



## Bréf Walden Moore til Alexanders Jóhannessonar

---

Bjarni Benediktsson – Stjórn­mál – Alþingismaður – Ritstjóri – Alexander Jóhannesson – Walden Moore  
– Declaration of Atlantic Unity – Utanríkismál – Varnarmál

## *Tekið af vef Borgarskjalasafnsins*

---

[bjarnibenediktsson.is](http://bjarnibenediktsson.is)

***Einkaskjalasafn nr. 360***

***Stjórn­málamaðurinn***

Askja 2-24, Örk 6

©Borgarskjalasafn Reykjavíkur

January 22, 1959

Dr. Alexander Johannesson  
Hringbraut 57  
Reykjavik, Iceland

Dear Dr. Alexander Johannesson:

Thank you very much for your letter of January 8 answering the questions in my letter of December 31.

From my knowledge of the internal political situation in Iceland I can understand why acceptance of the British offer must be delayed until after the March elections. I am glad you think it is a reasonable offer as this is also my opinion.

I hope to have further talks with our British friends on the subject.

Meanwhile I enclose for your information two British documents that were circulated to the delegates of the UN Assembly - one by the British government and the other by the British Trawlers' Federation.

With all best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

Walden Moore

P.S. I hope you will be on the Icelandic delegation to the Atlantic Congress in London next June and that we can look forward to the pleasure of seeing you (and perhaps your wife) there.

Enc: Two pamphlets

cc: Bjarni Benediktsson  
Johan Hafstein

February 6, 1959

Dr. Alexander Johannesson  
Hringbraut 57  
Reykjavik, Iceland

Dear Dr. Alexander Johannesson:

As you know, the British Sponsors of the Declaration suggested that the signers (who agreed to do so) present a set of proposals to the Atlantic Congress to be held in London in June.

The United States Sponsors all thought well of this idea and asked their British colleagues to prepare a first draft.

This draft, as revised by a committee of the U.S. Sponsors (with some deletions and additions), is enclosed herewith together with explanatory notes.

Would you please read the enclosed draft and let me know whether or not you are willing to subscribe to it or whether you have further revisions to suggest? We would particularly like to know whether there are any points in the combined draft that you do not agree to.

Our plan is to mail out to all signers of the Declaration proposals as agreed to by the Sponsors asking them to let us know if they are not willing to have their names signed to it.

The proposals will then be circulated to all delegates to the Congress over the names of all signers of the Declaration who have not signified their dissent.

The time requirements are such that we will need to begin mailing the letters to signers not later than March 2. We would therefore hope to hear from you not later than February 19 and we are setting a similar deadline for the other Sponsors.

If, contrary to our hopes, we do not hear from you by February 19, we will assume that the combined draft is acceptable to you.

Looking forward to seeing you in London in June, I am

Faithfully yours,

Enc: 1. Combined Draft No. 1  
2. Explanatory Notes  
3. Text of Declaration  
CC: Bjarni Benediktsson  
Johann Hafstein

Walden Moore

Political Proposals

1. The Atlantic Congress, comprising 650 members and meeting for only five days, cannot "examine exhaustively" the possibilities of achieving greater unity. The Congress, however, could very effectively bring home to the Atlantic peoples the urgent need for such an examination.

The Conference proposed in this resolution, which would comprise less than 100 members and which would "convene as often as necessary" to complete its task, would be an appropriate and exceedingly valuable follow-up of the Congress. Its endorsement by the Congress might prove to be the most constructive accomplishment of the Congress.

2. Any form of common citizenship for the peoples of the Atlantic Community would bring to each individual personally a new realization of the reality and importance of this Community. An American would then no longer regard a Frenchman or a Dutchman as an out-and-out alien.

Comprehensive common citizenship would, of course, represent an exceedingly far-reaching change which may now be regarded as impractical. But it is not impractical to begin consideration of whether some form of common citizenship could be developed. Such an inquiry alone would do much to drive home to the Atlantic peoples the intimacy of their relationship.

3. The value of such a meeting of Heads of Governments has been evident from the impact of the first one at the time and from the emphasis given it subsequently in NATO publications. It may not be possible to provide for such meetings on a regular basis, such as annually or biennially; no one can foresee in advance at what times they might be most valuable. But there is obvious advantage in wide recognition that such meetings should be held periodically.

4. Whatever their status, the Permanent Representatives on the Council will still be subject to the instructions of their governments. But the higher their status is, the more scope will be given them in respect to decisions and the more influence their views will have upon their governments. For example, the U.S. Permanent Representative could be accorded the status and the position now possessed by Ambassador Lodge at the United Nations.

5. The principle of inter-dependence has been accepted by the Council, yet every member of the Council still possesses the veto. To implement this principle as regards decisions, it would seem necessary to provide that at least some questions can be decided by less than a unanimous vote.

It is obvious that only certain questions would now be regarded as suitable for any form of weighted majority vote, comparable to that provided for in the new European institutions. What these questions are, and how votes might be weighted, are problems which only governments can decide. Should such a system work successfully on certain types of questions, it seems likely that it would be extended to include other types of questions.

There is wide recognition that any attempt to revise the North Atlantic Treaty at this time would be unwise. Consequently, it is proposed that the member governments should proceed by negotiating an agreement, which could be supplementary to the Treaty.

6. The Permanent Representatives on the Council and all their assistants represent their governments. Today only the Secretary General and the International Staff represent the Atlantic Community as a whole.

This proposal would bring about the creation of a small group of outstanding men, whose function would be only advisory, to represent the interests of the Atlantic Community as a whole. Their advice on problems before the Council could point the way to policies and actions which would be beneficial to this Community and should make it more difficult for any government to block action which would promote the general interest.

7. "Coordinate" is used here because obviously "concerted" policies might in some cases evoke antagonism on the part of friendly governments which are outside NATO.

8. The fourth proposal in the Declaration advocated an advisory Atlantic Assembly. In recent years parliamentarians and others have suggested that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference should be transformed into a formally constituted Consultative Assembly, comparable to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

The Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference resolved in 1957 that it should receive an annual report from the NATO Secretariat for discussion and that a link should be set up between its Standing Committee and the North Atlantic Council. This proposal is more specific in advocating such an official "link" and reiterates the request for an annual report. It could be implemented simply by a resolution of the Council.

### Economic Proposals

1. This text is taken from point 2 of the Declaration itself.

2. The Report of the Three Wise Men of 1956 concludes that NATO is not an appropriate agency for administering development programs or even for concerting national economic policies. These tasks can more effectively be carried out in the Atlantic area by some specialized economic agency. To propose that a new Atlantic agency be created for this purpose appears less likely to produce constructive results than to propose the adaptation of an existing agency for this purpose.

The principal economic agency in Western Europe, or in the entire Atlantic area, is OEEC, which includes Sweden, Switzerland, Austria and Eire as well as the European members of NATO. The United States and Canada have been associate members of OEEC since 1950. This organization has a Council as well as a highly qualified Secretariat and has during the last decade developed efficient teamwork.

At this time OEEC needs a wider field of activity. Since European and Atlantic economic cooperation involves so many interlocking problems, the simplest way of providing adequate machinery for Atlantic economic cooperation would appear to be the expansion of OEEC as proposed. Its existing machinery and qualified personnel could then be utilized for economic cooperation on an Atlantic, as well as a European, basis.

3. This proposal has considerable support in NATO and OEEC circles. While uncommitted countries might be reluctant to seek aid from such a Fund if it were either a part of NATO or were representative primarily of "colonial" powers, such reluctance is less likely if the countries participating in the Fund include a large proportion of "non-colonial" nations. This would be the case if they comprised the members of an OEEC, in which the "non-colonial" majority would be about two-thirds.

One advantage of such a Fund would be to demonstrate to the uncommitted nations that the peoples of the Atlantic Community have a real and tangible interest in their welfare. This would be evident regardless of whether actual aid were furnished directly or indirectly.

As compared with United States assistance of the same type, such a Fund would have a further advantage. It could employ a large proportion of qualified European personnel instead of Americans, thereby diminishing the overhead costs of assistance and avoiding antagonisms which American personnel have created in some under-developed countries due to inability to speak languages and disproportionately high living standards.

### Cultural Proposal

1. An Atlantic Institute would do, for the entire Atlantic Community, what such bodies as the Royal Institute for International Affairs, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the Societe d'Etudes de Politique Etrangere do for their respective countries. Sub-committee A-3 of the Atlantic Congress will deal specifically with this question.

COMBINED DRAFT NO. 1

(BRITISH - AMERICAN)

We, the undersigned signers of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity, call upon the Atlantic Congress to endorse the following proposals designed to strengthen NATO and to unify the Atlantic Community.

Political Proposals

1. Endorsement of the unanimous resolution of the Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in 1957 that the NATO governments "bring about, in accordance with the constitutional and governmental processes of their countries, a conference composed of leading representative citizens selected on a non-partisan basis and directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisioned by the North Atlantic Treaty, within the Atlantic Community may best be developed." (Unanimously approved by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1958)
2. Initiate the consideration of means of developing some form of common citizenship for the people of the Atlantic Community.
3. A meeting of the Heads of the NATO governments, similar to the one held in December, 1957, should take place periodically.
4. The Permanent Representatives on the North Atlantic Council should be given higher status equivalent to that of Cabinet Ministers.
5. To carry out its accepted principle of inter-dependence, the North Atlantic Council should, on certain questions, reach decisions by less than a unanimous vote. Our governments should proceed immediately to negotiate an agreement as to what kind of questions are suitable for such decisions and the weight to be given to the vote of each member country.
6. The North Atlantic Council should appoint a small group of qualified men of wide experience, who would represent the Atlantic Community as a whole, instead of their governments, to advise the Council on measures which might advance the common interests of the Atlantic Community.
7. The NATO governments should seek to coordinate their policies within the United Nations and other international agencies on all questions of common concern.
8. The North Atlantic Council should officially recognize the right of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference to advise the Council on political, economic, cultural and social questions and to receive an annual report from the Secretary General.

Economic Proposals

1. The elaboration, pursuant to Article II of the North Atlantic Treaty, of a comprehensive mutual program for lowering tariffs, freeing currencies and eliminating trade restrictions so that there may be established an adequate economic basis for the Atlantic Community and associated nations.
2. The creation of more adequate machinery for economic cooperation. To this end Canada and the United States should become full, instead of associate, members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) whose name should thereupon be changed to Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation (OAE).
3. An Atlantic Investment and Development Fund should be established to assist underdeveloped countries, either directly or through other international agencies.

Cultural Proposal

1. The financing and establishment of an Atlantic Institute which would serve as a research center and clearing house for the Atlantic peoples, promote a greater sense of community among them and discover and develop Atlantic leadership adequate to these tasks.

February 2, 1960

Dr. Alexander Johanneson  
Hringbraut 57  
Reykjavik  
Iceland

Dear Dr. Alexander Johanneson:

Many thanks for your letter of January 7.

I note from the NATO Letter of December, 1959 that our friend Bjarni Benediktsson, in addition to being Minister of Justice, is also Minister of Industry and Fishing Rights. This should give plenty of scope to his remarkable talents.

I saw John Muccio very briefly at a Senate Committee Hearing in Washington but did not get time to talk to him about Iceland. I know you, like us, are sorry to lose him although I am sure he will do a good job in Guatemala (a lovely country). Who has taken his place?

We all understand that the new Icelandic Government is faced with very difficult problems and will follow the efforts to solve them with great interest - despite a scarcity of news of Iceland in this country.

I am, however, somewhat disturbed about the rather ominous implication of the following extract from your letter:

"There has been no change in the fisheries dispute with Britain, but we are all waiting for the new conference in Geneva in March. If we do not get our rights at that time you must be prepared, that Iceland may take unexpected steps."

Could you give us some indication of what these "unexpected steps" might be? Of course I hope with all my heart that the new government will be satisfied with the results of the coming Geneva Conference.

I am sending you by regular mail a Prospectus on the Atlantic Institute and have given your name to the Rapporteur, James Huntley, from whom you will be hearing shortly.

I enclose herewith a report on the latest meeting of the U.S. Sponsors of the Declaration on January 7.

Would you please let me know at your earliest convenience: 1) Whether or not you agree to the insertion of a defense section in our Program for 1960 as suggested in section 4? 2) Whether or not you agree to a possible rewording of the second point in our program as suggested in section 5, point 2? The U.S. Sponsors plan to

Letter to Dr. Alexander Johanneson - Feb. 2

-2-

discuss this matter with Under Secretary Douglas Dillon. 3) Whether or not you have any suggestion for a new Executive Secretary of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference (Section 5 - point 5)?

With regard to section 5, point 1 we are informed that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will consider S. Con. Res. 17 on February 2 at which time they are expected to report it out with a recommendation for favorable action.

With all best wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

Walden Moore  
Director

WM:ml

P.S. We would, of course, also welcome any other suggestions from you.

W.M.

- Enc. 1. Report on Jan. 7 meeting
- 2. Program for 1960

cc. Bjarni Benediktsson  
Johan Hafstein



May 23, 1960

Dr. Alexander Johannesson  
Hringbraut 57  
Iceland

Dear Dr. Alexander Johannesson:

I enclose for your information a confidential report on my recent visits to various NATO capitals.

This report will furnish the basis of discussions for a meeting of the U.S. Sponsors of the Declaration on June 9. We would be happy to have before that time any suggestions from you as to what course the Declaration should now pursue.

We were all most distressed at the news that the U.S. - Canadian "Six-plus-Six" proposal had failed at the Geneva Conference by the agonizing margin of a single vote.

Other new items that I have since picked up are as follows: (1) The head of the British Trawler Association said that they would not attempt to fish within twelve miles of the Icelandic shore for a period of one month; (2) Norway announced a twelve mile fishing limit.

I would like very much to have your views on what will happen now as well as any information you can give me on the internal situation in Iceland.

My wife joins me in sending warmest regards to you and Mrs. Johannesson and to our other good friends in Iceland.

Faithfully yours,

WM:ml

Walden Moore

- Enc. 1. Memorandum - May 10  
2. Program for 1960  
3. Petition

cc. Bjarni Benediktsson  
Johann Hafstein