

Amb. Achilles Answers Senators
Freedom & Union, May 1966

Senator Church. I certainly agree that there is plainly a need for the assertion of a new American initiative, but I am wondering what concrete steps you might have in mind to recommend in terms of toward what this initiative might lead. What specifically could you suggest?

Mr. Achilles. Mr. Chairman, I think the need is less for new institutions at this time than it is for greater will on the part of all the Nato nations to utilize what we have. Primarily, for in the present crisis we must relocate the Nato civilian and military organization, we must strengthen the military side, but even more important, I think we must demonstrate this country's will to make more use of the Nato as an instrument of political consultation.

One concrete step which could be taken institutionally is transformation of the Nato parliamentarians conference into a true Atlantic assembly, as has been recommended at various times by the Nato parliamentarians conference.

Other steps, another step, would be to set up some sort of an advisory commission in Nato of the most distinguished figures available, the elder statesmen type, to act in an advisory role, the same as the Commission of the European Community act as a legal role. . . .

Senator Church. In your statement, you have referred to the position of dominance enjoyed by the U. S. in the Atlantic world, and the problems this poses for the smaller countries of Western Europe. Some have felt that this presents a kind of disability that is a serious impediment to a strengthened and more cohesive Atlantic Community, and have argued that effective integration must come first in Europe, so that Europe can then deal on more equal terms with the U. S. in whatever ultimate kind of closer communities that might evolve. *Do you think that further progress toward integration in Europe is a necessary prerequisite to significant progress in the larger Atlantic sphere?*

Mr. Achilles. *No, sir, I think further progress towards European unity is desirable but it should in no sense be a prerequisite. I would think that development of unity in Europe in whatever field, military, atomic or political, should be carefully fitted into a framework of more effective Atlantic unity.*

I do believe that the idea of partnership has been seriously oversold on both sides of the Atlantic, primarily in Europe where it is a very fine slogan for European unity; 'We must combine and be able to speak with an equal voice as the United States.' But I can't conceive of their ever developing a United States of Europe that would be able to speak with one voice as the United States of America.

I think that what emerges in the future will be something entirely new, it won't be a United States of Europe or the United States of the Atlantic. I think it will be based on federal principles, on

certain specific authority delegated to central authorities, but it will be something entirely new, and it will be something devised to meet the needs of this nuclear age.

Senator Church. Do you think that progress towards such a goal can now be made in view of the position that has been taken by President de Gaulle of France?

Mr. Achilles. I think it can. I think President de Gaulle's actions have put the whole European and Atlantic situations in a state of turmoil. I think definite indication at this time of U. S. interest in Atlantic unity, and not just European unity, as a basic long-range goal would do a great deal at this time to turn the tide away from this spreading disunity and start constructive action again towards developing greater unity.

Senator Clark. You quote President Johnson as Vice President when he said, "For we shape an Atlantic civilization with an Atlantic destiny." I have some question as to the validity of that statement. He means, and I think you mean, a North Atlantic civilization, don't you? You wouldn't include " South Atlantic" in your terms, would you?

Mr. Achilles. No, sir, I wouldn't define it in geographic terms. The word "Atlantic" has come to mean the center of Western civilization so I would see no reason why other nations such as New Zealand and Australia, certain other nations outside of Nato would participate. I look at this Atlantic unity as the nucleus and basis for a progressively wider world union.

Senator Clark. I am disturbed over the racial overtones of this position, because it seems to me primarily behind this is a white race coalition against all the other races of the world, and possibly even a white protestant racial coalition. I wonder if you would comment on that?

Mr. Achilles. I don't see necessarily any Protestant connotations. Certainly the members of the Atlantic Community are basically white and European, although that is not something that need necessarily continue. Japan has become a full member of the oecd. While Japan does not share our common Western heritage she does share some of our ideals. I see no necessary racial limitations outside of the problem of unity.

Senator Clark. One of the witnesses whom we had hoped to appear before the Subcommittee but who can't appear here is Mr. James P. Warburg. He has sent a statement which, at the appropriate time I would like to have entered into the record. Mr. Ambassador, as I am sure you know, this is a pretty controversial subject we are discussing, and for the purpose of bringing out the clash of opinion, I would like to read to you two very brief statements from Mr. Warburg's testimony and ask you to comment on them. He says:

"I think the Nato Alliance is obsolete, irrelevant to conditions as they exist today and in fact an obstacle to the achievement of what I conceive to be the vital interests of the U. S." Would you comment on Mr. Warburg's statement?

Mr. Achilles. I know that Mr. Warburg has opposed the Atlantic Alliance ever since it was first under consideration by the Senate. I do not at all agree that it is obsolete. On the contrary, I

believe that it should be continued and strengthened, not merely in the military field but even more in the political and economic fields, because the threat has changed.

Senator Clark. The final statement from Mr. Warburg is: "An East-West *detente* in Europe is now the key to world peace." Mr. Achilles. I think the extent to which a *detente* has developed in recent years is primarily due to the strength and unity of the Atlantic world. I think for many years that did slow down Soviet subversive intentions in Europe. In Bevin's world it did restore confidence and energy in Western Europe and elsewhere, meaning the Soviet Union. I think that any breakup of Western strength and unity would encourage Moscow as well as Peking—to take a much more active attitude.

Senator Clark. Finally, Mr. Ambassador, I take it you would place little credence in the view held by some that social, economic and even political changes in the Soviet Union since Mr. Bevin made his comment—which you quote in your statement—have been such that a parallel policy with respect to most major world programs is within sight which could bring Russia and the United States, each acting from their own enlightened self-interest, closer together and therefore render unnecessary the military aspects of the Atlantic alliance?

Mr. Achilles. I think there has been a trend in that direction (but it will be) quite a while before we can accept it as a basis for policy. I also believe that an increase in Western strength and purpose would contribute to understanding with the Soviet, rather than the opposite. . . .

Senator Carlson. Are you familiar with the trade program we are trying to work out? . . . trade arrangements that would be effective, through the Kennedy Round, as an opening wedge for military and political problems? Should we take the initiative in this trade field? Have you got any thoughts other than those presented in the resolution for getting a meeting? That is the important thing, to get a meeting.

Mr. Achilles. Yes. . . . I think it is of vital importance that the Kennedy Round succeed to the maximum extent possible. I think our present difficulties in the Kennedy Round are an example of the doubtful wisdom of counting on European unity before trying to get ahead with Atlantic unity. . . .

Senator Carlson. Mr. Ambassador . . . in your statement you stress the importance of our government taking the initiative. What is our next step, what can we do?

Mr. Achilles. Senator, I believe that the most important single thing we can do would be for this government to make very clear—preferably by both the Senate or the Congress and the Executive branch—that we were really serious about augmenting Atlantic unity in all these fields, that we were ready to work with our allies and explore concrete methods of getting ahead. . . .

Senator Carlson. Mr. Ambassador, I am fully in accord. . . .

On March 4th, there appeared in *The New York Times* an article by James Reston, and I am going to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to place it in the record. I want to read the first paragraph:

"The Federal Government of the United States was formed 177 years ago this week, and though nationalism is the most powerful political force in the world today, the ideal of political federation is still very much alive."

Senator McCarthy. Mr. Achilles, what is your general judgment of the Warburg criticism?

Mr. Achilles. I think there are people who, for various reasons, have felt that Nato was obsolete, that it was too military. One point of view on that is the nationalist, to which I definitely do not subscribe. Another is that since the military threat in Europe is no longer as acute or as ominous as it was, we should place less emphasis on military unity and greater emphasis on non-military unity. I don't believe that is what Mr. Warburg is bothered about.

Senator McCarthy. Do you think that the disposition in the State Department is also to continue to emphasize nationalism as the great determinant in foreign policy?

Mr. Achilles. No, I don't think that at all. I think the State Department definitely believes—Secretary Rusk and Under Secretary Ball have made clear repeatedly—that this is increasingly an interdependent world, and our national security and prosperity is interdependent with other nations.

Senator McCarthy. They say that, but do you see the same thing reflected in their affirmative policy moves?

Mr. Achilles. Senator, I don't like to be too critical of the State Department—

Senator McCarthy. We don't mind if you are critical—

Mr. Achilles.—where I spent most of my career. But, speaking personally, I do believe that the State Department is full of first-class people dedicated and highly intelligent, but if more than three or four of them get together around meetings, as they spend most of their time doing, you come out with a fairly low denominator of agreement, especially when something radically new is involved.

/ do feel that bureaucracies are inherently timid. In a democracy they are naturally responsible to public opinion, and particularly to public opinion in the Senate and Congress. For that reason I attach so much importance to Senate initiative in this matter as showing the State Department and the White House that there is strong support on Capital Hill for movement in this direction.

Senator McCarthy. Do you think that it is important that we take the initiative, or at least be the stronger force in this effort at the present time? You don't expect that the State Department on its own initiative would provide any significant leadership ?

Mr. Achilles. I think the State Department has been hesitant, I will say, for a long time. They have never felt that the timing was quite right. I agree that the timing has always been bad but I believe the timing has gotten steadily worse in the past few years.

Senator McCarthy. When you were in the State Department, did it appear that you and others who held these same views had any difficulty in getting any widespread and deep acceptance of them by the people who were making policy in the State Department.

Mr. Achilles. *In the case of the North Atlantic Treaty it was only after the passage by the Senate of the Vandenberg resolution that the State Department really entered into negotiations on such a treaty.*

Senator McCarthy. And in the years following that there was the same kind of reluctance, was there not, other than to emphasize the military aspects of Nato, which now seem to be relatively unimportant?

Mr. Achilles. I wouldn't belittle too much the military aspect of Nato. But I do feel that there is great importance in developing greater, more effective unity primarily in the political field, as well as the economic.

Senator McCarthy. Could you give me your judgment as to why the NATO Parliamentary Conference has not worked out to anything very significant or worthwhile ?

Mr. Achilles. I think it has accomplished quite a bit. ... It has been a fairly effective force in securing better informed action in the various national Parliaments on NATO matters. The reason it has not yet succeeded in transforming itself into an Atlantic assembly is because the other European nations who are members of the oecd but not of Nato, are thoroughly reluctant to become associated with anything which bears the Nato Label.

Senator McCarthy. You feel, however, that it is not been an effective instrument. We ought to have something more than that?

Mr. Achilles. Yes, sir, I think it has great potential which can and should be developed.

Senator McCarthy. My experience was that usually the opposition parties were overrepresented [in it:] it seemed there was something they could do, while the rest of the people were running the country back home. If you go to a meeting while the labor government is in power in England, all you meet (at the Nato Parliamentary Conference) are Tories, and if you go . . . while the Tories are in power, all you meet are Labor people. . . .

Senator Case. ... I want to express my personal appreciation for your appearance here and for that of your colleagues who are associated with you and are on our witness list today. There isn't anything in the world I would rather do than get hot behind some idea that friends like you are hot for, and I am trying to get steamed up, and I haven't yet, I wish you would steam me up about this, because you can't do it this artificially. You can't—you, Elmo Roper and Sam Waugh and some others—can't get a good idea and operate on a half dozen good Senators and than have

them operate on the Senate and then have them operate on others. This has got to be a mass leap movement, and I wish you could really get passionate about this, if this is possible, because this is going to require a lot—not just a little—which is debatable.

The State Department is definitely against this, no doubt about it. Also, so is the Warburg side of the show. You have known about these things for a long time. I can't believe that the State Department is just operating under . . . , inertia; they must think there is something really wrong with this. What is your judgment?

Mr. Achilles. I don't believe that the State Department really thinks there is anything wrong with it. Certainly every President and every Secretary of State since 1947 has advocated the development of greater Atlantic unity, and some of those have advocated it in strong and even in passionate terms. Again, the State Department objected — although I haven't heard what their specific objection to these resolutions is.

Senator Case. I haven't heard anything in this one, but I know the attitude.

Mr. Achilles. It has been basically one of timing and of wanting to know exactly what such a commission would recommend before they would agree to act. Now, naturally, the final judgment on the timing . . . must be up to the President. But certainly the U. S. Senate, going on record that this was something which the President should pursue at the proper time, would I think give enormous encouragement both to our friends from Europe and to the State Department here.

Senator Case. I repeat, there isn't anything that any of us want to do more than this thing on the whole question of foreign policy. We are not interested to do anything that may make difficult to accomplish the job that people who actually have to accomplish it, in the administration of policy, its operation from day to day, want us to do. I must confess that my joining on one of these resolutions— and I supported them in the past—has been largely due to the fact that those are people whom I greatly respect, you and your associates ... I assume . . . are instinctively the kind of people who must be right about this. / *want to take hold of this, and get on fire.**

Mr. Achilles. / *believe that Atlantic Union passions are in myself, but I have been a bureaucrat too long to show them.*