

## U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

FEBRUARY 23 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 15), 1960.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany S.J. Res. 170]

The Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) calling for a convention of delegates from Atlantic countries, report an original joint resolution on the same subject, Senate Joint Resolution 170, to the Senate and recommend that it do pass.

#### 1. PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

It is the purpose of the resolution to create a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO (hereafter referred to as the Commission) and to authorize its members to participate, on an unofficial basis, with similar groups from the other NATO countries, in a convention and such additional meetings as might be necessary to explore means of promoting greater cooperation among the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

#### 2. BACKGROUND

For several years there has been a strong feeling among the NATO nations that much more should be done within the alliance to counter the increasing Soviet bloc emphasis on competition with the West through political and economic measures. Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty, providing for cooperation in nonmilitary fields by the NATO members, has been regarded as the means whereby the North Atlantic alliance could be expanded in ways which, without diminishing the importance of its military aspect, would strengthen Western unity in the face of the Soviet "peace" offensive. Yet progress to date in developing this concept on a governmental level, while significant, generally has been considered minimal.

The Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in 1957, believing that private as well as official initiative should be brought to bear

on this problem, unanimously recommended that a conference of leading representative citizens from the NATO countries be convened "to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose \* \* \* may best be developed." It was contemplated that these citizens would be officially appointed but would act as individuals unable to commit their governments. The 650 delegates to the Atlantic Congress, held in London in June 1959, unanimously supported and urged this concept, which was reaffirmed without dissent by the Fifth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in Washington last November.

### 3. COMMITTEE ACTION

Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 was introduced in the Senate on March 19, 1959, by Senator Humphrey, for himself and Senators Case of New Jersey, Cooper, and Kefauver, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; Senator Church became a cosponsor at the beginning of the current session of Congress. The Department of State, in its report of May 28, 1959, withheld support from Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 primarily on the grounds that the further development of existing consultative organizations should be awaited. However, in a subsequent report, dated August 25, 1959, the Department withdrew its reservations, contingent on the clear understanding that the legislative and not the executive branch would select the U.S. delegates. The committee thereupon considered Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 in an executive meeting on September 8, 1959, but, owing to the lateness of the session, postponed further action to January 1960.

The committee held an open hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 on January 19, 1960. Senator Kefauver took the lead in presenting his views and those of his fellow cosponsors, Senators Case of New Jersey, Cooper, and Church, who also testified briefly in support of the resolution. Mr. Ivan B. White, Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, attended the hearing as the representative of the executive branch. The public witnesses were Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., appearing on behalf of the U.S. Committee for the Atlantic Congress; Mr. Elmo Roper of New York City; and Mr. Lithgow Osborne, representing the signers of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity. This testimony favorable to the resolution, and numerous written communications of support were noted by the committee.

During the hearing, committee members directed many questions to the witnesses. Most of these inquiries were concerned with clarifying the means through which it was intended that the U.S. delegates would be chosen and the desired convention would be brought about. There were also expressions of doubt concerning the distinctions that could be drawn between past conferences and the proposal under consideration.

As a result, a redrafted resolution, substantially changed in many respects, was submitted by the cosponsors. It was considered by the committee in an executive session on February 2 which was attended by those supporters and by Mr. Ivan White of the State Department. A number of additional changes were made at the direction of the committee, in concert with the sponsors, during that session and a subsequent one.

On February 10, 1960, the committee voted eight to seven to report the resolution to the Senate in the form of an original joint resolution.

#### 4. SUBSTANCE OF THE RESOLUTION

Senate Joint Resolution 170 would create a Commission of not more than 20 private U.S. citizens to be appointed jointly by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House after consultation with the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees. The Commission would be directed to seek to arrange and participate in a convention attended by similar citizens' commissions from the other NATO countries for the purpose of developing paths toward greater political and economic cooperation within the alliance. Members of the Commission would serve without compensation, but would be authorized to employ and remunerate a staff of not more than 10 members. While in no way enabled to represent the United States officially, the Commission would report, and account for its expenditures, to the Congress. Not to exceed \$300,000 would be authorized to be appropriated for the resolution's purposes; not more than \$100,000 of that sum would constitute the Commission's share of expenses in any International Conference. The Commission would cease to exist on January 31, 1962.

#### 5. POINTS DEVELOPED IN COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

While there certainly was no dissent from the proposition that NATO should be strengthened by all practicable means, many committee members were uncertain as to the merits of the proposed resolution, even in its thoroughly revised form. The chief matters of concern to these members included: (a) The difficulty of distinguishing between the functions of the envisaged convention and those of such organizations as the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and the Atlantic Congress; (b) the fear of setting a precedent with the creation of such a Commission; (c) the possibility that the Commission could be misrepresented as speaking officially for the U.S. Government; and (d) apprehension that the type of leading citizen likely to be appointed to the Commission would be too occupied with private business and public service to devote the time and effort required to generate new and practical concepts.

Supporters of the resolution presented several persuasive arguments bearing on those concerns. It was noted that the single session of the Atlantic Congress, while its results were valuable, had involved an unwieldy membership of 650, and met for only 1 week, while the annual NATO Parliamentarians' Conference brings a smaller number of very busy legislators together for less than a week and provides little continuity between meetings. The proposed convention, on the other hand, would permit roughly 100 leading citizens to confer together for whatever reasonable period of time might be necessary to examine NATO problems carefully and to develop new ideas. Secondly, it was argued that the proposed Commission could develop with respect to NATO as thoroughgoing and meritorious recommendations as the Hoover Commission produced regarding our national governmental organization. Finally, emphasis was placed on the clause stating that the Commission would not speak for or represent the U.S. Government, and it was pointed out that the executive

branch—as represented by the State Department—seemed satisfied as to the effectiveness of that proviso.

There was general agreement within the committee that, to the greatest extent possible, Commission members should be appointed from among leading private citizens in no way connected with any specific thesis regarding the future development of the Atlantic Community. It was also contemplated that the proposed Commission would utilize local currency counterpart funds insofar as they might be available for such purposes.

#### 6. CONCLUSION

The majority of the committee members gave substantial weight to two factors. First, there was the clearly expressed belief that, in the perilous conditions facing this country and its free world allies, no obstacles should be placed in the way of any proposal to evoke new and fresh ideas at a relatively small cost. A related second factor was the following testimony of the State Department representative:

The Department considers that meetings such as the one proposed in this resolution might well serve a good purpose. We in the Department of State would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas which might emerge \* \* \*. We particularly welcome the thought expressed in the resolution that the delegates to the proposed convention should be free to explore the problem fully as individuals.

The Committee on Foreign Relations recommends that the Senate approve Senate Joint Resolution 170.

