

---

*Essentials of American Foreign  
Policy*

---

Remarks of  
**Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey**  
of Minnesota  
in the  
Senate of the United States  
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

*Not printed  
at Government  
expense*

United States Government Printing Office, Washington : 1951

945560—39068

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## Essentials of American Foreign Policy

REMARKS

OF

**HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**

OF MINNESOTA

America's foreign policy is not created in a vacuum. It results from the fact that we are a nation among nations and in constant association with one another. In this association we must necessarily have a flexible policy to meet changing times and changing conditions. America's foreign policy can never be a predetermined, airtight program of inflexibility.

There are, however, important aspects of our foreign policy to which we are irrevocably dedicated:

1. The maintenance and guaranteeing of America's independence and freedom.
2. Working for and promoting the independence and freedom of peoples and nations everywhere.
3. A firm commitment to work through and with the United Nations. A policy of strengthening the United Nations in order to achieve a just and enduring peace, based upon sound principles of international law and social justice.
4. A well-planned program of political, economic, health, and cultural assistance to those nations and peoples who have dedicated their fortunes and their lives to the cause of freedom.
5. Promoting trade and friendly economic and political relations amongst the nations of the world.

6. A deep and sincere humanitarian concern and generosity for those who are underprivileged and suffering from the ravages of famine, disease, and poverty.

7. Honorably fulfilling all obligations and commitments entered into by treaties and compacts between ourselves and other nations.

8. The maintenance of our national defense military forces.

These principles are part of the glorious history of our Nation.

Let us never forget that we do not live in this world alone. We are not an island unto ourselves. The admonitions of Scripture which remind us that we are our "brother's keeper" need to be applied to the practical realities of international relations and foreign policy. In carrying out the above principles it has been the aim of our Government, first, to aid in the rehabilitation and relief of those who suffered so dearly from the ravages of World War II. This was exemplified by our generous gifts to UNRRA and the interim aid program in 1946 and 1947 to Western Europe.

Secondly, our Government's foreign policy has been directed toward strengthening those free nations that are resisting communism from within and without. This policy has taken shape in the adoption of the Marshall plan of economic aid; the North Atlantic Pact, a compact of the free nations of the Atlantic community dedicated to defense against aggression; aid now being considered for the Republic of India; the Greek-Turkish aid program which pre-

served freedom and independence for Turkey and Greece; the Voice of America; our program of defense mobilization; and military assistance to our allies.

Thirdly, the policy of our Government is to strike at the roots of Communist growth and infiltration by a broad program of economic, scientific, and technological assistance to the underprivileged and underdeveloped areas of the world. The point 4 program was a beginning. We are now preparing to move forward on a much broader and comprehensive program.

#### NATURE AND MENACE OF COMMUNISM

In shaping and carrying out our foreign policy, which must, above all, be based on our own self-preservation, it is imperative that every American understand the nature of the menace of communism—how it works, how it gains support, who and what are its natural allies. Communism is more than a military threat; it is destructive of the ideals and principles of our religious faith and of our political philosophy. Wherever communism has thrived, the individual has been enslaved; education has been corrupted and used for the selfish and greedy purposes of those in power; free institutions of business and labor have been destroyed; independent ownership of farms and property has been abolished; the very sanctity of the home and of the family has been jeopardized; freedom of worship has been restricted.

This is the menace of communism—a menace of military force and human slavery. Make no mistake about it—international communism will not satisfy its hungry appetite by enslaving and conquering Europe and Asia. Its ultimate objective and its final blow is directed against the United States, for here, in this great country, is to be found the heart and soul of freedom and democracy.

It is my sincere conviction that we cannot escape—nor, when we understand the issue, do I feel we would want to escape—

945560—39068

from assuming the responsibility of leadership for the millions of people who are still dedicated to liberty; nor dare we minimize the threat of brutal power and force that confronts us. It will do us no good merely to hope for peace and security. I believe we must be willing to work and sacrifice for world peace and our own security. The Soviet Union has brought under its control millions of people—satellite nations. Today communism controls over 800,000,000 people. We in the United States, with slightly over 150,000,000 citizens, cannot meet this menace alone. We need friends. We need free allies if we are to preserve our own freedom.

It was the recognition of this obvious fact that prompted our Government to enter into the North Atlantic Pact—an alliance of 13 free nations for mutual defense and common effort in securing peace. The North Atlantic Pact was established within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations. It lends strength to the United Nations. Let it be clearly understood that there can be no United Nations if free and independent nations are conquered and absorbed by the Soviet Union. It is because of the military power and the aggressive actions of the Soviet Union and her satellites that it became necessary to implement the North Atlantic Pact by, first, the military assistance program and, secondly, the creation of a Western European defense system including American troops, air power, and naval forces.

#### TROOPS FOR EUROPE

The defense of Western Europe is essential to the defense of the United States. Western Europe and the United States represent the muscle, the fiber, and the tissue of the forces of freedom. Communist aggression looks upon the countries of Western Europe as but the steps—the gateway—to a frontal attack upon the citadel of liberty, the arsenal of democracy—the United States of America.

The question is simply this: Where do we defend freedom against the constant pressure and force of Communist totalitarianism? Shall 150,000,000 Americans undertake this task alone, or shall we join as a strong and participating partner with our friends and allies where the battle line has been drawn?

Let's make no mistake about it: The defense of Western Europe is the key to the security of the United States. With the people of Western Europe on our side, we have a combination that the Communists cannot beat. But with Western Europe dominated by Soviet Russia, its people enslaved, its resources exploited, its factories producing the materials of war for Russia, we will be faced with an overwhelming preponderance of power that may well spell our doom.

The reasons for this are perfectly clear. Military power consists of manpower, industrial production, natural resources, strategic bases, and the will to fight and resist. If Western Europe is lost to the Communists, the majority of the world's manpower goes to the Communist forces.

If Western Europe is conquered or dominated by the Soviet Union, the balance of industrial production goes to the Communists.

If we lose Western Europe, the overwhelming proportion of raw materials and critical supplies goes to the Communists.

If we lose Western Europe we lose the strategic bases, air and naval, from whence to defend ourselves against Soviet attack.

If Western Europe is controlled by the Communists, a spirit of defeatism and hopelessness will befall all of humanity.

A word about industrial production. There are three great industrial workshops in the world: First, Canada and the United States; second, Western Europe; third, Russia and her satellites. A striking way to illustrate this fact is to look at the world's steel capacity. For every 10 tons of steel we

945560—39068

in the United States can produce, Western Europe can produce more than 6 tons. Russia and her satellites can turn out 4 tons. The significance of this is obvious. Add Russia's 4 tons to Europe's 6, and you wind up with a steel capacity equal to our own. On the other hand, combine free Europe and the United States, and the result is a 4 to 1 advantage in our favor.

There are dozens of other illustrations that can be shown, but they all lead back to the conclusion that the productive capacity of Western Europe and the United States combined tremendously exceeds that of Russia and her satellites. And they also lead to the conclusion that our margin of safety would be tremendously reduced if free Europe falls into Russian hands.

But productive capacity isn't the whole story. With Western Europe in their hands, the Communists would quickly take over all the resources of the Old World. The Mediterranean would become a Red Sea. Africa would be defenseless. The Middle East, India, the rest of southeast Asia, Australia, and the island areas of the Southwest Pacific would fall into the Red orbit.

With the loss of Africa would go the uranium supplies upon which our atomic weapons so largely depend. Manganese, an essential component of steel, reaches us today from India and Africa. Loss of those two regions would cripple our steel output. Much of our tin and all of our natural rubber comes from the Malay Straits and the island areas of the Southwest Pacific.

In short, the loss of Western Europe would mean that we were forced to defend ourselves with the resources and manpower of the Western Hemisphere alone and sharply reduced—and that is not a happy prospect.

There are 2,250,000,000 people on earth. About 300,000,000 of them live in the Western Hemisphere—about one-seventh of the world's population. I do not relish the prospect of living in the kind of world in

which the Communists control 85 percent of the world's population. And that is exactly what we would face if we walked out on Europe.

We must send troops to Europe because our national self-interest demands that we save Europe from Communist aggression. To refuse to send troops is to serve notice to the Soviet Union that it can walk across the continent.

And Europe can be saved. Our military experts, from General Eisenhower on down, tell us so, and this is a military question.

They tell us it can be done by building up the combined forces of land, sea, and air.

The second question is, should we limit troops to Europe? I say "No." If the security of Western Europe is basic to the security of the United States, then it would be sheer folly to limit that security by an act of Congress. World War II should have taught us the lesson of "too little and too late." The events leading to World War II should now be conclusive evidence of the futility of half-way measures. Let this be perfectly clear: Military assistance to Europe—troops for Europe—is in our own national interest. We do not know at any time what the next 24 hours may bring, and the lessons of Korea and Pearl Harbor should have taught us we must be thoroughly prepared.

How many troops belong in any one spot is a question which neither you nor I can decide. Congress and the President have decided, through the North Atlantic Pact and the military assistance program, the basic foreign and military policy. Military leaders must decide technical questions of military strength and troop movements. These decisions must then be finally approved and implemented by Executive direction, namely the President, who is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

945560—39068

#### MOBILIZATION FOR DEFENSE AND PEACE

There are those who are disturbed about our program of military mobilization and what appears to be the tendency toward war. I am sure that people everywhere are disturbed, confused, and emotionally upset. We live in dangerous times. We are faced with the possibility of war, and yet we are not a warlike nation. We desire peace. We have made an honest effort to preserve peace and will continue to make every effort humanly possible, but peace cannot be obtained without strength. Therefore, we are mobilizing our strength not for aggression, not for world power, but rather to impress upon the leaders of the Soviet Union that the free people of the world will resist aggression and force. At the same time, through the councils of the United Nations and through the normal diplomatic channels, we should let the world know that we stand ready at all times for real disarmament under international inspection.

It is our solemn duty to impress upon the people of the world the understanding that wars do not solve problems and that we in the United States have but one desire—peace, freedom, and security. We know that the answer to the aggression of international communism is not to be found in military preparedness and strength alone. Our major emphasis must be directed to creating and building the conditions of peace. Peace in Europe, peace in Asia will come only when injustice and exploitation have been removed; when people have the right of self-government; when economic and social opportunity is made available; when poverty, ignorance, and disease have been checked and rolled back. These are the objectives toward which we should dedicate our efforts.

#### THE CRISIS IN ASIA

Our world is changing. Whole areas in Asia and Africa are in revolution. Millions

of people are seeking their independence and freedom. Some have obtained it—such as the people of Indonesia, India, Burma, and Ceylon; others are aspiring to it—such as the people of Indo-China, North Africa, and Malaya. If there has been a weakness in our foreign policy it has been that we as a Nation have failed to identify ourselves with the legitimate desires of the people of Asia and Africa to attain their own independence and their own freedom. It is my considered judgment that we ought not to be resisting this revolution. We ought to give it leadership.

The tragedy of our time is that we have permitted the Communists to identify themselves with these liberation and emancipation movements in Asia and Africa. Yet communism by its very nature is counter-revolution, reaction, and subjugation. International communism's only purpose in joining with these people seeking their independence is to gain control and inflict on these people their vicious and brutal system of exploitation and oppression. Our job is to explain that to the world, not only in words but by setting an example through leadership, through guidance, through generous assistance.

#### INDIA

We must be patient and understanding—and we ought to be. We too, only a short time ago in human history, obtained our freedom. We rejected colonialism; we were sensitive and jealous of our liberty. And we were justly concerned with our own independence, trying to keep away from foreign entanglements. Let me give you a modern example. I refer to the Republic of India. Here is a nation of over 350,000,000 people that has just obtained its independence after 300 years of colonial exploitation. India is confronted with overwhelming problems within her own borders. She is new in the art of self-government. She is, in a

945560—39068

sense, weak in military and economic power but potentially strong and rich.

Many Americans are disturbed, yes, angry because the Government of India does not see eye to eye with us on the problem of communism in China. But shouldn't Americans consider that India is consumed with the difficulties of her new independence and freedom? That she wishes to keep away from foreign entanglements? This is the natural and the historic pattern of new nations. It was our pattern, our experience of less than a hundred years ago. India is a country that is prodemocratic by its constitution, its government, and its philosophy. It has taken stern measures against totalitarian groups within its own borders. It is a part of the British Commonwealth, our major ally. It is without a doubt the leading free country in Asia. Yet, because India has not aligned herself with us on the China question, even though she has supported the United Nations' resolution to resist aggression in Korea, she is today being criticized and condemned and is suffering at the hands of our own Government, which is withholding urgently needed food and wheat from India.

You will be interested in knowing that American policy with reference to the Republic of India has been a major concern of mine ever since my arrival in the United States Senate. I have realized the importance of cordial relations between our country and India. I have attempted to make an intensive study of American-Indian relationships, and in particular the political, economic, and social institutions of that great Asiatic power. On several occasions during the past 2 years I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on the subject of India and its position in world affairs. Not only have I brought these matters to the attention of the Senate, but I have also brought to the personal attention of the

President and the Secretary of State America's policy with regard to India and the other areas of the Far East.

Better than a year ago I outlined to the President and the Secretary of State the urgent need of food for India if that country were to avert famine and all of the accompanying agony and confusion. Approximately 8 months ago I had the privilege of meeting one of our great Christian leaders from India, Bishop Pickett, of Delhi. I had Bishop Pickett discuss the Indian food shortage with Members of Congress, with the Secretary of State, and with Special Assistant to the President, Mr. Averill Harriman, as well as with Vice President Barkley. I accompanied Bishop Pickett to all of these meetings where he presented the very real need of food for the people of India. At a later date I arranged for the bishop to visit the President.

On December 16, 1950, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, Madam Pandit, made a formal request to our Government for 2,000,000 tons of cereal grains. Following this formal request, I joined with other Members of the Congress in preparing a letter to the President asking for an audience to discuss the food needs of India. Along with Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, I arranged for a congressional delegation to visit the President. We received from him assurances that he supported India's request for 2,000,000 tons of grain. The President, subsequently, sent a very strong message to the Congress in support of food for India.

Immediately following the President's message, I joined with three of my colleagues in the Senate in introducing a bill to authorize the Government of the United States to provide the grain that India needs.

It is imperative that there be congressional approval of legislation to provide a grant of 2,000,000 tons of food grain to the people of India. There are disturbing signs in India

and in all of Asia—signs of great mistrust on the part of the people of that continent that the United States is not interested in their welfare. You and I know that the American people are a generous people; that by philosophy, tradition, and history we have always demonstrated a keen and abiding interest in the welfare of our fellow men. It is imperative that we use the strength of our abundance in our conflict with communism. Without an expansion of industrial capacity, without any further mobilization of manpower, we can strike deadly blows at international communism by lifting the standard of living and by aiding the sick, the hungry, and the exploited.

The people of Asia face starvation. Freedom loses its meaning if it is without bread. Our Nation, if it is to be effective in the struggle against communism, must respond to the appeal for food from the underprivileged peoples of Asia, Africa and the other underdeveloped areas. Yes, the most effective way to oppose communism and fascism is to eliminate the causes of those malignant diseases. It is not idealistic to say that we must attack poverty in the world. This is practical realism in the twentieth century. The time to assist the democratic forces in India and in other parts of Asia is now. Every humanitarian consideration, every political and religious consideration, and every consideration of our national interest calls for the Congress to act immediately in support of legislation for food grain for the people of India.

Food for India is symbolic of an over-all comprehensive program that is desperately needed—a program striking at the roots of communistic growth—a program that had its beginning in the point 4 program, as announced by President Truman. We can be a partner in the self-help efforts of these new nations in the Asiatic area. The governments of these new nations are struggling to

maintain their integrity and their freedom. These governments, as history has proven, can be destroyed from within. There need be no Communist military attack. The attack of poverty and economic distress can be just as ruinous and destructive as a military blow. Communism in Asia, particularly in the southern and southeastern portions, is growing because the economic conditions are favorable to its growth. The propaganda of communism offers bread and land to the under-privileged and to the exploited. A bold and comprehensive program of economic assistance can prevent these areas from going communistic.

I point up the issue of India because I believe that if we are to build a world dedicated to a just and enduring peace, if we as Americans are to give leadership, we must not expect all of our friends and allies to agree with us all the time on every issue. Freedom means the right to disagree. We condemn the policy of the Soviet Union for having satellite or stooge nations that say "yes" at every command. Are we not expecting our friends and allies to be subservient to our every wish? This must not be. Free allies, free nations must be expected to have independent judgment, and that judgment must be respected for what it is.

#### KOREA

I fully realize the tragedy, bloodshed, and destruction that has come with our resistance of aggression in Korea. The attack of the North Koreans and the entrance of Communist China into the Korean conflict is clear and unadulterated aggression. Were we to let this aggression go unchecked, we would again see the pattern of conquest unfold itself with ever-increasing greed and power. Our struggle in Korea is a struggle for freedom, for independence, and for a world based on law and order. Like yourself, I am disappointed that the other members of the United Nations have not felt free

to give us greater support. But those vallant men who have sacrificed their lives in Korea and those who are yet battling against tremendous odds, may well save this world from an all-out catastrophic World War III. While the battle is far away from our homeland, the aggressive attack of the Communists in the Korean area is a dagger pointed at our heart. Those who have given their lives in the Korean conflict have done as much to preserve and protect the freedom of America and the rest of the free world as the patriots at Valley Forge, the Argonne, and the Battle of the Bulge. They are fighting the fire of communism to prevent the conflagration from sweeping over our own homeland.

Aggression on the part of any nation against another is banditry and lawlessness. It needs to be challenged just as we in a local community take effective action against those who commit assault and battery or trespass against the private property of others. There isn't a shadow of a doubt that the North Korean action was a part of the over-all program of the Cominform and its aggressive tactics. I repeat, the fact that we met this aggression, despite the risks involved and despite the great sacrifice that it meant, has done a great deal to check the possibility of World War III.

I, for one, am convinced that if this attack had not been challenged, it would have been the "go ahead" signal for any nation in the world to move its troops against another. We know what happened in the Berlin air lift when Russia decided to blockade Berlin. We know that by firm and determined action on the part of our Government and that of Great Britain, the Soviets finally appealed for a settlement and the blockade was lifted. I think the facts of the last few years reveal conclusively that wherever nations refuse to resist Communist pressure, communism moves ahead, conquers, and controls. I think the facts reveal that wherever nations

do resist Communist pressure, communism takes another look, sizes up the situation, and comes to an agreement that preserves the peace.

I know there has been a great deal of criticism about what has transpired in Korea. I am not prepared to defend every action that we have taken, but I do defend the moral validity—the righteous purpose of our resistance of aggression.

#### CHINESE RELATIONS

We Americans are worried and concerned over what has transpired in China. But let us get the record clear. Our Government has been generous with the Chiang Kai-shek Government of the Republic of China. Our Government extended to Chiang's Nationalist Government of China a grand total of \$3,598,200 in economic and military aid. Our Government sent one of its most able public officials, Gen. George Marshall, to China in a desperate effort to save the situation. I do not know all of the reasons why the Chinese Communist movement conquered China and defeated the Nationalist Government. But I do know that it was through no fault of ours. The propaganda that has been let loose in America against our policy in China would lead many to believe that it was our responsibility, and ours alone, to save China. But no nation can be saved from the menace of communism if it refuses to save itself. Communism triumphed in Russia because corruption, exploitation, and injustice was rampant under the Czars, because the legitimate government ignored the social, economic and political needs of the people. I am led to believe that communism triumphed in China, not because of what happened on the battlefields alone, but because of what did not happen in constructive action in the villages, on the farms, in the cities, and throughout the entire society.

945560—39068

The tragic conquest of China by the forces of communism threatens our own security and the security of the free world. There is no doubt but what this was a part of the master plan of the Kremlin. China, a historical friend of the United States, has been turned against us by the Communist leadership and the Communist propaganda. The attack of the Red Chinese armies upon the forces of the United Nations in Korea has clearly demonstrated the true intentions and purposes of Soviet imperialism. The Chinese Communist aggression has brought into sharp focus a fundamental issue of American foreign policy. This was recently dramatized by the President's dismissal of General MacArthur.

#### DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

The real issue involved in the President's dismissal of General MacArthur is one basic to American Constitutional Government. The President, under the mandate of our Constitution, is Commander in Chief. The President, under the political tradition of our Republic, is responsible for foreign policy. It has been a basic principle of representative government that the military is subordinate to the civilian. The military officers and services are the servants of the Republic, not the master. The action of the President is within the tradition of American Constitutional Government.

The issue is: Shall military commanders dictate and formulate American policy or shall they carry out that policy. In this instance the issue was even more broad because the military action in Korea was not only an American action but one under the over-all supervision of the United Nations. President Truman, as all Presidents before him, demanded that foreign policy be established by the elected representatives of the people, not by any one or a few generals, able as they may be. Once we lose civilian

control over foreign and military policy, then we lose the fabric of our democracy.

In dismissing General MacArthur President Truman had no other choice. The general—a brilliant and able military leader, a great man in his own right and by his own record—openly disagreed with our Government's policy and with that of the United Nations. He disagreed with the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. No government can exist so divided in policy since no government can be guided by two inconsistent foreign programs.

General MacArthur, as an individual, has a perfect right to disagree with our Government's foreign policy, but as a general subordinate to his Commander in Chief, he has neither the right nor the prerogative to formulate and attempt to carry out his own program and to disregard the program established by the Government. While I have a high regard for General MacArthur and his abilities, I am not prepared to accept his judgment over that of the President, the Secretary of State, the overwhelming majority of the representatives in the United Nations, the majority in the Congress, the Secretary of Defense, and the combined Chiefs of Staff. It should be clearly recognized that the bold statements of General MacArthur were causing great concern in other nations and among our allies.

#### THE NEED OF ALLIES

While it is true that we as a Nation have been bearing the major burden of the war in Korea, we do have allies there, and those allies stand with us in Western Europe. They are the only allies that we have. It is impossible to keep allies and to maintain a solid defense against Communist aggression if we as a Nation and a Government act in opposition to our allies and disregard their wishes, their policies, and their program. To put it quite bluntly, faced as we are by

945560—39068

the Soviet Union and its satellites, with a total population of over 800,000,000, we cannot afford to stand alone. The Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to break us away from our allies. The old tactic of divide and conquer is again being utilized. We must not fall prey to this tactic. We must stand together and work together.

#### THE ISSUE AND THE RISKS

The issue of foreign policy which divides us today is primarily related to our country's relations with Red China. The issue, simply put, is whether or not, first, our Armed Forces should attack military bases on the Chinese mainland; and secondly, whether or not we should use and assist Chinese Nationalist troops in an attack on the Chinese mainland. This inevitably means extending and expanding the war in Korea.

It is the policy of our Government to do everything possible to limit the present Korean War to the Korean battlefield. It is the firm determination of our Government and our allies not to extend and expand the conflict to the mainland of Asia by any action of ours. The risk involved in a further expansion of the conflict is a possibility of World War III and the full-scale intervention of the Soviet Union. It should be remembered that the Soviet Union has a treaty of alliance and assistance with the Red Chinese Government. This treaty calls for Soviet military assistance in case China is attacked by Japan or any power associated with Japan. Today we are the prime occupiers of Japan. We are associated with Japan. We are now preparing to conclude a treaty with Japan. It is entirely possible that the Soviet Union, under the obligations of her treaty with Communist China, would take direct military action were we to advance to the Chinese mainland. The political policy of the United States Government and its allies is to bring the Korean War

to a conclusion and to negotiate an honorable peace.

The position of General MacArthur was clearly and brilliantly stated in his address to the joint session of the Congress. Not only did he recommend economic sanctions against China and a blockade of the Chinese coast by our Navy, but also the use of Chinese Nationalist troops from the island of Formosa and the strategic bombing of Manchurian bases by our Air Force. As I have stated, we must take into consideration were this program to be adopted, the possibility of open Russian intervention and its consequent effect upon our military position both in the Far East and in Western Europe. We must take into consideration the present military strength of the United States and its allies as compared with the Soviet Union and its satellites. Our mobilization program is just getting under way. Our total military strength is approximately 3,000,000 men. We as yet have not been able to send the additional four divisions to Western Europe. We have had to call up reservists in order to meet the commitments in Korea.

Is it not possible that the strategy of the Soviet is to trick us into a major war in Asia so that an all-out attack can be launched in Western Europe? It is Western Europe that has the industrial production, the skilled manpower and the strategic positions that are needed to round out the Soviet military machine. Russia and her satellites have an overabundance of population. They lack in supplies and productive machinery.

Those who support General MacArthur's position state quite confidently that the Soviet Union would not intervene were we to attack the Chinese mainland. Of course, no one really knows what the Soviet will do. But, I call to your attention that General MacArthur clearly stated to the President on the occasion of the President's con-

945560-39068

ference on Wake Island in October 1950, that the Red Chinese armies would not intervene in Korea. I call this to your attention because then as now a risk was being contemplated and a military decision was being made. The military decision was that of advancing to the Yalu River in order to destroy the North Koreans. The risk involved was whether or not the Chinese Communist armies would move into the Korean War. History now tells us the answer. The Chinese armies did come into the war and momentarily the forces of the United Nations suffered tragic losses. It is reasonable to expect that an attack upon the Chinese mainland could and would provoke open Soviet intervention. The questions that we must ask ourselves then are simply these: Do we wish to take that risk? Are we prepared at this time by military strength and mobilization to meet all-out attack by the Soviet? What would be the effect upon our Armed Forces in the area of such a Soviet attack? What would be the effect of a Soviet attack in Western Europe at this time?

It is not divulging any secret when we openly recognize that we are presently weaker in terms of military strength than our adversary. This position will change within a year but today the Soviet Union and its satellites have a much larger army and air force than the United States and its allies. It appears to me that Soviet strategy is based on trapping us into a war on the Asiatic mainland only to strike in Western Europe, destroy our allies, and overrun the Western European countries. If this should happen, we would lose the only allies we have. We would lose the productive power of European industry. We would lose the critical raw materials and the strategic bases that are now under the control and possession of our allies. We would find ourselves without friends or allies and without vitally needed raw materials.

#### INCONSISTENCIES IN CONGRESS

We must seriously consider the consequences involved in extending and expanding the present conflict when we know what a difficult assignment we now have in Korea alone. It seems contradictory and confusing that the very same Members of the Congress who did everything in their power to either defeat or weaken the North Atlantic Pact and the Marshall plan, to prevent shipment of arms to our allies in Western Europe, and finally to prevent sending American troops for the common defense of Western Europe are now advocating the extension and expansion of hostilities in the Asiatic area. Only a few months ago this same group in Congress was advocating that we get out of Korea; now they are advocating that we go into China. Some Members of the Congress, while advocating an expansion of the war in Asia, have only recently voted to limit our Armed Forces and to weaken the program for selective service and universal military training.

I point out these inconsistencies because they need to be understood. It is clear that you cannot expand a war from Korea to China without taking the risk of World War III. You cannot expand hostilities from Korea to China without having more manpower and a far greater military force. You cannot expand hostilities from Korea to China without risking loss of Western Europe by a Soviet attack. It is imperative that we face up to the facts of our present military strength and that we clearly understand that the Soviet threat is worldwide and not localized.

The logical and consistent outcome of the policy of extending military action to the Chinese mainland was pointedly brought to light by a recent resolution introduced in the Congress by Senator CAIN, of the State of Washington, who proposed that the Government of the United States declare war

945560-39068

on Communist China. If this conflict is to grow, if it is to be extended, let it come only by the aggressive designs and tactics of the Soviet Union. If the Chinese Communist forces are assisted by Soviet air power, if our troops in Korea are attacked by concentrated air power—then we have but one choice, and that is to retaliate. This means that our efforts to limit this war in Korea have been checkmated by Soviet interference. The very survival and safety of our troops will demand that we attack the air bases and destroy this air power lest it destroy us. Let it be clear, however, that we would do this in defense. Up to now the Communists and North Korean forces have not had any major air power. Therefore, it has not been militarily necessary to attack the Manchurian air bases. If this new Communist offensive in Korea brings with it waves of airplanes, then we must attack the nests and the bases from whence these planes take off. Let us hope and pray that we can limit the conflict and bring this tragic Korean action to a speedy conclusion on the terms of a just and honorable peace.

International communism now fully understands that we will resist aggression. The policy of our Government has been one of firm and resolute resistance to Communist aggression and subversion. No partisan debate nor any beclouding of the issues can remove from the annals of history the clear and unmistakable fact that President Truman, the Secretary of State, and the Congress in the development of our foreign policy have delivered hammer blows against Communist imperialism.

I welcome General MacArthur's arrival in the United States and his address to the Congress. The debate over foreign policy in the Far East will serve to reaffirm our Far Eastern program and to make it clear and understandable to the American people. It

is only fair and honorable that one should await the outcome of the congressional hearings before dogmatic conclusions are made. It is my hope that a basic sense of fair play will continue to permeate our attitude as we discuss and debate our foreign policy. Above all, we must be united as a Nation, for the dangers that we face are great.

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AND AMERICAN POLICY

The desire of our Government is to get out of Korea, but only when aggression has been stopped. We are not fighting the Chinese people. The Chinese people have been victims of corruption on one hand and now of a Communist police state on the other. It is the official policy of our Government, and it surely is my personal view, that at all times we should extend the hand of friendship and fellowship to the Chinese people, but to do this does not mean to embrace their masters or their dictators. In fact, if we have true affection for the Chinese people, we will not only want them free from Western domination, but also from Communist dictation. If one has real affection for the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and other countries, he should want, above all else, these people to be liberated from those who have defiled their government and their nation.

Recently I joined with several other Senators in offering a Senate resolution expressing friendship for the Russian people. It is the policy of our Government to disassociate the people from their Communist masters. Our whole program of information and truth must make it clear that our desire is for peace. We must appeal to the people of Russia and her satellites. That appeal must be directed over and beyond the government. There are many evidences of restlessness and of tension within the Soviet empire. It is thoroughly possible that one of the reasons that Russia has not precipitated conflict in Europe is because of the

945560—39068

fear that the Communist leaders have of their own people and, particularly, of the people in the conquered countries. Our intelligence agencies report that the Communist leadership is having a difficult time keeping order in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries. The people of Poland and Czechoslovakia are a freedom-loving people. They are proud of their national history. We must appeal to them. We must give them assurance of our support when and if they attempt to throw off the yoke of Communist oppression. This is what is called psychological warfare, an area in which we have been very weak.

#### SUMMARY

Therefore, our foreign policy must have many parts: in some areas economic assistance, in other areas such as Western Europe, economic assistance plus a political and military alliance. Our policy toward the nations taken over by Russia should be that of encouraging their breaking away, such as happened in Yugoslavia. Once they have broken away, we should offer them whatever assistance is within our means.

Another part of our foreign policy is and must be military and economic strength here at home in the United States. It is for this reason that we are mobilizing our forces, expanding our production, and strengthening our economy. The real secret weapon that America has is the strength of its people, the strength of its government, the power of its industry, the over-all health of its economy. Whatever we do, we must constantly keep in mind that we, the people of the United States, have a great responsibility of leadership. The whole world looks to us for guidance, for inspiration—yes, for economic aid and military assistance. This is a tremendous burden for our people to bear, but, I submit, it is a burden much less crushing than war.

There are no easy answers to these difficult problems that face us today. There is no short cut to peace. We must be prepared for years of earnest endeavor and sacrifice. We must develop a sense of poise and strength that comes through understanding

945560—39068

and a realization of the righteousness of our cause. I believe that Almighty God will crown our efforts with success. I join with you in seeking Divine guidance and inspiration, for there are some things man cannot do alone.

*[The text on this page is extremely faint and illegible. It appears to be a multi-paragraph document with several lines of text per paragraph. The content is mostly lost due to the quality of the scan.]*



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)