory while their boys were still dying in Vietnam. Streit would argue that if the media properly covered the Atlantic Union movement, Americans would not be dying in Vietnam in the first place.

Chapter 11—The Nixon/Ford Years

The Atlantic Union movement picked up speed when Nixon assumed office. To set the tone in Brussels, President Nixon appointed Robert Ellsworth as Ambassador to NATO in April of 1969. Ellsworth was a former cosponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution. On July 5, Representative Findley and friends then reintroduced Atlantic Union resolutions in the House with 79 cosponsors—54 Democrats and 25 Republicans. Among the cosponsors was future Secretary of Defense Donald M. Rumsfeld. Later in September, Adolph Schmidt, a member of the original U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, was appointed Ambassador to Canada. On December 2, 1969, Representative George H. W. Bush introduced an Atlantic Union resolution of his own.

Atlantic Union resolutions were reintroduced in 1970, but once again they failed to gain traction. The Democratic Congress placed its emphasis on domestic politics. Working with Congress, President Nixon established the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Nixon agreed with Congress that labor and environmental issues were best handled at the federal, rather than state, level. Were they also thinking the same regulatory approach could be applied on an international level?

By March of 1971, the Atlantic Union movement was back on track. The Atlantic Union resolution had 112 cosponsors in the House, but Streit and company were once again struggling to convince the State Department to endorse it. Establishing a federal Europe first was still their bureaucratic priority. Gradualism continued to prevail.

While the Atlantic Union resolution was gaining momentum, the junior Senator from California, Alan Cranston, introduced a concurrent resolution providing for United Nations Charter review. Senators Lloyd M. Bentson, Robert J. Dole, and Edward M. Kennedy cosponsored the resolution. Cranston, if you recall, served as president of the United World Federalists during the height of the world government movement in the 1950s. He

essentially replaced Senator Joseph Clark as the leader of the World Federalist movement in Congress after Clark was voted out of office for supporting gun control. Clark later became the president of the United World Federalists.

Turning back to the Atlantic Union movement, to prove that European leaders were willing to explore federation with the United States, Streit and company formed the Association to Promote Public Support for a Federation of Democracies. Once again, they used the NATO Parliamentarians Conference to foster political leverage. By July of 1971, 177 parliamentarians from 12 NATO countries publicly endorsed the Atlantic Union idea. Notable American members of the Association included —

Senators Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii, Lee Metcalf of Montana, and Robert W. Packwood of Oregon; and Representatives Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts, Ronald Dellums of California, Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts, Edward I. Koch of New York, and Charles B. Rangel of New York.

Later in July, the House Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on creating an *Atlantic Union Delegation*. Streit, representing the International Movement for Atlantic Union, testified before the committee—

Events since my previous appearances lead me to support the proposal before you with an even greater sense of its importance than before. This is not only for obvious reasons that the years through which it has been pending have left our country, and freedom, peace, and prosperity, facing ever-greater dangers. They have brought us nearer and nearer the inevitable deadline, when the approval of this proposal would come too late for it to help prevent another world monetary crash, another world depression,

another breakthrough for Communist dictatorship, another world war—although the resolution would still serve to mitigate those catastrophes, if anything can.

Representative Frelinghuysen queried Streit on the so-called exploratory nature of the resolution—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, I am also puzzled as to what it [Atlantic Union resolution] is supposed to accomplish. The convention is supposed to explore, you say, without a commitment to end results. But the resolution also suggests that the convention is to make certain recommendations which shall be submitted to Congress for action by constitutional procedure. I guess they would be beyond exploration if they are to make recommendations which are presumably to be enacted into legislation that would be binding on this country. So it is both to explore and to recommend.

Mr. STREIT. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, how would a convention composed presumably of some small countries and at least one very big country reach such a conclusion? In other words, could the European countries bind the U.S. delegates if they felt in their judgment that the United States should be bound by certain recommendations?

Mr. STREIT. Not at all.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How are you going to get a convention to reach any conclusion then? On what basis would they reach conclusions? Unanimity?

Mr. STREIT. I would hope not. I would hope that they could proceed on the basis of the convention that met in 1962. That convention made recommendations which unfortunately were pigeonholed in the State Department and got nowhere.

The recommendations were unanimous although voting I think was by delegate—and this later was proposed by the American delegation.

After the hearings, the Atlantic Union Delegation resolution failed to advance. Without an Atlantic Union alternative on the horizon, President Nixon decided to prevent an international monetary crisis by ending the dollar's convertibility to gold in August of 1971. By December, the Smithsonian Agreement established a new dollar standard pegging the dollar to the currencies of the Group of Ten. Nixon later signaled that he preferred a transatlantic monetary solution.

In March of 1972, President Nixon apparently had an epiphany after he remembered that he was President. He instructed Secretary of State William P. Rogers to give the green light to the Atlantic Union resolution in its federalist form. The House Foreign Affairs Committee approved the resolution 22 to 9. It was then introduced in the Senate for consideration.

While the Atlantic Union resolution awaited Senate action, the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs turned their focus on strengthening the UN after the Members of Congress for Peace through Law (MCPL) renewed their call for a Charter Review Conference. In May of 1972, the House Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on the *Review of UN Charter and Establishment of a Commission on U.S. Participation in the United Nations*. The MCPL failed to gain traction because the Soviet Union continued to oppose UN reform.

The Atlantic Union resolution, however, continued to move forward. In September of 1972, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs George Springsteen cleared the resolution before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during their hearing on creating an *Atlantic Union Delegation*—

The resolution before you proposes to explore
an additional means of perfecting the Atlantic

community. It is an ambitious proposal which the Europeans in their current search for identity may consider premature. Nevertheless, because it is keeping with the concept of seeking better ways to improve Atlantic relations, the Department of State has no objection to its enactment.

Asked to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Representative Findley welcomed the State Department's endorsement but took issue with Springsteen describing the Atlantic Union idea as premature—

The same sentence does contain a phrase that certainly could be interpreted as negative or certainly faint of praise, stating that the Europeans may consider this premature.

This is a hardly a severe indictment in light of the negative position of the State Department in previous years. It can accurately be said that Europeans do consider this proposal premature; some do, just as some Americans do. It is not a widely known as an idea in Europe; nor it is widely known as an idea here in the United States.

Representative Findley's admission that the Atlantic Union idea was not widely known by the American people was eye opening. Of course, one could argue that the American people did not have a clue what their Founding Fathers were doing in Philadelphia in 1787 either. *The Federalist Papers*, after all, emerged after the Constitution was drafted. Streit and company were clearly following their elitist precedent.

Without an imminent doomsday scenario to sell, Streit urged members of committee not to lose faith in the Atlantic Union idea—

The situation in the world and in our country is now such that it may be truly tragic if the resolution is

not enacted before this 92nd Congress adjourns. True, surface signs lull many into believing that peace for our generation is around the corner and that even the danger of another world depression is fading away. Nevertheless, I would strongly urge that these hopes which the Peking and Moscow summits brought for peace and the Smithsonian monetary agreement last December gave the world economy are all likely to prove illusory unless the Congress supplements them this year by approving the resolutions before you. The sooner Congress authorizes the proposed convention to explore the Federal Union approach to these and other major problems, the safer we and the free Atlantic community and the world will be.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations believed Streit was right. They unanimously recommended Senate approval of the Atlantic Union Delegation resolution. On October 4, the Senate approved it by unanimous consent. President Nixon was on the verge of signing an Atlantic Union resolution until the House Rules Committee decided that there was not enough time left to take up the resolution before the House adjourned. The resolution was deferred to 1973.

Representative Findley immediately reintroduced the Atlantic Union resolution in January. The next month, President Nixon appointed Donald Rumsfeld, a former cosponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, to serve as the Ambassador to NATO. The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs then invited Representatives Findley and Streit back to make their case at their hearing on *Creating an Atlantic Union Delegation* in March. Representative Findley opened his testimony with impressive stats—

The Atlantic Union resolutions, House Joint Resolutions 205, 206, and 213, were introduced on January 18 with 74 cosponsors, the largest ever to join

of the first day. That number continues to grow.

Among those supporting Atlantic Union is Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill. Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford has assured me that he will vote for it. House Republican Conference Chairman John B. Anderson is also a sponsor.

Streit delivered another jaw-dropping speech in favor of the Atlantic Union idea. He was an effective orator with statesman-like qualities. In his speech he declared the Atlantic Convention was hitched to individual liberty—

In this endeavor to find the way to win for freedom without another war or depression, this bill would have us put our trust, as I said, from the start—in the convention itself—in the immense resources of individual liberty.

Many have long complained that political science lags dangerously behind physical science in developing the political machinery needed to govern in peace and freedom the world that science and technology are so rapidly changing.

Well, here at last, is a proposal to try to catch up by letting those who are eminent and experienced in this area tackle it with the marvelous inventiveness that individual freedom brings to bear when harnessed even to the most “impossible” or “utopian” goals.

While the Atlantic Union idea was advancing in the House, Senator Cranston and colleagues introduced a series of resolutions designed to strengthen the International Court of Justice—

SR 74: Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the submission of the United States territorial disputes to the International Court of Justice

SR 75: Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the adjudication of disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of international agreements

SR 76: Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, selecting Judges of the International Court of Justice, and having the International Court of Justice consider cases outside The Hague

SR 77: Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice

SR 78: Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to access to the International Court of Justice

While Senators pondered the application of world law over American citizens, President Nixon was anxiously waiting to sign the Atlantic Union resolution. Before it could reach the floor for a vote, House Resolution 348 had to pass first—

H. RES. 348

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 205) to create an Atlantic Union delegation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint

resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage Without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.J. Res. 205, the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution S.J. Res. 21, and it shall then be in order to consider the said Senate joint resolution in the House.

On April 10, 1973, the House debated the resolution. Unlike the debates in the House and Senate in 1960, members of Congress undoubtedly knew that Atlantic federation was on the table. Below are some statements from the opposition during a debate—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to call attention to the hearings held on almost an identical resolution, in 1971. One of the long-time proponents has been Clarence Streit. In answer to a question he said this:

I would strongly favor including in such a Union's powers not only the common defense but a common foreign policy, a common currency, a common market and a common system for handling such interstate matters as mail, cables, aviation, etc.

So I believe the intention and the justification for a union is quite clear. It is a transformation of present relationships into a union and the transfer of certain aspects of national sovereignty to this new supranational entity.

* * *

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. If Members will turn to the resolution itself, on page 2, line 6, it provides authority as follows:

to explore the possibility of agreement (a)

I emphasize this:

to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on Federal principles:

And this is not all. Subtitle (b) provides:

a timetable for the transition by stages to this goal;

I have not heard from any people in my district asking me to vote for legislation to surrender sovereignty and independence to some supernatural government envisioned by this resolution.

* * *

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that the Congress would even consider such a resolution proposing Atlantic Union at this time when people across the Nation are preparing to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution, the war which freed our people from English rule. The bill before us would create a delegation of Americans to explore entering into a union based on federal principles. Such a union could only result in restoring economic, financial, and military ties with European countries, thus placing the destiny of the United States

and its people in the hands of a federation of governments in which the United States had only one vote. It is only reasonable to expect that the result of every vote taken in such a union would be favorable to European interests which could be detrimental to the United States and the interests of the American people.

On April 10, 1973, the Atlantic Union Resolution almost passed its procedural hurdle to reach the floor with a vote of 197 to 210 with 26 not voting. See Exhibit 15. Notables voting to advance the resolution included—

Representatives John B. Anderson, Les Aspin, Shirley Chisholm, John Conyers, Ronald Dellums, John Dingle, Robert Drinan, Gerald Ford, Ralph Metcalfe, Thomas O'Neil, Claude Pepper, Charles Rangel, Morris Udall, and Jim Wright, Jr.

It is also notable that members of the Congressional Black Caucus were consistent supporters of the Atlantic Union idea. Perhaps they longed for an opportunity to consent to a more perfect union? Would the establishment of an Atlantic Union improve race relations? Former Representative Charlie Rangel should answer these questions today.

In hindsight, the Atlantic Union resolution might have passed in 1973 if Woodward and Bernstein never broke the Watergate story. For whatever reason, the ruling class wanted Nixon gone. Perhaps one of the reasons is associated with the quick rise of fast-track trade authority. Free, rather than Atlantic federal, trade was advanced on October 3, 1973 when the Trade Reform Act was introduced in the House—

An Act to promote the development of an open, nondiscriminatory, and fair world economic system, to stimulate fair and free competition between the United States and foreign nations, to foster the economic

growth of, and full employment in, the United States, and for other purposes

Shortly after the Trade Reform Act was introduced, the 1973 Arab-Israeli War started after a coalition of Arab nations led by Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. The United States backed Israel, and the Soviet Union supported the Arab coalition. The two nuclear powers almost came to blows over the conflict. Although it only lasted six days, it had a huge impact on the future of American foreign policy.

The Arab-Israeli War shook Washington. In March of 1974, the Subcommittee on International Movements and Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on the “*Right to Peace*” Resolution introduced by 40 sponsors and cosponsors—

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate Concurring), That—

(1) A world without war is possible.

(2) In such a world nations will rely for their external protection on world institutions strong enough to stop any nation from making war, capable of assuring peaceful and just settlements of international disputes, and reliable enough to be entrusted with such powers.

(3) It is the policy of the United States to initiate and implement with other nations practical steps consistent with our commitment to the United Nations for the expeditious realization of such institutions.

Sponsors and cosponsors included—

Mr. Drinan, Ms. Abzug, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Bergland, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Bolling, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Conte, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Corman, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Eckhardt, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg,

Mr. Fraser, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hungate, Mr. Kastenmeter. Mr. Lehman, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Metcalfe, Ms. Mink, Mr. Moorehead of Pennsylvania, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Seiberling, Mr. Smith of New York, Mr. Stark, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Won Pat.

Senator Bob Packwood of Oregon had the following to say about the "Right to Peace" resolution—

Congressman Drinan and I and the World Order Strategy Committee have had responsibility for almost a year in the drafting of this resolution. Its brevity is not to be taken as any indication of lack of input. We purposely avoided getting into the specifics of what kind of international organization would have to be created—upon which different nations could rely for their protection—to promote a world without war.

We purposely did that, because we knew if we started getting into the specifics of what kind of organization should be created, we would draw 100 witnesses here who would want to chip away at each comma and period, who would want to argue over the technicalities of how the organization would function. We think that trying to argue that topic at the moment would be precipitous.

It is more important that the United States take the lead in the world and hopefully the other nations will follow us in reaching the philosophical conclusion that we want to create an international organization that has the power to prevent war. We were convinced as we discussed this that if we start with the right philosophy, we will be able to achieve an organization that can prevent war.

We want to emphasize we are not suggesting that we unilaterally disarm in the United States. None of us support that position. We do not plan to take any kind of a step that is going to jeopardize the national security or the defense of the United States, but we do think it imperative that the United States takes the lead in the world in suggesting that the time has come to pass beyond the era of détente and balance of power. Realizing that détente has been a good policy for the present, it nonetheless is not the be-all and end-all of a permanent world peace.

The “Right to Peace” resolution failed to gain traction. The Republican right-wing marginalized its sponsors and cosponsors as members of the “better Red than dead” crowd. Truth be told, the Soviet Union was still not interested in pursuing world order schemes designed to make the world safer for free trade imperialism.

Rather than focus on international organizations and law, Congress passed the Trade Reform Act in December of 1974—after President Nixon was forced to resign in shame. It provided fast track trade authority for the President to negotiate the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade. President Gerald R. Ford signed the Act into law in January of 1975.

Streit and company refused to give up on Atlantic federal trade. They knew President Ford was a former cosponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution. On July 31, 1975, Representative Findley and others reintroduced an Atlantic Convention resolution with the following preamble and purpose—

Whereas a more perfect union of the Atlantic Community consistent with the United States Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations gives promise of strengthening common defense, assuring more adequate energy resources, providing a stable currency to improve commerce of all kinds, and

enhancing the economic prosperity, general welfare, and liberty of the member nations, Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United of America in Congress assembled, That—

- (1) The Congress hereby establishes a delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorizes it to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as desire to join in the enterprise, and other parliamentary democracies may invite, to explore the possibility of agreement on—
 - a. A declaration that it is the goal of their peoples to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on federal or other democratic principles ...

The Atlantic Convention resolution above introduced the language “or other democratic principles” to the end goal of the resolution. The addition of democratic principles coincided with the rise of democratic peace theory—the notion that liberal democracies rarely, if ever, fight other liberal democracies. Below are the cosponsors of like resolutions—

House Joint Resolution 606

Paul Findley, John B. Anderson, Clement J. Zablocki, Richard Bolling, Dante B. Fascell, Manuel Lujan, Jr., Robert N.C. Nix, Spark Matsunaga, Gus Yatron, Morgan F. Murphy, Michael Harrington, Claude Pepper, Leo J. Ryan, Melvin Price, Charles Wilson (Tex.), Albert H. Quie, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Peter Rodino, Cardiss Collins, Herman T. Schneebeli, Helen Meyner, B.F. Sisk, Edward G. Biester, Jr., Leonor K.

Sullivan, Brock Adams

House Joint Resolution 607

Donald M. Fraser, Yvonne B. Burke, Joseph P. Addabbo, Bob Carr, Glenn Anderson, Elford A. Cederberg, Les Aspin, Silvio Conte, Les AuCoin, James C. Corman, Herman Badillo, Lawrence Coughlin, Max Baucus, Dominick V. Daniels, Berkely Bedell, Thomas Downey, Alphonzo Bell, Robert Drinan, James J. Blanchard, Robert Duncan, Michael Blouin, Robert W. Edgar, Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs, Don Edwards, Garry Brown

House Joint Resolution 608

Jim Wright, William F. Gooding, Glenn English, Willis D. Gradison, Jr., Marvin L. Esch, Gilbert Gude, Frank E. Evans, Tim L. Hall, Millicent Fenwick, Mark Hannaford, Joseph Fisher, Herbert Harris, Daniel J. Flood, Augustus F. Hawkins, Harold Ford, Philip H. Hayes, Bill Frenzel, John H. Heinz, III, Richard H. Fulton, Henry Helstoski, Robert N. Giaimo, Frank Horton, Sam Gibbons, Andrew Jacobs

House Joint Resolution 609

Allan T. Howe, Joe Moakley, Ed Jones, William S. Moorhead, William M. Ketchum, Charles Mosher, Martha Keyes, Stephen L. Neal, John J. LaFalce, Lucien N. Nedzi, Robert L. Leggett, Henry J. Nowak, William Lehman, James Oberstar, Clarence D. Long, James G. O'Hara, Paul N. McCloskey, Richardson Preyer, Matthew F. McHugh, Tom Railsback, Abner J. Mikva, Thomas M. Rees, Parren J. Mitchell, Ralph S. Regula

House Joint Resolution 610

Matthew J. Rinaldo, William A. Steiger, Theodore M. Risenhoover, Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert A. Roe, Charles Thone, Philip E. Ruppe, Morris K. Udall, James H. Scheuer, Richard F. Vander Veen, John F. Seiberling, G. William Whitehurst

In September of 1975, the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Committee on International Relations held their last hearing on the *Atlantic Convention Resolution*. To establish context for considering the resolution, Representative Alan T. Howe of Utah outlined the causes of Atlantic disunity—

The decade plus years since the last Atlantic Convention of 1962 have seen a deterioration in the atmosphere of trust and cooperation in the Atlantic Community fostered by the Marshall plan and information of NATO in response to our shared distrust of communism.

A number of factors have contributed to the strained relations between the United States and Europe.

First, the United States, caught up in an unwanted Vietnamese war, found ourselves with little support from our European allies and little energy left to deal with problems of mutual concern. Moreover, the conclusion of the U.S. role in Vietnam brought a new isolationism to our country and a push for troop reductions in Europe of compensatory payments to relieve our financial burdens for maintaining the troops.

Second, the growth of the European Economic Community generated a new strength and independence on the part of our European friends. No longer grateful recipients of American aid, the

European nations, became, instead, successful economic competitors and industrial equals of America.

Third, American initiatives to promote détente with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China were taken largely without consultation with our allies and created apprehension over the possible weakening of the defense structure of Europe.

Representative Howe went on to say that the pursuit of an Atlantic Union—based on federalist principles—was a bridge too far—

Many of us who cosponsored these resolutions have differing ideas about the extent to which the Atlantic union should be pushed.

Some feel a federation of American and European States should be the final outcome of the convention. I am not one of them. In my opinion, federation is not a realistic goal at this time and should not be made the issue. This was as I understand it the precise issue, in fact, that caused the defeat of the resolution in the last Congress and I am convinced that we will get nowhere if we continue to set this as our firm objective.

There is a great value, however, in the calling of a new Atlantic Convention—I note that few of the recommendations of the 1962 conference were implemented by the represented governments—to discuss and assess the changed realities of today with as much flexibility as possible. Such a convention could appropriately review our existing institutions, recommending reforms to strengthen them, and whatever new institutions they may deem necessary.

What is important is that we have some agreed upon framework which will allow us to act swiftly to resolve our mutual problems and to give unity to our ideals for the promotion of freedom through the world.

Representative Burke voiced his opposition to Atlantic federation on Orwellian grounds:

Mr. Chairman, I must once again enter into the record my absolute opposition to the concept of Atlantic Union as embodied in H.R. Res. 606, the "Atlantic Union Resolution." I have, as my colleagues know, consistently opposed similar resolutions in the past Congresses. My thinking has not changed because the essential fallacies of "Atlantic Union" have not changed . . . I wonder how many Atlantic Unionists have forgotten the terrifying vision of the future by the great George Orwell in his novel *1984* . . . what if the supranational machinery they are trying to create should be subverted to totalitarian ends?

In hindsight, proponents of Atlantic federation could have responded by asking Representative Burke if he had forgotten the lesson of Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Now that "fast track" free trade was authorized, there was blood in the water. Globalists—who believe they are more equal than others—were getting ready for a feeding frenzy. Who would check their power and hold them accountable?

For one last time before a congressional committee, an aging Clarence K. Streit offered Atlantic Union as a solution to the dangers of Atlantic disunity and gradualism. In his prepared remarks he wrote—

Chairman Fascell and Members of the Subcommittee, Thank you very warmly for inviting me again to testify on the Atlantic Convention resolution. This is—if memory serves—the 11th time I've testified

on this Hill in support of this proposal. Eleven is a lucky number, as every craps shooter knows (and I was among them in my World War I years in the American Expeditionary Force in France in 1917-18). And so I am the more hopeful that this bill's enactment this year will make this the last of many appearances before you in behalf of this proposal to explore, by our Philadelphia 1787 Convention method which worked out the "miracle" of our revolutionary Federal Constitution—to explore the federal answer to the problem of how to unite, democratically, with our democratic NATO allies so as to work together effectively to advance the common aims. Those are to avert another World Depression and another World War, and to advance morally and materially, the individual life, liberty and happiness of each of their citizens.

Consistent with the goal of preventing another world depression, Adolph Schmidt, who was a member of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO in 1962, called for a sound, transatlantic currency to end the myth of smart people—

The U.S. decisions of August 15, 1971, not only terminated the international monetary system established at Bretton Woods, but also the principle purpose and function of the International Monetary Fund which was to regulate the fixed exchange rates between its members. Worldwide inflation has brought about floating exchange rates which are the antithesis of the fixed system and negate the purpose of the IMF.

As Keynesian theory and the new economics demonstrate their bankruptcy and as personal and corporate resources are embezzled by further inflating, the demand for a sound money will grow as the only means to carry on a viable international monetary and

trading system. How else can a businessman write a contract for 5 years ahead, or trade in any article of commerce with the expectation of being paid in equivalent value to his cost?

An Atlantic convention would provide the means for exploring at this critical juncture such a concept as a merge of the Federal Reserve banks with the European central banks, and the revitalization of the International Monetary Fund as a new international central bank of issue.

The new currency would be soundly based, protected by monetary discipline and used exclusively in international transactions.

In March of 1976, the House Committee on International Relations issued a favorable report on the *Atlantic Convention* resolution. The committee provide the following justifications for calling a second Atlantic Convention—

Dividends of Calling an Atlantic Convention

It is probable that the Atlantic Community must become stronger or it will gradually become weaker. To prevent any weakening, the need is urgent for a more comprehensive goal and appropriate institutions to strengthen the common defense of our free peoples, provide for a stable currency for world trade, enhance the welfare of the people of developing countries. There is a growing realization on both sides of the Atlantic that some more permanent, perhaps federal, solutions must be found to address common problems.

H.J. Res. 606 authorizes exploration of whether to adopt such a goal, and how to develop such institutions. Adoption of this resolution by Congress would have positive benefits, for both the Atlantic

Community and the world, in several important areas.

First, American relations with Europe would be enhanced. It would reassure concerned European leaders that Atlantic Community interests rank high in U.S. priorities. It would underscore in a substantial way the importance Congress attaches to the development of even stronger institutional ties with Canada and Western Europe.

Second, it would bolster a seriously weakened international economy. It would impart new confidence in world money markets because it would demonstrate US willingness to harmonize trade relations looking toward the improvement of employment throughout all participating countries.

Third, it would begin to make good on long-awaited plans for a more effective, more equitable Atlantic partnership.

Fourth, it would serve as an inspiration to all peoples and nations facing future decades laced with seemingly intractable problems. And with democracies becoming increasingly scarce, such a move could also provide an example how cooperation based on democratic principles can promote peace and prosperity.

Finally, if the convention is able to agree upon a common goal for the Atlantic Community, and if Congress in fulfillment of its Constitutional responsibilities decides to adopt that goal, the American people can look forward to a significant improvement in the security of their liberty.

Soon after the committee issued its report, on April 1, 1976, the House considered H. Res. 1085—

H. RES. 1085

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 606) to call an Atlantic Convention. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Before the vote, proponents of the Atlantic Union idea attempted to soften their opposition—

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat awkward in appearing in opposition to the point of view expressed by my very close personal friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN). There is not another Member of this House whose sincerity and integrity I respect more. In this instance, however, I think the gentleman's apprehensions are unfounded.

Let us read exactly what the resolution would do. It would authorize us to "participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as desire to join in the enterprise, and other parliamentary democracies the convention may invite."

Certainly in this heterogeneous world those of us who believe in the foundation principles of parliamentary democracy ought to find ways to draw together and cooperate: Is there anything wrong in that?

This convention will be authorized to "explore the possibility of agreement." Now, is there anything wrong with exploring the possibility of agreement? Surely, it does not commit us to any agreement. Why would we want to deny our country the right to join with other like-minded countries, those that believe in parliamentary democracy, to explore the possibility of agreement?

Such an agreement might, according to the resolution, develop "more effective unity." Now, what is wrong with more effective unity among those nations of the world who embrace parliamentary democracy? It seems to me the words that follow have excited and alarmed some people. The words of the resolution describe a more effective unity "based on Federal or other democratic principles."

It seems to me that these are the scare words which cause people to see invasions of our national freedom lurking under the veil.

"Federal or other democratic principles." Perhaps some people feel that this presages a kind of suggestion that was made during World War II by Winston Churchill when he offered to the people of France in their hour of darkest need the privileges of common citizenship and common currency with his own people. That would have been one extreme form, perhaps, of an agreement based on Federal or other democratic principles. In behalf of the people of France, their government in exile speaking through General De Gaulle, rejected that offer, so nothing came of it.

NATO itself might be considered an exercise in "Federal or other democratic principles" to achieve more effective unity in common defense. Is there anything wrong with that? Are there Members who would object to our participation in NATO for the military defense of parliamentary democracy for the Western world?

The Common Markets might be regarded as exercises in more effective unity based upon "Federal or other democratic principles" for the purpose of reducing barriers to free trade and promoting interchange of commerce between nations.

* * *

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I am not a one-worlder. I am not a Communist, but I see absolutely nothing wrong with debating this resolution, amending it if that will take away some of the fears of the Members, pass it and let us talk. I have seen a lot of people die in two wars, and I do not mean we should back down to anyone, but I would a whole lot rather talk than bleed.

* * *

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal of talk: during the course of the debate in this legislation about how the passage of this resolution would somehow result in a surrender of sovereignty which would somehow impair the capacity of our Nation to function as an independent entity in international affairs. But I would remind my colleagues, particularly those who sit on the other side of the aisle, of a comment once made by that great American and great Republican, Wendell Wilkie, who,

after returning from a trip around the world in 1944 said:

Sovereignty is not something to be hoarded but something to be used.

What is at stake here is not the abstract and academic preservation of our constitutional independence but our ability to forge a more effective partnership with the other democracies around the world.

What I like about this resolution is that it calls for a convention not just of our NATO allies but of all the parliamentary democracies of the world so that we can collectively consult and together determine what we can do to reinvest our democratic ideology with more appeal to all the peoples of the world. The fact is that today democracy is on the retreat and the forces of dictatorship are on the advance. Unless we do something and do it soon the day will come when we will become an island of liberty in a sea of oppression and the liberty we love will have become compromised in the process.

The Atlantic Convention resolution was defeated by a vote of 165 to 194 with 73 not voting. See Exhibit 16. Compared to the 1973 procedural vote, the desire to explore Atlantic Union faded as the economic interests of the establishment changed. The Trade Act of 1974—and the influence of the Trilateral Commission—shifted the focus of American foreign economic policy toward the Pacific. Japan, after all, was emerging as a major economic powerhouse and China would soon follow. The American establishment was no longer fixated on transatlantic affairs.

This shift to the Pacific was evident after Governor Jimmy Carter, a member of the Trilateral Commission, was elected President of the United States in November of 1976. Carter edged

out former Democratic cosponsors of the Atlantic Union resolution, such as Mo Udall, Henry M. Jackson, and Frank Church, to secure the nomination, and later defeated President Gerald R. Ford in the general election. For all intents and purposes, the Atlantic Union movement was over as Carter placed his emphasis on advancing free trade without federal oversight along with UN reform efforts.

Ironically, the impeachment of President Nixon undermined bipartisan cooperation on foreign affairs in Congress. It fueled the more nationalistic wing of the Republican Party at the expense of so-called Rockefeller Republicans. In hindsight, it appears that partisan Democrats inadvertently saved the American Republic by removing President Nixon from office

Chapter 12—The Carter Years

Although Vice President Walter F. Mondale was a consistent supporter of the Atlantic Union idea, Representative Findley and friends did not reintroduce the Atlantic Union resolution during the core years of the Carter administration. President Carter placed his emphasis on seeking to strengthen the United Nations system. In March of 1978, however, his administration conceded in its report to the Committee on Foreign Relations—

that a widescale reform of the United Nations through Charter amendment is not feasible because it is opposed by the Soviet Union and because a number of other influential countries, including the United States, have expressed preference for reforms that would not require amendment to the Charter.

In January of 1979, President Carter bested former President Nixon by recognizing the Chinese Communist Party of the People's Republic of China. Deng Xiaoping recognized that China had to modernize and economically engage the West if it hoped to maintain power. America's willingness to normalize relations with China undermined the anti-communist undercurrents of the Atlantic Union idea—and undoubtedly shocked the Kremlin. The stage was now set for a new international economic order based on servant capitalism.

The last and final world government hearing was held in October of 1979. During the *United Nations Reform* hearing held by the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which Senator Joe Biden was a member, witnesses from the Campaign for United Nations Reform, World Association of World Federalists, and the World Order Research Institute presented their world order schemes. Rather than calling for a UN Charter review conference, the Campaign for UN Reform lobbied for fourteen specific reform proposals:

- 1) improving the dispute settlement process;
- 2) increasing the use of the International Court of Justice;
- 3) improving the UN's peacekeeping capability;
- 4) more stable UN finances;
- 5) modification of the veto;
- 6) a more equitable general assembly voting structure;
- 7) an International Criminal Court to try hijackers and terrorists;
- 8) improved human rights machinery;
- 9) an international ocean authority;
- 10) an international disarmament organization;
- 11) a stronger UN environmental program;
- 12) a more effective UN development program;
- 13) more effective world trade and monetary systems;
- 14) global conservation of resources.

During the hearing, proponents of world federation avoided calling for a general charter review conference—

The bugaboo of charter review

Proposals for U.N. improvement have generally been either of procedural and minor character—too weak to have much effect, or too sweeping to be considered. In particular, the bugaboo of “Charter Review” has impeded reform efforts—the notion that changes could not be considered because they would open a “Pandora’ box” of wholesale modifications and revisions of the Charter.

Their new strategy was to establish a world federation using gradualism.

Shortly after the hearing, President Carter had a new enemy to contend with—radical Islam. Following the Iranian Revolution led by Ayatollah Khomeini, the Islamic Republic of Iran spawned an energy crisis and later took Americans hostage in November of

1979. A year later, the Iran-Iraq War started in September of 1980. The UN Security Council did not have the collective will to stop it. The Soviet Union, after all, was too busy invading Afghanistan a month later. In response, Carter boycotted the Olympics. It was obviously time to elect a new President of the United States.

Representative Findley waited until after the 1980 presidential election to reintroduce the Atlantic Convention resolution. A month after Ronald Reagan won in a landslide, on December 3, 1980, Representative Findley announced his intentions—

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution to convene an Atlantic Convention of NATO and other parliamentary democracies. The purpose of this convention would be to explore the possibilities for transforming the present relationship among these nations into a more effective unity of their peoples. An Atlantic union based on democratic, federal principles would strengthen the common defense, assure adequate energy resources, and enhance the general economic prosperity of the people of the nations joining this December 3, 1980 effort. At the same time, it would preserve their welfare, liberty, and sovereignty.

It is, I believe, more important than ever, to pursue the ideal and objective of Atlantic union. We are entering a period of great challenge and enormous danger for all free peoples. Scarce energy supplies, vast economic dislocation, the growing Soviet military threat and aggression totalitarianism place our democratic way of life in jeopardy. Tragically, the West has been unable to concentrate its efforts in order to confront these challenges together. Instead, the West appears to be falling increasingly into disarray; 1980 has been a year of serious dissension within the Atlantic community. The Soviet invasion of

Afghanistan and the crisis in the Persian Gulf has stimulated divisiveness and recriminations among the United States and its allies rather than a stronger resolve to unite in opposition to common threats. There are worrisome trends in United States-European relations toward trade protectionism and reckless competition for scarce energy resources. The United States and Europe also seem to be headed toward divergent paths in East-West arms control efforts and Middle East peace initiatives.

It is critical that the people of the Atlantic community of democratic nations recognize that all will lose should their governments pursue policies antagonistic to one another rather than joining forces to confront mutual problems. Text of resolution follows:

H.J. Res—

Joint Resolution to Call an Atlantic Convention

Whereas a more perfect union of the Atlantic Community consistent with the United States Constitution gives promise of strengthening common defense, assuring more adequate energy resources, providing a stable currency to improve commerce of all kinds, and enhancing the economic prosperity, while preserving the general welfare, liberty, and sovereignty of the people of the member nations:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress hereby establishes a delegation, composed of United States citizens, and authorizes it to organize and participate in a convention, made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies and other parliamentary

democracies as desire to join in the enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on-

(1) a declaration that it is the goal of their peoples to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on Federal or other democratic principles;

(2) a timetable for transition by stages to this goal; and

(3) a commission or other means to facilitate this transition.

(b) The convention's recommendations will be submitted to the Congress, as part of the delegation's final report, for action under constitutional process.

SEC. 2. (a) The delegation shall consist of seven members appointed as follows:

(1) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the House leadership and the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(2) Two appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the Senate leadership and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(3) Three appointed by the President.

(b) The delegation shall elect, a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) All members of the delegation shall be free from official instructions and free to speak and vote Individually.

(d) Vacancies shall not affect the delegation's powers and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(e) Members of the delegation, who shall serve without compensation, shall be reimbursed for, or shall be furnished, travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties under this joint resolution.

Sec. 3. (a) The delegation may appoint not more than ten temporary professional and clerical staff without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, who may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no individual so appointed may receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The delegation may expend not to exceed \$200,000 of the funds appropriated to carry out this joint resolution for expenses incurred in conjunction with the meetings described in the first section.

Sec. 4. (a) The delegation shall report to the President and the Congress at least once each six months. Such reports shall include an accounting for all expenditures by the delegation and such other information as the delegation deems appropriate.

(b) The delegation shall submit a final report to the President and the Congress setting forth the results of the convention described in the first section of this joint resolution, including the recommendations made by the convention.

Sec. 5. Effective October 1, 1981, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out this joint resolution, payments to be made upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the delegation.

Sec. 6. The delegation shall cease to exist at the expiration of the three-year period beginning on the date that appropriations first become available to carry out this joint resolution.

Chapter 13—The Reagan Years

After Ronald Reagan became President of the United States on January 20, 1981, no member of Congress dared to reintroduce the Atlantic Union resolution. In his inaugural address, Reagan signaled to the world his administration would not support world government schemes—

To those neighbors and allies who share our freedom, we will strengthen our historic ties and assure them of our support and firm commitment. We will match loyalty with loyalty. We will strive for mutually beneficial relations. **We will not use our friendship to impose on their sovereignty, for our own sovereignty is not for sale.**

As for the enemies of freedom, those who are our potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. **We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it, now or ever.**

Reagan knew that the Soviet Union had no interest in disarmament or transforming the UN into a world federation. He also recognized that Europeans (particularly the French) had little to no interest in forming an Atlantic Union. Although he once was a member of the United World Federalists (during his acting years), Reagan opted for peace through strength—not international organization and law. Reagan placed his emphasis on promoting the national interest (globalism) and ending the Soviet regime.

To isolate the Soviet Union, Reagan normalized trade relations with Communist China. While President Carter granted China full diplomatic recognition in 1979, on August 17, 1982, Reagan advanced the following agenda outlined in a joint communication with China—

The development of United States-China relations is

not only in the interests of the two peoples but also conducive to peace and stability in the world. The two sides are determined, on the principle of equality and mutual benefit, to strengthen their ties in the economic, cultural, educational, scientific, technological and other fields and make strong, joint efforts for the continued development of relations between the Governments and peoples of the United States and China.

As Reagan focused on China and Japan at the behest of the Trilateral Commission, the Atlantic Union idea lost its influence. It was abandoned after Representative Paul Findley was voted out of office in 1983. In his book, *Speaking Out: A Congressman's Lifelong Fight Against Bigotry, Famine, and War* (2001), Findley blamed patriotic organizations and the American Israel Political Action Committee (AIPAC) for his loss. Without a legislative champion, the Atlantic Union movement in the U.S. Congress was over.

The world federalist movement withered on the vine as well. The Members of Congress for Peace through Law decided to change their name to the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus to conceal their world federalist roots. They continued to champion nuclear arms control efforts and vehemently opposed President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Their past attempts to transform the UN into a world federation were conveniently forgotten.

While President Reagan abandoned the federalist aspiration of the Atlantic Union idea in favor of transatlantic free trade, he saluted Clarence K. Streit on his 90th birthday —

January 17, 1986

Dear Mr. Streit:

I am delighted to join your many friends in sending warm greetings on your 90th birthday.

You've lived a long life filled with more

accomplishments than I could possibly recite. Nonetheless, your most noteworthy achievements are certainly the publication of *Union Now* in 1939 and your work ever since in pursuit of your goal of closer cooperation among the North Atlantic democracies. *Union Now* foreshadowed the Atlantic Alliance of World War II and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, through which we and our democratic allies have resisted the spread of totalitarianism.

Today, when it is taken for granted that democratic governments must work together closely for mutual security, prosperity, and the protection of our God-given human rights, it gives me great pleasure to salute you, Clarence Streit, as an early advocate of such cooperation and a true champion of individual freedom.

Nancy joins me in sending best wishes for a happy birthday and a wonderful year. God bless you.

Sincerely,

Ronald Reagan

On July 6, 1986, Clarence K. Streit passed away and the Atlantic Union idea faded away from public discourse.

Chapter 14 – The Globalist Years

The Atlantic Union idea originally advanced by Streit would have federated NATO nations as a nucleus of an eventual world federation. Strong enough morally, economically, and militarily to deter any sane autocrat, Streit predicted that the oppressed would pursue the political and economic reforms necessary to join the enterprise. Streit referred to this approach as a peaceful ripening method. The anti-federalist version of this approach is often referred to as gradualism or functionalism. It can also be described as globalism.

This chapter demonstrates that gradualism lived on after Atlantic federalism was abandoned. It also shows that globalism is inching the world toward war at the behest of special interests guiding American and European foreign policies. Enlarging NATO alongside the EU would not be dangerous if it truly benefited all citizens from all nations. Globalists continued to advance democracy during this anti-federalist era while Russia, China, and the Islamic resistance continued to sabotage their world order plans.

The Bush (41) Years

On August 2, 1990, Saddam Hussein miscalculated and invaded Kuwait. On September 11, 1990, President George H. W. Bush gave his famous “New World Order” speech outlining the reasons why UN-authorized coalition forces were going to restore the status quo. Bush wanted to prove to the Soviet Union that the UN system could work.

Iraqi forces were quickly dispatched from Kuwait during Operation Desert Storm. Demonstrating tremendous constraint, President Bush did not exceed his UN mandate. He did not remove Saddam from power. His restraint reassured Mikhail Gorbachev that the United States would follow the international rule of law if the Cold War ended. The Berlin Wall came down.

During negotiations over German reunification, the Bush administration allegedly assured Gorbachev the United States

would not seek to enlarge NATO beyond the obvious addition of East Germany. While diplomats on both sides contest this history, there is considerable evidence that such a promise was made. After a coup removed Gorbachev from power and the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, President Bush did not enlarge NATO even though he was pressured to do so. Gorbachev would later team up with former Senator Alan Cranston and call for world government in 1995.

Bush's decision to resist calls by the Visegrad Group (Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic) to let them join NATO earned points with the new President of the Russian Federation. Trust levels between President Bush and Boris Yeltsin were strong enough to open the door to the joint exploration and development of a Global Protection System (GPS). Yeltsin proposed GPS as an alternative to President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative because they both nations exposed to rogue nations.

While President Bush oversaw the peaceful transition of the Soviet Bloc to democracy, Amanda Erikson of the Washington Post reminds us that he was also the architect of modern globalization. She credits him for advancing trade relations with China, signing the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1992, and laying the political foundations for the World Trade Organization (WTO).¹²

President William J. Clinton

Radical Islamists welcomed President Clinton into office as well by attempting to bring down the World Trade Center in February of 1993. Al-Qaeda later ambushed special operations forces in Mogadishu, Somalia during Clinton's attempt to remove Mohamed Aidid from power in October. After Operation Restore Hope failed, he shifted his focus to European affairs. Clinton, after all, was a Rhodes Scholar like Streit.

President Clinton received some good news after the

¹² Erickson, Amanda. "How George H.W. Bush pushed the United States to embrace free trade." Washington Post, December 2, 2018.

Maastricht Treaty formed the European Union in November of 1993. Consistent with the ripening approach of the Atlantic Union idea, the EU adopted an accession approach requiring new entrants to be free market democracies willing to abide by EU law. It would take some time before Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries would meet all the standards.

In the meantime, President Clinton quickly soured relations with Russia after he refused to explore a GPS with Yeltsin and then launched the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program in 1994—which was designed to prepare CEE countries for NATO membership. Declassified documents show that the Clinton administration told Yeltsin that PfP was an alternative to NATO enlargement.¹³ Regardless, with an upcoming Chechen war and economic chaos, Yeltsin was powerless to stop the West from pursuing its globalist agenda.

President Clinton later signed on to the 1995 NATO Study on Enlargement and then authorized NATO airstrikes against Serb targets during the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Clinton's actions supported the narrative advanced by Russian nationalists that the United States was trying to enlarge NATO at the expense of Russia. NATO transitioned from a defensive alliance to an instrument of democratic war (regime change).

After the Clinton administration oversaw the creation of the WTO, the West further undermined Yeltsin by not inviting Russia to join. The Russian economy, after all, was in shambles and plagued with corruption. The West opted to dangle future WTO membership in front of Yeltsin to encourage deeper reforms. Again, Russian nationalists viewed this as another Western betrayal. It weakened Yeltsin's power and popularity.

After defending and extending NATO and finalizing the WTO, President Clinton turned his sights on Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden. With the help of resolutions passed by the Republican Congress, President Clinton made regime change in

¹³ National Security Archive. NATO Expansion: What Yeltsin Heard. March 16, 2018.

Afghanistan (1997) and Iraq (1998) an official foreign policy of the United States. Neither resolutions authorized the use of military force. Globalists opted for clandestine measures instead.

The campaign for world peace through world law also advanced during the Clinton administration. In July of 1998, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court was adopted. The International Criminal Court (ICC) was originally inspired by proponents of world federation. The ICC allows the UN Security Council to refer individuals suspected of crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression for prosecution. International terrorism was not listed as a crime under the jurisdiction of the ICC. Clinton would later sign the Rome Statute in 2000, but never submitted it for Senate ratification where it was dead on arrival.

In 1999, President Clinton needlessly rekindled Cold War tensions. He reneged on America's alleged promise not to enlarge NATO after German reunification. NATO added Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to its roster. The timing helped Vladimir Putin assume power after Yeltsin resigned for a myriad of reasons. Putin vowed to make Russia great again.

To counter NATO enlargement, Putin established the Eurasian Economic Community (EAEC) with Belarus and Kyrgyzstan in 2000. Western intelligence suspected Putin was trying to re-Sovietise the region. A new bipolar economic disorder emerged pitting Western globalists against Eastern oligarchs.

President George W. Bush (43)

After President George W. Bush became President, Russia and China made it extremely clear on July 16, 2001 that they both longed for a multipolar world when they signed the Sino-Russian Treaty of Friendship. At the time, the United States enjoyed hegemonic status, and remained committed to the enlargement of NATO with or without Russian consent. Putin desperately needed something to humble the Western world.

Putin received a huge gift from al-Qaeda after they attacked

the United States on September 11, 2001. President Bush took democratic war to the next level by using military force to finish what President Clinton and the Republican Congress started in 1997 and 1998. The Taliban was dispatched in 2001, and Saddam in 2003—but convincing these nations to embrace liberal democracy proved to be a bridge too far.

While NATO was distracted by a regime change wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, Putin was busy meddling in Georgia and Ukraine. After pro-Russian politicians suspiciously prevailed in Georgia in 2003, Globalists fomented the Rose Revolution by helping non-government organizations (NGOs) coordinate and execute election protests. Western-leaning Georgians successfully ousted President Eduard Shevardnadze and elected a pro-Western leader instead.

The West used the same color revolution approach to counter Russian intervention in Ukraine as well. In 2003, Ukraine signed a “Treaty on a Single Economic Space” with the Russia-led economic bloc. Globalists fomented the Orange Revolution after Victor Yanukovych was dubiously elected President in 2004. The West knew it meant Ukraine would eventually join the EAEC. Western-inspired Ukrainians took to the streets and prompted another election that reversed the results. Putin’s plan to enlarge the CSTO and the EAEC were put on hold.

Putin later tightened his grip on power after Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia joined NATO in March of 2004. He likely took notice years later when presidential contender, Senator John McCain, rehashed the Atlantic Union idea by calling for a League of Democracies in May of 2007. McCain suggested that the League—

would form the core of an international order of peace based on freedom. It could act where the UN fails to act, to relieve human suffering in places like Darfur. It could join to fight the AIDS epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa and fashion better policies to confront the crisis of our environment. It could provide unimpeded market access to those who share the values of

economic and political freedom, an advantage no state-based system could attain. It could bring concerted pressure to bear on tyrants in Burma or Zimbabwe, with or without Moscow's and Beijing's approval. It could unite to impose sanctions on Iran and thwart its nuclear ambitions. It could provide support to struggling democracies in Ukraine and Serbia and help countries like Thailand back on the path to democracy.

This League of Democracies would not supplant the United Nations or other international organization. It would complement them. But it would be the one organization where the world's democracies could come together to discuss problems and solutions on the basis of shared principles and a common vision of the future. If I am elected president, I will call a summit of the world's democracies in my first year to seek the views of my democratic counterparts and begin exploring the practical steps necessary to realize this vision.

Putin clearly viewed NATO—alongside EU—enlargement as a threat. The Bucharest Summit Declaration in 2008 stated—“NATO welcomes Ukraine's and Georgia's Euro-Atlantic aspirations for membership in NATO.”¹⁴ To prevent Georgia from joining NATO, he launched the Russo-Georgian War in August of 2008 and recognized South Ossetia and Abkhazia as independent states. Senator McCain never had an opportunity to call a summit of the world's democracies as he was defeated by Senator Barack Obama in November.

President Barack Obama

All eyes were now on President Obama. Atlanticists were naturally concerned about his past anti-colonialist views, but in

¹⁴ https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm

2009, he added two more nations to NATO's ranks—Albania and Croatia. By 2010, the NATO Parliamentarians Assembly released Resolution 384 on Building a More Stable and Prosperous International Order:

NATO PA RESOLUTION 384 ON BUILDING A
MORE STABLE AND PROSPEROUS
INTERNATIONAL ORDER

The Assembly,

1. **Acknowledging** that the economic foundation of power is a central and not a peripheral factor in determining relations among States;

2. **Recognising** that a tectonic shift may be underway in the global economic balance of power that requires greater co-operation among nations to prevent the rising of major tensions and conflicts;

3. **Stressing** that the international monetary order is, in part, a reflection of global power relations and that solving current disagreements about exchange rate policies, including the under-valuation of the renminbi, will be of fundamental importance to obtaining an internationally acceptable rebalancing of economic relations among nations, and to avoid protectionism;

4. **Lamenting** the persistent failure of the governments of many NATO member countries to balance their budgets over the business cycle, a failure which has caused a rise in sovereign debt and left a number of Allied countries, and particularly the United States, economically vulnerable to, and ever more dependent upon, China;

5. **Conceding** that fiscal consolidation in NATO countries could have dire implications for national defence budgets and that, consequently,

matching foreign and security goals with the means at hand will be more important than ever;

6. **Warning** that over the next 40 years, developed countries' share of the global population will fall by roughly 25% and that most of our societies will have aged significantly, thus putting ever greater pressures on national pension and healthcare systems and budgets;

7. **Understanding** that boosting productivity by improving national education systems will be a vital part of any effort to adjust to structural changes in the emerging international economic order;

8. **Recognising** that the global economic crisis has struck the world's poorest countries and pushed millions of people into poverty and greater insecurity—a dire humanitarian challenge that directly bears on the security of our own countries;

9. **Worrying** that aid commitments undertaken at Gleneagles are not being uniformly respected;

10. **Noting** that liberal democratic values continue to have enormous power and that this remains a great advantage for Western governments, which are the world's foremost exponents of these values;

11. **URGES** member governments and parliaments of the North Atlantic Alliance:

a. to work in concert to distinguish between genuine strategic threats that must be addressed forcefully and those tactical distractions that might squander power and wealth;

b. to recognise the entire range of tools Western societies have at hand to build a more stable and prosperous international order, and to use these tools in the most cost-effective manner, in part, by working together for common ends;

c. to recognise, therefore, that working multilaterally can help countries achieve more while spending less across a wide range of policy areas ranging from military spending to development assistance;

d. to revive global trade talks aimed at fostering a more open trading system that will benefit both the developed and developing worlds;

e. to fulfil the development spending commitments undertaken at Gleneagles;

f. to undertake the kinds of structural changes that will help our governments balance national budgets over the natural course of the business cycle;

g. to ensure that public spending is geared toward investing in long-term productivity rather than short-term consumption in order to maintain the critical edge needed to prosper in global markets;

h. to work in concert to build a more stable international monetary order that both reflects current economic realities, and encourages and rewards sustainable macroeconomic policies;

i. to improve our militaries' operational effectiveness even in an era of budget tightening, while co-ordinating this process within the Alliance, possibly through NATO's Defence Planning staff;

j. to collaborate more deeply to address some of the world's most pressing security challenges, including terrorism, nuclear proliferation, illicit drug production and trafficking, climate change, overpopulation, food and water security, and meeting our collective energy needs;

k. to engage with confidence rising powers, even those that do not share all our values, while endeavouring to inculcate these powers in those norms that we believe will foster greater global stability, development and prosperity;

l. to co-operate more with those powers like Brazil, India, Japan and South Africa and that share our values and interests in global security; and,

m. to do all in our power to ensure that we stay true to the values that animate this Alliance, including the rule of law, due process, freedom of expression and religion, open commercial relations, free markets, social solidarity and tolerance.

In March of 2011, the Obama administration waged democratic war against Libya after the CIA helped inspire the Arab Spring. A NATO-led coalition easily dispatched Muammar Gaddafi from power. He quickly faced mob justice. Hillary's war in Libya would later come back to haunt her after Ambassador Christopher Stevens and others were killed in Benghazi on September 11, 2011. Brave men died trying to save the Ambassador and his staff, but Hillary, like Bill, was too concerned about the optics to send help. She apparently was too busy planning the next phase of her democratic war against Syria.

When Secretary Clinton called for an "economic NATO" in September of 2012, Putin promised to forge a Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU). Hillary vowed to prevent the formation of the EAEU in December, but she was forced to resign in February of 2013. NATO—alongside EU—enlargement at the expense of Russia convinced Putin to forge a bipolar economic order. Hillary considered the EAEU project as an attempt to re-Sovietize the region.

After Hillary resigned, President Obama assured the Atlantic Council of the United States and the Transatlantic Policy Network that the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP) would move forward. He also assured the Trilateral Commission that the Trans-Pacific Partnership would move forward as well. President Kennedy's vision of an Atlantic partnership was right around the corner.

In November of 2013, European leaders were getting ready to sign a Ukraine-European Association Agreement. In response,

Putin convinced the Ukrainian President, Victor Yanukovych, to join the EAEU instead. Incensed, the West inspired the Euromaidan Revolution which dispatched Yanukovych from power—who then invited Russian intervention in eastern Ukraine which continues to this day. In the end, the EU got its trade deal but the Russians annexed Crimea in March of 2014.

In response to the annexation of Crimea, President Obama kicked the Russian Federation out of the G9 in May. Putin answered by preventing the UN Security Council from referring Bashir al' Assad and others to the ICC on May 22. This was a blow to proponents of world federation seeking to legitimize the exercise of world law over world politicians. Putin later signed the Treaty of Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) on May 29, 2014, to formalize an Eastern trade block. A new cold war was on the horizon.

On May 30, 2014, the NATO PA adopted its Declaration of Transatlantic Relations which reassessed the NATO-Russia partnership:

42. When partnerships are based on agreed common values and principles in addition to common interests, any violation of these values and principles must have consequences. Russia's aggression against Ukraine, illegal and illegitimate seizure of Crimea and a concerted campaign of violence by pro-Russian separatists, aiming to destabilize Ukraine as a sovereign state, have called into question the basis for our partnership. We must now define the new terms of this relationship. Any further Russian military interference, under any pretext, will only deepen Russia's international isolation.

Roughly a month after the NATO-PA shamed Putin, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) declared a worldwide caliphate. Radical Islam derailed the globalists' pursuit of a democratic peace in the greater Middle East. ISIS would later commit serious crimes against humanity.

With the world on the verge of a catastrophe, Henry Kissinger called for the Assembly of a New World Order in August of 2014. He fell short, however, of discussing the Atlantic Union idea he once endorsed. His call was cryptic to say the least. Roughly a year later, Putin announced that he wanted China, India, and Iran to join the Eurasian Union. He was planning a new world order of his own mirroring the Western approach.

By the end of President Obama's second term, the Transatlantic Trade & Investment Partnership (T-TIP) was ready to fulfill President Kennedy's legacy. Obama readied the Transpacific Partnership (TPP) as well. Facing political scrutiny from populists on the right and left, Obama opted to punt these historic FTAs to Hillary. He did not believe she could lose.

On November 8, 2016, Hillary Clinton won the popular vote, but Donald J. Trump won the Electoral College and became President of the United States. Hillary had a major meltdown. She blamed Russian interference in the election for her loss. A world war may have been averted because Hillary is a dangerous ideologue, and her globalist views represent a clear and present danger to world peace and prosperity for the developing world.

Hillary was prepared to bring Georgia and the Ukraine into NATO at the behest of the Atlantic Council of the United States—which could trigger another world war. She was prepared to escalate her democratic war in pursuit of a democratic peace in the greater Middle East. She was prepared to use the International Criminal Court against all her enemies, foreign and domestic. She was ready to establish the Atlantic partnership President Kennedy dreamed of and implement the vision of the Trilateral Commission in the Pacific.

Chapter 15—The Trump Years

Globalists were rocked after Donald J. Trump denied Hillary Clinton a chance to redeem herself. In January of 2017, President Trump derailed the T-TIP, scrapped the TPP, and adopted a new strategy in the greater Middle East. He begrudgingly allowed Montenegro to join NATO in June of 2017 after he previously questioned the need for NATO in the first place.

Echoing the vision of President George Washington, on September 23, 2017, President Trump outlined his “America First” foreign policy agenda based on principled realism before the United Nations General Assembly—

Lead with Principled Realism—Not Ideology—

We want harmony and friendship, not conflict and strife. We are guided by outcomes, not ideology. We have a policy of principled realism, rooted in shared goals, interests, and values.

No More Democratic War—

In America, we do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example for everyone to watch.

Respect National Sovereignty—

In foreign affairs, we are renewing this founding principle of sovereignty. Our government’s first duty is to its people, to our citizens—to serve their needs, to ensure their safety, to preserve their rights, and to defend their values.

As President of the United States, I will always put America first, just like you, as the leaders of your countries will always, and should always, put your countries first.

All responsible leaders have an obligation to serve their own citizens, and the nation-state remains the best vehicle for elevating the human condition.

Cultural coexistence—

We do not expect diverse countries to share the same cultures, traditions, or even systems of government. But we do expect all nations to uphold these two core sovereign duties: to respect the interests of their own people and the rights of every other sovereign nation. This is the beautiful vision of this institution, and this is the foundation for cooperation and success.

A year later, on September 28, 2018, Trump told the UN General Assembly that globalism followed by totalitarian world government is dead on arrival while he remains in office—

America is governed by Americans. We reject the ideology of globalism, and we embrace the doctrine of patriotism.

Around the world, responsible nations must defend against threats to sovereignty not just from global governance, but also from other, new forms of coercion and domination.

As America retreated, Russia advanced. Putin's EAEU increased trade and economic cooperation with China and Iran by signing FTAs in May of 2018 (which took effect in October of 2019). The EAEU added Serbia and Singapore in 2019 as well. The EAEU is now actively negotiating a free trade agreement with India.

Russia's rise did not go unnoticed by Atlanticists. At the NATO at 70 hearing before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on April 2, 2019, Ian Brzezinski of the Atlantic Council advised Senators that the "Alliance must accelerate its efforts to increase preparedness for high intensity conflict." He also called on the "Alliance to more substantially embrace and support the membership aspirations of Ukraine and Georgia." His advice to the Senate was to prepare for war against the Russian Federation.

Anthony Blinken and Robert Kagan (neoconservatives) proposed a trilateralist approach to countering Russia and China. They regurgitated the late Senator John McCain's proposal for a league of democracies¹⁵ in January of 2020—

To rally and protect ourselves, we must adapt. Our alliances are out of date in one key respect: The United States has European allies and Asian allies, but no institution links the Asian and European democracies. As China's Belt and Road initiative draws Asia, Europe and the Middle East closer together in ways that serve Beijing's interests, the democracies also need a global perspective—and new institutions to forge a common strategic, economic and political vision. Why shouldn't Germany and France work with India and Japan on strategic issues? Such an organization—call it a league of democracies or a democratic cooperative network—would not just address military security but also cybersecurity and other threats that democracies face today, from terrorism to election interference.

While Putin advanced the EAEU, President Trump brought Mexico and Canada to the negotiating table. He replaced the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with the United States,

¹⁵ <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/01/04/america-first-is-only-making-the-world-worse-heres-a-better-approach/>

Mexico, and Canada Agreement (USMCA) in 2020. Unlike NAFTA, the USMCA included enforceable labor obligations designed to promote fairer competition between the parties by promoting better working conditions and higher wages for Mexican workers.

[Author's Note]

In response to a conflict between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran in January of 2020, I self-published the First Edition of *In Search of a Capitalist Peace*. In the First and Second editions of *ISCP*, I called on President Donald J. Trump to hold a Capitalist Peace Summit during his first term and inspire an online Capitalist Peace Exploratory Convention (CPEC) modeled after the Atlantic Convention of 1962 during his second —

The best way to prevent another world war or economic catastrophe is for President Donald J. Trump to hold a Capitalist Peace Summit before his first term ends. World leaders should inspire an international consortium of colleges and universities to facilitate an online Capitalist Peace Exploratory Convention (CPEC) composed of leading free market economists from developed and developing nations. Selected economists should represent competing capitalist doctrines such as the Keynesian, Islamic, and Austrian schools of thought.

The economists would first examine the myriad of organizations, institutions, and agreements governing the world economy. They would openly debate the pros and cons of establishing a new world economic order that minimizes planning and intervention in the world market. Topics of discussion would include how to: (a) establish a sound world monetary system; (b) level the economic playing field between the developed and developing worlds; (c) protect the rights of workers, (d) minimize corruption

and cronyism, and (e) encourage competition.

The online CPEC must be transparent and offer all citizens from all nations a legitimate opportunity to comment and vote on proposed recommendations. At the end of the convention, the economists would draft a nonbinding Declaration for a Capitalist Peace and submit it to all CPEC participants for approval. If approved, the Declaration would serve as the foundation of a new social contract governing the world economy.

Chapter 16—The Biden Years

Shortly after Joe Biden became the 46th President of the United States, the World Economic Forum (WEF) at Davos set the stage for US-Russia relations on January 27, 2021. Klaus Schwab, founder of WEF, asked Russian President Vladimir “what should be done to ensure that people everywhere find peace and prosperity.” Putin spoke truth to power. Review Exhibit 17 for the complete transcript of his response.

At the beginning of his administration, Biden abandoned most of President Trump’s “America First” doctrine, but not all. Although he resurrected President Obama’s climate change agenda by rejoining the Paris Agreement on February 19, 2021, his first major foreign policy decision was to follow through on Trump’s decision to withdraw from Afghanistan—which he did in a dubious manner in August of 2021. At first glance, it appeared that Biden had abandoned Hillary’s pursuit of a democratic peace in the greater Middle East and beyond. Wishful thinking.

On February 8, 2021, “meeting in the framework of the Ukraine-NATO Interparliamentary Council (UNIC), 31 lawmakers from 13 NATO countries and Ukraine reviewed Ukraine’s extensive partnership with NATO and the country’s active contribution to Euro-Atlantic security”.¹⁶ NATO PA President, U.S. Representative Gerald E. Connally, a Democrat from Virginia, made it clear that the United States would never accept the illegal occupation of Crimea. In March of 2021, Putin began amassing troops on Ukraine’s border. Later in April, the NATO PA established an “informal support group for the Crimea Platform.”¹⁷ It was clear a showdown between NATO and Russia over the Ukraine was on the horizon.

In preparation for a NATO Summit, in May of 2021, Representative Connally doubled-down on NATO’s ideological intentions—“Our commitment to democracy, human rights and the

¹⁶ <https://www.nato-pa.int/news/nato-pa-legislators-review-state-nato-ukraine-cooperation>

¹⁷ <https://www.nato-pa.int/news/nato-pa-ukraine-establish-informal-support-group-crimea-platform>

rule of law distinguishes us from autocratic alliances...Without it, we would be just another military bloc.”¹⁸ With NATO’s Deputy Secretary General Mircea Geoana present, Connally continued—**“I am confident the Summit will reaffirm , for example, that Georgia and Ukraine will become members of NATO and that our doors will remain open to Bosnia and Herzegovina.”**

A Brussels Summit Communique issued by Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels 14 June 2021 reaffirmed Connally’s belief—

We reiterate the decision made at the 2008 Bucharest Summit that Ukraine will become a member of the Alliance with the Membership Action Plan (MAP) as an integral part of the process; we reaffirm all elements of that decision, as well as subsequent decisions, including that each partner will be judged on its own merits. We stand firm in our support for Ukraine’s right to decide its own future and foreign policy course free from outside interference. The Annual National Programmes under the NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC) remain the mechanism by which Ukraine takes forward the reforms pertaining to its aspiration for NATO membership. Ukraine should make full use of all instruments available under the NUC to reach its objective of implementing NATO principles and standards. The success of wide-ranging, sustainable, and irreversible reforms, including combating corruption, promoting an inclusive political process, and decentralisation reform, based on democratic values, respect for human rights, minorities, and the rule of law, will be crucial in laying the groundwork for a prosperous and peaceful

¹⁸ <https://www.nato-pa.int/news/world-systemic-competition-nato-summit-must-reaffirm-unity-and-commitment-democratic-values>

Ukraine. Further reforms in the security sector, including the reform of the Security Services of Ukraine, are particularly important. We welcome significant reforms already made by Ukraine and strongly encourage further progress in line with Ukraine's international obligations and commitments. We will continue to provide practical support to reform in the security and defence sector, including through the Comprehensive Assistance Package. We will also continue to support Ukraine's efforts to strengthen its resilience against hybrid threats, including through intensifying activities under the NATO-Ukraine Platform on Countering Hybrid Warfare. We welcome the cooperation between NATO and Ukraine with regard to security in the Black Sea region. The Enhanced Opportunities Partner status granted last year provides further impetus to our already ambitious cooperation and will promote greater interoperability, with the option of more joint exercises, training, and enhanced situational awareness. Military cooperation and capacity building initiatives between Allies and Ukraine, including the Lithuanian-Polish-Ukrainian Brigade, further reinforce this effort. We highly value Ukraine's significant contributions to Allied operations, the NATO Response Force, and NATO exercises.

At the inaugural Summit of Crimea Platform in August of 2021, NATO PA President Connally stressed "the illegal annexation and occupation of Crimea is the most egregious example of Russia's disregard for international law and norms—unparalleled in Europe since World War II . . . repeat time and again, for however long it takes, that we will never recognize nor accept it."¹⁹ "He [Connally]

¹⁹ <https://www.nato-pa.int/news/crimea-ukraine-nato-pa-representatives-attend-inaugural-summit-crimea-platform>

put Russia's aggression against Ukraine in the wide context of the revisionist autocratic power's attempt to undermine the rules-based liberal world order. **'Ukraine is on the frontlines in this contest of values.'**" Eventually, his words would literally come true.

On 10 October 2021, the NATO PA reported –

A draft resolution, to be voted on at Monday's Plenary Session in Lisbon, urges Allies to underline in the Strategic Concept that "Russia's aggressive actions pose the most immediate threat to Euro-Atlantic security and NATO's shared values of individual liberty, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law."²⁰

NATO clearly viewed Russia as a threat. Western elites believed adding Ukraine, Georgia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina would deter than threat. Naturally, Putin knew NATO enlargement was directed against the Russian Federation.

Increasing the pressure on Putin, the Biden administration opted to follow through on an election promise to host a **Summit for Democracy**. Russia and China were not amused. In late November of 2021, Anatoly Antonov (Russian Federation) and Qin Gang (China) warned in a **joint article** –

The United States will be hosting the online Summit for Democracy on December 9-10, 2021, empowering itself to define who is to attend the event and who is not, who is a "democratic country" and who is not eligible for such status. An evident product of its Cold-War mentality, this will stoke up ideological confrontation and a rift in the world, creating new "dividing lines." This contradicts the development of the modern world. It is impossible to prevent the

²⁰ <https://www.nato-pa.int/news/nato-warned-russia-china-attempts-undermine-rules-based-order-and-western-values>

shaping of a polycentric architecture but could strain the objective process. China and Russia firmly reject this move . . . **China and Russia call on countries to stop using “value-based diplomacy” to provoke division and confrontation; to practice mutual respect and win-win cooperation in international relations, and to work for harmonious coexistence between countries with different social systems, ideologies, histories, cultures, and development levels.”**

President Biden and Secretary of State Anthony Blinken opted to ignore their call. The Summit for Democracy was held as planned. Russia and China were not invited. They were painted in an autocratic corner.

On the first day of the Summit, Representative Connally introduced **H. Res. 831**—Calling on the United States Government to uphold the founding principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. According to Congress.gov, “the resolution also calls on the President to use the voice and vote of the United States to adopt a new Strategic Concept for NATO that is clear about its support for shared democratic values and committed to enhancing NATO’s capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries.” Connally wanted NATO to formalize its role as an instrument of ideological imperialism.

During the Summit for Democracy, globalists defined and pushed a progressive ideology not shared by most of the American people. The Biden administration acted on behalf of the globalist faction, not the American people. According to the White House—

The Summit brought together more than 275 participants, representing governments, multilateral institutions, activists, journalists, parliamentarians, human right defenders, mayors, business and labor leaders, and other actors essential to accountable,

inclusive, and transparent governance and the rule of law.

The Summit focused on three core themes—“(1) strengthening democracy and defending against authoritarianism; (2) fighting corruption; and (3) promoting human rights.” Biden signaled to the world that his administration would continue to pursue a democratic peace from Vancouver to Vladivostok. Again, Russia and China were not amused.

Weeks after the Summit for Democracy ended, on December 26, 2021, Putin signaled his intention to pursue a military response if NATO did not bar Ukrainian membership and curtail military deployments to Eastern Europe. In hindsight, it was NATO’s last chance to reevaluate its collective decision to bring Ukraine and Georgia into the Atlantic Alliance. It was an ultimatum NATO could never accept. Western globalists pushed Vladimir Putin over the edge.

On February 4, 2022, Putin and Xi Jinping issued a **Joint Statement** of the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China on the International Relations Entering a New Era and the Global Sustainable Development. First, Russia and China [the sides] rejected Biden’s democracy first approach—

The sides believe that the advocacy of democracy and human rights must not be used to put pressure on other countries. They oppose the abuse of democratic values and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states under the pretext of protecting democracy and human rights, and any attempts to incite divisions and confrontation in the world. The sides call on the international community to respect cultural and civilizational diversity and the rights of peoples of different countries to self-determination. They stand ready to work together with all the interested partners to promote genuine democracy.

Second, Russia and China [the sides] announced their intention to build a Greater Eurasian Partnership—

The sides are seeking to advance their work to link the development plans for the Eurasian Economic Union and the Belt and Road Initiative with a view to intensifying practical cooperation between the EAEU and China in various areas and promoting greater interconnectedness between the Asia Pacific and Eurasian regions. The sides reaffirm their focus on building the Greater Eurasian Partnership in parallel and in coordination with the Belt and Road construction to foster the development of regional associations as well as bilateral and multilateral integration processes for the benefit of the peoples on the Eurasian continent.

Third, Russia and China [the sides] reiterated their opposition to NATO enlargement—

The sides believe that certain States, military and political alliances and coalitions seek to obtain, directly or indirectly, unilateral military advantages to the detriment of the security of others, including by employing unfair competition practices, intensify geopolitical rivalry, fuel antagonism and confrontation, and seriously undermine the international security order and global strategic stability. The sides oppose further enlargement of NATO and call on the North Atlantic Alliance to abandon its ideologized cold war approaches, to respect the sovereignty, security and interests of other countries, the diversity of their civilizational, cultural and historical backgrounds, and to exercise a fair and objective attitude towards the peaceful development of other States.

Caught up in Cold War nostalgia, globalists refused to listen. Putin made good on his threat. On February 21, 2022, Putin recognized the independence of Donetsk and Luhansk. Two days later, on February 24, Ukraine-NATO Interparliamentary Council (UNIC) Co-chairs Oleksandr KORNYENKO (Ukraine), First Deputy Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada, and Michal ZSCZERBA (Poland), Deputy Head of the Polish delegation to the NATO PA issued the following joint statement—

We reject Russia's narrative of exclusive spheres of influence and are determined to uphold the core principle that all states have the right to freely choose their own path and security arrangements. **Ukraine, as a sovereign nation, has chosen European and Euro-Atlantic integration. This path is enshrined in the Ukrainian constitution and has the support of the people of Ukraine. We welcome Allies' repeated reaffirmation of the 2008 Bucharest Summit decision that Ukraine and Georgia will become members of NATO and that no third country holds a veto over their Euro-Atlantic integration.**

The UNIC statement was too little too late. Putin already made up his mind. Russia invaded Ukraine on February 24, 2022. Russians and Ukrainians are now dying because globalists made promises they were unwilling to keep. Summed up, Putin said loud and clear--Do you hear me now? Globalists now saying, See, we told you so! Globalists have put us all in a precarious position.

On April 5, the U.S. House of Representatives passed Representative Connally's NATO Center for Democratic Resiliency resolution by a vote of **362 to 63**—

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is the world's preeminent political and military alliance committed to democracy and the collective defense of its members;

Whereas the preamble of NATO's founding

North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington, DC, on April 4, 1949, declares the alliance is “founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law”;

Whereas democracies across the alliance face external threats from authoritarian regimes such as Russia and China and internal threats from proponents of illiberalism;

Whereas Russia launched a full-scale invasion of sovereign and democratic Ukraine on February 24, 2022, placing it on the frontlines in the contest between democratic values and autocracy;

Whereas in his address to Congress, President Zelensky remarked “Right now, the destiny of our country is being decided. The destiny of our people, whether Ukrainians will be free, whether they will be able to preserve their democracy.”;

Whereas Vladimir Putin’s unprovoked full-scale invasion of Ukraine has united the NATO alliance;

Whereas there is a broad agreement within the alliance of the need to strengthen the democracies of NATO members, partners, and aspirant countries;

Whereas, in April 2020, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg appointed an independent Reflection Group tasked with supporting a forward-looking reflection process meant to strengthen the political dimension of the alliance;

Whereas the Reflection Group’s report, “NATO 2030: United for a New Era”, included analyses and recommendations for the alliance to address “‘democratic recession,’ the global erosion of democratic norms, and the rise of authoritarianism”, including—

(1) “A shared democratic identity is what distinguishes the Alliance from the principal threats

and challenges it faces.”;

(2) “NATO should reassert its core identity as an Alliance rooted in the principles of democracy.”;

(3) “Any commitment to strengthening NATO’s political cohesion therefore has to be orientated toward those shared values and ideals, grounded in democracy, rule of law and individual liberty.”; and

(4) recommending the establishment of a Center of Excellence for Democratic Resilience in order to strengthen NATO democracies against external threats;

Whereas the Brussels Summit Communiqué issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels on June 14, 2021, stated—

(1) “NATO is the strongest and most successful Alliance in history. It guarantees the security of our territory and our one billion citizens, our freedom, and the values we share, including individual liberty, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law.”;

(2) “State and non-state actors challenge the rules-based international order and seek to undermine democracy across the globe.”; and

(3) “We reaffirm the Alliance’s shared democratic principles as well as our commitment to the spirit and the letter of the North Atlantic Treaty.”;

Whereas in Brussels the Allies also committed to updating NATO’s Strategic Concept;

Whereas NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg has reiterated that one of the primary purposes of updating the Strategic Concept must be a recommitment to the founding values of the alliance;

Whereas the NATO Parliamentary Assembly supports a new Strategic Concept that reaffirms that the support and strengthening of democratic institutions is foundational to the collective security of

Allies;

Whereas Russia's full-scale invasion of sovereign and democratic Ukraine underscores the importance of placing shared democratic values at the heart of NATO's Strategic Concept; and

Whereas the NATO Parliamentary Assembly has endorsed and advanced a proposal to establish a NATO Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO headquarters for the purposes of monitoring and identifying challenges to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law and facilitating democracy and governance assistance to member, partner, and aspirant states, when requested: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its unequivocal support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as an alliance founded on democratic principles;

(2) urges NATO to continue to provide unwavering support to the people of Ukraine as they fight for their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and a democratic future;

(3) calls on the President to use the voice and vote of the United States to adopt a new Strategic Concept for NATO that is clear about its support for shared democratic values and committed to enhancing NATO's capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries; and

(4) calls on the President to use the voice and vote of the United States to establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO headquarters.

Conclusion

Globalism represents a clear and present danger to world peace. It legitimizes unrecognizable democracy, sustains servant capitalism, and promotes ideological imperialism. It is an extremely dangerous spawn of the Atlantic Union idea that will eventually lead to democratic war against a nuclear power—namely Russia and China.

Globalists are a resilient bunch. They have an uncanny ability to weather populist storms. They always come back and pick up where they left off. An unpopular, but inconvenient, truth is globalists usually prevail when populists fail to engage them in the global arena.

History repeats itself. Globalists will try to use the crisis in Ukraine to forge an Atlantic union of sorts, federal or otherwise. The only way globalists can master the world for the good of the world is through global dominance.

The best way to control the effects of the globalist faction is to rise above them. Nationalistic approaches tend to focus on controlling the causes to faction—which threatens individual liberty. I believe citizen diplomacy is the answer.

The 1910 Commission, the Atlantic Convention of 1962, and the Summit for Democracy failed because they advanced the interests of factions rather than the individual. Americans must elect leaders willing to lead with capitalism rather than democracy. Sound capitalism is a pacific language every nation and every citizen can understand while enjoying the fruits of their economic activities.

Exhibit 1 - Senator Borah on the League

U.S. Congress, Senate, Congressional Record, 66th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 8781-84

Mr. President, I am not misled by the debate across the aisle into the view that this treaty will not be ratified. I entertain little doubt that sooner or later—and entirely too soon—the treaty will be ratified with the league of nations in it, and I am of the opinion with the reservations in it as they are now written. There may possibly be some change in verbiage in order that there may be a common sharing of percentage, but our friends across the aisle will likely accept the league of nations with the reservations in substance as now written. I think, therefore, this moment is just as appropriate as any other for me to express my final views with reference to the treaty and the league of nations. It is perhaps the last opportunity I shall have to state, as briefly as I may, my reasons for opposing the treaty and the league.

Mr. President, after Mr. Lincoln had been elected President before he assumed the duties of the office and at a time when all indications were to the effect that we would soon be in the midst of civil strife, a friend from the city of Washington wrote him for instructions. Mr. Lincoln wrote back in single line, “Entertain no compromise; have none of it.” That states the position I occupy at this time and which I have, in an humble way, occupied from the first contention in regard to this proposal.

My objections to the league have not been met by the reservations. I desire to state wherein my objections have not been met. Let us see what our attitude will be toward Europe and what our position will be with reference to the other nations of the world after we shall have entered the league with the present reservations written therein. With all due respect to those who think that they have accomplished a different thing and challenging no man’s intellectual integrity or patriotism, I do not believe the reservations which are involved in this contest.

When the league shall have been formed, we shall be a

member of what is known as the council of the league. Our accredited representative will sit in judgment with the accredited representatives of the other members of the league to pass upon the concerns not only of our country but of all Europe and all Asia and the entire world. Our accredited representatives will be members of the assembly. They will sit there to represent the judgment of these 110,000,000 people—more than—just as we are accredited here to represent our constituencies. We cannot send our representatives to sit in council with the representatives of the other great nations of the world with mental reservations as to what we shall do in case their judgment shall not be satisfactory to us. If we go to the council or to the assembly with any other purpose than that of complying in good faith and in absolute integrity with all upon which the council or the assembly may pass, we shall soon return to our country with our self-respect forfeited and the public opinion of the world condemnatory.

Why need you gentlemen across the aisle worry about a reservation here or there when we are sitting in the council and in the assembly and bound by every obligation in morals, which the President said was supreme above that of law, to comply with the judgment which our representatives and the other representatives finally form? Shall we go there, Mr. President, to sit in judgment, and in case that judgment works for peace join with our allies, but in case it works for war withdraw our cooperation? How long would we stand as we now stand a great Republic commanding the respect and holding the leadership of the world, if we should adopt any such course?

So, sir, we not only sit in the council and in the assembly with our accredited representatives, but bear in mind that article 11 is untouched by any reservation which has been offered here; and with article 11 untouched and its integrity complete, article 10 is perfectly superfluous. If any war or threat of war shall be a matter of consideration for the league, and the league shall take such action as it deems wise to deal with it, what is the necessity of article 10? Will not external aggression be regarded as a war or threat of war? If the political independence of some nation in Europe is assailed

will it be regarded as a war or threat of war? Is there anything in article 10 that is not completely covered by article 11?

It remains complete, and with our representatives sitting in the council and the assembly, and with article 11 complete, and with the assembly and the council having jurisdiction of all matters touching the peace of the world, what more to you need to bind the United States if you assume that the United States is a nation of honor?

We have said, Mr. President, that we would not send our troops abroad without the consent of Congress. Pass by now for a moment the legal proposition. If we create executive functions, the Executive will perform those functions without the authority of Congress. Pass that question by and go to the other question. Our members of the council are there. Our members of the assembly are there. Article 11 is complete, and it authorizes the league, a member of which is our representative, to deal with matters of peace and war, and the league through its council and its assembly deals with the matter, and our accredited representative joins with the others in deciding upon a certain course, which involves a question of sending troops. What will the Congress of the United States do? What right will it have left, except the bare technical right to refuse, which as a moral proposition it will not dare to exercise? Have we not been told day by day for the last nine months that the Senate of the United States, a coordinate part of the treaty-making power, should accept this league as it was written because the wise men sitting at Versailles had so written it, and has not every possible influence and every source of power in public opinion been organized and directed against the Senate to compel it to do that thing? How much stronger will be the moral compulsion upon the Congress of the United States when we ourselves have indorsed the proposition of sending our accredited representatives there to vote for us?

Ah, but you say that there must be unanimous consent, and that there is vast protection in unanimous consent.

I do not wish to speak disparagingly; but has not every division and dismemberment of every nation which has suffered

dismemberment taken place by unanimous consent for the last 300 years? Did not Prussia and Austria and Russia by unanimous consent divide Poland? Did not the United States and Great Britain and Japan and Italy and France divide China and give Shantung to Japan? Was that not a unanimous decision? Close the doors upon the diplomats of Europe, let them sit in secret, give them the material to trade on, and there always will be unanimous consent.

How did Japan get unanimous consent? I want to say here, in my parting words upon this proposition, that I have no doubt the outrage upon China was quite as distasteful to the president of the United States as it is to me. But Japan said: "I will not sign your treaty unless you turn over to me Shantung, to be turned back at my discretion," and you know how Japan's discretion operates with reference to such things. And so, when we are in the league, and our accredited representatives are sitting in Geneva, and a question of great moment arises, Japan, or Russia, or Germany, or Great Britain will say, "Unless this matter is adjusted in this way I will depart from your league." It is the same thing, operating in the same way, only under a different date and under a little different circumstances.

Mr. President, if you have enough territory, if you have enough material, if you have enough subject peoples to trade upon and divide, there will be no difficulty about unanimous consent.

Do our Democratic friends ever expect any man to sit as a member of the council or as a member of the Assembly equal in intellectual power and in standing before the world with that of our representative at Versailles? Do you expect a man to sit in the council who will have made more pledges, and I shall assume made them in sincerity, for self-determination and for the rights of small peoples, than had been made by our accredited representative? And yet, what became of it? The unanimous consent was obtained nevertheless.

But take another view of it. We are sending to the council one man. That one man represents 110,000,000 people.

Here, sitting in the Senate, we have two from every State in the Union, and over in the other House we have Representatives in

accordance with population, and the responsibility is spread out in accordance with our obligations to our constituency. But now we are transferring to one man the stupendous power of representing the sentiment and convictions of 110,000,000 people in tremendous questions which may involve the peace or may involve the war of the world.

How you view the question of unanimous consent it doesn't protect us.

What is the result of all this? We are in the midst of all of the affairs of Europe. We have entangled ourselves with all European concerns. We have joined in alliance with all the European nations which have thus far joined the league, and all nations which may be admitted to the league. We are sitting there dabbling in their affairs and intermeddling in their concerns. In other words, Mr. President—and this comes to the question which is fundamental with me—we have forfeited and surrendered, once and for all, the great policy of "no entangling alliances" upon which the strength of this Republic has been founded for 150 years.

My friends of reservations, tell me where is the reservation in these articles which protects us against entangling alliances with Europe?

Those who are differing over reservations, tell me what one of them protects the doctrine laid down by the Father of his Country. That fundamental proposition is surrendered, and we are a part of the European turmoils and conflicts from the time we enter this league.

Let us not underestimate that. There has never been an hour since the Venezuelan difficulty that there has not been operating in this country, fed by domestic and foreign sources, powerful propaganda for the destruction of the doctrine of no entangling alliances.

Lloyd-George is reported to have said just a few days before the conference met at Versailles that Great Britain could give up much, and would be willing to sacrifice much, to have America withdraw from that policy. That was one of the great objects of the entire conference at Versailles, so far as the foreign representatives

were concerned. Clemenceau and Lloyd-George and others like them were willing to make any reasonable sacrifice which would draw America away from her isolation and into the internal affairs and concerns of Europe. This league of nations, with or without reservations, whatever else it does or does not do, does surrender and sacrifice that policy; and once having surrendered and become a part of the European concerns, where, my friends, are you going to stop?

You have put in here a reservation upon the Monroe doctrine. I think that, in so far as language could protect the Monroe doctrine, it has been protected. But as a practical proposition, as a working proposition, tell me candidly, as men familiar with the history of your country and of other countries, do you think that you can intermeddle in European affairs; and, secondly, never to permit Europe to interfere in our affairs.

When Mr. Monroe wrote to Jefferson, he asked him his view upon the Monroe Doctrine, and Mr. Jefferson said, in substance, our first and primary obligation should be never to interfere in European affairs; and secondly, never permit Europe to interfere in our affairs.

He understood, as every wise and practical man understands, that if we intermeddle in her affairs, if we help her adjust her conditions, inevitably and remorsefully Europe then will be carried into our affairs, in spite of everything you can write on paper.

We cannot protect the Monroe doctrine unless we protect the basic principle upon which it rests, and that is the Washington policy. I do not care how earnestly you may endeavor to do so, as a practical working proposition your league will come to the United States. Will you permit me to digress long enough to read a paragraph from a great French editor upon this particular phase of the matter, Mr. Stephan Lausanne, editor of *Le Matin*, of Paris:

When the executive council of the league of nations fixes "the reasonable limits of the armament of Peru"; when it shall demand information concerning

the naval program of Brazil; when it shall tell Argentina what shall be the measure of the 'contribution to the armed forces to protect the signatures of the social covenant'; when it shall demand the immediate registration of the treaty between the United States and Canada at the seat of the league, it will control, whether it will or no, the destinies of America. And when the American States shall be obliged to take a hand in every war or menace of war in Europe (art. 11), they will necessarily fall afoul of the fundamental principle laid down by Monroe, which was that Americans should never take part in a European war.

If the league takes in the world, then Europe must mix in the affairs of America; if only Europe is included, then American will violate the necessity of her own doctrine by intermixing with the affairs of Europe.

If the league includes the affairs of the world, does it not include the affairs of all the world? Is there any limitation of the jurisdiction of the council or of the assembly upon the question of peace or war? Does it not have now, under the reservations, the same as it had before, the power to deal with all matters of peace or war throughout the entire world? How shall you keep from meddling in the affairs of Europe or keep Europe from meddling in the affairs of America?

Mr. President, there is another and even a more commanding reason why I shall record my vote against this treaty. It imperils what I conceive to be the underlying, the very first principles of this Republic. It is in conflict with the right of our people to govern themselves free from all restraint, legal or moral, of foreign powers. It challenges every tenet of my political faith. If this faith were one of my own contriving, if I stood here to assert principles of government of my own evolving, I might well be charged with intolerable presumption, for we all recognize the

ability of those who urge a different course. But I offer in justification of my course nothing of my own save the deep and abiding reference I have for those whose policies I humbly but most ardently support. I claim no merit save fidelity to American principles and devotion to American ideals as they were wrought out from time to time by those who built the Republic and as they have been extended and maintained throughout fifty years have been translated into my whole intellectual and moral being. I will not, I cannot, give up my belief that America must, not alone for the happiness of her own people, but for moral guidance and greater contentment of the world, be permitted to live her own life. Next to the tie which binds a man to his God is the tie which binds a man to his country, all schemes, all plans, however ambitious and fascinating they seem in their proposal, but which would embarrass or entangle or impede or shackle her sovereign will, which would compromise her freedom of action, I unhesitatingly put behind me.

Sir, since the debate opened months ago those of us who have stood against this proposition have been taunted many times with being little Americans. Leave us the, word American, keep that in your presumptuous impeachment, and no taunt can disturb us, no gibe discompose our purposes. Call us little Americans if you will, but leave us the consolation and the pride which the term American, however modified, still imparts. Take away that term and though you should coin in telling phrase your highest eulogy we would hurl it back as common slander. We have been ridiculed because, forsooth, of our limited vision. Possibly that charge may be true. Who is there here that can read the future? Time, and time alone, unerring and remorseless, will give us each our proper place in the affections of our countryman and in the esteem and commendation of those who are to come after us. We neither fear nor court her favour. But if our vision has been circumscribed it has at all times within its compass been clear and steady. We have sought nothing save the tranquillity of our own people and the honor and independence of our own Republic. No foreign flattery, no possible world glory and power have disturbed our poise or come between us and our, devotion to the traditions which have

made us a people or the policies which have made us a Nation, unselfish and commanding. If we have erred we have erred out of too much love for those things which from childhood you and we together have been taught to revere—yes, to defend even at the cost of limb and life. If we have erred it is because we have placed too high an estimate upon the wisdom of Washington and Jefferson, too exalted an opinion upon the patriotism of the sainted Lincoln. And blame us not therefore if we have, in our limited vision, seemed sometimes bitter and at all times uncompromising, for the things for which we have spoken, the things which we have endeavoured to defend, have been the things for which your fathers and our fathers were will to die.

Senators, even in an hour so big with expectancy we should not close our eyes to the fact that democracy is something more, vastly more, than a mere form of government by which society is restrained into free and orderly life. It is a moral entity, a spiritual force, as well. And these are things which live only and alone in the atmosphere of liberty. The foundation upon which democracy rests is faith in the moral instincts of the people. Its ballot boxes, the franchise, its laws, and constitutions are but the outward manifestations of the deeper and more essential thing—a continuing trust in the moral purposes of the average man and woman. When this is lost or forfeited your outward forms, however democratic in terms, are a mockery. Force may find expression through institutions democratic in structure equal with the simple and more direct processes of a single supreme ruler. These distinguishing virtues of a real republic you cannot commingle with the discordant and destructive forces of the Old World and still preserve them. You cannot yoke a government whose fundamental maxim is that of liberty to a government whose first law is that of force and hope to preserve the former. These things are in eternal war, and one must ultimately destroy the other. You may still keep for a time the outward form, you may still delude yourself, as others have done in the past, with appearances and symbols, but when you shall have committed this Republic to a scheme of world control based upon force, upon the combined military force of the four great nations of

the world, you will have soon destroyed the atmosphere of freedom, of confidence in the self-governing capacity of the masses, in which alone a democracy may thrive. We may become one of the four dictators of the world, but we shall no longer be master of our own spirit. And what shall it profit us as a Nation if we shall go forth to the domination of the earth and share with others the glory of world control and lose that fine sense of confidence in the people, the soul of democracy?

Look upon the scene as it is now presented. Behold the task we are to assume, and then contemplate the method by which we are to deal with this task. Is the method such as to address itself to a Government "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"? When this league, this combination, is formed four great powers representing the dominant people will rule one-half of the inhabitants of the globe as subject peoples—rule by force, and we shall be a party to the rule of force. There is no other way by which you can keep people in subjection. You must either give them independence, recognize their rights as nations to live their own life and to set up their own form of government, or you must deny them these things by force. That is the scheme, the method proposed by the league. It proposes no other. We will in time become inured to its inhuman precepts and its soulless methods strange as this doctrine now seems to a free people. If we stay with our contract, we will come in time to declare with our associates that force—force, the creed of the Prussian military oligarchy—is after all the true foundation upon which must rest all stable governments. Korea, despoiled and bleeding at every pore; India, sweltering in ignorance and burdened with inhuman taxes after more than one hundred years of dominant rule; Egypt, trapped and robbed of her birthright; Ireland, with 700 years of sacrifice for independence—this is the task, this is the atmosphere, and this is the creed in and under which we are to keep alive our belief in the moral purposes and self-governing capacity of the people, a belief without which the Republic must disintegrate and die. The maxim of liberty will soon give way to the rule of blood and iron. We have been pleading here for our Constitution.

Conform this league, it has been said, to the technical terms of our charter, and all will be well. But I declare to you that we must go further and conform to those sentiments and passions for justice and freedom which are essential to the existence of democracy. You must respect the territorial boundaries, not territorial integrity, but you must respect and preserve the sentiments and passions for justice and for freedom which God in his infinite wisdom has planted so deep in the human heart that no form of tyranny however brutal, no persecution however prolonged, can wholly uproot and kill. Respect nationally, respect justice, respect freedom, and you may have some hope of peace, but not so if you make your standard the standard of tyrants and despots, the protection of real estate regardless of how it is obtained.

Sir, we are told that this treaty means peace. Even so, I would not pay the price. Would you purchase peace at the cost of any part of our independence? We could have had peace in 1776—the price was high, but we could have had it. James Otis, Sam Adams, Hancock, and Warren were surrounded by those who urged peace and British rule. All through that long and trying struggle, particularly when the clouds of adversity lowered upon the cause, there was a cry of peace—let us have peace. We could have had peace in 1860; Lincoln was counseled by men of great influence and accredited wisdom to let our brothers—and, thank Heaven, they are brothers—depart in peace. But the tender, loving Lincoln, bending under the fearful weight of impending civil war, an apostle of peace, refused to pay the price, and a reunited country will praise his name forevermore—bless it because he refused peace at the price of national honor and national integrity. Peace upon any other basis than national independence, peace purchased at the cost of any part of our national integrity, is fit only for slaves, and even when purchased at such a price it is a delusion, for it cannot last.

But your treaty does not mean peace—far, very far, from it. If we are to judge the future by the past it means war. Is there any guaranty of peace other than the guaranty which comes of the control of the war-making power by the people? Yet what great rule of democracy does the treaty leave unassailed? The people in whose

keeping alone you can safely lodge the power of peace or war nowhere, at no time and in no place, have any voice in this scheme for world peace. Autocracy which has bathed the world in blood for centuries reigns supreme. Democracy is everywhere excluded. This, you say, means peace.

Can you hope for peace when love of country is disregarded in your scheme, when the spirit of nationality is rejected, even scoffed at? Yet what law of that moving and mysterious force does your treaty not deny? With a ruthlessness unparalleled your treaty in a dozen instances runs counter to the divine law of nationality. Peoples who speak the same language, kneel at the same ancestral tombs, moved by the same traditions, animated by a common hope, are torn asunder, broken in pieces, divided, and parceled out to antagonistic nations. And this you call justice. This, you cry, means peace. Peoples who have dreamed of independence, struggled and been patient, sacrificed and been hopeful, peoples who were told that through this peace conference they should realize the aspirations of centuries, have again had their hopes dashed to earth. One of the most striking and commanding figures in this war, soldier and statesmen, turned away from the peace table at Versailles declaring to the world, "The promise of the new life, the victory of the great humane ideals for which the peoples have shed their blood and their treasure without stint, the fulfilment of their aspirations toward a new international order and a fairer and better world, are not written into the treaty." No, your treaty means injustice. It means slavery. It means war. And to all this you ask this Republic to become a party. You ask it to abandon the creed under which it has grown to power and accept the creed of autocracy, the creed of repression and force.

Mr. President, I turn from this scheme based upon force to another scheme, planned one hundred and forty three years ago in old Independence Hall, in the city of Philadelphia, based upon liberty. I like it better. I have become so accustomed to believe in it that it is difficult for me to reject it out of hand. I have difficulty in subscribing to the new creed of oppression, the creed of dominant and subject peoples. I feel a reluctance to give up the belief that all

men are created equal—the eternal principle in government that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. I cannot get my consent to exchange the doctrine of George Washington for the doctrine of Frederick the Great translated into mendacious phrases of peace. I go back to that serene and masterful soul who pointed the way to power and glory for the new and then weak Republic, and whose teachings and admonitions even in our majesty and dominance we dare not disregard.

I know well the answer to my contention. It has been piped about of late from a thousand sources—venal sources, disloyal sources, sinister sources—that Washington's wisdom was of his day only and that his teachings are out of fashion—things long since sent to the scrap heap of history—that while he was great in character and noble in soul he was untrained in the arts of statecraft and unlearned in the science of government. The puny demagogue, the barren editor, the sterile professor now vie with each other in apologizing for the temporary and commonplace expedients which the Father of his Country felt constrained to adopt in building a republic!

What is the test of statesmanship? Is it the formation of theories, the utterance of abstract and incontrovertible truths, or is it the capacity and the power to give to a people that concrete thing called liberty, that vital and indispensable thing in human happiness called free institutions, and to establish over all and above all the blessed and eternal reign of order and law? If this be the test, where shall we find another whose name is entitled to be written beside the name of Washington? His judgment and poise in the hour of turmoil and peril, his courage and vision in times of adversity, his firm grasp of fundamental principles, his almost inspired power to penetrate the future and read there the result, the effect of policies, have never been excelled, if equalled, by any of the world's commonwealth builders. Peter the Great, William the Silent, and Cromwell the Protector, these and these alone perhaps are to be associated with his name as the builders of states and the founders of governments. But in exaltation of moral purpose, in the unselfish

character of his work, in the durability of his policies, in the permanency of the institutions which he more than anyone else called into effect, his service to mankind stands out separate and apart in a class by itself. The works of these other great builders, where are they now? But the work of Washington is still the most potent influence for the advancement of civilization and the freedom of the race.

Reflect for a moment over his achievements. He led the revolutionary army to victory. He was the very first to suggest a union instead of a confederacy. He presided over and counseled with great wisdom the convention which framed the Constitution. He guided the government through its first perilous years. He gave dignity and stability and honor to that which was looked upon by the world as a passing experiment, and finally, my friends, as his own peculiar and particular contribution to the happiness of his countrymen and to the cause of the Republic, he gave us his great foreign policy under which we have lived and prospered and strengthened for nearly a century and a half. This policy is the most sublime confirmation of his genius as a statesman. It was then, and it now is, an indispensable part of our whole scheme of government. It is today a vital, indispensable element in our entire plan, purpose, and mission as a nation. To abandon it is nothing less than a betrayal of the American people. I say betrayal deliberately, in view of the suffering and the sacrifice which will follow in the wake of such a course. But under the stress and strain of these extraordinary days, when strong men are being swept down by the onrushing forces of disorder and change, when the most sacred things of life, the most cherished hopes of a Christian world seem to yield to the mad forces of discontent—just such days as Washington passed through when the mobs of Paris, wild with new liberty and drunk with power, challenged the established institutions of all the world, but his steadfast soul was unshaken—under these conditions come again we are about to abandon this policy so essential to our happiness and tranquility as a people and our stability as a government. No leader with his commanding influence and his unquailing courage stands forth to stem the current. But what no

leader can or will do experience, bitter experience, and the people of this country in whose keeping, after all, thank God, is the Republic, will ultimately do. If we abandon his leadership and teachings, we will go back. We will return to this policy. Americanism shall not, cannot, die.

We may go back in sackcloth and ashes, but we will return to the faith of the fathers. America will live her own life. The independence of this Republic will have its defenders. Thousands have suffered and died for it, and their sons and daughters are not of the breed who will be betrayed into the hands of foreigners. The noble face of the Father of his Country, so familiar to every boy and girl, looking out from the walls of the Capitol in stem reproach, will call those who come here for public service to a reckoning. The people of our beloved country will finally speak, and we will return to the policy which we now abandon. America disenthralled and free in spite of all these things will continue her mission in the cause of peace, of freedom, and of civilization.

Exhibit 2—The World Constitution Resolution

Senate, Revision of the United Nations Charter, Hearings,
Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, 1950

Senate, Revision of the United Nations Charter, Report, Resolutions
Relative to Revision of the United Nations Charter, Atlantic Union,
World Federation, and Similar Proposals, 1950

A. World Constitution Resolution, SCR 66, 1950

Whereas, in order to achieve universal peace and justice, the present Charter of the United Nations should be changed to provide a true world government constitution; and

Whereas article 109 of the present Charter of the United Nations provides for a general conference to make alterations in said Charter; and

Whereas similar amendatory powers in the Articles of Confederation were used by the people of the United States in 1787 to adopt a new Constitution to insure a unified, peaceful nation; and

Whereas the combined effort of many able and intelligent citizens has resulted in the preparation of a proposed world constitution based upon the principles of peace through justice with both social rights and civil rights for all peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),
That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should immediately take the initiative in requesting a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of establishing a true world government through adoption of such a constitution; and if such a general conference is not called within one year after the adoption of this resolution, the President of the United States should then call a world constitutional convention of delegates elected directly by the people for the purpose of adopting a world government constitution.

B. Statement of Hon. Glen Taylor, United States Senator from the State of Idaho

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am appearing here in behalf of Senate Concurrent Resolution 66.

Here are some copies of a proposed constitution for a world federal government. I thought possibly you gentlemen might be interested in it. The document was prepared by Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins, G. A. Borgese, Mortimer J. Adler, Stringfellow Barr, Albert Guerard, Harold A. Innis, Erich Kahler, Wilbur G. Katz, Charles H. McIlwain, Robert Redfield and Rexford G. Tugwell. It is a very interesting document. I am particularly impressed by the regional arrangements for representations which it encompasses to prevent large blocs of population on the face of the earth from getting control of any proposed world federation that might be set up.

Senator WILEY. This Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, as I understand, meshes into this draft of a world constitution—in other words, this would be the preliminary step to bring about a world constitution, is that it?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, Senator Wiley. Dr. Borgese is here to testify, and I think he does suggest an amendment or two to the resolution.

Senator WILEY. Your resolution suggests, the same as the one that we had yesterday, the calling of a general conference of all the nations, instead of a conference for seven nations.

Senator TAYLOR. Yes. I cannot go along with the idea that we ought to set up any kind of an organization that is exclusive, or that does not leave the door open for all nations to come in, because I think that is further dividing the world, and I think what we need is unity, rather than further division or a drawing of lines.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Taylor, the germ of your Resolution 66 goes back to previous resolutions introduced at the time of the formation of the United Nations. The idea, or the germ of this idea has now seen fruit in the Hutchins study?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. But, your resolution of several years ago called for that to happen which actually has happened, as far as the study stages is concerned, isn't that true?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, I would say that.

PAST RESOLUTIONS FOR WORLD REPUBLIC

Four and one-half years ago I introduced my first resolution in the United States Senate. Each year since, I have presented similar resolutions all calling for creation of a world republic.

I might say that each resolution was modified as further study and circumstances would seem to indicate. It has taken over 4 years and some earth-shaking events to crystallize sufficient support among the people and in the Congress to convene these hearings and afford me the privilege of testifying on behalf of this resolution. Naturally, I am happy that this has come to pass and I deeply appreciate the privilege of appearing before this distinguished committee.

On that momentous day in my life in October 1945 I said:

I believe the people of America are ready – not only ready, but anxious and definitely craving – to have something done to preserve peace in the world and to prevent the beginning of another armament race which, in view of the development of far greater instruments of destruction, can result only in leading to the absolute erasing from the face of the earth of our civilization and of a large percentage of the actual inhabitants of the earth.

During the intervening years I have reiterated time and again my belief in the crying need for world disarmament, the outlawing of all instruments of war and the importance of instituting a program for peace. Slowly, but surely, I felt that we were embarking on a world armament race that must inevitably, inexorably, lead to destruction.

In March of 1948 I proposed an amendment to the ECA act which provided that the United States institute a program of reconstruction and economic development for all of Europe with an

initial contribution of at least \$5,000,000,000 a year for 5 years. This was to be done through the UN, with smaller contributions from other nations. Universal disarmament was to be our ultimate goal also.

Last week we heard a great address by the Chairman of the Committee on Atomic Energy on the need for stopping the atomic-bomb race and finding a path to peace. This week we were privileged to listen to the statesmanlike utterances of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and who is also a member of this committee, who made an eloquent plea for world disarmament.

The events of the past 6 months have had world-shaking repercussions. Many of us who have appeared to be divergently opposed on vital subjects in the past now find ourselves echoing sentiments that are similar in word and equal in purpose. In 1945 I said to the Senate:

It has been my observation that always when great armies are built up they are not disbanded until they have been used for purposes of making war upon some other nation.

The senior Senator from Connecticut said last Friday:

Arrayed against the choice of such a policy, meaning an armament-race policy or balance-of-power policy, is 5,000 years of recorded history, which teaches again, and again, and again that armament races lead to war-under today's conditions, hydrogen war.

I wish to congratulate both of my colleagues on the eloquence and wisdom of their remarks. I hope and pray that the resolution or at least the idea for which I speak today will have the support of these influential and honored gentlemen and all others who sincerely seek ways and means of establishing permanent peace on earth.

However, I have not come before you for the purpose of claiming credit as a pioneer in this or any other field. It is rather with a feeling of humility and Christian spirit that I speak today. The hour of self analysis and communion with our Creator is at hand. We must face the realities of life as they exist at this moment.

Yesterday it was the atom bomb. Today it is the hydrogen bomb. Tomorrow it may be a bomb that will destroy all civilization. And even then, there are the revolting and inhuman instruments of bacteriological warfare to haunt men's souls. I am told on good authority that bacteria is available that can wreak even worse havoc than atom bomb and hydrogen bombs. Whole cities and States can fall prey to germ-carrying bombs that can bring suffering, privation, unimaginable misery, and lingering death to millions of people.

DESIRE TO STRENGTHEN UNITED NATIONS

I have always been a firm believer in using the United Nations and doing everything possible to strengthen this existing instrument into an adequate world organization. All of my votes in the Senate on foreign policy issues have been based upon the firm belief that the United Nations should be strengthened and used in every possible way. Consequently, my resolution attempts to strengthen this existing world organization and give it the power necessary to enact, interpret, and enforce world law. Historical precedent in the writing of our own Constitution can be followed in adopting an entirely new constitution for the United Nations, preferably one such as that drafted by the Committee to Draft a World Constitution. The United Nations Charter provides for calling a convention to amend or make alterations in the existing charter and this entirely new constitution can be adopted in the same manner that the Constitution Convention adopted our Constitution to replace the Articles of Confederation. If this machinery is not used and the United Nations continues to have inadequate power, I have provided an alternate method for the people of the world through their own constitutional convention to create a true world government with the firm foundation of a constitution such as that drafted by the Committee to Draft a World Constitution, thus providing the basis of world law based upon justice.

Five years ago \$25,000,000,000 for world rehabilitation, as I suggested at that time, was an astronomical figure. Universal

disarmament was scarcely an acceptable subject in parlor conversations. A voice raised on behalf of world government was heard with a skeptical ear and the speaker watched with a suspicious eye. Today, thank God, we applaud utterances on behalf of disarmament and economic rehabilitation for all peoples. Tomorrow we may be willing to raise our thoughts on peaceful expenditures to \$100,000,000,000, \$200,000,000,000; certainly no monetary figure can be too high for the actual accomplishment of peace and brotherhood.

WORLD GOVERNMENT NEEDED

Let us be consistent in our outlook, in our approach, and in our thinking. We are sincere in our desire for peace even though it may have taken a hydrogen bomb to awaken us to reality. Let us follow that course to its logical conclusion-it can and must be world government. Anything else is a mere stopgap, a compromise in the face of the cold hard facts. Only a true world government can achieve everlasting peace.

The Charter of the United Nations could and should be changed to provide a true world government constitution. Such a change could be made by calling of a general conference as provided for in article 109. If that cannot be done under present conditions, then let us call a world constitutional convention of delegates for the purpose of adopting a world government constitution. True, this may involve sacrifices of sovereignty that are alien to our way of thinking. But, surely, the terrifying prospect of extermination by fire should provide sufficient incentive for us to embrace new concepts of thinking. It is imperative that we do so both from the point of view of self-preservation and Christian doctrine.

The time for final fateful decision is upon us. Either we will make the supreme effort for peace now, or we will be doomed to extinction. Getting tough is not the answer-armaments races can only lead to disaster. Balance of power arrangements are a discredited device recorded in past history. Even disarmament will

not suffice. Half measures are not enough. The idealism of yesterday is the realism of today. Let us obey the convictions that arise from the innermost recesses of our hearts and go forward in a consistent and practical approach to achieve world peace through world government. Let us hope and pray that the sacred fervor of the flame of peace, now kindled, remain alive within us, and that some day soon, the peoples of the earth may be relieved of the unbearable burden of fear and uncertainty which hangs over mankind like the sword of Damocles. We must either press forward now and make a supreme effort to actually and literally establish the brotherhood of man or resign ourselves to a way of life more regimental and degrading than anything the world has ever known.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Wiley?

Senator WILEY. Well, Senator, you express, I think, in the words of one noble writer, "A consummation devoutly to be wished for."

MECHANISM OF WORLD GOVERNMENT NOT ENOUGH

The point is, and I think that is what everyone has testified to with some force, as to the various ideas, as to how to bring about this consummation, and the point is-how, through any mechanism can you find the answer to the situation in the world today, with Russia at one end, and apparently the free world at the other?

If you called this conference, is that mechanism going to just automatically, of itself, change the mental approach that one or the other of these two great ideologies reflect in the minds of men?

I would like to get your reaction to that question.

I might say, parenthetically, it was admitted the other day, in relation to the other resolution, where they had in mind the getting together of the nations of Europe, and the Atlantic Pact nations, and ourselves, they admitted that there really was a conflict in ideology that was so basic that the only thing that would be recognized by the Russians was superior force, that otherwise they would proceed in their course of world domination and that is the argument for the creating of this group of nations into a

confederation with the surrender of each nation of certain of its inherent sovereignty, in order to create an arm that would be an effective rebuff against this oncoming of the Russians.

Now, I understand your proposition is either change the United Nations, or change or create, by a separate convention, a world order.

Now, I am asking, assume you get them all together, you see how they are getting together at times in the United Nations, how ineffective at times they are. The question involved is how the mere instituting of a mechanism that will bring about one or the other, how that will have a result, either as a modification of the United Nations so that one side will be the democracies and on the other side will be the Russians and their satellites, which is pretty much of the world-how that is going to bring the answer that we all want, this consummation devoutly to be wished for, with peace in the minds of men.

That is our real problem. We are all seeking the answer, and I am sure that we want to make no mistake. I cannot understand how a mere mechanism, no matter whether it is the Ten Commandments or anything else, could do the job unless that mechanism became a thing of the spirit in the hearts and minds of men. Then what are we going to do to meet this tremendous challenge that comes to this generation, to maintain peace?

You said that armament leads to war. Armament is just a result of the internal warfare in the minds of men, the result of fear, the result of the inability to get together, the inability to apply the Golden Rule. Armament, you might say, is just the excreta that comes from men's hates, distrust, and inability to love and serve one another. That is what an armament is. The armament by itself does not lead to war, it is just a result of the war within nations, and within the minds of men; and so, we have to think deep. If there is any hope that the race can find the answer, let's find it.

Pardon me for suggesting these things, but I am a seeker after the truth that will make us free.

Senator TAYLOR. I am convinced of your sincerity, Senator Wiley; and, I must say that you have very eloquently expressed

your fears and doubts and your estimate of the existing situation, and I am forced to agree that the condition in the world is most distressing and terrifying. There is no use crying over spilled milk.

PAST OPPORTUNITIES LOST

I think we were in a much better position to make an approach to a problem of this kind, and a solution of this kind 5 years ago almost, when I introduced my first resolution. Then, there was no argument. We were the strongest nation on earth. We could have led through strength. At the present time, the balance of power is shifting, and I am almost inclined to agree with my reactionary columnist friend, Constantine Brown, who said that these gestures toward this armament and plans for world peace now might be construed by people of other nations as an indication of weakness at this moment. That is deplorable, but it is a fact that we let the time go by when we were on top of the crest of the wave, so to speak, and the situation is not nearly so propitious at this time, I will agree, but it is more desperate.

The hydrogen bomb promises literally the extinction of mankind. While I am not an atomic scientist, it does seem to me that if they can set off an explosion like this hydrogen bomb, it won't be long until somebody will find a key to making one explosion out of the earth, and certainly we should seek some means to prevent that.

I imagine it would be rather painful for all of us to be blown up at once, in one big explosion, but I just cannot reconcile myself with the idea of no continuation of this world and a life on it.

SOVIET REACTION

There is no guaranty that you could even get to the Russians, or their satellites, to participate in this proposal of mine, at this time. I am not that optimistic, but I do think that when we do set up an organization, if we do, I pray we will go ahead with the idea, that we will leave the door open and try to behave in a Christian spirit to demonstrate that we do want peace. I certainly

am not an advocate of unilateral disarmament. I want to see the world disarmed, but I would never advocate or agree to our disarming alone, or ahead of others. I am afraid that we were a little autocratic at the time of our greatest strength.

I, in reading over the Baruch proposals for atomic control felt that it was more in the nature of a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. If we had considered the pride and aspirations of other people, if we had acted upon something like the McMahon proposal shortly after the war, I think it would have had excellent chances of being accepted and succeeding; but in my estimation, instead of doing that, we proceeded unilaterally and most generally outside of the United Nations.

Of course; I say there is no use in hashing over what has gone before. The thing to do is try to make the best of circumstances as they are today.

So, I think that we should go ahead and try to set this up, certainly not with the idea of simply formalizing a military alliance which is already in existence between us and certain other nations, but invite all peoples, everywhere, to join this idea.

As I said before, I am not offering this proposed constitution as the ultimate, neither are its authors. It is simply an idea, something to think about. But there are provisions in there for groupings of nations and peoples to prevent any one very populous section of the earth from getting control of this world government. I think it is a very able world document, and I do hope that you gentlemen will see fit to report out my resolution, or the so-called World Federalist resolution. It has a great deal of merit. I do not believe it has as much as mine, naturally, or I would not have introduced mine, but I am hopeful that some action can be taken.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Just one or two questions, Senator.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN WORLD GOVERNMENT AND WORLD FEDERATION

In the first place, let me get your thought as to the distinction between the World Federalist resolution and yours. What is the distinction between the two? They referred to Dr. Hutchins' study as being too complicated at this stage of the game. You don't share that point of view?

Senator TAYLOR. I think the main difference between their resolution and mine, is the provision in my resolution that if the United Nations fails to act, then the President takes the initiative in inviting nations directly to elect representatives to a world constitutional convention.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. And you would like to see us take the position that we want a world constitution, a world state, and just put in a call to have the delegates meet? You are not in the attitude of exploring what Justice Roberts referred to yesterday, exploring the different possibilities?

Senator TAYLOR. I presume that what you gentlemen are holding these hearings for is to explore the different possibilities, and after you explore them, action is required, I believe.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. My question is whether you are today advocating the actual calling of a convention to set up a world state period. Is that what you want to do?

Senator TAYLOR. First, it calls upon the President to ask for the convention, or the convening of such a convention through the mechanism of the United Nations.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I understand that.

Senator TAYLOR. And, after that, if that fails and they take no action, then to appeal directly to the people of the world.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. But you are asking us to take the all-out position that we are for a world state and act accordingly?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I wanted to get that clear for the record.

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

EFFECT OF WORLD GOVERNMENT IN FAR EAST

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I have not studied this program or the other suggestions with regard to setting up the state, but I am interested in knowing how you would deal with those areas of the world that have the nermous populations like India and China, and so forth, on the basis of a world state. How do you approach that problem today, under your plan?

Senator TAYLOR. It would be difficult to explain offhand. It is encompassed, however, in the proposed draft of a world constitution. It makes provision for representation from various regions of the earth, to do away with the balance of population in certain places, and gives each region a certain representation.

I hope you will find time, Senator Smith, to read that document.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I plan to. I am reading everything I can get because I think we are all searching for the answer, and especially this subcommittee. We are searching to see if we can get a proposal which will be a step ahead.

Senator TAYLOR. It is quite evident that there has been a tremendous amount of effort put into this proposal.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I understand there has been plenty of work, but the question is, "What can we do as a practical reality now?"

SURRENDER OF SOVEREIGNTY

Now, two more questions: Do I gather, from your proposal, that you would eliminate the separate identity of the United States, as such, in your plan? Do we just go into a new world scheme that forgets the fact that there is a United States of America that is part of the world?

Senator TAYLOR. We would doubtless be known as the United States of America, just as the section of the United States which I represent is known as Idaho. We did not lose our identity as Idaho by going into the Union; we are simply a part of the Union; we are still Idaho. However, we would have to sacrifice

considerable sovereignty to the world organization to enable them to levy taxes in their own right to support themselves, so that they will not be dependent on hand-outs, as is the United Nations at the present time. We would have to give them power to raise sufficient armed forces to keep the peace in the world, just as we keep peace at home in the United States.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You suggested that if we had started when you introduced your first resolution then we might have, because of our strength, brought about something along these lines.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Do you think that Woodrow Wilson was thinking too far ahead of his time with his suggestion of the League of Nations back after World War I when he had in mind some program such as you are talking about, some way by which the world could be organized to prevent recurring wars? I refer to the League of Nations proposal and prior to that we had the suggestion of a League to Enforce Peace. I remember studying that carefully, and talking to President Taft. That originally was his idea, the League to Enforce Peace-and that was the first step. Woodrow Wilson picked that up, I felt, and while it was not perfect and would eventually come to grief because of its limitations, it was a step in the right direction. I don't see what we could have expected at the San Francisco Conference any more than what we actually got, considering the thinking in the different parts of the world.

Apparently you have come to the conclusion that the San Francisco Charter was a complete flop.

Senator TAYLOR. It was adequate at the time. At that time, we had not introduced the atomic bomb. I introduced my first resolution after the atomic bomb had fallen. I felt that we had to hurry this along if we were to come out ahead of extinction.

Now, you asked if I thought Woodrow Wilson was ahead of his time, or if his thinking was ahead of his time. I guess any man who has an idea that doesn't come to fruition could be said to have

been thinking ahead of his time or else his thinking was wrong, one or the other.

The only way to prove an idea is right is to put it into operation, or have it work successfully.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. What I had in mind was whether you thought Woodrow Wilson's conception was inadequate, in the light of your broader conception.

I have always felt that Woodrow Wilson did a great service to the world in the position he took.

Senator TAYLOR. I agree that he was the first man to get any concrete action along these lines of closer integration of the nations.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I wouldn't say that. I wouldn't go quite as far as that. Senator Pepper pointed out, in one of our previous sessions, a succession of movements going away back, tending to approach a concept of a world organized to prevent war. That was a very interesting compilation of the various times. Woodrow Wilson picked up at his stage of the proceedings with a very constructive suggestion, but which found abuse ultimately and came to grief. However, it certainly was a milestone in the road toward world peace, just as I think the United Nations is a milestone.

Now you are asking us to go the whole way and organize the world, without feeling the need, apparently, of any further milestones or any further lesser amendments to the United Nations Charter.

Senator TAYLOR. I probably would not be here before you testifying today, and would not have introduced my first World Government Resolution; if it had not been for the atomic bomb. I just feel that the time is short and very short and getting shorter with the hydrogen bomb and all and, if we are going to do anything, we must start to do it now. If we fail, then certainly we are no worse off than we are now; we are still being blown up in a disorganized condition.

SOVIET REACTION

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Let me ask a practical question: Suppose we call such a convention, and suppose Russia came in and discussed the whole business and said: "Sorry, we can't go along."

What would you do then, go ahead and organize anyway, without Russia, proceeding on the line of the Atlantic Union group? If Russia won't come in, let her go her own way?

Senator TAYLOR. There is a difference. You organize without them, but without excluding them in the first place, which, to my mind, would be quite a different matter, and without calling down upon our heads all the curses you can think of, should they refuse to go along.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You will bear in mind that when Secretary Marshall presented the so-called Marshall plan at Harvard University, on the 5th of June 1947, I think it was, he included all of Russia, and included all of Europe, nobody was left out, all were invited, all the satellites. It is the action of Russia which has made it so difficult to go ahead. But we went ahead anyway, and we set up ECA and as a matter of fact you know Poland and Czechoslovakia had said they were coming in, until Russia said nothing doing, and they went out and pulled them back.

So do you want to offer Russia another chance? I have no objection.

Senator TAYLOR. Certainly.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I have no objection. I am trying to see your point of view.

Senator TAYLOR. It doesn't make any difference how many times people refuse. I have heard of men proposing, and being turned down numbers and numbers of times and finally the lady says, "Yes."

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Suppose they turn you down? Are you going ahead with your so-called world state, leaving Russia out? Would that be the end of the road on that particular chapter?

Senator TAYLOR. Suppose I say we go ahead, not leaving

Russia out, but getting in what we can. Put it that way.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I don't know what you mean by that.

Senator TAYLOR. That is a more friendly way to put it, that is all. Let us not say that we are going to leave them out, let us say that we are going to go ahead and organize on the best basis we possibly can. It is open to anybody that wants to come in.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You think that would be better: than the present United Nations set-up where Russia is in the thing and can use it as a sounding board to express their views? We have the open forum there to discuss these things and bring out different things. I think it is healthy to have a UN, and let Russia shoot off her ideas, call names and all that, much better than it is to have them repressed and self-contained.

Senator TAYLOR. I would rather have her in it, in the UN than out of the UN. I would prefer to have her in the world state. I am not dogmatic.

I don't know. I heard some place that they were not in there right now, really, sort of on the sidelines, but then I do think we should press ahead on this larger concept of a sacrifice of sovereignty. There is no sacrifice of sovereignty in the United Nations now, as it stands, and they have no real power. They cannot enforce peace or maintain peace.

INTERNATIONAL POLICE

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Well, do you visualize in that state set-up an international police to preserve the peace of the world where we would be safe in disarming entirely and letting that international police set-up take care of the dangers of aggression?

Senator TAYLOR. If the Russians didn't come in to this proposed world government, then naturally a police force would have to be just about as big, probably, or maybe even bigger, than the present armed forces of the western nations. Besides, the size of the police force would depend upon the threat, and, if at any time

the Russians came in, then of course we could disarm right down to the last gun.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. If I understand it correctly, Sena-tor, I think the Atlantic Union group feel that Russia will not come in now and that in any event, we have a much better chance of getting Russia into some kind of a set-up if we get a preponderance of power and have Russia realize the power there. Then we could invite them and let them come in, if they want, and if they will meet the conditions. But, the Atlantic Union group thinks that there is no hope of getting the thing solved by what you suggested. That is simply their thought. They feel that the alternative approach of getting the Atlantic powers together, and giving it larger power than the semi military defense which the present pact includes, would indicate that we are going to be integrated to meet the threat, and if at a later date Russia and her satellites see the advantages of it, they won't be able to afford not come in.

That is the line of argument I get from talking to proponents of the Atlantic Union.

You are opposed to that?

Senator TAYLOR. If it should be decided to go ahead with the Atlantic Union idea. I hope their line of reasoning is correct. I doubt it.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You doubt it?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I think I have got the picture of your position, because I think, as I said-you have made yourself clear. I am glad you mentioned the bacteriological warfare. I haven't heard that mentioned enough in these hearings. I feel, as you suggest, that there may be more danger in that than these other bombs.

Senator TAYLOR. Certainly I had much rather an atomic bomb cremate me cleanly and neatly, than to have them drop disease germs on the place where I happened to be residing, and see my family die, and, while I am not afraid to die, as I say, I would much rather die quickly than in agony.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You would certainly agree

that any move toward disarmament, or agreement about the atomic bomb, and those things, would not be complete if you left out your bacteriological warfare?

Senator TAYLOR. I think that the bacteriological element ought to be first.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I think that is an important thing that you have brought up in this discussion, because we have to cover the whole field, and that includes chemical warfare, too, I suppose, gas, and so forth—all those things?

Senator TAYLOR. Past experience has shown that they are very reticent to use chemicals, they have been hard to use in the past, but perhaps they have perfected them to where they can use them. They may not have been able to control them in the past, and that is why they have not used them.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Also, the fear that the other side may have something even more terrible than the ones they have.

Senator TAYLOR. I hope that applies to these new weapons.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Do you think we could control bacteriological warfare if we used it ourselves?

Senator TAYLOR. I am not an expert, but I don't see how. We have never been able to stop influenza from spreading from one continent to another continent.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Thank you, sir.

Senator TAYLOR. You have made provision to hear Mr. Borgese and Mr. Carney this morning, sir?

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Senator WILEY. I have one question.

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, Senator Wiley.

Senator WILEY. I have listened to this discussion between you and Senator Smith, and you haven't told me yet how you are going to get the Russians to agree, once they come in and say, "We will Join up with you"; whether you feel that is going to do the job or not, and I think you said that in the last few years our naiveté has been so demonstrated, so often, we have been so naive in our dealings with the Russians, that now we have gotten to the point

where as Mr. Acheson said yesterday, "Use the big stick of force."

In one sense you haven't told me yet how any of these are going to bring about a change of mind in this great virile, dynamic, evil force called communism, filled with the ideas of Marx. You haven't told us how your mere organism is going to do anything. You cannot get them together now. They are penetrating all the countries of the earth, including our own, according to Mr. Hoover the other day. And now, you are just going to bring back, I think, a very dangerous situation if we are not careful, and that is, getting the people to believe that by the mere institution of another mechanism, call it what we may, call it the United Nations as we did before, and now we might call it the North Atlantic Pact-or call it the World Organization, we can have peace. We must be careful not to give our people a sleeping powder. You have not indicated to me how it will finally go into effect. What gets me is when men like Mr. Roberts come out and say that you have to meet force with force, you have to have the strongest force and that is the only language the Communists understand, then you have something I understand and see the need for action among the peoples of like thinking. I can comprehend that. But what I do not comprehend is all these other thoughts that you can, by simply setting up the organization-find the correct answer.

Senator TAYLOR. It is most simple to think of this problem in the light of armament and just fighting it out.

Senator WILEY. I don't think that is the solution either, but I think it analyzes it properly.

Senator TAYLOR. I am convinced that another war, as I say, will mean probably the extinction of mankind, and most certainly the end of civilization. It will set back the progress of mankind possibly to the caveman era again, and I think that the only way you would ever get anything is to start doing something about it.

Senator WILEY. I agreed with that.

Senator TAYLOR. When I decided to run for office, it was pointed out to me that I wanted to run for office because I felt that the problems confronting us were settled here in Washington. I'm not so sure, since I have come here, that that is the answer, that you

get them settled –

Senator WILEY. You mean you are unsettled, too?

Senator TAYLOR. It was pointed out to me, when I decided to run for the United States Senate, that I didn't even know a precinct committeeman, which I did not. I had never taken any part in politics.

Therefore, if you follow that line of reasoning, it doesn't look like I should be in the Senate today, I should not have started to run for office. I had no money, no political organization, no political experience. I got into politics and I soon learned about it, and after several times, I did get to the United States Senate, so I think we ought to jump in here and start this idea of a world federation and begin learning from experience. Certainly, I don't see where it can hurt anything, and I don't believe it would lull the people into any false sense of security. I do believe it would fire the people of the world with an ideal of comparable magnetism to the Communist philosophy, give us an ideal that they desperately need to rally around at this moment.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Thank you, Senator Taylor.

(The statement of the Honorable Ralph E. Flanders, which was made at this point in the record, has been transferred to p. 178, where his testimony in support of S. Res. 133 appears with other witnesses who support that resolution.)

C. State Department Comment on Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, Testimony of Under Secretary of State John D. Hickerson

The next one is Resolution 66, if it is agreeable with you, sir.

This resolution resolves –

That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should immediately take the initiative in requesting a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of establishing a true world government through adoption of such a constitution; and if such a general conference is not called within one year after the adoption of this resolution, the President of the United States should then call a world

constitutional convention of delegates elected directly by the people for the purpose of adopting a world government constitution.

DEPARTMENT CANNOT SUPPORT S. CON. RES. 66

The Department cannot support world federation as an objective of United States foreign policy.

Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 deals only with world federation as an objective of United States foreign policy, Senate Concurrent Resolution 66 calls also for specific action by the President toward the attainment of the objective of world government. The President is to call a general conference of the United Nations under article 109 to establish a world government through adoption of "such a constitution." This presumably refers to the preceding paragraph which reads, "Whereas the combined effort of many able and intelligent citizens has resulted in the preparation of a proposed world constitution based upon the principles of peace through justice with both social rights and civil rights for all peoples * * *" I understand this refers to the world constitution plan developed at the University of Chicago.

It is difficult to see how a general conference to establish a world government could serve a useful purpose unless (a) the United States Government were prepared to propose a plan with the conviction that the American people would support it, and (b) there already existed a substantial agreement among the great powers. A general international conference usually confirms such great power agreement rather than constituting the initial diplomatic move.

The resolution also provides that, if the general conference is not called within 1 year, the President should call a world constitutional convention of delegates elected directly by the people. It is doubtful that governments which failed to agree to the general conference would be willing to arrange for the elections contemplated. Furthermore, in a large number of countries, free elections do not exist.

The Department must oppose passage of this resolution.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I have no questions.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I have just one idea in regard to any kind of a move for world government. You have two conflicting techniques for control of the world in the world today. The United Nations may represent one, which is a union in a sense of free independent entities. The other is technique of world domination—the technique which Hitler dreamed of or the technique which Napoleon dreamed of or the technique in which world revolution implies, and which the Communists in a political sense are trying to carry out everywhere.

Now I am not going to appear as an advocate for Resolution 66, but do think we ought to at least say for these gentlemen who worked for long at the University of Chicago that they have put forth a type of scheme which can be worked out in a democratic way to stand in the way of a Hitler or the world revolution as it is practiced on the communistic scale today.

The basis of the political aspects of the present communistic movement is that it hopes to hold the world confined to a single-will idea. The University of Chicago's scheme, if it could come into fruition, would at least give us world government which is based upon the theory, of many wills operating in the way in which many wills operate in our own Government or in democracies anywhere. If the great world problem is the problem of the atomic bomb plus a single will this results, of course, in the destruction of everything that we as a democracy hold dear, freedom of speech, freedom to think, freedom to inspire. All of those things go; the four great freedoms go, of course, as soon as you have a single will.

We ought not to dismiss this resolution with just so many words. I think you ought to say about this resolution what you said about the others, that it should be studied, that its weaknesses should be learned, that the shortcomings of our own Government with relation to the fundamental thesis should be definitely understood.

Mr. HICKERSON. I fully agree with you, Senator. Much of what I said about Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, of course, applies

to this University of Chicago plan. I understand and appreciate the public spirited motives that were back of that study, and what I said about further development and study, of course, applies with equal force to this particular study.

D. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Pros and Cons, 1950

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 66 (THE TAYLOR OR "WORLD CONSTITUTION" RESOLUTION)

A. Essential of resolution

This resolution, in the words of Senator Taylor, calls for the Charter of the United Nations to "be changed to provide a true world government constitution. * * * preferably one such as that drafted by the Committee to Draft a World Constitution. * * * Such a change could be made by calling a general conference as provided for in article 109" of the charter and "if that cannot be done under present conditions" then "a world constitutional convention of delegates" elected directly by the people should be called by the President "for the purpose of adopting a world government constitution."

With reference to the power which such a world government should have, Senator Taylor said:

We would have to sacrifice considerable sovereignty to the world organization to enable them to levy taxes in their own right * * * to raise sufficient armed forces to keep the peace in the world * * * If the Russians didn't come into this proposed world government, then naturally a police force would have to be just about as big, probably, or maybe bigger, than the present armed forces of the western nations (hearings, p. 318).

While the pending resolution does not spell out details of a constitution for the proposed world government, it is clear from the statements of supporters of the resolution that they have in mind a constitution such as the preliminary draft constitution of the Committee to Frame a World Constitution. This proposed constitution, according to its drafters, grew out of the -

common feeling of [members] that plans of international atomic control would not be feasible * * * except in the frame of a world federal government with power extending to all fields of universal relevance for the maintenance of peace and for the promotion of justice * * * (hearings p. 330).

While the committee which prepared the draft constitution recognized that "the 'conceivable circumstances' for the rise of a world republic are not at hand," the pending resolution would, if approved, advise the President, of the sense of Congress that he should "immediately take the initiative" in action designed to establish "a true world government."

The draft world constitution would endow the world government with authority to enact laws to preserve the peace, to issue money and control credit, to regulate commerce affecting world federal interest, condemn by eminent domain, to settle conflicts among component parts of the world state, to make final decisions on boundary changes among component states, to administer immature territories, etc.

It is not essential for the purposes of this report to analyze the draft constitution further since the resolution calls merely for a convention to consider a constitution along the line of that proposed. (For the full text of the draft constitution see: Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, May 4, 1948, at p. 485.)

B. Principal arguments in support of resolution

(See hearing, p. 318 and following.)

1. "Only a true world government can achieve everlasting peace," said Senator Taylor. That is what this resolution envisaged. Anything less than world government would be merely a stopgap.
2. Atomic control is not conceivable and feasible except in the frame of a world federal government with power extended to all fields of universal relevance for the maintenance of peace.

3. The west has not met the point –

Which Russia has persistently made, namely, that Russia does not choose to surrender any organ and function of her national sovereignty to allegedly supernational organizations, atomic or other, whose management she thinks is constitutionally in the hands of an automatic anti-Russian majority (hearing, p. 332)

The proposed world constitution is so –

Checked and balanced as to make, under any foreseeable circumstances, the building of any automatic majority impossible.

4. A true world government proposal would be such that if Russia refuses to join –

Her refusal must be unequivocally wrong, so as to align the vast majority of mankind with the world – government builders until the Russian people join (hearings, p. 333).

C. Principal arguments against resolution

(See hearings, p. 460 and following.)

1. The Department of State –

cannot support world federation as an objective of United States foreign policy (hearings, p. 460).

This position was taken because it was –

difficult to see how a general conference to establish a world government could serve a useful purpose unless (a) the United States Government were prepared to propose a plan with the conviction that the American people would support it, and (b) there already existed a substantial agreement among the great powers:

The Department of State felt that both elements were lacking.

2. Differences in political tradition, economies, literacy, and language make it questionable whether there is a common ground on which a workable world federation could be established. General agreement on fundamental laws and

institutions patterned along democratic lines would seem essential.

3. Most of the arguments against Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, the World Federalist resolution, are equally applicable to Senate Concurrent Resolution 66.
4. Unless there were reasonable assurances that a world constitutional convention would emerge with an instrument likely to be accepted by the majority of the states of the world (a situation deemed unlikely by opponents of this resolution), the calling and failure of such a convention would do more to delay the ultimate establishment of world order than a slower more realistic approach.
5. It would be most difficult, if not impossible, to formulate a basis of representation for the legislative body of a world federation. While the draft world constitution proposes a method of apportioning seats to the world legislature based upon population (1 delegate for each million of population or fraction thereof above one-half million, with the proviso that extant sovereign states with populations of 100,000 to 1,000,000 shall be entitled to elect 1 delegate), it has been pointed out that this method would give overwhelming power to the have-not nations as contrasted with the nations with industrial productivity and wealth.
6. In summary, it may be said that the opponents of Senate Concurrent Resolution 66 believe that it is impractical, visionary, and not cut to the pattern of the world in which we live.

Exhibit 3—The World Federalist Resolution

Senate, Revision of the United Nations Charter, Hearings,
Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, 1950

Senate, Revision of the United Nations Charter, Report, Resolutions
Relative to Revision of the United Nations Charter, Atlantic Union,
World Federation, and Similar Proposals, 1950

A. World Federalist Resolution, SCR 57, 1950

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives Concurring),
That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be the
fundamental objective of the United States to support and to
strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a
world federation open to all nations with defined and limited
powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through
the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law.

B. Statement of Alan Cranston, President, United World Federalists

ALAN CRANSTON: General McArthur was recently asked
what world war III will be like—if we let it come. The general
replied by telling a story of two quarreling members of the French
Army who wanted permission to have a duel. Their commanding
officer said he would authorize the duel provided he could
prescribe the weapons and state the distance at which they would
be used. Agreed.

"Fine," said the C.O. "The weapons will be pistols. You will
stand at arm's length, each holding your pistol upon the other's
heart. You will fire when I give the signal."

There was no duel.

General McArthur suggests that we have no world war III.

Any nation choosing to unloose the most terrible weapons
upon its foes will, of course, justify its course henceforth by citing

the precedent established by the United States at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Certainly, the war plans of the United States and presumably those of the U.S.S.R., are based upon offensive and defensive calculations involving the plutonium and hydrogen bombs. There is also reason to believe that nations are now prepared to unleash a bacteriological weapon capable of destroying all warm-blooded life in a chosen area, and, yet, of leaving the area safe to occupy after the 12 hours it takes to disappear—with no lingering danger of contagion, no lethal radioactivity, no destruction of property.

Even short of the actual outbreak of war, the results of the present course, if long pursued, will be catastrophic.

COST OF WORLD WAR II

Secretary of the Army Gray estimates that the final cost of World War II to the United States alone will be \$1,404,000,000,000.

Total tax collections now exceed the wartime peak—approximately, \$55,000,000,000 this year as against only \$52,500,000,000 in 1945. Seventy-five percent of our present Federal tax dollar is earmarked to pay for past wars and prepare-for future ones. We are adding some 55,300,000,000 to the deficit in the current fiscal year and President Truman proposes that we add another \$5,133,000,000 to the deficit in the coming fiscal year.

This is only the beginning. We are engaged on a capacity arms race, seeking, to maintain power superior to that of the Soviet Union. In the effort to stay ahead, we may well find ourselves compelled to devote a great many billion more to military purposes in the fateful years ahead.

Lenin once said: "We shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

Will the greatest arms race in the history of the world culminate in the fulfillment of the prediction of the Soviet leader?

The cost of the present course need not be measured by the dollar sign alone. As we move toward total preparedness, our traditional liberties shrink and shrivel in the stifling atmosphere of a

frightened world. The right of the individual to know the facts and to participate in determining appropriate action diminishes. More and more swift and secret decisions are made by fewer and fewer men.

The Committee for Economic Development, in a recent report entitled "National Security and Our Individual Freedom," representing the considered thinking of many of the Nation's top businessmen, declared:

"Though adequate security is essential to protect our freedoms, the program aimed at security raises new threats to our freedoms and to our way of life. Under it there has been a great increase in the role of the military in our government, a great increase in bureaucracy, and expanding dominance of government over industry and an increasing interference with individual freedoms.

"Public apathy and the pressure for security can lead us along a dangerous road—a road that ends in what has aptly been called a garrison-police state.

"In a garrison-police state, the soldier and political policeman rise to power while the institutions of civilian society and of freedom shrink. In the name of security, channels of public information dry up; the press becomes a mere purveyor of official hand-outs. Cut off from significant information, editors, commentators, and group leaders become less accurate in their judgments. The process of public discussion atrophies. Political parties decline. The power of Congress dwindles. Administration by civilians shrinks, relative to the administration in uniform. The courts weaken. Cut off from information, the power of the citizens fades. Local plans are subordinated to central purposes. The free market is constricted. Labor is hedged in by special regulations. Consumers find their range of choice reduced. Decisions come to be made by an all-powerful government. All freedoms suffer."

All this would be quite endurable if it seemed likely to lead to the end we seek: peace and a new birth of freedom.

All history cries out to the contrary.

All previous arms races in the history of the world have

ended not in peace but in war.

Plainly, the present course lends to war, bankruptcy, or both.

And will anyone declare that war is the most effective way to deal with communism?

In World War I, communism found its first home—in Russia.

In World War II, the hammer and sickle spread across eastern Europe and much of Asia.

In World War III, we might well destroy the Kremlin, Moscow, and the entire Soviet structure, and yet fail to destroy the ideology of communism.

World War III—if it comes—will leave in its wake the chaos, hunger, misery, and degradation in which communism flourishes.

War is irrational, and cannot be relied upon to produce a rational result. It is true that the United States and her allies achieved their main purpose in World War II—the destruction of the regimes of Hitler and the Japanese war lords.

Yet 5 years after the end of hostilities, the United States and the Soviet Union—mighty allies in World War II—busily prepare to destroy each other in World War III. Germany, the enemy destroyed in war, is being rebuilt by each as a potential ally in World War III. The United States rebuilds Japan alone. China saved in war by the United States joins the Russian camp.

Our times resemble the era of which Tacitus wrote:

"Rent with seditions, gloomy with wars, and savage in its very hours of pence."

WAR NOT EFFECTIVE IN DEALING WITH COMMUNISM

If we of the democracies fail to devise a weapon other than war for dealing with communism, and finally drift to the catastrophe of conflict, we shall have demonstrated to all mankind the political bankruptcy of the Western World.

Let me emphasize two points:

1. The United World Federalists are not sympathetic to

communism in any way. UWF has adopted the following resolution applying to Communist membership in our organization:

"UWF recognizes that world government must bring together under a rule of law peoples of various ideologies throughout the world. However, as a United States organization, UWF will not knowingly admit or continue as members persons who seek to overthrow the government of, or, in the interests of a foreign power, seek to weaken the United States, or to change its form of government by other than constitutional means."

UWF firmly believes that the most effective way to work toward world law is not by revolutionary processes but through existing structures of government.

This is in deep contrast to the secret and subversive strategy of the Communists, who are notorious for their advocacy of force and violence and extralegal means to gain their ends.

WORLD FEDERATION ALTERNATIVE TO FORCE

The whole purpose of UWF is to achieve an alternative to the use of force and violence by establishing constitutional means of settling the problems of civilized man.

We believe that war can be abolished and our great American heritage of freedom can be preserved only by extending to the world the rule of law and justice—under the kind of federal legal order proven by our own experience to be the best guardian of the inalienable rights of man.

The soviet Government is highly critical of UWF. Moscow recently referred to Cord Meyer, Jr., my predecessor as president of UWF, as the "fig leaf of American imperialism."

2. UWF does not propose that the United States disarm unless and until there are effective guaranties that all nations disarm with us. We recognize that the United States must be prepared to resist aggression as long ns the threat of aggression exists. We do not quarrel with the present preparedness program.

We simply refuse to surrender, abjectly and totally, to the tides of the arms race.

We refuse to accept the inevitability of war.

We believe that genuine peace is conceivable.

We believe that the main—the only—hope lies in the announced objective of United States foreign policy: To develop the United Nations to the point where we can rely upon it for peace and security.

Since the UN was established in 1945, however, we have been unable to place main reliance upon the UN for security.

We are spending in the current fiscal year, approximately \$15,000.000.000 for direct military purposes. In the same year, we are spending only \$16,076.000 as our share of the UN budget—only one one-thousandth of our direct military expenses, and considerably less than New York City spends annually to dispose of its garbage. The comparison of the two investments demonstrates that we do not really rely upon the UN for security.

Moreover, the Atlantic Pact and the Marshall plan, two of the great keystones of our foreign policy, are conducted outside the UN.

UN CANNOT ENFORCE PEACE

The United States, and all the other nations engaged in the arms race, know that the UN lacks the authority to enforce the peace.

Sir Carl Berendsen, New Zealand Ambassador to the United States, who has served as their representative upon the Security Council, once analyzed at a UWF convention the sterilizing effect of the veto.

He pointed out that the Security Council cannot take action against a great power, because it can use the veto to prevent it.

He pointed out that the Security Council cannot take action against a small power supported by a great power, because, again, the great power can use the veto to prevent it.

Well, asked Sir Carl, when can the Security Council act forcibly to prevent conflict?

It can act, he replied, only against a small nation not

supported by a great nation.

It is quite plain that the peace of the world is not primarily threatened by small nations not supported by great nations.

If we are to achieve the announced objective of the United States by developing the UN to the point where we can depend upon it for peace, what is required?

A principal requirement is that the laws of the strengthened UN must apply to all nations and all individuals. History offers abundant proof of the fact that there can be no security in any community, of any size, if anyone in it is above, beyond, or outside the law. In all communities where law and order exists—in other words, where people live in peace every individual lives under the law from the day of his birth or from the moment he enters the community. No nation will dare be bound by laws of disarmament until all are bound. Plainly, neither the United States nor any group of nations can safely disarm as long as any nation remains free to arm.

The arms race cannot be halted until all contestants in it are brought under equal control.

The UN must become universal. Everyone on earth must be in it. Everyone must stay in. There can be no withdrawal. If any nation were allowed to secede the world would again face an arms race.

UWF urges that this universal UN be given the increased authority necessary to enable it to prevent war and assure a peaceful world order.

We believe that something more is required than the mere lodging of power to conduct and control disarmament in a special commission established under the supervision of one or another of the organs of the UN as it is now constituted.

We believe that it would be folly to entrust the Security Council alone with the task of administering and insuring disarmament—even if the veto were abolished.

The Security Council represents only 11 of the several score of nations of the world. It would scarcely be democratic to request that all but six of the smaller powers vest such vast authority in a

body in which most of them would have no voice.

Furthermore, the United States could be outvoted 10 to 1 in a veto-free Security Council.

UWF does not believe that the people of the United States should or would be willing to entrust their security to the Security Council upon such a basis of representation. We doubt that the Soviet Union—or any other great power—would be willing to do so, even if the United States would.

We believe that if the UN is to become it trustworthy organ for the preservation of peace, it must be revised in such a way as to become representative in a fair and realistic way of all nations and all peoples. Its heart must be a representative body to write the common rules, but it must also have an executive to insure effective administration and enforcement of the laws and a system of courts to guarantee justice.

Without this trinity—it legislature, executive, and a judiciary—and without all possible checks and balances operating in, and between, them, no government call be anything but a tyranny.

It would endanger all that is cherished by the people of the United States and all free people everywhere if the UN were granted binding lawmaking authority under any other conditions.

There is abundant evidence that the people of the United States and of a very great many other lands desire a UN empowered to control the hydrogen bomb and other great weapons, and to keep the peace.

What guaranty would there be that the powers of a strengthened UN would be limited to these great and compelling purposes!

What would prevent the UN from rapidly expanding its powers?

Once all nations were in it, might it not proceed to dictate and dominate the day-to-day lives of all of us? To avoid this, the powers delegated would have to be carefully defined and written into the revised Charter itself.

AMENDMENT OF STRENGTHENED UN

It is obvious, on the other hand, that some method of amendment must be provided to prevent the strengthened UN from freezing into an unworkable framework.

The UN must be permitted to develop in accordance with the demands of future history. Yet, if the amendment procedure is too easy, the nations would justly fear that the UN might soon be transformed turn something altogether different from the original structure which formed the basis of their willingness to participate.

The United States would fear that impoverished nations might put over an amendment empowering the UN to seize our resources and wealth and distribute them to all people everywhere.

The USSR would fear that the UN might be granted power to control or alter the Soviet economy.

The new-born nations of Asia—India, Pakistan, the United States of Indonesia, and many more—tasting freedom at long last after centuries of struggle, would fear that the UN might proceed to rob them of their hard-won right of self-determination.

The problem is to provide an amendment procedure that is tight, yet not too tight. This is plainly a great test for statesmanship. As an illustration of how this problem might be met, a procedure somewhat like that in our own Constitution could be utilized. This would require adoption of a proposed amendment by majority vote of the UN's legislature, with the amendment actually going into effect only after being ratified by an overwhelming majority of the nations. It might well be that amendments affecting specific matters deemed of the most vital interest to one or another of the great nations, and minted in the Charter, would be forbidden mail approved by that nation—as the United States Constitution provides that no State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate without its own consent.

Such safeguards, however, would dispose of only one facet of the fears each nation will inevitably entertain as it considers strengthened UN.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO UN

How extensive must the original grant of powers be?

What would prevent a strengthened UN front becoming the instrument of a tyrant?

The main powers rested at the outset in the revised UN would, of course, deal with disarmament and weapon control.

A POLICE FORCE

The aim would be to set up world inspection and police forces whose creation would permit the abolition of all national military forces and armaments. Nations would then retain for internal policing—for the preservation of domestic tranquility—only authorized local municipal police forces such as those of our own towns and cities, small State police, and national units such as the FBI and the Secret Service.

As the nations disarmed—and no nation would disarm unless all others did simultaneously—it would be necessary to build up the world inspection and police forces concurrently, under separate commands, and under civilian control.

The threat of invasion or rebellion would still exist, if there were no world inspectors and police. Wars and invasions were carried out for centuries by hordes armed with swords, spears, crossbows, and the like. There is no way to guarantee absolutely against the launching of such incursions or uprisings unless an appropriate world force is available to suppress them promptly. It would be prepared also to prevent a nation from using its internal police forces for external purposes of aggression.

It would again require the greatest statesmanship to establish a world force at once strong enough to provide security to the disarmed nations, and yet not so strong as to impose a tyranny upon the world. It would be necessary to surround the armed force with safeguards insuring against improper use or seizure by a would-be tyrant. Many suggestions have been offered, but the problem is basically one for the best military minds, insofar as

disposition, equipment, and command is concerned, and for statesmen, insofar as civilian control is concerned.

One suggestion is that there should be no national contingents—the units would be thoroughly mixed as to nationality, making it impossible for a national group to seize any major part of it. The world police force would be so small that no draft would be necessary. Recruitment would be entirely voluntary.

Applicants should be selected with utmost care in respect to character and loyalty to the idea of world peace. They should be very well paid, provided with excellent living conditions, and guaranteed adequate security on retirement. The result would be (a) there would be many more applicants than places available, and (b) the members of the forces would be happy, contented, and not susceptible to the wiles of provocateurs.

Even with an infinite number of ingenious safeguards concerning the nature, disposition, command, and control of the world police force, the success or failure of the strengthened UN, and the acceptability of the proposals for its revision will finally depend in great part upon the wisdom guiding the creation of its political structure and authority. The heart of the strengthened UN will lie in its legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

REPRESENTATION IN WORLD ASSEMBLY

The present General Assembly of the United Nations is often spoken of as the beginning of a world legislature—the first step toward Tennyson's dream of a "parliament of man."

It functions now upon the basis of one vote for each nation. Iceland, with a population of 140,000 has equal voting power with the United States, with 150,000,000 citizens. Iceland and Luxemburg, with 430,000 between them, can outvote China's 400,000,000 people 2 to 1. 150,000,000 people south of the Rio Grande have 20 votes; 163,000,000 people north of the Rio Grande have 2 votes.

It is not conceivable that the great nations will be willing to permit any fundamental increase in the authority of the General

Assembly, without insisting that it be reconstituted upon a basis of representation reflecting more accurately the realities of power and influence in the world, just as certain of the inhabitants of George Orwell's fabled *Animal Farm* insisted upon amending the basic clause in their constitution which read, "All animals are created equal." They insisted upon adding an amendment stating, "but some animals are more equal than others."

Many factors have been suggested as the proper basis for representation. Nearly all proposals include population as the key factor, for, if the General Assembly is to be in any sense democratic, great importance must be placed upon the human factor. Some have suggested, however, that industrial capacity should be used as a factor in determining representation as is done in the International Labor Organization. Some have suggested including the monetary contribution of each nation, as in the World Bank. Regional formulas are widely supported; this factor is already considered by the UN in the election of members to the Security Council.

The United World Federalists have gone on record as favoring a form of balanced representation, declaring: "Representation in the legislative body should be determined upon a just formula recognizing all relevant factors such as population, economic development, educational level, and others, each representative to vote as an individual." The effect of such a system would be to translate the present realities of power and influence in the world—employed now in power politics and war—into voting strength. The present ability of any nation to have its way in the world would be neither diminished nor decreased. All would gain, however, if decisions were reached by ballot rather than by bomb.

Gen. Carlos Romulo, of the Philippines, President of the General Assembly of the UN, has answered those who suggest that the small nations might oppose a revision that would deprive them of their present equal voting rights in that body. He told the Assembly on November 16, 1946:

"As a spokesman for a small nation, I want to make it very plain that my nation, for one—and I am sure I speak the sentiments of many more—would be very happy indeed to trade the fiction of

equality in a powerless Assembly for the reality of a vote equal to our position in the world in an Assembly endowed with real power."

There would, of course, have to be a provision for periodic adjustments of the representation accorded to the various nations as representation in our own House of Representatives is adjusted every 10 years.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NEEDS LEGISLATIVE POWER

The present General Assembly does not possess legislative power. It exercised what many interpret to be quasi-legislative authority in the case of the disposition of Italian colonies, when the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, anti agreed in advance to accept as binding the decision of the General Assembly. Ethiopia, however, has now refused to recognize the decision. The General Assembly plainly must possess the power to write enforceable laws of certain clearly defined classifications if it is to exercise the authority requisite to the preservation of peace. To make a grant of such authority acceptable to the nations of the world, careful limitations and restrictions on the legislative power are mandatory.

The expansion of authority would of necessity be "federal" in form in the sense that that word means that all powers not specifically delegated to the UN should be reserved to the member nations as provided in our own United States Constitution.

AUTHORITY FOR ASSEMBLY TO TAX

In addition to granting the Assembly the authority required to provide for disarmament to be enforced by a world police force, it would need an adequate but strictly limited power to tax. No government can exist without the power to raise sufficient funds to sustain its functions, for it cannot survive on the basis of voluntary hand-outs from its members. It is plain that the voluntary contributions from member nations relied upon to produce the

\$40,000,000 comprising the budget of the present UN could not be depended upon to raise this larger sum. A dependable tax procedure would be necessary. Yet the suggestion that the UN be given taxation power might well lead to great outbursts of horror in the United States, where we possess nearly 50 percent of the present wealth of the world—unless the tax power was explicitly defined and very carefully limited.

The annual cost of a UN empowered to enforce the peace would undoubtedly run to several billion dollars—but it would amount to far less than the cost of the present arms race. A strengthened UN, keeping the peace and ending the arms race, would mean not higher taxes but a sharp reduction in taxes here and in every other land.

Two basic types of tax program for the UN have thus far been proposed. One confines the taxing power to "international transactions" such as international mail: cables, air, rail, and steamship tickets, and purchase and sale of goods. It would forbid any direct taxation inside any nation.

The other type, suggested by Grenville Clark, noted lawyer and vice president of UWF, who is at present drafting proposed detailed amendments to the UN Charter indicating how it could be transformed into a limited world federation, would permit direct national taxation. However, a provision would be written into the Charter prohibiting the UN from raising taxes within any nation in excess of 2 percent of its annual national income.

The limits and techniques of the taxing power might well be written into the Charter in the form of constitutional limitations not amendable without unanimous consent. The UN should be prohibited from levying any taxes except those specifically authorized.

BILL OF HUMAN RIGHTS

A bill of human rights would have to be an integral part of the Charter in order to protect individuals and nations against improper actions by the UN. This would not authorize the UN to

interfere in any way in the domestic matters of the member nations. It would not protect individuals against the actions of their own governments; but it would protect everyone on earth against any improper exercise of power by any organ of the United Nations.

The present Declaration of Human Rights of the UN would, of course, remain. However, the revised UN would have no more power than the present structure to enforce the provisions or the Declaration except where the separate nations specifically agree.

Executive authority in the strengthened UN would logically be lodged in a revised and veto-free Security Council responsible to the Assembly. Its primary function would be to insure compliance with the Charter and the laws enacted thereunder by the General Assembly. It should be placed under appropriate restraints to be exercised by the Assembly—to prevent the development of an all-powerful and tyrannous executive.

STRENGTHENED INTERNATIONAL COURT

The present International Court of Justice lacks compulsory jurisdiction. This makes it an entirely unsatisfactory organ of justice, for there must be an interpreting body if there is to be any semblance of order and justice in any community. At present no international body is empowered to interpret the Charter and order enforcement of UN decisions. Each nation is free to seek to interpret it for itself, and the Security Council, the General Assembly, and the Little Assembly have suggested different and conflicting interpretations of certain articles, thereby adding to the confusion.

The International Court of Justice must be given the authority to interpret the Charter. It must be given compulsory jurisdiction in cases involving legal questions. The disputants must be fully bound by the judgment of the Court.

Finally, the rule of law and the powers of the Court must apply directly to individuals, not just to nations. At present the ability of the UN to dispense true justice is rendered impotent because it can deal only with what Justice Jackson, in his great speech of indictment at Nurnberg, termed "that fictional being—the

state—which cannot be produced for trial, cannot plead, cannot testify, and cannot be sentenced."

The lack of any final authority to hand down and enforce decisions in all types of disputes would not mean that the revised UN could not therefore prevent war from arising out of such disputes.

The UN would always possess full authority to deal with violence. It would be vested with plenary power to prevent any nation involved in a dispute from resorting to a warlike solution. The world police force would act to prevent any solution by force of arms.

It is the deep conviction of the many thousands of Americans who have joined together in UWP that the UN must be revised and expanded along these lines if it is to be able to deal forcefully with the problem of peace.

We believe that nothing less can at the same time both end the arms race and preserve our freedom.

We believe that nothing less can implement the avowed purpose of the United States to achieve disarmament and control of great weapons.

I want to stress, however, that the 22 Senators sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 56—and the 112 Representatives sponsoring an identical measure in the House—are not committed to any particular formula.

This resolution lays down no precise blueprint.

It demands no immediate action by our Government, nor does it present any timetable. Tactics and strategy of implementation are not even suggested in the resolution. It simply declares a great purpose.

Adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 would, in a sense, be a fulfillment of American destiny. It would be a declaration that we offer something more to the world than an arms race, something more than a negative and leaky policy of containment, something more than a mere effort to purchase security with American dollars.

It would announce our willingness to join with the people of

the world in creating the institutions necessary to a world-wide realization of the American dream of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It would be an affirmation of American faith in the UN—as the UN is today and as it might be tomorrow.

It would signal to the world that this country intends to use the UN to the maximum degree possible. It would announce that we will do all that we can to strengthen the UN by using its present structure and by strengthening that structure as soon as we can.

It would be a recognition of the very great accomplishments of the UN in its less than 5 years of existence—of the peace that it has maintained in various parts of the world through its moral strength and its skillful mediation, and of the great progress it has made in health, education, trade, and many other vital matters.

The fact is that the advocacy of a strong UN must be viewed as a part of a complete foreign policy, having as its aim the greatest possible use and development of the international machinery available in the UN for the solution of all problems between nations.

UWF has deemed it a necessary and vital part of its advocacy of a strengthened and universal UN simultaneously to work in behalf of immediately available measures, such as a multilateral and effective point 4, the UN Participation Act, the UN ceiling legislation, and similar matters.

SPECIFIC STEPS TO STRENGTHEN UN

I believe that at present such steps as the following might be taken to make the UN under its present Charter a more effective instrument.

1. Elimination of the reservations made by the United States to its acceptance of the International Court of Justice, and acceptance by all states of compulsory jurisdiction.

2. Passage of appropriate legislation to facilitate the provision of independent sources of revenue for the UN in addition to the revenue provided by contributions made by members.

3. Support for the principles of the UN Charter respecting fundamental freedoms.

4. Preparation by the International Law Commission of the UN of an international criminal code and of a statute for an international criminal court. All this, of course, points in the direction of a stronger UN.

The plain fact is that the creation of some sort of world government is inevitable.

The world has been moving toward some form of world-wide political institution ever since man stood up on his hind feet and began to walk. The areas governed have grown steadily larger, commencing with the family, through the tribe, to the village, then the state, and now to the nation as we know it.

Plainly the world has shrunk so small, with transportation so rapid, with methods of destruction so violent, that it cannot long continue as a jungle of anarchistic sovereign nations.

The only real questions are:

When will world government come, and what will it be like?

Will it come before World War III, in time to prevent it?

And will it be a dictatorship, or will it be a federation in the democratic tradition?

To put it in a sentence, will it come by conquest—or by consent?

It is up to us.

We can wait for a new Hitler—armed with weapons the Nazis luckily lacked—to succeed someday in conquering the free world.

Or we can set about building a world political structure capable of preventing aggression.

History will not wait.

Either we must act—of our own free will—or others will act to fill the present void with a world tyranny. ~

C. State Department Comment of SCR 56, Testimony of the Under Secretary of State John D. Hickerson

STATE DEPARTMENT CANNOT SUPPORT
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

But for the reasons given we cannot support this resolution.
Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. There was one question brought up in the discussion of this resolution which impressed, I think, all of us a great deal, and that had to do with the substitution of the rule of law for the rule of force in determining international difficulties. Now, the advocates of this approach argue that unless you look forward, at least, to some sort of a world organization and the development of some kind of world law, you will never get to the place where the rule of law will govern the affairs of men. You will still have the rule of contest and force. That is the main line that struck me as the most impressive argument advanced for this particular proposal.

Do you take the position today that we must postpone the immediate goal, at least, of world law in the place of force? Do you think it is so out of reach, that we ought not even think in terms of it in the future?

Mr. HICKERSON. By no means do I think that, Senator. I think we should debate these measures, we should promote the widest public understanding of these measures, and I think that of course we should work toward some kind of world law. We must feel our way very cautiously, Senator, in this thing. We must recognize that since the beginning of organized society the best thought in every community has tended to be in terms of some collective system of security and some system of world law. But we must recognize the difficulties in the way.

I feel very strongly that we should continue to study, to endeavor to understand the issues involved and to explore ways and means under the Charter of the United Nations of working toward that objective.

I do feel very strong that setting our sights on and setting forth the objective of world federation is not the way to achieve that.

WORLD FEDERATION OR ORDER

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. The suggestion was made by someone, I forget who it was, in the discussion of this resolution, that if the expression in this resolution were changed from "world federation" to "world order," it might be more acceptable as an expression of an over-all ultimate goal. What is your opinion?

Mr. HICKERSON. I personally think, sir, that it would. I would still have misgivings about the advisability of passing a resolution of this sort at this time. I repeat, I think that the issues raised by this should be debated. I think that there should be the widest understanding of them and discussion of them. But I have doubts as to the advisability of passing even the amended resolution which you suggested, sir, even though that to me is an improvement.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I wanted to make it clear that I did not suggest that. It was suggested by someone at the hearing, and I am just trying to be sure we explore all of the suggestions that have come to us.

NEED FOR CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Of course, the thing that has precipitated this has been the terrible comprehension of people because of, first, the atomic bomb, and now the so-called H-bomb. They wonder whether we are going to have me to wait for anything. I realize that the world federation idea would be a long-drawn-out affair and it would not meet that immediate issue, but the people that are advocating this and all these other are concerned. I think Senator Thomas said a little earlier day they are concerned that something be done in the light of this critical situation.

How do you feel we can deal with the H-bomb proposition? Do you think we should go on pressing for the Baruch plan, for example, or the control of atomic energy, and how H-bomb energy, or how are we going to deal with that – just go on pressing that particular approach or trying something different?

Mr. HICKERSON. Senator Smith, I can understand, of course, that comprehension. All of us share it. We would like to do

something. But we must bear in mind that if this subcommittee reported that particular resolution, or any particular resolution, let's say this one, and the Senate unanimously approved it and every country in the world agreed to join this world federation, and if by some magic it could be done in the next 3 weeks, we still would not have the solution to the bomb.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with that.

Mr. HICKERSON. It would not solve that.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with that. As I said, this world federation idea is too far ahead of us to deal with the immediate crisis. I was leaving that and trying to see how you are thinking in terms of the immediate crisis and what you can do.

Mr. HICKERSON. As to your question on the control of atomic energy, I can say to you, sir, that all of us who have done any work on the subject have reached the conclusion that the so-called Baruch plan-it should be called, I think, in fairness to the other countries who made their contribution, the United Nations plan of control-would work. Mr. Baruch made proposals of a United States plan. They, you will recall, were discussed for a period of 2 years in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. Numerous changes were made in those proposals. To the extent that they represented improvements, the representatives of the United States were happy to concur in the changes. And what came out of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission was indeed a United Nations plan of control. That plan was debated at the General Assembly meeting in Paris in 1948, and by a vote of 40 to 6 was approved. The Soviet Union and those countries voting with the Soviet Union alone opposed it.

It is a good plan, Senator. I repeat, all of us who worked on the subject of atomic energy are convinced that it would work.

In the discussions since Paris, the Russians have declined to accept it, and not only have done that but have themselves advanced no alternative proposals of their own. In the discussions during the General Assembly last year in New York, the General Assembly by a vote of 49 to 5, this time Yugoslavia deserting the Soviet Union and abstaining from voting, voted to reaffirm the

principles of this. United Nations plan of control. They called upon the six permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the five permanent members of the Security Council plus Canada, to continue the consultations which had been in process since last August in an effort to find a basis for agreement. They called upon the six permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission to examine all concrete proposals that had been advanced during the General Assembly and elsewhere, to explore all avenues in an honest, sincere effort to find a basis for agreement.

Immediately after the ending of the General Assembly session the six permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission resumed their consultations. On January 19, 1950, the Soviet representatives in those consultations, at the beginning of the meeting, stated that he could not sit in these consultations with the representative of the Nationalist Government of China. He thereupon walked out, and no meetings have been held since that time.

We think that in that action over a wholly extraneous and irrelevant issue that had nothing to do with atomic energy the Soviet Union showed scant respect for the will of the General Assembly, who called upon us to try to reach a solution of this problem. We have been discussing ways and means of bridging this gap and breaking this impasse. Our position, sir, as stated by the President and the Secretary of State, is that we think the United Nations plan of control of atomic energy and prohibition of atomic weapons would work. We support it and we will continue to support it unless and until a better or equally effective plan is achieved. We do not think that human ingenuity was necessarily exhausted in that plan, and we are prepared to consider any proposals designed or calculated to produce a better or equally effective plan.

The Russians say they won't take it. They have made no new proposals, and there we are, sir. In those circumstances, what do we do? We simply, so far as we are concerned, are prepared to continue in these consultations of the six permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission, earnestly to continue, our efforts to find a

basis for solution. We think it would betray ourselves and world security if we adopted proposals just for the sake of an agreement which our judgment tells us would be ineffective. And that is a description of the Soviet proposals to date. They fall far short of providing the necessary safeguards.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to get that in the record just as you have stated it and as you have analyzed it. I gather that the net result of your discussion is that so far as this atomic crisis is concerned, with the H-bomb and everything else concerned with it, these terrible weapons of destruction, there is nothing in any of the proposals that have come before this committee that would come as close to meeting it as the particular proposals you are considering in the UN, a so-called UN plan built on the original Baruch proposal.

Mr. HICKERSON. That is correct. The only place that agreement can be achieved on this problem is among the interested states. The interested states are sitting, or were sitting until the Soviets walked out on us, in those consultations. It is the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union alone, which is blocking the acceptance of an agreement on atomic energy.

During the last session of the General Assembly, the British representative, in the debate in the plenary session, I believe, made the statement: What a tragedy it was; had the Soviet Union been willing, after reasonable debate in the Atomic Energy Commission, to accept the plan acceptable to everybody else, the plan probably by now would be in force and there would not be an atomic weapon in existence.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. That is assuming, of course-I do not want to get into debate about it-that we could be sure to have a method of inspection that would be watertight.

Mr. HICKERSON. That is correct, sir.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. That is the \$64 issue, as I see it, because even assuming Russia agreed to inspection, as a matter of fact she has violated some of her other agreements, and unless we had a pretty strong method of inspection we would not be sure that in some of those vast wastes of Siberia there might not be violations.

Mr. HICKERSON. That is a tough proposition.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Before you leave, Mr. Hickerson, in defense of the authors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 and also in defense of the State Department's statement, I think we ought to stress, and question, one sentence. I am sure the sponsors of the resolution did not assume that the mere fact that they want to move into a world federation means that they are moving into a vacuum without law and without some semblance of order. But in your statement you seem to imply that that is the State Department's interpretation of the way in which the authors are thinking. "What law and what institutions would govern the world federation?" You could ask that question, of course, as to any type of government that has come into existence. When our own Government came into existence or the United Nations or the League of Nations came into existence, the structure of the Constitution itself could not in any way give respect to the law which was necessary for setting up such structures.

WORLD LAW

Now, I think there is definitely world-community law, whether we recognize it or not. There is definitely an understanding between all of the peoples of the world and all lawmakers of the world that the middle of the ocean is a place without certain jurisdictions. Land area is a place with certain jurisdictions. I think that we can make a case for a great amount of world community law that is existing.

I think the Connally resolution, which you have quoted, states one thing, and that is the fact that the world recognizes independent sovereign states. They have not made any declaration of that recognition, have they? Here you haven't any positive law on it, have you? But it is the basis of all international law. You seem to assume that first we have to get the nations of the world together and create a positive law before we can move into a discussion about a confederation. But your big point here, and I think you have not stressed it enough, is that immediately you move into a world

federation status, you turn your back definitely upon the independent sovereign state idea, which is the law of the world as it exists today. You can go so far as to have an imperium and an imperio, if we may get that highbrow here, because we ourselves think that we have done that. When we had Mr. Justice Roberts before us he said that while he was on the highest Court of the land, the Court's greatest concern was to preserve the entity of the States, and we can see that we haven't destroyed independent states in moving into the United Nations. But when once you move into a federation you limit independent actions in the sphere where you delegate authority to the representative government of that federation to act. That is fundamental political science. These things which you said we haven't got, are here and we have got them.

Consciously, if we decide to have a world federation, consciously if we decide that we will change to a degree-it may be just the degree of half an inch, or it may be a degree of a whole mile, the fundamental law of the world, the notion of independence, of absolute sovereignty of the states of the world, is encroached upon.

Now, as a representative of the State Department, and we as representatives of the United States Government in the Senate, and all of us as representatives of our Government in some way or other, our first allegiance is and must be to the Government of the United States always, or else we destroy what definitely is-it has not been stated, but what definitely is-the law of the community of nations and the world today. If that were understood by all of us we would not call so many of us the bad names that we do, because I myself realize that when we accept the obligation of being an officer or a representative, or one who takes an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States, he enters into a rather serious obligation which must be given consideration at all times.

When I say that, I do not imply that a suggestion made by anyone sponsoring these resolutions is a suggestion which is looking to the destruction of something. It is looking to the building up of something, but at the same time that does not remove the problem.

Mr. HICKERSON. Senator Thomas, I completely agree with

what you have said, sir, and I want to assure you that it was far from our intention to criticize the motives of anybody in connection with this or any other of the resolutions. As to the particular question that you singled out, all we are trying to do there is to say we want further information about the law and institutions-some of these things are spelled out-so that we can agree, so the American people can agree, that this is the goal to which we can aspire.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Hickerson just one more question. There is a Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 66 which was introduced by Senator Taylor, and which is the resolution supporting the so-called Chicago Hutchins plan for a draft of a world constitution. Do I understand that your opposition to Resolution 56, which you have just been discussing, would apply to 66 also, which is just a further extension and elaboration of the world federation idea?

Mr. HICKERSON. That is correct, sir. I have a separate statement on that.

C. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Pros and Cons, 1950

2. SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56 (THE TOBEY OR "WORLD FEDERALIST" RESOLUTION)

A. Essentials of resolution

This resolution declares the sense of Congress that a fundamental objective of United States foreign policy should be (1) "to support and strengthen the United Nations" and (2) "to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

This is either a relatively simple proposal with limited implications or one with vast implications. Whether it is one or the other depends upon the meaning given the words.

In the words of Senator Tobey: "It is a policy statement * * * it is a general statement of purpose * * *"

The details of implementation are left "to the wisdom of the minds of Congress and the United Nations." In answer to a question as to whether the resolution expresses a specific program, Senator Pepper answered that he was committed only to the exact words of the resolution. Senator Magnuson in a statement inserted in the record wrote that the World Federalist proposal—

contemplates a very limited deposit of sovereignty in the United Nations * * * it means that the internal functions of member states would remain untouched (hearings, p. 100).

Senator Morse in testifying in support of the resolution remarked that the resolution—

will at least give assurance that the American people are in favor of the United Nations proceeding in the direction of seeking to enact international law that will be fair and just and usable * * * (hearings, p. 103).

While this resolution was supported by the United World Federalists, Senators testifying in support of the resolution made it clear that they were supporting the resolution as drafted and not the total World Federalist program as set forth in publications of that organization. Mr. Cord Meyer, chairman of the national executive committee of the United World Federalists, gave the following views to the committee. By passing this resolution—

we in the United States would be declaring our willingness to join with other nations in transferring to the UN constitutional authority to administer and enforce law that was binding on national governments and their individual citizens (hearings, p. 121).

A specific definition of the extent of the lawmaking powers would have to wait for thorough consideration of the problem by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government. Mr. Meyer did suggest, however, that the United Nations would need to be given legal authority to prevent the use of force, to control atomic-energy development, to regulate the size and character of national

armed forces, to raise revenue, and to maintain such international police forces as required to enforce this body of law. Subsequently, Mr. Philip W. Amram speaking for the United World Federalists, made it clear that the United Nations should not be given powers, for example, in the "fields of trade, commerce, tariffs, 'currency, immigration, and so forth" (hearings, p. 134).

Mr. Alan Cranston, president of United World Federalists, submitted a statement to the committee pointing out that "there can be no withdrawal" from a strengthened United Nations. He observed, however, that the Senators and Congressmen sponsoring this resolution—

are not committed to any particular formula. This resolution lays down no precise blueprint. It demands no immediate action by our Government, nor does it present any timetable. Tactics and strategy implementation are not even suggested in the resolution. It simply declares a great purpose (hearings, p. 525).

The important thing to bear in mind in considering this resolution is that if it is adopted as a declaration of policy it will presumably require implementation. The committee is aware, of course, that the United World Federalists do leave a fairly concrete program covering such matters as representation in a legislative body, an executive body responsible to the legislative, a judiciary with jurisdiction over individuals as well as states, etc. The committee did not feel that this program was a part of the pending resolution so did not examine in detail the way the UFW would propose the resolution be implemented if passed.

B. Principal arguments in support of resolution

(See hearings, p. 73 and following.)

1. The world situation "calls upon us to propose a policy of an affirmative and courageous nature, that is capable of changing the tide of world opinion from desperate despair, to renewed hope and faith." (Senator Tobey, hearings, p. 74.) "Our policy must have a positive and affirmative answer to the challenge of communism."

(Senator Pepper, hearings, p. 87.) This resolution, it is claimed, would serve those purposes.

2. The burden of an arms race "will not be eased until the United Nations in itself can guarantee the security of all nations" (Senator Magnuson, hearings, p. 100). Movement in the direction of a world federation through the United Nations would be a move toward given the United Nations strength to guarantee peace.

4. Passage of this resolution would be—

another step in the direction of informing the American people that we have to do something about setting up an international judicial system.

Furthermore, it would—

give assurance that the American people are in favor of the United Nations proceeding in the direction of seeking authority to enact international law (Senator Morse, hearings, pp. 102 and 103).

5. This proposal calls for working through the United Nations. It would not destroy the United Nations in the process of seeking a more effective international organization.

6. The resolution calls for an organization open to all nations. It would not, therefore, drive the Soviet Union out of the United Nations or seek to set up a world organization from which the Soviet would be excluded. Even if the Soviet Union should refuse to come into the world federation, the organization would always be open to her. Moreover, it is unlikely that the Soviet Union would find it expedient to stay out of a world federation.

7. Supranational government is the only way to end war and the threat of war. State sovereignty must be curbed. This resolution is the first step in the direction of creating world government with power sufficient to preserve peace.

8. International control over modern weapons of destruction will require limited world federal government. This means that the international government and its courts must have jurisdiction over the individual. This proposal envisages such control.

C. Principal arguments against resolution

(See hearings p. 427 and following.)

1. The constitutional issues posed by this resolution are as fundamental as any the United States has had to deal with since 1789. It is doubtful if the people of the United States have adequately considered or are now ready to place in the hands of others the power to dispose of the manpower and resources of the United States.

2. One may at least question whether a world federation based on democratic principles could prosper in a setting where—

two-thirds of the world's people live on less than adequate diet, one-half are illiterate, and only a minority live under truly democratic governments (hearings, p. 428).

3. If the United States goes into a world federation it will be necessary to compromise its way of life and institutions to some extent because it would be dangerous to assume that other nations would agree without question that the American way of life is best.

4. Questions have been raised as to the form of parliament contemplated, whether the United States representatives would be in a minority, what assurances there would be for the protection of minorities, what changes in the Constitution of the United States would be required etc., thus indicating some doubt as to whether proponents of the resolution had considered the full implications of the proposal.

5. It has been claimed that implementation of this resolution would not strengthen the United Nations, but would in fact destroy it by substituting another organization which would be something entirely different from the United Nations. A world federation would be a government with authority to legislate and enforce its will on states as well as on individuals. "The United Nations, on the other hand, is an organization of sovereign states without legislative authority and without authority to apply its mandate to individuals.

6. Any delegation of "defined and limited powers" to a

world government "adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression" would, to be effective in the world in which we live, mean, in fact, a delegation of power approximating the delegation to our Federal Government. Doubt has been expressed that even the supporters of the resolution would be willing to go this far.

7. There would be no assurance that in a true world federation Communist and Fascist parties would not, even though representing a minority of the people in the world, be able to obtain control of the world government. The proposal sponsored by the United World Federalists does not envisage any method whereby a state could withdraw from the world federation in such an eventuality.

8. A world federation could not expect by its mere existence to end the basic conflict between communism and capitalism, between totalitarianism and freedom. It would only project that conflict into a new area where more clearly than ever the stake would be world domination.

9. There is no substantial evidence that other states would be willing to join a world federation.

Exhibit 4—The Atlantic Union Resolution

Senate, Revision of the United Nations Charter, Hearings,
Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, 1950

A. Atlantic Union Resolution, SCR 57, 1950

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law", and "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security"; and

Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of thirteen sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the North Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

Whereas these federal union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

Whereas the United States, together with the other

signatories to the treaty has promised to bring about a better understanding of these federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

Whereas the United States and the other six democracies which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

B. Statement of Clarence K. Streit, Member of the National Board of the Atlantic Union Committee,

Mr. STREIT. My name is Clarence K. Streit, of Missoula, Mont. I testify as the author of *Union Now*, and as a member of the national board of the Atlantic Union Committee. I served in the American Expeditionary Force to France in World War I, first in the engineers and then in the Intelligence Service, where I was attached to President Wilson's delegation to the peace conference.

Thereafter I was a foreign correspondent in western Europe covering the rise of Mussolini, the Turko-Greek, and Moroccan wars, the Balkans, and so forth. From 1929 to 1939 I covered for the *New York Times* the League of Nations and the World Bank, the Manchurian and Ethiopian conflicts, Briand's efforts for European union, and the major world conferences on disarmament, economics, monetary, and labor problems. This experience led me to write *Union Now*.

Thereafter, in 1939, I left the Times and have given all my time to an effort to awaken the public to the need of federating the free. In that campaign I have crossed this continent more than 20 times and spoken in nearly every State to more than 1,000 audiences of all kinds.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 57 BASED ON FREEDOM

I am for the Atlantic Union resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, because it builds our hopes of peace on something far more powerful than any chunk of the sun, to use Senator McMahon's vivid description of the hydrogen bomb. This resolution builds peace on something whose power is creative as well as destructive, and so marvelous that it can destroy only evil and create only good. This something is the secret of all our other power. It is so secret that many of us seem unaware of it ourselves. We need no FBI to keep this secret from dictators. They could not possibly use it against us.

This mysterious source of all our power is light itself, in the highest sense of the word, the sense the dictionary gives as "that which illumines or makes clear to the mind," "mental or spiritual illumination or enlightenment, or its source." It is the power that brings out the truth, the truth that creates only the true, destroys only the false.

Let us seek light on the source of this great power itself, that we may build our peace upon it.

Where has the Almighty placed its source on earth? Does it not lie in the freedom of the individual combined with union of the free? Does not some bit of it lie scattered invisibly among all the individuals of our species, a spark of it called conscience? Are not other sparks of it scattered throughout mankind so unforeseeably that we believe it to be the interest of all, that each individual should have an equal chance to let his little light shine out? Do we not trust for truth in some mysterious power in each individual?

For all these little individual beams to give great light and penetrate far in space and time, must there not be effective union of

them? Union without freedom gives no light, it brings the night of tyranny. And freedom without union produces only fog, or anarchy's dark ages.

Do we trust in the truth of any man, unless it stands the light within us, and within other men and women, including those unborn? Can this test of truth be made secure in practice without individual freedom combined with union of the free? Shall we put our billions and our faith in the fusion of invisible hydrogen atoms—mere matter for builders—and overlook the fusion of freemen by federal union because the spark that makes them men instead of matter, builders instead of tools, is not visible to the eye, because the divine spark in each of them is so atomic we cannot see it?

You know how I would answer all these questions, but the major point is this: In asking them, am I not making the test of any truth in me your own free confirmation of it?

In the grave problem of securing now peace for years to come, we must calculate, amid many unknown factors, the risk of this policy or that. We can reach no answer without basing it to a high degree on faith in something or other, and the policy we adopt will show what, in last analysis, we have faith in most.

If we do not put our faith in individual freedom combined with union of the free, we must put our faith in union without freedom, or in freedom without union of the free. But the former, we have seen, is tyranny or dictatorship, and the latter is anarchy, disunion. And so, if we arrive at a policy that is not built on faith in freedom and union of the free, it must be a policy that trusts to dictatorship or to anarchy for peace.

OTHER PROPOSALS QUESTIONED

Because their supporters have not thought their proposals through, some of the policies now before the Republic would have us put our faith in dictatorship, others in anarchy, or in both.

Some would trust peace now, and 10 and 20 and 50 years from now, to the word of a dictator. They would make an offer to him. Whether the offer is one of mutual abolition of the UN veto,

general reduction of atomic or of all armaments with strict inspection through the UN, or changing the UN into a federation of all the world, what is the point of devoting precious time to such an offer if one does not see hope of the dictator accepting it, and does not also trust in his good faith thereafter?

What is the good of ending an arms race only to enter a race where victory is to the better conspirator, the country that can thwart inspection best and develop the strongest fifth column ready to seize power?

Policies that make dictatorship an equal partner of the free in the reduction or the governing of armed power make peace-and freedom itself-depend on faith that the dictatorship will change its spots, and do more; that this leopard of the international jungle will cast out its very nature, the nature that leads it to slink, lie camouflaged in wait, and spring with abrupt fury on any trusting prey that is not too strong for it to kill. Who, on second thought, would put his faith in this?

Others would put no trust in dictatorship changing its spots and its spirit, yet still they would make it and all the world an equal offer for moral purposes, and trust the dictator neither to accept it nor to pretend acceptance in order to prolong negotiations on details until he has his bombs and has lulled liberty into lethargy. These policies trust for peace in the dictator quickly saying no, and in our then organizing in one loose way or other all the remaining nations, or all of them we can coax in with us.

The backers of these policies put so little faith in freedom that they make it a pint of honor not to leave out any people because it has shown little or no ability to practice individual freedom even within its national boundaries.

Just as in the thirties there were those who sought peace by deliberately refusing to distinguish between aggressors and their victims and by expressly applying to both alike the same policy of neutrality or cash-and-carry, there are those now who ask us to trust peace to the belief that safety lies in deliberately treating the free, the unfree, and the inexperienced in freedom, all alike, as if freedom made no difference in this matter.

However one does it, or whatever one calls it, to organize the few free peoples of the world together with the many who are free on paper only, is not to organize a union of the free. This method cannot organize even a union, in the sense of an effective fusion. The result can be only a loose league at best, not an effective free government, but only some feeble disguise of anarchy. Who, on second thought, would put his faith in this?

A UNION OF THE FREE

Alone among the policies before you, the Atlantic Union resolution asks you-and asks you unequivocally-to trust for peace in individual freedom and federal union of the free as the keystone of the temple. Alone, this resolution is rooted in and inspired by the deeply religious faith, a faith too deep for it to matter whether the Almighty be called God or Allah or something else, the faith that there is in every man a spark of the divine, and that the more these sparks are free of every shutter and fused together federally, the more the false must flee, the truth prevail, and the more mankind shall enjoy not only peace but light on everything.

May I tell you briefly why we believe that now as in Webster's day we can put our faith most reasonably and most securely in liberty and union, one and inseparable?

First, why this combination forms the key to peace, on both the political and the economic sides.

Second, why we urgently need to unite the freest peoples in the strongest way, if we are to keep this key to peace.

Third, why federal union is the strongest way to unite them.

Fourth, why Atlantic Union now would end the arms race, if anything can.

To begin with the first point: Individual freedom, combined with union of the free, is the best safeguard of peace, rather than peace the safeguard of freedom.

Because the great danger we face lies in surprise atomic attack, many assume that the danger is in the arms themselves. But even hydrogen bombs do not go off by themselves. There must be a

will to pull the trigger. How is that will, the national will, formed? For all practical purposes, the armed power of the world is now divided by two systems of forming the national will. In one group the national will is formed by individual freedom, in the other by communist dictatorship.

Individual freedom serves both by its philosophy and by its institutions to keep a nation from using its atomic or other armed power to attack others by surprise in peacetime. Its philosophy puts the highest value on the dignity, happiness, life, and liberty of each person equally, and institutes government to serve these ends.

The institutions of individual freedom divide the national will into a myriad equal independent individual wills of the sovereign citizens, and require it be formed only by majority agreement. This insures sharp division, slow decision, the utmost publicity through free press, free speech, free elections, opposition parties, and so on, not to forget public hearings such as this where every policy is aired. But the more slowly and the more publicly the national will is formed, the less possible it becomes for that nation to attack by surprise. The safeguard is not perfect, but the more individual liberty there is, the stronger this safeguard becomes.

The opposite of all this is true of dictatorship. The philosophy behind it is not that light lies scattered among all men, but that light is concentrated in one man alone, that he alone knows the truth and needs not test it by the light in other men, but is justified in imposing it on others by fraud or force and sacrificing millions so that his "truth" shall rule future generations. This is the philosophy of dictatorship at its best, and it is only worsened when lust of power corrupts it, as it always does.

Where the institutions of liberty serve to inculcate in the government obedience to the will of the people, those of dictatorship serve to make the people blindly obedient to the government. They concentrate the national will in the will of one man, and you cannot form the national will more swiftly or more secretly than by leaving it to one man's will. Dictatorship maintains even in peacetime a censorship more complete than liberty permits even in war.

Even in the fields where circumstances now force secrecy on the free, their institutions inevitably cause them to give much more light than dictatorship on important facts. One of the most important facts from a military standpoint is the location of atomic plants, to give but one example. Even when the British arrested Dr. Fuchs on the charge of being a Communist spy, the court proceedings brought out the fact that he worked at the atomic research laboratory at Harwell, and our press supplied the additional information that Harwell is "55 miles southwest of London." This-and similar information about Oak Ridge, Hanford, Los Alamos-has long been known, but has Soviet Russia yet published any clue as to where its own atomic work is being done?

Dictatorship facilities to the nth degree surprise attack in peacetime, and the Communist variety worsens in several ways the usual dangers in dictatorship. Communism is rooted in a vast country whose people have never known individual liberty. They have been habituated to blind obedience to their government, to censorship and secrecy, much too long for these habits to be changed soon, least of all by a treaty-given promise of the dictator who profits most from this. The Communist dictatorship, moreover, has succeeded in inculcating blind obedience to it even among some Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Canadians, who are in no danger of its concentration camps. It has gained its power by a technique of conspiracy, spying, boring from within, which it has developed to the highest degree. This dictatorship is not only designed for surprise attack with all the arms it has, but for secret violation of any agreement to reduce, control, and inspect armaments which it signs. For the free to make such an agreement with it is merely to change an arms race, which they can win by their greater productive and moral power and by uniting now their strength, into a race in fraud which the free are bound to lose, a race in thwarting inspection, hiding hydrogen bombs, conspiring to convert peaceful atomic plants to purposes of war.

ECONOMIC THREAT TO SECURITY

Turn from the political to the economic side. Here the threat is no less dangerous, but more insidious. It lies partly in the burden of paying for past war and preparing for future war causing monetary depreciation, and thus wiping out the middle class, which Marxism aims to destroy, and increasing the misery of the poor. Inflation paved the way for communism's spread through China. And while it was spreading there, successive devaluations in France, Britain, western Europe have been wiping out the value of the war bonds, the insurance policies, the savings of the middle class, converting more and more of it into the proletariat, despite Marshall aid.

The economic threat lies also in the danger of our suffering the economic collapse that has followed every one of our major wars, and that we have not yet suffered since the last one.

It lies, too, in a fall in living standards causing nations, in a vain effort to raise them, to deliver themselves to the political system dictatorship - that most facilitates aggression. Communism is designed to profit most from this economic peril. Indeed, the Communists count on it to deliver the world to them without war. To escape this danger, the crying need is more production at less cost; and freedom, combined with union of the free, is the key to production. Experience proves this.

It is significant that the peoples that have contributed the least to invention and discovery are those that have suffered autocracy the longest, and that most of the world-changing discoveries and inventions have developed where individuals were freest, where men respected most the spark of light in every man. Let us not forget that if the Communist dictatorship produced an atomic explosion sooner than was expected, it was not so much by scientific or technological know-how as by conspiratorial know-how.

It is no less significant that the peoples with the lowest productive rates per man and the lowest standards of living are those that have longest endured dictatorship; and that those where the individual produces most and lives best are those that have longest practiced individual freedom. This is true whether they are

rich in natural resources as the United States, or are without any, as Switzerland.

From Switzerland and Sweden to America and Australia, individual freedom began with mountains and fjords, wilderness, and deserts. Yet everywhere, invariably, it has given the highest production and the highest living standards to the people who put freedom first, above peace and even life itself.

The Communists' sloganeer, "You can't eat freedom." What has the world been eating, what has stood between millions and starvation since the war, what but the products of freedom in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, a few other unions of the free that the war left intact? The fact is that freedom combined with union of the free is not only the best safeguard against aggressive use of armed power, but the best breadwinner the human race has ever found, the surest safeguard against dictatorship rising from within.

UNITY OF FREE URGENTLY NEEDED

Let me turn to my second point, and give four quick reasons why we urgently need to unite the free in the strongest way. For one thing, the free are so few. Many talk as if it sufficed to want to be free, as if it were easy to create and maintain a free government. Their proposals to change the United Nations as a body into a world government imply that this is even less difficult, that it is so easy that nations who have never succeeded in constituting or long maintaining a free government within their national boundaries can succeed in doing this on a world scale.

The fact is, it is so difficult for any people to govern themselves with equal individual freedom, to constitute and continue what I mean by a union of the free, that I find only about one-seventh of mankind has succeeded in doing this even fairly well on a national scale for so short a time as 50 years. About half of this one-seventh is supplied by the United States, and you know how far short we fall of our ideals of equal liberty. The other half, no less imperfect, is weakly divided in a dozen or so sovereign

nations: Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France Switzerland, the Scandinavians, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa.

This is no hard and fast list. Perhaps you find that some of these hardly qualify; perhaps you would add a few other nations. Still the conclusion remains that free government is very young, that freedom is very hard to practice, that the free are very few, in a small minority in a world accustomed to dictatorship since the year one. Must not one conclude, too, that modern techniques in mass destruction have immensely increased the danger to this small minority, make it imperative that it gain without delay the strength that lies in union? If you agreed before that freedom is the best safeguard against depression and aggression, must you not conclude, further, that the danger to the free is a danger to all humanity, that the safety of mankind lies in union of the free?

My second reason is that the aggressiveness of dictatorship by its very nature respects only the fact of decisively superior force. The Kremlin has proved more than once its proneness to appease such power. It has also proved its reluctance to let even the certainty of winning the opening battle induce it to begin a war where it might lose the final battle.

My third reason why it is urgent to unite the free in the strongest way is that the threat today is not only atomic, but economic. The Kaiser, Hitler, the Japanese war lords, none of these could hope to win the world by the burden of preparation for war causing economic collapse, but the Communists could win this way, and seem to count on it.

My fourth reason is that the free institutions that make great power relatively safe in the hands of the free require them now to have a vastly greater margin of superior power in every field than before. The basic cause of this is that today mountains, channels and oceans are not the cards they once were, but the free still have to win while playing with their cards face up.

There is simply no way on earth whereby all us American citizens can know what our Government is planning or doing without all the rest of the world-the Kremlin included-knowing as

much as we know. We can tell what some other peoples, the Canadians, British, French, Dutch, Belgians, and a few other democracies are doing, because they have the same institutions for keeping control of their government that we have. But practically speaking, we have little more means of knowing what a dictatorship is planning or doing than its own slaves have.

And so, as I see it, we are engaged in a game where Uncle Sam sits here with his cards face up, and John Bull there with his cards face up, and Marianne of France over here with cards face up—the searchlight of the press laying on all of them, and up their sleeves and under their part of the table to see if anything phony is going on and striving vainly to reach the other end of the table where sits the master of the Kremlin with his cards carefully hidden.

How are we going to win in a game where we must play with cards face up, and the other player doesn't? We cannot turn ours down without going the way of dictatorship ourselves, abandoning individual liberty without a blow, putting out the light which makes our power safe and productive, sacrificing the source of all our power. How can we keep our cards face up, and still win?

I know only one answer to that question. It is to have so strong a hand that no one can hope to beat it. How can we give such a hand to freedom? Again I know only one answer: By ceasing to leave freedom's aces divided, by ceasing to let them be played against each other, by combining them in one hand played by common federal government, by union of the free.

FEDERAL UNION STRONGEST WAY TO UNITE

I come to my third point. Why is federal union the strongest way to unite the free? What are the alternatives? The UN? Like the other policies before you, it strives to unite the unfree, the inexperienced and the free all together. It serves a useful purpose, but it is no answer to the question, How to unite the free in the strongest way? If it were, there would have been no need for the Atlantic Pact.

Is this alliance the answer? Clearly not. Another witness for Atlantic Union will bring out the inadequacy of alliance. Let me touch only on the basic reason why a union is far more reliable than the strongest alliance: In an alliance the supreme loyalty is not to the alliance but to each nation in it, because of the principle of national sovereignty on which alliances are built. This encourages each government in an alliance to sacrifice an ally's interest when dire emergency makes this seem to them the best way to save their own nation.

When the people of different states or nations form a federal union, they divide their loyalty as citizens between their state and their union, but their supreme loyalty is to the union. Or rather it is to the principle of individual liberty, the principal that man is not made for the sovereignty of the state, but the state is made for the sovereignty of the citizen, and is to be remade or extended when this will clearly serve better the freedom of the individual.

The fact that the citizen would be the sovereign if the principles of free federation were fully applied in an Atlantic Union makes some Americans fear that the United States would then be flooded with immigrants. The facts do not bear out this fear. The other six democracies which Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 would invite to explore union with us—Canada, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg—did not fill their quotas in the thirties before the war, nor does this group fill them now. The total quota of this group is now 73,364, and the total number of immigrants the United States received from them in 1947 was 26,195; in 1948, 35,738; in 1949, 30,895. If we add the Scandinavian and Swiss democracies to this group, the total quota rises to 82,043, and the total 1949 immigration to only 38,260.

One need only consider how much more insecure the citizen would be in every 1 of our 48 States if they were united in an alliance of sovereign States, as the Atlantic Pact countries are, instead of in a federal union of sovereign citizens, to understand that an Atlantic Union would put much greater power behind our freedom than could any alliance.

It would be so much stronger that it could end the present

arms race, if anything could, which brings me to my fourth point. Such is the amazing productive power of individual freedom that the peoples who have practiced freedom longest, though only one-seventh of the world's population, control the great bulk of the world's power. Power can be divided into the four suits of a deck of cards, and we need only unite the existing strength of these few democracies effectively by federal union to give freedom's hand all four aces and the joker, too.

It would hold the ace of clubs, or armed power; the ace of spades, industrial power; the ace of diamonds, raw material power; and the strongest act, the ace of hearts, moral power. I said the joker, too, and that would be the union's power-and, I trust, its policy-of extending its federal tie as rapidly as this proved practicable to other nations that desired admission to the union. Its creation, like the creation of the United States, would greatly encourage other nations to practice individual freedom. With every new state admitted to the union, its huge superiority in armed, industrial, raw material, and moral power would increase still more.

The far west of this union-in the sense of a vast area awaiting development, from which new member states would surely come-would lie to the south and cover two continents, South America and Africa.

But it is important to note that, to end the dangers in the present arms race, if anything can do this, we need only federate effectively with the few experienced democracies with whom we can now form a full federal union. For we would thereby increase the power of freedom, cut the cost of defense, and stimulate production, all so much as to remove both the economic and the military threats we face today. The Kremlin would not dare attack, and it could no longer hope to win by run-away inflation and economic collapse.

Justice Roberts has already shown how groundless are the fears that other non-Communist nations would fall in the arms of the Kremlin if they were not invited to the proposed conference. I would add that, in my judgment, the union from the start could

count on the friendliest relations with practically all the non-Communist nations of the world. It would be the natural leader and chief bulwark of a group totaling, with itself, 62 percent of the world's population. It would inherit the specially close relationship of the United States with the Philippines and Latin America, no longer vexed by the present rivalry with Britain in Argentina and other republics there. It would also inherit the special relationship of Britain with India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, and the rest of the sterling area; and of the Netherlands with the United States of Indonesia. It would be a threat to no nation, and every non-Communist one would look to it as its chief protection from the Cominform.

In my experience in international affairs, and my study of their history, good relations between nations are based on self-interest, not on invitations to a conference. In addition to the factors noted above, all the other nations would have this major reason to be friendly to the union. It would form not only, as Justice Roberts pointed out, the best market for their produce and their only source of many supplies, but the only place where they could hope to get the funds they need for their own development.

To a degree that would prove very trying to the Kremlin; this would also be true for China, and even more for the European satellites who would need this union market far more than it would need their produce. It would even be true to a substantial degree for Soviet Russia itself. The materials useful to its arming, which it now gets from the western Europeans, and which the United States has vainly sought to have its allies stop selling, might be cut off by an Atlantic Union if the Kremlin did not become more friendly.

DEFENSE COSTS LOWER

What is more, by securing greater defensive power at less cost, and by stimulating production-by giving it not only greater security but the advantages of economic and monetary union-the Atlantic Union could lower the price of many manufactured goods. This would greatly benefit every nation seeking to improve the

condition of its people, and help with their support.

Consider the alternative. What good is it to India, if, for its sake, we refuse to explore Atlantic Union, and are driven by the dangers of continued disunion to a policy, not of cannons before butter, but of bombs instead of tea? What will it profit Brazil if we let the high cost of disunion of the free drive us to a policy of cutting down our coffee so as to buy more planes?

The real danger we run of losing more of the world to communism from within lies in continuing to pay the high cost of disunion, in delaying to put behind freedom the vast advantages of federal union. But we can make still more sure of the continued friendship of all the non-Communist nations, at least, by an amendment to the Atlantic Union resolution, which I would like to suggest.

RELATION OF ATLANTIC UNION TO WORLD FEDERATION

As the author of a book whose readers have become divided, I find myself in a peculiar position. Many of the readers of Union Now favor the Atlantic Union resolution. Others of its readers favor the world federation resolution. Still others favor both.

I myself support the Atlantic Union resolution, but I have always worked for Atlantic Union as a step toward an eventual free world government. And so, speaking for myself-for the Atlantic Union Committee Board has not yet taken position on this-I would suggest that a second paragraph be added to the resolving clause of the Atlantic Union resolution, to read as follows:

2. That this Atlantic Federal Convention be called as the next step in strengthening the United Nations and in attaining a more distant goal which, in the sense of Congress, should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States; namely, the development of a free world federation which would be open to all nations willing and able to maintain its principles of free, representative government, and which would be capable of effectively safe guarding individual liberty, preventing aggression

and preserving peace by its defined and limited powers to enact, interpret, amend, and enforce world law.

This amendment would incorporate in the Atlantic Union resolution much of the language and all the major provisions of the world federation resolution (S. Con. Res. 56), while adding certain necessary safeguards, particularly as regards freedom and the United Nations.

As resolution 56 now stands, it makes no provision that the world government it seeks shall preserve individual liberty. This omission is no doubt due to oversight on the part of its sponsors.

As it now stands, the world federation resolution is quite compatible with dictatorship, slavery, and terror. It fits the kind of world government we would suffer if the present Soviet Communist Federation achieved its dream of bringing all the world under its law.

I know that this kind of world government and law is far from the one the backers of the world federation resolution have in mind, and so I trust they will welcome its being made clear that they aim at a free world government, or a free world legal order.

Experience proves that it can be practicable and wise for free governments to cooperate to some degree with dictatorial governments not only in alliances but in league such as the United Nations. Such associations by their nature must be formed without individual liberty being effectively safeguarded in the treaty establishing them.

To constitute a federation, a government, is-it cannot be emphasized too much-quite a different thing from forming an alliance, league, or other association of governments.

Since Americans began constituting government they have always been careful to make sure that the government was not only of the people, but by and for the people, for their individual freedom. Surely no American would, on second thought, seek as a fundamental objective of United States policy the formation of a world government that gave no safeguard for human liberty.

The only other important changes that my amendment makes in the world federation resolution may be thus clarified:

As that resolution now stands, it permits its objective to be achieved only through the development of the UN. My amendment, while calling for the strengthening of the UN and permitting us to make the most of every opportunity to develop it into a world government, does not restrict us to achieving a free world federation only by UN action. It leaves all possibilities open.

My amendment, moreover, makes clear that world federation is "a more distant goal." It thus guards against the resolution, once adopted, being interpreted as authorizing immediate or premature attempts by the United States to change the UN into a world federation. Such attempts could only result, in my judgment, in wrecking the sole world political organization mankind now possesses, and leaving the nations not only sharply divided into two camps but lacking even the common meeting place that Lake Success now provides.

Some argue that the United States should nonetheless make immediately an attempt either to make UN a world government or at least to abolish the veto, both of which are certain to be vetoed by the Kremlin. They contend this would improve our moral position and fix the responsibility for failure on Soviet Russia. They assume the UN would continue thereafter as before, and believe it would then be safe for the United States to form within the UN a federation or alliance of all the nations that had proved willing to make one when the offer was made to Moscow.

My 10 years of experience covering the League of Nations for the New York Times helps convince me that all this, though it seems quite plausible, is very unsound speculation.

Unless one is aiming to go to war, and ready for war, it is wiser not to try to pin down certain responsibilities, or to attempt to maneuver a great power into too openly humiliating a hole. A careful jockeying for moral position is too often the immediate prelude to war. It is very likely to be, if one of the disputants is more concerned with fixing blame on the other than with facing him with power too effective and overwhelming to be challenged.

A federation formed by the above process—that is of combining those nations, excluding Russia, which do accept the

offer-would not only tauten present tension to the breaking point but it would invite attack. Those who assume it would be stronger than the proposed Atlantic Union repeat a time-honored error, the one that brought the Persians to grief at Marathon and Salamis. They confuse mere numbers with power. They reckon the loosely organized horde to be stronger than the smaller but closely knit phalanx.

Above all, they overlook the basic fact that the great bulk of nonCommunist armed, industrial and developed raw material power in the world today is in the hands of the few North Atlantic democracies with which the Atlantic Union resolution would begin the formation of a world federal union.

To try to federate all the non-Communist world does not change the facts of power; it can result only in shifting away from the experienced Atlantic democracies more or less of the control they now possess over their power. If they should consent to enough shift of control to make the federation a real federation, which is highly unlikely, they would merely be placing their power in less experienced hands. What could encourage the Kremlin more?

If they refused thus to shift control of their power, the result would be another loose league instead of a federation, a smaller UN.

By taking either course we would not only sacrifice the overwhelmingly powerful federal union we could make with the other Atlantic democracies, but we would sacrifice precious time. The Kremlin could string out the discussion as it did the vain proposal for a world atomic authority. While the negotiations for the latter went on, the Kremlin succeeded in learning how to make an atomic explosion. Shall we give it time now to develop the H bomb, by putting our trust in policies that require us to begin by asking the Kremlin's consent?

The Atlantic Union resolution avoids these perils. Such union requires no action by the UN. Stalin cannot veto it. We thus avoid waste of precious time. We also avoid the kind of debate that would ruin the UN.

We preserve it, too, by not attempting to federate all its non-Communist members, but only a few Atlantic democracies at the start. We do not split it into two clear-cut camps; we leave the greatest number of its members where they are today, in between us and the Kremlin, but with us in an emergency.

By the Atlantic Union resolution we preserve, too, the Charter's bridge to the Russian people, and also all the possibilities the Charter gives of lining up a coalition of all the non-Communist world behind the union in the improbable event the Kremlin should threaten it. Even though the UN is not strong enough to insure peace, and even though it cannot be seriously strengthened by Charter amendment, it still can perform so many valuable services to peace that we should seek to preserve it.

The Atlantic Union resolution, in short, would avoid the dangers other policies involve, would preserve the UN and strengthen it in substance, and, by my amendment, would commit us to the goal of ultimate free world federation. And yet it would let us begin at once to explore whether we can now form the nucleus of such a free federal union with the other sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact. By joining with them in a federal union of the free, we can confront the Kremlin in good time with far more power than we can otherwise put behind freedom and peace, and at far less cost. We can thus block its scheme to win the world through economic disaster and further monetary depreciation in the Atlantic area. We can confront the Kremlin with such immense armed, industrial, financial, raw material and moral power that Soviet Russia dare not challenge it.

Thus we can stabilize the world situation long enough for the slow evolution, without world war, of our ultimate objective, a free federation of all the world. By this policy we wed the practical to the ideal. We put freedom on the march by creating this ever growing union of the free.

The more we identify our policy with freedom, the better will be our chance to federate firmly, and the more prestige freedom will have. We cannot hope to reduce armaments by example, but we can hope by example to increase freedom's control over arms.

Nothing succeeds, we know, like success. Think how the success of our Thirteen little States in forming the first federal union encouraged the Latin American colonies to revolt and model their governments on ours. Consider how many nations sought to copy Britain's parliament when parliament made Britain the strongest of powers.

We must put our faith, I said, in something, and the more clearly we put it in freedom for the light in every man, then the more clearly the results will show that freedom does lead to prosperity and peace. The clearer we make this, the more rapidly other nations will seek to be freer themselves, and to join in our union. The more clearly we demonstrate that freedom works when coupled with federal union, then the more nations we shall find imitating our institutions. These actions of America will speak more tellingly than any "Voice:"

Identify freedom clearly with power for peace and production, prove it by the fruits of union, promise to admit to the union those who best practice freedom, and you irresistibly stimulate the human imitative instinct. Carry out this premise once the union is made, and even the Kremlin itself cannot forever resist this peaceful, mounting pressure toward freedom and union. If this will not bring its dictatorship down without war, nothing else can.

It will take time to work out this Atlantic Union. But it will also take time to work out other solutions. They can be tried simultaneously, too, but what will we have for the time that we spend.

There is only one way we can immediately affect the whole situation. It is by the effect of our action on the spirits of men, by the awe we arouse in the Kremlin, the respect we inspire all through the world, the faith we inspire where people are free. And nothing could so electrify men, make dictators feel weak in the knees, and turn the world tide overnight, than for the United States Senate to vote to call this Atlantic Union convention this year.

I say this year, for if we try like mice to nibble and gnaw our way to this move, if we wait for events to force it upon us, we shall have nibbled and gnawed away nearly all its effect on the spirits of

men. This is a time to remember that the American emblem is no mouse, but an eagle.

Sooner or later, some of us will have to be bolder than we have been of late years. If we drift into war by being even more prudent than is this call for a convention to explore Atlantic Union, then the young will have to make up in daring for our reckless caution. If we are to see dictatorship, for once in our lifetime, undone without war, the bolder action now needed for this will have to come from us older men. I trust the Senate will set the example, will give the light that can save the world.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Mr. Streit, could you come back this afternoon for any questions the Senators may have?

Mr. STREIT. With great pleasure.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. We will stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 1p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 2:30p.m.)

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE K. STREIT – Resumed

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Streit, I was very much interested in your testimony this morning, as I have been in your writings on this very important subject, and in order to get the facts clear in my own mind I recall that in your first book you advocated the union of the Anglo-Saxon people, did you not?

Mr. STREIT. No, Senator. I advocated in Union Now a union of all the experienced democratic countries. There were 15 listed there, and that was not a hard-and-fast number. It included the United States, Canada, Britain, Eire, France, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. That was in Union Now.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I misunderstood that.

Mr. STREIT. Thereafter, disunion delivered the European democracies either to Hitler or they were surrounded as Switzerland and Sweden were, and only the British democracies were left. In those circumstances I proposed in a second book a

provisional union with the British and Canadians and the other Commonwealth members pending the liberation of the democracies on the Continent. When they were liberated I returned to my first thesis of Union Now.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. So that is where we are now, except you are limiting in this resolution those who will participate in this Federal council or convention, or whatever you call it, to the ones who were the sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact; is that right?

Mr. STREIT. Yes, sir. I try to be practical in these matters. I think it is practical to explain in principle, in theory, the basic lines, but not to expect that one can apply them in practice with all the beauty of logic. One has to take advantage of situations and circumstances. We have had this Atlantic Pact formed. It was formed by this nucleus of seven of those Atlantic democracies. It has produced results, and these seven include the great bulk of democratic strength; with the exception of Switzerland and the Scandinavians they include all the old experienced democracies. So it seemed to me that rather than wait until we could get all of them together, it was wiser to accept the solution that the resolution proposes, to begin with the seven sponsors of the pact and to authorize them to bring in others just as the seven brought in others to sign the Atlantic Alliance in the first place.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Well, the Atlantic Pact, as I recall it, would require the unanimous vote of all the people in the Atlantic Pact to get any other people in.

Mr. STREIT. I believe that is true. We are now in the stage of trying to constitute something, and in the early stages of that alliance it began with seven countries. They drafted it, and as I understand it, they then invited Norway, Denmark, Iceland, and Italy to sign with them, and thereafter it required unanimous consent, I believe, to bring other partners in.

ADMISSION OF STATES TO ATLANTIC UNION

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. What I am trying to lead up to is this: The criticism I have heard most frequently of your plan is

that it is a sort of a self set-up of people who feel they have something special and they are setting themselves apart, and they are going to determine who else in the world is worthy to join this group. Is that the theory? How are we going to define, when you say "a union of the free," the free, and who is going to do the defining? Can somebody come knocking on the door and say, "Now we are free"?

Let me give you a specific example. Indonesia is supposed to have its democratic or republican set-up. If they knock on the door, shall we say "No, you are not mature enough" or will we let them come in?

Mr. STREIT. I tried to make clear in my statement this morning that I would make the nucleus on the basis of experience and individual liberty at the start. In this particular case, thanks to the Atlantic Pact, we are not faced with any problem of distinguishing here and there, drawing any fine lines. All we need to do is to take a nucleus that is already constituted. It was formed by the facts of life and history, and we give the democracies in that nucleus the responsibility of deciding the fine points of what other countries they think it is wise to invite into the convention to aid in making a constitution.

As I said this morning, I believe it is true that the purpose of making any constitution is to maintain human liberty. I am not interested in making government for any other purpose. I think that one of the most difficult things on earth is to constitute such a government and to maintain it. The great problem to me is to get that government established between some nations, and it would seem to me, therefore, that it would be wise for us in so difficult an undertaking to begin with those who are most experienced in that undertaking. We do that in all other walks of life, and I don't for the life of me see why, if we make use of the nucleus that the Atlantic Pact presents to us, and carry out the obligations that we have incurred in that pact as regards liberty, we cannot proceed to apply the straightforward principles of liberty in the preamble and the articles of that pact. All we need to do here is to apply them in the same practical method by which the pact was made and which

caused, so far as I know, no serious offense to any people on earth. I do not for the life of me see why continuing on that line should offend anyone any more than the pact itself did.

POSITION OF ASIA IN UNION PLAN

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. For the moment you are thinking in terms of this hub of Europe that Mr. Van Zandt just called to our attention as the area of most importance in the world. I am wondering what your feeling today is with regard to this problem in Asia, which is giving me so much concern, and some others, and whether in setting up this program which you are proposing you are saying, "Well, we will just postpone Asia for the present and deal with that when we come to it."

Mr. STREIT. It seems to me that in winning a war we have to have priorities, top priorities and other priorities. I think we have to do it here, and it does behoove us to judge what is at a given time a more important area with which to deal. We did that with the Marshall plan. We put the accent on aid to western Europe. Although many Latin-American states desired and asked aid at that time, General Marshall informed them that we could not carry the whole load. We had to determine which was the area that needed our attention most at that time, and I think that is a very sound rule all along the line.

This does not mean, to my mind, throwing Asia overboard at all. It seems to me that what practically results, and has resulted, in the loss of Asia to us, has been the disunion among the democracies. I saw that begin in the Manchurian conflict which I covered in Geneva for the New York Times.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I think you are right about that. I am not debating that. But I do have a sense of postponement of the far eastern issue. It may be correct to do it. That is inherent, to my mind, in your proposal.

Mr. STREIT. I would think that our Government and the British Government and the other democratic governments and the United Nations are going to continue their diplomatic and their

other relationships with Asiatic nations. The calling of this convention is not going to stop all or any of the action that is now under way, or that may be put under way by the United States Government. It does not interfere in the slightest with that, so far as I can see. In that sense there is no postponement of it at all. But we do cease to postpone one thing. By calling this convention we cease to postpone giving some attention to free federal principles and to the hub of the principal hemisphere, to the countries with whom we have the closest economic, financial, historic, and other ties, and the countries that are on the freest basis.

So far we have made-except in the Atlantic Pact-none of our policies on the basis of our primary principle of individual liberty, and we still have not made any of them on the primary principle of federal union. That is the one big thing we have been postponing so far.

PREPONDERANCE OF POWER

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You are not going so far as suggesting a superstate, but you are going so far as to suggest a federal union modeled on the United States, which delegates to the Central Government certain extensive powers. You are leaving out of that area important other areas of the world that may very well raise their eyebrows and say, "What's going on here? Is this a balance of power being set up?" And will they naturally gravitate into the Russian orbit, or can we prevent that? I am troubled by that one phase of it.

Mr. STREIT. First of all, it is not a balance of power. As Dr. Urey said this morning, it is an unbalance of power, a terrific unbalance of power.

Secondly there is, so far as I can see, no possibility of any of these other powers gravitating to the Kremlin. For one thing, they have nothing to gain and everything to fear from the Kremlin on the political side. On the economic side they cannot possibly sell their goods to Soviet Russia, or its satellites, or the major part of them. They cannot possibly get from Soviet Russia and its satellites the

manufacturing material and the other goods they need to develop themselves. Even if Soviet Russia could produce them, how on earth can it deliver them? Take India, Pakistan. Can Soviet Russia deliver these goods across the Himalayas? How would they deliver them to Latin America? The rest of the world has to trade with this Atlantic group if it wants to do 'business at all.

There is another factor: Where else are other nations going to get the money they need to develop their country? They can float their loans only in this North Atlantic territory. Even Soviet Russia can only hope to gain many of the things it needs from this area.

I read in the paper a few days ago that the United States Government was endeavoring to prevent certain of our western European allies using some of the Marshall plan aid they get to ship these goods to eastern Europe, to satellite states and presumably to Soviet Russia. The United States Government feared that some of these things could be used for arming Soviet Russia. It could not get our western allies to cut that off because they needed this eastern European trade so much.

This shows, to my mind, that east Europe and Soviet Russia need products from us. When, thanks to union, western Europe is no longer under the present dollar shortage, that kind of east-west trade, if we think it dangerous, can be cut off by the union.

I have made a study of the figures of east – west trade in Europe, and believe me, Senator, the eastern part of Europe needs western Europe far more than western Europe needs it as a market.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I think you are right about that. I agree with that.

Mr. STREIT. So even the satellites will have to gravitate to a degree toward the Atlantic Union. I am talking now just on a hard dollar and – cents basis, leaving aside more important things such as the moral factors involved in it. Even the satellites would have to do business with this union, and the more this union cut down on the cost of defense and the more it stimulated production by the principles that have built up our own prosperity and our own mass production and lower prices, the more Yugoslavia, Indonesia, and India could get their goods at a lesser price and develop themselves.

That is what they want to do. That is what they need to do. And we must either choose a policy, it seems to me, that will lead to that good result for them, or we follow policies that may seem at first glance more polite, or whatever term you wish, but if the net result of the policy is to raise the cost of defense, to retard production, to keep prices up, to build up inflation, they will suffer the most. And I would fear that we would lose India, as we lost China that way.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You rather visualize, then, that with this preponderance of power built up by this group, if you get them together it will be a magnet to attract other countries. Countries will by degrees see that their system isn't as successful, that they need to trade with this area, and they had better join with the free nations rather than stay under the other domination. They will be chipped off by degrees until Russia herself, in self-defense, self-survival, would have to come and join the group.

Mr. STREIT. I have always looked on this union to follow another standard American practice. We began with 13 States. Then we expanded, bringing other States into the Union. I would expect this union to do the very same thing. I think it would be very wise for it to do that, and very unwise not to do it. That is why I brought in my suggested amendment to Resolution 57; I wanted to make clear that possibility.

We put a premium on democracy by thus offering membership to these other countries, and induce them by the success of our Union, its rising standards of union and even by the convention's discussion of free federal principles to go in our direction. This discussion during the convention will be an object lesson to all the nations of the world in what are the basic principles of free government? It will go in to not only every cracker barrel discussion here, but in western Europe, and I think it will percolate to the satellite countries to a greater degree than many imagine; its effects will be felt in Latin America, Asia, and everywhere. This convention will be a ferment for freedom that will be far more potent than anything we can possibly get through the Voice of America. The acts of America in this sense are bound to have, it seems to me, much more telling power for freedom throughout the

world than any words we have used.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I think that is a very impressive argument. That does not mean, though that you are deprecating the importance of continuing the Voice of America and that type of ideological approach and exchange of scholarship, and so forth, that has been carried on?

Mr. STREIT. No, no, no. I am all in favor of keeping up all the efforts we have. I tried to say this morning, all of us can be certain as we can of any truth we may have, but experience teaches us we may still be wrong, and so I would be in favor of these other methods being followed at the same time.

What we are pleading for, Senator, is that the United States cease to ignore, forget, postpone, the one system of solving this problem - the system of freedom and union-that has brought the greatest good to the greatest number over the longest period of time. I think it will be incomprehensible to our children in even 20 years that we waited so long that it took two world wars and a depression in between before we even began to explore whether our own Federal principles could not be applied among us and other democratic countries.

And if the convention should find that there is any grave danger of countries flocking to Soviet Russia-and as I say I do not foresee that in the slightest-the way is open in this resolution for the delegates to invite whatever countries they desire to it. But it is much easier, in my experience-and as a foreign correspondent I have covered a great number of diplomatic conferences in Geneva and elsewhere over a long period of time-to bring more States into a conference if you find that you haven't enough, than it is to get any of them out once you have started. If you have too many divergent elements in your conference, you can do nothing about it. You can't expel anybody from a conference. And when they walk out you have a worse situation than you had before.

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC OBLIGATIONS UNDER ATLANTIC UNION

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Do you think that your plan would contemplate the sharing-the-wealth idea with all these countries? Would the United States be called upon to give to a larger extent than we have, for example under ECA, to try and help these countries recover? If you merge them all together, we will be vitally concerned with the economic progress of the whole works, because you will put economic issues in there as well as military defense.

You talk about a common currency. It is hard for me to visualize at the moment a common currency that would not be backed by the resources of the United States to make it stable. It might be backed by Belgium and Switzerland, but those are the only going currencies that would really be supporting us. We would be picking up lots of this paper stuff that something would have to be done about.

Have you thought through those implications or are you thinking in terms of tackling those as part of the whole convention?

Mr. STREIT. I have thought into them. In the first place, it seems to me that in more than one way these European democratic nations do occupy the hub of the principal hemisphere. France is there at the hub, England close by, the Lowlands close by, Switzerland close by. They do have the basic economic and military strategic position in the area. We cannot get away from that.

The next thing is, they are the countries with the most freedom and the most free enterprise. Now, if we want to maintain the free enterprise system, are we to let these countries go by the board? If we do, they go Marxist or to some other form of dictatorship. We are not saving our free system that way.

It then boils down to what is the best way of building them up again. We are trying the Marshall plan. We are keeping these countries on a dole from year to year. They can't tell from 1 year to another how much they are going to submit.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I have not conceived the Marshall plan as a dole at all. I have conceived of the Marshall plan as an aid to getting them on their feet so they are self-sustaining and they can be weaned from the bottle by 1952. That is the way we

conceived the Marshall plan aid, not as a dole and not as relief. Otherwise I would not feel we could have gone ahead with it.

Mr. STREIT. I did not mean it in the sense of pure relief. I meant it in the sense that it was on a year-to-year basis that could be changed, could be reduced, could be increased if you wanted to, but it was on a year-to-year basis. Your best analysis of that is made by Mr. Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, who will testify on February 13. I have heard him say that there is no hope of the Marshall plan countries being on a self-supporting basis at the end of the period, in 1952.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I will agree with you in this: I think in 1952 we will face problems there, after we see what has happened with the Marshall plan. I agree with you it won't be a closed book with curtain down and with those nations able to sustain themselves. But we are going to end the particular approach to this problem that has been followed in this 4-year attempt at economic aid. What we will do then I don't know. Some of the countries may be all right and some may have to go on a different kind of treatment.

But what I am troubled by, what I feel I will have to explain if I am supporting this resolution, will be to answer those who say, "Here, the United States is a self-contained unit. Our prosperity is due to the fact that we have removed the barriers, et cetera, between our various States."

You have pointed out how our prosperity has been due to the overall homogeneous population we have, and the way we approached these questions and the way we have solved them. But are we taking too large a meal to digest if we apply the same principles to these other countries who have many of the same traditions as ours, although fundamentally they believe in freedom? Where are we going? Are we taking off more than we can digest?

Mr. STREIT. That is a difficult problem.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. That is the thing that is going to be put right up to us.

Mr. STREIT. It is a difficult problem. We have tried to cut the difficulties down, and although I said in Union Now I favored

starting with 15 democracies, I am willing to start here with 7. But if you get below that there are various objections that would come up, and one would be the question you raised at the very start. Then we would have to be picky and choosy. Here in the Atlantic Union resolution, we have a natural nucleus. We know that that nucleus has not caused any harm. We have tried that and we know it won't cause any harm. But try to get below that, and I see trouble.

On the economic and monetary question you raise, my thought is we will have to support those countries, and we should do it in the way which will be the most effective and cheapest way to do it right now. The policies we are now following, I say, are ones that do not promote that end in the best degree because they keep up a major degree of uncertainty on the part of the European peoples. They don't know what they can plan on, really, for more than 1952 at the most, and even now they don't know what they will get from us from year to year.

On our side we don't know another thing. We have only the Atlantic Alliance to guarantee us that they would be on our side if we were involved in war in the Far East. If war should come in Europe, which heaven forbid, our troops are there and we are bound to be involved. But if we were involved on the other side of the world we can't tell what our European allies would do. So we are uncertain there. So that keeps up the cost of defense. The whole set-up is one that tends to magnify the cost to all concerned, and to give a minimum of certainty on both sides the ocean. Well, the less certainty there is the more it encourages communism on the economic and political sides to hope that it can win.

Now, to turn to the question of a union currency, the technical problems is not inseparably difficult. It is increased by the fact that there is a Socialist government in Britain and ours is a free-enterprise system. The Belgians have a free-enterprise system. The differences in that regard cause great difficulties. But I do believe, and I have talked with a number of men who are experts in this field, who think that even that problem is not insoluble. If the committee should want to hear some expert opinion on the currency problem, I would suggest they call Mr. Winfield Riefler,

administrative assistant to the chairman of the Federal Reserve bank, or Prof. Raymond Whittlesy of the Wharton School of Finance. I think they are recognized as distinguished authorities in that field.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Do those gentlemen both favor this approach?

Mr. STREIT. I would leave that for them to say.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Naturally I am troubled because I represent New Jersey, which is an industrial State. I have supported the reciprocal trade-agreements program, for example, because I felt that was the approach we had to make in the new chapter opening after the war in order to try and get international trade going again, which I feel is one of the best roads to peace, but under this proposal of yours you would have as free trade an area as we have in the United States between our States.

Mr. STREIT. I would certainly aim at that. I think here is a system that has worked. Union would cause some inconvenience at the start, but look at the results over a period of time.

PROPOSAL INVOLVES ONLY EXPLORATIONS

This proposition, the resolution itself, however, does not commit us to such a union free market. It commits us only to exploring with the British and French and Canadians and others how far we can go toward applying the principles that have worked so well with us.

I would anticipate considerable difficulty from the British Socialist Government from that particular point, even more than you would have in New Jersey. No one can foretell how far they are going to go in monetary union, defense union, economic union, the various parts if a federal union.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. They could not run off and devalue the pound all on their own. They would have to go in cahoots with all of their partners.

Mr. STREIT. Not if they made a union such as we have.

I am glad you brought up the currency question. You spoke

of the danger, as I understood it, that the United States would pour out its wealth to hold up this currency. It seems to me that would not cost us very much at all. Having the same currency we would then have eliminated, insofar as we can, this danger, which I consider a very grave one, of devaluations and depreciations here and there.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Quotas and embargoes and everything else; currency devaluation.

Mr. STREIT. All that. Such devaluation upsets trade and it cuts down the savings of the middle class, turns them into a proletariat. If we are going to maintain the free enterprise system we must keep some private capital in the rest of the world, I would say, and the present policy is not doing it.

Well now, if we have one currency we have eliminated this monetary danger insofar as we can humanly do it, and the danger of Marxism spreading from that particular source, and I would think that was well worth some cost. I hardly, however, see why any cost should result from establishing that currency.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You would probably have to have some fundamental readjustments with your entire American industrial system, because if Germany comes in-would you include west Germany?

Mr. STREIT. Not at the start, but I think we ought to aim at such a solution, eventually.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. If we are going to save west Germany, I think we have to think in terms of that. If German toys came piling in here at a lower cost of production than our own, we would have that problem even though we had federation, wouldn't we?

Mr. STREIT. That is true. We would have to have transitions made on several counts, on the defense side, on the economic side, on the currency side. None of us anticipates a union that overnight will change us from the state of bliss we are in at the present time to the state of misery that the union is going to produce, according to some people. We anticipate transition measures that would have to be worked out in the convention or in the first sessions of the union

government.

As I said earlier, in all these problems it comes down to what you put your faith in. Either we put our faith in theory, either we put it in nationalism and national sovereignty and alliances and things that Americans have never put their faith in before, or we put it in these free federal principles that have worked, and try to get over to that basis, see if we can't get over on that basis.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I think that is a very potent argument.

Mr. Chairman, I could ask a lot more questions. I am thoroughly interested in this subject, but I do not want to take too much time.

Mr. STREIT. Might I add just one word, Senator Thomas?

When they come to the question of industry in any particular State here, I think one will find that certain American industries, and the major industries as a matter, of fact through the country, the great breadwinners of the country, will be advantageously affected by this union. I would leave that for Mr. Clayton to discuss, but whether they will be advantageously or disadvantageously affected, we will have to face all the realities of life in this convention. Right now we are trying to deal with trade questions piecemeal. In my State, in Montana, there is wool growing. If you talk on the wool tariff it is a very delicate subject. The only thing that comes in is the price of wool.

In the proposed set-up, where we have to consider defense and economics together, in such a Federal convention, in the end we will also have to consider how much we value the lives of our sons, as well as the price of wool. If we save the, one and lose a little on the other, it seems to me it is more than a little of a bargain.

I covered for the New York Times for years at Geneva and Basle, attempts to deal with the economic questions over here and the financial questions over there, and the armaments question over in another conference, as if they were in watertight compartments, when they are closely interrelated in reality. It has proved a fraud. It has resulted in nothing but depression and in wars, devaluations, and all that sort of thing.

Now, here is a chance to tackle this thing for once as a whole, and to tackle it, again for once, on the basis of citizen sovereignty instead of national sovereignty, the purpose being the welfare, the liberty, and the security of the individual citizen, his freedom rather than that of the state, primarily.

EFFECT OF UNION ON STANDARD OF LIVING

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Do you think the plan would tend to normalize the standard of living and make it the same all over the different areas?

Mr. STREIT. I think it would tend to raise it in all the areas, just as it did in every federal union I know of. All the members benefited from it, in Switzerland, in Canada, in the United States, in South Africa.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I think I would agree with you on that. I wonder if it would tend to find a certain level that they would all attain to. Would the United States standard of living, as we have it today, probably higher than anywhere else in the world, higher certainly than France or England or Italy today, be such that that difference would still maintain, or would we look to the time when the standard would be about the same, with people in the same general situation?

Mr. STREIT. I believe that our standards of living would increase at the outset more probably than those of any other democracy; and more rapidly. We would gain more in that regard, in my judgment, than the others, for this simple reason. I have noticed that when any big opportunity, any new area, is opened, the people who have the money are the ones that make the most of it. They can put their money in and invest. When we were opening land out West, when I was a boy, that seemed to be what happened. The people who had the money could go in and finance the mines and other things.

I don't see why that wouldn't be true here. We have the plant, we have the finance, and all that. What we are going to be lacking more and more is a market for some of our products. I saw

only the other day that in the automobile business the foreign market is going down and down. We need this European market, and we are in position to take advantage of it, but we can't take advantage of it unless we have a system that is building up the standards of living in the other countries too, and this union would build up theirs .and build up ours both.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, you will have some people who will be fearful that we will be opening our own great market here to anything that may be produced abroad. There will be a fear that there will be a rush here to grab the wonderful market that the United States presents.

Mr. STREIT. I would say, let us see whether there is any sense in these fears by making a thorough exploration, as only this convention can, by having the thing fully argued out, and every one of these thoughts being given a thorough airing (a) in the convention and then in the period of ratification of any constitution it puts before us. Every industry that feels it is going to be hurt, you know how they will yell about it and bring it to everybody's attention. So I think that there isn't much danger of us escaping, or overlooking, any troubles in this thing.

But there is danger, however, of our overlooking what the facts are, what industries are going to be hurt, and which are going to be helped. Right now our magazine, *Freedom & Union*, is making a study of that very problem: Which are the industries that would actually be hurt by such a union in this country, and which would be aided by it?

From the expert opinion I have so far had, the belief is that the great majority of the breadwinner industries of the country, the ones with the big pay rolls, are going to be helped by it. There will be some that will be hurt. I would think that we could have some transition measures for them, something to tide them through to some other kind of industry, or to tide over any industry in England or France or Holland or Belgium that is going to be hurt. That would be much less costly than to maintain this system of separate armed forces, of separate currencies, for with all their devaluation dangers which you mentioned, the cost of those measures would be

infinitely more than the cost of union.

PERSISTENCE OF VETO

Senator THOMAS of Utah. One question: I am always back on the same question, because there is really and truly only one basic question to federation, and that is getting rid of the individual entity and sinking a little bit of his individuality into the group notion.

I want to point out how the veto idea persists, and while we call it by a different name, it is there. The last big international pact we entered was the North Atlantic Pact. How does anyone else join the North Atlantic Pact, any other country that is not in it?

Mr. STREIT. You are asking me?

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Yes. I want to make this point, because that is your big problem.

Mr. STREIT. In that pact, I am not an authority on it, but I understand you have to have the acceptance of all the others.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Yes. So that, not to be too extreme, Iceland could veto the entrance of Spain.

Mr. STREIT. In theory, sir.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. In theory, yes.

In going over the whole world's history with regard to trying to bring countries together there is only one way of doing it. The theory of the big fish eating the little fish is one good way to unite countries. That is in reality the Soviet theory today. Their theory is a political theory quite as much as it is an economic theory, quite as much as it is a governmental theory. They have the three things combined, and the reason they can grow in the way in which they do grow is because they have a political concept connected with what they are accomplishing. They have a single will, to begin with, that there shall be only one judgment in a state, and then, wherever they go, that judgment must be accepted. That is a political idea and it takes in both peoples and lands, so that you have in theory, at any rate, almost a virtual annexation wherever you go.

Still they have a federal system. That is, the Soviets are more or less independent and they can all meet together and they can hold their discussions in which they enjoy themselves in their discussions.

Each time that the world has got to the place where it has attempted-for instance to have 50 nations together. The thing that breaks it is this idea of, you call it the veto now, but it is the idea of sovereignty, the idea of being frightened, of being compelled to do something that you do not want to do.

You talk about the standard of living, and therefore you must have a veto to protect your standard of living. Our standard of living is based upon a monetary national average. It is perfectly possible to find some people in the poorest state in the world living better than our best people do, where the standard of living is high. That is, if the living standard depends upon how many eggs for breakfast and lamb chops for lunch and how much roast beef for supper. If that represents the high standard, we find that standard very high in some places where the standard of living is not so high. There are very few people in America who can afford to sleep on silk sheets, but there are lots of poor people in the world who use the equivalent of silk sheets-if they use sheets.

There are all of these factors, and with each one of them comes a fear. We say we have solved the problem in America of free trade between the States. I think it has been two generations since a ton of Utah hay ever got into California. You see, it is the same old question. No Arizona grapefruit can get into California now. It isn't because it isn't grapefruit, but they have some other reason. .And if you can, in this educational process you are going through, get rid of some of the notions that we have in regard to our individual sovereignty, we may step forward.

I can give you one idea of our being able to go and get rid of those ideas. Look at the opposition to the World Court. In the beginning it was one kind of opposition. The second time it was still about the same kind of opposition. Then we accepted the compulsory clause but we added to it two amendments, which showed that old veto idea is still there in regard to certain things.

Now, even in your scheme, you see, you say that when it comes to currency there must be certain limitations; when it comes to armament there must be certain limitations; when it comes to various factors there have to be certain limitations.

Mr. STREIT. I meant there would be certain transition measures.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Do not let us be entirely discouraged because we are changing in so many ways. It is unbelievable how fast we change, and it is also unbelievable how quickly economic factors in relation to our lives and to other countries cause us to change.

I think that health provisions-foot-and-mouth disease; the way we changed our minds on that, for example-are a very, very helpful sign that probably we may be able to understand this thing, which I call national sovereignty, more when it is in practice, and solve that. The rest of it will be easy.

LOCATION OF SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. STREIT. You have put your finger on the heart of it, I think, Senator Thomas. The basic thing to my mind is where the sovereignty lies, and we have wandered so far away from the basic American principles on that question that we have unconsciously adopted the Old World theories of it, that the principle thing is the sovereignty of the state. Well, I was brought up in Missouri in the notion that the state was made for the people in it, and I didn't realize how much I had absorbed that until I got to the League of Nations and saw it operating on the other basis, that we must always sacrifice the people, their lives, their liberty, their prosperity, for the sake of the sovereignty of the state.

I thought that we citizens picked and chose where to delegate our own sovereignty. We made and changed government according to whether the people would be more powerful and freer. But that is not the way we have been going. We have unconsciously absorbed the idea that because the sovereignty of the United States has been beneficial to freedom in some respects, at some time, it

must therefore be that in all respects forever. We had to go through the same problem before in each of the thirteen States, the same issue of sovereignty, and we established, by the grace of God-really, it was a miracle; the more I look back into that period the more of a miracle it seems to me that they established this Constitution of ours, which has no veto except the veto of the Senate over the House and the veto of the House over the Senate. That is the only absolute veto in our form of government, that legislation has to be adopted by both Houses of Congress, but it is the majority in each that can veto that legislation, the President's veto being only temporary if Congress chooses to override it.

That, as you say, was a bloodless revolution but a tremendous revolution nevertheless, and the net result of it was to increase the sovereignty of the individual, his freedom, to an extraordinary degree. It gave him far more security for his life; it gave him a far greater market in which to get his goods in the cheapest place and to sell them in the dearest place all over the country. It gave him one currency that he could use wherever he went through this country. It gave him-you spoke of sinking individuality. Well, in a sense yes, but I find that individuality is enormously expanded by our system. At least I feel that I am very lucky to have been born in this country, an American citizen with all the country, so to speak, as my oyster, if you understand what I mean. It is all before us. Instead of being in some cramped little country with a language that nobody can understand, we have this huge area for any person to expand in, no matter where his ideas may lead him whether they are in engineering science, or what you will. It is a great free advantage and a great free possibility of developing the individual that our American Federal Union gives each of us.

You spoke this morning about the flag, and people often bring that up, the symbol of the flag. This Atlantic Convention won't be taking down the United States flag. Our flag is the only flag I know of which stands for a body of principles. It is not just colors up there. The design is there to represent what? Federal union-federal union of the free.

Well, how on earth are we taking down that flag when we apply those principles between nations, when our generation does what every previous generation of Americans before our time has done? That was to extend this area of free Federal Union to more and more States, to more and more people, until we reached the Pacific, the Rio Grande, the Great Lakes. And then we stopped. We stopped in the Air Age extending the advantage union gave. Union brought us the airplane; brought us mass production; brought us all these things, and it was at that time we stopped this expansion of a great free market, of a common currency, of a strong free government, and we have seen the trouble that follows.

Well, to go on with that union—that is what this resolution would have us do. We haven't got the time, it seems to me, to go creeping along as we have before; we must begin now to apply these principles that the United States flag so beautifully embodies, see whether we can apply them around the Atlantic Ocean to begin with and then, following the practice that led us across this continent, carry the principles of our flag all around the world.

PUBLIC SUPPORT OF ATLANTIC UNION

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. Streit, I know you and I would be somewhat biased witnesses on this question, but I have had the impression that perhaps we here in Congress may be a little bit behind the American people generally on the idea that they want us to get on at least with an exploration of what further we can do to apply principles of federation with the people that we have been doing business with. I know in my own case, having been in a good many sections of the country and particularly with students in universities and schools, I find that there is not only a great deal of interest but a strong feeling that we have reached a point where we must not only hold the imagination of our own people and rouse the imagination of people in other democracies, but that we must commence an investigation to see what further we can do along the lines of federal union, or limited federation,

You have had the opportunity, I believe, of appearing before audiences and meeting with people all over the United States. What is your opinion about the rate of increase of interest and acceptability on the part of the people to a program of this kind?

Mr. STREIT. Thank you very much for that question, Senator Kefauver. I think it is a very important ne.

I do have some basis to answer on. I have addressed I do not know how many audiences in all parts of our country in the last 10 years. There has been a steady increase in the responsiveness, and from the start I have felt this, and also checked it by polls of audiences – I would ask audiences a series of questions before I even began to speak as to how far they were prepared to go, and all the audiences were ready to go far beyond what people thought they would do. And these were not audiences, I would have you understand, that were hand-picked. I have spoken to Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions Clubs, Optimist Clubs, others where it doesn't matter to them what speaker is there, they have to come anyway. Almost invariably the result is the same. There is a very deep interest in union of the free.

You gentlemen are all much better speakers than I. I am just a writer. But you can tell when you are talking to an audience whether you have their interest, whether the thought is really catching hold. There is a sort of an electricity that sets up between speaker and audience, and I have felt that all over our country.

Well now, if that can happen to a man like me, with no particular standing, what would happen if men of your caliber and other men in the Government here would speak in these terms to the American people?

I think we are all playing the American people short. They have done everything that has been asked of them in the past 10 years, in the war, in the building of ships, in the building of planes. atomic bombs. In everything we have tried to do, the American people have responded. To explore Atlantic union, this is the one thing we have not asked them to do, and my experience all over the country is such that there isn't a doubt in my mind, if the men of top caliber in our country will take this issue to heart and study it and

get down to these basic principles of freedom and union and get out and talk about them, they can carry the country. There is no doubt about it, and they can carry Europe along, too.

I have had experience over there, too. I lived for many years as a correspondent traveling and living in various countries in western Europe. I haven't the faintest doubt that such an offer as this would electrify Europe as nothing else we can do.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Thank you very much, Mr. Streit. The hearing will stand in recess.

C. Testimony of Will Clayton, Vice President, Atlantic Union Committee

Mr. Clayton. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee and to discuss with you briefly a subject which I am sure is very near the hearts and minds of all of us and this the question of world peace, how to get it and how to keep it.

I have a short statement that I would like to make first and then I will be very glad to submit myself to the questions of the committee.

I am appearing here in support of House Resolution 107 and 111, concurrent resolution, which I believe is known as the Atlantic Union Resolution. I think we have to start off by recognizing that Soviet Russia has separated the world into two hostile camps, a Communist world and a free world. These two worlds it seems to me could exist side by side in complete peace, if the Communists would only conduct themselves honorably. As we all know from very bitter experience, they will not do this. The gigantic struggle known as the cold war which is now going on between these two worlds is so universal and so explosive in nature that I think we would all agree it could result in consequences too dreadful to contemplate. Indeed the outcome of this war may decide the question of man's freedom for a thousand year's to come. This is not a war—at least not yet—of opposing armies, guns, bombs, and battleships but it could quickly become that kind of war. It is now a war of opposing ideas and ideals of life and government. It is a war

of paganism against Christianity.

The people of the United States, as Justice Roberts said a few days ago, could easily lose their freedom in this war without ever firing a gun in their defense.

Now Lenin and Staling have told the world time and again what they intend to do to it, just as Hitler did, but nobody believed Hitler and few believe Stalin. Hitler failed, it is true, but as he went out he slammed the door so hard it jarred the universe, as he promised he would do.

Stalin is a much shrewder, abler man than Hitler ever was. Guided by Oriental cunning, he works with this new technique, the cold war. Boring from within. It is less risky, less costly and much more effective. If we had before us here today a map of the world, drawn to outline the progress and developments in the cold war—black for communism and white for freedom, this is what it would show: Most of continental Asia in black and the rest of it resting under a very dark shadow; most of the European Continent in black right up to and west of Berlin and much to the rest of it sustained by subsidies from the United States; the United States still in white, of course, but caught midway between Europe and Asia is a sort of huge economic vise or pincers, the pressures of which are fast becoming unbearable. Those pressures will grow and grow.

The principal weapons in this war are economic. One of Stalin's most effective weapons is the fear which he instills into the ranks of democratic governments, causing them to spend excessively for armaments, and the fear which he instills into private people, causing them to withhold the capital upon which free enterprise depends.

The economic burden of fighting the cold war is getting too heavy for the democracies. It is straining even our strong backs. We should recognize that this economic burden is much less on Stalin than it is on us. It is much less on the Communists than it is on the democracies for the simple reason that theirs is a totalitarian economy and the people are really slaves who work for very little and can be made to do anything that the master commands.

We must find some less costly road to world peace and we

must find it quickly. In our modern world, enormously shrunk by scientific developments, the United States could not long exist as an island of democracy and free enterprise, surrounded by a sea of socialism and communism. I think we are all agreed on that statement, that in our modern world we could not long go on as a democracy and a country of free enterprise if the rest of the world were Communist and Socialist.

Stalin is winning the cold war. The Communists are closing in on us. If we go on for another 5 years like we have the last 5 years, 1955 will probably find the Western Hemisphere surrounded by communism.

Some people say "Oh, well, the world has been threatened by 'isms' before and they usually disappear, they have always disappeared and communism will be no exception. It is a pretty tough old ward and it can stand the pressures until communism does disappear." I wonder if want to gamble on communism disappearing, because we might lose. The truth of the matter is that communism is catching on in the world. It feeds on cold, hunger, and hopelessness. There is entirely too much of that kind of food in the world today and too little of the kind that nourishes the body, the heart, and the spirit.

Communism aims to destroy religion, the home, and the dignity of man. It would set up the state as master and the people as slaves. Communism is lead by shrewd, determined men. They care little for human life, their own included. If the leaders of the free peoples of the world had the same develop and the same drive to preserve freedom as the Communists have to destroy it, there would be no need to fear. The Communists are awakening the masses and make no mistake about it, the masses are listening. In the old days the masses suffered in silence, in isolation and in ignorance but in our modern world they are no longer silent, their isolation is gone forever, and their ignorance is fast disappearing. The masses know there is something wrong with a system that leave them suffering for the bare necessities of life. It does little good to preach democracy to a man who has to see his wife and children go to bed cold and hungry every night. Too many

hundreds of millions of people throughout the world are in that condition, today.

The United States has poured billions of dollars into various parts of the world—principally western Europe—to try to restore conditions of economic health. Economic health is the greatest bulwark against the march of communism. Without this help there is little doubt that communism would have marched to the English Channel before now.

When Viscount Montgomery was here a short time ago he made the statement that the greatest bulwark in the difficult days which lie ahead of us, the greatest bulwark in the difficult days which lie ahead of us, the greatest bulwark against communism and against the probability of a third world war, would lie in the restoration of economic health to western Europe. I think that was not an overstatement.

Beginning with World War I up to the present time, the United States has given away to other nations, in war and in peace, right at \$100,000,000,000 and spent another \$300,000,000,000 fighting two world wars.

We cannot go on that way. A continuation along that road would lead to disaster.

Nevertheless, we must not forget at the very heart of the foreign policy of the United States is the principle that the preservation of the integrity and independence of the remaining free peoples of the world is of vital concern to the United States.

We cannot sit idly by and see friendly nations picked off one by one, and added to Russia's satellites. We read the other day that one of the arguments in favor of our development of the hydrogen bomb is the fear that Russia will develop such a bomb and use it against us. Of course, Russia will develop this bomb if she can. But we must remember that plans for mutual destruction provoke destruction. Let us try to find a way to save the world instead of destroying it. The Atlantic Union Committee believes there is such a way.

If we can win the cold war before it becomes a shooting war we will have found the road to world peace. To win the cold war,

economic health must be restored to the free people of the world.

The Marshall plan has been extremely useful in affording a breathing spell; but it has not and cannot restore economic independence to western Europe; the loss of independence is to be found in causes deeper than anything the Marshall plan can reach.

These causes relate largely to the pattern of small economic compartments in which Europe operates. The fetish of nationalism and sovereignty is deeply embedded in the fabric of our western civilization. It is a heritage of many centuries when a man could travel no farther than this horse would take him and when the range of his voice was a few hundred yards. This system of sovereignty did not work too badly until the beginning of the twentieth century but it was really doomed by the advent of the industrial revolution.

In our modern world an economy built on a pattern of division into many small economic compartments will not function. Economic health can be restored to western Europe by bringing into one union of the free peoples of the world. We would then have one single competitive economy for all the democracies.

Every producer in the union would have a free market of 350 to 400 million consumers, but we now have a free market in our 48 States of 150,000,000 consumers, on which fact more than on any other single fact, perhaps, rests the great progress, the outstanding progress, which the United States has made economically and in other ways.

If our forefathers in writing the Constitution in 1787 had decided the question as to whether there should be tariffs and impediments to trade between the Thirteen Colonies, if they had decided that question in a different way from the way in which they did decide it, and we had continued on that road, imagine what kind of country we would have today.

Competition within this vast, rich, free market area would create within a few years the most efficient system of production and distribution that the world has ever known; the standard of living would rise; free enterprise would be strengthened; communism would disappear. Some people say, "What do you

have in mind joining up the free United States with Socialist England?" The answer is: "Certainly because if that were done, socialism in England would quickly disappear." If you open up any Socialist country freely to the competition of the outside world, socialism cannot and will not prevail. In the union that we are talking about, of the United States and other free countries of the world, joined in one union with one single competitive economy, it would be impossible for socialism in the sense that it involves socialization of the principal means of production and distribution of goods, it would be impossible for socialism to continue.

The union that we are talking about would possess such an overwhelming weight of the world's economic, industrial, military and spiritual power, that no nation on earth would dare attack. If this union had been organized prior to 1914, there would have been no World War I or World War II. I do not think anybody can deny that statement. If organized now, there will be no world war III. We may have a difference of opinion about that but I don't think we can have any about the fact that if the union had been in existence in 1914 there would never have been World War I or World War II.

Such a union would be so prosperous that the pull on the Russian satellite countries lying in between the east and the west in Europe would be so much greater from the west than from the east that these satellites would in time gravitate to the west, and Russia would be compelled to return to her prewar boundaries. Then and only then will there be peace in the world.

The Communist world is unified, covering an area now of 15,000,000 square miles with 750,000,000 people. Why should the free peoples of the world erect all kinds of walls and barriers between them to break down and divide their strength? And if those walls and barriers now exist, why should they not be torn down, to put the free peoples of the world in a position where they can stand up against a unified Communist world?

We cannot win the fight against communism in the way in which the democracies are carrying it on today. We must unify the democracies of the world with one foreign policy, one defense policy, one currency and no customhouses between its members, in

order to give the free world the strength and mobility to resist the onslaughts of the Communist world.

Atlantic Union would break down the small economic compartments in which western Europe now operates and which keeps her tools of production inefficient, unable to compete in the markets of the world. It would solve the dollar problem. It would dispel the fear of war and greatly reduce the present unbearable military burden of the democracies. It would release and vitalize the labor, the genius, and capital of men everywhere. It would give a great new hope to the world that at last we are on the road to a permanent world peace.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that any expression of views by me regarding any of the detailed structure of the constitution of the union that we are talking about are entirely my own personal views and are not to be interpreted as the views of the Atlantic Union Committee for the simple reason that the Atlantic Union Committee has not yet formulated its views on matters of that kind. However, I cannot conceive of a union such as we are talking about being formed and being effective unless it is organized along the general principles that I have here enumerated. However, I want to make it clear that what the Atlantic Union Committee is seeking to do at the present time is to get this resolution adopted by Congress, for the purpose of which, as you know, is to call an international convention of representatives of the sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty, to meet with representatives of any other governments that they might invite to sit in with them for the purposes of exploring how far they can go within the framework of the United Nations, to form a federal union of their peoples.

D. State Department Comment on SCR 567, Testimony of Under Secretary of State John D. Hickerson

Mr. HICKERSON. Mr. Chairman, in addressing myself to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, calling for United States initiative in convening the participants to the North Atlantic Treaty with a

view to the establishment of a free Atlantic Federal Union, I should like to point out that application of "the principles of free federal union" as between the United States and any other country or countries would involve not only basic economic and social changes but also changes in the structure of the United States Government. While all of us in the department are acutely aware of the urgency for continued study to sound, practicable action in progressing toward closer association of the free world, it is the fundamental issues which this resolution raises in terms of both the United States and other countries which I would like first to discuss.

Senator WILEY. It seems to me the basis of the resolution is simply to explore, is it not?

Senator HICKERSON. Yes, sir. I shall deal with that in the course of my comments, Senator Wiley.

Senator WILEY. All right.

PUBLIC REACTION TO ATLANTIC UNION

Mr. HICKERSON. What would be the reactions of our fellow Americans to the implications of such an Atlantic Federal Union?

Clearly, United States participation in such a union would involve the ceding of power by the United States Government to some new authority in many fields, such as the conduct of relations with other governments, control of our armed forces, taxation, imports, currency, exploitation of our national resources, and immigration. Are the American people prepared to do so? To what kind of authority? By what process?

Most of the powers which would be transferred would affect every American, but some powers would affect some groups more than others. What would be the effect on labor standards? Business? Agriculture?

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Presumably, amendment of the United States Constitution

would be involved. What mandate from the people or the Congress would United States representatives need to negotiate with other governments on matters which would involve such changes?

Other countries proposed for membership have different forms of government than ours and different political systems. How far would the American people be prepared to go in altering our form of government? Are they prepared to have the representatives of the American people a minority in the parliament of such a union?

EFFECT ABROAD

Now let us consider the effect of this proposal on other nations of the free world. It would be difficult to establish a federal Atlantic Union without profound economic repercussions upon agriculture, industry, and labor of all participating countries. Just as in our own case, which peoples would be prepared to relinquish part of their sovereignty in such fields as imports and exports, currency, taxation, immigration, and defense?

What would be the effect of the establishment of the proposed Atlantic Union upon free countries not included in the Union upon their sense of security and upon their attitude toward the United States?

Furthermore, one of the most difficult problems in any new international arrangement is the question of membership. What other countries would be invited to participate in this Union and on what basis would they be selected? The composition of this Union or Convention would greatly affect its character. The more homogenous the group, the easier it is to make progress, but the greater the number excluded. For the present, the approach of separate arrangements for dealing with different problems, and with different membership, is valuable in preventing any sharp distinction between the "ins" and the "outs."

CLOSER ASSOCIATION NECESSARY

It is true that the acceleration of scientific development and of the impact of events in an increasingly crowded world lends urgency to the need for further developments in the field of political relationships. We believe that progressively closer association, by limited and practicable steps on the basis of common interests, and in support of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, within as much as practicable of the free world, is both necessary and desirable. The United States as a world power must accordingly participate in the process of association in such ways and to such an extent as may be necessary most effectively to promote its common interests with other free nations.

In the development of such closer associations, care must be exercised not to set in motion forces which will render more difficult the maintenance of the solidarity of the free world in support of the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

In a number of countries in the Atlantic community, progress in both the national and international fields has resulted from the willingness of certain groups to accept sacrifices primarily on the basis of national interest. It will take a very long time before similar strong loyalty to a new political unit emerges. We believe that under the present North Atlantic Treaty arrangements, we are utilizing this force in the most constructive way at this stage of development in international relations. The establishment at this time of such a federation, far from providing additional strength, could be a source of weakness and greater internal divisions. Furthermore, the effective operation of democracy in some of the suggested participants is severely hampered by the system of splinter parties which might be carried over and even intensified in such a federation.

We are dealing with new problems, new at least in form, magnitude, and intensity. We need new answers. We must draw on available patterns and historical experience as far as we can, but this field involves far-reaching pioneering. New patterns, new methods, and new institutions will all be necessary, and they cannot be found, much less developed, overnight.

It is easy to overemphasize the importance of institutional

changes. The basic functional problems, economic and other— such as the dollar gap, for instance—must be solved in any event. New institutional forms will undoubtedly be necessary, and work on the functional problems will help to indicate their nature more clearly. The establishment of new institutions can facilitate solution of these problems, and where that is true they should certainly be established. Their establishment, however, will not in itself solve them.

We are convinced that the Congress and the people support our working toward world conditions adequate to assure the individual the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness through both the method of seeking by all practicable means to strengthen the United Nations and the method of progressively closer association within the free world, utilizing practicable associations based on common interest.

We should continue to support such presently practicable measures as the Economic Cooperation Administration, mutual defense assistance program, operation of the North Atlantic Treaty and the inter-American system, cooperation with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, ratification of the International Trade Organization, and encouragement of such developments as Benelux and the Council of Europe. The people, the Congress, and the Executive can each play a valuable role in formulating the basis for further decisions as to what is practicable and in the United States interest, and each has a great responsibility to discharge in considering such decisions and implementing them when taken.

CONVENTION WOULD RAISE FALSE HOPES

The proposed resolution directs its attention primarily to calling a convention to explore the possibilities of Atlantic Union. We believe that if the Government should sponsor such a convention at this time, it would raise false hopes. If the convention did not succeed, it would lead to reactions unfavorable to the cause of collective security.

Under present circumstances, such a convention appears more likely to bring to light and emphasize the divisions among the proposed members of the Atlantic Union than to lead to substantial progress in the desired direction. In view of these facts, the projected convention would seem likely to weaken rather than strengthen both the Atlantic community and the United Nations. We, therefore, feel that the convention should be called only if it is clearly evident that (1) it will advance American interests; (2) that both the convention and program have the support of the American people and other peoples concerned, with a full understanding of the implications of each; (3) that there is a reasonable chance of agreement; and (4) that it would strengthen rather than weaken both the North Atlantic community and support for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

STATE DEPARTMENT CANNOT SUPPORT SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

For the reasons which I have given, the Department cannot support this particular resolution. Yet I believe that the finding of answers to the problems which have just been raised constitutes a great challenge to both official and private thoughts, and we at the State Department are devoting our best efforts toward making our contribution.

E. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Pros and Cons, 1950

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 57 (THE KEFAUVER OR "ATLANTIC UNION" RESOLUTION)

A. Essentials of resolution

In the light of the experience of the United States in the creation of a Federal union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberties and common heritage of the American colonies, this resolution requests the President to invite the democracies of the North Atlantic (Canada, United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the United States) to name

delegates representing their principle parties to meet in a federal convention "to explore how far their peoples. . .can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union." Other democracies might be invited to join the convention or come into the union, if one were established, at a later date.

The resolution calls for a convention "to explore" the possibilities of the creation of an Atlantic Union. Representation to the convention, according to supporters of the resolution, would be roughly on a population basis; voting would be by states on the instrument the conference might produce, subject to subsequent ratification by the parties; the United States delegation might include representatives from the executive, the legislature, State officials, and private citizens. Some proponents of the resolution might envisage a constitution which would contain a bill of rights, and a frame of government including a legislature, and executive capable of enforcing law upon the citizens, and judiciary to adjudicate disputes between citizens. Power might be divided in three ways: (1) those reserved to the people, (2) those reserved to the states, and (3) those delegated to the union. The latter might include "(1) a union defense force and foreign policy; (2) a union free market; (3) a union currency; (4) a union postal system; (5) a union citizenship in addition to national citizenship; and (6) a union power of taxation to render the union capable of implementing and exercising its delegated powers" (Mr. Justice Roberts, hearings, pp. 235 - 236).

United States participation in such a union would require amendment to the Constitution. An attempt to form such a union would not, according to its proponents, violate any provisions of the UN Charter. The union would be "totally independent" of the Charter.

The Atlantic Union proposal differs from most of the other proposals in two very important ways. In the first place, it does not contemplate any kind of open door for the Soviet Union to come in if it wishes. Secondly, while it does propose bypassing the United Nations, neither does it call for working through the United

Nations.

B. Principle arguments in support of resolution

(See hearings, p. 228, and following.)

1. This is a simple resolution that asks nothing more than that the United States "explore" the possibility of applying federal union principles to unite the democracies of the North Atlantic. No one should object to exploration of this important matter at this critical time in world history.

2. This resolution contains an idea and a definite plan for strengthening the democracies in the cold war. It is realistic because it seeks to bring together peoples with a like heritage and with experience in democracy.

3. An effective Atlantic Union would reduce the danger of Soviet aggression since it would "cement the tremendous resources of these democracies" and thereby supply the only safety we can expect in this world – "a tremendous preponderance of power..." (Justice Roberts, hearings, p. 248.). "No nation on earth would dare attack" such a union (Mr. Clayton, hearing, p. 267).

4. Passage of the resolution would quiet European fears of our possible return to isolationism.

5. This plan cannot be vetoed or delayed by the United Nations and yet it would immeasurably strengthen the United Nations by uniting those members most devoted to the UN aims of world peace, world freedom, and world justice.

6. An Atlantic Union would establish a free market 400,000,000 people. This would provide an element of stability for the people within the union as well as for people outside the union who would have to deal with it. Competition within this vast, rich, free market area would create within a few years the most efficient system of production and distribution that the world has ever known.

7. The people of the world interested in democracy and freedom would get a psychological lift from the creation of a union of the democracies. Such a union would hold forth hope to people behind the iron curtain who now see no hope of eventual liberation,

as well as to backward and colonial peoples of the world who aspire to freedom and democracy.

8. An Atlantic Union would create such preponderance of military and economic strength on the side of freedom that the Soviet Union would be willing to make agreements that might lead to world peace.

C. Principal arguments against the resolution.

(See hearings, p. 435 and following.)

1. The establishment of a federal union as between the United States and any other country or countries would involve not only basic economic and social changes but also important changes in the structure of the United States Government. It is very doubtful if the American people are ready to amend the Constitution to the extent necessary to give an Atlantic Union the powers it would need to be effective.

2. The establishment of a federal Atlantic Union would have—

profound economic repercussions upon agriculture, industry, and labor of all participating countries (hearings, p. 436).

Such a union at this time might raise more problems than it would solve and care would need to be exercised—

not to set in motion forces which will render more difficult the maintenance of the solidarity of the free world in support of the principle and purposes of the United Nations (hearings, p. 437).

Furthermore, the establishment at this time of such a federation might not provide additional strength but might instead be a source of weakness and internal divisions within the Atlantic Treaty area.

3. While it is recognized that new basic functional problems, such as the dollar gap, must be solved and new institutional forms will undoubtedly be necessary, it is early to overemphasize the

importance of institutional changes. The establishment of new institutional forms will not itself solve the problems.

4. If the Government were to sponsor at this time a convention to explore the possibilities of Atlantic Union, it might raise false hopes. If the convention did not succeed, it might well lead to reactions unfavorable to the cause of collective security.

Under the present circumstances, such a convention appears more likely to bring to light and emphasize the divisions among the proposed members of the Atlantic Union than to lead to substantial progress in the desired direction (hearings, p. 438).

5. The representatives of the Department of State indicated that a convention should only be called

only if it is clearly evident that (1) it will advance American interests; (2) that both the convention and program have the support of the American people and other peoples concerned, with a full understanding of the implications of each; and (3) that there is a reasonable chance of agreement; and (4) that it would strengthen rather than weaken, both the north Atlantic community and support for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter (hearings, p. 438).

6. An attempt by the Atlantic nations to create a preponderance of power might be construed by other nations as an attempt on the part of the democracies to dominate the world. That construction of the event would certainly be put forth by the Soviet Union. Furthermore, such a development might be construed as a surrender to the balance of power theory and might intensify the arms race.

Exhibit 5 – The European Federation Resolution

A. European Federation Resolution, SCR 12, 1950

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the political federation of Europe.

B. Statement of Senator Thomas of Utah.

There will be no witnesses for this resolution. In a sense, the purposes of the resolution have expanded. The idea of a European Federation is, of course, very old, and Senator Fulbright and I have been sponsors of these resolutions for a long time.

I was associated back in my early days with Mr. Briand, the former Foreign Minister of France, with his movement to attempt to create the Federation of Europe right after the First World War. There has been some progress in a sentimental way since the end of the Second World War. However, conditions often prove to people what our last witness mentioned, that we are unable to get rid of the notion of national sovereignty.

We brought this resolution forth when the Marshall plan was first under consideration. We were trying to figure some way of aiding Europe to become more stabilized and better established. It seemed to us that it was necessary for European countries to move along political lines in connection with any movement along economic lines or social lines, in bringing about that unity.

We have succeeded, of course, in every one of the bills which Congress has passed, which are now laws, of bringing some pressure for the political integration of Europe. Our purpose was to assist the Marshall plan in working effectively to eliminate to some extent the intense nationalisms that must not work against one

another in the accomplishment of a restored Europe.

The idea, of course, will never die. It will never succeed, however, as every witness who has appeared before us has pointed out, until the everlasting conflict—which exists among independent sovereign nations, until the barriers which are set up in support of the various nationalism are things of the past—have died. They have made peace and cooperation almost impossible. This holds, whether it is an economic movement that is attempted, whether it is an economic movement that is attempted, whether it is a social movement or whether it is a political movement.

It would not be right to not say a word about this resolution, as we are covering all of the other resolutions that are before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

C. State Department Comment Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

Mr. HICKERSON. The next one is Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, sir. This is the Thomas-Fulbright resolution, sir.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Is that world federation?

MR. HICKERSON. Federation of Europe.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Do you realize why that was brought out at this time?

Mr. HICKERSON. Yes, sir. I understand that no witnesses were to be called to discuss that resolution, and that you wished to include it for the completion of the record.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. That is right.

Mr. HICKERSON. We did not prepare a detailed official statement dealing with that proposal. If you wish, sir, I can give you a brief, two-paragraph comment.

I may say that with Congress, the Department has for some time viewed favorably the measures which have been undertaken in Europe to develop and strengthen the unity of the nations of that area. In the preamble of the Economic Cooperation Act, Congress encouraged the unification of Europe. The Department of State shares gratification felt by many Members of Congress over the movement toward stronger economic and political inter-

relationships. This is an example of the trend toward the closer association under the United Nations of all free nations in the world.

In view of the fact that such a positive statement favoring this movement was included in the preamble of the Economic Cooperation Act, I would think that no further expression of Congress' favorable sentiment would be necessary. In fact, it might be preferable for Congress not to adopt any particular resolution on this subject at the present time.

D. SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12 (THE FULBRIGHT - THOMAS OR "EUROPEAN FEDERATION" RESOLUTION)

A. Essentials of resolution

This resolution states that Congress "favors the political federation of Europe" in order that a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe may be encouraged. This resolution first offered when the Marshall plan was under consideration, grew out of the belief that "it was necessary for European countries to move along political lines in connection with any movement along economic lines or social lines" if Europe was to become more stabilized and better established

(hearings, p. 344).

B. Comment on resolution

This resolution has been pressed during the past few years when one of the aims of the Marshall plan has been to encourage the economic unification of Europe in order that its economy as a whole might recover.

Proponents of the resolution have felt that it was a mistake to assume, as they felt the administration was doing, that the nations of Europe could be brought together in an economic union without some kind of a political union. While the resolution never passed, the preamble of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, states that it is the "policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe." There is some doubt as to the meaning, whether this language refers to political federation, economic federation, or both. (See Conference Report of

Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, H. Rept. No. 2117, 81st Cong., 2d sess., p. 16.)

The representative of the State Department in testifying on this resolution commented with gratification upon "the rapidity with which the European nations have on their own initiative undertaken various progressive steps toward stronger economic and political interrelationships."

In view of this fact and the positive statement on this subject, which Congress has inserted in the Economic Cooperation Act, the Department felt that "it might be preferable for Congress not to adopt any particular resolution on this subject at the present time." (Hearings, p. 462.) This did not necessarily represent the committee's opinion.

Exhibit 6—Statement of Mrs. Agnes Waters

United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations,
Subcommittee on the Revision of the United Nations Charter,
February 20, 1950

Mrs. WATERS. I should like to challenge the right of this committee to hold any hearings on such subversive resolutions to overthrow our form of government.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. We have the statement of Mrs. Agnes Waters.

Mrs. WATERS. I am protesting the hearings. I protest the right of the Senate to hold any hearings on such subversive measures as this.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Her statement will be printed in the record.

(The statement of Mrs. Agnes Waters is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Mrs. Agnes Waters. My address is P. O. Box 3560, Washington 7, D. C. I appear here against all the resolutions. I will not discuss these resolutions, as they are not worth my time, and I do not consider that any of them have any merit whatsoever. I charge that they are part of an international conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government.

How is it that if these resolutions were sincerely offered in the interests of preventing world wars, that no representative of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Generals Bradley or Collins, or any official of the War or Navy Departments, or any of the security or intelligence officers, or any defense branches of the United States Government, has ever been invited to testify here? And neither were they invited to appear here to testify in the matter of the Genocide Treaty. Why? Do not these matters concern national defense, national security?

The answer is, They don't want these world government things to overthrow the United States of America done to us. Why, even the witness for these resolutions here in the hearings testified

that the public has shown they do not want any part of these resolutions done to us.

We are in a world revolution and we Americans are to go the way of Germans and Japanese. If these treaties and resolutions are passed they mean the extinction of this Republic. And they are with the Genocide Treaty, and other vile treaties to follow, by far the most serious move ever made to bring the people of the United States to their knees, * * * Now let me remind the Members of Congress that they were not elected by the majority to serve special interests. * * * What right have these special interests to be so favored by this breaking-out of a rash of congressional "sponsors" for these subversive resolutions? Why these congressional sponsors are acting like a lot of trained seals performing here at the whip-lash of threats of Red atomic war while these enemy agents or Red lobbies watch and laugh? * * * Let me remind these sponsors of their oath to uphold the Constitution they are aiming to destroy, and let me say that every one of them are liable to arrest for treason, and should resign. The Senate is a party to this conspiracy by offering and sponsoring these resolutions, and also by silence. The Congress of the United States of America has had indisputable evidence and information relative to an amazing international conspiracy to overthrow this Government for many years. * * *

Now some of you who have been supporting world government, can you be sure you are not being used?

I demand that these resolutions and treaties be killed.

I appear here against all world government schemes and specifically against Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, Senate Concurrent Resolution 52, Senate 72, 56 Concurrent Resolution 57, and Senate Resolution 134, all of which resolutions I challenge as against the security and the general welfare of the people of the United States; and I challenge the right of the Senate to hold hearings on these subversive resolutions and treaties, all of which tend to destroy the Government of the United States of America and to set up a world government. You have no authority to do this. This is a legislative coup d'etat, and neither the Senate nor the House has ever been given any such mandate from

the people, such mandate being to overthrow and destroy our Republic. It cannot be legally done to us under our United States Constitution. In fact, such a hearing as this is really punishable by death, as it is nothing short of high treason. * * *

Well, if you pass these treasonous resolutions and treaties now pending, all our American rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will have passed into pure or mere fiction, together with the American flag, and we will become slaves of a foreign power.

And that seems to be the game here, with much laughter from the internationalists who are here pressing for these resolutions unless the American people revolt as in the American Revolution. * * *

First of all, I deny the lie that there is anything fictional about the American flag, whose symbols are liberty and justice for all and whose broad stripes and bright stars unfurled to the sky made tyranny tremble. Was it fictional for great heroes to die for that flag? I want to know. Is it fictional that behind that glorious banner stands an unseen army of hundreds of thousands of American patriots who died for that flag? Is it fiction that by fighting and dying for the flag this Nation was preserved? Is it fiction that today here and now under God, a free Nation standing at attention behind Old Glory, is amassed the bravest and grandest body of American fighting men, the armed forces of the United States of America: our United States Army, our United States Navy, and our United States Marines, who keep the American flag flying over this Capitol? I want to know. Is it fiction that both the armies of the dead and living are here with all the superhuman power of great godlike souls to preserve those Stars and Stripes flying forever? I want to know.

And behind the United States armies stand 140,000,000 Americans. Who will dare haul down that emblem of glory? I want to know.

I am the widow of one of those men, and I have a right to know. I am also the mother of a veteran, and all of my ancestors were patriots, some of whom were with Washington and some later

generations served at Gettysburg.

What is behind this traitorous move to haul down the Stars and Stripes? This question I can answer myself, from more than 10 years of watching, identifying, and pointing out to the Senate the enemies of America coming in here as witnesses and lobbyists under the leadership of Red fronts for Moscow * * *.

And I demand that these bills and treaties be killed—or is it true that the Senate is the prisoner of the Communists? I want to know.

Yours for America,
AGNES WATERS,

Only Woman Candidate for President of the United States of
America

Exhibit 7—Statement of Omar B. Ketchum

Director, National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of
the United States

United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations,
Subcommittee on the Revision of the United Nations Charter,
February 20, 1950

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am grateful for the opportunity and privilege of appearing before your subcommittee as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization composed of approximately 1,250,000 men who have served in the armed forces of the United States on foreign soil or in hostile waters during some war, campaign, or expedition in which our Nation has been involved. My appearance today is to present the viewpoint of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, Senate Resolution 133, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, relating to world government, federation, or union under consideration by this subcommittee.

Since 1943 the Veterans of Foreign Wars has opposed the entrance of our Nation into any form of world government, federation, or union which would require any substantial yielding of our national sovereignty.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Might I ask, does that include the United Nations? Do you oppose the United Nations? You say that since 1943 that your organization has opposed the entry of our Nation into any form of world government.

Will you explain that?

Mr. KETCHUM. We oppose world government, and I will get to that, I will explain our position a little later.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You are not opposed to the United Nations?

Mr. KETCHUM. No, sir; I will make that clear in the

remainder of my statement.

OPPOSITION TO WORLD FEDERATION

This opposition was first expressed in the forty-fourth national convention held in New York City in September of 1943. Continued opposition to a philosophy of world statism was vigorously renewed and reemphasized at our national convention held in Miami, Fla., August 21 – 26, 1949. The resolved clause of the 1949 national convention resolution reads as follows:

Be it resolved, by the Fiftieth Annual National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we hereby declare that we are unalterably opposed to any program which would entail the surrender of any part of the sovereignty of the United States of America in favor of a world government; and be it further

Resolved, That our legislative representatives on both the State and National level be directed to vigorously oppose any effort to place the United States of America in a position which would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty in any form whatsoever.

On the basis of the foregoing resolution the Veterans of Foreign Wars is, therefore, opposed to all of those resolutions now pending in either the Senate or the House of Representatives which declare, imply, or infer that the United States should enter into any form of world government, federation, or union, in which our national sovereignty would be diminished or subordinated.

We recognize there is some confusion and misunderstanding with respect to the intention of those Members of Congress who have sponsored the varying resolutions but is our considered judgment that all of the resolutions which refer to world government, federation or union poses a threat to our national sovereignty. We find it exceedingly difficult to correlate the written and oral statements of objectives by advocates who are supporting these resolutions, in relation to the expressed intention of some of the

Members of congress who have sponsored the resolutions.

We are, therefore, compelled to interpret these resolutions in the light of printed statements and definitions distributed by such supporting groups as the United World Federalists, Inc., and the Atlantic Union, as well as in the light of what would be required to effect a world government, federation or union which could go beyond the present authority and jurisdiction of the United Nations. Proponents of some of these resolutions frankly admit that world government, with all the sovereign powers required, is the definite objective while other proponents deny they are seeking more than to strengthen the United Nations to the point where aggression and war may be prevented and peace maintained. It appears to our organization that there has been much shifting and sidestepping among the proponents of these resolutions when specific points of opposition are encountered.

Out of the morass of confusion, charges and countercharges, there remains the clear and unmistakable fact that no world government, federation or union can be effected without granting it certain sovereign powers over all the participating nations. To participate in either a complete or partial structure of world government, federal or union the United States would have to surrender a substantial part of its present national sovereignty and it would mean the end of the United Nations organization as we know it.

SUPPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has been a staunch supporter of the United Nations since its inception. Our organization was represented by three official observers in San Francisco when the Charter of the UN was adopted. We believe in an association of sovereign nations dedicated to the principle of adjudicating international disputes, discouraging aggression, and preserving the peace. We believe, in spite of its critics, the United Nations has been very effective and, if given the opportunity, will do as much as any world agency that could be formed to settle international disputes

and maintain peace.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars understand from personal experience and the horrors of war and no group of American citizens is more desirous of peace than our organization. However, we want peace with honor and not peace at any price. We recognize the tremendous appeal of the promise of peace which is being advanced by the proponents of world government, federation or union but we also believe that to enter into any one of such proposals would require surrender of national sovereignty and would constitute peace at any price.

If peace at any price, though some form of world federation, is the answer, why did this Nation expend its wealth and manpower in fighting Imperial Germany in 1917-18? Kaiser Wilhelm would have been pleased to bring us in under a world government which he and his military leaders had in mind. The same question could be asked with respect to our all-out opposition to Adolph Hitler and his Nazi cohorts in 1941-45. Herr Hitler would have been delighted to have accepted us-on his terms-into his dream of world government. We are equally certain that Joe Stalin and his satellites would welcome the United States into his plan for world government.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, having risked their lives in three foreign wars and several campaigns to preserve the independence and sovereignty of the United States, take a very dim view of this peace at any price program which is now being advanced. We believe now, as we believe in time of national peril, that it is better to die on our feet than to live on our knees.

DANGER OF A SUPERSTATE

Any plan of world government, federation, or union which could go beyond the authority and jurisdiction of the United Nations would require the following sovereign authority:

First, a super legislature to enact superlaw governing the participating nations. It is inconceivable that representation in such a legislature could be established other than on a population basis.

Second, a supercourt to interpret the law and to sit in judgment on officials and citizens under said law.

Third, a superpolice force or armed services to enforce law and to prevent civil war between participating nations. This would mean that the United States would have to disband its armed forces, surrender its heavy weapons and its military secrets to this supergovernment and maintain only an internal policing force.

Fourth, grant to this supergovernment the authority to impose and collect taxes, above national taxation, and to enforce the collection of said taxes.

Fifth, the free movement of all citizens between the participating nations. This would mean that the supergovernment would control the policy of immigration and the United States would no longer have anything to say concerning immigration. This alone would pose the greatest problem ever to confront our labor and the economy of the United States.

The foregoing points have been directly or indirectly admitted in writings and speeches by responsible spokesmen for groups supporting one or another of these resolutions which are under consideration by this subcommittee. In addition, common sense tells us that any world or supergovernment must have certain overall powers, such as the Federal Government of the United States, if it is to go beyond the present powers of the United Nations. This would clearly require the United States, if a participant, to surrender substantial national sovereignty.

We were delighted to note that the present Federal Administration, through the State Department, has pointedly advised this subcommittee that it wants no part of any scheme for world federation or union and that the administration is satisfied to depend upon an association of sovereign nations the United Nations-to effectively solve international problems without the necessity of surrendering our national sovereignty. We sincerely hope this subcommittee will be guided by the position of the Federal administration, along with the millions of people who are in opposition to these schemes, and bury these resolutions in pigeonholes where they will catch only dust. We have faith that if

mutual understanding and peace between nations can be accomplished, it can best be accomplished through the United Nations. If one or more nations are determined to impose their will and vengeance upon their neighbors it is not likely that any world government, federation, or union could prevent them from trying.

In conclusion, may I urge, on behalf of our organization, that after these hearings are concluded the subject matter be dropped and forgotten. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Thank you for coming, Mr. Ketchum. We appreciate your statement.

Mr. KETCHUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Exhibit 8—The Bricker Amendment: Limiting the Treaty Power by Constitutional Amendment

The Bricker Amendment: Limiting the Treaty Power by
Constitutional Amendment, Congressional Research Service, June 1,
1978

I. Background Information

From 1952 through 1957* considerable interest existed in both Congress and the legal community over a proposed constitutional amendment that would have prevented the United States from entering into certain international obligations. The proposed amendment would have barred the federal government from signing treaties and executive agreements that conflicted with the Constitution, ended the concept of self-executing treaties (treaties that are the law of the land upon exchange of ratifications without the necessity of implementing legislation), and required that the legislation necessary to implement the treaty be based on one or more of the powers delegated to the federal government (other than the treaty power). The chief legislative sponsor of such an amendment was Senator John W. Bricker of Ohio, and the proposed amendment 1/ has become popularly known as the "Bricker Amendment".

Proponents of the Bricker Amendment were concerned that the United States might become obligated to certain international conventions containing provisions violative of the U.S. Constitution. One supporter of the amendment described his concerns in this manner:

The proposed Covenant on Human Rights expressly permits such restrictions on freedom of speech, press and assembly as "are prescribed by law" or "are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety." Article VII of the Convention on Gathering and International Transmission of

News and Right of Correction, which has already been signed for the United States, may well be construed as authorizing peacetime censorship; and the draft Statute for an International Criminal Court, for which a place is made in the Genocide Convention also ready signed, contains no limitation on venue and expressly proscribes trial by jury. 2/

Proponents of the Amendment believed that the Constitution permitted ratification of treaties that were in violation of the Constitution. They pointed out that under Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution laws must be enacted pursuant to the Constitution, while treaties seemingly had 3/only to be made under the authority of the United States. 3/ In 1952, John Foster Dulles commented that

"The treaty-making power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights." 4/

Judicial support for such an interpretation was supplied by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in the case of *Missouri v. Holland*. 5/ That case concerned a 1916 Treaty between Great Britain and the United States which provided protection for certain species of migratory birds that traversed the United States and Canada. The Migratory Bird Act of 1918 prohibited the killing, capturing, or selling of any of the birds listed in the treaty, except when compatible with regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of

Agriculture. The State of Missouri challenged the Treaty on the grounds that the federal government lacked the authority to enter into a treaty governing such subject matter. Plaintiffs also urged that since, in the absence of a treaty, Congress would arguably have had no authority to pass such legislation, law enacted pursuant to the unconstitutional treaty was similarly invalid. The Court ruled that the treaty with Britain was a valid exercise of the treaty power. Since the treaty was valid, the legislation was equally valid under Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution: that is, as a necessary and proper manner of carrying out the powers of government. 6/. Justice Holmes wrote the Opinion of the Court for this case. In the course of that Opinion, Mr. Justice Holmes commented that

Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. 7/

* H.J. Res. 862 (95th Cong., 2nd Sess.) introduced by Mr. Ashbrook (with 20 co-sponsors) is quite similar to Senator Bricker's proposals, and is indicative of continuing Congressional interest in the relationship between treaties and the Constitution.

1/ Senator Bricker actually sponsored several amendments in the various sessions of Congress. The major areas will be discussed *infra*.

2/ Deutsch, Eberhard, "Should the Constitution be Amended to Limit the Treaty-Making Power?" 26 So. Cal. L. Rev. 347, 351 (1953)

3/ Article VI Clause 2 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 made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the

supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

4/ Address before Regional Meeting of the American Bar Association, Louisville, Ky., April 12, 1952, reprinted in Hearings before Subcommittee on the Senate Judiciary Committee on S.J. Res. 1, 83rd Cong. 1st Sess. (1953) at page 863.

4/ cont'd

Later, as Secretary of State in the Eisenhower Administration, Dulles testified in opposition to the Bricker Amendment. He noted that:

The treaty-making power, as it was written into our Constitution, is, to be sure, a large power. Treaties made by the President and concurred in by a two-thirds vote of the Senate become law of the land. No limitation upon the treaty-making powers are explicitly defined in the Constitution or decisions of the Supreme Court. But the treaty-making power is not an unlimited power. All of the Supreme Court cases which deal with the subject are uniform to that effect.

Furthermore, while the Constitution provides that treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, they only rank on an equality with congressional enactments.

The effect of any treaty as internal law can be overcome by a simple act of Congress. That is a constitutional fact which must be, and is, accepted by all other nations which make treaties with us.

The present system has worked well for 160 years. The Supreme Court has never had occasion to hold a treaty to be unconstitutional. On the other hand, no treaty has ever yet been made which can be cited as an example of the abuse of the treaty-making power. These two circumstances are

persuasive evidence of the care with which treaty power has been exercised during the entire existence of our Republic. [Hearings at 824.]

5/ 252 U.S. 416 (1920)

6/ That clause provides that the Congress shall have power... To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

7/ 252 U.S. at 433.

II. Legislative History of the Bricker Amendment

During the 82nd Congress, Senator Bricker sponsored two resolutions concerning limitations on the treaty power. S.J. Res. 102 was introduced during the first Session, on September 14, 1951. The resolution was referred to the Judiciary Committee, but did not receive further attention.

Early in the second Session Senator Bricker and several co-sponsors introduced S.J. Res. 130, a slightly modified version of S.J. Res. 102. A Judiciary Committee Subcommittee held hearings on S.J. Res. 130 in May and June of 1952, but the Senate adjourned in July without taking further action on the proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Senator Bricker and some sixty co-sponsors introduced S.J. Res. 1 at the beginning of the first session of the 83rd Congress. 8/ The Judiciary Committee held hearings on that resolution in February, March, and April of 1953, and favorably reported a modified ^{9/} "Bricker Amendment" to the Senate on June 15, 1953. 10/ The proposed amendment was debated by the Senate from June 20,

1953 until February 26, 1954. 11/ On February 26th, sixty Senators voted for the amendment as it had been further modified on the floor during the debate. 12/ "Thirty-one Senators voted against the amendment. Since two-thirds of each House of Congress must approve a proposed constitutional amendment prior to submission to the States for their approval (U.S. Constitution, Article V) the amendment failed passage.

Senator Bricker offered resolutions similar S.J. Res. 1 in the 84th and 85th Congresses, but they were never voted upon by the Senate.

8/ As introduced, S.J. Res. 1 read

Sec. 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Sec. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Sec. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

Sec. 4. All executive or other agreements, between the President or any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

Sec. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Sec. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.

9/ As modified and reported it read

Sec. 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Sec. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

Sec. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

Sec. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Sec. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.

10/ See S. Rpt. No. 412, Committee on the Judiciary, 83rd Congress, 1st Session.

11/ An amendment offered by Senator Walter F. George was accepted on the final day of debate, February 26th. The George Amendment further emasculated Senator Bricker's proposal. It read:

Sec. 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Sec. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

Sec. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Sec. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

12/ 100 Cong. Rec. 2374

Exhibit 9—Roster, Atlantic Union Committee

Relating to the Calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention,
Senate, Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations on S.
Con. Res. 12, 1955

ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, INC

1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

OFFICERS OF THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE

President: Hon. Owen J. Roberts (deceased), former
Supreme Court Justice.

Vice president: Hon. Will L. Clayton, former Under
Secretary of State.

Secretary: Hon. Lithgow Osborne, former Ambassador to
Norway.

Treasurer: Elmo Roper, marketing consultant and public-
opinion analyst.

Chairman, executive committee: Gerald B. Henry, president,
Henry & Henry, Buffalo, N.Y.

Note.—According to a public opinion survey, published in
Public Opinion Quarterly in January 1954, nearly 10 million
Americans believe in Atlantic Union.

The Atlantic Union Committee is composed of a national
council and thousands of men and women, organized into more
than 100 chapters. Similar committees exist in Canada, Britain,
France, and the Netherlands.

ADDITIONS TO ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, INC.,
NATIONAL COUNCIL SINCE MARCH 15, 1955

Hon. Chester Bowles, former Governor of Connecticut

The Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich, bishop of Michigan
Hon. Guy M. Gillette, former United States Senator
Hon. Rudolph Halley, former president, city council, New
York

Mr. G. E. Hamilton, Democratic State committeeman for
Crawford County, Meadville, Pa.

Dr. Wilbur K. Jordan, president, Radcliffe College,
Massachusetts.

Nicholas Kelly, director, Chrysler Corp., New York
Gen. George C. Marshall, former Secretary of State, and
General of the Army

Hon. Henry T. McIntosh, editor, Albany Daily Herald,
Georgia

The Right Reverend Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta, Ga.

Richard W. Norton, Jr., oil producer, Louisiana

Milton Rosenthal, president, Nelson's of Rome, Inc., New
York

Rev. Harold Paul Sloan, Jr., Michigan

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

A. Van Nierop, former banker, New York

Edward S. White, attorney, Atlanta, Ga.

Harold L. Bache, senior partner, Bache & Co., New York

DELETIONS FROM ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, INC.
NATIONAL COUNCIL SINCE MARCH 15, 1955

Deceased:

Mrs. Mary McCloud Bethune, founder of National Council
of Negro Women, Inc., Florida

Allen L. Billingsley, president, Fuller, Smith & Ross,
Cleveland

Prof. William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard

John Knight, judge, United States district court

Resigned:

Stanley Pedder, attorney, California

Mrs. F. K. Weyerhaeuser, civic leader, St. Paul, Minn.

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL AND BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Alabama:

Dr. Lee Bidgood, dean, School of Commercial Business
Administration, University of Alabama

James A. Simpson, attorney, Birmingham

Arizona:

Herbert Agar, historian, former editor, Louisville Courier
Journal

Dr. Grady Gamage, former president, American Association
of Teachers Colleges; president, Arizona State
College

William A. Glassford, vice admiral, USN, retired

H.O. Hammond, mining engineer, Tucson

Hon. Richard F. Harless, former Member of Congress;
attorney

Dick Jenkins, rancher

Rt. Rev. A. B. Kinsolving II, bishop of missionary district of
Arizona

George F. Spaulding, Phoenix

Arkansas:

Mrs. John R. Hackett, civic leader, Little Rock

Hon. Sidney McMath, former Governor of Arkansas

California:

Paul S. Achilles, former president, the Psychological
Corporation of New York

James D. Adams, attorney, San Francisco

Albert C. Agnew, former attorney, Federal Reserve bank

Warren H. Atherton, former national commander of
American Legion

Dr. Robert R. Aurner, administrative consultant

Dr. Thomas Swain Barclay, professor of political science,
Stanford University

Dr. Rosalind Goodrich Bates, president, International
 Federation of Women Lawyers
 Admiral Andrew C. Bennett, retired naval officer
 George Biddle, writer and artist
 Edgar Bissantz architect, Carmel
 Dr. Elliot Blackwelder, geologist; past president, Geological
 Society of America
 William A. Boekel, attorney, San Francisco
 Dr. Karl Brandt, agricultural economist, Stanford University
 Frank Capra, motion-picture producer
 Lyle E. Cook, attorney, Oakland
 Aylette B. Cotton, attorney, San Francisco
 Chester C. Davis, economist: associate director, Ford
 Foundation
 Maj. Gen John R. Deane, USA, retired, president, Italian-
 Swiss Colony Wine Co.; Chief, American Military
 Mission to Russia, World War II
 Hon. Douglas L. Edmonds, California Supreme Court Justice
 Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., writer, motion-picture Actor,
 producer
 J. R. Files, attorney, Los Angeles
 Farnham P. Griffiths, attorney: president of Bohemian Club,
 SF
 Dr. Robert Gulick, Jr., director, Teaching Institute of
 Economics, University of California
 Prof. Morgan Harris, professor of economics
 Conrad N. Hilton, president of Hilton Hotels Corp.
 Arthur Hornblow, Jr., motion picture producer
 Dr. Henry S. Houghton, physician: former director, Peking
 Union Medical College, China
 George Jessel, motion picture producer, actor, author
 Dr. Theodore J. Kreps, economist, writer, educator, Stanford
 University
 Dr. Russel V. Lee. Physician; educator, Stanford University
 Rev. Franklin D. Loehr, congregational minister, Los Angeles
 Frank McCarthy, motion picture executive, former Assistant

Secretary of State
Wiley W. Mather, attorney, professor of political science
Yehudi Menuhin, violinist
Dr. Clark B. Millikan, director. Daniel Guggenheim
Aeronautical Laboratory, California Institute of
Technology
Victor P. Montgomery, businessman. Montgomery
Properties, Ltd.
S. F. B. Morse. chairman of board, Del Monte Properties Co.
Dr. Peter Odegard, former president, Reed College;
chairman, political science department, University of
California
Lee E. Owens, publisher, Rio Grande Newspapers and
Richmond Independent
Lee E. Owens, Jr., Oakland
Mrs. Wallace T. Partch, Oakland
Donald Culross Peattie, roving editor, Reader's Digest;
Botanist
Stanley Pedder, attorney, Carmel
Dr. Hubert Phillips, president, San Francisco State College
Roy Pinkerton, editor in chief, John P. Scripps Newspapers
Dr. George X Reeves, president. Chapman College
Hon. Will Rogers, Jr., newspaper publisher, former
Congressman
T.W. Rolph, former president, Holophane Corp.
Ben Rust, president, California Federation of Teachers
Mrs. Clara Shirpser, Democratic national committeewoman
for California
Dr. Preston W. Slosson, former professor, University of
Michigan
Adm. William H. Standley, former Ambassador to Russia,
former Chief of Naval Operations
James L. Taylor, businessman, Oakland
Dr. Lewis M. Terman, psychologist, past president American
Psychological Association
Prof. Julian Towster, political scientist and author,

University of California
Anthony Veiller, Warner Brothers Studios
Dr. John A. Vieg, professor of government
Eugene Weston, Jr., architect
Mrs. Patrick Welch, journalist, associate editor, Woman's
Day
Will B. Weston, rancher
William Wright, producer, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures
Darryl F. Zanuck, producer, vice president, 20th Century
Fox Film Corp.

Colorado:

Mrs. Ira Barrows, Rollinsville
Palmer Boyt, editor and publisher, Denver Post
W. E. Sikes, professor of sociology, University of Denver

Connecticut:

George S. Armstrong, management consultant; president,
Geo. Armstrong & Co.
Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, former Senator and Governor of
Connecticut
Robert O. Bell, Jr., attorney, Stamford
Alfred M. Bingham, attorney, New London
Dr. Brand Blanshard, professor of philosophy; writer, Yale
University
John D. Briscoe, farmer
William L. Ohenery, former publisher, Collier's
Joseph S. Daltry, professor of music, Wesleyan University
John V. N. Dorr, engineer; chairman of the board, Dorr Co.
Alfred O. Fuller, chairman of the board, Fuller Brush Co.
Allen Grover, vice president, Time, Inc.
Borden Helmer, Riverside
Howard E. Houston, mayor of East Meriden
Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, former Congresswoman, Diplomat,
playwright
T. C. P. Martin, Weston
William McFee, writer, Roxbury
Roy F. Steward, patent attorney, Meriden

Llewellyn A. Tobie, president, Meriden Savings Bank
Dr. Sam B. Warner, owner, Shoreline Times Publishing Co.,
Guilford Sanford B. Wendover, editor, Meriden Daily
Journal

William J. Wilcox, president, Meriden Rotary Club
John Orr Young, former partner, Young & Rubicam

Delaware:

Walden Pell II, headmaster, St. Andrews School, Middletown
William Prickett, attorney, Wilmington

District of Columbia:

Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, member Republican National
Committee

H.R. Baukhage, writer, lecturer, radio commentator,
journalist

Ralph E. Beeker, attorney; past chairman, Young Republican
National Federation

Hon. Robert Woods Bliss, former Ambassador and Assistant
Secretary of State

Mrs. Robert S. Brookings, philanthropist

Edward B. Burling, attorney

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director, social insurance activities,
A.F. of L.

Rev. A. Powell Davies, All Souls Unitarian Church

Mrs. Dwight F. Davis, former president, Women's National
Republican Club

F. Joseph Donohue, former President, Board of
Commissioners, District of Columbia

Dr. Paul F. Douglass, former president, American University

Dr. Ralph C.M. Flynt, Vice Chairman, American Council on
NATO

Clayton Fritchey, former editor, New Orleans Item;
Democratic National Committee

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D.C., Hebrew
Congregation

Rev. Charles Leslie Glenn, St. John's Church

Bon. Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan and

former Under Secretary of State
 Dr. Walter Hager, president, Wilson Teachers College
 Livingston Hartley, author and writer
 A. J. Hayes, international president, International
 Association of Machinists
 Iris Beatty Johnson, artist, illustrator
 Col. Winant Johnston, United States Army (retired), author
 Adm. Emory S. Land, president, Air Transport Association
 of America
 Mrs. Cole McFarland, Library of Congress
 Hon. Garrison Norton; former Assistant Secretary of State
 Leonard H. Pasqualicchio, national deputy, Order Sons of
 Italy in America.
 Duncan Phillips, director, Phillips Gallery
 Paul A. Porter, former Ambassador and former Chairman,
 Federal Communications Commission
 Stanley I. Posner, attorney
 Melvin Ryder, Army Times Publishing Co., editor
 Lawrence E. Spivak, radio producer, former editor, the
 American Mercury
 Clarence K. Streit, president, Federal Union, Inc.; author,
 Union Now
 J. Parker Yan Zandt, president, Aviation Research Institute
 Elmer Walker, vice president, International Association of
 Machinists
 Hon. Robert N. Wilkin, United States district judge
 Hon. Luther W. Youngdahl, former Governor of Minnesota

Florida:

Mrs. Mary McCloud Bethune, former president, Bethune-
 Cookman College; vice president, NAACP
 Robert J. Bishop, attorney, Orlando; former president,
 National Junior Chamber of Commerce
 Hon. Doyle E. Carlton, former Governor of Florida
 Hon. J. Ollie Edmunds, president, Stetson University
 James E. Edwards, attorney, Fort Lauderdale
 Dr. Grace C. Hardy, pediatrician, Jacksonville

Prof. Leroy Waterman, former professor, University of
Michigan

Olin E. Watts, attorney, Jacksonville

Georgia:

R. E. Barinowski, president, Feedright Milling Co.

Dr. J. Whitney Bunting, president, Oglethorpe University

Hon. Robert A. Heinsohn, Thomasville

Hon. Frank Lunsford, former State senator

Lloyd A. Moll, president, Georgia Southwestern College

F. Hodge O'Neal, dean, Walter F. George Law School, Mercer
University

Charles Forrest Palmer, former president, National
Association of Building Owners and Manufacturers

Hon. Francis Shackelford, former Assistant Secretary of the
Army

John Bell Towill, attorney, Augusta

Col. Blake R. Van Leer, president, Georgia Institute of
Technology

Dr. Philip Weltner, former chancellor, University System of
Georgia

Idaho:

James H. Hawley, Jr., political scientist, Boise

Judge W. F. McNaughton, Coeur d'Alene

Dr. G. W. Todd, former president, Northern Idaho College of
Education

Illinois:

Dr. Emery W. Balduf, dean, student services, Roosevelt
College

Rev. Preston Bradley, Peoples Church, Chicago

Ernest Estwing, president, Estwing Manufacturing Co.,
Rockford

George H. Hand, former president, Fairmont State College,
W. Va.

Oliver J. Keller, former editor, Pittsburgh Gazette; president,
radio station WTAX, Springfield

Prof. Abba P. Lerner, professor of economics

Laurance C. Martin, attorney, Winnetka
Col. John A. Mathews, United States Air Force
Mrs. Stewart Y. McMullen, Glencoe
F. F. McNaughton, publisher, Pekin Daily Times
Dr. Curtis W. Reece, dean, Abraham Lincoln Center
John H. Sengstacke, publisher, the Chicago Defender
John F. Schmidt, patent attorney; writer
Mrs. Sara I. Sommer, Peoria
Rev. Clarence A. Spaulding, former vice president,
Presbyterian College of Christian Education
Dr. Edward Teller, atomic physicist, Chicago
Dr. Harold C. Urey, atomic chemist, Chicago
Mrs. Lynn A. Williams, Sr., civic leader, Winnetka

Indiana:

Herman D. Becker, Terre Haute
Dr. Frederick Hovde, president, Purdue University
Louis Ruthenburg, chairman of the board, Servel, Inc.
Hon. John R. Walsh, former United States Congressman
Dr. Herman B. Wells, president, Indiana University
H.F. Willkie, president, Kingan & Co.

Iowa:

Hallett Abend, foreign correspondent and lecturer,
Marshalltown
Gardner Cowles, publisher, Look magazine
Mrs. Marion Gaston, president, Coca-Cola Bottling Co.
Henry Gadd Harmon, president, Drake University
Miss Anna B. Lawther, educator, Dubuque
Rev. Clement D. Loehr, Presbyterian pastor, Winterset
Harlan Miller, editor, Des Moines Register and Tribune
Arthur Sanford, Sioux City

Kansas:

Hon. Paul Aiken, former Second Assistant Postmaster
General of the United States
Dean John Warren Day, dean, Grace Cathedral, Topeka
Victor Haflich, farmer, Garden City
W. B. Harrison, retired banker, Wichita

Dr. Charles W. Helsley, Congregational minister, Topeka
Dr. James A. McCain, president. Kansas State College
Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of Kansas
Hon. Ralph Perkins. State senator and president, Howard
National Bank
Prof. Walter E. Sandelius, political scientist, Kansas
University
William L. White, editor. Emporia Gazette
Hon. Harry H. Woodring, former Secretary of War and
former national commander, American Legion

Kentucky:

John B. Breckinridge, attorney, Lexington
Dr. Frank H. Caldwell, president, Louisville Presbyterian
Seminary
Rt. Rev. Charles Clingman, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of
Kentucky
Dr. Philip Davidson, president, University of Louisville
Mrs. Mark Ethridge, writer, Kentucky
Hon. Charles P. Farnsley, mayor of Louisville
Earle B. Fowler, attorney, Prospect
Lewis J. Gorin. Jr., Reynolds Metals Co., Louisville
Lawrence W. Hager, publisher, Messenger and Inquirer,
Owensboro
Dr. Duke McCall, president, Southern Baptist Theological
Seminary
Lea B. McIntire, accountant, Louisville
Mark V. Marlowe, Marlowe Coal Co., Lexington
Mrs. John A. Serpell, Louisville
Robert T. Weston, Louisville

Louisiana:

Charles Edward Dunbar, Jr., attorney, New Orleans;
professor of law, Tulane University
Dr. Rufus C. Harris, president. Tulane University; president
of the board, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta
G. W. Healy. Jr., editor, New Orleans Times Picayune
Mrs. Lucy Benjamin Lemann, New Orleans

Joe J. Mickle, president, Centenary College Shreveport
J. Raburn Monroe, attorney, New Orleans
Dr. Mary S. Sherman, orthopedic surgeon, New Orleans

Maine:

J. Seelye Bixler, president, Colby College
Miss Jessie K. Bayt, Southwest Harbor
Dr. Clarence C. Little, former president, University of Maine
and University of Michigan
Edward Allen Whitney, former associate professor, Harvard
University

Maryland:

Dr. Benjamin M. Baker, Jr. physician, Baltimore
Wendell Berge, former United States Assistant Attorney
General
Hon. Claude T. Ellis, former Member of Congress, Arkansas
John Henry Ferguson II, president, Monumental Printing
Co., Baltimore
Morris Kruger, accountant, Baltimore
David B. McCalmont, economist
Leo H. McCormick, former assistant director, Office of Price
Stabilization
Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, governor of Maryland
Thomas S. Nichols, chairman of the board, Mathieson
Chemical Co., Baltimore
Mrs. Frank J. Otenasek, professor of economics, Trinity
College
Brig. Gen. Harry H. Semmes, patent attorney, Rockville
E. G. Shelton, former professor of public speaking,
University of Texas
Dr. Francis A. Smith, chemist, Bureau of Standards
Dr. Theodore E. Sterne, physicist, Bell Air

Massachusetts:

Copley Amory, retired
Prof. Robert Braucher, professor of law, Harvard University
Prof. Alzada Comstock, professor of economics, South
Hadley

Prof. William Yandell Elliot, professor of government,
Harvard University

Prof. Carl J. Friedrich, professor of government, Harvard
University

Carlton P. Fuller, vice president, Polaroid Corp., Cambridge

Rt. Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, former Episcopal Bishop of New
York Diocese

Prof. Joseph H. Keenan, professor of engineering, MIT

William Scott Keith, banker, Durfield

Prof. James Angell MacLachlan, professor of law, Harvard
University

Hon. William Phillips, former Ambassador and former
Under Secretary of State

Prof. Ascher H. Shapiro, professor of engineering, MIT

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

Prof. Walter F. Whitman, professor of engineering, MIT

Michigan:

Hon. Paul Lincoln Adams, attorney, Sault Ste. Marie

Dr. Max P. Allen, college administrator, historian, Northern
Michigan College of Education

Paul D. Bagwell, past president, United States Junior
Chamber of Commerce

Harold D. Beaton, attorney

Dr. Alexander W. Blain, surgeon, Detroit

Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, former United States Senator and
former chairman of the board, Detroit Edison Co.

John S. Coleman, president, Burroughs Corp., Detroit;
president, Detroit Board of Commerce

John P. Dawson, professor of law, University of Michigan

Prof. Harold M. Dorr, political scientist, director of summer
session, University of Michigan

Mrs. Margaret K. Furlong, leader in Michigan State
Federation of Women's Clubs

Dr. Weimer K. Hicks, president, Kalamazoo College

Martin B. Hutchinson, president, Brown Hutchinson Iron

Works

Ernest Kanzler, chairman of the board, Universal CIT Credit Corp.

Prof. Donald L. Katz, chairman, division of nuclear engineering, American Institute of Chemical Engineers

Mrs. Thomas McAllister, chairman of the board, National Consumers League

Dr. John C. Montgomery, pediatrician, Detroit

Edgar K. Orr, president, Edgar S. Kiefer Tanning Co.

Mrs. Chase S. Osborn, author, Sault Ste. Marie

Dr. Warner G. Rice, chairman, department of English, University of Michigan

George W. Stark, columnist, the Detroit News

Minnesota:

Hon. Joseph H. Ball, former United States Senator, Minnesota

Mrs. Margaret Culkin Banning, author, Duluth

Julius H. Barnes, president, director, American Industries, Inc.

Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills

Dr. Charles F. Code, physician, Mayo Foundation

Amor S. Deinard, attorney, Minneapolis

Dr. Henry F. Helmholtz, former head, department of pediatrics, Mayo Clinic

Prof. I. M. Kolthoff, professor of chemistry, University of Minneapolis

Reginald D. Lang, professor, international relations, Carleton College

Mrs. Irvine McQuarrie, former State chairman, League of Women Voters

Mrs. Philip W. Pillsbury, Minneapolis

Mrs. F. K. Weyerhaeuser, civic leader, St. Paul

Alfred M. Wilson, vice president, Minneapolis Honeywell Regulator Co.

Mississippi:

Mrs. Richard Capel Beckett, Long Beach
Hodding Carter, Pulitzer prize editor, publisher Delta
Democrat Times
Col. Alexander Fitz-Hugh, retired from P.P. Williams Co.
Judge William Haralson, Hattiesburg
W. T. Wynn, attorney, Greenville

Missouri:

Hon. Orland K. Armstrong, former Congressman, Missouri
Roy B. Chipps, secretary-treasurer, Middlewest Freightways,
Inc.
J. Robertson Claggett, attorney, Kansas City
Dr. Arthur H. Compton, chancellor, Washington University,
St. Louis; Nobel prize physicist
Dowdal B. Davis, president, Negro Newspaper Publishers
Association, Kansas City
J. Lionberger Davis, chairman of board, Security National
Bank Savings & Trust Co.
Dr. George W. Diemer, president, Central Missouri State
College
Mrs. T.W. Hardy, Sr., Hardy Salt Co., St. Louis
Miss Vera Harmer, insurance broker, St. Louis
Ernest Howard, engineer, Kansas City
C. B. Hudson, professor emeritus, ethics and philosophy
Robert L. Lund, former president, NAM
Dr. Bomer P. Rainey, president, Stephens College
Edgar E. Rand, president, International Shoe Co.
Mrs. Thomas M. Sayman, president, Sayman Products
Corp., St. Louis
Dr. Paul G. Steinbicker, professor of political science, St.
Louis
Bollis E. Suits, president, Suits Family Laundry, St. Louis
Dr. Edgar Curtis Taylor, headmaster, the Taylor School

Montana:

Horace H. Koessler, Missoula

Prof. B. G. Merriam, chairman, division of humanities,
Montana State University
Harry B. Mitchell, former chairman, United States Civil
Service Commission
Dr. Roland R. Renne, president, Montana State College
J. R. Thomas, industrialist, Montana Power Co.

Nebraska:

Edmund O. Belsheim, dean, University of Nebraska, College
of Law
Karl N. Louis, vice president, Brandeis & Sons, Omaha

Nevada:

George S. Franklin, Jr., attorney general of Nevada
J. E. Martie, educator, former national vice commander,
American Legion

New Hampshire:

Edward Y. Blewett, dean, University of New Hampshire
Julius A. Brown, former dean, arts and sciences, American
University of Beirut, Lebanon
Prof. Herbert w. Bill, chairman, History Department,
Dartmouth College
Alfred O. Boyt, businessman, Walpole
Judge John R. McLane, attorney, Manchester
Robb Sagendorph, publisher, Old Farmer's Almanac
Hon. Foster Stearns, former Member of Congress, New
Hampshire
Hon. Gardner C. Turner, attorney, Keene
Dr. Arthur R. Upgren, professor, Dartmouth College
John H. Vincent, Center Sandwich

New Jersey:

Bon. Norman Armour, former Ambassador and Assistant
Secretary of State
Dr. Frank Aydelotte, former president, Swarthmore College
Percival F. Brundage, senior partner, Price Waterhouse & Co.
John L. Carter, businessman, Montclair
Thomas Chabrak, attorney, Perth Amboy
Dr. Robert O. Clothier, former president, Rutgers University

Wilton D. Cole, general counsel, Union Bag & Paper Corp.

Louis K. Comstock, engineer, Montclair

Thomas M. Debevoise, director, the Debevoise Co., New
York

Nelson J. Edge, Jr., attorney, Jersey City

Milton S. Erlanger, businessman, Elberon

Wilfred Funk, publisher, president, and director, Kingsway
Press, Inc.,

New York:

William V. Griffin, chairman, Brady Security & Realty Corp.;
president, English Speaking Union

Mrs. Henry A. Horwood, Englewood, N. J.

Paul B. Hudson, executive vice president, Empire Trust Co.,
New York

Percy H. Johnson, former president, Chemical Bank & Trust
Co., New York

Rev. Arthur Lee Kinsolving, rector, St. James Church, New
York

Henry Luce III, editorial staff, Time, Inc.

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

John E. Raasch, president, John Wanamaker's, Philadelphia

Gerard T. Remsen, attorney, Upper Montclair

John Q. Robinson, insurance, Glen Ridge

W. T. Rowland, insurance, Upper Montclair

Sylvester O. Smith, Jr., general counsel, Prudential Insurance
Co. of America, Newark

Eugene R. Spauling, vice president, the New Yorker

Ralph Stoddard, businessman, Madison

Prof. W. Taylor Thom, Jr., Blair Professor Geology, Princeton

Hamilton M. Warren, vice president, National Carbon Co.

Donald C. West, manager, Research Laboratory

Alexander J. Williamson, educator, Atlantic City

New Mexico:

Claude W. Robinson, Tucumcari Daily News

New York:

John Harlan Amen, attorney, New York City

Dr. Max Arzt, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of
America

Mrs. Frank C. Baker, civic leader, New York City

Howard Baldwin, advertising manager, the New Yorker

Hon. Joseph Clark Baldwin, former Congressman,
industrialist, journalist

Jacques Barzun, professor of history, Columbia University

Harry E. Benedict, banker, Scarborough

Hon. Augustus W. Bennet, former Member of Congress,
attorney

Hon. Paxton Blair, former State supreme court justice,
attorney

William E. Bohn, editor, New Leader, New York City

Hon. Orlo M. Brees, former member, State assembly, New
York

Thomas Cook Brown, senior editorial writer, Buffalo
Courier-Express

Arthur H. Bunker, president, Climax Molybdenum Co.

G. Forrest-Butterworth, attorney, Rye

Curtis E. Calder, chairman of the board, Electric Bond &
Share Co.

Edwin F. Chinlund, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co.

Harry Cohen, retail consultant, New York City

Edward Corsi, industrial commissioner, department of labor,
New York

Philip Cortney, president, Coty's, Inc.

C. R. Cox, president, Kennecott Copper Corp.

Frank Crosswaith, chairman, Negro Labor Committee

Harry E. Crouch, former head of New York State Marketing
Office

Fulton Cutting, physicist, Stevens Institute

William H. Davis, former chairman, National War Labor
Board

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

Don Dennis, general manager, Foreign Policy Association

Mrs. Julie D'Estournelles, executive director, Woodrow
Wilson Foundation

Dr. J. Frederic Dewhurst, director, 20th Century Fund

Howard Dietz, vice president, MGM

Hon. Edward Jordan Dimock, Federal judge, New York City

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

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

Robert F. Duncan, president, Kersting, Brown & Co.

Max Eastman, editor, author, lecturer, New York City

Ferdinand Eberstadt, president, F. Eberstadt & Co.; former
Vice Chairman, War Production Board

Col. C. A. Edson, district manager, Social Security
Administration, Syracuse

Dr. Ralph Epstein, Consulting Economist', Buffalo

Louis Fischer, journalist, writer, New York City

Henry O. Flower, Jr., Vice president, J. Walter Thompson Co.

Marlon B. Folsom, United States Under Secretary of the
Treasury; former treasurer, Eastman Kodak

J. Russell Forgan, investment banker, New York City.

Clarence Francis, chairman of board of directors, General
Foods Corp.

Hon. Artemus L. Gates, former Under Secretary of the Navy;
former president, New York Trust Co.

Bertram B. Geyer, Geyer Advertising, Inc., New York City

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president. Brooklyn College

Charity Grace. artist. actress, New York City

Lester B. Granger, executive director, National Urban
League

Dr. Clarence W. Hall, managing editor. the Christian Herald

Carl S. Hallauer, vice president, Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.

Chauncey J. Hamlin, president. International Council of
Museums

Thomas J. Hargrave, president. Eastman Kodak Co.

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

Railroad

Lewis G. Harrison, president, Manufactures & Traders Trust
Co., Buffalo

Duncan Harris, chairman of the board, Brown, Harris,
Stevens. Inc.

The Reverend Leland B. Henry, executive director,
department of Christian Social Relations, Diocese of
New York

Prof. Sidney Hook, chairman, department of philosophy,
NYU

Edward F. Hudson. vice president. Ted Bates & Co.

Wolcott J. Humphrey, Banker, Warsaw

Dr. Charles W. Hunt. former president, State Teachers
College, Oneonta

Frantz Martin Joseph, attorney, New York City

Frank E. Karelsen, Jr., attorney, New York City

Adm. Alan Goodrich Kirk, USN (retired), former
Ambassador to Russia, Belgium, Luxembourg

Judge John Knight, judge United States district court

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

Judge Samuel Leibowitz. county court. Brooklyn, N.Y.

Samuel L Levitas, executive editor, the New Leader.

Dr. George A. Lipskey, Council on Foreign Relations

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

Deane W. Malott, President, Cornell University

Miss Beatrix Mathieu, editorial staff, New Yorker

Crandall Melvin, president, Merchant National Bank &
Trust Co., Syracuse

Mrs. Harold Milligan, past president, National Council of
Women

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

Walden Moore, educator and administrator, New York

Mrs. Victor Morawetz, New York City

Malcolm Muir, president and publisher of Newsweek
Dean Charles C. Noble, dean of the chapel, Syracuse
University

Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, former bishop, the diocese of
Albany

James F. O'Neil, past national commander, American Legion
Courtlandt Otis, vice president, Johnson & Higgins, Inc.

Robert C. Palmer, attorney, New York City

Kay Peterson Parker, Rochester

Mrs. Hattie May Pavio, author, lecturer, Rye

Hon. Herbert Pell, former Member of Congress, N.Y.

Rabbi Jerome M. Pines, New York City

Miss Elizabeth Robinson, attorney, New York City

Walter B. Sanders, Nunda, N.Y.

Harry Scherman, president, Book of the Month Club

Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, publisher, New York Post

Thomas N. Schroth, managing editor, Brooklyn Eagle

Larry H. Schultz, president, Blue Bus Lines, Batavia

George E. Shea, Jr., financial editor, Wall Street Journal

Carlton M. Sherwood, executive vice president, Pierce,
Hedrick & Sherwood, Inc.

Prof. James T. Shotwell, president emeritus, Carnegie
Endowment for International Peace

Theodore E. Simonton, patent attorney, Cazenovia

Spyros Skouras, president, 20th Century Fox

James N. Slee, trustee, village of Cornwall

Mrs. Margaret G. Spilsbury, New Rochelle

Ralph I. Straus, director, R. H. Macy & Co.

Herbert Bayard Swope, founder, American Society of
Newspaper Editors; former editor, New York World

Joseph F. Taylor, president, Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.

Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, former United States chief
prosecutor at Nuremberg trials

George L. Todd, president, the Todd Co., Rochester

Vanderbilt Webb, attorney, New York City

Richard Whorf, motion picture actor

Wythe Williams, writer, New York City
Owen D. Young, honorary chairman of the board, General
Electric Co.

North Dakota:

Hon. Albert Jacobson, State treasurer
Harold S. Pond, past grand master, Grand Lodge,
A. F. & A. M.
William Stern, banker, Fargo

North Carolina:

Rev. Richard H. Baker, Greensboro
George Watts Hill, chairman of board, Durham Bank & Trust
Co.
Mrs. Walter S. Hunt, civic leader, Raleigh
A. R. Keppel, president, Catawba College, Salisbury
Thomas L. Robinson, editor-publisher, the Charlotte News

Ohio:

Allen L. Billingsley, president, Fuller, Smith & Ross,
Cleveland
Louis Bromfield, writer, Lucas
W. Russell Burwell, director, Brush Development Co.,
Cleveland
Gordon K. Chalmers, president, Kenyon College
Professor Stanton Ling Davis, professor of history, Case
School of Applied Science
E. A. Emerson, president, Armco International Corp.
Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, Episcopal bishop, diocese of
southern Ohio
Dr. Oscar Jaszi, political scientist, Oberlin
Paul W. Litchfield, chairman of the board, Goodyear Tire &
Rubber Co.
Groye Patterson, editor-in-chief, Toledo Blade
David W. Roberts, travel editor, the Cincinnati Enquirer
Mrs. Ralph S. Schmitt, Cleveland
Dr. William E. Stevenson, president, Oberlin College
Whiting Williams, writer, Cleveland

Oklahoma:

Mrs. Walter Ferguson, national newspaper columnist, Tulsa

Oregon:

Steve Anderson, attorney, Salem

Hon. James T. Brand, acting chief justice, State supreme
court

Prof. Paul B. Means, former head, department of religion,
University of Oregon

David C. Shaw, attorney, Gold Beach Maurice Springer,
Industrialist, Eugene

Lofton L. Tatum, attorney, Portland

Pennsylvania:

Mrs. Sadie T. M. Alexander, attorney. Philadelphia

Dr. Paul R. Anderson, president, Pennsylvania College for
Women

Hiland G. Batcheller. chairman of the board, Allegheny
Ludlum Steel Corp.

Edgar D. Bell, retired attorney, Pittsburgh

Dr. Stephen Borsody, professor, Pennsylvania College for
Women

Helmuth G. Braendel, director of production and
engineering, Wilkening Manufacturing Co.

Mrs. J. Gordon Claypool, Narberth

W. Edwin Collier, unitarian minister, Philadelphia

Mrs. Eric de Spoelberch, Haverford

Dr. Calvert N. Ellis; president, Juanita College, Huntington

Eugene Shedden Farley, president, Wilkes College, Wilkes-
Barre

Charles Gape, general secretary, YMCA, Franklin

Clinton S. Golden, former vice president, United
Steelworkers of America

Dr. Aristid V. Grosse, president, Research Institute, Temple
University

Leland Hazard, director, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Rt. Rev. John T. Heistand, Episcopal bishop, diocese of
Harrisburg

David Hinshaw, public relations counselor, West Chester
 Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University
 Judge Charles E. Kenworthy, Pittsburgh
 Carlton G. Ketchum, president, Ketchum, Inc., Pittsburgh
 D. W. LaRue, former professor of psychology, Pennsylvania
 State Teachers College
 Stuart F. Louchheim, treasurer, Stuart F. Louchheim Co.,
 Philadelphia
 Frederick C. McKee, former national treasurer, AAUN,
 Pittsburgh
 Mrs. Grenville D. Montgomery, honorary vice president,
 World Affairs Council of Philadelphia
 Grenville D. Montgomery, retired, Haverford
 Hugh Moore, chairman of the board, Dixie Cup Co.
 Dr. John W. Nason, president, Foreign Policy Association;
 former president, Swarthmore College
 Wilbur I. Newstetter, Jr., attorney, Pittsburgh
 Charles B. Nutting, dean, University of Pittsburgh School of
 Law
 Mrs. Thomas Parran, Pittsburgh
 Dr. Thomas Parran, educator, ex-Surgeon General of the
 United States, Pittsburgh
 Dr. Daniel A. Poling, chaplain, Chapel of the Four Chaplains;
 editor, Christian Herald
 H. W. Prentis, Jr., chairman of the board, Armstrong Cork
 Co.
 Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp.
 Alexander P. Reed, president, Fidelity Trust Co., Pittsburgh
 Dr. Allan Lake Rice, professor of language, Ursinus College
 Andrew W. Robertson, former chairman of the board,
 Westinghouse Electric Corp.
 A. W. Schmidt, vice president, T. Mellon & Sons
 Hon. Edward L. Sittler, Jr., former Member of Congress
 Max Slepín, vice president, Pennsylvania Laundry & Star
 Industrial Towel Co.

Judge Sara M. Soffel, judge, court of common pleas,
Allegheny County

Lt. Col. R W. Valimont, attorney

Lester B. Vernon, president, Vernon-Benshoff Co., Pittsburgh

Rhode Island:

Hon. John Nicholas Brown, former Undersecretary of the
Navy

Sevellon Brown, editor and publisher, the Providence
Journal and the Evening Bulletin

Judge Luigi De Pasquale, judge, district court, Providence

Mrs. M. C. Edgren, secretary, English Speaking Union,
Rhode Island

Almet Jenks, writer, Little Compton

Albert E. Noelte, president and treasurer, Priscilla Braid Co.

A. Hamilton Rice, explorer and geographer; Newport

L. Metcalf Walling, patent attorney, Rhode Island

Adm. H. E. Yarnell, USN, retired

South Carolina:

Beverley Herbert, attorney, Columbia

South Dakota:

Hon. M. A. Brown, assistant United States attorney for South
Dakota

Tennessee:

John W. Apperson, attorney, Memphis

Gordon Browning, former Governor of Tennessee

Lucius E. Burch, Jr., attorney, Collierville

Hon. Walter C. Chandler, former Member of Congress,
Tennessee

Hon. James F. Corn, Cleveland

Rt. Rev. Edmund P. Dandridge, Episcopal bishop of
Tennessee

H. L. Dickason, Morristown

Glen A. King, Cash Economy Wholesale Grocery Co.

George L. McInturff, public utilities commissioner,
Chattanooga

Edward J. Meeman, editor, Memphis Press Scimitar

W. F. Moehlman, vice president, Tennessee Metal Culvert
Co.

Edmund Orgill, president, Orgill Bros. & Co., Memphis

Joseph Orgill, Jr., secretary-treasurer, Orgill Bros. & Co.,
Memphis

J. Winfield Qualls, teacher, Nashville

Dr. Peyton N. Rhodes, president, Southwestern College at
Memphis

Gilmer Richardson, Memphis

Mrs. Carl Stafford, Knoxville

Texas:

Mrs. George Abbott, Dallas

George Abbott, teacher, Nashville

Hon. Mark Edwin Andrews, former Assistant Secretary of
the Navy

Paul Carrington, attorney, Dallas

Paul E. Daugherty, attorney and oil operator, Houston

E. L. De Golyer, geologist; president, Atlatl Royalty Corp.

James Frank Dobie, professor of English, University of
Texas; author

Hon. W. St. John Garwood, associate justice, Supreme Court
of Texas

Mrs. W. St. John Garwood, Austin

Fred L. Hillis, industrial insurance engineer, Dallas

Rt. Rev. John Hines, bishop coadjutor, Episcopal diocese of
Texas

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, United States Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare

Rabbi David Jacobson, Temple Beth-El, San Antonio

Miss Betty Jameson, former women's golf champion, San
Antonio

Prof. A. R. Jaqua, director, Institute of Life Insurance, SMU

Gerald C. Mann, former attorney general of Texas

Mrs. S. M. McAshan, Houston

Charles T. McCormick, professor of law, University of Texas

Maj. Gen. G. Ralph Meyer, retired, El Paso

Walter Schroeder, vice president, First National Bank, Dallas
Tom Slick, industrialist: director, Slick Airways, San Antonio
Bishop A. Frank Smith, Methodist bishop, Houston
Rev. Malcolm N. Twiss, St. Albans Episcopal Church
Marshall Webb, president, Marshall Webb Co., San Antonio

Utah:

Arthur L. Crawford, director, Utah Geological Survey
Hon. Charles R. Mabey, former Governor of Utah
Grant W. Midgley, Salt Lake City
Charles Redd, La Sal

Vermont:

Dr. Ernest M. Hopkins, chairman of the board, National Life
Insurance Co.; former president, Dartmouth College
Dean Gorge V. Kidder, University of Vermont
Mrs. H. W. Norton, civic leader, Brattleboro

Virginia:

Remmie L. Arnold, president, R. L. Arnold Pen Co., Inc.
Hon. Thomas H. Burke; chief, congressional liaison, CIO;
former Member of Congress, Alexandria
Dr. Wilson Compton, former president, State College of
Washington
Hon. Colgate W. Darden, president', University of Virginia;
former Governor of Virginia
Hon. Horace H. Edwards, former mayor of Richmond
Miss Elsie Gilliam, Lynchburg
Col. Francis Pickens Miller, retired, member, board of
governors, Mary Baldwin College
Mrs. Walter I. Miller, former secretary, Federal Union,
Alexandria
Wayne Catfield Taylor, former Under Secretary of
Commerce

Washington:

Stephen F. Chadwick, former national commander,
American Legion
John M. Coffee, former Member of Congress, Washington
Kenneth Fisher, treasurer, Fisher Flouring Mills

Dr. Richard E. Fuller, president, Seattle Art Museum
Dr. David T. Hellyer, physician, Tacoma
Benjamin H. Kizer, former Walker-Ames professor of
international relations, University of Washington
Allan G. Paine, attorney, Spokane
Emil G. Sick, brewer; president, Seattle Baseball Club
A. Stanley Trickett, former president, Kansas Wesleyan
University

Wisconsin:

Henry P. Baldwin, Madison
Don Anderson, industrialist, Wisconsin Rapids
William T. Evjue, editor, the Capitol Times, Madison
Guy R. Radley, consulting electrical engineer, Outler-
Hammer, Inc.
Mrs. Thomas L. Tolan, Milwaukee
Jennie M. Turner, retired educator and writer
Charles H. Velte, attorney, Neenah

Wyoming:

Katherine Newlin Burt, author, Moran

Exhibit 10 – Atlantic Convention: Vote in the Senate, 1960

Congressional Record, June 15, 1960

YEAS—51

Bartlett; Beall; Bush; Carlson; Carroll; Case, N.J.; Church; Cooper; Dodd; Douglas; Engle; Fong; Fulbright; Gore; Gruening; Hart; Hartke; Hayden; Hill; Humphrey; Jackson; Javits; Johnson, Tex.; Keating; Kefauver; Kennedy; Kuchel; Long, La.; Lusck; McCarthy; McGee; McNamara; Magnuson; Monroney; Morse; Morton; Moss; Murray; Muskie; Pastmore; Proxmire; Randolph; Scott; Smathers; Sparkman; Symington; Williams, N.J.; Yarborough; Young, Ohio

NAYS—44

Aiken; Allot; Anderson; Bennett; Bible; Bridges; Bundale; Byrd, Va.; Byrd, W. Va.; Cannon; Capehart; Case, S. Dak.; Chavez; Cotton; Curtis; Dirkson; Dworshak; Eastland; Ellender; Ervin; Frear; Goldwater; Green; Hickenlooper; Holland; Hruska; Johnston, S.C.; Jordan, Kerr; Lausche; McClellan; Mansfield; Martin; Prouty; Robertson; Russell; Saltonstall; Shoepfel; Smith; Stennis; Talmadge; Thurmond; Williams, Del.; Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—5

Butler; Hennings; Mundt; O'Mahoney; Wiley

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res 170) was passed.

Exhibit 11—Atlantic Convention: Vote in the House, 1960

Congressional Record, August 24, 1960

YEAS – 289

Adair; Addonizio; Albert; Allen; Anderson, Mont; Anfuso; Arends; Ashley; Aspinall; Auchincloss; Avery; Ayres; Baker, Baldwin; Barr; Barry; Bass, N.H.; Bass, Tenn.; Bates; Becker; Beckworth; Bennet, Fla.; Bennet, Mich.; Blatnik; Boggs; Bolton; Bonner; Bowles; Boykin; Brademas; Breeding; Brewster; Brooks, Tex.; Broomfield; Brown, Ga.; Brown, Mo.; Broyhill, Burke, Ky.; Burke, Mass.; Burleson; Byrne, Pa.; Cahill; Canfield; Carnahan; Chamberlain; Chelf; Chenoweth; Chipperfield; Church; Clark; Coad; Coffin; Cohelan; Collier; Conte; Cook; Cooley; Corbett; Cramer; Cunningham; Curtin; Curtis, Ma.; Daddario, Dague, Daniels; Delaney; Dent; Denton; Derounian; Diggs; Dingell; Dixon; Donohue; Dooley; Dorn, N.Y.; Dulski; Durham; Dwyer; Edmondson; Elliot; Everett; Evins; Fallon; Farbstein; Fenton; Fino; Fisher; Flood; Fogarty; Foley; Forand; Ford; Frazier; Frelinghuysen; Friedel; Fulton; Gallagher; Garmatz; Gathings; Giaimo; Gilbert; Granahan; Gray; Green, Oreg.; Green, Pa.; Griffin; Griffiths; Gubser; Hagen; Halleck; Halpern; Hardy; Hargis; Hays; Hechler; Hemphill; Henderson; Hogan; Holifield; Holland; Holtzman; Horah, Huddleston; Inouye; Irwin; Jackson; Jarman; Johnson, Calif.; Johnson, Colo.; Johnson, Md.; Johnson, Wis.; Jonas; Karsten; Karth; Kasem; Kastenmeier; Kearns; Keith; Kelley; Keough; Kilday; Kilgore; King, Calif.; King, Utah; Kluczynski; Knox; Kowalski; Lafore; Laird; Lane; Langen; Lankford; Latta; Lennon; Lesinski; Levering; Libonati; Lindsay; Lipscomb; McCormack; McCulloch; McDowell; McFall; McGovern; McIntire; Macdonald; Machrowicz; Mack, Madden; Mailliard; Marshall; Martin; May; Meader; Merrow; Metcalf; Meyer; Michel; Miller, Clem; Miller, George P.; Miller, N.Y.; Milliken; Moeller; Monagan; Moore; Moorhead; Morgan; Morris, Okla.; Moss; Moulder; Multer;

Mumma; Murphy; Natcher; Nelson; Norbiad; O'Brien, Ill.; O'Brien, N.Y.; O'Hara, Ill.; O'Hara, Mich; O'Neill; Oliver; Osmera; Ostertag; Patman; Perkins; Philbin; Pilcher; Poage; Porter; Powell; Price; Prokop; Pucinski; Quigley; Rabout; Randall; Rayburn; Rees, Kans.; Reuss; Rhode, Pa.; Riehlman; Riley; Rivers, Alaska; Rivers, S.C.; Roberts; Rodino; Rogers, Colo.; Rooney; Roosevelt; Rostenkowski; Roush; Satangelo; Saund; Schenck; Schneebeli; Schwengel; Selden; Shelley; Sheppard; Shipley; Sisk; Slack; Smith, Iowa.; Smith, Miss.; Spence; Springer; Staggers; Stratton; Stubblefield; Sullivan, Taylor, N.C., Teague, Calif.; Teller; Thomas; Thompson, Tex.; Thornberry; Toll; Tollefson; Trimble; Udall; Ullman, Vanik; Wallhauser; Walter; Wampier;Watts; Weaver; Weis; Windall; Willis; Wilson; Wolf; Wright; Yates; Young; Younger; Zablocki; Zalenko.

NAYS – 103

Abbitt; Abernethy; Alexander; Alford; Alger; Anderson, Minn.; Andrews; Ashmore; Bailey; Baring; Belcher; Berry; Betts; Blitch; Bosch; Bow; Bray; Brock; Brooks, La.; Brown, Ohio; udge; Byrnes, Wis.; Cannon; Casey; Cederberg; Colmer; Curtis, Mo.; Davis, Ga.; Derwinski; Devine; Dorn, S.C.; Dowdy; Downing; Feighan; Flynt; Forrester; Fountain; Gary; Gavin; Goodell; Gross; Haley; Harmon; Harrison; Herlong; Hiestand; Hoeven; Hoffman, Ill.; Hoffman, Mich.; Holt; Hosmer; Hull; Jennings; Jensen; Jones, Mo.; Kitchen; Kyl; McGinley; McMillan; Mason; Matthews; Mills; Minshall; Montoya; Morris, N. Mex.; O'Konski; Passman; Pelly; Pfost; Pillion; Pirnie; Poff; Reece, Tenn.; Rhodes, Ariz.; Rogers, Fla.; Rogers, Tex.; Rutherford, St. George; Saylor; Scherer; Scott; Short; Sikes; Siler; Simpson; Smith, Calif.; Smith, Va.; Steed; Taber; Teague, Tex.; Thompson, Wyo.; Tuck; Utt; Van Pelt; Van Zandt; Westland; Wharton; Whitener; Whitten; Wier; Williams; Winstead

NOT VOTING – 39

Barden; Barrett; Baumhart; Bentley; Bolling; Buckley; Celler; Davis, Tenn.; Dawson; Fascell; Glenn; Grant; Harris; Healey; Hebert; Hess;

Ikard; Kee; Kilburn; Landrum; Loser; McSween; Magnuson; Mahon; Mitchell; Morrison; Murray; Nix; Norrell; Preston; Quie; Rogers, Mass.; Smith, Kans.; Taylor, N.Y.; Thompson, La.; Thompson, N.J.; Vinson; Withrow.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herbert for, with Mr. Taylor of New York against.

Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Baumhard against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Winthrow against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Thompson with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Loser with Mrs. Rogers, Mass.

Exhibit 12—To Enhance the Strength and Unity of the Atlantic Community through The Atlantic Convention

[The following text is from a brochure authored by the United States Citizens Commission on NATO. Notice that a lot of the members of the commission were members of the Atlantic Union Committee. The commission also steered clear of reference Clarence K. Streit as the true inspiration of the Atlantic Convention—Editor]

United States Citizens Commission on NATO
722 Jackson Place Washington 25, D. C.

The United States Citizens Commission on NATO was created by Public Law 86-719, adopted by the 86th Congress and approved by President Eisenhower on September 7, 1960.

The legislation, the text which appears on page 9, provides for appointment by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of a Commission of twenty United States citizens, not more than half of whom should be from any one political party. Although the Commission is an official body, its members are uninstructed by the Government and are free to act as individuals; the legislation specified that the Commission "is not in any way to speak for or to represent the United States Government."

The members of the Commission, whose names are listed on the inside back cover, were appointed by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson and Speaker of the House of Representatives Sam Rayburn on March 21 and 22, 1961. The Commission held its first meeting in the Capitol in Washington on April 8 and elected as its Co-Chairmen former Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton and former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and as its Vice Chairman Mr. Elmo Roper, market consultant.

The life of the Commission was subsequently extended to June 30, 1962, by Public Law 87-115 signed by President Kennedy on July 31, 1961.

Purpose

The purpose of the Commission, as stated in this legislation, is "to endeavor to arrange for and to participate in such meetings and conferences with similar citizens commissions in the NATO countries as it may deem necessary in order to explore means 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."

For this purpose the Commission is authorized to seek to arrange and to participate in an international Convention.

The first call for such a Convention from an official body came from the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, meeting in Paris, in a resolution adopted unanimously on November 16, 1957. This resolution recommended that the NATO Governments bring about "a conference composed of leading representative citizens selected on a non-partisan bases and directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisioned by the North Atlantic Treaty, within the Atlantic Community may best be developed." It further proposed that "the members of the conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed but should act in accordance with their individual convictions."

In London, a year and a half later, on June 10, 1959, the Atlantic Congress of 650 citizens of the NATO countries unanimously requested their Governments to carry out this recommendation urging that "this special conference be brought about as early as possible in 1960."

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

Work of the Commission

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. Subsequently, they and other members of the Commission made visits to the Western Europe and Canada and conferred with heads of parliament and the foreign ministries of most of these countries.

As a result of these contacts, an International Preparatory Committee, composed of representatives of the national commissions, met in London on October 26 and 27 at the invitation of the British Government to make arrangements for the Convention. The Committee decided that the Convention should meet in Paris on January 8, 1962, for a session of about two weeks. It was left to the Convention to decide whether, when and where it should convene for a second session later in the winter. The Committee also agreed on rules of procedure for the Convention designed to give it maximum flexibility, allocation of its costs, and the representation of each NATO country.

Another task of the Commission has been to make preparation for the participation of its members in the Convention. For this purpose, it has initiated studies of problems confronting the NATO nations which are likely to be considered by the Convention, and has held discussions with leading officials of the Government who are concerned with such problems, including Thomas K. Finletter, United States Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council.

Fresh Approach to Atlantic Unity

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee Report on the Resolution enacted as Public Law 86-719 concluded:

"The majority of the committee members gave substantial weight to two factors. First, there was clearly expressed belief that, in the perilous conditions facing the country and its free world allies, no obstacles should be placed in the way of any proposal to evoke new and fresh ideas as a relatively small cost. A related second factor was the following testimony of the State Department representative:

"... We in the Department of State would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas which might emerge . . . We particularly welcome the thought expressed in the resolution that the delegates to the proposed convention should be free to explore the problem fully as individuals."

Summarizing the testimony given at the hearing on this resolution, the same Report stated:

"it was noted that the single session of the Atlantic Congress, while its results were valuable, had involved unwieldy membership of 650, and met for only 1 week, while the annual NATO Parliamentarians' Conference brings a smaller number of very busy legislators together for less than a week and provides little continuity between meetings. The proposed convention, on the other hand, would permit roughly 100 leading citizens to confer together for whatever reasonable period of time might be necessary to examine NATO problems carefully and to develop new ideas."

In his testimony on the resolution before the Committee, Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., made the following point, which was subsequently stressed in the debate in the Senate:

"Departments of the Government deal constantly with national and international problems but our Government has from time to time felt the need for a fresh and independent look at these problems by a commission of citizens. The Hoover Commission is a notable and successful example. . . .

"The special conference or convention proposed in this resolution would be comparable to one of our national commissions, but operating on an international basis.

"Its function of inquiry, report, and recommendation would be the same as that of a national commission. Its members would

similarly be officially appointed, but would act in accordance with their individual convictions.”

The Objective—To Enhance the Strength and Unity of the Atlantic Community

A key objective of Communist imperialism has long been the disintegration of NATO because this could open the way to a Communist world.

Ever since NATO was founded, its members have sought to develop greater unity in purpose, policy and action. This has been the purpose of their Governments, of the North Atlantic Council, of its 1956 Committee of “Three Wise Men” and of the NATO Parliamentarians. But this purpose has not yet been achieved to an adequate degree, while, as the Berlin crisis and the Soviet attitude towards arms control have again made it clear, the threat from Communist imperialism is growing. The need for greater unity of purpose in the NATO countries is now more compelling than ever before.

In his message to the North Atlantic Council on February 15, 1961, President Kennedy stated:

“In the three weeks since I became President I have been increasingly impressed by the magnitude of perils which confront the United States and free nations everywhere. But I have also been increasingly convinced that we can face down those perils if we mobilize the unified strength and will of the nations of the Atlantic Community.

“We of the Atlantic Community are the single most effective obstacle between tyranny and its desire to dominate the world. Our historic bonds of friendship have been strengthened by common values and a common goal—the creation of a world where free men can live at peace and dignity, liberated from the bonds of hunger, poverty and ignorance. If we act together, this goal is within our grasp.”

In his authoritative address at SHAPE on April 6, 1961, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson stated,

“ . . . the United States is resolved to do everything within its power—and I emphasize the word everything—to enhance the strength and unity of the North Atlantic Community. . . .

“Our end goal . . . should be a true Atlantic Community in which common institutions will increasingly be developed to meet common problems.”

The Convention provides a new, unprecedented instrument in this vital endeavor, a means of working out fresh approaches to solutions of our common problems. These fresh approaches, if they are sound, can lead to action by our Governments which will insure our freedom and the future of our peoples.

Public Law 86-719
86th Congress, S. J. Res. 170
September 7, 1960

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of United States delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That a) the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives acting jointly are hereby authorized, after consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to appoint a United States Citizens Commission on NATO, hereafter referred to as the Commission. Said Commission shall consist of not to exceed twenty United States citizens, not more than one-half of whom may be from any one political party, and who shall be appointed from private life.

(b) Vacancies in the Commission shall not effect its powers. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the

original selection. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman amongst its members.

SEC. 2. a) It shall be the duty of such Commission, to endeavor to arrange for and to participate in such meetings and conferences with similar citizens commissions in the NATO countries as it may deem necessary in order to explore means 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.

b) The United States Citizens Commission on NATO is not in any way to speak for or to represent the United States Government.

SEC. 3. To promote the purposes set forth in section 2, the Commission is hereby authorized

(1) to communicate informally the sense of this resolution to parliamentary bodies in NATO countries;

(2) to seek to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary;

(3) to employ and fix the compensation of such temporary professional and clerical staff as it deems necessary; Provided, That the number shall not exceed ten: And provided further, That compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of the Congress.

(4) to submit such reports as it deems appropriate; and

(5) to pay its share of such expenses as may be involved as a consequence of holding any meetings or conferences authorized by subparagraph b) above, but not in excess of \$100,000.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission, who shall serve without compensation, shall be reimbursed for, or shall be furnished, travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties under this joint resolution, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of said Committee.

SEC. 5. Not to exceed \$300,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State to carry out the purposes of this resolution, payments to be made by voucher approved by the Chairman of the Commission subject to the laws, rules and regulations applicable to the obligation and expenditure of appropriate funds. The Commission shall make semi-annual reports to Congress accounting for all expenditures.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall cease to exist on January 31, 1962. Congress in 1961 extended the deadline to June 30, 1962.

Approved September 7, 1960.

(Expiration date extended to June 30, 1962, by Public Law 87-116 enacted on July 31, 1961.)

UNITED STATES CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

CO-CHAIRMEN

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON
Houston, Texas

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
Washington, DC

VICE CHAIRMAN

ELMO ROPER
New York, NY

Donald G. Agger
Washington, D. C.

Ralph D. Pittman
Washington, D. C.

William A. M. Burden
New York, N. Y.

Ben Regan
Chicago, Ill.

Charles W. Engelhard, Jr.
Newark, N. J.

Edith S. Sampson
Chicago, Ill.

Morris Forgash
New York, N. Y.

Oliver C. Schroeder
Cleveland, Ohio

Francis S. Hutchins
Berea, Ky.

Burr S. Swezey
Lafayette, Ind.

Eric Johnston
Washington, D. C.

Alex Warden
Great Falls, Mont.

William F. Knowland
Oakland, Calif.

Douglass Wynn
Greenville, Miss

Hugh Moore
Easton, Penna.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Richard J. Wallace, Jr.

Exhibit 13—The Declaration of Paris

From—United States Citizens Commission on NATO, Letter from the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, A Report of the Activities of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, 1962

We, the citizens delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO nations, meeting in Paris, January 8 - 20, 1962, are convinced that our survival as free men, and the possibility of progress for all men, demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade, and therefore submit this declaration of our convictions:

PREAMBLE

The Atlantic peoples are heir to a magnificent civilization whose origins include the early achievements of the Near East, the classical beauty of Greece, the juridical sagacity of Rome, the spiritual power of our religious traditions and the humanism of the Renaissance. Its latest flowering, the discoveries of modern science, allow an extraordinary mastery of the forces of nature.

While our history has too many pages of tragedy and error, it has also evolved principles transcending the vicissitudes of history, such as the supremacy of law, respect for individual rights, social justice and the duty of generosity.

Thanks to that civilization and to the common characteristics with which it stamps the development of the peoples participating in it, the nations of the West do in fact constitute a powerful cultural and moral community.

But the time has now come when the Atlantic countries must close their ranks, if they wish to guarantee the security against the Communist menace and ensure that their unlimited potentialities shall develop to the advantage of all men of good will.

A true Atlantic Community must extend to the political, military, economic, moral and cultural fields. The evolution we contemplate will contribute to the diversity of achievements and

aspirations which constitute the cultural splendor and intellectual wealth of our peoples.

The Atlantic Convention, keeping this ideal constantly in view, recommends the following measures which, in its opinion, would foster the necessary cohesion of the West, would bring the final objective closer and should be adopted forthwith by the governments concerned.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) To define the principles on which our common civilization is based and to consult about ways of ensuring respect for these principles.

(2) 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. Pending the establishment of the Council be strengthened through the delegation of additional responsibilities.

(3) To develop the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference into a consultative Assembly which would review the work of all Atlantic institutions and make recommendations to them.

(4) To establish an Atlantic High Court of Justice, to decide specified legal controversies which may arise under the Treaties.

(5) To harmonize political, military and economic policy on matters affecting the Community as a whole.

(6) That the North Atlantic Council treat the development of an agreed NATO policy with respect to nuclear weapons as a matter of urgency.

(7) That it welcomes the development, progress and prospective expansion of the European economic institutions, and the spirit of President Kennedy's statement that a trade partnership be formed between the United States and the European Economic Community, the basis of an Atlantic Economic Community, open to other nations of the free world.

(8) That the Atlantic nations, acknowledging the right of every

people to freedom, independence and pursuit of happiness, co-operate on a larger scale with the developing nations in their economic programs, through direct and multilateral action; through the acceleration of investments; and especially through measures which would increase both the volume and value of their exports, including special tariff concessions for their exports.

(9) 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.

(10) That the Atlantic nations, noting the destruction of the national independence and the human rights of many peoples in Eastern Central Europe, reaffirms its belief that the problem of these captive nations should be resolved in accordance with the principles of both individual liberty and national self-determination.

(11) To create an Atlantic Council for youth, education and culture in order to draw up Atlantic plans for exchanges of young people, students and teachers and for the purposes of scientific and cultural collaboration.

(12) 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.

RESOLUTIONS

We, the delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, in meeting assembled, taking note of the recommendations of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference of 17 November 1961, that an organized Atlantic Community be created, have adopted the following documents:

PART I—POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

A. Special Governmental Commission to Propose Organizational Changes

Call upon the Governments of the NATO countries to draw up plans within two years for the creation of an Atlantic Community

suitably organized to meet the political, military and economic challenges of this era. To this end they should, within the earliest practicable period, appoint members to a Special Governmental Commission on Atlantic unity. The Commission should study the organization of the Atlantic Community, particularly in the light of the recommendations of this Convention, and it should be instructed to propose such reforms and simplifications of existing institutions, and such new institutions, as may be required.

B. Institutions

(1) Recommend, as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic Community, the creation of a Permanent High Council, whose competence would extend to political, economic, military and cultural matters. Such a Council, assisted by the Secretariat, would not only prepare and concert policies on current questions and, in defined cases, decide them by a weighted, qualified majority vote, but would also undertake long-term planning and propose initiatives on matters of concern to the Community. All members of the Community would be represented on the Council.

Whether the High Council be a new institution or a development of the North Atlantic Council should be a matter of recommendation by the Special Governmental Commission. In any event, however, pending the establishment of the Atlantic Community, the members of the Convention urgently request their governments to reinforce and develop the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a political centre. To this end, the Convention recommends that the North Atlantic Council be strengthened through the delegation of additional jurisdiction. Where authority for decision is delegated to the North Atlantic Council by governments, it should employ a weighted majority vote.

(2) Propose that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference be developed into a consultative Atlantic Assembly, to meet at stated intervals, or upon the call of its President or otherwise, to receive reports regularly transmitted to it by the Secretaries General of other Atlantic bodies; to raise questions and to consider, debate and review the work of all Atlantic institutions, and make

recommendations to other Atlantic bodies and governments on questions of concern to the Atlantic community. A permanent secretariat and an annual budget should be provided for the Atlantic Assembly to insure continuity. In certain defined cases, recommendations should be by weighted majority vote. Members of the Atlantic Assembly would be selected by governments in accordance with their constitutional procedures. They need not necessarily be Parliamentarians. The members thus chosen would have the power to elect a limited number of additional members of equal status.

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

C. Policies

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.

(1) A primary objective is the continuing expression through national and international action of an overriding community of national interests in political and military policy. Closer and more effective action in this field should not await the growth of Community institutions; the development of an agreed NATO policy with respect to nuclear weapons should, among other immediate problems, be treated as a matter of urgency by the North Atlantic Council.

(2) A second cardinal policy objective is to realize the opportunity for economic progress available through the creation and development of the Atlantic Community. The expanding European Economic Community is an economic advantage not only for its members, but for North America and the free world as well. The Convention welcomes the spirit of President Kennedy's recent statement that a trade partnership be formed between the United

States and the European Economic Community. We hope that the negotiations envisaged by President Kennedy succeed in establishing a relationship which constitute the nucleus of an Atlantic Economic Community, with the framework of Community institutions, and open to all other qualified countries. Such a development would be of advantage to all countries, and particularly to those which participate directly in it. Among the fruits of this expanding Community would be its stimulus to competition, investment and more rapid growth in the mass markets appropriate to the modern technological age, with progressive reductions in tariffs and other barriers to trade.

(3) Another important goal of the Atlantic nations is to co-operate with those developing nations which wish to do so in their efforts to overcome the burdens of poverty, which may well be that of a falling per capita income in some countries. The Convention recommends that the Atlantic Community increase its already considerable participation in development programs of this kind, through direct financial and technical measures; through increased United Nations programs; OECD programs and other multilateral efforts; and above all through policies which favor commerce with and investment in the development countries, such as the abolition of tariffs on tropical and primary products, and the reduction and, under agreed circumstances, even the eventual abolition of tariffs on their other products. The Convention also recommends that the development of equitable and agreed programs for the acceleration of investments, and for the protection of investors against political risks.

(4) An important goal of the Atlantic Community's economic program should be to help raise the standard of living and economic activity of the different segments of the Atlantic Community, so that the proportional economic and social potential of all the members will be relatively less unequal.

(5) In view of the hundreds of millions of hungry people alive today, and the prospect that, if the present trends continue, there will be three thousand million more people added to the population in the next generation, the Convention recommends that

the Atlantic Community should address itself forthwith to the population problem.

(6) Since the Soviet expansion has destroyed the effective national independence of many peoples in Eastern and Central Europe, denying to their individual members the free exercise of their religious rights and democratic liberties—with all the attendant injurious effects upon the general climate of European security and progress, the Convention affirms its recognition of the inalienable rights of all nations to assume freely the responsibilities of self-determination and self-government, and expresses its firm belief that the problem of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe should be resolved in accordance with the rights and principles of both individual liberty and national self-determination.

(7) As most governments of the Atlantic Community countries have accepted the obligatory clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice at The Hague, the Convention recommends that all members of the Atlantic Community accept this obligatory clause.

PART II—CULTURAL AND MORAL QUESTIONS

A. The Atlantic Convention of NATO nations

Declares that the basic moral and spiritual principles upon which the lives and acts of the nations forming the Atlantic Community are based are as follows:

(1) The purpose of political and economic institutions is the protection and promotion of the rights, liberties and duties which enable every human being to fulfill his or her spiritual vocation;

(2) Liberty is inseparable from responsibility, which implies recognition of a moral law to which men, as individuals and in groups, are subject;

(3) Liberty is inseparable from the duties of men toward one another, which implies the obligation to ensure that all men gradually attain physical and moral well-being;

(4) Liberty is inseparable from tolerance, which recognizes the right to free discussion of all opinions, which are not in violation of the very principles of civilization;

(5) That there can be no freedom without variety, the natural result of the different peoples in all fields. But this variety should not entail disunity. On the contrary, retaining the common factors, it should become the permanent force impelling the peoples of our Western civilization to unite;

(6) Freedom is inseparable from the spirit of objective truth, which must restore to words the exact meaning they have in the Free World.

And therefore *invites* member countries:

(1) To defend and promote the values and principles of civilization by means of education, publications, lectures, radio, the cinema and television;

(2) To uphold in their conduct with all nations the ethics and values of Western civilization and by their example to impress on others that discord and disunity result when they are not observed;

(3) To defend these values and principles against intellectual and moral subversion within the Community;

(4) To try to establish an atmosphere of mutual understanding between the members of the Atlantic Community, appreciating to the full the riches of their diversity;

(5) To demonstrate to all peoples that respect for these values and principles can alone make a technical civilization and instrument of improving the physical and moral well-being of mankind;

Reconstruction of the Acropolis—To decide that the Acropolis shall become the symbol of our culture and the shrine of our Alliance and to call upon governments to consider how this resolution might be given concrete form.

B. The Atlantic Convention of NATO nations:

Considering that a major obstacle to the formation of real European and Atlantic Communities is the difference in language and therefore in mentalities and ways of thinking;

Considering that this language barrier is particularly prejudicial to the scientific co-operation upon which the Western potential depends:

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 of Scientific Affairs, cultural and educational authorities and representatives of universities and scientific research organizations, with a view to:

(1) Determining the comprehensive aims of an education likely to promote the ideals and purposes of the Atlantic Community, studying ways and means of implementing the principles laid down, and periodically reviewing the results achieved;

(2) Organizing—

a bold Atlantic Plan for Youth and Education with 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,

a program of scientific co-operation among the scientists and the scientific institutions of the countries of the Community,

both of the above being financed by all participating nations.

Within the framework of the above recommendations, the Convention *draws the attention of governments* to the following points:

(a) alongside the study and use of foreign languages, it is essential that mutual understanding be developed between men with different ways of thinking from all parts of the free world, including those of emerging nations.

This program should in the first place benefit university students, as many as possible of whom should be enabled to spend at least one year of their course in a university or other advanced training establishment where teaching is in a language other than their own.

However, in the case of the most promising citizens of the emergent nations this program should have a special priority, since their intellectual hunger must be satisfied at all costs.

Steps will have to be taken to be ensure that such periods spent at foreign universities or other establishments do not prejudice the career of the student concerned but rather confer advantages upon him in the form of either a degree specially created for the purpose of enabling him, for instance, to exercise his profession either in his own country or in that where he has completed one or more years of study always providing that his knowledge of the two languages is sufficient.

(b) It is to be hoped that, in the future, those who have pursued a course of training, which would subsequently be supplemented by exchanges of civil servants between Atlantic nations, will be given priority in selection for posts as officials required to take part in international negotiations.

(c) It should be made possible for teachers, and particularly university teachers, research workers and curators of museums and art galleries, either to be seconded periodically to equivalent foreign organizations, or to establish close contacts with them. Although it may not be immediately possible for all Atlantic Community countries, the introduction of the system of the "sabbatical year" for professors and research workers would be generally desirable.

(d) In the field of scientific documentation and co-operation, it would be necessary to supplement existing organs by setting up a Scientific Documentation Centre

responsible, among other things, for the translation and distribution of the principle articles, reports and other publications appearing throughout the world, and which have not yet been distributed by other agencies. The Committee considers this a most urgent matter.

(e) The “pairing-off” of universities and other advanced educational establishments of different languages within the Community should be encouraged and intensified.

(f) The establishment and exchange of comparable statistics on education and research in the Atlantic Community countries should assured.

C. Recommends that these proposals be studied further by the Atlantic Institute to assist in the accomplishment of these tasks in co-operation with existing agencies, such as the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe to avoid duplication of effort.

GENERAL RESOLUTION

The Atlantic Convention of the NATO Nations requests its President to forward the forgoing Declaration and Resolutions to the NATO Council and to the NATO Parliamentarians’ Conference at the earliest possible date, and that the delegates to this Convention report the same to their representative Governments or Legislative authorities at their earliest convenience.

Exhibit 14—Report of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO

United States Citizens Commission on NATO, Letter from the
United States Citizens Commission on NATO, A Report of the
Activities of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO,
Which Includes the Declaration of Paris and Resolutions Adopted
by the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, 1962

"We, the citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO nations, meeting in Paris, January 8-20, 1962, are convinced that our survival as free men, and the possibility of progress for all men, demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade, and therefore submit this declaration of our convictions."

With this statement the citizen delegates from NATO countries concluded their Convention. It is a preface to the Declaration of Paris, which embodied their common convictions. The words of this preface deserve analysis. They reflect both the spirit which guided the convention in its deliberations and the text of the Declaration.

* * *

"We, the citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations ... are convinced ..."

Ninety representatives from the NATO nations on either side of the Atlantic speaking nine different languages met and substantially agreed on matters of concern to their future. These men and women were leaders in various fields—government, journalism, education, and business to name a few.

They had been selected by their respective parliaments (the U.S. delegation of 20 had been chosen by the Vice President, acting in his capacity as President of the Senate, and by the Speaker of the House); at the Convention they spoke and voted as individuals

representing their own convictions. There was no national unit rule or decision by a government. Yet there was substantial agreement on issues of transcending importance, issues which underlie the growing conscious that mountains and oceans no longer divide man from man.

Beneath all the different political styles and social customs of the free nations, there is a deep-rooted common belief in the value primacy of the individual. This belief, held by all who have grown in the climate of democracy, brings free men together today.

On such a foundation the concept of an Atlantic community has been built. The nations of the West are moving together, and not merely in response to the Communist drive. This search stems from an incredible advance in science and communications, great strides in education and heightened understanding among peoples.

Since World War II, three major steps have been taken toward an Atlantic Community. The first was the "Marshall Plan," of American inspiration, which revived an economically prostrate Europe and laid the foundation for the current high levels of productivity and prosperity. The second was NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—a military and political alliance unprecedented in history. Finally, the European Economic Community, often referred to as "the Common Market," of European inspiration, has coordinated once rival economies of members nations into a workable plan of mutual cooperation that has already substantially increased trade and elevated standards of living throughout the area.

There is unity then among the Atlantic people, beneath the surface dissimilarities of language and custom; and this unity found vigorous expression among the NATO citizen delegates.

* * *

" ... *that our survival as free men, and the possibility of progress for all men ...*"

These words of the preface reflect the concern of the

Convention with the supreme challenge of our time.

Our basic task is to unify and articulate the principles of our civilization—its spiritual values, its respect for law and the dignity of the individual.

It is also of concern that these principles take hold and grow into developing areas of world where people may lose freedom in the illusion that an autocratic government can best fulfill their aspirations. And that they can only grow in societies that have advanced beyond a subsistence level.

It is up to the industrialized free nations, therefore, by aid, by economic assistance and above all through trade policies designed to encourage productive growth, to assist those nations to develop a capital and technical knowledge needed to achieve economic self development.

Through existing machinery, the members of the Atlantic Community can increase and coordinate their development assistance. Accelerated private investment can be encouraged through abolition of tariffs on primary products and under agreed circumstances on other products of the developing area, and measures can be devised to protect such investment from political risks. Such action taken now can decisively affect the world's destiny.

Let there be no mistake. In the interdependent life of today we will not survive on the Atlantic shores as free men unless these principles of our civilization stand firm around the world.

* * *

" ... demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade."

These words in the preamble reflect the conviction of the delegates that the survival of free men and our ability to assist effectively the developing nations require the creation of an organized Atlantic Community.

Sovereign power—the right in man to direct his destiny—

resides in every individual. In primitive societies elements of this sovereignty were vested in tribal chieftains. During the past few centuries delegated sovereign powers were increasingly transferred to nation-states, although other subdivisions within the nation framework held a share.

It was the judgment of the Convention that a measure of delegated sovereignty in the Atlantic area should be transferred to an Atlantic Community.

Of prime importance in this connection is the mass trading area—larger than that contained within national boundaries—required for the efficient use of modern technology. The comparable economics of the Atlantic nations and their common heritage in ideas make expansion with this great neighborhood singularly appropriate. They allow, too, for common military defense and common planning of assistance to developing nations with an appropriate division of the costs involved.

Accordingly, the Convention recommended that the governments of the NATO countries appoint members to a Special Governmental Commission to study the organization of the Atlantic Community with certain proposals in mind.

Of particular importance was the recommendation that a Permanent High Council be established to prepare and concert politics on political, economic, cultural and military matters and, in certain cases, decide them by a majority vote weighted to reflect population differences among the member countries.

The High Council could be a new institution or evolve by development of the North Atlantic Council. Pending its formation, however, the North Atlantic Council should be strengthened through the delegation of additional jurisdiction.

The Convention proposed, too, the development of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference into a consultative Atlantic Assembly to review and debate questions of concern to the Atlantic Community and in certain cases to make recommendations by weighted majority vote to national governments and other Atlantic institutions.

Finally, a High Court of Justice was proposed to settle legal

differences between members of the Atlantic Community and between members and Atlantic organizations arising from the interpretation and application of the treaties.

In addition to the foregoing institutions the Convention proposed certain policies. It welcomed the suggested trade partnership between the U.S. and the European Economic Community as the nucleus of an Atlantic Economic Community open to all qualified nations. Members of the Convention were mindful of the potential dangers of division between Europe and North America inherent in European progress towards economic and political unity unless accompanied by some corresponding progress on an Atlantic scale, and even on a larger scale.

The Convention believed that the political institutions and the programs proposed for the Atlantic Community would be increasingly effective with greater communication and understanding between peoples, without prejudice to the diversity that is a natural expression of different origins and varying achievements. It recommended that authorities in education, science, and culture be convened to determine the kind of education likely to contribute to the ideals and purposes of the Community including the study of languages and the widest feasible exchange of students, teachers, and persons of industry, agriculture, science and the arts.

In view of the hundreds of millions of hungry people living today, the Convention recommended that the Atlantic Community should address itself forthwith to the population problem. We recognize that the policies proposed above are endangered by the population explosion and by the racial prejudice that is at large in the world.

* * *

Steps must be taken to make the Atlantic Community a reality and they must be taken soon. Each new Communist thrust brings home again the lesson that democracies must unite to be a match for dictatorships. But, as history has also taught us,

democracies united and aroused are a formidable force. We must then grid ourselves and find ways to create a unity more intimate and enduring than we have known before. We must learn to grow, not as nations greedy for power and influence, but as peoples united in a concept of government both modest and liberating, based on a faith in the rewards of human life lived in freedom.

The recommendations of the Atlantic Convention, as embodied in the Declaration of Paris, are a first step in that direction. We respectfully urge that they be affirmatively and actively pursued.

PART II

The Commission is pleased to report that it has finished its task within the allotted time granted by Congress, and, in fact, will expire three weeks ahead of the legal expiration date.

The Commission also is pleased to report that it has operated well within its budget, and, in fact, will return more than \$100,000 to the Treasury of its appropriation of \$250,000. A statement of expenditures and commitments, as of May 15, is attached as Appendix A.

The U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO was appointed under terms of Public Law 86-719. It is composed of 20 members, 10 appointed by the President of the Senate and 10 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The appointments were announced on March 21 and 22, 1961.

The membership is equally divided between the Democratic and Republican Parties.

A list of the members is attached to this report as Appendix B. As it indicates, there has been one change of membership since the original appointments. Former Senator William F. Knowland, because of business and personal reasons, resigned on January 2, 1962, and was replaced by Mr. Edward Fenner, whose appointment was made by the Vice President on January 11, 1962. Since the Convention was already under way when Mr. Fenner was appointed, he was not able to participate and does not join in this

report.

The Commission met for the first time on April 8, 1961, and organized itself, electing Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State in the Eisenhower Administration, and William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State in the Truman Administration, Co-Chairmen, and Elmo Roper, marketing consultant, Vice Chairman. Richard J. Wallace, Jr., was elected Executive Director.

The duty of the Commission was outlined in the law as follows:

"It shall be the duty of such Commission to endeavor to arrange for and to participate in such meetings and conferences with similar citizens commissions in the NATO countries as it may deem necessary in order to explore means 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."

It was directed to "seek to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary."

In order to be prepared to perform this duty the Commission organized itself into five committees. The membership and functions of these Committees are shown in Appendix C.

The first major task of the Commission was undertaken by the Committee on Relations With Other Nations. With the active participation of Co-Chairmen Clayton and Herter, it undertook to inform other NATO nations of the existence of the Commission and of its purpose and to bring about the appointment by other nations of similar commissions.

This task was initiated by letters to the presiding officers of the legislative bodies of the other nations. These letters were followed up by personal visits with Parliamentary and other officials of the various nations, made by the Co-Chairmen and by mission. The Commission appreciates letters from the Vice President to these presiding officers prior to these visits.

As a result of the initiative of the U.S. Citizens Commission

on NATO, an International Preparatory Committee was organized. This Committee met in London, on October 26 and 27, 1961. The British Government was host for the meeting.

Members of the Preparatory Committee are shown in Appendix D.

The Preparatory Committee agreed:

1. That the Convention should be held and that it should convene in Paris on January 8, 1962, for an initial session of two weeks, with the Convention itself to decide whether further sessions were necessary.
2. That the scale of representation at the Convention be based on the NATO Parliamentary voting scale, but adjusted to suit a body of "less than 100 members." This scale is shown in Appendix E.
3. To the adoption of a budget of \$50,000, for the International Expenses of the Convention, and divided this budget among the countries according to the scale developed by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. The U.S. share was \$12,100. The full scale is shown in Appendix F.
4. To rules of procedure to propose to the Convention. They are shown, as finally adopted by the Convention itself, in Appendix G...

The U.S. Commission, as sponsors of the Convention, undertook the international organization of the Convention. During the succeeding period of approximately two and a half months the U.S. Commission maintained contact with the appropriate officials in all the other NATO countries to this end. The U.S. Commission also took the leadership on all other international preparations for the Convention.

In the meantime, the U.S. Commission had been holding meetings of its own, in the U.S., in order to prepare itself to participate in the Convention. Various officials of the U.S. Government, including the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, were invited to meet with the Commission and did so. During these sessions, the economic and political problems

confronting the Western alliance were thoroughly explored and discussed. Individual members of the Commission studied specific topics thoroughly and led the discussion of those topics.

The Commission also prepared a series of studies and background papers on economic and political topics. In all these papers—as well as in the discussions—it was emphasized that they were for educational and background use only. The Commission took an early decision that, in the spirit of the Act under which it was appointed, there would be no attempt to bind members to any point of view—no attempt to adopt a Commission, or U.S. position on any subject. The members were, the Commission decided, appointed to explore the problems of the Atlantic Community and, in the Convention, to speak and vote as their individual judgment and consciences dictated.

This policy was also adopted at the Convention at the initiative of the U.S. Commission, even to the extent of seating delegates alphabetically rather than by national groups to emphasize that they were there as individuals, not representing or able to bind either their countries or their delegations, but simply as representative citizens officially appointed and bringing their best judgment to bear on the issues facing the Atlantic Community.

On January 8, 1962, the Convention assembled in the International Conference Center, on the Avenue Kleber, in Paris, France. Commissions from fourteen of the 15 NATO nations were present. Portugal, although it had previously appointed a commission, sent only an observer.

The Convention elected Co-Chairman Herter, of the U.S. Commission, to the position of Chairman of the Convention. It elected Mr. Wallace to the office of Secretary General of the Convention.

For the first week, the Convention met daily in plenary sessions, morning and afternoon. During this time a total of 50 speeches were made by members. At the end of the first week, the Convention divided itself into two committees. The largest, composed of 42 members, considered resolutions and recommendations that had been filed on political and economic

subjects. The second, composed of 21 members, considered cultural questions. Two U.S. members were elected to offices on the Committees, Mr. Donald G. Agger to the position of Rapporteur of Committee I—the Political and Economic Committee—and Dr. Francis S. Hutchins to the position of Vice Chairman of Committee II.

Committee sessions continued through Wednesday, January 17, and on Thursday, January 18, the Convention reconvened as a Committee of the Whole. On Friday, January 19, the Convention resumed plenary session to consider the work of the committees that was now before it.

The Convention called upon the Governments to "draw up plans within two years for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military and economic challenges of this era." To this end they recommended the appointment "within the earliest practicable period" of a Special Government Commission on Atlantic unity, this commission to "propose such reforms and simplifications of existing institutions, and such new institutions, as may be required."

The Declaration was unanimously adopted with the exception of three abstentions. Those who abstained were Mr. Alastair Stewart, of Canada, and Mr. Ivan Matteo Lombardo and Professor Mario Montanari, both of Italy. All three abstained on the ground that the Convention did not go far enough in its recommendations, not from disagreement with the recommendations. Throughout the Convention a significant proportion of its members gave evidence of a belief that the Convention should go much further than it actually did.

The discussion leading up to the Declaration and Resolutions is contained in summaries of each day's plenary sessions on following pages of this report. These summaries of the plenary sessions, as well as a list of those who participated in the Convention, follow the full text of the Declaration and the Resolutions.

Exhibit 15—Atlantic Union: Vote in the House, 1973

Congressional Record, April 10, 1973

YEAS-197

Abzug; Adams; Addabbo; Alexander, Anderson (CA); Annunzio; Arends; Ashley; Aspin; Badillo, Barrett, Bennett, Bergland; Biester; Bingham; Blatnik; Boggs, Bolland; Bolling; Bowen; Brademas; Brasco; Breckinridge; Brooks; Broomfield; Brotzman; Brown (CA); Brown (MI); Burke (MA); Burton; Carey (NY); Chisholm; Clay; Cleveland; Conte; Conyers; Corman; Culver; Daniels; Danielson; Dellenbeck; Dellums; Dingell; Donehue; Drinan; du Ponte; Eckhardt; Ellberg; Erlenborn; Esch; Evans (CO); Fascoll; Findley; Fish; Ford, Gerald R; Ford, William D; Forsythe; Fraser; Frenzel; Fulton Giaimo; Gibbons; Gonzales; Grasso; Gray; Green (PA); Griffiths; Gubser; Gude; Hanley; Hanna; Harrington; Hawkins; Hebert; Hechler (WV); Heckler (MA); Heinz; Holtzman; Horton; Howard; Hungate; Johnson (CA); Johnson (CO); Jordan; Karth; Kluczynski; Koch; Kyros; Leggett; Lehman; Litton; Long (MD); McCloskey; McCormack; McDade; McFall; McKinney; Macdonald; Madigan; Mallary; Mathias (CA); Matsunga; Mayne; Mazzoli; Meeds; Metcalfe; Mezvinsky; Mills; Mink; Mitchell (MD); Moakley; Mollohan; Moorehead (PA); Morgan; Mosher; Moss; Murphy (IL); Nedzi; Nix; Obey; O'Hara; O'Neil; Owens; Patman; Pepper; Perkins; Pike; Podell; Preyer; Price III; Quie; Railsback; Rangel; Rees; Regula; Reid; Reuss; Reigle; Rinaldo; Robison (NY); Rodino; Roncalio (WY); Rooney; Rostenkowski; Ruppe; Ryan; St. Germain; Sarasin; Sarbanes; Schneebell; Schroeder; Seiberling; Sisk; Skubitz; Black; Smith (NW); Stanton; J. William; Stanton, James V; Stark; Steelman; Stokes; Studds; Sullivan; Symington; Thompson (NJ); Thornton; Udall, Van Deerlin; Vander Jagt; Vanik; Vigorito; Waldie; Wampier; Ware; Whalen; Whitehurst; Widnall; Wiggins; Williams; Wilson (Bob); Winn; Wright; Wydler; Yates; Yatron; Young (GA); Young (IL); Zablocki; and Zwach

Abnor; Andrews (NC); Andrews (ND); Archer; Armstrong; Ashbrook; Bafalis; Baker; Beard; Bevill; Blaggi; Blackburn; Bray; Breaux; Brinkley; Brown (OH); Broyhill (NC); Broyhill (VA); Buchanan; Burgener; Burke (FL); Burleson (TX); Burleson (MO); Butler; Byron; Camp; Carney (OH); Carter; Casey (TX); Cederberg; Chamberlain; Chappell; Clancy; Clark; Clausen, Don H.; Clawson (DE); Cochran; Cohen; Collier; Conable; Conlan; Cotter; Cotter; Coughlin; Crane; Cronin; Daniel, Dan; Daniel, Robert W., Jr; Davis (GA); Davis (SC); Davis (WI); de la Garza; Delaney; Denholm; Dennis; Dent; Derwinski; Devine; Dickenson; Dorn; Downing; Duncan; Edwards (AL); Eshleman; Fisher; Flowers; Flynt; Fountain; Frelinghuysen; Frey; Froehlich; Fuqua; Gaydos; Gettys; Gilman; Giinn; Green (OR); Gross; Grover; Gunter; Guyer; Haley; Hamilton; Hammer-schmidt; Hanrahan; Harsha; Hastings; Hays; Henderson; Hicks; Hillis; Hinshaw; Holt; Hosmer; Huber; Hudnut; Hunt; Hutchison; Ichord; Jarmon; Johnson (PA); Jones (NC); Jones (OK); Kastenmeier; Kazen; Keeting; Kemp; Ketchum; Kuykendall; Landrebe; Landrum; Latta; Lent; Lott; Lujan; McClory; McCollister; McEewan; McKay; Madden; Mahon; Mailliard; Mann; Maraziti; Martin (NE); Mathis (GA); Michel; Milford; Miller; Mills (AR); Minish; Minshall (OH); Mitchell (NY); Mizell, Montgomery; Moorehead (CA); Myers; Natcher; Nelsen; Nichols; O'Brien; Parris; Patten; Peyser; Poage; Powell (OH); Price (TX) Pritchard; Quillen; Randall; Rarick; Rhodes; Roberts; Robinson (VA); Roe; Rogers; Roush; Rousselot; Roy; Runnels; Ruth; Sandman; Satterfield; Saylor; Scherle; Sebelius; Shoup; Shriver; Shuster; Sikes; Snyder; Spence; Staggers; Steed; Steiger (AZ); Stephens; Stratton; Stubblefield; Stuckey; Symms; Taylor (MO); Taylor (NC); Thomson (WI); Thone; Tiernan; Towell (NV); Treen; Ullman; Veysey; Waggoner; Walsh; White; Whitten; Wilson, Charles (TX); Wolff; Wyatt; Wyman; Young (AK); Young (FL); Young (SC); Young (TX); and Zion

NOT VOTING-26

Bell; Burke (CA); Diggs; Dulski; Edwards (CA); Ewins (TN); Goldwater; Hansen (ID); Hansen (WA); Harvey; Holifield; Jones (AL); King; Long (LA); McSpadden; Passman; Pettis; Rooney (NY); Rosenthal; Roybal; Shipley; Steiger (WI); Teague (CA); and Wilson, Charles H. (CA) ~

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York wftb Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Teague of Tenn. with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. King.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Holofield with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Charles R. Wilson of California with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Ewins of Tennessee with Mr. Pickle.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. McSpadden.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Passman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Exhibit 16—Atlantic Union: Vote in the House, 1976

Congressional Record, April 1, 1976

YEAS-165

Abzug; Adams; Addabbo; Allen; Anderson, Calif.; Anderson, Ill.; Andrews, N.C.; Ashley; Aspin; AuCoin; Badillo; Baldus; Baucus; Bedell; Bennett; Bergland; Bingham; Blanchard; Blouin; Boggs; Boland; Bolling; Brademas; Breckinridge; Brown, Calif.; Brown, Mich.; Brown, Ohio; Burke, Calif.; Burlison, Mo.; Carr; Cleveland; Collins, Ill.; Conte; Conyers; Cornell; D' Amours; Daniels, N.J.; Danielson; Diggs; Dodd; Drinan, du Pont; Early; Edgar; Edwards, Calif.; Eilberg; Erienborn; Evins, Tenn.; Fascall; Fenwick; Findley; Fisher; Forsythe; Fraser; Frenzel; Gibbons; Gonzalez; Gradson; Gude; Hail; Hanley; Hannaford; Harkin; Harrington; Harris; Hawkins; Hechler, W. Va.; Hicks; Holtzman; Horton; Howard; Howe; Hungate; Jacobs; Jeffords; Johnson, Colo.; Jordan; Kastenmeier; Ketchum; Keys; Koch; Leggett; Lehman; Lloyd, Cali.; Long, La.; Lujan; McClory; McCormack; McFall; McHugh; McKinney; Madden; Madigan; Matsunaga; Mazzoli; Metcalfe; Meyner; Mezvinsky; Mikva; Mineta; Mink; Mitchell, Md.; Moakley; Moffett; Moorhead, Pa.; Morgan; Mosher; Moss; Myers, Ind.; Myers, Pa.; Neal; Nedzi; Nolan; Nowak; Oberstar; Obey; O'Brien; O'Hara; O'Neill; Ottinger; Pike; Preyer; Price; Pritchard; Quie; Railsback; Rangel; Rees; Reuss; Richmond; Riegle; Roncalio; Rooney; Rosenthal; Roybal; Ruppe; Ryan; Sarasin; Scheuer; Schneebeli; Schroeder; Seiberling; Sharp; Simon; Sisk; Skubitz; Smith, Iowa; Solarz; Stark; Steiger, Wis.; Studds; Symington; Thompson; Tsongas; Van Deerlin; Vander Jagt; Vander Veen; Vanik; Wampler; Waxman; Whitehurst; Wilson, Tex.; Wright; Yates; Zablocki.

NAYS—194

Alexander; Ambro; Andrews, N. Dak; Annunzio; Archer; Ashbrook;

Bafailis; Bauman; Beard, R.I.; Beard, Tenn.; Beville; Biaggi; Bonker; Bowen; Brinkley; Brodhead; Brooks; Broomfield; Broyhill; Buchanan; Burgener; Burke, Fla.; Burleson, Tex.; Butler; Byron; Carney; Carter; Cederberg; Chappeil; Clancy, Clausen, Don H.; Clawson, Del.; Cohen; Collins, Tex.; Conlan; Coughlin; Crane; Daniel I, Dan; Daniel, R.W.; Davos; de la Garza; Delaney; Dellums; Derrick; Derwinski; Devine; Downey, N.Y.; Duncan, Oreg.; Duncan, Tenn.; Edwards, Ala.; Emery; English; Evans, Ind.; Fary; Fish; Fithian; Flood; Floria; Flynt; Ford, Tenn.; Fountain; Frey, Fuquia; Gaydos; Gillman; Ginn; Goldwater; Goodling; Grassley; Hagedorn; Haley; Hamilton; Hammerschmidt; Hansen; Harsha; Hays, Ohio; Heckler, Mass.; Hefner; Helstoski; Hightower; Hillis; Holt; Hubbard; Hutchinson; Hyde; Ichord; Jarman; Jenrette; Johnson, Calif.; Jones, N.C.; Jones, Okla.; Jones, Tenn.; Kasten; Kazen; Kelly Kindness; Krebs; LaFalce; Lagomarsino; Latta; Lent; Levitas; Litton; Lloyd, Tenn.; Long, Md.; Lundine; McCollister; McDade; McDonald; McKay; Maguire; Mahon; Mann; Martin; Mathis; Melcher; Michel; Milford; Miller, Calif.; Miller, Ohio; Mills; Minish; Mitchell, N.Y.; Mollohan; Montgomery; Moore; Moorhead, Calif.; Motti; Murphy, Ill.; Murtha; Natcher; Passman; Patten, N. J.; Patterson, Calif.; Pattison, N.Y.; Perkins; Pettis; Poage; Pressler; Randalll Regula; Rhodes; Rinaldo; Risenhoover; Robinson; Roe; Rogers; Rose; Rostenkowski; Roush; Rousselot; Runnels; Russo; Santini; Satterfield; Schulze; Sebelius, Shipley; Shriver; Shuster; Slack; Smith, Nebr.; Snyder; Spellman; Spence; Staggers; Stanton, J. William; Steed; Steiger, Ariz.; Stuckey; Symms; Taylor, Mo.; Taylor, N.C.; Thone; Thornton; Traxler; Treen; Ullman; Vigorito; Waggonner; Walsh; Weaver; Whalen; Whitten; Wiggins; Winn; Wolff; Wylie; Yatron; Young, Alaska; Young, Fla.; Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING-73

Abdnor; Armstrong; Barrett; Bell; Biester; Breaux; Burke, Mass.; Burton, John; Burton, Phillip; Chisholm; Clay; Conable; Corman; Cotter; Dent; Dickinson; Dingell; Downing, Va.; Eckhardt; Esch; Eshleman; Evans, Colo.; Flowers; Foley; Ford, Mich.; Giamo;

Green; Guyer; Hayes, Ind.; Herbert; Heinz; Henderson; Hinshaw;
holland; Hughes; Johnson, Pa.; Jones, Ala.; Kemp; Krueger;
Landrum; Lott; McCloskey; McEwen; Mcdonald; Meeds; Murphy,
N.Y.; Nichols; Nix; Pepper; Peyser; Pickle; Quillen; Roberts; Rodino;
St Germain; Sarbanes; Sikes; Stanton, James V.; Steelman; Stephens;
Stokes; Stratton; Sullivan; Talcott; Teague; Udall; White; Wilson,
Bob; Wilson, C.H.; Wydler Young, Ga.; Zeferetti

The Clerk announced the following pairs :

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Dent.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Zeferetti.

Mr. Hayes of Indiana with Mr. Krueger.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Jam V. Stanton.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Sykes.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Karth with Murphy of New York.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Nichols.

Mr. Sarbanes with Mr. Teague.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Stratton.

Kr. Stokes with Mr. Breaux.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Burke of Massachusetts.

Mr. White with Mr. Giaimo.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Ford of
Michigan.

Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Rodino.

Mr. Herbert with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Green with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mr. John L. Burton with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Downing of Virginia with Mr. Abdnor.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Biester.

Mr. Phillip Burton with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Esch.

Mr. McCloskey with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Eshleman With Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Hughes with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Lott with St Germain.
Mr. McEwen. with Mr. Steelman.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mt. Talcott-.
Mr. Wydler wth Mr. Bob Wilson.

Exhibit 17—Vladimir Putin at Davos Online Forum – Transcript

Eurasia Review, January 27, 2021

World Economic Forum Founder and Executive Chairman

Klaus Schwab: Mr President, welcome to the Davos Agenda Week.

Russia is an important global power, and there's a long-standing tradition of Russia's participation in the World Economic Forum. At this moment in history, where the world has a unique and short window of opportunity to move from an age of confrontation to an age of cooperation, the ability to hear your voice, the voice of the President of the Russian Federation, is essential. Even and especially in times characterised by differences, disputes and protests, constructive and honest dialogue to address our common challenges is better than isolation and polarisation.

Yesterday, your phone exchange with President Biden and the agreement to extend the New START nuclear arms treaty in principle, I think, was a very promising sign in this direction.

COVID-19, Mr President, has shown our global vulnerability and interconnectivity, and, like any other country, Russia will certainly also be affected, and your economic development and prospects for international cooperation, of course, are of interest to all of us.

Mr President, we are keen to hear from your perspective and from that of Russia, how you see the situation developing in the third decade of the 21st century and what should be done to ensure that people everywhere find peace and prosperity.

Mr President, the world is waiting to hear from you.

President of Russia Vladimir Putin: Mr Schwab, dear Klaus, Colleagues, I have been to Davos many times, attending the events organised by Mr Schwab, even back in the 1990s. Klaus [Schwab] just recalled that we met in 1992. Indeed, during my time in St Petersburg, I visited this important forum many times. I would like to thank you for this opportunity today to convey my point of view to the expert community that gathers at this world-renowned

platform thanks to the efforts of Mr Schwab.

First of all, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to greet all the World Economic Forum participants.

It is gratifying that this year, despite the pandemic, despite all the restrictions, the forum is still continuing its work. Although it is limited to online participation, the forum is taking place anyway, providing an opportunity for participants to exchange their assessments and forecasts during an open and free discussion, partially compensating for the increasing lack of in-person meetings between leaders of states, representatives of international business and the public in recent months. All this is very important now, when we have so many difficult questions to answer.

The current forum is the first one in the beginning of the third decade of the 21st century and, naturally, the majority of its topics are devoted to the profound changes that are taking place in the world.

Indeed, it is difficult to overlook the fundamental changes in the global economy, politics, social life and technology. The coronavirus pandemic, which Klaus just mentioned, which became a serious challenge for humankind, only spurred and accelerated the structural changes, the conditions for which had been created long ago. **The pandemic has exacerbated the problems and imbalances that built up in the world before.** There is every reason to believe that differences are likely to grow stronger. These trends may appear practically in all areas.

Needless to say, there are no direct parallels in history. However, some experts – and I respect their opinion – compare the current situation to the 1930s. One can agree or disagree, but certain analogies are still suggested by many parameters, including the comprehensive, systemic nature of the challenges and potential threats.

We are seeing a crisis of the previous models and instruments of economic development. **Social stratification is growing stronger both globally and in individual countries. We have spoken about this before as well. But this, in turn, is causing today a sharp polarisation of public views, provoking the growth**

of populism, right- and left-wing radicalism and other extremes, and the exacerbation of domestic political processes including in the leading countries.

All this is inevitably affecting the nature of international relations and is not making them more stable or predictable. International institutions are becoming weaker, regional conflicts are emerging one after another, and the system of global security is deteriorating.

Klaus has mentioned the conversation I had yesterday with the US President on extending the New START. This is, without a doubt, a step in the right direction. Nevertheless, the differences are leading to a downward spiral. **As you are aware, the inability and unwillingness to find substantive solutions to problems like this in the 20th century led to the WWII catastrophe.**

Of course, such a heated global conflict is impossible in principle, I hope. This is what I am pinning my hopes on, because this would be the end of humanity. However, as I have said, the situation could take an unexpected and uncontrollable turn – unless we do something to prevent this. There is a chance that we will face a formidable break-down in global development, which will be fraught with a war of all against all and attempts to deal with contradictions through the appointment of internal and external enemies and the destruction of not only traditional values such as the family, which we hold dear in Russia, but fundamental freedoms such as the right of choice and privacy.

I would like to point out the negative demographic consequences of the ongoing social crisis and the crisis of values, which could result in humanity losing entire civilisational and cultural continents.

We have a shared responsibility to prevent this scenario, which looks like a grim dystopia, and to ensure instead that our development takes a different trajectory – positive, harmonious and creative.

In this context, I would like to speak in more detail about the main challenges which, I believe, the international community is facing.

The first one is socioeconomic.

Indeed, judging by the statistics, even despite the deep crises in 2008 and 2020, the last 40 years can be referred to as successful or even super successful for the global economy. Starting from 1980, global per capita GDP has doubled in terms of real purchasing power parity. This is definitely a positive indicator.

Globalisation and domestic growth have led to strong growth in developing countries and lifted over a billion people out of poverty. So, if we take an income level of \$5.50 per person per day (in terms of PPP) then, according to the World Bank, in China, for example, the number of people with lower incomes went from 1.1 billion in 1990 down to less than 300 million in recent years. This is definitely China's success. In Russia, this number went from 64 million people in 1999 to about 5 million now. We believe this is also progress in our country, and in the most important area, by the way.

Still, the main question, the answer to which can, in many respects, provide a clue to today's problems, is what was the nature of this global growth and who benefitted from it most.

Of course, as I mentioned earlier, developing countries benefitted a lot from the growing demand for their traditional and even new products. However, this integration into the global economy has resulted in more than just new jobs or greater export earnings. It also had its social costs, including a significant gap in individual incomes.

What about the developed economies where average incomes are much higher? It may sound ironic, but stratification in the developed countries is even deeper. According to the World Bank, 3.6 million people subsisted on incomes of under \$5.50 per day in the United States in 2000, but in 2016 this number grew to 5.6 million people.

Meanwhile, globalisation led to a significant increase in the revenue of large multinational, primarily US and European, companies.

By the way, in terms of individual income, the developed economies in Europe show the same trend as the United States.

But then again, in terms of corporate profits, who got hold of the revenue? The answer is clear: one percent of the population.

And what has happened in the lives of other people? In the past 30 years, in a number of developed countries, the real incomes of over half of the citizens have been stagnating, not growing. Meanwhile, the cost of education and healthcare services has gone up. Do you know by how much? Three times.

In other words, millions of people even in wealthy countries have stopped hoping for an increase of their incomes. In the meantime, they are faced with the problem of how to keep themselves and their parents healthy and how to provide their children with a decent education.

There is no call for a huge mass of people and their number keeps growing. Thus, according to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), in 2019, 21 percent or 267 million young people in the world did not study or work anywhere. Even among those who had jobs (these are interesting figures) 30 percent had an income below \$3.2 per day in terms of purchasing power parity.

These imbalances in global socioeconomic development are a direct result of the policy pursued in the 1980s, which was often vulgar or dogmatic. This policy rested on the so-called Washington Consensus with its unwritten rules, when the priority was given to the economic growth based on a private debt in conditions of deregulation and low taxes on the wealthy and the corporations.

As I have already mentioned, the coronavirus pandemic has only exacerbated these problems. In the last year, the global economy sustained its biggest decline since WWII. By July, the labour market had lost almost 500 million jobs. Yes, half of them were restored by the end of the year but still almost 250 million jobs were lost. This is a big and very alarming figure. In the first nine months of the past year alone, the losses of earnings amounted to \$3.5 trillion. This figure is going up and, hence, social tension is on the rise.

At the same time, post-crisis recovery is not simple at all. If some 20 or 30 years ago, we would have solved the problem

through stimulating macroeconomic policies (incidentally, this is still being done), today such mechanisms have reached their limits and are no longer effective. This resource has outlived its usefulness. This is not an unsubstantiated personal conclusion.

According to the IMF, the aggregate sovereign and private debt level has approached 200 percent of global GDP, and has even exceeded 300 percent of national GDP in some countries. At the same time, interest rates in developed market economies are kept at almost zero and are at a historic low in emerging market economies.

Taken together, this makes economic stimulation with traditional methods, through an increase in private loans virtually impossible. The so-called quantitative easing is only increasing the bubble of the value of financial assets and deepening the social divide. The widening gap between the real and virtual economies (incidentally, representatives of the real economy sector from many countries have told me about this on numerous occasions, and I believe that the business representatives attending this meeting will agree with me) presents a very real threat and is fraught with serious and unpredictable shocks.

Hopes that it will be possible to reboot the old growth model are connected with rapid technological development. Indeed, during the past 20 years we have created a foundation for the so-called Fourth Industrial Revolution based on the wide use of AI and automation and robotics. The coronavirus pandemic has greatly accelerated such projects and their implementation.

However, this process is leading to new structural changes, I am thinking in particular of the labour market. This means that very many people could lose their jobs unless the state takes effective measures to prevent this. Most of these people are from the so-called middle class, which is the basis of any modern society.

In this context, I would like to mention the second fundamental challenge of the forthcoming decade – the socio-political one. The rise of economic problems and inequality is splitting society, triggering social, racial and ethnic intolerance. Indicatively, these tensions are bursting out even in the countries with seemingly civil and democratic institutions that are designed

to alleviate and stop such phenomena and excesses.

The systemic socioeconomic problems are evoking such social discontent that they require special attention and real solutions. The dangerous illusion that they may be ignored or pushed into the corner is fraught with serious consequences.

In this case, society will still be divided politically and socially. This is bound to happen because people are dissatisfied not by some abstract issues but by real problems that concern everyone regardless of the political views that people have or think they have. Meanwhile, real problems evoke discontent.

I would like to emphasise one more important point. Modern technological giants, especially digital companies, have started playing an increasing role in the life of society. Much is being said about this now, especially regarding the events that took place during the election campaign in the US. They are not just some economic giants. In some areas, they are de facto competing with states. Their audiences consist of billions of users that pass a considerable part of their lives in these eco systems.

In the opinion of these companies, their monopoly is optimal for organising technological and business processes. Maybe so but society is wondering whether such monopolism meets public interests. Where is the border between successful global business, in-demand services and big data consolidation and the attempts to manage society at one's own discretion and in a tough manner, replace legal democratic institutions and essentially usurp or restrict the natural right of people to decide for themselves how to live, what to choose and what position to express freely? We have just seen all of these phenomena in the US and everyone understands what I am talking about now. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of people share this position, including the participants in the current event.

And finally, the third challenge, or rather, a clear threat that we may well run into in the coming decade is the further exacerbation of many international problems. After all, unresolved and mounting internal socioeconomic problems may push people to look for someone to blame for all their troubles and to redirect their

irritation and discontent. We can already see this. We feel that the degree of foreign policy propaganda rhetoric is growing.

We can expect the nature of practical actions to also become more aggressive, including pressure on the countries that do not agree with a role of obedient controlled satellites, use of trade barriers, illegitimate sanctions and restrictions in the financial, technological and cyber spheres.

Such a game with no rules critically increases the risk of unilateral use of military force. The use of force under a far-fetched pretext is what this danger is all about. This multiplies the likelihood of new hot spots flaring up on our planet. This concerns us.

Colleagues, despite this tangle of differences and challenges, we certainly should keep a positive outlook on the future and remain committed to a constructive agenda. It would be naive to come up with universal miraculous recipes for resolving the above problems. But we certainly need to try to work out common approaches, bring our positions as close as possible and identify sources that generate global tensions.

Once again, I want to emphasise my thesis that accumulated socioeconomic problems are the fundamental reason for unstable global growth.

So, the key question today is how to build a programme of actions in order to not only quickly restore the global and national economies affected by the pandemic, but to ensure that this recovery is sustainable in the long run, relies on a high-quality structure and helps overcome the burden of social imbalances. Clearly, with the above restrictions and macroeconomic policy in mind, economic growth will largely rely on fiscal incentives with state budgets and central banks playing the key role.

Actually, we can see these kinds of trends in the developed countries and also in some developing economies as well. An increasing role of the state in the socioeconomic sphere at the national level obviously implies greater responsibility and close interstate interaction when it comes to issues on the global agenda.

Calls for inclusive growth and for creating decent standards

of living for everyone are regularly made at various international forums. This is how it should be, and this is an absolutely correct view of our joint efforts.

It is clear that the world cannot continue creating an economy that will only benefit a million people, or even the golden billion. This is a destructive precept. This model is unbalanced by default. The recent developments, including migration crises, have reaffirmed this once again.

We must now proceed from stating facts to action, investing our efforts and resources into reducing social inequality in individual countries and into gradually balancing the economic development standards of different countries and regions in the world. This would put an end to migration crises.

The essence and focus of this policy aimed at ensuring sustainable and harmonious development are clear. They imply the creation of new opportunities for everyone, conditions under which everyone will be able to develop and realise their potential regardless of where they were born and are living

I would like to point out four key priorities, as I see them. This might be old news, but since Klaus has allowed me to present Russia's position, my position, I will certainly do so.

First, everyone must have comfortable living conditions, including housing and affordable transport, energy and public utility infrastructure. Plus environmental welfare, something that must not be overlooked.

Second, everyone must be sure that they will have a job that can ensure sustainable growth of income and, hence, decent standards of living. Everyone must have access to an effective system of lifelong education, which is absolutely indispensable now and which will allow people to develop, make a career and receive a decent pension and social benefits upon retirement.

Third, people must be confident that they will receive high-quality and effective medical care whenever necessary, and that the national healthcare system will guarantee access to modern medical services.

Fourth, regardless of the family income, children must be

able to receive a decent education and realise their potential. Every child has potential.

This is the only way to guarantee the cost-effective development of the modern economy, in which people are perceived as the end, rather than the means. Only those countries capable of attaining progress in at least these four areas will facilitate their own sustainable and all-inclusive development. These areas are not exhaustive, and I have just mentioned the main aspects.

A strategy, also being implemented by my country, hinges on precisely these approaches. Our priorities revolve around people, their families, and they aim to ensure demographic development, to protect the people, to improve their well-being and to protect their health. We are now working to create favourable conditions for worthy and cost-effective work and successful entrepreneurship and to ensure digital transformation as the foundation of a high-tech future for the entire country, rather than that of a narrow group of companies.

We intend to focus the efforts of the state, the business community and civil society on these tasks and to implement a budgetary policy with the relevant incentives in the years ahead.

We are open to the broadest international cooperation, while achieving our national goals, and we are confident that cooperation on matters of the global socioeconomic agenda would have a positive influence on the overall atmosphere in global affairs, and that interdependence in addressing acute current problems would also increase mutual trust which is particularly important and particularly topical today.

Obviously, the era linked with attempts to build a centralised and unipolar world order has ended. To be honest, this era did not even begin. A mere attempt was made in this direction, but this, too, is now history. The essence of this monopoly ran counter to our civilisation's cultural and historical diversity.

The reality is such that really different development centres with their distinctive models, political systems and public

institutions have taken shape in the world. Today, it is very important to create mechanisms for harmonising their interests to prevent the diversity and natural competition of the development poles from triggering anarchy and a series of protracted conflicts.

To achieve this we must, in part, consolidate and develop universal institutions that bear special responsibility for ensuring stability and security in the world and for formulating and defining the rules of conduct both in the global economy and trade.

I have mentioned more than once that many of these institutions are not going through the best of times. We have been bringing this up at various summits. Of course, these institutions were established in a different era. This is clear. Probably, they even find it difficult to parry modern challenges for objective reasons. However, I would like to emphasise that this is not an excuse to give up on them without offering anything in exchange, all the more so since these structures have unique experience of work and a huge but largely untapped potential. And it certainly needs to be carefully adapted to modern realities. It is too early to dump it in the dustbin of history. It is essential to work with it and to use it.

Naturally, in addition to this, it is important to use new, additional formats of cooperation. I am referring to such phenomenon as multiversity. Of course, it is also possible to interpret it differently, in one's own way. It may be viewed as an attempt to push one's own interests or feign the legitimacy of one's own actions when all others can merely nod in approval. Or it may be a concerted effort of sovereign states to resolve specific problems for common benefit. In this case, this may refer to the efforts to settle regional conflicts, establish technological alliances and resolve many other issues, including the formation of cross-border transport and energy corridors and so on and so forth.

Friend

Ladies and gentlemen,

This opens wide possibilities for collaboration. Multi-faceted approaches do work. We know from practice that they work. As you may be aware, within the framework of, for example, the

Astana format, Russia, Iran and Turkey are doing much to stabilise the situation in Syria and are now helping establish a political dialogue in that country, of course, alongside other countries. We are doing this together. And, importantly, not without success.

For example, Russia has undertaken energetic mediation efforts to stop the armed conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh, in which peoples and states that are close to us – Azerbaijan and Armenia – are involved. We strived to follow the key agreements reached by the OSCE Minsk Group, in particular between its co-chairs – Russia, the United States and France. This is also a very good example of cooperation.

As you may be aware, a trilateral Statement by Russia, Azerbaijan and Armenia was signed in November. Importantly, by and large, it is being steadily implemented. The bloodshed was stopped. This is the most important thing. We managed to stop the bloodshed, achieve a complete ceasefire and start the stabilisation process.

Now the international community and, undoubtedly, the countries involved in crisis resolution are faced with the task of helping the affected areas overcome humanitarian challenges related to returning refugees, rebuilding destroyed infrastructure, protecting and restoring historical, religious and cultural landmarks.

Or, another example. I will note the role of Russia, Saudi Arabia, the United States and a number of other countries in stabilising the global energy market. This format has become a productive example of interaction between the states with different, sometimes even diametrically opposite assessments of global processes, and with their own outlooks on the world.

At the same time there are certainly problems that concern every state without exception. One example is cooperation in studying and countering the coronavirus infection. As you know, several strains of this dangerous virus have emerged. The international community must create conditions for cooperation between scientists and other specialists to understand how and why coronavirus mutations occur, as well as the difference between the

various strains.

Of course, we need to coordinate the efforts of the entire world, as the UN Secretary-General suggests and as we urged recently at the G20 summit. It is essential to join and coordinate the efforts of the world in countering the spread of the virus and making the much needed vaccines more accessible. We need to help the countries that need support, including the African nations. I am referring to expanding the scale of testing and vaccinations.

We see that mass vaccination is accessible today, primarily to people in the developed countries. Meanwhile, millions of people in the world are deprived even of the hope for this protection. In practice, such inequality could create a common threat because this is well known and has been said many times that it will drag out the epidemic and uncontrolled hotbeds will continue. The epidemic has no borders.

There are no borders for infections or pandemics. Therefore, we must learn the lessons from the current situation and suggest measures aimed at improving the monitoring of the emergence of such diseases and the development of such cases in the world.

Another important area that requires coordination, in fact, the coordination of the efforts of the entire international community, is to preserve the climate and nature of our planet. I will not say anything new in this respect.

Only together can we achieve progress in resolving such critical problems as global warming, the reduction of forestlands, the loss of biodiversity, the increase in waste, the pollution of the ocean with plastic and so on, and find an optimal balance between economic development and the preservation of the environment for the current and future generations.

My friends,

We all know that competition and rivalry between countries in world history never stopped, do not stop and will never stop. Differences and a clash of interests are also natural for such a complicated body as human civilisation. However, in critical times this did not prevent it from pooling its efforts – on the contrary, it united in the most important destinies of humankind. I believe this

is the period we are going through today.

It is very important to honestly assess the situation, to concentrate on real rather than artificial global problems, on removing the imbalances that are critical for the entire international community. I am sure that in this way we will be able to achieve success and befittingly parry the challenges of the third decade of the 21st century.

I would like to finish my speech at this point and thank all of you for your patience and attention.

Thank you very much.

Klaus Schwab: Thank you very much, Mr President.

Many of the issues raised, certainly, are part of our discussions here during the Davos Week. We complement the speeches also by task forces which address some of the issues you mentioned, like not leaving the developing world behind, taking care of, let's say, creating the skills for tomorrow, and so on. Mr President, we prepare for the discussion afterwards, but I have one very short question. It is a question which we discussed when I visited you in St Petersburg 14 months ago. How do you see the future of European-Russian relations? Just a short answer.

Vladimir Putin: You know there are things of an absolutely fundamental nature such as our common culture. Major European political figures have talked in the recent past about the need to expand relations between Europe and Russia, saying that Russia is part of Europe. Geographically and, most importantly, culturally, we are one civilisation. French leaders have spoken of the need to create a single space from Lisbon to the Urals. I believe, and I mentioned this, why the Urals? To Vladivostok.

I personally heard the outstanding European politician, former Chancellor Helmut Kohl, say that if we want European culture to survive and remain a centre of world civilisation in the future, keeping in mind the challenges and trends underlying the world civilisation, then of course, Western Europe and Russia must be together. It is hard to disagree with that. We hold exactly the same point of view.

Clearly, today's situation is not normal. We need to return to

a positive agenda. This is in the interests of Russia and, I am confident, the European countries. Clearly, the pandemic has also played a negative role. Our trade with the European Union is down, although the EU is one of our key trade and economic partners. Our agenda includes returning to positive trends and building up trade and economic cooperation.

Europe and Russia are absolutely natural partners from the point of view of the economy, research, technology and spatial development for European culture, since Russia, being a country of European culture, is a little larger than the entire EU in terms of territory. Russia's resources and human potential are enormous. I will not go over everything that is positive in Europe, which can also benefit the Russian Federation.

Only one thing matters: we need to approach the dialogue with each other honestly. We need to discard the phobias of the past, stop using the problems that we inherited from past centuries in internal political processes and look to the future. If we can rise above these problems of the past and get rid of these phobias, then we will certainly enjoy a positive stage in our relations.

We are ready for this, we want this, and we will strive to make this happen. But love is impossible if it is declared only by one side. It must be mutual.

Klaus Schwab: Thank you very much, Mr President.

About the Author

Rick Biondi has studied world order strategy since 1994. Biondi earned a BA in political science from the University of Washington (1997); studied international relations at the graduate level at the University of Idaho (1998-2000); and holds an MA in Security Management from American Military University (2014). Rick is a former executive consultant/historian (2001-2002) for the Association to Unite the Democracies (AUD), and served on the Board of the Ashburn Institute. In 2008, Biondi ran for U.S. Congress in Arizona's 6th Congressional District as a libertarian. Rick is a veteran of the U.S. Army. He served as an Airborne Ranger (1989-1991) and a motorized infantryman (1991-1992). Email: **capitalistpeace@gmail.com**