

ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

JULY 9, 1968.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ZABLOCKI, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs,
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

SUPPORTING AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H. Con. Res. 48]

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 48) to establish an Atlantic Union delegation, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

House Concurrent Resolution 48 provides for the establishment, by the Congress, of an 18-member citizens' delegation, authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries.

The purpose of the convention is to advance the unity of the countries of the North Atlantic area. Specifically, the convention is to explore the possibility of arriving at some agreement among the participant delegations regarding the eventual goals of their states; a tentative timetable for achieving those goals; and the creation of interim democratic institutions which would hasten the development of a unified North Atlantic community.

Eight members of the proposed delegation are to be named by the Congress, and eight by the President of the United States. Not more than one-half of the delegation's membership may be drawn from any one political party.

The resolution further expresses the request of the Congress that President Harry S. Truman and President Dwight D. Eisenhower serve as cochairmen of the delegation.

BACKGROUND

On September 7, 1960, Public Law 86-719 was approved, creating the first U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO. That Commission attended the Atlantic Convention of the NATO countries, held in Paris in January 1962. The recommendations of the Atlantic Convention were outlined in a document known as the Declaration of Paris. They included proposals that the governments of the NATO countries—

Appoint a Special Governmental Commission to study the organization of the Atlantic Community;

Establish a Permanent High Council to "prepare and concert policies on political, economic, cultural, and military matters";

Transform the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference into a Consultative Atlantic Community;

Create a High Court of Justice; and

Transfer "a measure of delegated sovereignty in the Atlantic area" to an Atlantic Community.

The U.S. delegation to the 1962 Atlantic Convention was constituted as a citizens' commission and prohibited by law from speaking for or representing the U.S. Government.

REASONS FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

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 a 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 America 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 resolutions does not presume to offer solutions to the issues which presently confront, and frequently divide, the countries of the North Atlantic area. It simply proposes that the exploratory dialog begun in 1962 be continued at the level of citizens' commissions.

The committee hopes for the widest possible participation in that dialog, and for the inclusion of all interested countries in the eventual North Atlantic Community. For the time being, however, it may be advisable to build on a somewhat narrower but already tried base. This is the reason for the specific reference in the resolution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The concepts outlined in the resolution should not be construed as an attempt on the part of the U.S. Congress to dictate the form or the future direction of the North Atlantic Community. Decisions on such basic and complex issues will have to be made at the appropriate time by the peoples of the countries concerned, and their governments.

EXECUTIVE REPORT

The text of a communication from the Department of State, pertaining to House Concurrent Resolution 48, follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1967.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been asked to reply to your letter of April 24, 1967, to the Secretary, requesting the comments of the Department of State on House Joint Resolution 391 and House Concurrent Resolutions 48, 186, 232, and 320. These resolutions call for the creation of an Atlantic Union delegation which would organize and participate in a convention of the NATO countries. The convention would explore the possibility of transforming NATO into a federal union, of setting up a tentative timetable for such a goal, and creating interim institutions to hasten the integration process.

These resolutions are very similar in their language and intent to House Concurrent Resolution 523, submitted on October 18, 1965, on which the Department gave its views in Assistant Secretary MacArthur's letter to you of July 12, 1966. In that letter, Mr. MacArthur stated that the Department favored closer relationships among the Atlantic nations by improving the operation of existing institutions, notably NATO and the OECD. Mr. MacArthur noted that at the same time we wished to encourage our European allies to continue to seek common solutions to their problems through European integration. He observed that any proposal such as House Concurrent Resolution 523 looking to an Atlantic Union would be regarded by the Europeans as a reversal of our support for European integration and possibly an attempt to assert American domination.

On September 20, 1966, Mr. George Ball, then Under Secretary of State, testified on the same subject before your committee. Mr. Ball said: "* * * I find little evidence of any strong interest among Europeans for any immediate move toward greater political unity with the United States. We Atlantic nations are of different size and the Europeans are sensitive to this disparity. They fear the overwhelming weight of U.S. power and influence in our common councils. * * * 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."

The positions taken by Mr. MacArthur and Mr. Ball a year ago continue to reflect the Department's view. A number of subsequent events have demonstrated the advantages of pursuing the policy which they outlined, that of seeking intensified cooperation in NATO while supporting a stronger and a more unified Europe. Recent actions by the European Economic Community to consolidate and advance economic integration have brought into sight the completion of a single economic system at the center of Europe. The determination of other European nations to join in this process has been heightened, with the result that enlargement of the Community is today a preoccupying concern to most of the nations of Western Europe.

During the same period, NATO has not only surmounted the crisis brought on by the French withdrawal from the integrated military command of the Alliance but has taken steps to improve the Alliance machinery for military cooperation. At the NATO ministerial meetings of last June and December, 14 nations reaffirmed their support of an integrated and interdependent military organization and evinced a mutual desire to strengthen and modernize NATO. We and our allies have therefore set out to improve and streamline the military side of the Alliance and are embarked on a searching reexamination of its future, with particular attention to political consultation. The United States has also endorsed the proposal of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference to convert itself into an Atlantic Assembly with an official relationship to the North Atlantic Council.

The advances that have been made both in European integration and, despite France's withdrawal from many NATO activities, in the wider area of Atlantic cooperation reflect with utmost clarity the desires of most of our European partners. They wish to complete the work of European economic integration and to realize NATO's existing potential for collective defense and political cohesion. This is our view as well of the best way to achieve growing solidarity of the Atlantic nations. A proposal for Atlantic Union at this time would generate uncertainty over U.S. objectives toward Europe and detract from progress on these important and more immediately practical tasks. For these reasons, the Department does not favor House Joint Resolution 391 and House Concurrent Resolutions 48, 186, 232, and 320.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

SUPPORTING VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE PAUL FINDLEY

PRESENT INSTITUTIONS NOT GOOD ENOUGH

World problems mount rather than recede for the United States, despite our massive outpouring abroad of dollars, guns, and troops.

The European-directed empires which yesterday provided a semblance of worldwide security and stability are gone. The alliances established under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower are in serious trouble. The most promising of them, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, has not developed in influence, solidarity, and scope as its founders expected. Indeed, the very survival of the alliance is in question on the eve of 1969, the critical 20-year milestone when members may withdraw.

Obviously its present form does not reflect today's realities. It is somewhat like a castle on the Rhine, an outdated relic of a past era when political facts were vastly different.

The arms race quickens. The proliferation of nuclear weapons seems inevitable, wishful treaties to the contrary notwithstanding. Respected authorities view the international monetary crisis as the deepest since the thirties. Barriers to trade are going up instead of down. Crises sputter in Berlin, the Middle East, Korea. The war in Vietnam continues in full fury.

In coping with these crises the United States has found itself increasingly and distressingly alone.

Obviously, present policies and institutions are not good enough. Something better is needed, and the search for it should be undertaken at the earliest possible date by the best available minds.

House Concurrent Resolution 48 proposes such a search. It recognizes implicitly the fundamental weakness of alliances and provides a forum in which the federal alternative can be explored. It is therefore as American as apple pie and in perfect harmony with our traditions and history, during which the federal answer to alliance weakness was developed.

In his Farewell Address, George Washington, who led the federal development, took note of frailty of alliances when he said:

To the efficacy and permanency of your (the United States) Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which alliances, in all times, have experienced.

Under this resolution, a delegation of 18 eminent U.S. citizens—each applying his own individual ideas—would be authorized to explore with similar groups from other NATO nations the possibility of agreement on federation as the long-range goal of the alliance.

Any recommendation the convention might produce would, of course, be subject to constitutional processes. Support of the resolution commits no one to anything beyond simply the exploration of federation as the alliance goal.

Agreement on this general goal could, however, serve a highly useful purpose, providing inspiration and direction as the nations of the Atlantic Community deal on a day-by-day basis with problems which often are divisive in their very nature. Agreement on goal could help us stay together over the rough spots that may lie ahead.

Support for the resolution is already impressive.

ONE HUNDRED AND FOURTEEN HOUSE MEMBERS SUPPORT RESOLUTION

One hundred and fourteen House Members have either introduced or pledged support for the resolution (H. Con Res. 48, et al.).

This total figure breaks down as follows:

Democrats: 61 (41 introduced resolution, and 20 others pledged support.)

Republicans: 53 (41 introduced resolution, and 12 others pledged support).

The broad bipartisan character of support for this initiative is further demonstrated by endorsements by all men who are actively seeking the presidential nomination.

Printed below are statements of support by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator Eugene McCarthy, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. Also included is a statement of support issued by Senator Robert F. Kennedy shortly before his death.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

We stand now at the threshold of a new age—an age in which all of us along the Atlantic Basin * * * all of us who share a common heritage and common values will be able to work together, freely yet effectively, toward man's final liberation around the world. Let the course ahead be clear. We shall not achieve great goals with limited investments. We shall not achieve mighty purposes with petty actions. We shall not find our way guided by small dreams. While a Senator, I was among the sponsors, from 1949 on, of all the resolutions for an Atlantic Convention to explore with our 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.—May 7, 1968.

SENATOR M'CARTHY

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That (1) the Congress create an Atlantic Union delegation * * * to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such NATO allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on—(a) a declaration that the eventual goal of their States is to transform the Atlantic Alliance into a federal union, (b) a tentative timetable for the transition to this goal, and*

(c) the creation of interim democratic institutions to hasten the process of integration. * * * —From Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, introduced in the Senate March 1, 1967 by Senators McCarthy (Democrat, of Minnesota) and Carlson (Republican, of Kansas).

RICHARD M. NIXON

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. * * * It would be foolish for us to ignore the fact that science and history are even now fatefully combining to accomplish the same goal. * * * The Atlantic Union Resolution (Representative Paul Findley's House Concurrent Resolution 232, similar to McCarthy's bill) 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. Statement, September 1, 1966, to House Foreign Affairs Committee.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER

Our generation is called on for a pioneering act of political creativity and economic construction—on an intercontinental scale. * * * The practical first step would be to form a federal political structure for the North Atlantic area. * * * The time has come for us and our Atlantic allies to take the leadership by appointing a preparatory convention of delegates to work out answers. * * * November 20, 1964. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the purposes set forth in these resolutions * * * a practical first step toward forging a union of the free * * * Enactment would be a historical milestone in the annals of human freedom and world peace.—March 2, 1966.

SENATOR KENNEDY

The fulfillment of which I then spoke (6 years ago) 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. We live in a world whose transformation is often swift and cataclysmic. * * * Political federation often has its roots in economic reciprocity. Our own Constitutional Convention in 1787 sprang from a desire to banish obstacles to trade * * * among the 13 * * * American States. To fail to study this concept * * * would be to turn our back on the lessons of history.—April 8, 1968.

Correspondence I have received shows the strong support of former President Eisenhower and Barry Goldwater, the Republican presidential candidate in 1964.

In a letter to me dated April 6, 1966, General Eisenhower said:

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: First, I strongly favor your undertaking; let there be no mistake about this. Second, I warmly

appreciate the invitation to share the chairmanship of the delegation with former President Truman and would like very much to be able to do so. Third, my declination of the invitation is dictated therefore, not by a reluctance to become identified with this effort, not by a desire for leisure, not even, by a personal awareness of increasing years, but instead by considerations of health which have imposed upon me very explicit medical disciplines for some considerable time to come. In short I would prefer to respond favorably; and if I could, I would. * * *

I wish your undertaking well and wish I could personally help to advance it as you have suggested.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

On February 11, 1966, former Senator Goldwater wrote to me as follows:

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 just 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.

REPUBLICAN SPONSORS

Republican House Members who introduced an Atlantic Union delegation resolution during the 89th or 90th Congress:

Anderson, John B., Illinois.	May, Catherine, Washington.
Broomfield, William, Michigan.	Michel, Robert H., Illinois.
Burton, Laurence, Utah.	Mores, F. Bradford, Massachusetts.
Button, Daniel E., New York.	Morton, Rogers C. B., Maryland.
Cederberg, Elford A., Michigan.	Quic, Albert H., Minnesota.
Clausen, Don H., California.	Quillen, James H., Tennessee.
Conte, Silvio O., Massachusetts.	Railsback, Tom, Illinois.
Cramer, William C., Florida.	Reid, Ogden R., New York.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebraska.	Reinecke, Ed., California.
Derwinski, Edward J., Illinois.	Robison, Howard, New York.
Esch, Marvin, Michigan.	Rumsfeld, Donald M., Illinois.
Findley, Paul, Illinois.	Schneebeil, Herman T., Pennsylvania.
Gubser, Charles, California.	Scott, Wm. Lloyd, Virginia.
Halpern, Seymour, New York.	Smith, Henry III, New York.
Horton, Frank, New York.	Stafford, Robert T., Vermont.
Keith, Hastings, Massachusetts.	Stanton, J. William, Ohio.
Kupferman, Theo. R., New York.	Steiger, W. A., Wisconsin.
Langen, Odin, Minnesota.	Teague, Charles M., California.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., California.	Wyatt, Wendell, Oregon.
McDade, Joseph M., Pennsylvania.	Wyddler, John W., New York.
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr., Maryland.	

DEMOCRATIC SPONSORS

Democratic House Members who introduced the Atlantic Union delegation resolution in either the 89th or 90th Congress:

Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.	McCarthy, Richard D., New York.
Boland, Edward P., Massachusetts.	MacDonald, Torbert H., Massachusetts
Brown, George E., Jr., California.	Matsunaga, Spark M., Hawaii.
Carey, Hugh L., New York.	Moorhead, William S., Pennsylvania.
Casey, Bob, Texas.	Moss, John E., California.
Corman, James C., California.	Multer, Abraham J., New York.
Daddario, Emilio, Connecticut.	O'Hara, Barratt, Illinois.
Diggs, Chas. C., Michigan.	O'Hara, James, Michigan.
Eilberg, Joshua, Pennsylvania.	Price, Melvin, Illinois.
Farbstein, Leonard, New York.	Purell, Graham, Texas.
Fraser, Donald M., Minnesota.	Rees, Thomas M., California.
Fulton, Richard H., Tennessee.	Resnick, Joseph Y., New York.
Gilbert, Jacob H., New York.	Rhodes, George M., Pennsylvania.
Gonzalez, Henry B., Texas.	Roybal, Edward R., California.
Hechler, Ken, West Virginia.	Scheuer, James H., New York.
Helstoski, Henry, New Jersey.	Sisk, B. F., California.
Holifield, Chet, California.	Thompson, Frank, Jr., New Jersey.
Holland, Elmer J., Pennsylvania.	Udall, Morris K., Arizona.
Irwin, Donald J., Connecticut.	Wright, Jim, Texas.
Karh, Joseph E., Minnesota.	Zablocki, Clement J., Wisconsin.
Leggett, Robert L., California.	

OTHERS PLEDGE SUPPORT

Other House Members who have pledged their support to the Atlantic Union delegation resolution by communication to chief sponsors of the resolution:

Republicans

Bates, William, Massachusetts.
 Fimo, Paul, New York.
 Gurney, Edward J., Florida.
 Mailliard, William S., California.
 Reifel, Ben, South Dakota.
 Smith, H. Allen, California.

Democrats

Cabell, Earl, Texas.
 Barrett, William A., Pennsylvania.
 Fallon, George, Maryland.
 Friedel, Samuel N., Maryland.
 Hamilton, Lee H., Indiana.
 Hanna, Richard T., California.
 Johnson, Harold T., California.
 King, Cecil R., California.
 Machen, Hervey G., Maryland.
 Morris, Thomas G., New Mexico.
 Wilson, Charles H., California.

In addition, 15 other House Members recently signed statements of support in response to a survey conducted by Freedom and Union magazine, Washington, D.C.

They are:

Democrats: Brock Adams, Washington; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Thomas S. Foley, Washington; Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey; Peter N. Kyros, Maine; Richard L. Ottinger, New York; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; and Jerome R. Waldie, California.

Republicans: Robert V. Denney, Nebraska; Donald E. Lukens, Ohio; Alexander Pirnie, New York; Charles W. Sandman, Jr., New Jersey; Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin; and Bob Wilson, California.

PAUL FINDLEY.

DISSENTING VIEWS

We believe in the pursuit of a close and effective relationship with Western Europe. Nevertheless, we take sharp issue with the notion that the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 48 will in any way advance us toward the goal of a harmonious North Atlantic community.

In our view, both the form and the timing of this legislative initiative are most unfortunate. We have grave reservations about both.

In form, the resolution lends itself to varied interpretations. While its ostensible purpose is to establish a citizens' commission which would organize a convention for the purpose of exploring ways and means of achieving closer relationships within the North Atlantic community, the wording of the resolution appears to commit the countries involved to the goal of a federal union. Further, section 2, which refers to action in accordance with U.S. constitutional procedures, gives great weight to the convention's recommendations long before these have been arrived at.

Moreover, the timing of this proposal is inauspicious.

Barely 2 years have passed since NATO, the bulwark of the North Atlantic alliance, experienced the shock of President de Gaulle's decision to withdraw France from the military structure of that organization. That decision transcended military considerations and raised a host of issues which go to the heart of the relationship between the United States and Europe.

In essence, General de Gaulle served notice that the era of American predominance in Europe was coming to an end; that military power and necessity could no longer dictate political policies; and that a new structure of relationships would have to evolve both within the continent and within the larger North Atlantic area.

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 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 be well advised to start playing a less active role in reshaping the Atlantic partnership.

Political attitudes in Europe and in the United States support this conclusion. This is particularly so in view of the tumultuous events of the last few months in France.

In the 6 years since the first Atlantic Convention, virtually no progress has been made to carry out its resounding recommendations.

And in the U.S. Congress, suggestions that another Atlantic Convention be convened have declined sharply. During the last Congress, 85 resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives proposed that course; in this Congress, there are only 20.

We urge strongly, therefore, that the House take no action on this proposal.

Frances P. Bolton, W. S. Mailliard, L. H. Fountain, Omar
Burleson, Dante B. Fascell, John Buchanan, Peter H.
B. Frelinghuysen, E. Ross Adair, Edward J. Derwinski.

○