

# WNYC

MUNICIPAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM  
MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
NEW YORK 7, N. Y.



WH.3-3600 EXT. 2159-2164

# NEWS RELEASE

SENATOR HUMPHREY CALLS FOR COMPLETELY UNITED GERMANY IN NATO  
URGES IMMEDIATE OIL SHIPMENTS TO WESTERN EUROPE UNDER OEC

EMPHASIZES FREEDOM OF ACCESS AS VITAL POINT OF SUEZ SETTLEMENT

"Should be Maintained as International Highway Even Under Egyptian Ownership"

Proposes Firm Stand on Arab Refugees, Settlement of Israeli Boundaries  
Regional Economic Development Plan for Middle East Peace

Declaring that the United States should make oil immediately available to Western Europe, SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Dem., Minnesota) announced on WNYC that shipments should be handled through the Office of European Cooperation (OEC) under some form of economic assistance. Speaking on WNYC's "INTERNATIONAL INTERVIEW" (Wednesday, December 5, 8:30-8:55 P.M.) the member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations strongly urged a firm and positive leadership by the UN and the U.S. in reaching a sound solution to the Middle East and Hungarian problems.

Citing freedom of access as a vital point in the settlement of the Suez Canal crisis, Senator Humphrey said it would be a mistake to remove UN forces before the full problem is solved. Pointing out that he was not opposed to the Egyptians deriving revenue from the Canal under their ownership rights, he stated that insofar as control is concerned, freedom of access should be guaranteed all ships of all nations as the Suez Canal is an International highway.

Senator Humphrey was interviewed by a panel of top newspapermen from overseas papers, with Seymour N. Siegel, Director of Radio Communications for the City of New York, as moderator. Interviewing Senator Humphrey were Paul Sanders, of Het Parool, Amsterdam Holland; George Wronkow, of Die Tat, Zurich, Switzerland; and E.V. Blakeny Britter, of the London Times. "International Interview" is presented each week by the Municipal Broadcasting System in cooperation with the Foreign Press Association.

COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HUMPHREY FOLLOWS:

Ques: Mr. Dulles spoke of the necessity to make NATO stronger. I would like to ask how that policy of strengthening the military alliance could be related with the policy to so-called uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa?

Sen. Humphrey: "I personally never thought there was any particular conflict between strengthening our North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, which is a regional alliance or Western Europe Collective Security and the most friendly relationships with the countries in the African-Asian areas. What I feel however, is that we could do much more to improve the economic and political stability and strength of NATO and not merely its military capacities. This is not to underestimate the importance of its military strength or capacities, but I do feel that greater economic cooperation in Western Europe and greater political consultation and cooperation amongst the NATO countries would be highly beneficial to the over-all North Atlantic Treaty Alliance."

Ques: The New York Times, this morning, had a story telling that you helped persuade the administration to release oil for Western Europe without delay. I hope that's right! Certainly, we in Europe hope that's right. Only, there are at this point several question marks...most of the Western Europe countries like Belgians and Scandinavians are mere victims of the circumstances. Do you think nevertheless, that there should be one over-all solution with regard to the whole situation in Europe?

Sen. Humphrey: "One of the reasons that I felt that our country ought to quickly make oil available to Western European nations, was because that many of the countries there were the victims of a set of circumstances over which they had no control. Now the British and the French obviously did have some control with the circumstances. I did not believe that it was right to punish all other allies in Western Europe because of the transgressions of one or two of the countries. Furthermore, may I say that is one thing to call the British and the French to time, as we would say, to chastise them for an attack upon Egypt; and it's another thing to try to discipline them or to continue to punish them and Western Europe. I think that we ought to dis-associate these matters, as a matter of fact. I think that it is fair to say that the American people did not approve and surely our government did not approve of the attack upon Egypt, regardless of provocation, we do not believe in settling disputes by force...if there is any way we can avoid that. However, we also recognize that France and Britain are vital allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into which we have poured billions of dollars and to which we have literally pledged the lives of American people. I did not feel that it was wise to sacrifice our Allies in Western Europe because of a transgression or because of a mistake in the Middle East. I thought you ought to try to separate these, and let the British and the French know that when they're wrong, we're going to say so; just as we expect them to say so when we're wrong. Another way we put it is, you just don't rub their nose in their mistakes!"

Ques: If cash payment would be difficult, what kind of payment will be arranged---through an institution controlled by the U.S. government as an import-export bank, or through a kind of Marshall Plan for this special purpose?

Sen. Humphrey: "Yes. I feel that first of all that the shipments of oil ought to go through the Office of European Cooperation--the OEC--all of the European countries working together, that is, that ought to be the way that the oil is distributed. Secondly, I do feel that there <sup>will</sup> be a dollar shortage for the payments of the Western Hemispheric oil. Therefore, I feel, as a member of Congress that we will have to face up to this in Congress, and

MORE

Sen. Humphrey: be willing to make some economic assistance available during the period of time that Western Hemispheric oil is shipped to Western Europe. Also, I would suppose that we could accept some local currencies in many of these countries, particularly in areas where we have American forces and American installations, which currencies could be used for payment of local costs in those countries."

Ques: Senator Humphrey, if we assume that the United Nations' actions have been effective in inducing Britain and France in seeing the error of their ways in the Middle East, and to withdraw, what do you think of the United Nations or the United States can do in the practical sense to bring effective pressure to bear on Russia, to induce her to get out of Hungary; to leave that country to work out its own destiny?

Sen. Humphrey: "I spent almost an hour discussing this matter in the Delegation of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, this morning. I have no hesitancy in telling you what I said, in part, at least. Number One, I said that we must be careful that the UN does not find itself in a situation where it can only discipline its friends, (the friends of the Charter) the Democracies, and at the same time finds itself incapable of disciplining or in any way correcting the transgressions of the totalitarians. The Soviet bloc who apparently wish to defy the Charter and to violate the principles of the Charter. I said that if we got into that situation, it would mean in fact, that the United Nations become an additional force in behalf of the totalitarian, in behalf of those who were the transgressors. Now, you say, what do we do? Well, number one, I want to say that I'm convinced in my own mind that the willingness of the British, the French and the Israelis to accept the decision of the United Nations, stands them well in world public opinion and surely here in the United States of America, and also, may I say, gives them a wonderful background of adherence to the principles of the charter. All of this, is what I call, money in the bank for the future, good will, good solid performance in behalf of the United Nations.

"Secondly, may I say that failure of the Soviet Union to respond to UN resolutions, does not demonstrate that the UN is incapable of doing something positive. I say that the Soviet Union has made one of its greatest blunders in its oppression in Hungary. It has weakened its Communist organization throughout the world--it has split Communist Parties right down the middle and crosswise--it has exposed itself as not being willing to live in a period of co-existence, of peaceful co-existence. It has really wrecked much of the so-called Geneva spirit to which it was giving such great lip-service over the years. My feeling is, that we should relentlessly pursue this in the United Nations. By that, I mean, every day remind the Soviet Union and the stooge government in Hungary that it has violated the Charter; hold it up to public scrutiny and in fact to public scorn. May I say that it may be necessary that we be a little more adept than we've been here.....

"Such as; having observers go to other countries to interview refugees; having UN observers going to Vienna, Austria and to intercept the refugees as they come for purposes of interview. I think that we ought to have a resolution passed (I've never said this before, I just want to get it off my chest) here in the United Nations where the Secretary-General and those who he may appoint for any purpose, to carry out any resolution of the United Nations, will have free entry into any country that is a member of the United Nations. In other words, it's something like we gave Mr. Lafayette one time, the right to come into the United States--a kind of permanent citizenship. I think, the Secretary-General and his observers who are acting under the rule of a resolution of the United Nations, pertaining to any particular problem, should not have to ask whether they can go into a country. They should have world-citizenship rights, world passports, world visa rights.

MORE

Sen.Humphrey: And, let us see whether or not into those circumstances, if  
(Cont'd) such a resolution were made a part of the basic rules of this body, whether or not Hungary or the Soviet Union would dare keep them out. Sometimes I think that they put up a bigger bluff than they have the willingness to back it up. "

Ques: Do you think it likely that such a resolution might be introduced shortly?

Sen.Humphrey: "I don't know. But I've been surely thinking about it. I'm not a very good diplomat, you know. There is a lot of double-talk around here, on occasions. I think we ought to come to the point and I think that the point ought to be quite clear. If a nation is a member of this organization, then the officers of this organization should have entry into that nation, particularly under the specific resolution which may be adopted where there seems to be some violation of the Charter, or at least some desirability of looking into a possible or alleged violation of the Charter. "

Ques: You spoke a moment ago of the 'stooge' government of Hungary. The way it has been acting in the United Nations would seem to indicate the truth in that statement. Do you think that we should do something to challenge the credentials of the present representatives of the Kadar regime?

Sen.Humphrey: " That may be necessary in due time. I think you have to weigh these matters, not on the basis of just the moral judgments relating to the Hungarian Kadar Regime, but also to other practical problems in the UN. The most important thing it seems to me is to try to get observers into Hungary; try to keep the lines of communication open, and at the same time not to be looking foolish in terms of UN authority....ridiculous, is a better word. The Soviet can just want it. There may be a time when sanctions will have to take place, but I don't think that you rush pell-mell into this. I think the first rule I've learned here is patience...persevering patience with conviction. You need to have firmness and the right. I can't help but think of that wonderful admonition of our great Lincoln who said 'with malice towards none, with Charity for all'. Now that's the spirit of the charter in the UN, and that should be the spirit of every member here. But he also concluded that wonderful phrase 'with firmness in the right' as God gives us to see the Right' and I think what we need here is this kind of dedicated firmness to conviction and persevering patience and not to blow our tops as some people would have us do and do things that would be foolish and would be detrimental. At the same time, know what our objective is, and I think we know what our objective is.

My objective is to give the peoples of Eastern Europe an opportunity for self-determination. My objective is to see that no people are the victims of outside oppression or if possible, inside oppression, and I think that we can pursue this objective if we do it rather relentlessly. "

Ques: Senator, you answered part of the question I wanted to ask. To come back to NATO, to Make NATO stronger in the military sense means also that the so-called Warsaw Pact countries would react. That means that the Russian troops would remain in the civilized countries, the West wants these troops to get out, but they cannot be brought out by force; how then can it be done?

Sen.Humphrey: " I have right here in my folder a document that relates to this very problem. There is an area of a possibility of discussion in Eastern Europe, the whole problem of German re-unification and the relationship of Germany to the Western-Alliance System as relates, may I say, to the Soviet-Union and her satellite states in the Warsaw Pact. MORE

Sen. Humphrey:  
(cont'd)

I personally want to see Germany unified or not unified in NATO. Now there may be a point or not as to whether or not you need foreign troops in Germany if she is in NATO. And, if that is a negotiable item, then I would say that you might have a chance to talk about at least getting foreign troops out of Eastern European countries, at least up close to the German border, without at the same time demanding those Eastern countries get out of the Warsaw Pact. I'm not so opposed if Poland wants to be a member of the Warsaw Pact, I guess that's her privilege. I think the important thing is how many troops do you have in a country for the purposes of disciplining or coercing or oppressing the people. There is a good deal of difference in American troops being in France, may I say, living under French law and subject to the courts of France, than it is to have Russian troops in Poland or Hungary that are dominating the people. In Poland today, the Polish people have been able to do a little better by what I would say, astute political activity on their part and some firm resistance. But I do not feel that this is an impossible question of negotiating--- number one; the removal of certain forces from limited areas in the East and the West, provided that you do not leave a completely neutral zone in the sense of no feeling as to who is right or wrong.

In other words, I wouldn't be opposed to having Poland remain in the Warsaw Pact, Western or a united Germany in NATO. This would be for a United Germany--for a completely United Germany in NATO with a possibility of talking about, (I'm not prepared to say that we do this,) but the possibility of talking about maybe American forces being withdrawn to a certain point, and Soviet forces. This is opening up a whole new question which is not decided in any way by our government. But, I think you have to be willing to talk out loud about these things."

Ques: You told us what practical steps the United Nations should take to tackle the Hungarian crisis; can you tell us now what in your view are the practical steps the United Nations or the United States should take to help solve the Middle East crisis, especially the pacification of Palestine and the problem of the future control of the Suez Canal?

Sen. Humphrey:

"I'll give you my point of view, and I want to say that I'm speaking now only as a private citizen and as a member of Congress, and not speaking for the official Executive policy of our government. Number one; I think that it would be a mistake for UN forces to be removed from the Middle Eastern area and leave exactly the same conditions that were there prior to the movement of forces by the British, French and Israelis into that area. In other words, all we're doing is substituting UN forces during the period of withdrawal of British, French and Israeli forces and the same economic, political turmoil and uncertainty exists at the end of that period as before, then you are going to have trouble, and more trouble than ever! Therefore, I would feel that during the period of time of withdrawal of British, French and Israeli forces and the build-up of UN forces, that immediate activities be started for negotiating a settlement. Number one; the Suez Canal. This is an international highway, so to speak, Now, it may be that the Egyptians need the revenue from that canal. I'm speaking now personally. I would not be opposed to the Egyptians being able to get the revenue from the canal--that would be ownership. But insofar as the control over the canal is concerned, guaranteeing freedom of access for all ships, of all nations, without discrimination, I mean without any discrimination, that would have to be guaranteed by the United Nations or an international body of some competence. I think we ought to insist upon that as a point of settlement. I say we, I mean every peace-loving nation ought to insist upon that.

MORE

Sen.Humphrey: Number two; I think we ought to get to the boundary question between Israel and her neighbors. There are two sets of boundaries: the 1947 boundaries of the UN resolution for the State of Palestine; the 1949 boundaries as a result of the truce in the Armistice. There is also a third set now that's due to the Israeli movement into the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza Strip and the Port of Achaba. Those are negotiable. There has got to be a settlement of boundary areas ( I would say that somewhere between '47, '49 and what's happened recently), maybe an internationalization of the City of Jerusalem. I'm only talking of possibilities. Somebody has to say that this has to be done and I think my country, the United States of America, must take a firm position on this and insist that something be done. Furthermore, we have to insist that the Arab-refugee problem be met. I feel that you must give the Arab refugees the freedom of choice of repatriation. Where do they want to go, but at the same time to permit those who make the inquiry as to where they want to go, permit them to be neutrals, so that you don't bring pressure to bear, so that the Arab leaders or Israeli leaders don't say 'now, don't you come, or don't you go here!' Let them make a free choice and that will mean that Israel will have to accept a certain number of the Arab refugees and that will mean that the other Arab countries will have to accept it plus generous compensation for their loss of property.

Finally, economic assistance on a regional basis through the United Nations, I think, could be done. For regional development, the Jordan River plan has been so well developed, if we could ever get at it, the building of the Aswan Dam in the Nile, in Egypt.... These things are possible and I think that to this kind of a regional economic development by our country would make a substantial contribution if we see that political conditions make it possible for these programs to really work out."

Ques: Senator, you said that the United States should take the initiative. Do you then agree with almost the general opinion in Europe that the United States has lost the lead in politics today?

Sen.Humphrey: "A question like that does two things to me. Number one; Like every other national, as an American, I love my country and I'm very proud of it and I wanted to do great things and secondly; it catches me as one who would like to be an objective observer of what's going on. So in betwixt these you'll have to judge my statement. I would say that we have lost a good deal of the leadership initiative that we once had. I think that we regained some of that in recent weeks, in the United Nations. But, I feel that for a period of time, we were unwilling to make the decisions that needed to be made, particularly in the Middle East, and sometimes in other areas of the world. I personally must say, that if you're going to be a great power, you have to be willing to make great and little decisions. Decision-making does not always make you popular, and there has been an addiction in this country to popularity, and sometimes popularity and principle are not exactly synonomous and sometimes popularity and leadership are not exactly the same. I would suggest that we Americans would do well to put aside our desire for being liked and being popular for awhile, and to really take on to ourselves the mantle of leadership with all of the terrible burdens and responsibilities that befall a leader. May I say that leadership does not mean 'dictation'. It means consultation. And the more consultation we have, but finally making decisions, the better we're going to be off."

Ques: I take it then sir, that you are not really worried about the alleged growth of anti-American feeling in Britain and France. Do you think that if your country takes a strong line risking unpopularity, it can tackle that problem?

Sen.Humphrey: "May I say that part of that alleged unpopularity in Britain and France is due to the fact that the people there have never quite

Sen.Humphrey: known just exactly what we were going to do, or where we stood. I think that some of the political therapy that we need right now, or diplomatic therapy, is to really 'firm up' our position and I think that by so doing---when I say our position, I mean after consultation, may I say, not only with our European friends and neighbors but with our Asian and Africans. I think that consultation today is a big operation and it includes a large number of people, a large number of nations. But after consultation, after exchange of views, you've got to come to a decision...and, I think when you do, you'll be more acceptable and at least respected."

Ques: Mr. Nehru is coming into this country in a few days time. What do you think your country can do to help to convince India, another un-committed Asian country, that the West rather than the Soviets are their true friends?

Sen.Humphrey: "I'm not at all convinced that the un-committed countries feel that the Soviet is their true friend. I think that the un-committed countries are trying to be so uncommitted in some of their statements, they sometimes appear to be more friendly to the Soviet than the facts would really justify. It is not unusual for a country to want to be a neutral. May I say that our great nation preserved a spirit, in fact, not only a spirit, but a letter of neutrality for 150 years--it's an old American habit. My personal feeling is that if the Indian people and the Indian government is for India, that will be quite a contribution to the free world. The same thing is true of Indonesia, Ceylon and the others. Of course, I would like to have them agree with us, but I'm not always sure, that on every question, we're always right. We have some limits of our vision and our perception, and our understanding. So, my own feeling is, that if we can get people in India and their government--to use that example, if Mr. Nehru and his government develop the economic resources of India, if they'll develop the educational and health resources of India, if they'll develop the political resources of India, they would be making a tremendous contribution to world freedom. When a country has its economic, its cultural, its educational and its political resources developed, in a sense where you do not extinguish competition and the right to disagree, you're making a real contribution to the areas of freedom. I don't think that you have to prove that you're for freedom by every day, getting up and singing the Star Spangled Banner if you live in India, Thailand, Pakistan or some place else. If they'll sing their own national anthem, if they'll love their own country, if they'll love their own traditions, and if they'll try to build their own country and not be subservient to anyone else, they'll make a real contribution to world peace and world freedom!"

Ques: There have been many items in United States papers about over-production of oil in the U.S. If there is over-production, the extra export of oil would be a God-send to producers. Why is there talk of the raise of the oil price?

Sen.Humphrey: Whenever there seems to be a large market, there is always somebody that wants to raise prices, whether it's oil, soda crackers, or automobiles. In a competitive system, there is a feeling that this may offer a little better market, and therefore a little better price. The producer always feels that a new market should give them new profits, this is understandable. I think this is a matter of our government exercising restraint upon those who would like to take all the market would bear. Also, there is over-production only in this sense that if you let every oil well in American spurt out as much oil as it is capable of spurting, there will of course be over-production and we have conservation programs for our great oil and gas resources in this country, and they ought to be even more extensive than they are. So we are going to call on certain producers to produce more than they have produced for a certain period of time. I hope that our country will not let inflationary pressures get a hold of oil prices, because my friends in the oil industry have done quite well with present prices."

Moderator: Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey. You have been listening to an 'International Interview' with Sen. Hubert Humphrey, Minn.



# 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)