

Atlantic Union

Hearings before the
Committee on Foreign Affairs
House of Representative
U.S

ATLANTIC UNION

HEARINGS BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. Con. Res. 107

(and similar pending resolutions)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION INVITING THE DEMOCRACIES
WHICH SPONSORED THE NORTH ATLANTIC
TREATY TO NAME DELEGATES TO
A FEDERAL CONVENTION

JANUARY 23, 1950

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1950

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JOHN KEE, West Virginia, *Chairman*

JAMES P. RICHARDS, South Carolina	CHARLES A. EATON, New Jersey
JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, New York	ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, Illinois
THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois	JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio
HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, California	FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin
THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania	CHESTER E. MERROW, New Hampshire
LAURIE O. BATTLE, Alabama	WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida	JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania
A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Missouri	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
THURMOND CHATHAM, North Carolina	JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Connecticut
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin	DONALD L. JACKSON, California
A. A. RIBICOFF, Connecticut	
OMAR BURLESON, Texas	

BOYD CRAWFORD, *Administrative Officer and Committee Clerk*

CHARLES B. MARSHALL, *Staff Consultant*

IRA E. BENNETT, *Staff Consultant*

SHELDON Z. KAPLAN, *Staff Consultant*

GEORGE LEE MILLIKAN, *Staff Consultant*

JUNE NICH, *Staff Assistant*

WINIFRED OSBORNE, *Staff Assistant*

DORIS LEONE, *Staff Assistant*

MABEL WOFFORD, *Staff Assistant*

MARY G. CHACE, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

	Page
Atlantic Union Committee, list of delegation of the.....	42
Clayton, Hon. Will L., former Under Secretary of State, and Vice President, Atlantic Union Committee; statement by	2
House Concurrent Resolution:	
107, text of.....	1
108, text of.....	42
Roberts, Hon. Owen J., President, Atlantic Union Committee, letter to Hon. John Kee, from.....	41
Society of Mayflower Descendants, District of Columbia, resolutions adopted by.....	43
Streit, Clarence K., author of Union Now, statement of.....	33

ATLANTIC UNION

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1950

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 11 a. m., in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, United States Capitol, Hon. John Kee (chairman) presiding.

Chairman KEE. The committee will come to order.

As members of the committee will recall, we had for 2 days during the last session of Congress, hearings upon a resolution which had been introduced or sponsored by approximately 100 Members of the Congress. Several of those Members testified in favor of a resolution to strengthen the United Nations in an effort to build it into a world federation.

There were about three resolutions differently worded before the committee at that time, and one of those resolutions was supported by Mr. Justice Roberts. I believe the Justice supported a resolution similar to House Concurrent Resolution 107 introduced by Mr. Boggs of Louisiana, providing for an Atlantic Pact.

Without objection, House Concurrent Resolution 107 will appear in the record at this point.

(House Concurrent Resolution 107 is as follows:)

[H. Con. Res. 107, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law", and "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security"; and

Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of thirteen sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the North Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

Whereas these federal union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

Whereas the United States, together with the other signatories to the treaty, has promised to bring about a better understanding of these federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

Whereas the United States and the other six democracies which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

Chairman KEE. I had a delegation of some 16 or 18 citizens of the Nation, coming from as far west as California and as far east as New York, visit me last week and they asked if the committee would not hear Mr. Clayton upon Concurrent Resolution 107, in connection with our hearings upon the resolution for the World Federation, to which request I acceded. They really wanted some other witnesses, but in view of the fact that we have spent considerable time on this matter, I granted to them the privilege of having Mr. Clayton appear. We are glad to have him with us as he has been before us on many other occasions and all of us have great respect for his views. I knew the committee would appreciate hearing him.

Mr. Clayton, we are very glad to have you here with us today. If you have a written statement you may read it or you may proceed orally, as you please.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILL L. CLAYTON, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE

Mr. CLAYTON. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee and to discuss with you briefly a subject which I am sure is very near the hearts and minds of all of us and that is the question of world peace, how to get it and how to keep it.

I have a short statement that I would like to make first and then I will be very glad to submit myself to the questions of the committee.

I am appearing here in support of House Resolution 107 to 111, concurrent resolution, which I believe is known as the Atlantic Union Resolution. I think we have to start off by recognizing that Soviet Russia has separated the world into two hostile camps, a Communist world and a free world. These two worlds it seems to me could exist side by side in complete peace, if the Communists would only conduct themselves honorably. As we all know from very bitter experience, they will not do this. The gigantic struggle known as the cold war which is now going on between these two worlds is so universal and so explosive in nature that I think we would all agree it could result in consequences too dreadful to contemplate. Indeed the outcome of this war may decide the question of man's freedom for a thousand years to come. This is not a war—at least not yet—of opposing armies, guns, bombs, and battleships but it could quickly become

that kind of war. It is now a war of opposing ideas and ideals of life and government. It is a war of paganism against Christianity.

The people of the United States, as Justice Roberts said a few days ago, could easily lose their freedom in this war without ever firing a gun in their defense.

Now Lenin and Stalin have told the world time and again what they intend to do to it, just as Hitler did, but nobody believed Hitler and few believe Stalin. Hitler failed, it is true, but as he went out he slammed the door so hard it jarred the universe, as he promised he would do.

Stalin is a much shrewder, abler man than Hitler ever was. Guided by Oriental cunning, he works with this new technique, the cold war. Boring from within. It is less risky, less costly and much more effective. If we had before us here today a map of the world, drawn to outline the progress and developments in the cold war—black for communism and white for freedom, this is what it would show: Most of continental Asia in black and the rest of it resting under a very dark shadow; most of the European Continent in black right up to and west of Berlin and much of the rest of it sustained by subsidies from the United States; the United States still in white, of course, but caught midway between Europe and Asia in a sort of huge economic vise or pincers, the pressures of which are fast becoming unbearable. Those pressures will grow and grow.

The principal weapons in this war are economic. One of Stalin's most effective weapons is the fear which he instills into the ranks of democratic governments, causing them to spend excessively for armaments, and the fear which he instills into private people, causing them to withhold the capital upon which free enterprise depends.

The economic burden of fighting the cold war is getting too heavy for the democracies. It is straining even our strong back. We should recognize that this economic burden is much less on Stalin than it is on us. It is much less on the Communists than it is on the democracies for the simple reason that theirs is a totalitarian economy and the people are really slaves who work for very little and can be made to do anything that the master commands.

We must find some less costly road to world peace and we must find it quickly. In our modern world, enormously shrunk by scientific developments, the United States could not long exist as an island of democracy and free enterprise, surrounded by a sea of socialism and communism. I think we are all agreed on that statement, that in our modern world we could not long go on as a democracy and a country of free enterprise if the rest of the world were Communist and Socialist.

Stalin is winning the cold war. The Communists are closing in on us. If we go on for another 5 years like we have the last 5 years, 1955 will probably find the Western Hemisphere surrounded by communism.

Some people say "Oh, well, the world has been threatened by 'isms' before and they usually disappear, they have always disappeared and communism will be no exception. It is a pretty tough old world and it can stand the pressures until communism does disappear." I wonder if we want to gamble on communism disappearing, because we might lose. The truth of the matter is that communism is catching on in the world. It feeds on cold, hunger, and hopelessness. There is entirely too much of that kind of food in the world today and too little of the kind that nourishes the body, the heart, and the spirit.

Communism aims to destroy religion, the home, and the dignity of man. It would set up the state as master and the people as slaves. Communism is lead by shrewd, determined men. They care little for human life, their own included. If the leaders of the free peoples of the world had the same devotion and the same drive to preserve freedom as the Communists have to destroy it, there would be no need to fear. The Communists are awakening the masses and make no mistake about it, the masses are listening. In the old days the masses suffered in silence, in isolation and in ignorance but in our modern world they are no longer silent, their isolation is gone forever, and their ignorance is fast disappearing. The masses know there is something wrong with a system that leaves them suffering for the bare necessities of life. It does little good to preach democracy to a man who has to see his wife and children go to bed cold and hungry every night. Too many hundreds of millions of people throughout the world are in that condition, today.

The United States has poured billions of dollars into various parts of the world—principally western Europe—to try to restore conditions of economic health. Economic health is the greatest bulwark against the march of communism. Without this help there is little doubt that communism would have marched to the English Channel before now.

When Viscount Montgomery was here a short time ago he made the statement that the greatest bulwark in the difficult days which lie ahead of us, the greatest bulwark against communism and against the probability of a third world war, would lie in the restoration of economic health to western Europe. I think that was not an overstatement.

Beginning with World War I up to the present time, the United States has given away to other nations, in war and in peace, right at \$100,000,000,000 and spent another \$300,000,000,000 fighting two world wars.

We cannot go on that way. A continuation along that road would lead to disaster.

Nevertheless, we must not forget at the very heart of the foreign policy of the United States is the principle that the preservation of the integrity and independence of the remaining free peoples of the world is of vital concern to the United States.

We cannot sit idly by and see friendly nations picked off one by one, and added to Russia's satellites. We read the other day that one of the arguments in favor of our development of the hydrogen bomb is the fear that Russia will develop such a bomb and use it against us. Of course, Russia will develop this bomb if she can. But we must remember that plans for mutual destruction provoke destruction. Let us try to find a way to save the world instead of destroying it. The Atlantic Union Committee believes there is such a way.

If we can win the cold war before it becomes a shooting war we will have found the road to world peace. To win the cold war, economic health must be restored to the free peoples of the world.

The Marshall plan has been extremely useful in affording a breathing spell; but it has not and cannot restore economic independence to western Europe; the loss of that independence is to be found in causes deeper than anything the Marshall plan can reach.

These causes relate largely to the pattern of small economic compartments in which Europe operates. The fetish of nationalism and sovereignty is deeply embedded in the fabric of our western civilization. It is a heritage of the many centuries when a man could travel no farther in a day than his horse would take him and when the range of his voice was a few hundred yards. This system of sovereignty did not work too badly until the beginning of the twentieth century but it was really doomed by the advent of the industrial revolution.

In our modern world an economy built on a pattern of division into many small economic compartments will not function. Economic health can be restored to western Europe by bringing into one union the free peoples of the world. We would then have one single competitive economy for all the democracies.

Every producer in the union would have a free market of 350 to 400 million consumers, but we now have a free market in our 48 States of 150,000,000 consumers, on which fact more than on any other single fact, perhaps, rests the great progress, the outstanding progress, which the United States has made economically and in other ways.

If our forefathers in writing the Constitution in 1787 had decided the question as to whether there should be tariffs and impediments to trade between the Thirteen Colonies, if they had decided that question in a different way from the way in which they did decide it, and we had continued on that road, imagine what kind of country we would have today.

Competition within this vast, rich, free market area would create within a few years the most efficient system of production and distribution that the world has ever known; the standard of living would rise; free enterprise would be strengthened; communism would disappear. Some people say, "What do you have in mind joining up the free United States with Socialist England?" The answer is: "Certainly because if that were done, socialism in England would quickly disappear." If you open up any Socialist country freely to the competition of the outside world, socialism cannot and will not prevail. In the union that we are talking about, of the United States and the other free countries of the world, joined in one union with one single competitive economy, it would be impossible for socialism in the sense that it involves the socialization of the principal means of production and distribution of goods, it would be impossible for socialism to continue.

The union that we are talking about would possess such an overwhelming weight of the world's economic, industrial, military and spiritual power, that no nation on earth would dare attack. If this union had been organized prior to August 1914, there would have been no World War I or World War II. I do not think anybody can deny that statement. If organized now, there will be no world war III. We may have a difference of opinion about that but I don't think we can have any about the fact that if the union had been in existence in 1914 there would never have been World War I or World War II.

Such a union would be so prosperous that the pull on the Russian satellite countries lying in between the east and the west in Europe would be so much greater from the west than from the east that these satellites would in time gravitate to the west, and Russia would

be compelled to return to her prewar boundaries. Then and only then will there be peace in the world.

The Communist world is unified, covering an area now of 15,000,000 square miles with 750,000,000 people. Why should the free peoples of the world erect all kinds of walls and barriers between them to break down and divide their strength? And if those walls and barriers now exist, why should they not be torn down, to put the free peoples of the world in a position where they can stand up against a unified Communist world?

We cannot win the fight against communism in the way in which the democracies are carrying it on today. We must unify the democracies of the world with one foreign policy, one defense policy, one currency and no customhouses between its members, in order to give the free world the strength and mobility to resist the onslaughts of the Communist world.

Atlantic Union would break down the small economic compartments in which western Europe now operates and which keep her tools of production inefficient, unable to compete in the markets of the world. It would solve the dollar problem. It would dispel the fear of war and greatly reduce the present unbearable military burden of the democracies. It would release and vitalize the labor, the genius, and the capital of men everywhere. It would restore and strengthen free enterprise. It would give a great new hope to the world that at last we are on the road to permanent world peace.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that any expression of views by me regarding any of the detailed structure of the constitution of the union that we are talking about are entirely my own personal views and are not to be interpreted as the views of the Atlantic Union Committee for the simple reason that the Atlantic Union Committee has not yet formulated its views on matters of that kind. However, I cannot conceive of a union such as we are talking about being formed and being effective unless it is organized along the general principles that I have here enumerated. However, I want to make it clear that what the Atlantic Union Committee is seeking to do at the present time is to get this resolution adopted by Congress, the purpose of which as you know, is to call an international convention of representatives of the sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty, to meet with representatives of any other governments that they might invite to sit in with them for the purpose of exploring how far they can go within the framework of the United Nations, to form a federal union of their peoples.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if any member wishes to ask me any question I will do my best to answer it.

Chairman KEE. I have one question I would like to ask you before turning the meeting over under the 5-minute rule to the membership: As the world is situated and as conditions exist in the world today, what nations would be invited to sit in on this convention?

Mr. CLAYTON. The nations, it is contemplated, would be invited in accordance with the resolution, are the sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty which are the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. They are the original sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty. We thought it well to start with those nations.

The resolution provides, however, that those nations may invite other nations to send representatives, so that it would be largely up to these seven nations as to what other nations would be invited to send representatives to this convention.

Chairman KEE. Have you personally envisioned just what other nations would be invited?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, Mr. Chairman, I have not. I would think that all other democratic nations, those nations which have shown an ability to govern themselves by democratic principles, would be invited to send representatives.

Chairman KEE. Would that be regardless of the geographical location?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir. I do not think in these days that geography makes very much difference in that sense because we move about and convey our thoughts from one part of the world to another so quickly that in the physical sense, it is one world.

Chairman KEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Clayton, for your statement.

Mr. Gordon.—

Mr. GORDON. I am very glad to see you again, Mr. Clayton.

Mr. CLAYTON. Thank you.

Mr. GORDON. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KEE. Mr. Chipperfield—

Mr. CHIPPERFIELD. No questions at this time.

Chairman KEE. Mr. Richards—

Mr. RICHARDS. I am very glad to see you, Mr. Clayton.

Would there not be danger of getting away from the regional organization idea under United Nations by doing that? Would that not result in deterioration of the United Nations Organization itself?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think so, Mr. Richards. What we contemplate here is something entirely within the framework of the United Nations. We do not contemplate anything antagonistic to the United Nations. I am a great believer in the United Nations. I think it has done some splendid things and all of us want to see it continue. However, the United Nations can do very little in this cold war. It is the cold war we are talking about. It is the cold war that Russia is winning and she is closing in on us by the technique of the cold war. The United Nations can do very little about it. It is boring from within. It is internal, it is not an external attack or threat of attack. There is very little the United Nations can do about it. At any rate they have done very little about it up until now.

Mr. RICHARDS. Do you think this approach would be better than strengthening United Nations by amendment of the Charter so as to be able to better handle the other side in this cold war?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Richards, it is very difficult for me to see in what way the United Nations or any similar organization could effectively deal with the problems of the cold war. Russia just simply says, for example about France, "We have nothing to do with that. What you see going on inside of France is something stirred up by Frenchmen. They have an idea of the way things should run. They are French people and are not Russians. That is an internal matter and we have nothing to do with that."

I do not see that there is very much that a world organization can do in the matter of the cold war. The only way we will ever win the

cold war is to take some action which will restore economic health to the nations that are threatened in the cold war.

Mr. RICHARDS. There is a lot in what you say. The United Nations is not getting anywhere as it is. The idea is wonderful and we still have hope. As the thing is operating now, I agree 100 percent with you that we cannot continue to finance the whole world the way we have been doing. We simply cannot do it. Now as to your proposal, I see no chance of it succeeding unless the United States is willing to underwrite the economies of these countries. Unless we underwrite the economies of Great Britain and these other countries participating in the Atlantic Pact, I do not think there is a chance in the world of them coming in there on any such basis as you propose.

Mr. CLAYTON. I think the idea of bringing them all into one democratic union will be as much of an underwriting of the economy as will be necessary.

If you had the western European democracies in a union with the United States and Canada under one flag, you would find that capital would come out of hiding. Certainly a great deal of the private capital of Europe is in hiding. Private people will not go forward with their plans of reconstruction and modernization and that sort of thing because they are afraid. It puts a disproportionate part of the burden on governments. Governments cannot do the job.

If we had one union under one flag, as I say it would be so strong—it would have over 80 percent of the industrial capacity of the world and 90 percent of the navy of the world—it would be so powerful that I think people would not fear any longer. Not only the people within the union but people elsewhere who were not in the union. I think they would have a feeling that “really, now, we have started on the road to world peace and we can go ahead and use our money, ideas, and plans and start to build, reconstruct and modernize and so on.” You would have instead of a small country like Belgium or Holland of 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 people you would have an economy of 350,000,000 to 400,000,000 people. Every producer in it would have a potential market of 350,000,000 to 400,000,000 people. You would have with a highly competitive economy of that size, within a short time efficiency and a reduction in the cost of manufacture and distribution of goods and the countries that have become so highly industrialized like some of the countries of western Europe would again have a market for their goods and be able to pay for the food and raw materials that they had to import.

Chairman KEE. Mr. Vorys—

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Clayton, I am gratified that you are giving your thought to this vast and important problem. In your statement you mentioned the out-worn nationalism in the area to which the Atlantic Union has been giving primary attention. I agree. We have tried in this committee to do something about it, when we attempted to seek “unification of Europe” in the ECA law extension, a greater break-down of nationalistic barriers between the countries which you have mentioned by name. Our efforts have been disappointing to us.

On the other side of the world there are about 1,000,000,000 people where we are told nationalism is aflame and that it should be the policy of our Government to encourage this nationalism. Do you

think we could proceed very ably to take leadership in breaking down nationalism in Europe and building it up in Asia?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Vorys, I do not understand that we are building it up or proposing to build it up in Asia in the sense that we would have each unit there erect barriers against trade with the other. I believe that the idea is more to build up that nationalism in the sense that they would be encouraged to resist encroachments—frankly by the Russians—that we would try to instill in them a love of their own nation and a determination to remain independent of the encroachments of any other nation. I think that is what we have in mind. That is what I would have in mind. And at the same time, to try to get them to break down these economic barriers that exist between them and their neighbors and other parts of the world, get them to break those down as much as possible, with the idea that that would give them the higher standard of living which they so much need.

Mr. Vorys. I realize that in attempting to go over this rapidly, we choose words like "nationalism," "democracy," "socialism," and "communism." They are big words and it is hard to be precise.

However, you said two things in your statement that interested me as to the dilemma we are facing. You said that in the modern world the United States could not long exist as an island of democracy and free enterprise, surrounded by a sea of socialism and communism. You also said that if you open up socialism to competition with the free world, socialism could not long endure.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right.

Mr. Vorys. You express a paradox there, that the United States, as one of the few remaining apostles of free enterprise cannot exist in a socialistic world. However, could it also be true that the socialistic world could not exist in competition with us?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Vorys, I think both statements are true. To begin with what I have envisioned in the first statement is that, if all Europe goes communist, if all Asia goes communist, you look on the world map and we lie between Europe and Asia, about midway, the Western Hemisphere will be surrounded by socialism and communism. We could continue to exist of course but we would in those circumstances be compelled to make such radical readjustments in our whole economy that it would take a dictator to do it. We could not do it by the free democratic process. That I think is true.

Now, the other statement which I made, that socialism could not stand up against competition, we have a relatively small segment of the democratic community which is Socialist today. It is a relatively small segment. That is a great difference. If we had a relatively small segment of it free and all the rest Socialist, then you would have great difficulty in bringing the Socialist part into conformity with the free enterprise again. But today we have a relatively small part of these 350,000,000 to 450,000,000 people that we are talking about who are really Socialists or practicing socialism to any considerable degree. If you put them all together and you have 20 percent who are practicing socialism to some considerable degree, the competition of the other 80 percent—indeed, the competition of 50-50—if you have 50 percent of the economy free, and put it together with the other 50 percent that is Socialist, the Socialist part cannot stand up. It cannot stand the competition.

Chairman KEE. Have you any questions, Mrs. Douglas?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. No questions.

Chairman KEE. Mrs. Bolton—

Mrs. BOLTON. It is nice to see you again, Mr. Clayton.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is nice to see you, Mrs. Bolton.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have a number of questions which we cannot cover of course in 5 minutes.

Do you take into consideration the efforts that are being made for an increase of unity in the European states at the moment? Of course Mr. Hoffman and the ECA people are presenting that rather heavily. As I recall, Mr. Spaak has spoken of the central European bank they are trying to form, and the Strasbourg Conference last summer is something that cannot be taken lightly. Do you feel that what they are attempting is not going to take place, or do you feel it will not injure them in their efforts to have anything like the Atlantic Union which you suggest intruded into their efforts at this time?

Mr. CLAYTON. If the United States takes the leadership, it should be good for the United States as well as Europe.

Mrs. BOLTON. You took the nations that sponsored the Atlantic Pact only.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does that really include all the nations—there were 12 nations that met at Strasbourg. Do you think they will like it?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think they would like it if the United States says to them, "You ought to do so and so," but if the United States says, "We are willing to do so and so, and we think you ought to join us," I do not think they would object to that. I think it would have an electrical effect on those countries. I believe the people would rise up and force their politicians to act. That is No. 1. No. 2, even if you had complete union of western Europe such as Mr. Hoffman hopes for, and I hope for—it is certainly the right thing to do, but it is not enough to accomplish the purpose that we have in mind.

Mrs. BOLTON. Of course that is not what the Strasbourg group are working for. They are working for a far more complete union.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; they are working for political as well as economic union, and I think they are right.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wanted that clear in the discussion.

Mr. CLAYTON. Every step we can take in this thing is useful but I think we have to recognize they are only steps to an ultimate end, and if we are not careful we may be led to espouse a certain course as being complete and sufficient when it is not. The economy of western European nations is very similar. The economy of none of those countries is complementary. It is all similar. They need, from an economic point of view, a union with the United States and Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, for example large producers of surplus food and raw materials. In other words a complementary economy with the European economy. Now we have been speaking in terms of economy. There are many, many good reasons to support the political union of these units.

Take for example our present situation where England has gone off in one direction and we have gone off in another—at any rate we are standing at the post in the recognition of Communist China.

In a union you would fight that out on the inside but to the rest of the world you would have one policy.

We cannot stand up to the Communist world with that sort of situation. The Communist world is having difficulty with Yugoslavia. They are going to have to work that out in some way or else say "Yugoslavia is no part of us; they can go their way."

You have to have unity I think in our modern world in these great opposing alignments such as we are in today between communism and the free world.

Mrs. BOLTON. Your sense of it is then that the military end of the Atlantic Treaty needs this, and that only with military strength there can be any opposition. That the group must be together, your military treaty, your Atlantic Pact, and your Atlantic States that you suggest here. Are you discounting military things?

Mr. CLAYTON. The North Atlantic Treaty is a military union but it does not go far enough.

Mrs. BOLTON. You want this added.

Mr. CLAYTON. I want this to take the place of it. All history proves that military unions are generally short-lived, they do not prevent wars, they sometimes provoke wars—indeed, they have often provoked wars. You can never completely rely upon them.

Mrs. BOLTON. So this must be a joint matter.

You refer to the Atlantic Pact. What about the countries on the Pacific side of South America?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mrs. Bolton, as I visualize it, the door would be wide open here for the inclusion of any country which proved itself eligible, and to be eligible it would have to be a free country, a country with free elections, a country that observed all the civil liberties that our country observes.

Mrs. BOLTON. You do not contemplate it as a New Hemisphere?

Mr. CLAYTON. Oh, no.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. It is now a quarter after 12. Many of us are due on the floor promptly at 12. Could we inquire, Mr. Clayton, whether you will be available this afternoon and whether the Chair would be disposed to recall him. I for one would not like to lose my opportunity to question him.

Chairman KEE. I do not think we have anything else on hand this afternoon.

Mr. Clayton, would you be available?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir; I would be glad to come back.

Mr. JAVITS. Could we make it 2:30?

Chairman KEE. Do you think we will be through on the floor by 2:30?

Mr. JAVITS. Let us pray.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Richards seems to think not.

Mr. VORYS. Even though a full committee could not be available all afternoon, I wonder if we could arrange to have the committee in session anyhow. Those who could do it could confer with Mr. Clayton and all of us would later have the hearings available, just as we did with a rather small representation of the committee last fall when we went into this matter.

Mr. RICHARDS. I consider Mr. Clayton's testimony very informative and very valuable and it is regrettable if some of us cannot be here this afternoon while he is testifying further.

Chairman KEE. Suppose we have it understood, then, tentatively, at least, that when we recess we recess until 2:30 p. m., or 3 p. m. That will depend upon whether or not we are free. When we recess we will recess until 2:30.

Mr. Mansfield—

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is always nice to have you before this committee and get your comments on the pertinent questions of the day, Mr. Clayton.

I am delighted that you are associated with my old friend, Clarence Streit, in this proposal, but I am wondering, following up what Mrs. Bolton has already said, if it would not be a good idea to keep in mind the age-old relations which we have had with the Latin-American countries. What will they think if we go over and form not an Atlantic Union in reality, but a North Atlantic Union and they are left out in the cold, having to request admittance and having to be certified as eligible? What would be your reaction to that?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Mansfield, I think if we make it very clear at the beginning that any nation may enter under certain conditions—they must subscribe to the constitution, of course, and must be able to show that they are being governed in accordance with democratic principles, and under those circumstances I do not believe the South American countries would take great exception to it. I think they would feel a great relief that we had really done something here which should avoid a third world war and that we were really getting ourselves into position where we could do that and where we could help in having the world go forward to better and greater things without being under the fear of war all the time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What I had in mind, Mr. Clayton, was that insofar as the South Atlantic would be concerned, taking in the African Continent, practically all that area would be eligible to join, with the exception of Liberia; whereas on the west side of the Atlantic it would place the Latin-American states in a difficult position but you have explained that part of it to my satisfaction.

I would assume, therefore, that on the basis of your recommendations you would look upon the formation of a North Atlantic Union as a nucleus for an eventual world federation.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, Mr. Mansfield; I think in time we will have one world government. I think it is a long, long time in the future, but I think this would be one more step in that direction.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In your talk about socialism and free enterprise you made the statement I believe, or gave the implication at least, that, if such a union as you contemplate is formed, it will mean that socialism will become less of a factor and free enterprise more of a factor, due to the fact that there will be a common currency system; due to the fact that trade barriers will be erased and I imagine due also to the fact that these countries who are practicing socialism at the present time, due to force of circumstances, will be able to have markets in which they can expand and in which their own private enterprise may develop; is that correct?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is correct, with the further thought that, in the kind of union we propose here, every part of it and every element in it would be exposed to the competition that would be generated in an area with 350,000,000 to 400,000,000 of the most progressive people

in the world, and socialism once fully exposed to the competition of free enterprise cannot stand up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you; Mr. Clayton. That is all.

Chairman KEE. Dr. Judd—

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, may I yield to Mr. Javits as he must leave.

Mr. JAVITS. Thank you very much.

First, let me join my colleagues in saying that we are very glad to see you and hear you testify on such an important matter.

Mr. CLAYTON. Thank you.

Mr. JAVITS. It strikes me that if we did what you are advocating we do today, at a time of serious economic imbalance such as now, people may flock to the richer countries on a mass basis and the imbalance only be made worse thereby. That is a very practical question.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is. I do not think what you suggest would happen, Mr. Javits, for several reasons. As you know, the immigration quotas are very small. There are some which have not been filled. However, if we had such a union and if the constitution of the union did provide that there should be free movement of persons and property within the union, I think that the whole union would within a very short time become prosperous, there would be work for everybody, and in those circumstances I do not think you would find that people would want to leave their homes. People leave their homes in a country and go to another country generally for one of two reasons. One is they have been oppressed in their religion, politics, or something else, they have had to put up with oppression, and another is for economic reasons. I think in this case you would have neither reason causing them to move.

Mr. JAVITS. Your point is ultimately it would resolve itself, or you think fairly soon?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; I would think quickly, within a few years.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that in considering Nehru's position in India, if we did what you suggest we could absolutely lose Asia, because Nehru says the minute the world chooses up sides, just count him out. He seems to have enormous backing by especially the new governments in Asia for that policy.

Now if we say we are going to compartmentalize and choose up sides, are we not saying in practical effect "We will forget Asia; we will work with this group of Atlantic countries and no others"?

Mr. CLAYTON. With all respect to Mr. Nehru, I think his statement is very faulty. It is not a question of choosing up sides. Sides have already been chosen. This battle is here. We have already chosen sides. The only trouble is that one side is organized and unified and the other side is not. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that as long as we keep the United Nations open and make that our prime agency for international cooperation and Russia is in it and continues to be in it we have not chosen up sides in that sense; whereas if we keep the United Nations alive only as a paper organization as we would be doing under your plan and we go into this union—industrially, physically, spiritually and militarily, as you say—then the die is cast.

Mr. CLAYTON. We are not excluding anybody, Mr. Javits. We have two worlds today. There is a neutral world in between, but

the opposing sides here have certainly chosen sides. I mean there is no question where we stand, there is no question where the other democracies stand today and where they want to stand as long as they can. There is no question where Russia and her satellites stand but we have not excluded anybody. Anybody who can qualify and who wants to join our side, I take it we are perfectly willing and delighted to have them do it.

Mr. JAVITS. I am talking about what happens in Atlantic Union.

You say we would save a good deal on armament if we went into this aggregation of power. Then I notice you couple that with a statement:

The union would possess such an overwhelming weight of the world's economic, industrial, spiritual, and military power, that no nation of the world would dare attack.

I would assume therefore we would be arming the whole union.

Mr. CLAYTON. No; the union would arm itself. It is already armed, but the point is if you put these 12, 13, 14, or 15 units together as one, with a central direction of military preparation, and that sort of thing, as I am sure you would agree, under those circumstances, you could greatly reduce the cost and make much more effective the military preparation that would be necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly one unit would be armed as against another unit, instead of there being a superbody.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; but the world federation idea fails to take into account that we may lose this war without firing a gun.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask you a question on that?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. You are a very able man yourself and I have the highest regard for everything you have done, especially in the field of economic integration, like ITO. Does it not seem to you that from the point of view of an ideological definition of what we stand for, we have a much more powerful effect in the world, we give the neutral people, who count, the much better case, when we say "We want everybody in; we are not trying to work out an exclusive group for us which will be armed against somebody; we want everybody in"? Is that not a much better propaganda technique than the Atlantic Union proposition which says "We are going to be armed against somebody"?

Mr. CLAYTON. We are armed today, Mr. Javits.

Mr. JAVITS. You say your group is to be better than another?

Mr. CLAYTON. We are going to continue to be armed against somebody. United Nations or no United Nations, because the United Nations is not armed and I do not believe it is possible, today, to reconstitute the United Nations in such a way that all the nations can make each of the nations be good. But even if they could, they could not reach the cold war. The cold war is outside the scope of the United Nations and in my opinion there is nothing the United Nations can do to deal with the cold war. As I said a moment ago, and I think it is true, we could lose our freedom in this country and in every democratic country without firing a single gun.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about that, that we could lose our freedom without firing a single gun. What we are discussing is the most effective way to preserve our freedom and get the major proportion of the people of the world behind protecting it. That is the question between us as I see it.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think there is any formula by which you could reconstitute the United Nations so it could do that.

Mr. JAVITS. Thank you very much, Mr. Clayton. Thank you very much, Dr. Judd.

Chairman KEE. I presume the best policy at this point would be to recess, since we all want to be on the floor promptly.

Mr. BATTLE. We do not have anything on the floor this afternoon?

Chairman KEE. Nothing this afternoon.

We will recess until 2:30.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman KEE. The committee will be in order.

Dr. Judd, if you have some questions, you may proceed.

Mr. JUDD. It is nice of you to appear before us again, Mr. Clayton. There are two or three things I wanted to bring up for fuller discussion. One is with reference to your statement "Economic health can be restored to western Europe by bringing into one union the free peoples of the world." Then you say "This union would possess such an overwhelming weight of the world's economic, industrial, military, and spiritual power that no nation on earth would dare attack."

Where will this union with all its economic, industrial, and military power get its raw materials?

Mr. CLAYTON. They produce a great many of them.

Mr. JUDD. Do you think the North Atlantic community, the United States and Canada and western Europe have adequate raw materials to maintain their workshops?

Mr. CLAYTON. No; they have not, Dr. Judd, and they would secure the remainder from other raw material-producing countries; the Western Hemisphere, Africa, and whatever countries produce them, and will be able to obtain them easier than they can today.

Mr. JUDD. That is right, but with China gone, and other parts of Asia almost certain to follow and with Africa riddled with Communist propaganda, I fear that one by one the countries where the basic raw materials are in great reserve, are also going to be taken over by the Communists. Personally, I think that is their strategy, to keep us preoccupied in western Europe while they get control of the sources of raw materials in the world. Then, as you say, they do not need to go to war. We bleed ourselves to death trying to supply western Europe, or let it go down and stand alone with the world lined up against us.

I have talked to Mr. Streit and Justice Roberts about this. I am not sure whether the obvious benefits, the clear-cut unmistakable benefits that would come from this union, would offset the danger of apparent abandoning of the other areas of the world where the largest reserves of raw materials are, or even driving them into the Soviet camp. If we form a club with western Europe, they have to have some leader and there is no leader left except the Soviet Union.

Mr. CLAYTON. Dr. Judd, I think the point at which we perhaps differ in that is instead of the union abandonig these areas to the Communists, I would think that these areas would look to the union as a source of strength and of protection. What is the union, how is it formed, and what is its purpose? It is formed by the free peoples of

the world who want to maintain and preserve their integrity and independence.

That is on a high plane. All the other countries of the world who might not at the moment be eligible for entrance into the union but do not want to belong to the Communist side of it, I think would gather strength and courage and an example from that. I think what will happen will be they will seek to make themselves as quickly as possible eligible to come into that strong union which they see has 80 percent of the material wealth and strength of the world. I think that union will act as a magnet to people of that kind, rather than, as some people say, that those people in between would be driven into the arms of the Communists. Not at all. They will be driven there certainly if we stay disunited as we are today. If the free peoples of the world remain disunited, one by one as you said a moment ago, these areas will be taken over by the Communists, I am afraid. That is where lies our danger. We just sit here and see it happen. We have sat here for 5 years, nearly, since the end of the war and we have seen what happened. Russia started and took over central Europe, contrary to her solemn promise at Yalta that she would give those people free elections and let them choose their own place in the world. Instead of that, she took them over and now she has China. We see this map getting black quite fast.

If we unite ourselves so we have one foreign policy and one defense policy and make one economic area out of all our great countries, I think we will stop that process.

Mr. JUDD. As I get it, your idea would be that there would be two forces. One would be the psychological attraction of the strength of this free community and, as you say, it would be a magnet that would inspire them to work their hardest to become eligible to be taken into it; and the other would be—I judge you anticipate—that this union would itself assume a lot of the burdens which the United States has been carrying single-handedly of helping strengthen the economies of the other nonincluded countries through Point IV programs or meeting dollar deficits or military assistance or whatever these countries needed to keep themselves free—if they evidenced a real will to strive to remain free.

Mr. CLAYTON. Indeed you stated it exactly as I visualize it. This union with all of its strength would take over then the responsibilities that the United States carries almost alone, today. Not only that, but with a union of 350,000,000 or 400,000,000 people, this vast wealth of productive capacity, the exchange of goods, not only within that union but between that union and the rest of the world, would be so greatly facilitated and expedited, and goods would be produced more cheaply and better, that that alone would greatly help to improve the economy of the rest of the world.

Mr. JUDD. It certainly would be with those parts of the world that are still free, but I cannot manage to conceive the Soviet Union being so short-sighted as to allow those countries under its control to carry on normal relations.

Mr. CLAYTON. I would except them but only for a while. Russia is not going to find it too easy even under the best conditions to keep her heel on the necks of millions and millions of people who do not want the heel there.

Mr. JUDD. Provided they have some other place to go. You cannot expect these peoples to rise up and throw it off as long as there is no hope of real assistance and as long as the Soviets are winning in the world struggle. I am utterly convinced that if we stop the Soviet advance, their regime will fall apart, just as it is now having trouble in eastern Europe; because it cannot deliver on all its fancy promises except by continuing victories. I am for whatever is the best means of stopping that advance. Everything else is secondary to that. None of these reforms can take place if the people are not free.

That brings me to the second major point in which I was interested in your testimony. You were speaking of the United States standing alone and being an island surrounded by communism and socialism. Is or is not this the fact, that it is not the communism or socialism that we fear as a competitor, it is the police state that they set up which is the real threat? I am not afraid of the United States being overcome in free competition or contest with communism or socialism, if there is such a thing; we can beat them. But socialism and communism to them are fancy names for what is in fact the police state. Communism is no longer an economic doctrine, it is the instrument of a ruthlessly imperialistic nation's foreign policy. We could not live as an island surrounded by free states without freedom. Is that right?

Mr. CLAYTON. I could not agree with you more. It is not just the idea of socialism and communism. If you expose socialism and communism to the free competition of the world, they cannot stand up economically. However, they are not so exposed. They are organized on the basis of elimination of that free competition which their own organizers know better than anybody else would destroy them if it were allowed to function in their economy.

Now if we form a union, suppose you have a fourth socialistic and three-fourths free enterprise. The socialistic end of it has to go, if it is a real union, where the economy works as one economy.

Mr. JUDD. That brings me to a point you have discussed, which I think is one of the half-dozen major fallacies widespread in our country today; namely, that poverty leads to communism. I do not believe that at all. There is no evidence that I know of that poverty leads to communism. It is Communists and their propaganda which lead to communism. It is because they are constantly on hand working, saying to the people who are in poverty, "The answer is communism; the answer is communism."

They can only promise; they cannot deliver. The reason they succeed is because we are not there saying "No, the answer is freedom—the thing to do is what we did: got out of the jails of England and came to the United States and established a free society as the way to get ahead. That is the answer to your poverty." There is no shred of truth in what they say. It is not poverty that leads to communism, it is propaganda that leads to communism. We do have to correct the bad conditions, but that alone will not do the job unless we have our propaganda skillfully saying in a hundred ways, "The answer to your bad conditions is political freedom. That is the only way to economic betterment. That was the secret in our country. The economic betterment in my judgment, came out of the political system established, and not the reverse. It released the creative capacities which all peoples have if given opportunity to use them.

It allowed them to build and venture, succeeding sometimes and losing sometimes. Thus was our material progress achieved. The other methods are like those of the Soviet Union—the police state system. It imagines that the state can bring up living conditions. It has not done it yet in a single place. They have had all sorts of places where they have tried, beginning with Russia. They have not yet succeeded;

It is tragic default on our part that allows this fatalistic notion to get abroad, that poverty and associated bad conditions will automatically lead to communism, and if we correct those conditions we will avoid communism. That is not what leads to communism; on the one hand it is somebody telling people the lie that communism is the answer to their problem, and on the other hand, our failure to be there showing that under our system ordinary people who started in poverty have gone further than anywhere else. There are inequities, injustices, inadequacies here, yes; but if you consider the size of the country and the nature of its population, fewer shortcomings than any place else in the world. They need such ideas and inspiration as well as material aid. The ideas somehow have to be reborn in our own country too, or even the best political arrangements, whether a world federation or a partial union may not succeed. Perhaps those who know it best can lead the world to have a new birth of freedom as Abraham Lincoln put it. If we extend freedom and federation into a larger area it could be that all of a sudden a new wave of upsurging creativity would take place, at least psychologically.

Which of the ways, or can they both be combined in some way, will lead to pooling the strengths of the people who have most freedom, and on the other hand will avoid the danger of seeming to say to less developed peoples who are on the firing line "We have been abandoned." We must not let that happen.

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir; we must not. Either we are in complete agreement or I am sadly mistaken. I think what we are both trying to say is that poverty sows the seed, prepares the soil for this destructive preaching.

There is no question about it, the Communists cannot do anything for them, and democracy can, if it is allowed to work. Or course, we have to be there and have to tell them so. But we have to take, Dr. Judd, some constructive action to try to improve the standard of living, the economic level of those people.

We cannot start with the whole world. We have to start with those countries which think as we do about life and government. Those that have the same ideas and the same ideals. That is the area which is now under the most vicious attack or will be under the most vicious attack and the area in which we have our greatest interests. We do not want to sit here and see our friends, the people who think like we do and who want to have the kind of life we want to have, we do not want to sit here and see them picked off one by one as we saw them picked off after the shooting stopped in World War II. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and all of them. Now in Asia, we have not seen the end of it by any means. If we wait another year or two we may see almost the whole continent of Asia in Communist hands. Then look what that means to us in Japan and the Philippines where we have definite responsibilities.

Mr. JUDD. Sir, you are making the speech I have been making for 5 years.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is going to be a very, very serious thing. As you know perfectly well, Japan cannot continue to exist with 75,000,000 people, except through active trade with the continent of Asia. That is the only way she can do it. Then she is in close contact with the Communists and we do not know where that will wind up.

Mr. JUDD. The Communists do not need to try to coerce Japan into the Communist family of Asia. Whenever the day comes that we cannot continue to feed and support the Japanese, they have to come to the Reds and beg to be taken in in order to eat and survive.

You have doubtless read of the speech made Saturday night by the editor of Pravda at a big doings in Moscow where he said with great confidence that the balance of power in the world is shifting irreversibly; their tide cannot be stopped. I am afraid they are right.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am afraid they are, too.

Mr. JUDD. I believe there has to be something dramatic, something that will break this deadlock or this stalling of the machine on dead center. As you know, I have introduced both of these resolutions. If there were five others that offered some hope, I would put them in too.

The one thing that I do not like under Atlantic Union is for us to select the members. It would be far better if when we first sit down to decide what to do, or preferably prior to that, we could make or would make a genuine effort to do the thing on the universal level, or at least on the level of all those who are members of the United Nations. If Russia excludes herself, if she refuses to agree to and live by laws that apply equally to all countries, then our case would be so much stronger, because we would not have gotten together a select few and excluded her, she would have excluded herself by her refusal to put herself under laws equitably and equally applied to all. How can we best do that? That is the thing I would like to know. Should we not try on the universal level and then if we fail, go ahead with a smaller group within the United Nations? I think our moral case would then be unassailable. I think it is not unassailable if we issue invitations to only six nations or whatever the number might be and hope that by beginning with a small club we can expand it. I would rather begin with the whole club and let it be reduced through a process of eliminations by some nations themselves, reduced to those who are willing to belong.

Mr. CLAYTON. I recognize the point you make and I sympathize with it. It seems to me that you have to take a small nucleus group of nations here and it seems to me that the natural thing is to take those who first sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty and put on them the responsibility of widening this circle and asking other nations in.

Now this union has to be of such a character, it has to be so strong, that in effect it amounts to a fusion of the peoples. It amounts to the kind of union that we ourselves established in 1787, as I am sure you will remember. There was a goodly number of leaders of people at that time, who insisted the Constitution should be a matter between the legislatures of the different colonies and that the legislatures should ratify it and it would still be a kind of a federation, a little tighter than it was but still just a federation. George Washington, Madison, Jefferson, and Hamilton, if I remember correctly, insisted that would never do and that it had to be ratified by the people of these different Colonies and the people did ratify it. One or two

stayed out for a year or something like that but in time they all came in. We had a strong government that has persisted and prospered until this time.

However, I do not believe that to deal with this economic problem which I think is at the bottom of the cold war, is the heart and soul of the cold war, I do not believe that to deal with that problem, that we can do it effectively except by a union of peoples who have the same ideas of life and government, people who can fuse their interests. If you go outside of that group you get ideologies so different from ours, so foreign to our nature, that it will not work. Some day it may. Many, many years from now it may work, but it will not work at any rate in coping with the cold war. The United Nations, I do not care how you reconstitute it—I have thought about it a great deal—I do not believe it can be made to deal effectively with the cold war. And we must not overlook this, that Stalin is likely to win everything he wants without firing a gun. If he goes on for the next 5 years like he has the last 5, what is the use of shooting anybody?

Mr. JUDD. That unquestionably is his strategy. He uses the United Nations as a means of preventing real progress. He has a ring-side seat, where perfectly legally and without reproach, he can prevent any real headway being made. His purpose of course is to buy time for his side by keeping us disunited and divided. I myself think this—I have said it here before—that the United Nations in its present form can be one of the enemies of peace. That is, its machinery can be used to prevent agreement and block peace if any one of the big 5 so chooses. It can be used as an instrument against the establishment of peace and has been so used because one of the big 5 has so chosen. Therefore its faulty structure must be corrected. We must quit kidding ourselves that it has any real usefulness in preventing war, or get its structure so amended or revised or modified that it cannot be used to prevent the making of peace, which is what it has been used for by the Soviets.

Chairman KEE. Will you yield for just a moment?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Chairman KEE. At that point I would like to clear up something in my mind. I would like to ask you, Mr. Clayton, as to the character of the world government you envision. It is not a federation which is your concept of this proposed world Federal Government, but is it not an actual government with a constitution or articles of confederation of the kind that gives it power, similar to the power that we have in the United States—is that correct?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. The constituent elements of the union would surrender to the union itself a limited degree of power.

Chairman KEE. Would that include the power of legislation? You would have a legislative body made up of constituent members of the confederation or the government?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think we would have a legislative body just as the United States has, a body that would be allowed to legislate with respect to these limited powers which were reserved for the union. In general, they would be matters concerning all the members of the union alike.

Chairman KEE. Would that include the power of taxation and the power of conscription for the armies or police force?

Mr. CLAYTON. The power of taxation would certainly have to reside in the union because the union would have to provide for defense and for services of one kind and another, for which they would have to get the revenue by taxation. As to whether or not there would be the power of conscription, I presume that that power would reside in the union as it does in our own case here, through our own Constitution, but would have to be, I would think, implemented by legislation as we do it here.

Chairman KEE. Would that also include the power to wage war?

Mr. CLAYTON. It would necessarily have to include that power, I would think. However, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am answering your questions according to my own individual ideas. The Atlantic Union Committee has not formulated a policy on all of these questions and indeed I presume it would not do so. These are questions which would have to be worked out by the delegates to the convention that we are trying to have called, or the international conference we are trying to have called.

Chairman KEE. Is it supposed to be included in the proposals that would be submitted, either by our Government, its representative, or a representative of the other governments?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir; that is right.

Chairman KEE. Therefore, your Committee has not formulated as yet the complete plan of procedure, or list of proposals which you would have our Government make through its delegation?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir; it has not.

Chairman KEE. That is all.

Mr. Carnahan—

Mr. CARNAHAN. The United Nations is an organization which must proceed with the approval of both groups at the present time, both the democracies and the totalitarian groups. Is not the procedure going to be rather difficult under a set-up like that?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Carnahan, I rather doubt that it would be any more difficult than it has been up to the present time. Russia has used the veto over 37 times, I believe. The procedure has been extremely difficult.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The Communists are making a united effort to establish their philosophy in the world and are still maintaining their membership in the United Nations. It is my opinion they are there to see that the United Nations does not work, rather than to see that it does work. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. CLAYTON. There is much evidence to support that point of view.

Chairman KEE. Mr. Carnahan, will you assume the chair and proceed with your examination from this end of the table? I must appear on the floor.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Would you care to comment on whether or not is it probable that the United Nations acting alone as it is now constituted, will effectively follow a course which will strengthen and make secure the democratic concept of government or of the economy?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is a very difficult question for me to answer, Mr. Carnahan. If you do not mind, I would prefer to stick to this thesis, that the United Nations, as now constituted or as it might be constituted, with amendment, cannot become an instrument for dealing with the cold war because the cold war is a boring from within.

It is internal. The United Nations is not set up to deal with situations of that kind.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The winner of the cold war, assuming there should be one, will certainly fall heir to the United Nations?

Mr. CLAYTON. I would not think it would be necessary or useful.

Mr. CARNAHAN. No; it would perhaps serve no purpose.

It is certainly your feeling that the democracies should put forth some type of a united effort, still maintaining their membership in the United Nations and still attempting to make the United Nations work?

Mr. CLAYTON. It is. I think the United Nations has justified its organization. It performed excellent service in the Near East soon after the war, and I think it is an organization which is useful and should be continued. I think even if it is continued in its most effective way, it will not help the democracies win the cold war. I think the democracies can lose the cold war and still the democracies and the Communists remain in the United Nations, and I think we can go on in that way and finally wind up with Europe and Asia in Communist hands.

Mr. CARNAHAN. It is not your feeling, then, that a united effort on the part of the democracies would be an attempt to bypass the United Nations or to play down the United Nations?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think so; no, sir.

Mr. CARNAHAN (presiding) Mr. Lodge—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Clayton, with respect to the United Nations, I think it should be clearly understood that the United Nations was never designed to make the peace, but was designed to preserve the peace, and that peace has not yet officially been made. I am sure you will recognize that that is an important distinction. Certainly we cannot expect the United Nations to do something which it was not designed to do.

A question about this Atlantic Union concept which I should like to ask you is whether you believe that with the Council of Europe in existence and functioning under the very able leadership of Mr. Spaak, it will be helpful for us to instigate a movement of this kind or whether it might not act as a brake upon such undertakings as the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the Atlantic Treaty, the OEEC, and the other organizations which have been set up within the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Lodge, I would like to comment first on your first statement regarding the United Nations. I agree, of course, that the United Nations was not set up to make peace, but was set up to preserve peace. The point that I have been making all along is that the United Nations also was not set up to deal with this new technique of a cold war which is something that the world had to learn about after the shooting war stopped and that the United Nations cannot effectively deal with it and that as far as we are concerned, the democracies of the world, we can sit right here and watch the map and see Russia finally take over all our friends, if we do not look out. That is just what will happen. She is making great headway in that direction. The point I was making was that the United Nations cannot stop her and was not set up to stop her in that kind of thing.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is entirely right.

Mr. CLAYTON. Now on the matter of the Council of Europe, I am delighted to see a movement started like the Council of Europe.

They had an extremely interesting session at Strasbourg and I think it is fine. It is a step in the right direction. However, it is absolutely ineffectual in the matter of a cold war. As a matter of fact, as you very well know, it has no power. Every question is merely debated and referred to the foreign ministers of the respective countries.

Mr. LODGE. In what sense, Mr. Clayton, do you believe that an Atlantic Union such as you conceive it, and I do not know exactly what details you have in mind, would have more power for peace than a combination of the Marshall plan, plus the Atlantic Treaty, plus military aid, plus the Council of Europe and the United Nations? Of course we are discussing the possible, here. In what sense do you believe that such a union would be a more powerful implement in achieving victory for us in the cold war in order that we can avoid war?

Mr. CLAYTON. The union we visualize would be a real union. As I said a moment ago, a fusion of the peoples of the world who have the same ideas of life and government. As such it would have 350,000,000 to 400,000,000 consumers over 80 percent of the industrial power of the world and 90 percent of the naval power of the world and from that point of view would be a very, very strong entity.

Mr. LODGE. Would you have a common currency?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; a common currency.

I am giving you my own ideas, Mr. Lodge.

Mr. LODGE. You are a great expert on economic problems and you certainly know a great deal about currency. Certainly one of the problems that would suggest itself to me right away in connection with a common currency is the kind of economy under which the British are laboring at the moment. The minute you get a common currency—in the first place, you have to get British consent and if you should get British consent to that then you are going to pull the rug out from under their whole wage-price structure, it seems to me, and make their position with the Commonwealth of Nations extremely difficult. Is that not right?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly. Mr. Lodge, you have to view this matter in terms of the alternative. This may be and indeed we believe it is, the only way to keep Russia from winning the cold war, hands down. She is winning it now so fast that it makes you dizzy to look at the map and the changes on it.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with you that Russia is winning the cold war.

Mr. CLAYTON. You have to view this thing in terms of the alternative. Are we going to sit here and go on with OEEC, and the Council of Europe, and Benelux and all these wonderful things that have been started; the Marshall plan and so on, are we going to sit here and be content with those things if they do not do anything to stop Russia from winning the cold war? What will happen?

Mr. LODGE. No, sir; I do not believe we should and I think we have to be very imaginative. I am just wondering why you believe the Atlantic Union is the only constructive alternative that we have at this time. I do not think that we should be satisfied with the way things have been going. I am as much alarmed about it as anyone. However, I wonder whether the way to mobilize the free countries against the threat of aggressive war—whether the only way is through an Atlantic Union of the kind you have in mind, which I understand is a complete federal union of the type we have in this country.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right.

Mr. LODGE. Why do you believe that that is the only way to do it, Mr. Clayton? I regret that I was not here this morning. I do not want you to repeat a statement which you have already made.

Mr. CLAYTON. I will be glad to make it as brief as I can: The cold war is largely an economic war. If we are going to prevent Russia from picking off our friends one by one and adding them to her list of satellites we are going to have to find some way to restore economic help to those friends. We tried that with the Marshall plan. It has been extremely useful. It has helped greatly as we all know, but it has not and cannot reach to the basic causes of the economic malady that is eating at Europe. One of those basic causes is the way in which they operate in these small, economic compartments. They cannot possibly compete in our modern world. Those little compartments were all right in the days prior to the industrial revolution and indeed right up to the beginning of this century. But the advent of the industrial revolution sounded the death knell to this system of extreme nationalism and sovereignty in my opinion. It is because that system will not function and operate against a system on the other side where there is 15,000,000 square miles and 750,000,000 people in one single economy. That is what the Russians have.

Mr. LODGE. I certainly think your ideas as to the desirability of a free market for the 270,000,000 Europeans, plus the 150,000,000 Americans, are most provocative. I think you are aware of the enormous difficulties Mr. Harriman and his whole team have been encountering in an effort to break down these barriers.

If you had this federal union, they would have but one vote in the United Nations, is that not correct? Would that not constitute immediate destruction of the United Nations? Perhaps you are willing to confront that but would that not be the net effect?

Mr. CLAYTON. I would rather face destruction of the United Nations than destruction of the democracies of the world. If I had to make my choice, I would make it do to destroy the United Nations! If I had to make the choice between those two things, I would choose to keep the democracies.

Mr. LODGE. If that is the choice then I think you are right, but I think you will agree that it would constitute destruction of the United Nations if you were to be able to form this Atlantic Union, would it not? It would be one nation, would it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. It would only be one nation of the democracies, that the countries taking part in the international convention or conference to write the constitution, decided that they would take in. I take it they would only include real democracies, countries which had demonstrated their ability to govern themselves by democratic laws, free elections, freedom of religion and all the freedoms we enjoy in this country.

Mr. LODGE. Could they each have a vote, such as the Ukraine and Byelo-Russia? Would that be your theory?

Mr. CLAYTON. Without amendment of the United Nations, perhaps the proposed Union might have only one vote. I do not know why the Ukraine or Byelo-Russia ever got a vote in the United Nations. If they get one, Texas should have one, and I am for that. Let me put it this way: I do not know how many democracies would be included in that Union, but call it 12. I think the pull of that strong

aggregation, materially strong, militarily strong, and spiritually strong, on the other countries in the world, the non-Soviet countries in the world, would be so strong that they would be more likely than ever to vote with that Union than they would with the Soviets. I do not think there is any question about it. The strength of such an aggregation as that—I do not mean merely material strength and military strength; I mean spiritual strength.

Mr. LODGE. If we were to do that then we would forget about the ITO and we would not need the Marshall plan, or the Atlantic Treaty, or military aid, because all those measures refer largely to the nations which would be included in the Atlantic Union and since it would be one nation, all these matters would become superfluous; is that correct?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think the Marshall plan would have quickly served its purpose and would pass out. The ITO is universal. It takes in all the countries. It would take in Russia if she would come in.

Mr. LODGE. It would have no applicability as far as the Atlantic Union countries are concerned?

Mr. CLAYTON. It would have applicability only insofar as the Atlantic Union dealt with other countries. It would have no applicability, as I visualize it, with respect to the units that form the Atlantic Union, the inside countries that formed it.

What we are trying to get away from, Mr. Lodge, is the continuation of the Marshall plan. We are trying to get away from subsidizing ourselves out of these international emergencies as they arise. We Americans are great people to subsidize. We have a lot of money and economic power and if we run into something that is tough, we say "Let's pass a bill and appropriate a couple billions of dollars and go on about our business." That is the way we meet these things. I was all for the Marshall plan, as you know. I worked on it hard. I think it did a great service in giving us a breathing spell. Without it, I think we would have had communism right up to the English Channel today. It certainly has performed a very great service. However, I think when the plan runs its course, we have to be through with this system of subsidization. We have to substitute something that is more real and more substantial, something that is dynamic and positive.

Mr. LODGE. You do not believe that it is possible to get the kind of unity that will adequately serve to repel the Communist aggression unless we have a complete federal union.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not believe it is, Mr. Lodge. I do not believe it is possible in any other way. We have this question up today and Mr. Hoffman has been working on it quite hard, trying to get economic integration among the Marshall plan countries in Europe. He has made some progress but very little. I personally do not believe that any of those countries are likely to act favorably on a statement by us that we believe they ought to do so and so.

Mr. LODGE. We must show willingness to participate?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think to get any action we have to put ourselves in the position of getting out in front and saying "This is what we all ought to do in this situation, so come on and let's do it." If that is done, the people will mow down the politicians for an opportunity to join. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I will yield to Mr. Judd.

Mr. JUDD. You say we have to end this compartmental organization and you do not think it can be done without a union in which we are a member?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Without American participation it would be pooling weaknesses whereas with our participation there is a chance some of those weaknesses can be converted into strength?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think that is right, but I think over and above that and ahead of that is this simple fact, that they will not do it without our leadership and without our being willing to go into it with them. They will naturally say "If that is a good thing, why does the United States not form an economic union with Canada, for example," or "Why do you not come in with us and let's make a real union of it?"

Mr. LODGE. The great difficulty insofar as Benelux is concerned has been that the Belgian economy has been more healthy than the Dutch economy and therefore Holland had more to gain.

Since we are the healthiest and most prosperous, this Atlantic Union would be an extremely generous gesture, because we would probably be diluting our own wealth.

Mr. CLAYTON. It undoubtedly would, Mr. Lodge, but I do not believe that in the formation of this union we would be diluting our own wealth. I think the formation of this union with 400,000,000 consumers, with one competitive economy for the whole area, would make the whole area much more prosperous than it is now, including the United States. And it would be like a magnet to the other countries who have to decide which way they are going.

Let me put it this way: This is not a proposal to divide up the pie that we have with other countries; the other democracies. It is not that in my mind at all. It is to bake some more pies. To enlarge the pie. To greatly activate the economy. We cannot go on as we have, giving away \$5,000,000,000 of goods a year, \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentlemen yield at that point?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Why can we not go on?

Mr. CLAYTON. For one thing, it is silly to give away \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 of your wealth every year.

Mr. JAVITS. You would not say it was silly to have kept communism from getting to the English Channel for \$5,000,000,000 a year. Would you be willing, if necessary, to pay \$5,000,000,000 a year every year to keep the same thing from happening?

Mr. CLAYTON. Not if there is a better way. And besides that I do not think that would do it. You cannot make these countries in Europe receivers of charity and expect them to keep their self-respect.

Mr. JAVITS. You know that their total economy is much greater than that amount of money. You are not saying we are making the Europeans indigents?

Mr. CLAYTON. You are making them recipients of gifts and that is very, very destructive to the moral fabric of anybody. I mean to have them feel that it is not just a situation arising from the war where we had to help them get on their feet, but from now on out the next 50 years, they are going to have to be dependent on the

United States for gifts in order to live. You will not make good citizens and good nations by any such process as that and we cannot do it.

Mr. JAVITS. Do you think the job can be done any more cheaply through your scheme?

Mr. CLAYTON. Under the plan that we have of Atlantic Union, Mr. Javits, it is not a question of cost. It is a question of reorganizing the economies of the democracies in such a way that it will really work and really put them on their feet again and make the whole economy more prosperous than it has ever been in my opinion.

There are all kinds of difficulties and hurdles to be overcome, of course, in this thing. If you read the history of our own Federal Union, as we all have, you know the troubles that they had. Well, this will be vastly greater, of course. However, as I said a moment ago, we have to view it in terms of the alternatives. What will we do? You would not be in favor of continuing to give 4 or 5 billion dollars a year for the next 50 years to these countries. If we do that we will stimulate in our own country all kinds of demands for subsidies which will put this budget not \$5,000,000,000 out of balance, but perhaps \$10,000,000,000, and how long can we go on on that basis?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the case for what you call Atlantic Union as a great program in which we are ourselves a part of a dynamic whole, would have more validity if it stood solely on economic grounds. However, you tie it up with the cold war and the dynamic and positive policy which is proposed to the peoples of the world as a counterpoise of communism. That I do not think will stand. In other words, I think you are fine, insofar as you argue economics, industrial revival, reconstruction, and so on. But when you try to translate this into a fundamental philosophy which will galvanize the people of the world in the cause of democracy, which is what we are all looking for, that is where, just speaking for myself, I have to pause and say I do not go along with you. As long as we stick to the economics and the integration of this great family of democratic nations which have industrial power, I think we are on very much sounder ground where we can speak a common language.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not believe it would be very useful to argue that point, Mr. Javits. I prefer to say this: I do not believe it is possible to integrate economically these 12 nations or 15 nations without doing so politically. It is not possible in my opinion to do it.

Mr. LODGE. You do not think it could be done without the United States, either?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not.

Mr. LODGE. In other words, when Mr. Hoffman comes before the OEEC, as he did 2 or 3 months ago and makes a very vigorous speech in which he says that they must integrate—his use of words was perhaps somewhat misunderstood—do you feel that speech could have been more significant and more helpful had he been able to say that we, the United States, will also participate in the integration which we request of Europeans?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right; I do.

Mr. LODGE. You have given us a very provocative statement, Mr. Clayton, and certainly it is something that should be considered very carefully.

Mr. CLAYTON. Thank you.

Chairman KEE. Are there any further questions?

Mr. JAVITS. I have two further questions: Is it not a fact, Mr. Clayton—discussing the cold war—is it not a fact that the cold war could go right on and be just as hot as it is now, with the Atlantic Union? After all, the Soviets could be infiltrating into what is not more than a bigger body, striving to stir up strikes and discontent, for political purposes?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think that insofar as the democracies in the union are concerned, that the cold war will be no longer a factor. It might be that the Soviets would choose to carry on in other countries, but I really think that if such a union as we have been discussing here should be formed, it would really end the cold war and end the danger of a shooting war.

Mr. JAVITS. The other question was this: Is there anything inconsistent between the idea of regionalism such as you have described and an ultimate world federation, which incidentally is also before this committee just as is this Atlantic Union proposal. Could you not advance from regionalism to world federation? Or, are the two exclusive?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not believe you could do it today, Mr. Javits, in our present state of progress in the world. I believe that the time will come when we will have one world government, but I think it is a long, long time in the future. What I have in mind is a government of peoples who have the same ideas and ideals of life and government; people who can fuse themselves and make one government and one nation out of 12 or 15 or whatever the number may be.

When I look around the world, I see so many elements that I am absolutely sure would not come into that family. They would not belong there.

Mr. JAVITS. Do you feel it will be necessary to fight a world war before you can get over that hurdle of regionalism and world federation?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not believe so. I believe if we were to form a union of democracies and we used wisely the power that we would get from that, which I would hope we would do, being a democracy, I really think it would end world wars. I do not think we would have any more world wars. You might have local disturbances and troubles, but not a great world war again, if we had a democracy of that kind.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, your plan does not take in all the democracies.

Mr. CLAYTON. In time, Mr. Javits, I would assume they would all come in. Certainly, everyone that was eligible, I think, would be knocking at the door just as soon as the union is formed. If they are eligible, they should be admitted.

Mr. JAVITS. Then there would be two great systems in the world facing each other. One would be the Communist totalitarian system as we prefer to call it, organized in a tremendous bloc, China, Russia, the satellites, except such as we can detach—that is what there is now—much thought. On the other hand would be the democracies. You feel that is the best objective that we can give the world as the road to peace? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. CLAYTON. Almost but not quite. Let me give my idea of it. We have those two systems, today. There they stand across this chasm facing each other. On the one side you have them organized

and unified with one direction. On the other side you have them acting independently and separately and sometimes against each other, as for example the action with reference to the recognition of Communist China. One element goes off one way and we either go the other way or we sit there and do nothing. We have disagreement there that the whole world can look at.

If we had a union, there might be a disagreement inside the union as we have disagreements in our own country all the time as to what our foreign policy should be, but in the end we would compose those differences and face the world united.

Mr. JAVITS. We would just be facing, however, one entity. That is true, is it not? We would not be facing the world, we would be facing an entity.

Mr. CLAYTON. We would be facing the world.

Mr. JAVITS. The world would be composed of that other entity.

Mr. CLAYTON. There might easily be quite a substantial part of the world that would be in neither camp for awhile. There would be a very substantial part that would be in neither camp, but the point is that with the democracies unified and acting as one, in one union, with one foreign policy and one defense policy and one economy, you would be so strong that these other independent countries certainly would not be taken into the Soviet camp, which they may be now if we sit here, disunited as we are today.

Chairman KEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly.

Chairman KEE. I noticed Mr. Javits did not take into consideration in his question the sections of the world that would be left if we divided the world up into two great rival parts. The balance of the world, of which you speak would be in neither class, not in the World Union, nor in with the Soviet class. Those who were on neither side would constitute the bone or bones of contention, would they not, between the two classes which Mr. Javits has created?

Mr. CLAYTON. They would sooner or later have to divest themselves of neutrality and decide which way they would go. Take India, for an example. Mr. Nehru, I believe, when he was here said India would be neutral. However, Mr. Stalin does not intend for India to be neutral and he is taking measures to see that in time India is not neutral.

Mr. LODGE. What are the intentions of our Government with regard to India?

Mr. CLAYTON. That I do not know, Mr. Lodge.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Clayton, may I just say that with the leadership that we have at the moment, sir, in all due respect, why do you believe that in an Atlantic Union suddenly we would know where we are going because there are 12 countries involved rather than 1?

Mr. CLAYTON. You would not have 12 countries, insofar as foreign policy is concerned. You would have one country. Insofar as foreign policy and defense policy is concerned, you would have one policy. You do not get a union unless you have it that way.

Mr. LODGE. I hope they would not fail to know what to do about Mr. Stalin's intentions toward Mr. Nehru, because I have no indications that our Government has any ideas in that connection.

Mr. CLAYTON. Our Government, in effect, must act alone today. If we had this union of 400,000,000 people, I do not think Mr. Nehru

would be saying that he was going to be neutral. I think that the pull on him and upon all countries in his position would be so much greater from the west than from the east, that he would come into the western camp.

Mr. LODGE. I thought you said, sir, that we would accept only the countries which have a democratic system.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right. That would be my idea. In saying that, I think they would be more inclined to come into the democratic camp, I did not mean to imply that he would be immediately taken into the union or that he would want to come into the union. What I really wanted to say was that we would have created conditions which in my opinion would make it extremely difficult for the Communists to pick off India and add it to their union. That is what I really meant to say.

Mr. LODGE. In that connection, I would like to say this, and I know you have given this a great deal of thought: That is the one aspect of your statement that fills me with a certain amount of doubt. I am assuming that your thinking is based on the idea that the forces which bind men together are stronger than the forces which drive them apart. And, I would agree with that. However, let us consider a dictatorship which had all the things in it which we do not like—and I will not pick out any one country—and they went to join this union; the minute they join they give up their dictatorship by definition. And therefore unless you feel for instance that the people of Hungary do not want freedom—and I would reject that concept—provided Russia would let them loose, which of course she would not, why not have Hungary, Bulgaria, Franco-Spain, and all these countries that have dictatorships, come in? Certainly you do not believe that the people in these countries are different than we are.

Mr. CLAYTON. Far be it from me to decide whether or not they should come in. That would be for this group of countries who form this union to decide.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that that is very important, sir, because if you do not take that view, following Mr. Javits' and my questioning, you are laying these countries open to be capsized by Russia rather than so be absorbed into this great union.

Mr. CLAYTON. They are open to be taken in by Russia now and it is much easier to take them in than if we had this union. However, I want to make it very clear that I have no set opinion on that. In the case of a country like you mentioned, Hungary, it may be that 85 percent of the people of Hungary would vote for a democracy, I do not know.

Mr. LODGE. They did.

Mr. CLAYTON. It might be that they would be eligible to come into this union. That would have to be decided by the states that would form the union, the states that were there at the time Hungary applied.

Mr. LODGE. Let us not assume, Mr. Clayton, that the dictators in these countries speak for the people whom they are governing.

Mr. CLAYTON. I would not assume for a moment that in every case they speak for their peoples. I think there is something to be said for this, Mr. Lodge, that before a country would be eligible for admission to the union, they should have demonstrated by some experience their ability to govern themselves by the democratic process. I do not think you could say "Well, here are 20,000,000 people and we

believe that 15,000,000 of them would like to be under a democracy." Suppose they had never been under a democracy?

Mr. LODGE. Will they be allowed the opportunity of showing that they can govern themselves before they are absorbed into the union or do you believe that perhaps Mr. Stalin will see to it that they do not get that opportunity?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Lodge, that is a question that I would not be able to answer because as I have said I am not fixing the conditions under which these countries would be allowed to enter and I do not know what the conditions are that the organizing countries or the foundation countries will fix. However, I think there is something to be said on the side that only countries would be eligible where their people had demonstrated by actual experience their ability to govern themselves by democratic principles. I think there is something to be said on that side.

Mr. LODGE. Thank you.

Mr. JAVITS. I have just one further question, Mr. Chairman.

Would it be fair, Mr. Clayton, in view of the fact that we are trying to narrow the issue, to narrow it this way: The whole question comes down to whether we will, by the plan that you give, be more able to attract first the neutral nations and then the satellite nations away from the Soviet Union and into this union that you have described? Can we narrow it to that issue?

Mr. CLAYTON. I feel positive that this is the case, Mr. Javits, that we would, with the strength of union, have a much greater attraction not only to the so-called neutral countries, but to the Russian satellites themselves, than we have today when they sit there and see us going off at tangents, one element going one way and another element going another, and see that we are disunited and that the economic burden on us is getting too heavy.

Mr. JAVITS. And you feel that does not run counter to the only thing so far that has been able to begin to detach a Russian satellite—to wit, a consciousness of nationalism?

Mr. CLAYTON. It may be.

Mr. LODGE. Will the gentleman yield, there?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I think nationalism is the greatest enemy of communism, much as it would be the greatest enemy of this plan. Nevertheless, I think it could also be said that it would be to the national advantage of Yugoslavia to be a part of a union of which the nations involved had a rather higher standard of living than the Yugoslavs themselves. They might find it to their advantage to do that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Clayton, is it not also true that the major factor in Yugoslavia may not be nationalism but the egoism of a man who feels he should be No. 1 dog instead of No. 2 dog? I am sure it was the nationalism of the Yugoslavs that had much to do with it.

Mr. JAVITS. I think Mr. Tito wants to continue to be top dog and he does not feel he can stay there unless he responds to the nationalism of the Yugoslavs.

Mr. JUDD. Responds to the man who wants to hold on to his own land rather than have it collectivized.

May I ask another question at this point: Coming back to Mr. Nehru, there is reason to believe that one of the two major reasons why Mr. Nehru has said he will be neutral in the struggle between the

two great powers is because he is not confident of the outcome being in our favor. As things are going, he sees perfectly well that the Communists are going to win and why should he bet on us when the blindest man can see we are losing. Whereas if we had—it seems to me this is an argument that has real validity—a union of this sort and it did have a common mine and a common foreign policy, then he would be far more likely to throw in his chips with the Atlantic Union than he would to resign himself to be taken over as China has been taken over by the Soviet Union, or be torn to pieces and have the fate of Chiang Kai-shek, should he be foolish enough to resist communism as Chiang has.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is what I have been trying to say right along. For example, England has had for a long time certain responsibilities in the Far East. Certainly the union we are talking about would be much more competent to discharge responsibilities of that character than England by herself. Certainly that is true today.

Mr. JUDD. I want to ask this question: What do you think would happen to the industries, for example, in the United States, which is the most advanced industrially of these countries, under such a union? Would the same thing happen that has taken place in our own country, where factories and industries from New England have moved down into the South where there was cheaper labor, and the labor was less well organized; and thereby great damage has been done, at least for the moment, to the industrial areas of New England? Would our industry go to these foreign countries because there is cheaper labor there?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is a good question. We are going to do some research on questions of that kind, as well as immigration. I would say that in this matter of movement of industries, you have that as you very well pointed out in our own country, today. They are moving all the time from one part of the country to the other. In the South we have the chemical industries coming down there all the time. Everything relating to oil and gas and things of that kind are moving South, moving to Texas and moving to Louisiana. You have that constant movement based on changing conditions even within a country like America, or within a country like France. But in the matter of movement, I think that the difficulty and the danger in what we are talking about might be of an entirely different character than what most people suppose. Most people say "Oh, well, what would we do in the United States if we had a union of that kind and subjected ourselves to the competition of this low-priced labor in Europe, Italy, France and what have you?" A much more important question than that would be, what would the industries of the United States in certain mass production fields, as for example automobiles, radios, refrigerators, business machines, office machines and things of that character—

Mr. JUDD. Agricultural implements.

Mr. CLAYTON. Agricultural implements. If tomorrow morning all these countries joined into one union and every impediment to the flow of goods is removed between them, the giant industries of the United States in certain mass production fields would put out of business every comparable industry or every industry in that same field within the union, in other countries. That is a much more serious question than exposing the United States to the competition of these

low-wage countries. But that is a question that can be worked out. Adjustments can be made or the changes can come gradually. Something can be done to take care of that. In time, I do not doubt that there would be movement of a goodly amount of capital to European areas—American capital to European areas of the union for the establishment of industries that seem to be suited to those particular areas, and that would be a good thing. It would take American machinery and American know-how to set them up and get them going. I do not think we have anything to fear from that.

The truth of the matter is that the whole economy would be so tremendously activated by forming a union of that kind that the United States would, I think, get more benefit from it than any other country, in time.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JUDD. Thank you, Mr. Clayton.

Mr. JAVITS. Do you feel Americans would hesitate to put their capital goods over there as long as this monolithic Soviet Union remained even close to them as a threat?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, that is the point, Mr. Javits. They hesitate today—not only Americans, but people living in those countries, the nationals of those countries in many cases they put their capital in a safe place so that in case of war they can go get it and move out of the country with their families.

However, if you have this union, I feel sure that the mere act of organizing the union in the way in which we have described it, or in which we have in mind, would restore the confidence of capital everywhere, and people in the United States would be willing to invest their money in France, if they saw a good opportunity in France that had a potential market of 400,000,000 people instead of just the 45,000,000 people who live in France, as it is today.

Mr. JAVITS. In spite of the fact that that would be much closer to Russian bases?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KEE. Mr. Clayton, you have given us a very interesting statement. I think we have explored the subject quite fully this afternoon, and we thank you for coming.

Mr. CLAYTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE K. STREIT, AUTHOR OF UNION NOW

Mr. STREIT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you are faced with two different types of resolution for international federation. Many people deplore this difference of opinion, and have urged me to try to unite all the federalists, beginning with those in Congress, behind a common resolution.

As the author of a book whose readers have become divided, I feel a particular obligation to do this. Many of the readers of *Union Now* favor the Atlantic Union resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, House Concurrent Resolution 107-111. Others of its readers favor the World Federation resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, House Concurrent Resolution 64. Still others favor both.

I myself support the Atlantic Union Resolution, but I have always worked for Atlantic Union as a step toward eventual free world government. And so—speaking only for myself, though my soundings show that I am speaking for many of my friends who are now divided—I would make the following concrete suggestion:

Since the World Federation resolution has no whereas clauses, as the Atlantic Union resolution, and since the whereases of the latter tie the resolving clause tightly to the obligations the United States has already assumed in the North Atlantic Treaty, I would suggest that we begin with the Atlantic Union resolution, and fit the World Federation resolution to it as a second section of the resolving portion. I suggest the following text for the whole combined resolution:

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law," and "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security"; and

Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of thirteen sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the North Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

Whereas these Federal union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

Whereas the United States, together with the other signatories to the treaty, has promised to bring about a better understanding of these Federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

Whereas the United States and the other six democracies which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

1. That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a Federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

2. That this Atlantic Federal Convention be called as the next step in strengthening the United Nations and in attaining a more distant goal which in the sense of Congress, should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States—namely, the development of a free world federation open to all nations willing and able to maintain its principles of free, representative government, and capable of effectively safeguarding individual liberty, preventing aggression and preserving peace by its defined and limited powers to enact, interpret, amend and enforce world law.

This amendment would not change at all the text of the Atlantic Union resolution, except to add to it, as the last paragraph, much of the language and all the major provisions of the world federation resolution.

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the U. N. and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law.

The only noteworthy changes in the latter are aimed at providing certain necessary safeguards, particularly as regards freedom and as regards the United Nations.

To safeguard freedom as the World Federation resolution now stands, it makes no provision that the world government it seeks shall preserve individual liberty. This omission is no doubt due to oversight on the part of its sponsors, resulting from the present widespread American habit of taking freedom for granted. I trust that on second thought they will agree that it is wiser to return to the habits of our forefathers. They based our Government on the principle that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" and devised a remarkable set of checks and balances to secure that vigilance.

The fact that the World Federation resolution now contains no reference to individual freedom should make it much more acceptable to Stalin than to us. "A world federation open to all nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law,"—to quote the present text of the World Federation resolution—is quite compatible with dictatorship, slavery, and terror. It fits the kind of world government we would suffer if the present Soviet Communist federation achieved its dream of bringing all the world under its law. That law has proved more than adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression with its present jurisdiction.

I know that this kind of world government and law is far from the one the backers of the World Federation resolution have in mind, and so I trust they will welcome its being made clear that they aim at a free government. We Americans, and a number of other Atlantic peoples, have long insisted on something more than peace and law—a something called freedom. To secure this freedom we, and these other peoples, have sacrificed peace more than once.

True, our forefathers sought to insert no safeguards for individual freedom in the alliance they made with the French Bourbon autocracy during the War for Independence. But when they turned to the task of constituting a federation—a government, instead of a mere association of governments—they did not attempt the impossible feat of making it with their autocratic French ally, or with their allies among the Indian nations who had little notion of free, representative government. They were careful to limit the enterprise of constituting government to those peoples who were willing and able to build it on a free basis. And they climaxed the preamble of their, and our, Constitution with a declaration that its aim was to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Experience proves that it can be practicable and wise for free governments to cooperate to some degree with dictatorial governments not only in alliances but in leagues such as the UN. Such associations by their nature must be formed without individual liberty being effectively safeguarded in the treaty establishing them.

To constitute a federation, a government, is—it cannot be emphasized too much—quite a different thing from forming an alliance, league, or other association of governments.

Since Americans began constituting government—as early as 1639 in federating the three towns that formed the Colony of Connecticut—they have always been careful to make sure that the government was not only of the people, operating directly on them as citizens, but was by and for the people—for their individual freedom. Surely every American would want this precedent maintained now when freedom is so threatened, and would not, on second thought, seek, as the fundamental objective of United States policy, the formation of a world government that gave no safeguard for human liberty. Perhaps I should add that Union Now, though it popularized the ideal of world government as far back as 1939, insisted that freedom must be the basis and the aim of any such government.

To strengthen the UN: Apart from safeguarding individual freedom, the only other important changes that my amendment makes in the World Federation resolution may be thus clarified:

The World Federation resolution, as it now stands, permits its objective to be achieved only through the development of the UN, and risks having the objective interpreted as an immediate one. My amendment, while calling for the strengthening of the UN and permitting us to make the most of every opportunity to develop it into a world government, does not restrict us to achieving a free world federation only by amendment of the Charter or other action by the UN. It leaves all possibilities open, and there should be no objection to that.

While keeping the strengthening of the UN as an immediate goal, my amendment, moreover, makes clear that world federation is “a more distant goal.” It thus guards against the resolution, once adopted, being interpreted as authorizing immediate or premature attempts by the United States to change the UN into a world federation. In my judgment, such attempts could result only in wrecking the sole world political organization mankind now possesses, and leaving the nations not only sharply divided into two camps but lacking even the common meeting place that Lake Success now provides.

The Kremlin would veto any attempt to develop the UN into a free world federation, and the United States would veto any move to convert it into an autocratic world government. Consequently, there would seem to be no possibility of changing it into either so long as dictatorship rules the U. S. S. R., and freedom rules the U. S. A.

Some argue that the United States should nonetheless immediately make an attempt to amend the Charter, either to make it a world government or at least to abolish the veto—which is also certain to be vetoed by the Kremlin. They contend this would improve our moral position and fix the responsibility for failure on Soviet Russia. They assume the UN would continue thereafter as before, and believe it would then be safe for the United States to form within the UN a federation of all the nations that had proved willing to federate when the offer was made to Moscow.

My 10 years of experience covering the League of Nations for the New York Times helps convince me that all this, though it seems quite plausible, is very unsound speculation.

Unless one is aiming to go to war, and is ready for war, it is wiser not to try to pin down certain responsibilities, or to attempt to

maneuver a great power into too openly humiliating a hole. A careful jockeying for moral position is too often the immediate prelude to war. It is very likely to be, if one of the disputants is more concerned with fixing blame on the other than with facing him with power too effective and overwhelming to be challenged.

A federation formed by the above process—that is, one that would combine those nations, excluding Russia, which do accept the offer—would not only tauten present tension to the breaking point, but it would invite attack. Those who assume it would be stronger than the proposed Atlantic Union repeat a time-honored error, the one that brought the Persians to grief at Marathon and Salamis. They confuse mere numbers with power. They reckon the loosely organized horde to be stronger than the smaller but closely knit phalanx.

Above all, they overlook two basic facts: One is that it is extremely difficult to establish and maintain a free representative government on an effective and stable basis. It is so difficult to do, that—apart from the seven democracies who sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty—only half a dozen or so of all the many nations of the world have succeeded in doing this for as long as 50 years even within their national boundaries, where they have all the advantages of a common language, a common history and culture, and a contiguous territory. To establish and maintain an effective free government between nations is manifestly a far more difficult task. The greater the number of inexperienced democracies—to say nothing of dictatorships—who are invited to help draft the federation's constitution, the more difficult, not to say impossible, the task becomes.

Assume, however, that 40 or 50 nations that have never constituted or maintained a free government in their own territory achieve the miracle of constituting such a government on a world scale, of transforming the UN as a body into a federal government—assume this miracle, and there remains a still greater miracle we must then assume. For what assurance have we that such a world government would effectively endure, would be stable, even as stable as most national governments are? Can we, or any other democracy, safely trust today in such a double miracle, trust in it to the point of confiding to this federation, at this stage of human development, the armed power on which we now depend for the defense of freedom and the maintenance of peace?

Remember, we must assume, too, that the huge Communist bloc would be outside of this federation, busily arming atomically. Could we wisely trust freedom's future defense against dictatorship to a federal government constituted by 50 nations that have not yet succeeded in maintaining an effective free government on their own territory for even 50 years?

The second basic fact that is overlooked in the reasoning behind the present World Federation resolution is this: The great bulk of non-Communist armed, industrial, and developed raw material power in the world today is in the hands of the few North Atlantic democracies with which the Atlantic Union resolution would begin the formation of a world federal union. These democracies are experienced in constituting and maintaining free government. Moreover, because of their greater community of interest and stronger natural bonds, they can be much more closely knit together than they can be federated now

with a large number of divergent, inexperienced democracies or dictatorships.

To try to federate all the non-Communist world does not change the facts of power; it can result only in shifting away from the experienced Atlantic democracies more or less of the control they now possess over their power. If they should consent to enough shift of control to make the federation a real federation—which is highly unlikely—they would merely be placing their power in less experienced hands. What could encourage the Kremlin more? If they refused thus to shift control of their power, the result would be another loose league instead of a federation. Would another, smaller UN overawe the Kremlin?

By taking either course we would not only sacrifice the overwhelmingly powerful federal union we could make with the other Atlantic democracies but we would sacrifice precious time. The Kremlin could string out the discussion of any Charter amendment as it did the vain proposal for a world atomic authority. While the negotiations for the latter went on, the Kremlin succeeded in learning how to make an atomic explosion. Shall we waste more time now on attempts to strengthen the UN and achieve world federation that require us to begin by asking the Kremlin's consent, while it develops the hydrogen bomb?

Before we consider further so dangerous a course, let us rid ourselves of the notion that such a proposal to change the Charter would, when if failed, leave the UN still functioning as before. True, if an amendment to the United States Constitution fails of adoption, the government goes on unchanged, and so it is not surprising that many assume the same would be the case in the UN.

But suppose a powerful group of our 48 States proposed to change our Constitution fundamentally—to make it, for example, a dictatorship, or to change it from a federal union into a league of States from which any State could secede. If they failed to get their way, would the United States still continue as before, or would it be wrecked, and probably plunged into civil war by the bitter controversy this attempt inflamed?

Certainly, if the United States could not survive peacefully such an attempt to change its basic character despite a powerful minority, the much weaker and younger UN would be destroyed, for all practical purposes, by any American move to abolish the veto or change the Charter into a world government—while dictatorship rules the Kremlin and the Atlantic democracies remain unfederated.

Why embark on a policy that so gravely endangers our best remaining bridge to Soviet Russia, while giving the Kremlin time to stockpile atomic bombs—and make hydrogen bombs—before we even attempt to federate with our closest and strongest friends?

The Atlantic Union resolution avoids these perils. There is nothing in the UN Charter preventing any members from going the limit toward achieving its ideals by mutually, peacefully uniting in an organic federal union. Such union requires no action by the UN. The Atlantic Union resolution takes advantage of this fact. We can call the Federal Convention it proposes without having first to ask the Kremlin's consent. We thus avoid waste of precious time. We also avoid the kind of debate that would ruin the UN.

We preserve it, too, by not attempting to federate all its non-Communist members, but only a few Atlantic democracies at the start. We do not split it into two clear-cut camps; we leave the greatest number of its members where they are today, in between us and the Kremlin. The procedure we follow involves no more danger of offending nations by making them feel excluded than did the same procedure which we followed in drafting the Atlantic Pact. That pact not only left most of the nations outside, it has left them morally certain to be on our side in an emergency, and so would the Atlantic Union. For the Atlantic Union would be no threat to them but a protection—and the only place where they could sell their products and get the manufactured goods they need.

The addition of paragraph 2 to the Atlantic Union resolution is a valuable further guaranty of the friendship of all the inexperienced democracies. The unhappy fact is that we split the world into two camps only if we adopt the present text of the World Federation resolution—though that is the very thing its advocates seek to avoid. Their only hope of avoiding this danger is a hope that many of them have privately admitted to me is a very forlorn one indeed. It is the hope that the Communist dictatorship will not only help constitute a world federation but will help form it on a free and enduring basis. But if the Kremlin refuses to do all this, if it (1) vetoes changing the UN into a federation, or (2) vetoes changing it into a free federation, or (3) by its unexcelled conspiratorial techniques it sabotages and overthrows such a federation after it is formed, then, by the present World Federation resolution, we would be left with the world clearly split into two sharply defined worlds, the Communist and the non-Communist. The text I propose would avoid this danger. It would allow the free to be as strongly united as the Communists—but could leave most of the nations in between them.

By the Atlantic Union resolution we preserve the Charter's bridge to the Russian people, and at the same time all the possibilities the Charter gives of lining up a coalition of all the non-Communist world behind the Union in the improbable event the Kremlin should threaten this powerful Atlantic Union. In this connection, I would like to add to this statement an article by Livingston Hartley in the January 1950 *Freedom & Union*. It shows that the Atlantic Union could line up a coalition of more than 60 percent of the world—virtually as much as a non-Communist world federation. Even though the UN is not strong enough to insure peace, and even though it cannot be seriously strengthened by Charter amendment, it still can perform so many valuable services to peace that we should seek to preserve it.

The Atlantic Union resolution, in short, would avoid the dangers other policies involve, would preserve the UN and strengthen it in substance, and, by my amendment, would commit us to the goal of ultimate free world federation. And yet it would let us begin at once to explore whether we can now form the nucleus of such a free federal union with the other sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact. If we cannot federate with them, how can we hope to federate effectively with the rest of the world now? And if we can join with them in a federal union of the free—as I am confident we can, difficult though even such federation is—we can confront the Kremlin in good time with far more power than we can otherwise put behind freedom and

peace, and at far less cost. We can thus block its scheme to win the world through economic disaster and further monetary depreciation in the Atlantic area. We can confront the Kremlin with such immense armed, industrial, financial, raw material, and moral power that Soviet Russia dare not challenge it.

Thus we can stabilize the world situation long enough for the slow evolution needed to attain without world war our ultimate objective—a free federation of all the world. By this policy we wed the practical to the ideal. And we do more.

We promptly begin to carry out the pledges in the Atlantic Pact that commit us and our allies—

to safeguard the freedom * * * of their peoples, founded on the principles of * * * individual liberty—

and—

to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded.

Our American freedom is based on our Federal Constitution, and nothing could contribute more to a better understanding of its principles than to explore in a Federal Constitutional Convention the possibility of our unity through these principles with the other sponsors of the Atlantic Pact. By this policy we keep freedom first. We recognize and act on it for what freedom truly is—the key to peace.

Chairman KEE. We will adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10:30 a. m., at which time we will hear from Mr. McCloy recently returned from Germany, who will be with us in executive session. The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:03 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

APPENDIX

ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE

The Honorable JOHN KEE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee, The Capitol.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEE: As the spokesman for a delegation of members of the Atlantic Union Committee, who, reposing confidence in your leadership in the present critical world situation, on behalf of the members of that committee and for myself, I respectfully urge your consideration of the following statements:

The forces of freedom have bled themselves white physically and economically in defending, twice within one generation, the freedom they value more than life itself.

These forces have, on each occasion, subordinated their nationalism to the united effort to overcome the forces of aggressive autocracy.

The United States has, as a result of her contributions in these struggles, succeeded to the leadership of the free world. Free people throughout the world today look to us for both moral leadership and physical assistance. They recognize the unselfishness with which we have poured out our substance to support our less fortunate brethren.

We suggest, Mr. Chairman, that subsequent events have demonstrated the inadequacy, each in its turn, of the measures of support we have so far undertaken. These measures, however, have bought valuable time in which to undertake steps which are adequate to meet the challenge we and all free peoples face.

Communist despotism, following the tenets of its prophets and founders, has now extended its grip over a third of mankind. These tenets call for its continued extension until it engulfs the other two-thirds, including ourselves.

A parallel may be drawn between the lack of unity among the free peoples today and that which divided our forefathers into 13 bankrupt and discordant states in their "League of friendship."

The principles they then applied brought order out of chaos. They preserved individual freedom and self-government. They have brought more blessings to more people than any other system yet conceived. And these same principles, wherever applied, have brought beneficial and enduring results.

The application of these principles in a citizen-to-citizen rather than nation-to-nation solution is the broad, but today neglected, road blazed by the founders of this country. We cannot urge too strongly your leadership in bringing about early exploration of this road.

Such an exploratory effort is called for by the Atlantic Union Resolution which was introduced into Congress July 26. It involves no advance commitments. It does not obstruct or condemn previous or present policies and methods. Requiring no Charter amendments, it would leave the United Nations intact. Its success would strengthen the United Nations.

The Atlantic Union Committee is less than 1 year old. In this short time it has enlisted the support of thousands of citizens throughout the country. It has chartered chapters or community leaders in every State of the Union. From the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to the Gulf—from Key West to Seattle and from Bangor to Twenty Nine Palms its membership is increasing rapidly.

The merit of the Atlantic Union Resolution has attracted the support of more than 50 Senators and Congressmen. They are encouraged in their support by the active interest of increasing numbers of their constituents.

We believe that the exploratory convention called for by this resolution can find the answers to our problems today as did the convention which met at Philadelphia in 1787, and that these answers can bring the American people and other free peoples both peace and prosperity.

History pays homage to the leadership and vision which brought about that earlier convention. History is now selecting those to whom similar homage will be paid by future generations.

Yours respectfully,

OWEN J. ROBERTS, *President,*
Atlantic Union Committee.

[H. Con. Res. 108, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security"; and

Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of thirteen sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the North Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

Whereas these federal union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

Whereas the United States, together with the other signatories to the treaty, has promised to bring about a better understanding of these federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

Whereas the United States and the other six countries which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to invite the countries which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other countries as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

LIST OF DELEGATION—ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE

Henry E. Atwood, president, First National Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, civic leader, Washington, D. C.
 Robert J. Bishop, attorney and citrus grower, Orlando, Fla.
 Rev. A. Powell Davies, pastor, All Souls' Church, Washington, D. C.
 Dr. A. V. Grosse, atomic scientist, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Livingston Hartley, author, Washington, D. C.
 Gilbert Lamb, frozen foods, Milton, Oreg.
 Mr. and Mrs. L. B. McIntire, certified public accountant, Louisville, Ky.
 Mrs. Stewart Y. McMullen, civic leader, Glencoe, Ill.
 Mrs. Walter Miller, civic leader, Alexandria, Va.
 Garrison Norton, former assistant secretary of State, Washington, D. C., and New York.
 Victor Reinemer, rancher, Circle, Mont.
 Roy F. Steward, patent attorney, Meriden, Conn.
 Mrs. Sara Sommer, civic leader, Peoria, Ill.
 Mr. and Mrs. Clarence K. Streit, author, Washington, D. C.
 Senator Estes Kefauver, Tennessee.
 Congressman Hale Boggs, Louisiana.
 Congressman James W. Wadsworth, New York.
 L. H. Schultz, president, Blue Bus Lines, Batavia, N. Y.
 Mrs. Laurance Martin, civic leader, Evanston, Ill.
 Wilbur L. Dunbar, economist, North Manchester, Ind.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF MAYFLOWER DESCENDANTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ADOPTED JANUARY 31, 1950, IN RE PROPOSED WORLD GOVERNMENT

At a meeting of the board of assistants, the governing authority of the Society of Mayflower descendants in the District of Columbia, held in the city of Washington, on January 31, 1950, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, to wit:

Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States proposals for the establishment of a so-called world government, to embrace all nations and peoples of the earth, with the United States of America as a constituent member; and

Whereas because of the wide divergences, prejudices, antagonisms, distrusts and misconceptions attendant upon the existing differences of race, custom, creed, religion, speech, economic aim, interest, and need, political concept, ideal, ideology and ambition; and because, also, of the inherent urge and force of self-interest and demagogic appeal everywhere to be encountered—a single government, created for all lands and tongues, functioning with power, authority and universal harmony and beneficence, is absolutely impossible and out of the question; and any reign thus set up would prove to be a veritable Babel of criminal folly and confusion; and

Whereas the joinder of our own nation in such a tragic and colossal misadventure would surely result in the overthrow of its system of liberty and constitutional government, and the regulation of its internal and domestic affairs; the inevitable loss of its nationality and freedom; the destruction of its unexampled enterprise and progress; the ultimate depletion and pillage—for the world at large—of its vast resources; and its reduction to a condition of hopeless impotence and futility: be it, therefore

Resolved, that the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia absolutely opposes any and all efforts for the establishment of such world organization, and respectfully calls on the American Congress to register its prompt and overwhelming disapproval of all such schemes and proposals; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be furnished to the Congress and its appropriate committees, for their consideration.

×