

Congress Authorizes Atlantic Unity Convention

Freedom & Union, September, 1960

The House of Representatives approved the Atlantic Convention resolution by a vote of 288 to 103 on August 24 after nearly three hours of debate and six moves to kill the bill. This added significance to the three to one majority in the House, whose two-year term makes it traditionally more responsive to public opinion than the six-year Senate.

The vote completed Congressional approval of Senate Joint Resolution 170 which was approved June 15 by the Senate 51 to 44, with Senators Kennedy and Johnson voting for it and Vice President Nixon announcing he would actively support it if still a Senator. The bill requires the President's signature.

BULLETIN: President Eisenhower signed S.J. Res. 170 on Sept. 7.

This measure, which in various forms has been before Congress since 1949, makes a new kind of approach to world problems in general and NATO unification in particular. It sets up a "U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO," composed of 20 representative private citizens appointed by Senate President Nixon and Speaker Rayburn to organize and take part in a convention composed of similar commissions from other NATO nations. The convention's purpose is "to explore means by which greater Atlantic cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end the democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means."

Though not stipulated in the bill, supporters explained that they expected the convention to be limited to 100 citizens, with the commissions from other countries roughly proportioned to population. The bill states that the U.S. delegates are "not in any way to speak for or to represents the U.S. Government." They are to serve without pay until the commission expires Jan. 31, 1962, but a \$300,000 appropriation is authorized for expenses, staff and the U.S. share in the convention's cost. Appropriations require a separate vote and it was thought impossible so late in the short session to get any more money appropriated. Senator Kefauver, however, got the Senate to approve his amendment to the Second Supplemental Appropriations bill, allotting the \$300,000. Because of other items, notably for Mutual Security Aid, this bill was referred to a conference committee composed of 17 Senators and Representatives—all but five of whom (one of these exceptions being Lyndon Johnson) had voted against the Atlantic Convention resolution on the Floor roll-calls. Experts deemed it a "political miracle" that this committee recommended \$150,000 for the immediate needs of the Citizens Commission on NATO, with the understanding that it could ask for the remaining \$150,000 next year. Both Houses approved this one on Aug. 31, in a session that lasted until 3:30 a.m.

Clement Zablocki (D., Wisc.) and Walter Judd, Minnesota keynoter at the recent Republican Convention, both of whom had sponsored similar resolutions for many years had the satisfaction of being the Floor managers for their respective parties who led the bill to its brilliant victory, with the telling support of another of its sponsors, Thomas E. Morgan (D., Pa.), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Another committee member, Wayne Hays (D., Ohio) backed it effectively as past President of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference which has recommended this measure since 1956. Other who spoke strongly for it included Ray Madden (D., Ind.), Barratt O'Hara (D., Ill.) Porter Hardy jr. (D. Va.) and Republicans John V. Lindsay (N.Y.), Robert R. Barry (N.Y.), Robert J. Corbett (Pa.) and James G. Fulton (Pa.).

Mr. Zablocki, in opening the debate on the resolution, held: "The fact that the approach is a novelty in the international field is no argument against it. We are living in a time when innovations are more a norm of action than ever before. Certainly in the physical sciences innovation is the order of the day."

He and Dr. Judd stressed, however, the Commission's resemblances to the Hoover Commissions which were set up to explore how to make the U.S. Government function more effectively and economically. "The novelty," Mr. Zablocki said, "is only that it extends into the international arena a pattern we have used profitably at home."

Chairman Morgan added:

"There is very real need for application of the Hoover Commission-type approach to the problems we face. Although NATO has achieved a significant posture of defense, Western Europe is presently split into two rival economic groups...If these two groups continue their divergent ways, the consequent...disunity would NATO into an unworkable anomaly."

In the House hearing it was also likened to the Federal Convention of 1787, and there, too, the success of the American example was emphasized. Although the resolution's approach resembles neither of these examples completely—a fact the debate did not bring up—it does resemble both in permitting convention participants to explore the problem as individual citizens.

The opposition was begun and ended by H.R. Gross (R., Iowa) whose concentration on the negative is so notorious to his colleagues as to lessen considerably his persuasive power. He made much of the high negative vote in the Senate. Others who spoke against the bill included John J. Flynt Jr. (D., Ga), John Dowdy (D., Tex.), James Haley (D., Fla) and Otto Passman (D., La.) and Republicans Bruce Algar (Tex.), Frank Bow (Ohio), Clarence Brown (Ohio), Clare Hoffman (Mich.), John R. Pillion (N.Y.), John Taber (N.Y.), and Keith Thomson (Wyo.).

Opponents attacked the resolution both as an unconstitutional innovation permitting citizens "with no responsibilities" to meddle in the State Department's field, and as a needless extension of the practice of resorting to advisory commissions, to which they all

objected to even in the national arena. Mr. Alger saw little analogy to the Hoover Commission, which had "guidelines and goals" this commission lacked and needed. He and Mr. Taber thought the job should be left to the State Department.

Apparently he did not realize that the State Department had conditioned its support on the bill's including the very features which he and others attacked. The Department not only favored giving this task to private citizens but insisted that Congress instead of the Executive take the responsibility and appoint the citizens. It pointed out that the resultant freedom "to explore the problem fully without being officially instructed or able to commit their governments" was "obviously in the interest of full and free exploration which it "would welcome." The bill's opponents, however, insisted that the Commission should, like the Hoover Commission, include delegates named by the Executive, and certainly should include Members of Congress in its membership.

Mr. Thomson conceded the Commission "did a splendid job," but added: "Others seeing success have seized upon this as a vehicle for getting through about every pet scheme imaginable. This becomes a taxpayer-paid lobby to lobby Congress." This basic objection to commissions anywhere was widely voiced by opposition speakers. A number feared this new commission would waste taxpayer money or "give-away" programs for foreign aid or lower trade barriers.

The attack centered on the recent Draper Commission when Mr. Gross noted that its chairman, General William Draper, "was one of the principal witnesses in favor of his resolution before the Senate." It was pointed out that he had been invited to testify there for the U.S. delegation to the Atlantic Congress, since its honorary chairman, former ambassador Lewis Douglas, and its general chairman, Eric Johnston, were absent. This connection of Mr. Johnston with the resolution sufficed to make Mr. Thomson smell "another lobbying" proposition. Mr. Passman complained that the Draper Commission had been expected to "find ways to save money" but instead had "recommended an increase of \$400,000 million in the military program," he predicted that any commission General Draper favored "will wind up by spending more money."

"Wisdom is not the monopoly of any one group in a democracy," Mr. Zablocki pointed out: "The purpose of this resolution is to tap the vast human resources of our country and other countries. I do not know who the participants will be. But I expect that they will not approach their assignment with fixed dogmas and static ideas. As we state in our report, they should have a depth of knowledge and understanding and flexibility of approach that would make it possible to develop reasonable and intelligent recommendations to achieve the objectives sought..."

"Some weeks ago I read a stimulating article in which the author made a clear and succinct distinction between the free world and the Communist world. He said that the free world has liberty but lacks unity. The Communist world, on the other hand, has unity but lacks liberty. He then observed that whichever of these two competing systems is the first to achieve both liberty and unity would win the struggle for men's minds. This resolution is

intended to strengthen the unity of the non-Communist world."

Dr. Judd followed with an eloquent speech in which he stressed: "Peace is the by-product of order. The problem is how to get a stable order. Basically there have been only two ways of establishing order: One, when it is imposed from the top, and the other, when it comes from the bottom by agreement of sovereign states or nations, as was the case with our Original Thirteen States when they formed the order known as the United States of America.

"There was Pax Britannica the last century during which the world had probably the best period of peace and development in the history of mankind...The British Government advised us in the spring of 1947 that it was not longer in a position to maintain world order...The U.S. Government to the eternal credit of President Harry S. Truman and the Department of States at that time said: We have got to take over; somebody has to maintain order...

"Now the old order passeth away and the new order is yet to be born. What is the new order to be, and how and by whom is it to be established?"

After pointing out that Communism "knows the kind of world order it wants to impose on the world and has the will to do it," and forecasting it would succeed "unless the free peoples of the world, with imagination and determination, face up to this new situation," Dr. Judd said,

"Surely the best place to begin is where there is already the greatest development—politically, socially, educationally, and economically. Most of the highly developed countries of the world lie around the North Atlantic. One the west side, the U.S. and Canada have 200 million highly developed people with stable institutions and economy....

"On the other side of the North Atlantic, in Western Europe, are some 250 million people, as experienced in self-government, and as well disciplined in orderly behavior as any people on the planet. Is it not good sense to explore ways to increase cooperation among these 2000 million on our side and 250 million other side? Surely we need to pool the strengths and experience of the 450 millions so that, instead of being divided, we may work more unitedly for a free-world order and against the type that a united enemy seeks to establish.

"The Communist strategy everywhere is to try to divide the strong and subvert the weak. Our policy has to be to try to increase the unity of the strong and to help the weak become strong so that they cannot be subverted. In simple and broad terms, this is the rationale of this resolution."

Chairman Morgan, after pointing out that his committee unanimously recommended it and that it had "impressive support," noted:

"Testifying in support of the resolution, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Percival F. Brundage, estimated that 'the overall saving, if we were to accomplish a real effective coordination to the extent of unified forces, common bases, common weapons, and a common master plan, could amount to more than \$10 billion a year.' Mr. Brundage added that 'the strength that lies in Atlantic unity has rightly been called our vast untapped reserve of power.'

"Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the passage of this resolution will make possible a very effective effort to promote improved conditions in the North Atlantic Community."

Before the debate on the bill opened, the House debated whether to approve the resolution of the Rules Committee permitting it to be brought to the Floor. Only in this preliminary discussion, which ended in approval by a roll call vote of 349 to 39, was the resolution attacked as possibly resulting in "surrender" of U.S. sovereignty or "Atlantic Union" or "Union Now."

Roll Call Emphasizes Victory

Mr. Brown brought them up by mentioning that one of the witnesses for the bill at the House hearing was Clarence K. Streit who, I believe, was a sponsor of the union now movement" and adding the hope that the resolution "will not result in our giving up any our national sovereignty under a union now arrangement of any kind." The Streit name had "a familiar ring" to Mr. Hoffman and led him to insert in the *Congressional Record*—but not in the floor debate—a long diatribe he had delivered in 1942.

Mr. Pillion then twice asked Mr. Fulton, who was contending that the resolution should be debated on the Floor, "Does this resolution contemplate...the Atlantic Union type of government," "a political union—one government of the Atlantic nations?" In answer Mr. Fulton said that the resolution originated in the NATO Parliamentarians conference and "that the goals of the Commission are not set," while Mr. Hays thought the "definite answer" was "no."

Mr. Alger next asked, "Are we suggesting here that we unite politically with other peoples, or is the course of the U.S. made stronger by protecting our sovereignty?" In reply, Dr. Judd said that the members of the Commission "will be high-grade people who will approach the problem with unprejudiced minds.

Let them report back what they think ought to be done. The Commission will give us a chance to look at our total relationship afresh." That was practically all the discussion there was of sovereignty, Atlantic Union and *Union Now*.

In the roll call on the bill itself the opposition vote, as in the Senate, was composed mainly of Southern conservatives and Midwest Republicans. Two contrasts with the Senate, however, were striking. In the Senate, Republicans voted almost two to one against the bill; in the House, they voted almost two to one for it—91 to 50 with 11 absent. In the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee approved the bill only eight to seven, with Frank

Carlson the only Republican for it. In the House the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously recommended the same bill, with 15 Democrats and five Republicans present, and in the Floor vote only of its 32 members, L.H. Fountain (D., N.C.) voted no, and he did not speak in opposition. Senate Minority Leader Dirksen voted against it; House Minority Leader John W. McCormack support the resolution even more strongly than Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson.***