

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 99th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

The History of the North Atlantic Assembly

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

of MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE of THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 28, 1986

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, during the last quarter of a century many Members of the Congress have participated in sessions of the North Atlantic Assembly. Some have served as officers of the Assembly and as chairmen of Assembly committees. But today few Members have any personal recollection of the days when the concept of a parliamentary group within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was first discussed and developed.

It is useful to refresh our memory in this respect. As we consider the future agenda of the North Atlantic Assembly there is value in reviewing the purpose in the minds of the founders of the Assembly and the goals that they sought. One important element in setting our course for the future is to be very familiar with the road over which we have come.

An interesting paper entitled "Evolution of an Atlantic Assembly" by John A. Matthews was recently brought to my attention by former Representative Henry P. Smith III. It is dated January 20, 1962, so we can read it today with all the wisdom of hindsight. But we can also use it as a benchmark to determine how well we have employed an important institution. I ask that this paper be printed in the RECORD.

The paper follows:

EVOLUTION OF AN ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

(By John A. Matthews)

INTRODUCTION

Interparliamentary assemblies have been made a substantial component of wholly-European political structures which have been created since World War II in the general social movement toward unity of "Western" countries. Such assemblies are now an important component of the Council of Europe, the Western European Union, and the three European communities—Coal and Steel, Atomic Energy and Economic. Only the "Atlantic" structures—the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—and the decaying European Free Trade Association—have failed to make use of an interparliamentary assembly. However, the value of such an assembly to the more extensive Atlantic structures has not gone unnoticed but has been proposed and promoted privately to a point where it may soon gain acceptance by the cooperating governments. It is the purpose of this paper to trace the evolution of this historic development.

ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROPOSAL FOR
AN ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The first widely-publicized proposal for an Atlantic Assembly was made by Senator Guy M. Gillette in a speech at Charlotte, North Carolina, on November 20, 1951. He said:

"What a great advance it would be if the legislators who

are elected by and responsible to the peoples of the North Atlantic could meet regularly in a continuing forum to cooperate on solving common Atlantic problems!

“Why should we not set up; machinery through which the legislators of the Western European and British parliaments, the parliament of Canada, and the U.S. Congress could come together to consider common problems in the framework in which those problems really fit? Why should there not be created a North Atlantic Assembly?”

This proposal, made at the very moment that a delegation from the United States Congress was conferring with a delegation of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, aroused interest in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. That meeting had been arranged by Mr. Spud and Lord Layton, President and Vice-president of the Consultative Assembly in compliance with a resolution of that Assembly several months before. They had visited the United States, presented the Resolution to the Speakers of both Houses of Congress together with a synopsis of the Assembly's structure, role, and record, and had developed an agenda for such a meeting.

The Resolution had been proposed to the Assembly by Mr. Paul Reynaud, who in a speech at a World Brotherhood dinner in Washington in March 1951 had suggested that members of the U.S. Congress belonging to both parties come to the September meeting of the Assembly of the Council of Europe to discuss the "vital interests which bind us together . . ."

Senator Gillette's proposal probably culminated from numerous favorable responses he had received from legislators and political leaders of the North Atlantic countries to a letter he had sent in February 1951 “urging them to press for a governmental union of the democracies now associated in the Atlantic Alliance.” In this letter, which had been sent with the concurrence of 26 others, he also described an informal committee being formed in the U.S. Congress to advance this cause, and suggested that similar groups be formed within the parliamentary body of each of the Atlantic-pact-sponsoring countries.

Concurrently with the Gillette proposal, Freedom & Union magazine published an article proposing a North Atlantic Assembly as an organ of NATO. Written by Mr. Livingston Hartley, a dedicated student of Atlantic unity, this article argued that duality cannot be forged by government alone; there must be a desire for unity and a feeling of unity among people or else their representatives in Congress and in parliament will balk at steps which the common welfare requires." It also proposed several ways by which such an assembly could be created.

What was the background of the proposals for an Atlantic Assembly? It is probably that an assembly was considered and rejected by the drafters of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1948, so what encouraged Senator Gillette and Mr. Hartley to make their proposal in November 1951? The most obvious encouragement was the booming success of the program of the Atlantic Union Committee which had been formed about two years before for the purpose of:

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

(b) continuing this support until such a Federal Union of Democracies becomes an accomplished fact.”

Led by Owen J. Roberts, a former Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Judge Robert Patterson, a former Secretary of War, and William L. Clayton, a former Undersecretary of State, this Committee had secured the introduction into both Houses of Congress (July 1949) of a resolution “inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a Federal Convention.”

Their personal influence and that of thousands of citizens who had joined the Committee in the two years since, had secured the publicly declared support of almost a third of the Senate and over a fourth of the House. A brochure of the Atlantic Union Committee including the text of the Resolution is attached as Appendix A. Senator Gillette had been one of the original sponsors of the Resolution and had become an enthusiastic advocate of it. Mr. Hartley had been a governor of the Atlantic Union Committee almost from its inception and had been devoting all of his time to promoting its purposes.

It is not the purpose of this study to discover the individual inspiration of the Atlantic assembly concept but the foregoing discussion would be superficial without some explanation of the origin of the Atlantic Union Committee. This Committee was an offspring of another private citizen's movement, Federal Union, Incorporated, which had been struggling for ten years to spread the concept of a federation of free people to form a nucleus for eventual world federation. Its founder, Clarence Streit, was a reporter for the New York Times. As its representative in Geneva about eight years before it, he had witnessed the decline of The League of Nations and gotten the inspiration for his “Union Now” which many widely-revered persons acclaimed as an epoch-making proposal.

Incorporated as a non-profit education membership association in 1940, its roots were local committees of little known persons in communities from Boston to Oakland, California. These had met in July 1939 and organized the Inter-Democracy Federal Unionists, which a year later

became Federal Union, Incorporated.

The need for direct political action was gradually recognized in the years immediately following World War II. The impact of the atomic explosions and the creation of the United Nations had evidently convinced many Federal Union members that they should begin to crusade for a universal federation without the intermediate phase of interdemocracy federation. Federal Union rapidly shrunk in size but its leaders retained faith in the practicality of its purpose. In 1946, it began publication of a monthly magazine, *Freedom & Union*, which has been very influential in promoting the "union of democracies" concept.

In January 1949 Justice Roberts at the suggestion of Mr. Streit, Senator Kefauver and several others, invited a group of about seventy to form the Atlantic Union Committee of which he became and remained the president until his death in May 1955.

The above "flashbacks" thus reveal that the proposal for an Atlantic Assembly stemmed from a more fundamental proposal to create a comprehensive government of democratic nations—most of which have gradually come to be thought of as the Atlantic Community.

POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

When the assembly proposal was made, the Council of Europe had been in operation more than two years. In Consultative assembly had shown considerable vitality and a profundity to overcome the habits of nationalism. Negotiations for the Coal and Steel Community had been completed and it was awaiting ratification. It would have an Assembly with power to review the performance of the executive and dismiss it if unsatisfactory. The European Defense Community had been proposed a year before. It would have an assembly with similar power.

The Gillette and Hartley proposals for an Atlantic Assembly were soon supplemented by group action in widely distant places. In the Netherlands, two groups—the Association for the International Rule of Law and the Netherlands Council of the European Movement—issued in March 1952 a joint resolution as a basis for action toward a North Atlantic federation, and established a committee to further their cooperation in this. The first paragraph of the Resolution advocated "A North Atlantic representative assembly within the framework of NATO.

Even if this assembly could not make binding decisions, as a representative body it might have a great deal of influence in molding opinion.

About a month later, sixty Canadian senators and members of Parliament were hosts to a U.S. delegation comprising Justice Roberta Senator Gillette, and Congressman Leroy Johnson. Other top officials of the

Atlantic Union Committee accompanied the Delegation.

After two full sessions of debate, the joint group unanimously adopted the following resolution: "Therefore be it resolved that, as a first step, this Conference urges the national legislatures of the sponsor nations of NATO to give consideration to the creation of a North Atlantic assembly, composed of parliamentary representatives of the people concerned, which will have as its objective the implementation of Article II of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Only two days before, on a motion of Alistair Stewart, Member of Parliament for Winnipeg North, the Canadian parliament had debated the Atlantic Union Resolution and adopted the following policy:

"That, in the opinion of this house, if an invitation is receded by the Parliament of Canada to appoint delegates to meet with delegates from the legislatures of the sponsor nations of NATO, with a view to discussing their closer cooperation within the framework of the United Nations Organization, the Government should give consideration to the acceptance of the invitation."

In the same week on a motion of John Tilney, a Conservative Member of Parliament from Liverpool, the British House of Commons declared itself in favor of using to "... every endeavor to bring about a closer partnership, economically and politically, among the North Atlantic Treaty Powers and any other nation which practices the concepts and ideals of Western civilization."

Several weeks later (May 1952), the Atlantic Union Committee held a "strategy conference" in Washington and, at the request of General Draper, the U.S. Permanent

Representative on the North Atlantic Treaty Council in Paris, cabled its views to him. The first recommendation was "a North Atlantic Assembly composed of representatives of the peoples of NATO whose objective would be to implement Article II of the treaty." The European Defense Community Treaty was signed in May and the Coal and Steel Community was ratified two months later.

In a report to President Truman the following August Mr. Draper said, "In the free world the trend toward unity and strength is now clear. If this trend can be maintained, we can see ahead the changes in world relations for which free men everywhere have waited since Soviet imperialism unmasked its evil intentions."

By then (August 1952), Atlantic Union groups had been formed in five of the seven countries which founded NATO: the United States, Canada, France, Netherlands and Great Britain.

In the U.S. election only a few months away, voters were confronted with Atlantic Union supporters on both tickets. Both nominees for vice-president—Senators Nixon and Sparkman—had co-sponsored the Atlantic Union Resolution. Senator Kefauver, its chief sponsor, had been a leading candidate for the presidential nominee on the first two

ballots of the Democratic Convention.

In September 1952, three events improved the environment for Atlantic unity. First was the 41st session of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Several hundred parliamentarians of thirty-five countries adopted a resolution recommending that each national delegation work for the adaptation of its own constitutional laws to render international collaboration more effective. Senator Kefauver, member of the U.S. Delegation, praised the progress being made toward federation in Western Europe but stressed that the most important effort for federation is the North Atlantic Treaty organization. Second was a conference of nearly a hundred influential individuals from fourteen of the NATO countries in Oxford, England. They met to consider how to promote among the people of these countries a fuller understanding of the implications of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Sponsored by the British Society for International Understanding, this meeting was addressed by Lord Ismay, the first Secretary-General of NATO, and had been inspired by his influence on the Society about six months earlier. This was the beginning of the first international movement to promote Atlantic unity. Third was the biennial meeting of the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Ottawa. Among the ninety-five delegates representing forty-seven legislatures were several from Ireland and the United States. At its previous meeting it had adopted a new object reading:

“To promote understanding and cooperation through the exchange of information and visits between its members and the members of legislatures which are not part of the British Commonwealth, but which share with it common parliamentary practice or tradition, common language and interests, or past political relations.”

While the first draft of a European constitution was being prepared by the Ad Hoc Assembly created for this purpose by the Council of the European Coal and Steel Community, Mr. Edward Herriot, President of the French National assembly, and Mr. Gaston Monerville, President of the Council of the French Republic, joined the French Atlantic Union Committee.

Writing in *Look* magazine in November 1952, Arnold Toynbee said:

“In Western countries whose constitutions are federal as well as democratic, it is an axiom that a political unity at the governmental level will remain precarious, and perhaps illusory, unless and until it has been underpinned by unity at the deeper level of popular representative institutions. If we were now to take this first step of convening delegations of national

legislatures from all the NATO countries to deal, at this level, with NATO's common affairs we might find that we had created a growing point from which a democratically governed Western community could bring itself into being step by step.”

In the meanwhile, Mr. Hartley, an originator of the Atlantic assembly proposal, continued to keep it current by timely articles in *Freedom & Union*. See “Four Trends Knitting the Atlantic Community”, Nov. 1952, and “A North Atlantic Assembly” in January and February 1953. The latter is a research report comprehensively dealing with the purpose, function and structure of such an assembly.

The Dutch Atlantic Committee now a year old, sponsored a conference at the Hague in March 1953 which achieved two important results:

“(1) it expressed and was itself the proof that the pursuit of European Union and Atlantic Union was compatible and could be undertaken simultaneously;

“(2) It resulted in the first authoritatively formulated request to be made in Europe for giving the people—not simply the governments—representation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.”

As the Council of NATO was about to meet in Paris in April 1953, one hundred and forty prominent citizens of Britain, Canada, France and the United States addressed an open letter to their countrymen and NATO representatives. It called attention to the “authority in the Treaty for further development of the North Atlantic Community” and suggested among other things:

“The creation of a North Atlantic Consultative Assembly, composed of representatives of peoples of the NATO countries, which would have as its principal objective the implementation of Article II of the North Atlantic Treaty which pledges members to bring about “conditions of stability and well being” and to “encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.”

This letter had been initiated by Governor Christian Herter of Massachusetts; Joseph C. Crew, former Ambassador to Japan; former Undersecretary of State, Will L. Clayton, Texas; and former Ambassador to Norway, Lithgow Osborne. Among its signers were numerous leaders in the field of industry, education, religion, labor, publishing, finance, science, law, civic organizations and public affairs. This proved to be the impetus for a similar but more important later enterprise. (See p. 14)

Reporting on the meeting of the NATO Council, Pierre Streit of the Paris Bureau of *Freedom & Union*, noted:

“That proposals are now reportedly being considered by the NATO international staff to create something very similar to a consultative body. The proposal is that each member Parliament appoint a special committee on NATO affairs and that these committees meet together in Paris from time to time to thrash out problems of common concern.

His report is supported by later information that the Norwegian Storting (parliament) had discussed such a proposal and its NATO representative had placed it on the agenda of the North Atlantic Council which had referred it to a working committee.

The international movement started by the British Society for International Understanding in September 1952 held a "Second Atlantic Community Conference" at Copenhagen in Sept. 1953. One hundred and twenty persons from all fourteen NATO countries studied the progress of private national organizations "working to enlighten public opinion on the Atlantic community" in several member countries, and made plans to "hasten the creation of Atlantic committees in member nations where they do not exist and set August 1954 as a deadline for drafting a constitution for a permanent International Atlantic Organization" (of all these private national organizations). It did not adopt but noted a resolution of one of its commissions which:

"Recommends to the North Atlantic Council and its Member Governments that they consider favorably the creation within the framework of NATO of a conference, advisory in nature, representative of the Parliaments of Member Nations which would meet periodically to discuss common problems concerning the development of the Atlantic Community, in particular those relating to the implementation of Article II of the treaty."

A similar resolution had been rejected the year before. A year later, this became the Atlantic Treaty Association with affiliates in most NATO countries.

Senator Kefauver placed the Atlantic Assembly in a historical frame of reference in addressing the 42nd session of the Interparliamentary Union. One of the main topics for this session held in the United States Capitol in October 1953 was "Parliaments and Foreign Affairs." His comprehensive discourse on the history and nature of various parliaments ended with an endorsement of the proposals of the Norwegian parliament and the Copenhagen Conference that NATO create "an advisory body drawn from the parliaments of the member nation."

Dennis Healy, a member of the British House of Commons, who had supported Senator Kefauver's endorsement at the Interparliamentary Union meeting, put it before the House of Commons the following December (1953) during debate on foreign affairs. *The Economist* of London reported Mr. Healy's action and published a long editorial on the ramifications of giving NATO a consultative assembly.

THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

Although Senator Gillette had mentioned an informal committee of U.S. legislators early in 1951—in connection with his letters to legislators and political leaders of North Atlantic countries urging them to do

like-wise, the first formally-constituted group of legislators for this purpose was formed in Canada in May 1954. This group included fifty members of both Houses and of all four major parties; it was led by Senator Wishart Robertson, Speaker of the Senate, including John Diefenbaker, then spokesman on External Affairs for the main opposition party in the House of Commons (now Prime Minister), and the chairman for External Affairs of both Houses. Its objectives were:

1. To develop among its members a greater knowledge of the accomplishments of NATO, and to consider in what manner, while maintaining adequate common self-defense, it may be further developed as an instrument in assisting to achieve for the peoples of the signatory countries, and incidentally for all men of good will, the greatest possible degree of freedom, economic betterment and political stability.

2. To make and maintain contact with parliamentary representatives in other NATO countries who have similar purposes, and to seek to meet periodically with all such representatives for joint public discussions of common problems and aims.

Senator Robertson then wrote to the Speakers of the legislative assemblies in all the other NATO countries inviting them to form similar associations to cooperate with Canada's.

In August 1954 ratification of the European Defense Community failed, and the proposed European Political Community was abandoned. However, the Brussels Treaty was then quickly converted into the Western European Union.

By October 1954, the "open letter" mentioned above (see page 12) had developed into what has since been known as the Declaration of Atlantic Unity. One hundred and sixty nine leaders in many fields from eight of the NATO countries had signed the Declaration and it had been released to the press of these countries on the same day as the Nine Power Accords in London. Soon thereafter, the number of signatures increased to 244 undistinguished citizens of many occupations . . . including members of nearly all the political parties of . . . nine countries." (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom and United States). All nine foreign ministers, the heads of five governments, other party leaders, and the civilian and military chiefs of NATO commented favorably on it.

At a dinner in New York in November 1954, a group including the Speakers of the Canadian Senate and the Belgian Chamber of Representatives, the Foreign Affairs Chairman of the Norwegian Storting, a former Defense Minister of France and members of four other NATO legislatures decided to promote the formation of NATO Parliamentary association in each of their legislatures and the sending of delegates to a conference of legislators from

NATO countries at Paris in July 1955.

On December 16, 1954, a distinguished delegation headed by Roy H. Thomson, leading Canadian newspaper publisher, and representing the eight countries then participating, presented the Declaration formally to the North Atlantic Council in Paris. The delegation was entertained at lunch, together with the President of the Council and the Permanent Representatives of the eight countries, by Lord Ismay. Addressing the delegation and the press, Lord Ismay said: "I will send copies to all the governments and the Council in permanent session will continue, we hope, with even added vigor to try to carry out those clauses (points 2, 3 and 4) of the Declaration.

The Declaration with a list of the signatories, the comment of government leaders, the text of the North Atlantic Treaty, a summary of the Paris Agreements which modified the Brussels Treaty, and a brief description of eleven organizations promoting Atlantic union or unity was published early in 1955 in English and French and sent to all members of the sponsors' national legislatures.

Those endeavors succeeded and a NATO Parliamentary body was created in Paris at the Palais de Chaillot July 18-22, 1955. It comprised 190 legislators from all the NATO countries, and although many were outstanding leaders with long experience in Atlantic Affairs, only six of them—all from the House—represented the United States. Several U.S. Senators had signed the Declaration but it proved impossible to send a delegation from the Senate. This first assembly of parliamentarians of NATO countries apparently considered it wise to make no pronouncements of substance but simply to provide for regular meetings arranged through the North Atlantic Council. It adopted a resolution to this effect and established a Continuing Committee to implement it.

This Committee met several times and prepared comprehensive plans for the second assembly. In U.S. Member, Congressman Wayne Hays introduced timely legislation which assured continuing and appropriate representation of the United States.

The Second NATO Parliamentary Conference met at the Palais de Chaillot from November 19-22, 1956 but, unlike the first, had a carefully prepared agenda, considered proposals prepared by experts, and adopted several important resolutions. Meeting in the midst of the Suez-Hungary crisis served as a special test of its usefulness. Of the 175 delegates from all NATO legislatures, seventeen were from the United States and included the Majority Leader of the Senate, prospective chairman of the Senate Foreign relation Committee, and Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Evidently in appreciation of his devotion to the cause,

Congressman Wayne Hays was elected president. Canadian Senator Robertson, the founder and first president, was named Honorary President. He was unable to attend but sent a long letter expressing his views concerning the auspices and functions of the assembly. Resolutions adopted concerned the Soviet use of force against Hungary, political and military consultation on development outside the NATO area, training of scientific and technical personnel, oil supply, aid to underdeveloped countries, cultural progress, future status of the Conference, and possibility of financing future conferences from NATO funds. Among those attending were: Senator Johnson (now U.S. Vice President), Hugh Haskell (leader of the Opposition in United Kingdom), Senator Michel Debré (now Premier of France) and Lord Ismay, Secretary-General of NATO.

The third meeting of the Parliamentarians at the same place in November 1957 reveals signs of a mature and durable institution. Permanent rules of procedure were adopted including a system of voting not requiring unanimity and giving voting power to countries on a basis approximating their populations. Committees were established to deal with cultural, economic and political matters—and each had for consideration proposals prepared by rapporteurs selected at the previous conference. Addresses by the Secretary General of NATO and three outstanding military leaders were each followed by a searching question and answer period.

Resolutions adopted were more significant than before and the meeting was given much better coverage by the Press. The Conference of 160 legislators from twelve NATO countries unanimously adopted resolutions:

(1) initiating two steps towards greater Atlantic unity on the citizen level: the first instructing its Standing and Political Committees to arrange a meeting of leading citizens "whose cooperation would be valuable and appropriate for the convening in 1959 . . . of an Atlantic Congress comparable to the Hague Congress of 1948" and requesting the heads of government to support this proposal at their next meeting; the second recommending that the NATO governments, in consultation with these two committees, bring about a conference composed of leading representative citizens to convene as often as necessary to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisioned by the North Atlantic Treaty, may best be developed. This resolution proposed that "the members of the Conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed but should act in accordance with their individual convictions." Findings and recommendation would be reported to the appropriate committees of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference as well as to governments and the North Atlantic Council.

(2) suggesting that a link be set up between the Standing Committee and the North Atlantic Council, that the NATO

Secretariat prepare a report each year for discussion by the Conference, and that the NATO Council delegate one of its members to be present.

(3) urging improved consultation and implementation of Article II of the Treaty.

(4) to submit to the North Atlantic Council and urge it to bring to the attention of the forthcoming heads-of-government meeting, a Conference report proposing talent development scholarships, mathematical science awards, summer institutes, cooperative project research under NATO contract, a NATO Defense Missile Training Center and an Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies.

(5) proposing a “coordinated Atlantic policy to serve as the basis for a common system of defense” as well as steps to improve defense, including close collaboration between NATO political and military leadership and how to apply the NATO infrastructure program elsewhere.

(6) requesting the Standing Committee to study during the coming year the proposals for an Atlantic Institute made by the Bruges Conference on North Atlantic Community in September and, if desirable, cooperate with groups seeking this objective.

(7) recommending that the NATO Secretary General produce a publication which would give an account of the achievements, the power and the possibilities of NATO and of the Atlantic Community.

(8) urging further assistance by NATO members to bodies dealing with refugees from Communist enslavement.

(9) recommending specific steps to bring about consideration of economic affairs of member countries, aid to under-developed areas and foreign economic and technical assistance and private investment which might be coordinated within the NATO framework.

(10) adopting an annual budget of 40,000 pounds, (\$112,000) to enable the new work envisioned in these resolutions to be undertaken.

At this the third meeting of the Parliamentarians there was considerable evidence of “a growing spirit of teamwork among the Atlantic legislators.”

SOME EFFECTS OF THE PARLIAMENTARIANS

The NATO Parliamentarians have continued to meet annually and to expand their influence but further references to these meetings will be made only as related to three actions of this Assembly which seem to have a great portent for the future.

A. *The Atlantic Congress*

The first step in the first resolution adopted by the third NATO Parliamentarians Conference came to fruition in London in June 1959. As instructed by the

Conferences its Standing and Political Committees proceeded to arrange for an Atlantic Congress comparable to the Congress of Europe held at The Hague in 1948. The latter had adopted resolutions proposing the merging of some aspects of sovereignty preparatory to the creation of an economic and political union the establishment of a European consultative assembly and a court of human rights. It was a major impetus to the establishment of the Council of Europe.

Special non-governmental national committees selected about 650 eminent citizens from their countries-former prime ministers, foreign ministers, legislators, ambassadors, generals, corporation and labor union executives, college presidents, religious leaders, editors, authors and persons from other fields of endeavor. The number from each nation was approximately proportioned to the respective populations.

These met for six days, June 5-10, in London to consider the theme: “The Atlantic Community in the Next Ten Years.” This Atlantic Congress was opened by Queen Elizabeth and addressed by Prime Minister Macmillan, Opposition Leader Hugh Gaitskell, and the Archbishop of York from Britain; Prince Bernhard, Foreign Minister Luns and Colonel J. J. Fens, President of the NATO Parliamentarians Association and of the Congress, from the Netherlands; NATO Secretary General Spaak, former Premier Van Zeeland and J. Oldenbrock, General Secretary of the World Federation of Free Trade Unions, from Belgium; J. F. Cahan, Deputy Secretary General of OEEC, from Canada; Foreign Minister Lange of Norway; and General Lauris Norstad, NATO Commander-in-Chief, Admiral Jerauld Wright, Supreme Allied Atlantic Naval Commander, Lewis Douglas, former Ambassador to Britain, Eric Johnston, former President U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, from the United States.

The Congress established five committees to consider various kinds of problems:

- A. Spiritual and Cultural.
- B. Political.
- C. Economic.
- D. Free World.
- E. Communist Bloc.

The Congress adopted many of the resolutions emanating from these Committees and also consolidated them into a declaration which is quoted below:

“DECLARATION OF THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS, 1959

“I. PRINCIPLES

“Six major principles have guided this Congress.

“A-1. The NATO military alliance has, in its first ten years, preserved the peace of Europe, although the threat of aggression is still present.

“A-2. Great changes have taken place in this decade that

make essential increased cooperation among Atlantic nations in all field.

“A-3. No military alliance can endure unless supported by close political and economic cooperation.

“A-4. The time is ripe for these nations to build an Atlantic community with responsibilities extending to military, political, economic, social and scientific fields.

“B-5. The Atlantic nations are interdependent with the other nations of the free world. All these nations want peace and the preservation of their own conception of life. All have a common interest in the development of economic activity and social improvement throughout the world; all people have a common stake and status in a free world.

“B-6. The Atlantic community has a duty to help less developed countries to help themselves.

“II. PROPOSALS

“In order to apply these principles, the Congress has passed a number of important resolutions, attention being drawn particularly to the following:

“A. Political

“1. That there should be increased consultation and cooperation among member states. Consultation should become a habit, not an occasional exercise.

“2. That there should be broader and more frequent consultation among Parliamentarians of the Atlantic countries, and that the governments should convene a special conference of leading citizens to examine exhaustively means of attaining greater unity, as recommended by the third NATO Parliamentarians’ Conference.”

“3. That national governments should not take major decisions affecting NATO unity without previous consultation.

“4. That the report of the “Three Wise Men” should be more fully implemented.

“B. Military

“1. That the forces forming the European shield should be brought my soon as possible up to the minimum strength laid down in the agreed strategic concept of NATO.

“2. That governments should give continual attention to improving the military structure of NATO, and in particular should foster increasing interdependence throughout the military field.

“C. Economic

“1. That governments should promote the maximum economic growth in production, employment and living standards and should avoid restrictive economic measures, take all feasible actions to reduce tariff

barriers and maintain monetary stability; and.

in view of the services rendered by OEEC and EEC and those one might expect from any other form of effective multilateral association, they should work especially for an increase of the benefits of closer economic integration.

“2. That consideration be given to the possibility of transforming OEEC into an OAEC in which all Atlantic countries would hold full membership.

“3. That the Atlantic countries should undertake a motive and sustained effort to help the peoples of the less developed countries to achieve a rising standard of living together with individual freedom, human dignity and democratic institutions; in this effort we must act not as outside patrons but as equal partners with them in a joint enterprise of freedom.

“D. Cultural

“1. That effective counter measures be taken by NATO countries to combat Soviet ideological warfare and that there be set up an international unofficial free nations organization for the dissemination of information to this end.

“2. That a ‘Studies Centre for the Atlantic Community’ be set up, to serve as a clearing house and intellectual focus.

“3. That there should be further integration of scientific research and in particular of pure research.

“4. That informational and educational activities should be strengthened and broadened in order to bring the significance of the Atlantic Community with its spiritual and moral content more deeply into the hearts and minds of the peoples of the world.”

The greatest significance of this Declaration is perhaps the fact that all three of its proposals for the establishment or further development of institutions have been implemented. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development which began last September fulfilled proposal C 2; the Atlantic Institute recently established in Paris fulfilled proposal D 2; and the Atlantic Convention which began in Paris several weeks ago fulfilled proposal A 2.

B. The Atlantic Institute

In September 1957-two months before the third conference of the NATO Parliamentarians, another Conference on North Atlantic Community was held at Bruges,

Belgium. The University of Pennsylvania and the College of Europe had collaborated to assemble more than a hundred scholars, journalists, and other intellectuals from nineteen countries to study the spiritual and cultural aspects of Atlantic community. Its most concrete recommendation called for the establishment of an Atlantic Institute to develop a sense of community among the Atlantic peoples and all others who share their basic ideals. It was to be

governed by a board of eminent citizens and so constituted as to be able to receive funds from foundations, individuals, institutions and governments in order to provide research and coordination of related endeavors.

Among the distinguished participants and observers were former French Premier

Robert Schuman; British Member of Parliament Walter Elliott, treasurer of the NATO Parliamentarians; Thomas K. Finletter (now U.S. Ambassador to NATO); General Pierre Billotte, former French Minister of Defense; Marcel Decombis, director of the European School of the Coal and Steel Community; Hans R. Nord, Chairman, Netherlands Atlantic Committee; James Reston, Washington correspondent for the New York Times; Jacques Rueff, Judge, Court of Justice, Coal and Steel Community; and former Belgian Premier Paul Van Zeeland. The Institute was promptly endorsed by the Parliamentarians (see page 20) and later (1959) given a greater boost by the Atlantic Congress which had been initiated by the Parliamentarians.

A nucleus for such an Institute was created by the formation of a Standing Committee of some of the distinguished scholars who had met at Bruges in 1957. This Committee met in Zurich, Switzerland in May 1958 and made plans to create the Institute.

In the autumn of 1961 the Atlantic Institute was formally established in Paris. It is a private institution of leading citizens from Western Europe, Canada and the United States, with the purpose of bringing the intellectual resources of the Atlantic community to bear on its common problems. Its Board of Governors is headed by Paul Van Zeeland, a former prime minister of Belgium and includes men such as Dr. James Conant, Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, Adlai Stevenson, Lord Gladwyn, William C. Foster, Antoine Pinay, Haakon Lie, and Lester Pearson. Last November, its Policy Committee elected Henry Cabot Lodge to be its first Director-General, and announced a budget of \$350,000 for the first year of operation.

“C. The Atlantic Convention

The second step of the Resolution mentioned in (A) above was accomplished when approximately 100 distinguished citizen-delegates from all the NATO countries met in Paris January 8, 1962 to explore how to attain greater political and economic cooperation within the Atlantic community. This was a unique gathering: its delegates were appointed by the various governments but were to act as private individuals collectively seeking a solution to a common problem.

The Convention's Preparatory Committee with members from all the NATO countries had met in London in October 1961, and had recommended rules of

procedure generally similar to those of the NATO Parliamentarians but with several important differences:

1. The members of the Atlantic Convention will be seated alphabetically by their individual names, and not in the customary national groups. The aim is to stress that they meet as individual citizens, not as government representatives, and to facilitate their knowing one another, voting across national lines and generally developing an Atlantic community spirit.

2. The voting will be by delegates as equal members of the Convention, and not by nations.

3. All decisions will be taken by a simple majority of those present and voting. This rule was adopted after it was pointed out that the Convention could take no actions binding on any government, but could only make recommendations to the NATO governments and peoples.

4. The Convention will tackle the Atlantic problem as a whole in a committee of the whole, instead of dividing into various committees—political, economic, defense, etc. The latter is the standard European practice which Americans have hitherto accepted with hardly a thought of the more fruitful “committee of the whole” approach which the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 followed.

The Atlantic Convention was not arranged directly by agencies of the NATO Parliamentarians—their Resolution was a recommendation to the various governments—but was initiated by the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO which had been established by U.S. Public Law 86-719 enacted in September 1960. A brochure of the Commission is attached as Appendix I. Such Act had evidently resulted from the persistent efforts of the Atlantic Union Committee and Federal Union for the past eleven years, and from the influence of the resolutions of the NATO Parliamentarians and the Atlantic Congress described above. Since the Convention was still in session at the completion of this paper, nothing can be reported concerning its actions.

A CURSORY APPRAISAL OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE EVOLUTION

The foregoing portion of this study is substantially factual at least it has been the intention to make it factual. Some inferences will now be drawn concerning the relations of those facts and their portent for the future.

Clarence Streit's concept of uniting all the experienced democracies of the world, conceived in the early thirties, gained considerable momentum in the United States as a result of the unifying tendencies of World War II. Similar momentum in European countries was weakened or lost as most of those countries were defeated and demoralized by the German military forces led by Hitler. The advent of atomic weapons, the creation of the United Nations, and the end of the War diffused and weakened the momentum in the United States. Many of its advocates veered to support of universal world government hopefully through modification

of the United Nations, but, if necessary, through a constitutional convention. Others simply became apathetic.

As the European (*sic*) countries began their reconstruction, the long-dormant urge for European unity resurged and was enhanced by their common plight. However, the former advocates of democratic unity continued to influence unifying tendencies.

Ideological cleavage between the Soviet Union and the "West" coupled with the resurgence of democratic leadership in Germany and Italy increased the momentum for both "brands" of Western unity—European and Atlantic. In the meanwhile the remoteness of Australia and New Zealand, the neutrality of Sweden and Switzerland, and the Brussels Treaty had changed the focus from democratic unity to Atlantic unity.

Three movements gradually formed:

(1) one for European union—through a functional approach.

(2) one for an Atlantic alliance—with gradual de-emphasis of national sovereignty.

(3) one for Atlantic union—the sooner the better.

The first and second movements have made concrete accomplishments exemplified by the three supranational communities in the first instance, and by NATO in the second. The third, naturally more difficult, is now surging—spurred by the ever-increasing challenge of the Soviet Union and encouraged by the experience gained from the other two. This experience has been both positive and negative. The success of the supranational communities has provided confidence for the larger

undertaking, and the weaknesses of NATO have added urgency for something stronger.

The desirability of Atlantic union has rarely been denied. Its faltering progress has been due to: (1) long-ingrained habits of nationalism and (2) human reluctance to fundamental change.

The three groups now seem to be merging. The European Unionists are more willing to consider Atlantic Union for two reasons: (1) the progress of European integration has assured them of adequate influence to resist possible United States domination of such a union, and (2) they have witnessed increasing willingness of United States leaders to promote it. The advocates of simple alliance are more ready for closer integration—also for two reasons: (1) they have witnessed the weaknesses of alliance to counter growing challenge of the Soviet Union and (2) they have always favored ever-closer relations but insisted the growth must be gradual. The Atlantic Unionists are more willing to compromise on their basic principle in order to gain the support of the other movements which they consider essential to progress toward the goal of complete federation.

The numerous conferences, proposals, and endorsements of Atlantic Assembly described above seem to portend its formal establishment as an organ of NATO in the near future. Whether or not this happens, the momentum of the movement for Atlantic unity is now so strong that it is quite unlikely to subside before further common institutions are created.