

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D.C.
National 8-3120, Ext. 881

For Release: Saturday a.m.
May 12, 1956

SENATOR HUMPHREY OUTLINES 12-POINT FOREIGN POLICY 'GEARED TO PEOPLE'

While maintaining "a shield of strength", the United States must expound and exemplify a more dynamic and constructive American foreign policy "appealing to people rather than just governments, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) warned yesterday.

In an address before the Convocation of the Senior Class at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore yesterday on "The Strengths and Weaknesses of our Foreign Policy", Senator Humphrey declared:

"The greatest challenge of our time is to recognize the kind of world in which we live...to profit and learn from the lessons of history, that we are in a world of revolutionary change.

"Governments come and go, but the people go on forever. A successful foreign policy is one that has the support of the people back home as well as the acceptance of the people abroad to whom it is directed. A weakness in our foreign policy is that too much attention is paid to the embassies and the foreign ministers, and too little attention to the workers in the factories, to the native in the villages," Senator Humphrey declared.

"To the extent that we have lost friends, we have done so because we have forgotten the message of human brotherhood and equality, or forgotten to preach and live that message."

Senator Humphrey outlined a 12-point program by which he declared "we can live as well as preach that message," including:

1. "We must embrace that spirit of nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries...we must remind these people that we too are the children of revolution, and that we have never lost our goals of self-determination, freedom and independence.
2. "We must reflect a warm and genuine respect for the dignity of people everywhere, a respect which does not fluctuate with Russian policy, and which does not exhibit itself only when events have reached the crisis stage.
3. "We must respect the so-called neutrality of new-born nations for what it is -- a frank assertion by sensitive people that they do not want to become appendages to Soviet imperialism or Western collective security.
4. "We should engage in greater use of our capital through international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and other international financial development groups. We should consider doing more on the basis of long-term loans rather than on the basis of gifts.
5. "We should step up our technical assistance program, and add to it by working through the United Nations and offering to expand UN technical assistance.
6. "Let us use our blessings of food and fiber. We can proceed through the United Nations offering vast quantities of produce to be placed under the direction of an International Food and Fiber Reserve.
7. "We must set a good standard at home...liberalize our immigration laws, extend our Refugee Relief Act, and improve our program of civil rights.

M O R E

8. "We should authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchanges, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, workers, businessmen, journalists and others engaged in public communication.

9. "We should devote new emphasis to the United Nations agencies whose progress represents America's compassion and generosity on a world scale...the World Health Organization, the Children's Emergency Fund, the Food and Agricultural Organization and the International Labor Organization.

10. "We must systematically set about reducing tariffs and other artificial obstacles to world trade, including a re-examination of East-West trade restrictions.

11. "We must make unceasing efforts toward the reduction of armaments and the realization of universal disarmament. We must instill spirit and meaning into the disarmament discussions by demonstrating imagination.

12. "Let us again and again challenge the Soviet Union to fulfill the requirements of the United Nations Charter, asking her to join with us in the expansion of the agencies and services of the United Nations, asking her to join with us, not only in a program of disarmament, but in a program of economic rehabilitation under the guidance and direction of the United Nations. Let us be so bold and daring and imaginative with our program and proposals that a refusal on the part of the Soviet to go along will leave her alone and forsaken."

Speech by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
before the
Convocation of the Senior Class
at Johns Hopkins University
May 11, 1956

Please Return to Sen. Humphrey

THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

It is a special honor for me to come to Baltimore to address you this morning. When my friend, Dr. Malcolm Moos, of your distinguished Political Science Department told me that I would be speaking to members of the senior class, I remembered what used to be said about my own alma mater, the University of Minnesota. Someone on a commencement platform there once casually remarked that the University had achieved its high academic reputation for two reasons: the freshmen brought so much information in with them when they came, and the seniors took so little out with them when they left. I trust that this same statement cannot be made of you.

As a matter of fact, I am particularly pleased to come to Johns Hopkins to discuss "The Strengths and Weaknesses of our Foreign Policy". It was here at your University in 1876, 80 years ago, that a famous visiting Englishman, Thomas Huxley spoke some words which have long been a challenge to me. He told his Johns Hopkins audience:

"I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree

impressed by your bigness, or your material resources as such. Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs a true sublimity and the terror of overhanging fate, is what are you going to do with all these things?"

What we are doing or not doing with them, my friends, has a lot to do at the moment with the strengths and weaknesses of our foreign policy.

To begin with, we have built enough into the American tradition so that the very term foreign policy has always disturbed me. The word "foreign" has a negative meaning. It indicates something apart, different, unusual. I suggest that our relationships with other nations are no longer something apart from our everyday life. Nor should these relationships be different from our domestic policy. I prefer to recognize our relationships with other nations as an international policy, a policy of interdependence rather than a foreign policy. Just to show how strongly I support this contention, I have introduced a resolution in the Senate to change the name of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Committee on International Relations. Foreign policy seems to suggest the 19th Century, the era of colonialism and imperialism. International policy speaks of the 20th Century. It has its roots in the United Nations, in a spirit of interdependence without sacrificing national independence.

What I have just said was a digression, but I think it has some bearing on my theme. Let me proceed now with some general observations which occur to me as I try to relive some of the things I have read, heard, seen and done during the past few years, not so much as a Senator who happens to be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but more as an ordinary American who tries to remain moderately alert to what is going on about him.

The greatest challenge of our time is to recognize the kind of world in which we live, and to profit and learn from the lessons of history. -- A world in revolutionary change.

We here in America have learned that peoples of different backgrounds, races, national origins and creeds can live together, work together, and build together. This achievement was made possible by a belief in and dedication to the universally accepted principles of a free society -- the dignity of man, freedom of conscience and a recognition of fraternity and brotherhood. Our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the principles of the French Revolution and the Magna Charta are the historical testimonials to the practical adaptation of these democratic ideals and principles. If it is possible to build a great nation whose destiny and progress is guided by these ideals, it should give us faith and hope that we are capable of doing our part in building a world order that will not sacrifice these principles and the institutions of freedom and justice.

Our history, our heritage and experience in self-government, yes our own revolution, are in fact the sources of our strength. Our foreign policy is weakened and limited only insofar as we forget or fail to apply the yardstick of our democratic experience to the complex and intricate problems of the world in which we live. The enhancement of freedom is not made possible by aping the enemies of freedom. Democracy and free institutions are not made more secure or advanced by utilizing totalitarian techniques. To be strong we must be true to ourselves.

How true to ourselves have we been? Considering the whole sweep of the past half century, I am still proud of what our country has done in world affairs. During this time we have gradually learned that national independence can be sustained and made meaningful only by a recognition of international interdependence. It took us two world wars and a world-wide depression to have this fact driven home.

It is to our credit, however, that we have learned our lesson and to our sorrow that we have had to pay so dearly for this belated knowledge. Today the climate of public opinion in America is one of acceptance of international responsibility. Isolationism is a thing of the past. The acceptance of our role in the affairs of the world is the most prominent political fact of our generation.

The crowning glory of the 20th Century is the creation of the United Nations. We can ever be proud of our leading role in this greatest of all achievements in the realm of international politics. Once the victory on the battlefield was won we did not turn our backs upon a war-weary and stricken world. Our finest hour was yet to come. We mobilized our resources to help the needy, to feed the hungry, to heal the sick, to rebuild the devastated cities, to help others re-constitute free government, to re-establish commerce and trade, to rehabilitate the exhausted economies of friend and foe alike. Here was the true expression of the spirit of American Democracy. Here was a practical blending between applied democratic policy and the spirit of our religious teachings. Here was compassion and charity, here was forgiveness and kindness, here was the full expression of American generosity and faith.

In the course of all of this, we made mistakes. We Americans had been so absorbed with the challenges of American political and economic life that we were not prepared, either psychologically or professionally, for international administration or participation, but we did the best we could.

We worked with what we had. We compensated for our lack of expert knowledge and training with a will to succeed, and an abundance of resources, and a spirit of compassion and

generosity. The strength of our foreign policy in this period was the strength of a good heart and a willing spirit. It was the strength of practicing our ideals. It was the strength of doing when something needed to be done. It was the strength of action when those of lesser courage might have hesitated.

Nor should we forget or underestimate the accomplishment of creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- the most successful and the greatest alliance in the world's history. We did not content ourselves merely with a paper structure. We set ourselves to the task of building muscle and sinew around the structural anatomy of a collective security pact. The programs of military assistance, the Marshall Plan, and mutual security gave spirit and strength to nations that only yesterday were weak and helpless. The Marshall Plan will live in the pages of history as the most successful program of economic rehabilitation and recovery of recorded history. Not only was it great and imaginative in its design and purpose, but it has been equally great in its accomplishment.

It was almost beyond human capacity to rebuild a war-weary world. But to this awful burden was added the even more intolerable burden of resisting and defeating the inroads of

Communist imperialism and subversion. It is nothing short of a miracle that the areas of human freedom are as great as they are.

In large part the reason for this miracle was the fact that at a critical time we did not shirk from the deal. We moved into action. It was here that NATO played such a significant role, because supporting Communist subversion was the power of the Red Army. The Marshall Plan met the Communist aggressor on the economic front. In both areas we checkmated the Communist conspiracy. The Red Army did not move. The Western European economies did not fall prey to collectivism and Communism. Germany did not fall into the hands of the Kremlin. Berlin was not strangled into submission. Soviet troops were removed from Iran. The Mediterranean area did not become a Soviet Lake. Greece and Turkey were not destroyed by Communist subversion and armed attack. The Truman Doctrine, backed by the Greek-Turkish Aid Program, filled the power vacuum that was left by the withdrawal of British strength from the Mediterranean. Men like Mayor Reuter of Berlin, Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany, supported by American aid, defied the Communists and brought Germany and Berlin safely through the Communist onslaught.

These developments represent the strength of American foreign policy, but a strength that was always fortified by

the wholehearted cooperation of our allies and associated^S
in the great North Atlantic Treaty Alliance.

Communist aggression and subversion checked in Western Europe moved to a new front and the attack was launched on South Korea.

The decision of our government and of the United Nations to resist aggression in Korea may well be recorded in history as the turning point in the struggle against Communist totalitarianism. The design and plan of the Kremlin, thwarted in Western Europe, was now challenged and defeated on the battlefield in Korea. Collective security had met its first test and it succeeded. The free nations stood together.

Yet today no objective observer of America's position in the world would say that our world position is as strong as this splendid record might indicate. For any one who believes what he reads in today's newspapers, we seem at best to be engaged in a holding operation with our main position everywhere being undermined. From the North Atlantic to the Sea of Japan, examples of the deterioration of our position can be found:

In Iceland, at the urging of the Communists and their usual allies, the extreme nationalist, the Parliament recently passed a resolution that American troops should leave.

In Scandinavia, the governments are engaging in increased diplomatic and trade negotiations with Moscow.

In Britain, ~~new voices wait only for~~ emergency in Britain's world-wide economic condition to add to the demand that the strategic air command leave its crucial East Anglia bases. The Communist^s may soon be in a position to supply such an economic crisis by the conquest of Malaya.

In Germany, there is increasing demand for closer economic cooperation with Russia following last year's diplomatic recognition of the U.S.S.R. by the Bonn government.

I have tried in vain to discover whether the State Department has any alternative German policy in mind against the day when our staunch friend, Chancellor Adenauer is no longer head of the West German government.

In Italy, President Gronchi has been one of the most conspicuous critics of present American policies, and the Communist party of Italy remains the largest Communist party in the world outside of the Soviet Union.

In Yugoslavia, Marshall Tito has made gestures of reconciliation with the Soviet Union, thereby adding to rehabilitate the Communist position in the satellites and to insure against further defection.

In Greece, anti-American demonstrations over our ambiguous position on the Cyprus dispute have at times matched the vehemence of Greek opposition to British position. The Cyprus controversy has embroiled all three of our NATO allies -- Britain, Greece and Turkey, and the whole southern flank of NATO could crumble.

In North Africa, the French divisions which we have maintained to help defend Western Europe against Soviet aggression are busy in a vain attempt to bolster the decadent French colonial position.

In the Middle East, Dag Hammarskjold has won us a slight reprieve in an explosive situation which is still capable of embroiling us in a world struggle at any moment.

In Pakistan, our "strongest" military ally ^{the} on Asian continent, a Chinese Communist good-will delegation from Peking, headed by the widow of Dr. Sun Yat-Sen, has just been given a warm and enthusiastic reception.

In Afghanistan, as a reaction to our arms aid shipments to Pakistan, the Soviet Union has made greater inroads in the last two years than it has in the past century. I do not know how many British soldiers died in the Afghan wars of the 19th century to forestall Russia's age-old ambitions to expand southward, but within the past few months we have seem^ed to let the situation go by default.

In India and Burma, the most important countries of free Asia, American policy is publicly and repeatedly denounced, and instead of trying to retrieve our position in South Asia we act petulant and resentful and continue to cut off our nose to spite our face.

In Thailand, ~~as only other~~ Asian SEATO ally besides Pakistan, ~~we are asking~~ and relying upon a nation which prides itself on not having fought a war in 400 years and whose Prime Minister now is the same gentlemen who surrendered overnight to the Japanese invaders in 1941.

In Indonesia, a definite increase in pro-Communist sentiment can be detected in the recent election results in this vast new nation which used to be a part of the Dutch empire.

In South Korea and Formosa, we are backing regimes which have given us loyal and stalwart support, but which are suspect throughout the rest of Asia and which have little or ~~not~~ support *elsewhere* even among our NATO allies.

In the United Nations, there has been a definite increase among almost all U.N. members of agreement with the Soviet Union on important votes. 60% of the members of the U.N. agreed ^{more} with the Soviet Union in General Assembly votes in 1955 than in 1954.

How has this alarming situation been allowed to develop?

The Communists themselves, of course, are partly responsible.

I call to your attention the meeting of the Communist Chieftans in Moscow in September and October of 1952. It was here that Joseph Stalin outlined the change of Soviet tactics and strategy. The program of open violence and aggression was to be replaced by a policy of political maneuver, economic warfare, stepped-up subversion, and dividing the United States from her allies.

Special attention was to be directed to the underdeveloped, uncommitted nations where the margin of clear-cut victory might lie.

Since 1952, and especially during the last year, the Soviet Union has exhibited a remarkable flexibility in its diplomatic behavior. If the true sentiments of the world's population could be learned today, we ^{might} very possibly discover that our country's policies and attitudes have been subject to tremendously increased misunderstanding and resentment. This is not necessarily reflected in our formal treaty engagements or in the colorful number of little pins stuck to the military maps at the Pentagon. But I am speaking of genuine heart-to-heart loyalty, people and nations whom we can count upon abroad. These we no longer have to the extent we had them in earlier years.

My friends, I am convinced that this deterioration of our world position is relevant to the American political scene. You do not win elections by continuing to convince the convinced, or by discrediting an opponent already discredited. We in American politics understand it is the independent vote that determines the outcome. You gain that vote by standing on principle and coming forth with a program that has a wider appeal than just to the partisans you have already won. To put it another way, I have a feeling that we have become more concerned about the importance of exposing Soviet tactics than we have of expounding a dynamic and constructive American foreign policy.

The world is hungry for peace. The Kremlin talks peace. Bulganin and Khrushchev seem to sense world public opinion. To be sure they are not able to convince the leaders of the nations that their program for peace is honorable and true. These leaders, however, are always subject to public opinion of their respective countries and I noticed that Moscow again and again appealed over the governments to the people. Soviet propaganda has never convinced delegates to the United Nations, but it has been effective in the villages, cities, and rural areas of countries that have delegates in the United Nations. The Soviet propaganda repeats the word "people" again and again, and regrettably the statements of our present diplomatic officials reveal that we are permitting our diplomacy to become the special privilege of the elite -- of the diplomat -- or even more unfortunate, sacrificing sound policy for domestic political advantage.

Governments come and go, but the people go on forever. A successful foreign policy is one that has the support of the people back home as well as the acceptance of the people abroad to whom it is directed. A weakness in our foreign policy is that too much attention is paid to the embassies and the foreign ministries and too little attention to the workers in the factories, to the native in the villages. How paradoxical this is.

Here we see the ironical situation of the dictators speaking like democrats, with a small 'd', appealing to the people; of the tyrant extolling the virtues of freedom; of the oppressor dramatizing himself as the liberator and the emancipator. Yes, the irony of an imperialist extolling the virtues of self-determination. In our anxiety to win the debate point by point, to discredit our opponent on each and every occasion, we sacrifice the affirmative case that we need to make.

To be sure this is not always the case. The President's proposal of use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is an example of what I mean by accentuating the positive and stating the affirmative case. Whenever we have done this we have been on the march to victory. The Marshall plan is another example where we literally ignored the arguments of the Kremlin and proceeded with our own program. NATO again provides a concrete example of action. The Point Four Program is another example where a positive and constructive proposal left the Communists bewildered, confused, and weakened. We have examples of seizing the initiative, but all too often once we have seized it, and are parading down the boulevard of a better world, we lose our trail and end up in a side street or back alley of bitter arguments with the Communist protagonist.

We may very well have the shift the emphasis in our foreign policy in the days to come. I am personally convinced that the

Soviet Union has ~~given up any hope of any~~ further success in Europe. She may well seek to stabilize Europe even to the point of cooperating in the reunification of Germany and granting her satellite states a degree of independence and autonomy. We have no accurate way of knowing how much trouble, economically or politically, exists within the Iron Curtain area. We do know that all is not well. We do know that if the burden of rearmament is heavy upon rich America, it rests much heavier upon the much weaker Soviet economy. Remember it costs money to build guns, tanks, and planes in the Soviet ~~Union~~ just as it does here.

I am always shocked and disappointed when I hear spokesmen of American finance and industry expound upon the fear of bankruptcy for our country ~~if~~ we maintain a strong defense program. They show little faith in free political and economic institutions or possibly they reveal gross ignorance of what the burden of such a rearmament race is upon a relatively poor and collectivized economy.

Then I imagine it is fair to assume that all has not been well in the satellite countries. They were impoverished and destroyed by the war as were huge areas of the Soviet Union itself. Add to this, the costs of the Korean war to the Soviet, her aid to China, the admitted deficiencies of Soviet agriculture, the difficult task of rebuilding the area destroyed by world

war II, and it seems reasonable to say that there is and has been trouble behind the Iron Curtain.

There is more reason to believe that the men in the Kremlin want time to consolidate their empire, time to strengthen their economy, time to consolidate their position -- a position which has been very unstable since the death of Stalin. Whatever may be the reason for the Soviet peace talk, there is ample evidence to lead one to believe that concessions will be made, that tensions, at least temporarily, will be eased, that there will be a period of time when the possibilities for peace look more inviting and encouraging.

COPY

The one word that seems important to me is time. But this concept of time is meaningless unless it is used, and the question is who will use the time and for what purpose. If there is to be a time period for easing of tensions, will this mean less effort on our part? Are we to assume that the long-range objective of Communism--namely, to dominate the world--will be given up or set aside? I see no convincing evidence to lead to that conclusion. Therefore, time is an ally to whomever preempts it--uses it. We can be sure the Bolsheviks will not waste it--whether we like it or not. "Coexistence" will be competitive. We had better plan our future around this fact.

We Americans are prone to underestimate the technical competence of the modern Soviet system. The record should be clear: The Soviet has made remarkable strides in technical and scientific advance. She emphasizes in her educational structure, science and technology. Every policy and every directive is concentrated on producing military strength. Civilian goods, the needs of the consumer, are subordinated to the production of capital goods and modern armaments. The police state is not responsive to public opinion as is a democratic state. We must never forget that dictatorship removes dissident elements through the cruel and heartless process of liquidation, murder and

COPY
banishment. Public demonstrations of protest are crushed, at the same time that the dictator arouses in the minds of the people a fear of foreign intervention, encirclement or attack.

I say these things because even some of our own policy makers have, on occasion, indicated that there may be a split between the Russian people and the Communist party. The people have nothing to say about the government of the Soviet. The Communist party and the government are one and the same. They are political Siamese twins, but with only one head -- the Communist party apparatus.

It is wishful thinking to base a foreign policy upon any major upheaval in the Soviet Union, or even in the satellite states. What is more, when one such upheaval did take place, namely the riots in East Germany and Czechoslovakia in June of 1953, we were unprepared, we had no policy. All the loose talk of liberation that was so much a part of the 1952 Presidential campaign, was either forgotten or forsaken. We were without an ambassador in the Soviet Union on the death of Stalin. Our central intelligence was unable to obtain any information that indicated the demotion of Malenkov and the elevation of Bulganin. We were short of facts and information, and therefore unprepared to make any policy shift that might have worked to our advantage.

COPY

Every conceivable effort should be made to expand our intelligence service to give us more information. We were caught short even at the time of the North Korean invasion, despite the fact that our own military had been in North Korea for at least two years prior to the agreement on the 38th Parallel as a line of demarkation between North and South Korea.

Therefore, wishful thinking about the condition of the Soviet will get us no where. What is more important is to build strength and cooperation between ourselves and our allies. To use every means at our command, to expand the area of freedom, to strengthen the independent and neutral nations so they can resist subversion from within and aggression from without. Yes, to be prepared for every eventuality, recognizing we face the most powerful and diabolical menace the word has ever known.

Having said this, what do we do? Let me offer a few suggestions.

Until some fool-proof, iron-clad, universal system of disarmament can be arrived at and fully agreed to with proper supervision, or other protective devices, we must maintain in cooperation with our allies a powerful defense force. The heart and core of that defense force must be continuing and expanding emphasis upon research and development. This includes both basic and applied research.

COPY

Here the present Administration flounders and vacillates. Far too often Secretary Wilson has been content with slogans and cuts. During the first few months as Defense Secretary in 1953, Mr. Wilson authorized a five million dollar cut in the military budget without bothering to explore the details of how this would affect our military position. He later told Congress that nobody had told him exactly how these cuts would affect the Air Force. Today when confronted with incontrovertible evidence that the Russians are developing new planes in half the time that it takes our Air Force to do a comparable job, ^{are} ~~are~~ out-producing us in plane types such as heavy bombers and supersonic fighters, and have a significant lead in ballistic missile development, Secretary Wilson shrugs it off as of little importance. The astonishing story of how American airpower has been forced to relinquish its once significant lead over all international competition is currently being laid before the American people by the Senate investigating subcommittee headed by Senator Symington.

I am not a military expert, but I do suggest that it should be a matter of firm national policy that this nation have the greatest airforce in the world -- modern, available, combat effective. The airforce, of course, must be supported by modern weapons. We cannot afford to be second-best, nor

COPY
can we be satisfied with having the planes on the drafting board or the modern weapons at laboratory research stage of development. I am talking about a defense force in being. Whatever the cost of that defense force may be, we must be prepared to pay it.

I re-emphasize the importance of scientific and technological development. This means giving our scientists greater leeway, being less suspicious, recognizing that scientists frequently are unorthodox in their social and political views. There is a wide difference between disloyalty and non-conformity. We must protect our nation from disloyalty and subversion. But this does not necessarily mean discharging a scientist of foreign birth who maintains his citizenship in a country like Switzerland, who is a known anti-Communist. We need the intelligence and scientific know-how of free men everywhere. Just as we have created a collective defense force in NATO, I suggest we build a collective scientific force amongst the free nations, pooling ideas and knowledge, and drawing from that common pool for the development of defense and the expansion and progress of the partners.

A protective shield^{ie} of military strength bolstered by continuing scientific progress, is an elementary essential for national security, but armed strength in a democracy is supposed to be the servant and protector of policy, not

COPY

a substitute for it. Military strength is a shield which need not be brandished. It should be consistently maintained but quietly regarded.

Hence, while I have emphasized military strength, I want to make it crystal clear that a policy based on military strength alone is hopelessly inadequate and is rapidly becoming less and less pertinent to the challenge which we now face in world affairs. ~~Military strength must be supported by a dynamic and expanding economy.~~

Yet in recent months we have so conducted ourselves that the world has seen an increasingly militaristic image of us. A recent public opinion poll in Calcutta showed that 38% of the Indians interviewed said that America was the nation most likely to start World War III. Only 2% selected the Soviet Union. Only ^{1%} ~~10%~~ Communist China, and the rest did not know.

This seems incredible until we read that another survey showed that 86% of all newspaper references to the United States in a single month were wire service reports from America of statements by American officials on military matters — our ^{newest} ~~best~~ atomic submarine, our far-flung air bases, our latest jets, our guided missile program. Thus millions of Indians, through our own statements, have come to think of us as a militaristic nation.

COPY

Politically designed publications and articles employing clever catch phrases such as "massive retaliation" and "brink of war" make good headlines for American newspapers and magazines but they do not make good policy, nor do they provide a strong defense, nor do they win us friends.

If we are to achieve a real position of strength we must devote our political and economic resources and our time and talents to the challenge of a better world. We must maintain the closest cooperation with our allies, and we must ^{ei} seize the opportunity to expand NATO, for instance, beyond a mere defense organization into the fields of ^{political} broader economic and social policy.

The first principle of Soviet strategy is to divide us from our allies, to break up the grand alliance, ^{to} ~~to~~ portray America as the real threat to the independence and self-determination of peoples and nations. Therefore, every conceivable effort must be made for a meeting of the minds, for a common understanding by the leaders of the nations of the free areas of the world. This requires patience along with respect for and confidence in our partners. We have allies, not satellites. We cannot bully and coerce. We can only seek to persuade and give counsel. But decisions arrived at through consultation and discussion are firm decisions -- the privileged possession of all participants.

COPY

I also urge that we give special attention to the attitudes and policies of our Asian, African, and Latin American neighbors.

Negotiating from strength, therefore, means military power and political unity, based on mutual respect and confidence among the free nations.

Any step in the direction of relaxed tensions must be welcomed by us and we should lead in the effort. It is essential that we peer behind and beyond the Communist threat long enough ^{to} look thoughtfully at the basic problems that we would have to face even if there were not a Communist ^{alive} Asia anywhere, even if Karl Marx had never lived. Most of these issues ^{are} ~~are~~ problems of revolt against the status quo in the interest of a wider achievement of human dignity. Today this revolt has swept Asia, and it is already reaching Africa. The Communists, however wrong they may be, are not blind to these problems. In a sense they are challenging us Americans to be true to ourselves and our own past traditions. As General Romulo of the Philippines has written recently: "To get closer to the heart of Asia, America must use its own heart more. The peoples of Asia will respond with understanding and sympathy to the freedom-loving, the generous-hearted, the deeply humane America of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

COPY

I have been disturbed because of the reluctance of some of our top officials to recognize the opportunity that was at hand once the plan of a Big Four conference crystallized. This is no time for timid souls. This is the time for men of imagination, courage and daring. The peoples of the world are weary of the constant threat of nuclear war, and particularly when that threat keeps coming from us in the strident voices of small men. The peoples are looking for a clear and challenging political faith that will arouse them to self-determination and liberation from both political and social tyranny. The toxin of fear has run its course. A tired and suffering humanity seeks the nourishing food of applied idealism. This is it our advantage.

We are not warriors in the strict interpretation of the word. Our history is traditionally one of an expanding democracy -- the fulfillment of equality of opportunity, the relation of human equality of law in the social order, and the dedication to a rising standard of living for all. It is these very virtues that fit the present world scene.

It is time, therefore, that we walk confidently in the stature, strength and competence that our history and our present circumstances verify. In a world that is desperately in need of capital, we have the greatest capital resources among all nations. In a world where people are anxious for the blessings of science and technology, we are

COPY

richly endowed with these blessings. In a world where the majority of people are ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad, we are privileged to have an abundance of food and fiber and the knowledge of scientific progress for health and shelter.

We have that intangible source of strength that was so brilliantly emphasized ^{at} in the recent Bandung conference, the spiritual values of freedom, the history of a people that cast off the yoke of colonialism, the thrilling and inspiring story of a new nation conceived in liberty, with a government of the people, and by the people, and for the people.

I know we Americans take all of this for granted, but it truly is the good news of the Twentieth Century. Millions of people in Asia and Africa are repeating in their own way the dramatic story of American independence. They are doing what we did. We above all people, should be understanding and sympathetic to their cause. There is an identity of interest, of purpose and of history, if we will but see it and make ourselves a part of it. National independence self-determination, liberation from colonialism--all of this we have experienced. This is our message to the world. This message, found in the Declaration of Independence, has given faith to millions of people seeking dignity in all corners of the globe. This message of faith in human brotherhood and in human equality is our reservoir of goodwill in

COPY

the world. It was this message that found its way into every speech at Bandung, save that of Chou En Lai. It is the spiritual and political values that make our society what it is, that really topped the news in the Asian-African conference. America was respected not for her atom bombs, nor her wealth, but for her ideals and her history. We must be true to these.

To the extent that we have lost friends, we have done so because we have forgotten the message of human brotherhood and equality, or forgotten to preach and live that message.

We can live as well as preach that message by doing several specific things:

1. I suggest that we embrace that spirit of nationalism that grips the under-developed and under-privileged countries. We must remind these people that we too are the children of revolution and that we have never lost our goals of self-determination, freedom and independence.
2. We must reflect a warm and genuine respect for the dignity of people everywhere, a respect which does not fluctuate with Russian policy, and which does not exhibit itself only when events have reached the crisis stage.
3. We must respect the so-called neutrality of new-born nations for what it is -- a frank assertion

by sensitive people that they do not want to become appendages to Soviet imperialism or Western collective security.

They have unhappy memories of exploitation by certain Western European countries who are now our allies. Their leaders have a keen awareness of the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion and have taken strong measures to defeat the Communist conspiracy. These neutrals are not pro-Communist they are pro-themselves. And I suggest that as long as nations remain free, as long as the new nations of Asia and Africa work for themselves, create self-government, build their own economies, they are in fact strengthening the forces of freedom in the world. Why are we so much more critical of the neutralism of Burma and India than we are of the neutralism of Switzerland, Finland, and Sweden? Surely we realize that our friends of Switzerland, Finland, and Sweden are pro-democratic, pro-freedom. We admire their qualities, we admire their democracy, we herald their accomplishments. Let us be equally tolerant with the Asian nations.

4. We should engage in greater use of our capital through international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and other international financial development groups. We should consider doing more on the basis of long-term loans rather than on the basis of gifts.

COPY

Our total loan economic aid program should be thought of in an over-all relationship relative to our own and our allies' trade with underdeveloped countries. The Paley report, for instance, has indicated that we will become increasingly dependent on underdeveloped areas for minerals and other natural resources. Loans made now might be repaid 25 years from now in the form of natural resources. Above all our foreign economic policy should be viewed in the perspective of our long term economic relations as a part of a viable, integrated, free-world economy rather than in the harsh terminology of "handouts for foreigners". When Krushchev and Bulganin ^{they met} went to India, /peasants on the roadside and told them "we will share with you down to our last crust of bread". They did not mean it, but they said it. We are not saying it. We should. And we should mean it.

5. We should ~~step~~ up our technical assistance program and add to it by working through the United Nations and offering to expand UN technical assistance. Our government has consistently dragged its feet on the special United Nations Fund for Economic Development known as SUNFED, despite the fact that a majority of our friends in the United Nations have long begged us to support it. The Administration still refuses to budge.

COPY

6. Let us use our blessings of food and fiber.

We can proceed through the United Nations offering vast quantities of produce to be placed under the general direction of the UN Food and Fiber Reserve. Here we can seize the initiative. In the absence of Administration action, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has scheduled hearings on a Resolution of mine which would promote the development of a World Food and Fiber Reserve.

7. We must set a good standard at home, *Liberalize* our immigration laws, extend our Refugee Relief Act, and improve our program of *rights* civil defense.

8. We should authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchange, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, workers, businessmen, journalists and others engaged in public communication. I am delighted to report that the Senate last month adopted a new measure of mine to promote international cultural exchange and *participation in* *trade fairs,* international affairs and festivals.

9. We should devote new emphasis to the United Nations agencies whose progress represent America's compassion and generosity on a world scale. These groups include the World Health Organization, Children's Emergency Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the International Labor Organization. I regret exceedingly that our participation in both of the latter organizations may be curtailed because

COPY

of shortsighted action taken in the Senate to restrict our financial contributions to both. Until this week we have also had a running fight with the State Department over its opposition to the proposed International Labor Organization convention against forced labor. Until Monday we had been in the preposterous position of being the only member of the International Labor Organization which has opposed this stand against forced labor. After Congressional prodding the State Department has finally reversed its position and we are ^{now} belatedly going to support this forthright international action.

10. We must systematically set about reducing tariffs and other artificial obstacles to world trade including a re-examination of East-West trade restrictions. In the present Congress the debate on this issue will center upon the proposed organization for trade cooperation. I am hopeful that the Administration will pay more than lip service to this proposal, because we will need votes from the Republican side of the aisle this year to pass this legislation.

11. We must make unceasing efforts toward the reduction of armaments and the realization of universal disarmament. We must instill spirit and meaning into the disarmament discussions by demonstrating imagination.

COPY

Lately I have been spending considerable time as the Chairman of a special subcommittee on disarmament. We have had some stimulating hearings, printed copies of which are available to any of you who may be interested. I should be delighted to send them to you if you will write to my office. No one can study the disarmament picture and feel optimistic. Nevertheless the prospect of ever larger bombs and hitherto unimagined terrors is a prospect which requires everyone of us to devote his best thought to the subject. Personally, I would like to see a little more proposing by our disarmament negotiations. ~~xxx~~ The conscience of the world will insist that we persevere in this disarmament effort.

12. Let us again and again challenge the Soviet Union to fulfill the requirements of the ^{United Nations} Charter, ^{ASKING} ~~Ask~~ her to join with us in the expansion of the agencies and services of the United Nations, ^{ASKING} ~~Ask~~ her to join with us, not only in a program of disarmament, but in a program of economic rehabilitation under the guidance and direction of the United Nations. Let us be so bold and daring and imaginative with our program and proposals that a refusal on the part of the Soviet to go along will leave her alone and forsaken.

It is time we recognized that power is more than armaments and wealth. Power is people and ideals -- people

COPY

who aspire to freedom and dignity, ideals that make possible an enlightened and civilized society.

I shall long remember what the Prime Minister of Burma had to say on his ~~recent~~ visit here to Washington. He said: "American ideals are more explosive than your atom bombs."

Here is the voice of the New Asia asking us to reassert our faith; asking us to live by the inspiration of our own traditions. Reminding us that the strength of the spirit is mightier than the sword.

I am sure that it is that strength too which Thomas Huxley had in mind 80 years ago at Johns Hopkins in the words ^I ~~he~~ quoted when ^I ~~he~~ began:

"I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree impressed by your bigness, or your material resources as such. Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs a true sublimity and the terror of overhanging fate, is what are you going to do with all these things?"

Huxley's question is with us still, more urgently and insistently than ever before. What this nation does with its great gifts depends in the last analysis on what you and I do. Whatever the answer to the question is, you and I in our lifetimes ^{will} ~~may~~ probably have to write it.



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