

In Search of Atlantica

Editors

Richard R. Biondi

Nejat Dogan

Kseniya M. Khovanova-Rubicondo

In Search of Atlantica

Editors: Richard R. Biondi, Nejat Dogan, Kseniya M. Khovanova-Rubicondo

Cover Design: Gamze Uçak

©Siyasal Kitabevi Tüm Hakları Saklıdır.

June 2016, Ankara

ISBN: 978-605-9221-25-2

Siyasal Kitabevi-Ünal Sevindik

Yayıncı Sertifika No: 14016

Şehit Adem Yavuz Sok. Hitit Apt. 14/1

Kızılay-Ankara

Tel: 0(312) 419 97 81 pbx

Fax: 0(312) 419 16 11

Printed by:

Desen Ofset A. Ş.

Sertifika No: 11289

Birlik Mah. 448. Cad. 476. Sk. No: 2

Çankaya / ANKARA Tel: (312) 496 43 43

Distribution:

Siyasal Yayın Dağıtım

Şehit Adem Yavuz Sok. Hitit Apt. 14/1

Kızılay-Ankara

Tel: 0 (312) 419 97 81 pbx

Fax: 0 (312) 419 16 11

e-mail: info@siyasalkitap.com

<http://www.siyasalkitap.com>

In Search of Atlantica

Table of Contents

Introduction In Search of Atlantica: Robert L. Frantz	9
Message from the Former Chairman of the Board: Menko Rose	14
Editorial Introduction: Richard R. Biondi	16
About Clarence K. Streit: Richard R. Biondi	18
PART I—ATLANTIC UNION PRINCIPLES.....	19
1- The Atlantic Union Proposal (1939)	21
2- King Nation or King Citizen? The Confusion over Sovereignty -April 1955-	23
3- Free Enterprise Makes for Peace -January, 1947-.....	35
4- Free Enterprise Makes for Peace: II—Stalin's Unchallenged Error -February, 1947-.....	38
5- Free Enterprise Makes for Peace: III—The Marxist Monopoly Fallacy -March 1947-	44
6- Free Enterprise Makes for Peace: IV—The Real Internationalizer -April, 1947-	47
7- “Free Enterprise Makes for Peace: V—A Substitute for War” -May, 1947-	50
8- Free Enterprise Makes for Peace: VI—Unemployment and War -June, 1947-.....	52
9- Free Enterprise Makes for Peace: VII—Marxism Makes Trade a Weapon -July, 1947-	54
10- Free Enterprise Makes for Peace: VIII—Federalism, Not Marxism, Needed -August-Sept, 1947-	57
11- The New Federalist	60
12- Editor’s Foreword.....	61
13- Introduction	64
13.1. Our Purpose.....	65
13.2. Basic Federal Principle	68
13.3. Sovereignty	71
13.4. Neither League nor Nation	73
13.5. Federal Union’s Basic Balance	76

13.6. Federal Union’s Division of Power	79
13.7. Where Union Brings Freedom	81
13.8. Who Shall Found the Union	84
13.9. No Union with Dictatorship	86
13.10. Self-Governing Peoples Needed	89
13.11. Nuclear Union vs. the Universalist Approach	91
13.12. The Nucleus of Union Now	94
13.13. The Essentials in a Federal Legislature	96
13.14. More Essentials of the Federal Legislature.....	98
13.15. Hamilton on the Executive	101
13.16. Essentials in a Federal Executive	103
13.17. The Essentials in a Federal Judiciary	106
13.18. More Essentials in a Federal Judiciary	109
13.19. Federalism Safeguards Small Nations.....	111
13.20. Federalism’s Expansion Principles.....	114
13.21. Federal Taxation	117
13.22. Federal Taxation (continued).....	119
13.23. International Trade.....	121
13.24. Dual Federal Citizenship	124
13.25. A Common Currency.....	127
13.26. How to Set Up a Federal Convention Now	129
14- Freedom Comes First – Peace Follows.....	133

PART II—ATLANTIC UNION POLITICS..... 153

Basic Chronology of Events

15- Atlantic Union Movement Began in March 1939 -March 1959-	160
16- Federal Unionist Began National Organizations in July 1939 in U.S., Britain, France -July-August, 1959-.....	164
17- How the Atlantic Convention Came to Be -January, 1962-	174
18- Text of U.S. Public Law 86-719 -January, 1962-	183

PART III—THE ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF 1962 185

19- Clayton, Herter Head Commission Organizing Atlantic Convention -May, 1961-	186
20- Convention Offers New Approach -January, 1962-.....	199
21- Some Basic Facts About Convention -February-March, 1962-.....	202
22- Proposals the Convention Faced -February-March, 1962-	204

- 23- Convention Urges an Official Commission Draft / Plans in 2 years for
‘True Atlantic Community’-February-March, 1962- 213
- 24- Why Convention is Unlikely to Reconvene -February-March, 1962- 221
- 25- The Declaration of Paris -February - March, 1962- 223
- 26- U.S. Citizens Commission Urges NATO Sovereignty Shift
-July-August, 1962-..... 232
- 27- Selected Text of the U.S. Citizen Commission’s Report to Congress
-July-August, 1962-..... 235

PART IV—PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS 245

- 28- Declaration of Atlantic Interdependence -July 4, 1962- 247

PART V—SUPPORTING ARTICLES AND RESEARCH 251

- 29- In Union Lies the Power to Win the War and the
Peace—A Petition -January 27, 1942-..... 252
- 30- Elmo Roper Poll Encourages Atlantic Unionists -July 9, 1947- 253
- 31- World Federalists Open the Door to Congress -July 9, 1947- 254
- 32- Atlantic Union Committee Formed! -April, 1949- 256
- 33- Atlantic Union Key to Free World Order -May, 1949-..... 260
- 34- AUC Resolution Reaches Congress -September, 1949-..... 262
- 35- Election Increases Atlantic Union Strength in Congress
-December, 1950- 270
- 36- Pros and Cons of the Atlantic Union Resolution -September, 1950- 271
- 37- Atlantic Union Resolution Re-Introduced -February, 1951-..... 275
- 38- The New Resolution to Explore Atlantic Union -February, 1955- 278
- 39- Atlantic Exploratory Convention Resolution / Senate Concurrent
Resolution 12 -July, 1955- 282
- 40- Atlantic Union Makes Twofold Advance -September, 1955- 283
- 41- Senate Committee Weighs Atlantic Convention Call
–Dulles Opens New Way -September, 1955- 288
- 42- Resolution is step to world union and undermines
America's strength -September, 1955- 290
- 43- Kefauver-Dulles Correspondence -October, 1955- 294
- 44- Dulles Defers Atlantic Commission Idea -October, 1956- 299
- 45- NATO Parliamentarians Endorse Basic Atlantic
Convention Idea -December, 1957- 300
- 46- International Movement for Atlantic Union
Constituted -September, 1958- 303

47- Humphrey Puts in Atlantic Convention Bill -April, 1959-	311
48- Herter’s Work to Unite Atlantica -June 1959-.....	313
49- Atlantic Congress Backs Convention Proposal -July-August, 1959-	316
50- Declaration of the Atlantic Congress, 1959 -July-August, 1959-.....	319
51- Herter Gives the Green Light to Resolution for Convention to Explore Atlantic Unification-October, 1959-.....	322
52- Three Points to be Added to Resolution -October, 1959-.....	328
53- Hearing Advances Atlantic Convention as StateDepartment Adds Positive Approval -February, 1960-.....	330
54- Senate Committee Approves Atlantic Convention -March, 1960-.....	338
55- Senate Report: U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO -March, 1960-	345
56- Statement of Clarence K. Streit in Support of the Atlantic Convention -May, 1960-.....	350
57- House Set for August Vote on Atlantic Convention / Senate & All Presidential Candidates Approve It -July-August, 1960-.....	357
58- Senate Debate on Atlantic Convention -July-August, 1960-	363
59- Congress Authorizes Atlantic Unity Convention -September, 1960-.....	392
60- House Votes ‘Unprecedented’ Approach, 288 to 103 -September 1960-	399
Further Reading.....	437
About the Editors	439

Introduction

In Search of Atlantica

It is a pleasure to introduce to you - and to help to preserve - an important period of history that contributed to world peace during the Cold War. This was the proposal for a limited Euro-Atlantic Union as envisioned by Clarence Streit in his book *Union Now*.

This book, titled "In Search of Atlantica," is a compilation of key events in the United States Congress that brought the U.S. and Europe to nearly codifying a limited union for the purpose of preventing another disastrous world war based on the notion that a new union would be so strong that no one would dare attacking it. Although the union was not consummated, the U.S. effort did contribute to the formation of the European Union, which to date has resulted in an enduring peace in Europe.

At a recent international conference, co-sponsored by Ashburn Institute and Portland State University's Center for Turkish Studies and the Middle East Studies Center, the guest speaker, Dr. Jacek Kugler, stressed the importance of capturing this important historical period for its relevance in contributing to International Relations theory. And this book accomplishes this. My thanks to Mr. Richard Biondi for his diligent historical compilation and to the editors who contributed to the completion of this book.

Today we face a challenging world of new power transitions resulting in a dangerous multi-polar world of competing philosophies and religions that could again threaten our existence to an even greater degree than the previous world wars.

Is it possible to envision a renewed Euro-Atlantic Union to act as a more powerful broker for world peace? Was Streit right? Ashburn Institute is planning another international conference in the spring of 2016 in Turkey and we hope this book might prove an inspiration for dialogue on Streit's proposals.

Robert L. Frantz, Ph. D.

Chairman of the Board, Ashburn Institute

Message from the Former Chairman of the Board

The search for Atlantica was one of the most productive series of steps on the long trial-and-error road from pre-historical, primitive anarchy to the worldwide peace with freedom and justice to which all of the inhabitants of our Earth are entitled, and which they may someday achieve.

In Search of Atlantica provides sovereign citizens, scholars and statespeople a wealth of knowledge about the efforts of international federalists that worked well—and which worked not so well—in structuring the peace they brought to the North Atlantic community after World War II. The understanding gained from this knowledge will be of inestimable value in choosing optimum paths for the rest of this epochal journey. Its importance cannot be overstated. The outcome of the fearful current race between the accelerating destructive power of weapons and, through the accelerating ability of large groups to communicate and solve problems together, the institution of effective, just world law, which alone can enable the elimination of these weapons, will determine the fate of the occupants of our planet. Truly, nothing less is at stake than humanity's survival, the survival of *all* higher life.

In order to better understand the context, impact and significance of the search for Atlantica, let us remind ourselves of early efforts to achieve civil societies. Surely there were benevolent leaders as agricultural communities evolved from the previous, freer hunter-gatherer cultures. But largely life looked much as Edith Hamilton described it in *The Greek Way*.

The ancient world, in so far as we can reconstruct it, bears everywhere the same stamp. In Egypt, in Crete, in Mesopotamia, wherever we can read bits of the story, we find the same conditions: a despot enthroned, whose whims and passions are the determining factor in the state; a wretched, subjugated populace; a great priestly organization to which is handed over the domain of the intellect.

Some of the significant steps from this “wretched, subjugated populace” with little intellect toward law and order, toward intelligent self-government, toward increasing measures of freedom with justice, toward sovereignty of the individual from oppressive sovereignty of the state accomplished during early civilizing attempts include:

- Hieroglyphic and cuneiform writing (5,000 years ago). Initially, probably, to record sales of produce and land and related debts, in any case, an initial recording of human interaction.
- Use of an alphabet to write (beginning ~3700 years ago). Enabled greater precision and variety of written communication.
- Hammurabi's code of law, generally considered the first written law. It was inscribed on stone some 3700 years ago and enabled citizens, perhaps for the first time, to have some degree of confidence that they knew what the laws were that governed them;
- Early philosophers and religious prophets scribed what they believed were the best rules for states and people to live by (~3300 to 1400 years ago).
- Papyrus was invented about 4,000 years ago in Egypt and then paper by the Arabs about 2,000 years ago, but not brought to the West until some 1,000 years ago. Gutenberg invented a wooden printing press 700 years ago. It used movable metal type. These developments permitted increasing communications, not just, as initially, solely from rulers to ruled, but also gradually between and among citizens, eventually enabling larger and larger groups of them to consider ruling themselves. As importantly, they permitted the words of wise men to be carried over the years to an ever wider audience.
- Athens in ancient Greece is assumed to be the planet's first democratic state. About 2500 years ago, its democracy lasted for 170 years. Athens provided us with, among many of our most cherished and valuable inheritances, the first record of a large group of citizens, the size of a city-state, governing themselves.
- The Prince of Peace taught peace and justice 2,000 years ago.
- 800 years ago, the Magna Carta limited the British king's power. It gave certain civil rights to the barons and some to other citizens; and it initiated the British constitution.
- About 600 years ago, Switzerland formed the beginnings of the first state federation.
- 400 years ago, the Peace of Westphalia was an unsuccessful attempt, through treaty, to end war between nation states and bring lasting peace to Europe.
- 400 years ago in 1619 in the pre-United States America, Jamestown's charter was written providing for the first representative government in "the New World." It provided important elements for the U.S. constitution.

- Over 300 years ago, John Locke wrote and thought about freedom and equality and sovereignty. His ideas along with those of the ancient Greeks, influenced and inspired the founders of the American democracy.
- 230 years ago, The Declaration of Independence of the then uniting American states declared that all individuals have the right to self-government and to pursue happiness.
- 220 years ago, the 85 Federalist Papers persuaded and guided the writing and the adoption of the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights. It structured and justified the first democracy since the republic of Athens and the first democratic federation.
- 100 years ago, following World War I, The League of Nations was a valiant, but unsuccessful attempt to end war and bring a secure and permanent peace to our planet.

Evolving out of these many ideas and developments, the search for Atlantica may best be thought to have begun as World War II was gathering its fierce storm in the mid and late 1930's, 80 years ago. It was then that Clarence K. Streit wrote *Union Now* (1939) and a few years later Emory Reeves penned *The Anatomy of Peace* (1945), two "bibles" of the world federalist movement, along with Louis Bruno Sohn and Grenville Clark's *World Peace Through World Law* (1958).

The terrible worldwide devastation of World War II (1939 - 1945) and the still greater threats to all life by the new atomic and thermonuclear weapons gave continuing and powerful stimulus to those searching for Atlantica as a means to finally end war and bring a sustained and secure peace to our planet before it was, in their real and very justified fears, completely destroyed.

From the search for Atlantica, much progress resulted both directly and indirectly. This included, among many other accomplishments: the World Bank (1944), the International Monetary Fund (1944), the United Nations (1945), the Marshall Plan (1947), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—*now the World Trade Organization* (1947), the Organization for European Economic Co-operation—*now the Organization for Economic Development* (1948), the Organization of American States (1948), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (1949), the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (1955), the European Coal and Steel Community—*now the European Union* (1957), the Organization of African Unity—*now the African Union* (1963), the International Criminal Court (2002), the Community of Democracies (2007), and the Responsibility to Protect (2009). And while not more than a dozen states were democratic in 1940, in 2008 Freedom House rated 90 states "Free" and 60 more states "Partly Free," with only 43 states still "Not Free." This

great expansion of democracy is a critical element of the peace structure, since established democracies do not make war on each other.

In the 1940's, the North Atlantic democracies sought to coalesce in order to bring peace. Today, democracies worldwide seek to coalesce to bring peace. Threats today are different but certainly as great and as real, and goals are similar. The threats are from different sources and the goal now is peace for the entire world. The moves made then which were constructive and those, which were not constructive, may be studied for suggestions on how to proceed successfully today.

"Wake up, damn it!" Mr. Biondi seems to be shouting. We have come close. But we are not there yet! The seemingly unending struggle from tyranny to self-government is not yet over. We *must* get the rest of the way! We can and we absolutely must securely end war and genocide and then eliminate weapons of mass destruction before they eliminate us.

This idea of ending war and securing peace, not very long ago, was a dream, just a pleasant fantasy. Now, in stark reality, on the very hard, hard ground and below most people's radar, it has very sneakily and very quickly once again become a very urgent and fearful necessity. Communications and problem-solving facility may well have grown as rapidly as the destructive power of weaponry. But the terror instilled in the hearts of men and women by the terrible power and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and our continuing failure to eliminate them and our consequent doubt we ever can, clouds the eyes and seduces our most profound and effective thinkers toward challenges more susceptible to the rewards of more immediately successful solutions.

But, those clouded eyes must clear. The old cry of "war no more!" must be rescued, resuscitated, intensified, amplified and shouted from every single rooftop the world over until our leaders awaken, attend to and stay with it until they have developed all of the structures needed to assure us all the secure peace that is our inalienable birthright.

Menko Rose

Former Chairman of the Board,
Ashburn Institute

Editorial Introduction

"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."

The secure peace that Menko Rose declares is our inalienable birthright is not simply a world without genocide and war. It represents the full and successful exercise of *all* of our inalienable rights—"life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." War, a product of tyranny, negates these rights, reducing individuals to sacrificial pawns of our separate, yet *unequal*, nations.

In Search of Atlantica presents a proposal inspired by our Founding Fathers to secure these rights for all humankind—without force or fraud. It is based on the notion that peace cannot be secured without freedom protected through federal union. It celebrates individual sovereignty, rather than the sovereignty of the collective, or state. It recognizes the responsibility of the individual to defend and extend the blessings of liberty. It relies on a strict adherence to the terms of a social contract embodied within a written constitution designed to check and balance the exercise of power within the union. This proposal, advanced by the late Clarence K. Streit, is known as *Union Now: A Proposal for an Atlantic Federal Union of the Free*.

In Search of Atlantica documents the history of Clarence K. Streit's attempt to establish an Atlantic Union through his own literary and editorial lens. Professing an enduring passion for journalism, Streit documented the movement he inspired with editorial consistency and dedication to the principles he held dear. The reader must therefore recognize that this publication is naturally biased toward *proponents of Atlantic Union of the Free*—without apology.

In Search of Atlantica clearly outlines Streit's proposal, the principles behind it as well as documents the Atlantic Union Movement in the United States Congress and beyond from 1949 to President John F. Kennedy's

Declaration of Interdependence speech on July 4, 1962. It documents how Atlantic Unionists inspired the Atlantic Convention of 1962—only to witness their principles to be compromised by the so-called practicality of Atlantic functionalism.

In Search of Atlantica will likely inspire more questions than it is capable of answering. It will evoke justifiable emotions ranging disbelief to anger. It will fuel preconceived notions as well as open doors to new political horizons. Readers of this publication will hopefully take away one truth—that the success of freedom and union, at any level, ultimately depends on the eternal vigilance of its sovereign members. In the end, you and I, hold the key to the secure peace.

Richard R. Biondi

Ashburn Institute

About Clarence K. Streit

In Search of Atlantica begins with a single man, Clarence K. Streit, a man who refused to wait for the world to change.

Streit became interested in international politics during his undergraduate studies at the University of Montana where he served as the editor of his school newspaper, the *Montana Kaimin*. A first glimpse of his character emerged when he refused to succumb to nationalistic pressures at the University after the United States entered World War I in April of 1917. When the Associated Students of the State University of Montana sent a telegram to President Wilson in full support of the war effort, Streit refused to blindly stand behind the President. In an editorial to the student body he wrote: "To say that we are behind the President in everything he undertakes, especially at this stage of the international system, is to undermine the very foundations of democratic government. It is an indication of mob-mindedness and is least to be expected and most to be deplored when found in our colleges." Streit established himself a thinker who placed the principles of democracy above nationalism.

In June of 1917, Streit placed his journalism studies at the University of Montana on hold, and volunteered for service with the 8th Railway Engineers in France during the First World War. He was among the first Americans to volunteer and serve the cause of democracy in Europe. An idealist with a love for adventure, Streit was a man of action who walked the words he wrote and spoke.

After a year of service he was transferred to the Intelligence Service (G.2, S.O.S.), and subsequently attached to the American Peace Commission in Paris during the negotiations at the Treaty of Versailles. According to Streit:

"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" (*Union Now*, 1939).

Streit's firsthand knowledge of the political process behind the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations proved extremely valuable on both an intellectual and professional level. After the war, Streit returned home, completed his degree in journalism and eventually worked as a reporter. It didn't take long for Streit, however, to cross the Atlantic once again, after he accepted a Rhodes scholarship. In January of 1920, Streit returned to Europe to attend Oxford, where he was undoubtedly exposed to internationalist thinkers committed to promoting the cause of international understanding and peace.

He left Oxford in 1921 after covering the Turco-Greek War, while on vacation, for the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, accepting a position to serve as their international correspondent—a position based in Rome. His journalistic talent and professionalism earned him a more prestigious position with *The New York Times*. In 1929, *The Times* sent him to Geneva, Switzerland to cover the activities of the League of Nations.

After witnessing firsthand the inability of the League of Nations to prevent the rise of totalitarianism, Streit began his personal search for Atlantica—which eventually would change his career as a foreign correspondent to an outspoken advocate of defending and extending the blessings of individual liberty as the *sine qua non* of world peace. Uniquely positioned to understand the realities of world war—and the inability of statesmen to forge a just and lasting peace—Streit decided to propose a Union of the Free capable of preventing a second world war, and inevitably a third.

Clarence K. Streit published *Union Now* in 1939 and campaigned for Atlantic Union until his death on January 21, 1986. While he failed to witness the realization of his dream, his greatest victory was his unwillingness to compromise on the fundamentals of freedom and union as inspired by our Founding Fathers in 1787. While the political world was compromising around him, he stoically pushed for Atlantic "Federal" Union now, rather than later. He should be an inspiration to all freedom-loving peoples.

One of his mottos:

The best way to be heroic is to allow those around you to become heroes.

Richard R. Biondi

Ashburn Institute

PART I—ATLANTIC UNION

PRINCIPLES

Before we explore the political history of the Atlantic Union Movement in the United States Congress and beyond, it is imperative that we understand the political principles behind the Atlantic Union idea. The words “world government” and “Atlantic Union” often conjure thoughts of sinister plots to enslave the world under a totalitarian system. Many outspoken opponents of international organization deliberately paint *all* proponents of world government in a corner with one sinister color—*Red*.

The fact is, there were, and still are, a plethora of proponents of world government who *are* politically misguided. Agents of the former Soviet Union *did* infiltrate world peace organizations in an effort to get the United States to enter World War II. During the Cold War, Moscow *did* launch a phony peace offensive as a means of dividing the Atlantic community of nations. Undeniably, the establishment of an international federation *could* pave the way to hell with the great intentions of so-called “high-minded” scholars or “high-level” politicians. The *means* of forging an Atlantic Union, therefore, are more important than the *ends*.

Of course our Founding Fathers faced the same dilemma when they were sent to Philadelphia in 1787 to strengthen the Articles of Confederation and emerged with the Constitution of the United States. In defense of the Anti-Federalists, they based their objections to the Constitution in a reasoned manner. The average opponent of world government today, however, relies on conspiracy theories, innuendos and smears. This approach weakens their faith in the principles of our Republic.

Like our Founding Fathers, Clarence K. Streit placed his trust in the sovereign and free individual, rather than the state. Nationalists and misguided patriots tend to place their trust in the collective—often at the

expense of the individual. They are under the impression that free men and women are somehow prohibited from voluntarily forging a more perfect union with other free citizens around the world. This imaginary political boundary is perpetuated by statist, not freedomist.

The purpose of this section is to explore three basic components of the Atlantic Union idea: individual sovereignty, free enterprise, and federalism. The relative success of the Atlantic Union Movement in the U.S. Congress was advanced by its focus on the notion that freedom comes first—peace follows. Proponents of Atlantic Union helped the West win the Cold War by establishing an epistemic community of Atlantic leaders committed to the preservation and advancement of the institutions of liberty.

This section is closed with Clarence K. Streit's first Atlantica pitch.

1-The Atlantic Union Proposal (1939)

Streit, Clarence K. (1961). *Freedom's Frontier—Atlantic Union Now*. Washington: Freedom & Union Press.

"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."

2-“King Nation or King Citizen? The Confusion over Sovereignty”

Clarence K. Streit, *Freedom & Union*, April, 1955—Reprinted in United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *Relating to the Calling of an Atlantic Exploratory Convention*. July 11, 1956.

Confusion has been rife ever since the American Revolution established the U.S. on a new concept—one that reversed the Old World dogma of sovereignty.

In the international field where the sovereignty issue most imperils life and liberty, there is such fog now that some who pride themselves most on being Sons or Daughters of the American Revolution are fighting today against the very principle of sovereignty that the Founding Fathers fought to establish. In the misguided belief that they are upholding the work of the Founders, they uphold instead the notion of sovereignty that George III fought for. Some veterans, and many other worthy citizens, have fallen into the same confusion. It has become, indeed, so widespread that some Senators and Representatives either suffer from this confusion themselves, or fear to help remove it.

"A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles * * * [is] absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty, and keep the government free," Pennsylvania's Declaration of the Rights of Man asserted in 1776. It is high time we did this in regard to sovereignty.

Sovereignty Before 1776

The concept of sovereignty which the American Revolution challenged ruled the world then even more than it does now. This concept held the State supreme, and reduced man to the role of subject, made him a mere cell in the body politic. Nearly everywhere the State then meant in reality one man, the Sovereign—otherwise known as the King, Emperor, Kaiser, Czar. This Sovereign was alleged to have a divine right to rule absolutely, to be a law unto himself, as regards not only all foreign national Sovereigns or Kings, but all the people of his own nation. In practice the Sovereign had to make some concessions, but in principle he accepted no diminution of his supreme or absolute power, his freedom to do as he pleased with all other men, both in domestic and foreign affairs. This concept of sovereignty was summed up

most brutally and briefly by the Bourbon Louis XIV who said, "L'état, c'est moi"—"I am the State."

There had been, of course, the English Revolution in the 17th Century which temporarily overthrew one divine right sovereign and put the Parliament in place. But "about the year 1770," as Lord Acton says in his *History of Freedom*, "things had been brought back . . . nearly to the condition which the Revolution had been designed to remedy forever. Europe seemed incapable of becoming the home of free States. It was from America that the plain ideas that men ought to mind their own business . . . burst forth like a conqueror upon the world they were destined to transform, under the title of the Rights of Man."

1776's Revolutionary Idea

Against the Old World dogma that Man is made for the Sovereign State, the American Revolution raised the principle that the State is made for Man—that sovereignty is lodged equally in every man, that the citizen is the supreme Sovereign. This new concept reduced the State from a sacred end in itself—a deity to which men should sacrifice their own lives and liberties—to the role of a mere means to serve Man. In sweeping terms, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed its revolutionary principle of sovereignty—"that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable 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 abolish it, and to institute new government . . ."

The Daughters and Sons of the American Revolution—and the far larger number of citizens who, like Lincoln, feel a spiritual rather than a blood relationship with the Founding Fathers—may be excused for the confusion that tricks them into fighting for George III's concept of sovereignty in the fond belief that they are upholding the Declaration of Independence. There is this extenuating circumstance they can plead today: The majority of the Founding Fathers themselves fell for a while into the same confusion, and some of them, such as Patrick Henry, never thought their way out of it.

How Confusion Arose

Through confusion, the Founding Fathers abolished at first only half of the George III concept of sovereignty. As regards their domestic affairs, the people of each of the 13 States made State government subordinate to them. But as regards the foreign affairs they had in common with the citizens of the other 12, they clung in each State to George III's idea. Taking the State instead of the citizen as sovereign—as we have done in the Atlantic Alliance—they formed the Articles of Confederation.

In their confused Confederation, the Americans operated simultaneously on two opposing principles: The citizens governed their common affairs within each State on the principle that the citizen was sovereign and the State was made equally for the people in it, but they governed their common affairs with other States on the principle that the State was sovereign and the people were made for the State. In other words, they sought to preserve their citizen sovereignty, as the supreme purpose of government, by a system whose supreme purpose was, instead, to preserve the State's sovereignty.

It is understandable that the Founding Fathers should have become confused over sovereignty. The concept of citizen sovereignty was then so new they had no name for it. Moreover, they had to deal not merely with States that shared this concept but also with nations that upheld the opposite idea—the dogma that the Royal Sovereign was a law unto himself.

The people of the 13 States obviously could not govern their affairs with their ally, the King of France, on the basis that the people were sovereigns in France. They had to base their relations with such nations on the Old World concept of sovereignty. The people in each of the 13 States unthinkably slid from this necessity into the notion that they must deal with the other 12 States too on the same principle which they had to apply to States whose people where not the Kings.

How Confusion Continues

The same confusing situation that befuddled the American people in the 18th Century exists for the people of each of the Atlantic democracies now. The sovereign people of the U.S., Britain, France and other States of Atlantica obviously cannot govern their relations with the Soviet Dictatorship by the theory that the citizen is the real sovereign in the Communist Empire. They must deal with Moscow on the basis of the Kremlin's concept of national

sovereignty. But the people of these Atlantic democratic States are now upholding this concept against each other, too, even in their joint efforts to preserve their citizen sovereignty from being overthrown by this Kremlin concept which makes Man the slave of the State. This confusion makes no more sense now than it did when the 13 States fell into it. It divides freedom against itself no less dangerously now.

Sovereignty in Federal Union

The Founding Fathers came to their senses before the confusion over sovereignty had led to anything like the massive dangers which it has already produced for the people of the Atlantic Community in our day. They sent delegates to the Federal Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 to explore how to reorganize the relations of the 13 States on a basis that would make the government of their common affairs serve the lives and liberties of their people, instead of the sovereignty of their States at the expense of the citizens. The result was the U.S. Federal Constitution.

By Federal Union, the American people doubly maintained the principle of the sovereignty of the citizens of each State. First, they effectively placed the united power of all the 13 States behind the right of each State to govern its domestic affairs independently. At the same time they established the sovereignty of the U.S. as a whole, so that the citizens could govern their inter-State affairs by the same principles they used for governing their domestic affairs. As an adjoining box reminds us, this simple but revolutionary change was achieved only after such clear-headed, courageous leaders as Washington, Hamilton, and Madison had tackled head—on the false Old World concept of sovereignty which had sunk like a wolf in sheep's clothing into the 13 States, much as it is fooling the people of the free Atlantic Community now.

Creating U.S. Sovereigns

When the people of the 13 States applied the principles of the Declaration of Independence to establish their Federal State, they surrendered none of their sovereignty as citizens. To set up their State governments, they had delegated certain portions of their citizen sovereignty to the representatives they elected to its government. In setting up their Federal Government, they simply transferred to the men they chose to represent them in it, certain powers which

they had previously delegated to their State Government. They merely shifted some jobs from one set of agents to another, while remaining boss of both.

When the citizens of Pennsylvania agreed to transfer power over defense from the State to Federal Government, their representatives in the State Government lost power. But the people lost none, since the citizen retained exactly the same sovereign vote in choosing those to whom he delegated his power, whether in the Federal or the State Government. Thus the Founding Fathers made the citizen of every State a U.S. sovereign, too, and sacrificed none of the revolutionary American concept of sovereignty when they established their Federal Union. But the present American generation has been sacrificing this sovereignty tragically, increasingly—by refusing to go forward with it.

Sacrificing U.S. Sovereigns

If you agree that U.S. sovereignty is not vested in the President or the Government but equally in all the citizens, then every citizen who is burdened with excessive taxation is sacrificing that much of his share of the national sovereignty. Every citizen who is drafted into the armed services is sacrificing another big portion of his share of the national sovereignty. And every citizen who is slain in war is sacrificing all the rest of his share of U.S. national sovereignty.

Look at the way we Americans are now sacrificing the citizen's sovereignty. In 1938 the bill for U.S. defense amounted to only \$16 a citizen. Now it is \$256 for every man, woman and child—16 times as much as it was before the worst war in history. In 1938 no American citizen was subject to draft. Now millions are drafted and subject to draft. In World War I, the U.S. called into the services 4,609,190 men, of whom 53,403 were killed in battle. In World War II, 15,513,657 U.S. citizens were called into armed service and 293,105 sacrificed in battle their entire share of the nation's sovereignty. All this ends up to an appalling sacrifice of U.S. sovereignty.

How much more of U.S. sovereignty will be sacrificed by the cost of the third World War, with taxation already so high, and the dollar's value already halved by war?

How much more of the citizen's sovereignty will be sacrificed in military service by World War III, with so many drafted now?

How many, many more Americans will sacrifice all their share of the national sovereignty in the Third World War toward which we are steadily moving, despite all this taxing and drafting—a war in which millions can be killed by a single H-bomb?

We Atlantic Federal Unionists are anxious to prevent more fearful, flesh-and-blood sacrifice of national sovereignty than our nation has already suffered. We want to save the real sovereigns of this republic, and of every democratic nation. We are not pacifists; we realize that some sacrifice of liberty and even of life is necessary to preserve freedom. We want to save the citizens from unnecessary sacrifice and make them stronger sovereigns. We believe this can be done by extending U.S. federal principles around the North Atlantic.

Washington Warned

To keep from sacrificing needlessly the sovereign citizens, Americans, in particular, should be ready to sacrifice the power of those who now govern them: The Founding Fathers set the example. They sacrificed the sovereignty of King George III when they set up their independent State Governments. Then they sacrificed some of the sovereign powers of those State Governments when they set up the Federal Constitution. George Washington foresaw that this second move would be opposed by those who lost power by it, just as the revolution before it angered the British Sovereign. Referring to the proposal to federate the 13 States, Washington wrote in a letter to Henry Knox dated Feb. 3, 1787:

"I believe that the political machine will yet be much tumbled and tossed, and possibly wrecked altogether, before such a system as you have defined will be adopted. The darling Sovereignties of the States individually, the Governors . . . the Legislators . . . whose political consequence will be lessened, if not annihilated, would give their weight of opposition to such a revolution."

Some of the Governors and legislators of the 13 States tried hard to make the people believe that their loss of power was a lost to the citizens. But the people were not fooled. They saw that the Federal Constitution simply transferred some powers which they themselves had given their State officers, to Federal officers whom they retain the same right to elect. They didn't mind lessening the "political consequence" of their State representative so long as they, the people, gained in the process.

The establishment of an Atlantic Federal Union, it must be said, would lessen the political importance of the President of the U.S. and of U.S. Senators and Congressmen. Certain powers they now have over the citizens would be transferred to the Executive and Senators of the Atlantic Union Government. But the citizen would remain the sovereigns who elected them all.

It is natural that Senators should not want to lose any of the power the citizens have given them. It is understandable that they should be more concerned with the government's sovereignty than with that of the citizen. Senators and Representatives are therefore indeed unselfish statesmen.

Present Pioneers

Members of Congress who favor Atlantic federation represent not only the people who elect them, but the pioneering American spirit and its concept of national sovereignty. Each is willing to sacrifice some of the present official power he has if his constituents find this will help secure their own life and liberty, prevent further sacrifice of their sovereignty as citizens, give them each more power individually.

Such Senators and Representatives would have you explore carefully whether you might not reduce your tax burden, lessen military service, and save your family and freedom from extinction by sacrificing instead some of their official power and giving it to some other representative you elect to an Atlantic Federal Union. It is evident from what George Washington wrote to Knox in 1787 that, were the Father of this Country alive today, he would warmly applaud the self-sacrificing stand—not the view of sovereignty taken so selfishly, or thoughtlessly, by other Members of Congress.

To Gain Sovereignty

You would not only sacrifice none of your sovereignty as a citizen but would gain sovereignty through an Atlantic Union. Let Americans remember this: When the sovereign citizens of your State approved the Federal Constitution, they remained not merely the sovereigns of their State but gained citizen sovereignty in another State, a much greater State—the United States—where before they had no vote, no sovereign rights.

Similarly, when you help constitute an Atlantic Federal Union, you retain your sovereign right to govern your State affairs as you please, and your national U.S. affairs as you please, without interference of anyone in England,

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think he has made the best argument that could be made for my amending. If we have only two Members from the House, one Democrat and one Republican, then it would be sometimes virtually impossible to have this body represented at a meeting of the Commission.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. If Members of Congress who are paid a salary of \$22,500 would not have time to devote to this, I wonder how somebody serving without compensation is going to find time to do it.

Mr. FLYNT. I think the gentleman has made a very interesting observation, and I agree with his remarks.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to know if other countries have parliamentary representatives on this Commission.

Mr. FLYNT. I do not know, but I will say for one that I am interested in the national interest of the United States first and foremost and above any other nation on earth.

Mr. BARRY. Do you think that your amendment would be duplicating the NATO Parliamentarian Conference where Members of this Congress and members of other Parliaments congregate? The Commission we are setting up here is a layman's group.

Mr. FLYNT. If this Commission is going to perform any good, effective purpose on behalf of the people of the nations, it is worthy of having at least one member from each party from each House of the Congress in attendance whenever this Commission is meeting.

Mr. BARRY. I am inclined to agree, but I think the ratio is a little high. You have got it very heavily weighted in favor of the legislative branch.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman justify this on any basis? If you put Members of the House and Senate on this Commission you have only duplicated the junketing which already exists.

Mr. FLYNT. I will have to say that I have not justified it yet. The resolution may pass and I want it to be in the best possible form in the best interests of the American taxpayers, if it does prevail.

Mr. GROSS. Let us lay the whole thing at rest and plant a bouquet on it and call it over.

Mr. KYL. You hit very close to a vital matter, because the matter we are debating originated in an ex officio group. Then we are told this proposed conference will be held whether we are present or not. We are either obligated

to go along with this or we give the appearance that we are not cooperating. I fear that each time we create another agency or function of this kind, we go further to getting our hands tied. We are forced to go along with the decisions made by ex officio groups.

I agree with the gentleman's thought. We have got to consider the national welfare of our own country first, then the welfare of these other nations.

Mr. HAYS. I am in sympathy with the general idea. One of the prime reasons I supported this resolution in the beginning was because I have found that in these international meetings which are planned to last a week or 10 days, they do not have the time to give the study to the propositions which may be advanced that the propositions need.

The gentleman knows there is a lot of criticism of Congress because it does not get its work completed in five or six months, but the gentleman also knows that the committees give very careful scrutiny and observation to the matters coming before them.

Can the gentleman tell me how the ideal of setting up this Commission, which was that it should meet for three or four months, if necessary, to give the proposals the kind of study, scrutiny, debate, and discussion they need, if he can tell me how Members of Congress can get away for such a length of time? That is the problem we are up against; how do you solve it?

Mr. FLYNT. The objective of having 10 Members of Congress on this Commission was to meet such a contingency.

I believe the gentleman knows from his own able experience in participating as U.S. representative on the NATO inter-parliamentary group—I think that he certainly agrees that the experience which he and other Members of this body have gained would be of incalculable value to the best interests of the United States whenever this Commission meets.

Mr. HAYS. I am inclined to agree, but I am confronted with the practical situation of how a Member of Congress could get away for the length of time that would be necessary.

Mr. FLYNT. Does not the gentleman feel that the interests of the United States would be increased and enhanced by having men of parliamentary experience representing this Nation on that commission?

Mr. HAYS. I do not think there is any question about it. But there are people available in private life who have had such experience, and it would be desirable that such people be picked. I am overwhelmed by how to solve the

problem that is involved of a Member's getting away for such a long period of time.

Mr. PILLION. I certainly congratulate the gentleman on his amendment. The important part of the amendment is: these Members of the House and Senate would have the power to refuse the recommendations which will be made eventually to this Congress.

Mr. FLYNT. I feel it is an important part of the amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. A similar proposal was given full consideration and study in the committee. The amendment was not adopted because at this late stage in the session the measure would die in conference. I am sure that the gentleman from Georgia will agree that any amendment offered at this time to the proposal in effect will kill the resolution.

Mr. HALEY. Just because the gentleman thinks it is so late in the session we cannot work this thing out, we should pass bad legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Why not go ahead and defeat it now?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I disagree with the gentleman that it is bad legislation. Since it has been announced that the session may end within a week, the gentleman will agree with me that it would be impossible to have a conference report before adjournment.

In reference to membership on this commission of Members of the Senate and the House, I call to the attention of the gentleman from Georgia the fact that we have many able former Members of Congress who could serve on this commission. It is my understanding that in the Chamber at the present time is the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Richards, who would be an excellent member and would serve with distinction on this commission.

Mr. JUDD. I want to associate myself with the views expressed by my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. Zablocki. As has been said heretofore, I prepared an amendment in committee to have two Members from the House and two from the Senate on this commission. But we are faced with a practical situation. I accepted that situation in committee, and I accept it here. The main thing is to pass this legislation. If we accept amendments here today, the whole thing is likely to fall by the board. Therefore, I hope these amendments will not be adopted, and that any other amendments that may be offered will not be adopted. I hope the House will accept the bill as passed by the Senate,

and recommended by our committee, and then we can go ahead and make some progress, I hope, in this important field.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Richards would make an ideal member of this commission. He has had experience in Congress, he has had experience as an ambassador. He is the only man I ever knew that they sent out to give away money, some \$200 million, and who brought some of that back with him. That would answer the economy end of the argument.

Mr. PASSMAN. Are we admitting that we have legislation that should be amended and could be amended, but on account of the lateness of the session we have to take it as is on account of getting a resolution through?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am not saying anything of the sort. I am pointing out that this is a meritorious piece of legislation. It received the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Perhaps it could be perfected. The question is whether a minor perfection should be adopted at the expense of the loss of the entire resolution.

Mr. PASSMAN. We cannot perfect the legislation on account of the lateness of the session, is that what the gentleman in effect said?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I said in effect, if we want to see the resolution passed, all amendments should be rejected. In my opinion any amendment would very likely kill the proposal for this session.

Mr. FLYNT. Is it not true that several members of the committee in committee sessions expressed approval of the objective of my amendment?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes; but over and above the acceptance of the amendment the sponsors and committee considered the meritorious features and passage of the proposal during this session of Congress. Certainly, we do not want to lose the resolution at the expense of an amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. What is the urgency here after we have gotten along for 150 years without commissions of this kind?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We are living in a critical era. We need the counsel and assistance and wisdom of informed citizens. It is our hope that such citizens would be appointed to this commission. I am confident that the deliberations, discussions, and recommendations of the commission proposed by this legislation would be helpful in coping with world problems. I am sure that the gentleman will agree that the situation in the world is not very harmonious.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Does the gentleman feel that is best served by expediency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Flynt), there were—ayes 33, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, when we reach the point where we say that no amendment should be considered because it might defeat the bill, then we have reached the point where we should consider letting this important and novel proposal go over until such time as we can consider it with the due deliberation it deserves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter, because it is going to set a pattern, as I will show you. In the first place, if I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly in response to my question when he was discussing the resolution, it was indicated that the Department of State was strongly in favor of it. Is that correct?

Mr. FULTON. I did not use the word "strongly." The Department's position is contained on pages one and two of the Senate hearings and on the last page.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred twenty-two members are present, a quorum.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. By letter of May 28, 1959, Mr. Macomber, Assistant Secretary in the Department, replied that:

The NATO Parliamentarians Conference is itself a new institution and the forthcoming Atlantic Congress is an even more recent initiative. In fact, the entire very remarkable development of NATO in the last few years, particularly in the field of political consultation, is a new process in a state of growth and development.

And then in *italic* is this statement: The Department therefore suggests that action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 be deferred.

Then under date of August 25, 1959, we see another letter from Mr. Macomber, and this letter says:

The Department has no objection. They continue to kick it back and forth some time. I shall not read the letter at length, but I have here the colloquy in the Senate immediately after its insertion in the record.

Senator GREEN. Are these letters favorable?

The CHAIRMAN (the Senator from Arkansas). They are not unfavorable. In brief, the Department takes the position that they have no opposition.

Senator GREEN. They are noncommittal?

The CHAIRMAN. The nearest I can state is that they say they have no opposition to the resolution.

Senator GREEN. This means it is favorable.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter speaks for itself.

It gets down to this. The State Department says that the executive wants no part of this. They say in effect, if you leave us out entirely we will not interpose opposition. In other words, the executive is not about to turn over its affairs to some 20 people from among the citizenry of the United States. I submit, why should the elected Representatives of those people, the Congress of the United States, turn its powers or responsibilities over to any such group? And why should they do it by giving the taxpayers' money to such a group to go out and hold this congress or convention or whatever you want to call it and give these 20 citizens full discretion as to whether they report at all and to whom they report, and so forth. If the executive branch is not going to turn its powers over to them and is afraid of such a situation as this, does not want anything to do with it, why should we as the elected Representatives of the people be willing to create such an agency, using the taxpayers' money, and give them the authority of Congress to go out, then come back with a report or reports if they in their sole discretion so elect and set up another lobby such as we had set up after our more recent commissions, to carry out their recommendations.

I suggest to you that the lobby is already at work. The lobby went to work between the dates of these two letters from the State Department in May and in August, to get the Department to change its position and at least interpose no objection. I suggest to you that those people are already at work, figuring out, getting recommendations of who might serve. They are very fine people, but they are not elected to represent the United States. They are not agents of the U.S. Government. And here is the great danger, as I see it. It is this: If there is one thing we need—and I agree in this respect with some critics of our foreign policy, it is to have clear-cut lines of authority and lines of

responsibility. But how are you going to maintain or obtain that when you have people that are not responsible to the Congress although they are appointed by it, and who have nothing to do with the executive, meeting in a convention and coming up with reports and recommendations?

How many of you remember the Conference on Education and how it was used and manipulated to lobby for Federal aid to education. Yes; the Hoover Commission as the first such a commission did a splendid job, but there we had a committee formed to carry out the recommendation of the Hoover Commission. Others seeing the success have seized upon this as a vehicle for getting through about every pet scheme imaginable. This becomes a taxpayer-paid lobby to lobby the Congress, and we are appropriating the taxpayers' money to pay for it. If you please we are hiring a lobby to lobby the Congress in many instances.

Look at what this joint resolution sets up. There are no guidelines as to what they shall do or anything else. They are responsible to no one. They are required to report only as they themselves see fit. The joint resolution states that the Commission is "to submit such reports as it deems appropriate."

I admire the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd]. He made a very persuasive argument about the need to discuss world situations and how they could possibly come up with some solutions. But I find that original Senate Resolution 17 expressly provided that this Commission would be "designed to achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing economic and political affairs, joint defense, and the aims of world peace and individual freedom."

In the joint resolution before us "aims of world peace and individual freedom" have been stricken from the bill. The only thing they can do, as is stated on page two of the joint resolution, is to hold conferences 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. The rest is stricken.

Then I begin to wonder who is promoting this. I find Mr. Draper, Eric Johnston, and others who have contacted me on one occasion or another. I am happy to have their opinion. I do not happen to agree with them. They are the ones who are promoting this economic and political cooperation. I think that is fine, but their idea seems to be more foreign aid at our taxpayers' expense and giving up more of our American products and jobs to foreign imports. I wonder if there are going to be some recommendations for more economic

cooperation whereby this country opens further its trade doors and other countries shut theirs to us. I wonder which one of these NATO countries it is that needs this economic help I heard mentioned. It seems to me they are all doing great. Their economies are advancing, with one exception, and I recognize that one exception. In that case they do not now have a legislature to appoint anybody to go to this convention. But look at Italy, Germany, England, and so forth. Their economies are going up, up, up. So I think we have been doing pretty well in helping them.

I am very happy to see us develop greater political cooperation and greater economic cooperation, but I should like to see it done within the framework of the Constitution of the United States of America by an executive department that is elected by the people with the regular appointive officers and with treaties confirmed by the Senate of the United States. Above all, I do not want to see the Congress of the United States give up its power by adding agencies and commissions like this, appointed with no responsibilities or guidelines, to make policy, to write reports, and propagandize at taxpayers' expense as they see fit. There are no controls on the spending of this \$300,000. So my position is simply this: that I think we would do well to let this go over until next session and give us time to give it the deliberate consideration it deserves. If it is to be considered at all, we should know more about it. I fear it embarks us on a dangerous course that might well threaten our very liberty and our constitutional government.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to recall some history for you. I am sure all of you remember the Hague Conference of 1949. That was a citizens' group from all the countries that are now the NATO nations. It met at a time of strict military emergency. One of the recommendations which came out of that and which was ultimately enacted into a working organization was what is now called NATO. This simply proposes a smaller, more workable group of people to sit down and give some thought to the problems confronting these NATO nations in a different field of activity.

I certainly do not envisage that this organization will call upon us to make any contributions to the NATO countries. I would think it would be more likely it would call upon the NATO countries to join with us and carry some of the burden of fighting this economic cold war. I have been led to believe by what I have read in the press and by what I have heard in other places that some of these countries are willing to do this if there is some kind of meeting of the minds as to how to do it.

Now the gentleman expresses great fears because this is a nongovernmental body. I am sure he is sincere. I think that is a legitimate point to be raised. I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee on the State Department and one of the things that these people tell our subcommittee in the Committee on Foreign Affairs many times is that they do not have the time to sit down and give the thought to some of these problems that they would like to because they are so busily involved in the day-to-day operation of the Department of State.

I would like to say to the gentleman in all honesty and sincerity, in answer to what I know is an honest fear, that this specifically spells out that we are not going to bind the executive to anything and we are not going to bind the Congress to anything, and that we are going to try to have these people, and I would hope that some of them would be the kind of people we had at the Atlantic Congress, like the president of the University of Pittsburgh and the president of the University of Minnesota and the president of the University of Alabama, who are three that I remember, who would give of their fine brains and of their time to think out some proposed solutions to some of these problems to lay before the Congress and to lay before the executive.

Then, if we do not like them, we do not have to take any of them. But I think the gentleman will agree that all of us are pressed for time to think about these problems. This is an effort to get the job done by some of the best people that we can talk into doing this for the good of the country and for the good of the free world. It is just as simple as that.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Does the gentleman envision this as a continuing setup?

Mr. HAYS. No; the gentleman envisions this as a one shot or, at most, a two shot operation; perhaps, a meeting and then a recess for the national delegations to get together and then a final meeting and recommendations. I certainly would not ever envision it as being a continuing body. I do not think very many people in the Atlantic Congress who proposed the resolution so envisioned it. I heard nobody express an opinion that it would be a continuing body.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Dr. Litchfield testified on page 6 of your hearings. He was the leadoff witness on this and he said:

What one such convention would do I think is limited. I think it would do a great deal to help citizens in the various parts of these countries to talk together. He further said:

I think this is another of many, many steps that are essential in gradually building a Western culture into a closer understanding.

Mr. HAYS. Of course, he has the right to speak his own opinion, but I just do not feel that a continuing organization of this kind is what we want to set up. I do not envision that as being set up by this resolution. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki] that I would not be in favor of continuing it unless it can show some overwhelming progress and some overwhelming reason to continue it for another year.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has correctly stated that this commission would have no authority to speak for any governmental body, either legislative or executive, of these United States. And, certainly, we want it that way. But, is it not also true that the Congress would not in the slightest degree be delegating or limiting any of its powers when it appoints this commission?

Mr. HAYS. Of course, it would not. It would be just like the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body when they hire universities and other organizations to make studies of certain facets of foreign policy matters.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one point—that there are many good precedents for this sort of ad hoc commission. Next January there will be a conference here in Washington called by the President to consider the problems of the aging. This is also a citizens' group, set up by the executive branch, to study all the facts and facets and factors of the problems of our elderly citizens. It will have no authority. It will make recommendations, which I hope the Congress will find useful. They will be considered by the proper committees of the Congress. If the committees approve them, they will formulate appropriate bills, report them to the Congress, and the Congress then can vote them up or down as the majority deems wise.

We had the Hoover Commission a decade ago to study the various agencies within our own Government and the relations between them. The Congress did not surrender any power when it established that Commission. The findings of the Hoover Commission were studied by the proper committees of the Congress. If the recommendations which the committees thought to be desirable were worked into legislation and brought before the Congress and the Congress worked its will.

I cannot see how anybody can find any danger in this proposal to appoint 20 distinguished, public-minded, public-spirited citizens of the United States to sit down with 80 citizens of other NATO countries to study our relations with the other countries of the NATO area in terms of our present world situation. It is not in any sense to increase the burden the United States is carrying. It is an attempt to share the burden by pooling our strengths, that is, to get help in carrying the burden. The dangers are infinitesimal compared to the benefits that may be gained. So I hope we will go ahead and pass this resolution.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this resolution and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the resolution and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my approach to this legislation is one of trust in peace. I think we are living in very serious times. I think if we are going to find a solution we must go not to the legislative halls but to the grass roots. So I welcome this suggestion that 20 Americans, not Americans in public office, Americans perhaps in the ministry, in education, in the professions in the various fields, to meet with people from other lands in the countries friendly to us, and in their talks together perhaps find a solution for our own problems.

I am not in favor of study groups. They get nowhere, only kill time. I am not in favor of expenditures of money unnecessarily, but it seems to me, just as a matter of commonsense, that while we still have hope of reaching our objective of peace we should encourage this bringing together—not dressing them up with authority—they are only getting together as people talking together. Certainly I think this is only commonsense that we should view with sympathy and pass this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bass of Tennessee, Chairman of the committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (S.J. Res, 170) 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 U.S. delegates to such convention, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 587, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. GROSS. I am unequivocally opposed to it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit Senate Joint Resolution 170 to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with the following amendment: On page 4, line 3, strike the period and insert a colon and add the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this resolution or of the funds available for expenditure for any individual included in this resolution, shall be used for publicity or propaganda, purposes designed to support or defeat legislation proposed or pending before Congress."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 103, not voting 40, as follows:

Yeas – 288

Adair; Addonizio; Albert; Allen; Anderson, Mont; Anfusio; 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.; Burlison; 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; Giamo; 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; Ray; Rees, Kans.; Reuss; Rhode, Pa.; Riehlman; Riley; Rivers, Alaska; Rivers, S.C.; Roberts; Rodino; Rogers, Colo.; Rooney; Roosevelt; Rostenkowski; Roush; Satangelo; Saund; Schenck; Schneebeili; 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; Budge; 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; Pfof; 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 – 40

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; Wainwright; Withrow.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hebert for, with Mr. Taylor of New York against.

Mr. Wainwright for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Hess against. Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Baumhart against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Withrow against.

Mrs. MAY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The Significance of the Atlantic Union Movement

Clarence K. Streit supported the Atlantic Union Resolution—

“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 any 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 highest 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 in 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 what 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.”

What is the significance of the Atlantic Union Movement?

This is a question you must answer for yourself.

Further Reading

Recommended Books by Clarence K. Streit

- ❖ *Union Now: A Proposal for an Atlantic Federal Union of the Free*
- ❖ *Union Now With Britain* (1951)
- ❖ *Freedom Against Itself* (1954)

Websites

- ❖ *Ashburn Institute*—www.ashburninstitute.org
- ❖ *The Streit Council*—www.streitcouncil.org
- ❖ *Dr. R.J. Rummel*—www.hawaii.edu/powerkills

About the Editors

- **Richard R. Biondi** is a former member of the Board of Directors for the Ashburn Institute, a Washington D.C. based research institution spawned by the Association to Unite the Democracies (AUD), formerly known as Federal Union, Inc. Biondi, who holds a B.A. in Political Science from the University of Washington, studied international organization and law at the graduate level under the tutelage of Professor Jack. E. Vincent, University of Idaho. He was elected Vice President of AUD and subsequently served as an executive consultant for the organization in Washington, D.C. from July 2001 to April 2002. His research on NATO-related issues has been published in the *Journal of Peace Research*. Rick is veteran of the United States Army, where he served in the 2nd Ranger Bn. and other infantry units, and is a former Libertarian candidate (2008) for U.S. Congress in Arizona's 6th Congressional District. He is a proud father of four wonderful children, Jasmine, Katalina, Sierra and Tanner.
- **Nejat Dogan** is a member of the Board of Directors for the Ashburn Institute. He received his Ph.D. in Foreign Affairs from the University of Virginia and his Master's degree in International Politics from The American University/Washington D.C. Dr. Dogan is a full professor of International Relations and the Head of the Department of International Relations at Anadolu University/Eskisehir-Turkey. His research interests include IR theory, international security, international law and organization, American foreign policy, and European Union.
- **Kseniya M. Khovanova-Rubicondo** has served on the Advisory Board of the Ashburn Institute and acted as its European Office Director. She holds a Ph.D. in Public Administration from the University of Chicago. During her career Dr. Khovanova occupied policy advisory, management, teaching, research and consulting positions in a number of leading international organizations, including the Council of Europe (CoE, France), the European Commission (EC, Belgium), European Investment Bank (EIB, Luxembourg), the US Agency for International Development (USAID, USA), and the Government Financial Officers' Association in Chicago (USA).



The Atlantic Union symbol represents the philosophical marriage of freedom & union.