
"The Goal is Government of All the World"

By *ELMO ROPER*

In this address, made to the Montclair Forum, Mr. Elmo Roper, public opinion analyst and Treasurer of the Atlantic Union Committee, says:

"I judge all moves in the international arena on the basis of whether they are leading toward government of all the world, with peace, and freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, freedom of religion for all."

He then sketches the practical steps leading to this goal.



ORIGINAL RESOLUTION

THE ATLANTIC UNION 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 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 SENATE (the House of Representatives 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.

FEDERAL UNION—THE WAY TO ONE WORLD

Four years ago the United Nations was born.

A year ago the Marshall Plan passed in Congress.

Recently, the North Atlantic Security Pact was ratified in Washington.

Next year I hope the first constitutional convention of the Atlantic Union will be going on. And in not too many years from now, I hope that we will attain One World in reality.

I want to talk now about a Federal Union of the Free, about a world government. This idea of world government is something more than just a fervent plea or an idealistic hope. It is a concrete "must" if men are to survive in a world free from wars: And I think the cause of world government is making progress.

It might be well to remember that it was only several years ago that Wendell Willkie made his historic globe-circling One World flight. He came back to tell the American people and people everywhere that this is actually One World in which we are living and that it's time we, the occupants, realized it.

He said, "When I say that peace must be planned on a *world* basis, I mean quite literally that it must embrace the earth. Continents and oceans are plainly only parts of the whole, seen, as I have seen them, from the air. England and America are parts. Russia and China, Egypt, India, Syria and Turkey, Iraq and Iran are also parts. And it is inescapable that there can be no peace for any part of the world unless the foundations of peace are made secure throughout all parts of the world."

As I reread these words, it seems inconceivable that Willkie's idea of One World is only six short years old.

Well, how should we interpret Willkie's One World today? The present impasse between East and West hardly indicates that we are headed for One World and peace. The talk we hear is of war and of prevention of war. There is little talk of positively building the peace.

But I think we should not give up on One World—not

by any manner of means. The fundamental proposition that there can be planning for peace only on a world-wide basis is still inherently sound. But when we plan for anything, when we map out a goal, we usually shoot for more than we can get right away. And, today, if we plan for world peace through a world state, we must not give up the *idea* of a world state simply because some nations will not go along with it *at the moment*.

It might take us a decade, or four decades, or a century, to achieve One World.

At this point, let me confess my own bias so you'll know how much to discount the balance of what I have to say. First, I'd like to say that the ultimate goal is not a government of a part of the world, however large or powerful or compatible that part might be.

The goal is a government of all the world.

Second, let me say that while I see Peace as one of the most attractive goals I can imagine, it is no more attractive to me than is Freedom—freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.

So my bias is that I find myself judging all moves in the international arena on the basis of whether or not, in my best judgment, they are leading toward a government of all the world, with Peace and these Freedoms for all.

If in my opinion they *are* leading there, or *can* lead there, they seem to me good.

If not, they don't seem good.

Now that you have the simple, one-track philosophy on which I operate you'll know best how much of what I say you want to discount.

We must start building toward One World now, today, positively, with a clear head and with a firm faith that if we can lay one stone in the foundation we will be able to lay more stones there, and, eventually, build a structure of peace.

Let us all recognize that military preparedness—essential as it is—by itself will not achieve One World. In fact, alone and by itself it might well achieve an even more divided world. We need something more positive than a

counter threat to war. Stopping Communism is only the negative side of the coin. We must, I think, turn the coin over and start out on the positive side.

And I can think of no more positive or more practical tack to take these days than that suggested by Federal Union. Let me briefly describe to you my concept of what federal union is.

HOW FEDERAL UNION WOULD WORK

Federal Union is a proposed union of the governments whose people believe in the dignity of the individual and in freedom. Sometimes these are loosely called the civil liberty governments. Such nations as Norway, Canada, Denmark, Italy, France, Great Britain, our own United States and others of those who recently signed the North Atlantic Pact would qualify—at least on a rough yardstick—as some of the civil liberty governments.

These governments would merge into a single Atlantic Federal Union. Such a union would have the right to conduct foreign relations, maintain armed forces, issue currency, regulate commerce and communications between states in the Union, and grant Union citizenship. The Union must have the power to tax and to uphold its own Bill of Rights. The distribution of executive, legislative, and judicial powers which would be left to the member states would all have to be worked out in a Constitutional convention.

There would be no veto in this Union, other than the limited kind of veto the President of the United States has now. The only absolute veto in the Union would be the collective veto that each branch of its Congress would have. For no law could be passed without the consent of a majority in both the House and Senate.

Under at least one of the many plans for Federal Union the large democracies would be safeguarded by the fact that representation in the House would be apportioned according to population. Thus—just as an example of how it *might* be done—if each congressional district in the Union had 1 million population, the American people would elect 140 representatives; the British, 48; the French, 40; the

Canadians, 12; the Dutch, 9; Belgians, 8; Danes, 4; Norwegians, 3; and so on. The smaller nations would be safeguarded through the Senate where, if the United States' example were followed, every nation would elect two Senators. The party system would cut across national lines in both houses and thus serve as another safeguard against any nation's dominating or blocking the others.

Perhaps a good deal of this sounds familiar as I describe one possible framework of this new Union of the Free. There have been other federal unions, which have successfully stood the tests of governing, such as Canada and Switzerland, both of which are multilingual nations.

But of course the finest and first example of a federal union which has worked is that of our own country, the United States of America.

AMERICA—AN EXAMPLE OF SUCCESSFUL FEDERAL UNION

You will recall that the 13 original colonies fought a war of independence and then almost immediately thereafter began feuding amongst themselves. In 1786, 10 years after Lexington and Concord, trade disputes threatened war among New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey. Territorial disputes led to bloodshed, and threat of war between New York, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and between Connecticut and Pennsylvania.

The distinguished Dean of Gloucester, Josiah Tucker, undoubtedly reflected the gloomy outlook of 1786 when he wrote in England: "As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchical, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes, and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatsoever; a disunited people, till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will

be divided and sub-divided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains.

How familiar those words sound now, but how unprophetic those words proved to be! In two hard years of debate and argument and meeting, the idea of union was achieved by our founding forefathers. And the constitution then adopted and later ratified by the states still stands—with the amendments *it* provided for—as the governing instruments not merely for 13 states, but for 48, and not just for 3 million persons, but for almost 150 million people.

Now it is proposed that this principle of Union be extended beyond the 48 United States to include as many of the freedom-loving, civil liberty states as want to join. The price of admission to this Union of the Free would be that each member government have a basic regard for the worth of the individual and guarantee his rights. Obviously this involves, and in a sense is dependent on, freedom of speech and thought.

ADVANTAGES OF FEDERAL UNION

The advantages of such a Union as another step toward One World would be enormous. First, it would mean that the strength of freedom-loving nations would be rallied together and united for the first time in the history of the world. And I mean by strength the strength of freedom—the moral will to preserve and extend freedom on a permanent, peacetime basis.

Second, such a union would bring together peoples doing about three-quarters of the world's trade and having a tremendous productive power. Here, indeed, would be the economic hub of the universe.

Third, by merging their institutions and resources, these member states of the union would automatically provide the singly greatest counter-force to any potential aggressor.

By having such a Union, the cause of peace would be

enhanced. By raising living standards, by extending freedom to an ever-widening circle of people, the conditions for a lasting peace would be fostered. The attention of the world might well be taken off the impending collision of the modern Leviathans—the United States and Russia—and would be focused on the task of making democracy work on a larger scale than ever before.

Cooperation in recovery could be made the prime business of the Union, replacing in large measure, the traditional struggle among states for the survival of the fittest.

The impact of such a union upon any aggressive designs there may be on the part of Soviet Russia or any other power would be decisive. Here there would be a living example of democracy in action on an expanding scale. The chaos and disunity on which absolutes such as fascism and communism thrive would be diminished and finally expelled. The political and economic appeal of communism would be largely if not wholly negated. The military threat of the Red Army would pale by comparison with the united potential defensive might of the new Union. The economic progress and the rise in standards of living and standards of education could be enormous indeed.

It would be a step toward making democracy dynamic rather than static. While it would, for practical reasons, include only those governments whose people were like minded on a few basic principles such as a desire for peace, the dignity of the individual, and the four freedoms, it would seek to continue to be dynamic, continue to show to others by living example the advantages of democracy. It would continue to expand the acceptance of these principles, and would finally expand its membership until it included all the peoples of the world who believed in them regardless of how much they differed in other respects—as our Mississippi, for example, sometimes differs in other respects from our Vermont.

WHO WOULD BELONG TO FEDERAL UNION?

I'm sure there are certain questions which have arisen in your mind, just as they did in mine, when this idea of

Federal Union was first broached to me. For example, it might well be asked, "Why are only the so-called civil liberty democracies to be included in this Union at first?" Part of the answer is that if all the nations of the world were to sit down *now* around a table, and were asked to live by a constitution and bill of rights and to permit a free press, some might find it impossible to do so. The difficulties in such a convention might well split up the union before even an elemental structural framework could be completed.

And there is another and even more compelling reason. Many of the nations of the world, the Soviet Union chief among them, would not consent to a world government now if that world government recognized the dignity of the individual and guaranteed the four freedoms. It seems to me, at least, that no other kind of world state could succeed. We Federal Unionists believe—with regret—that not all the nations would be genuinely willing to form such a union at this time.

But the fact of the matter is that we must start to build some sort of a world government now. And the nations which would most likely go along with the idea would be the civil liberty nations.

If ten—or twenty—or thirty—nations are ready to take ten steps now toward the goal of world government, I believe the taking of those ten steps will do more to achieve the goal than were we to do nothing but wait until all nations were ready for two steps. If I am wrong in this, it is simply an error in judgment as to methods; it is not that I have given up achieving the ultimate goal of One World.

Some have said, isn't this saying that we believe in world government but not for all of the world? Let me make this emphatically clear.

At no point should membership in this Union of the Free be limited to just those countries which happen to be in it.

The door must be kept wide open for the time when all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world will be ready to come in. Such a union must make it abundantly

clear to the rest of the world that this is no closed corporation, but is open to all who wish to meet the simple criteria of believing in the Four Freedoms and the dignity of the individual.

FEDERAL UNION TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

It has been said that any form of international organization outside of the United Nations is a move to undermine and ultimately destroy the UN. As I see it, this proposed Federal Union should not, could not and would not supplant the United Nations in any way.

You can believe in the Union and also believe in the UN. The Union would make the UN stronger. The most difficult problem the United Nations has faced is that there hasn't been a *unified* enough force within it devoted to, and working toward, peace to give it the strength it needs to enforce its decisions and make the needed progress.

The Union of the Free would be a member state in the United Nations. And this is an important point, because the UN must be preserved as a sounding board for open discussion and an airing of differences between all nations. It must continue to be the town meeting of the world. It is better to have the harsh words of Gromyko come hurtling across the conference table at Lake Success than to have Russian-adapted V-2's come hurtling across the Arctic wastes. Better, too, than to have our own atomic bomb dropped on Russia.

At the moment not all of the United Nations' problems concern the clash between the West and the East. In fact, easily one-third of the disagreements in the United Nations have been among the so-called democracies. The difficulties over Palestine are but one illustration. Or the Dutch in Indonesia is another. Or the civil war in India. Such a Union would automatically solve a great many of these disputes, since a single parliament would legislate for all of the states involved, and a single judicial system would make the single code of law clear and a single executive branch would carry out the acts of the Union. And a

single police force would maintain order between states in conflict.

FEDERAL UNION TO EXTEND SOVEREIGNTY

There is one further point of explanation. And that is the age-old bugaboo of national sovereignty. It has been claimed that *American* rights would be invaded, that the independence of the United States would be imperiled if we were to join a world state or even a Union such as I am advocating as another step toward a world state.

It is abundantly clear that the citizens of the United States, not the government of the United States, are sovereign, in the last analysis. The citizens put governmental authority where they want it.

They keep certain basic rights to themselves and delegate their share of authority in some fields to the national government, in others to their individual state governments.

By creating the new union, we, the citizens, would merely transfer to our delegates in the Union some of the power we now delegate to our representatives in Washington. Our United States government would continue to administer internal affairs of the United States, while our representatives in the Union government would deal with those problems which properly belong to the Union. To be sure, our *national government* would lose some of its authority, just as the 13 *state governments* did when the United States was formed, but the *citizens* would *extend* rather than weaken their sovereignty. Each of us would retain our United States citizenship, and in addition we would gain a more powerful and freer status—by becoming also citizens of the Union of the Free.

Up to now, I have said that if we joined this Union, such and such would happen. This has all been predicated on an "if"—what at first glance might seem to be a highly problematic "if."

But actually, today, at this very moment, we are right next door to such a union. We stand on the threshold of such an arrangement with our partners in Western Europe.

FEDERAL UNION IS A PRACTICAL POSSIBILITY NOW

Despite the disintegration of relations between our wartime allies, these past few years have seen the beginnings of a new union among the freedom-loving nations. Partly as a result of the external pressures of Russian expansion, and partly as a result of the newly-learned lesson of unifying to meet common needs the nations of the West have grown steadily together. The circumstances of our times have telescoped what might have been the history of a century into the history of a comparatively few years.

When we finally put out the flames of world war in 1945, we started from a long way back, almost from less than scratch. As Winston Churchill told us about a month ago, "Little did we guess that what has been called the Century of the Common Man would witness as its outstanding feature more common men killing each other with greater facilities than any other five centuries put together in the history of the world."

We began this postwar period with almost half the world laid waste from the devastation of war. The most immediate task was reconstruction. Perhaps we did not realize then as we do now that the job of reconstruction would soon become synonymous with building the peace.

After the initial efforts of UNNRA to meet the most urgent emergency food and clothing needs of the people of war-devastated lands, it became clear that we had to think about reconstruction on a more fundamental basis. Not only was there need to send the Europeans the consumer goods with which to prevent starvation, but we had to begin sending them the machine tools with which they could produce their own consumer goods.

This was the underlying motive behind the Marshall Plan. It got together 19 of the nations of Western Europe, set them around a table, and said, you draw up a balance sheet of your needs. We will draw up a balance sheet of our resources. *Plan*, not as one nation, or as separate sovereign states, but instead as an integrated economic unit.

And let us not forget that Russia and Czechoslovakia

and Poland and other nations were invited to participate and refused.

The results of the Marshall Plan are well-known. In one year, some very concrete results have been produced. In Great Britain, clothing rationing has been removed, and Sir Stafford Cripps reports that within another year or two it may be possible for the British to have a favorable export balance—for the first time in well over 10 years.

In France, the crippling inflation has apparently been halted, and the French franc is beginning to take on a more stable value. This means that in France, the catastrophic chase of rising wages after runaway prices might very well be ending.

In country after country, there are bright reports on the progress of reconstruction as a result of the efforts of the Europeans themselves.

But in the process of meeting the needs of reconstruction, something important and significant has taken place among the European nations. The closer they work together, the more each country identifies its own welfare with the welfare of the whole. And, on their own initiative, the countries of Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg have formed a kind of European Union. The larger bloc of 19 Marshall Plan nations have formed continuing committees to handle all phases of their joint economic activity. There are tariff committees, trade union committees, and many others.

These 19 Western European states have formed themselves more nearly into a union than any one imagined could have been possible three years ago. *To be sure, there are still questions of a free flow of goods between all of the nations, and there are severe currency problems in need of solution. And the economic planning is not as integrated as it is, let us say, within the borders of any given nation.* These problems have helped precipitate the present economic crisis in Britain, and the trade difficulties throughout Europe.

But for all of the difficulties and the traditional jealousies and stumbling blocks, the unity of Western Europe is being slowly forged. It is being forged really into a basic

unity of the Western World—a Union of the Atlantic nations. For the raw materials of nations on *this* side of the Atlantic have become indispensable to the industrial development of the countries on the other side of the Atlantic.

The important news which has come out of the Marshall Plan is that nation-states are committing themselves in the economic sphere to greater interdependence.

We are, I think, on the road toward economic union with our 19 Marshall Plan partners in Europe.

But it is true that men quite literally cannot live on bread alone. In this modern world, they must have other things and among them is military security. War probably won't be prevented until we have One World and while wars may have economic and political roots, they are settled in large part by military superiority. To feel secure from attack has become one of the marks of general security in this atomic world.

Thus it is that in an elaborate ceremony in Washington, the foreign ministers of 12 Atlantic nations signed the North Atlantic Security Pact, which pledges each member nation to go to the assistance of any other member state which is attacked. It is a mutual defense pact, and all of the signatories have emphasized its defensive nature.

For us here in America, the Pact marks at least the beginning of our formal commitment to support our democratic neighbors by force of arms if necessary. Under the plans of the implementation of the Pact, there will be a common defense strategy developed among the 12 Atlantic Pact signatories. The decision as to whether we go to war will, of course, still be reserved to the Congress of the United States. But the strategy of defense, the deployment of forces, the assessments of strength and weakness—all this will be developed out of a common military pool.

Yet, the Pact by itself is a negative step. It is a move to protect against war. It will not automatically insure the peace, as perhaps some of its more enthusiastic advocates seem to imply. If it should stand as our *last* step toward more unity, it might be argued either that it would eventually provoke war or that because of its preponder-

ance of armed forces, it will be an effective discouragement to any potential aggressor. But in any event it will not automatically insure peace—that is a more positive business.

But the Atlantic Pact need *not* be our last effort toward greater unity. It can be converted into one more sound and important step working toward world peace. It can be one of the most positive moves in the direction of One World. For it provides an additional part of the house of Federal Union.

Let's recapitulate a bit: through the Marshall Plan, we are forging a basic economic unity. Through the Atlantic Pact, we can have a common military strategy. Yet, these two are only part of the necessary steps which will secure the peace. We must look beyond the time when the Senate will ratify the Atlantic Pact, and must plan our next and perhaps most crucial step. Please note I did not say the *final* step. I said the *next* step.

As I see it, that next practical step is the formation of an Atlantic Union of the Free, which will expand the existing cooperation under the European Recovery Program and the Atlantic Pact into a basis for building a common political structure.

For it becomes clear that the first step toward World Government cannot be completed until we have advanced on four fronts; the economic, the military, the political, and the social. By chance, the economic came first, and that was a very positive step. The military has now come next, and that is a necessary defensive step. The political must come next, and the social will follow the political organization.

PURPOSE OF THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE

Several of us who have been interested in World Government for several years now have come together to form the Atlantic Union Committee. Our objective in the Atlantic Union Committee is to have the Congress pass a resolution supporting the calling of a constitutional convention of at least the Atlantic Pact sponsors, possibly others among the civil liberty nations—such as the rest of

the Marshall Plan nations, for example. Such a Resolution has already been introduced in the House and Senate. The convention, for which it calls, would explore the possibilities of a political, economic, and military union among the democracies in the Atlantic area. It would undoubtedly take a constitutional amendment for the United States to agree to participate in such a political union. It is true that some of our traditional rules of governmental organization would have to undergo some change.

But we would gain from such a step the real consolidation of freedom in at least a large and powerful part of the world. We will be taking another and even more decisive step in breaking down national barriers and moving toward a true government of the world. The door should always be held wide open to any nation whose people believe in the four freedoms and in the dignity of individual citizens as a good basis for government.

Such an Atlantic Union would be a member of the United Nations and would immeasurably strengthen the UN by its positive influence. There *would* be nothing—and there *must* be nothing—in such a union which would be out of consonance with the aims and objectives of the UN.

I'm sure some of you are wondering whether or not such a union, which left Russia out for the present, wouldn't have a chance of precipitating war. Of course, it would have a *chance* of precipitating war. But the isolation of the democratically-minded sovereign state democracies has already helped precipitate two wars and might just as easily precipitate a third. The only thing men of good will can do is to appraise the chances as best they can.

For my part, I have concluded that the power of such a federal union as I have described is more apt to prevent war than to precipitate it.

If time weren't pressing we might well sit back and wait for developments. But some of us believe time is running out and that we must risk action. In taking action we all have to risk being wrong. To me, inaction is more risky than action. Inaction on the part of the democracies has already produced two world wars in 25 years.

I feel very sure that a union of democratically-minded peoples would be in a position to make democracy dynamic. The word "dynamic" has for far too long been associated with non-democratic philosophies.

There has been much discussion of World Government in forums throughout the country. There are several groups who are working energetically and actively for World Government. In our surveys, we have found that sentiment has risen from a fairly small 16 per cent three years ago to close to 25 to 30 per cent of the people a few months ago. One eminently effective group in the world government field has been the World Federalists, headed by Cord Meyer, with help from such people as Will Clayton and others.

On this Atlantic Union Committee, Federal Union people, like Justice Roberts, and World Federalist people like Will Clayton, and other world government advocates have joined together in what I hope can become a common effort to see one very practical step toward world government taken. Atlantic Union is not just a possibility. It is bordering on being a reality. World Government is not just a dream which Clarence Streit and Cord Meyer and others have dreamed up. It is not merely a fine, idealistic concept which would be good if we could do it.

We do not accomplish these things overnight. We do not expect to transform petty nationalisms into a shining world state through some miracle of atomic transformation. We must proceed wherever freedom is afoot, wherever free men are. It has never been an American tradition—for that matter it has never been a human tradition—to refuse to keep trying to accomplish the difficult, if the difficult is good. In a world where space has been shrunk by the airplane and where the time we have in which to save ourselves has been shortened by the atomic bomb, we must take steps toward our own salvation rapidly. Peace and Plenty and Freedom are the primary goals. World planning for Peace and Plenty—as Willkie said—must be undertaken on a world-wide basis. We may have to get it a little at a time. But we must get it in order to survive.

This booklet is a reproduction of the original, which explains the added pages and some underlining. It is the plan and final GOAL of the Atlantic Union Committee for their idea of World Government, written (a speech) by Elmo Roper, then AUC Treas., but AUC President, when their resolution S.J. 170 was passed by Congress. Since it was greatly "camouflaged" to cover this fact, we feel this is of great importance at this time. This AUC res. was introduced several times in Congress by Sen. Estes Kefauver, but this time cleverly reworded, it was introduced by young Sen Frank Church of Idaho. Previously, patriotic citizens and groups were allowed to appear at hearings on this vital issue, and defend our country. In '55 and '56 we were represented there and have copies of the printed hearings. This time, we were not allowed nor even notified. It was pressured through, so Pres. Eisenhower could sign it, before he retired, according to his desire. This seemed a bold and high-handed attempt to force us into the very alliance against which George Washington warned us, and by our own elected ! We appeal to YOU to alert people to this danger - and help us to protect our Nation -

Q U O T E S

"The vital need of our foreign policy is new political creativity—leading and inspiring the formation, in all great regions of the free world, of confederations, large enough and strong enough to meet modern problems and challenges. We should promptly lead toward the formation of such confederations in the North Atlantic community in the Western Hemisphere."

—VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON AND
GOVERNOR NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

"To our friends and associates in the Atlantic Community: We propose a broader partnership that goes beyond our common fears, to recognize the depth and sweep of our common political, economic and cultural interests."

—DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM FOR 1960

Re-worded resolution which passed Congress.

Public Law 86-719
86th Congress, S. J. Res. 170
September 7, 1960

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of United States delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives acting jointly are hereby authorized, after consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to appoint a United States Citizens Commission on NATO, hereafter referred to as the Commission. Said Commission shall consist of not to exceed twenty United States citizens, not more than one-half of whom may be from any one political party, and who shall be appointed from private life.

U. S. Citizens
Commission on
NATO.

(b) Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of such Commission to endeavor to arrange for and to participate in such meetings and conferences with similar citizens commissions in the NATO countries as it may deem necessary in order to explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means.

Conferences
in NATO coun-
tries.

(b) The United States Citizens Commission on NATO is not in any way to speak for or to represent the United States Government.

74 STAT. 818.

74 STAT. 819.

SEC. 3. To promote the purposes set forth in section 2, the Commission is hereby authorized—

Authorizations.

(1) to communicate informally the sense of this resolution to parliamentary bodies in NATO countries;

(2) to seek to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary;

(3) to employ and fix the compensation of such temporary professional and clerical staff as it deems necessary: *Provided*, That the number shall not exceed ten: *And provided further*, That compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of the Congress;

(4) to submit such reports as it deems appropriate; and

(5) to pay its share of such expenses as may be involved as a consequence of holding any meetings or conferences authorized by subparagraph (2) above, but not in excess of \$100,000.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission, who shall serve without compensation, shall be reimbursed for, or shall be furnished, travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties under this joint resolution, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of said Commission.

We maintain this is un-constitutional because the LOGAN ACT - passed by Congress, prohibits private citizens negotiating with foreign nations.

WE MUST TRADE SOVEREIGNTY FOR FREEDOM.

So said Mr. Will Clayton - Co-Chairman with Christian Herter - of the so-called "Citizens Commission" now "exploring" ways to carry out the plan of The Atlantic Union Committee's Res. S.J. 170 -

We ask - what freedom will we have if we lose our American Independence - and can make no decisions for the U.S.A. without the consent of all NATO countries ???

Mr. Clayton was also a member of The United World Federalists - whose aim is WORLD FEDERATION WITHIN THE U.N. including all nations , even Soviet Russia.

Mr. Clarence Streit, original promoter of Atlantic Union is an indoctrinated Rhodes Scholar, as is Elmo Roper, Pres. of AUC - and another of this "Commission."

The top professional promoters of the ONE WORLD scheme were selected to serve on this "Commission" - Congress allowed this biased Commission to carry out their own schemes, unknown to the American public.

Quote from Mr. Streit - at the time of the formation of The Atlantic Union Committee - " After ten years of "educational ground breaking", the Atlantic Union Committee for a FEDERAL CONVENTION OF DEMOCRACIES is swinging into political action. THE AIM OF THIS COMMITTEE WILL BE TO PERSUADE THE U.S. CONGRESS TO CALL FOR AN EXPLORATORY CONVENTION FOR THE NEW UNION."

- - - - -
In 1960 - CONGRESS OBEYED THIS COMMAND.

Quote from THE ATLANTIC UNION NEWS - after S.J. RES 170 was passed. " This historic legislation marks the end of phase 1 of the Program of the AUC ," Elmo Roper - President at the time- was then awarded a beautiful plaque for his great success in putting over this resolution.

The AUC feel certain that this Commission will carry thru their plans and their work finished. Lincoln said - "If this nation is ever destroyed it will be from within- " This is one method -