

dated June 18, 1957. All of these editorials are entitled "Arthur T. Vanderbilt."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 17, 1957]

ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT

The death at 68 of Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt, of the New Jersey Supreme Court, closes one of the most distinguished and valuable judicial careers in modern-day America. His monument is the New Jersey judiciary, which Justice Vanderbilt transformed from an archaic, tortuous, overburdened institution into one of the Nation's most effective and respected court systems. And the New Jersey constitution, whose adoption in 1948 came about largely through Justice Vanderbilt's efforts, similarly stands as a model of its kind.

Justice Vanderbilt was a jurist whose attainments and outlook went considerably beyond narrowly legalistic considerations. He was a leader in education and good government, no less than in court reform. As an attorney in private practice he showed particularly deep concern for civil liberties, even at the risk of espousing unpopular causes. To him the protection of the law was the right of every American citizen.

With this underlying basic approach it was no surprise that Justice Vanderbilt was in the forefront of the battle to make the courts serve the people with the utmost efficiency and speed. He labored unceasingly to bring about improvements in court structure, administration, and procedure, and the results he achieved in New Jersey served as an example and goal for jurists in other States.

Judges like Arthur T. Vanderbilt, courageous, hard working, and farseeing, are a credit to America and its legal profession. He will long be remembered as one to whom the administration of justice was a sacred trust.

[From the New York Times of June 18, 1957]

ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT

Chief Justice Vanderbilt of the New Jersey Supreme Court made his influence felt for many years in the interest of good government, good courts, good citizenship, and good human relations. He was known throughout the country for his forward-looking views. He was respected for his integrity and his courage.

One of his many contributions to New Jersey was his leadership in the rewriting of the State constitution. Another was reform of the judicial system. He worked to the same high purposes toward improvement of the Federal court system. His example made itself felt in New York State, through encouraging constant examination and application of new ideas to management of the courts' business. So the death of this distinguished judge will be widely and deeply regretted.

[From the Washington Post of June 18, 1957]

ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT

The death of Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt of the New Jersey Supreme Court is a tragic loss to the causes of justice, judicial reform, and legal education. In the last decade he had directed almost a judicial revolution in New Jersey. That was the culmination of many previous years of hard struggle to bring administrative management, sound organization, and highly qualified judges into the judicial system. As chief justice in New Jersey, he was able to put into practice what he had been preaching, with the result that that State now has

one of the best judicial systems in the Nation.

After trying for 17 years to interest the bar, the judges, and the politicians in judicial reform, Mr. Vanderbilt decided a decade ago to carry his fight to the people. Govs. Charles Edison and Alfred E. Driscoll joined in the struggle, and a new constitution was adopted for New Jersey, including a model judicial system. Mr. Vanderbilt, who had won eminence in the practice of law and as dean of the New York University Law School, was then named chief justice.

There followed a decade in which rules were simplified, dockets were cleared of old cases, able and energetic lawyers were named to the bench, and modern administrative management was applied to the work of the courts. In a single year the output of the New Jersey courts was increased by 98 percent. Justice is no longer soured by endless delays, confused jurisdiction, or excessive emphasis on technicalities. Arthur Vanderbilt's leadership in this sphere has brought New Jersey to the forefront among the States seeking to modernize their judicial systems.

In his practice as in his teaching, Mr. Vanderbilt was a strong defender of civil liberties and of independent judgment on the bench. As counsel for Norman Thomas, he induced the Supreme Court of the United States to strike down the Jersey City ordinance under which the late Mayor Frank Hague had forbidden the Socialist leader to address a public meeting there. As president of the American Bar Association, he contributed enormously to the defeat of President Roosevelt's efforts to pack the Supreme Court in 1937. It is the judicial reforms that he helped to establish in New Jersey, however, that are likely to stand as his most enduring monument.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on June 8, 1957, in Minneapolis, Minn., a foreign policy conference was held under the sponsorship of the distinguished former Ambassador to Denmark, Mrs. Eugenie Anderson. Nearly 800 people attended to hear a series of speakers on different aspects of the international situation.

Ambassador Mehta from India discussed the role of India in world affairs. It was my privilege to present a report based on my experience at the United Nations, and more recently in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE MIDDLE EAST

For all of us there is nothing more important in the world today than foreign policy. The most important thing about foreign policy, of course, is that there is no such thing any more. Foreign indicates something apart, different, unusual. The very terminology smacks of a bygone age. Even the committee on which I serve, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, ought, I think, to change its name and move into the 20th century. I have introduced a Senate resolution to rename it the Committee on International Relations.

The briefest recollections of the tragedies and triumphs of the last 20 years should be

enough to prove that the seemingly solid stable symbols of a generation ago are gone forever. The world of 1914—even of 1929—is now more foreign to us than Patagonia or Siberia was to our parents' generation. The old order has not only passed; it was fled.

The tragedies of depression and war will never be forgotten by those of us who have lived through them. Let us hope that we shall not forget the triumphs: the burying of isolationism as the New World went forward to rescue the Old, the leadership of a Franklin Roosevelt and a Winston Churchill, the creation of the U. N.; the courage and collective purpose that went into the formulation of the Truman doctrine, NATO, and the defense of Korea, the imagination and boldness that formulated the Marshall plan and point 4.

In practical living terms, these decisions and achievements reflected at the time an accurate understanding of America's new world role and our stake in peace and world development. By 1952, American policy had demonstrated considerable flexibility, accommodation and capacity to reshape itself to meet new kinds of challenge.

But today's new world is a fast-moving one. Even 5 years can make a lot of difference. Policies which were adequate, or at least hopeful in 1952, may be much less adequate and much less hopeful in 1957.

1952 was only yesterday, but who then would have thought that 5 years later newspaper headlines would tell of Hungarian men and women trying to beat back Soviet tanks with their fists in the streets of Budapest, British planes dropping bombs upon Cairo, the collapse of our joint boycott against mainland China trade, the American flag being torn down by Nationalist Chinese on Formosa, the Polish Catholic Church lending its support to a new kind of Communist government in Warsaw, nuclear scientists and geneticists warning us about Strontium 90, Nikita Khrushchev "facing the nation" on a Sunday afternoon.

These developments have come pretty thick and fast for any among us who have been the victims of slogans, or who insist on total solutions for complicated problems.

The nostalgic desire to withdraw from it all is a natural reaction. I have seen a lot of it lately in the extravagant letters I have received from some people urging multi-billion dollar cuts in our defense and foreign aid programs. But I think that the vast majority of our people know in their hearts today that withdrawal from these complicated problems is impossible and that we are going to have to grapple with them one way or another.

Grappling with them becomes an increasingly personal problem for each of us as world events begin to impinge more and more upon our lives. It seems to me that even the most casual among us—particularly in such a group as this—owes it to himself to try to assemble his own scattered thoughts to see whether any practical wisdom and answers have come to him from his experience, his reading, his conversations and his work.

I want to do this publicly myself today, especially with regard to two experiences which I have had during the past few months and which have profoundly affected my own views of the world and what we ought to do in it.

Many of you know that I have served as one of the American delegates to the 11th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York and also that I have just returned from a month's visit to the Middle East. In a sense, this is my first personal report to the people of Minnesota on both of these experiences.

One of them, the United Nations, gave me a perspective in breadth and scope which I suppose is difficult to duplicate anywhere else.

The other, the Middle East, gave me a perception in depth of the intensity and ferment of just one of the world's many areas of crisis. Taken together, these two experiences have given me an opportunity to review and reconsider the strengths and weaknesses of American foreign policy against the backdrop of this world that refuses to stand still.

Let me begin with the United Nations and describe for you a scene which became familiar to me during my service at the United Nations General Assembly. Here sat representatives of 80 nation states unequal in power, wealth, or culture. All claimed an equal sovereignty and each pursued, or tried to pursue, an independent policy. Each judged its own best national interest. Each entertained its own private and public opinion about the characteristics of a perfect world.

Very few of the delegates at the United Nations pretended for a moment that the United Nations itself, either as an organization or in terms of its record of achievement, constituted that perfect world. One of my fellow delegates, Senator KNOWLAND, however went to great lengths to criticize the United Nations for its lack of perfection. He complained about an abuse of the veto power, a so-called double standard of morality, a tendency toward bloc voting, possible interference in domestic jurisdiction, and the disproportionate financial burden placed upon large nations like the United States for the United Nations support. There is a grain of truth in each of his criticisms, and no one would deny it.

But the delegates themselves represent contrasting historical backgrounds and exhibit cultural differences to such a vast extent that most logical men could easily despair over the possibility of any commonly accepted standards. Some of the members of the United Nations do pay much of the cost of its operation; others pay very little. There are blocs. Delegates frequently think more of their interests than the overall peace of the world—or rather, I should say, almost all delegates identify their own interests, and the interests of their own blocs, with the overall peace of the world. Lately, it has seemed to be painfully true that those who defy the law of nations seem to get away with more than those that respect the charter.

But we are foolhardy, if we judge the United Nations by the standards of literal-minded men. I shall not claim that it is able to produce absolute justice or even rough justice for all. I shall not claim that the weak are as powerful as the strong. Neither will I claim that the weak are necessarily wise in some of their voting.

But I will say that the United Nations represents the early stages of the evolution of mankind to international law and order. So tenacious is the desire of man for peace, so strong is this impulse for law and order, that within the last 12 years the United Nations has withstood the most terrific shocks and assaults upon it. It has survived the advent of the atomic age and the revolt of a quarter of the world against the colonial system. I earnestly believe that had it not been for this organization, the world might well be in its third and final war.

The United Nations is far from perfect. But all the hopes of man to evolve a just international economic order, to advance human rights, to stop aggression, to disarm, to establish a reign of law, are bound up in the United Nations. It is for us to apply not absolute logic, but rather the tests of imagination and insight.

This, of course, does not mean smothering the United Nations with excessive reliance. I had the feeling on critical issues last October, November, and December that the administration's policy of full reliance on the United Nations occurred most readily in those cases when the administration did not

have or could not agree upon a specific policy to meet the situation. Reliance on an infant world organization under such circumstances is hardly adequate to the tasks now facing us as the most powerful nation on earth.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I should like to see the United Nations used increasingly, but used effectively. I should like to see it energized by American leadership. I should like to see it strengthened and developed in a dozen different ways, not only in its political, but in its economic and scientific aspects as well.

Here are just a few of the thoughts that occur to me as I recall my experiences at the United Nations General Assembly.

1. A cushion for nationalism: One of the basic facts of our time is the upsurge of nationalism which dominates the thinking of people in two-thirds of the world. This upsurge is not limited to the antiwesternism so evident in much of Asia and Africa and so enticing to Soviet blandishments. A similar spirit of nationalism has re-emerged in Eastern Europe, and has shaken the very foundations of the Soviet satellite empire.

It is a paradox that nationalism is still such an explosive force in much of the world at the very time when the United States and the nations of Western Europe are moving more and more toward forms of international organization. But it would be futile and wrong to oppose nationalism which springs from basically good patriotic feelings widely shared by men everywhere.

But I was impressed again and again with the value of the United Nations as a means of assisting nationalism to find a proper and responsible role in the world society. The United Nations can channel nationalism toward constructive purposes and to keep it from running wild. With UN membership comes a dignity and security as well as a widened sense of responsibility—qualities which new and inexperienced nations and governments might otherwise take much longer to achieve.

2. A symbol of equality: The United Nations has been criticized for equating small states and large states when it comes to voting rights. But exaggerated as this arrangement may be in certain particulars, the United Nations in its very makeup recognizes one of the dominating ideas of this century—the idea of equality. It is not news to anyone any longer that we are living in the midst of a worldwide revolution which has equality as one of its central themes. This revolution has many facets: Democratic socialism in Europe and in Asia, anticolonialism in Asia and Africa, the drive for industrialization of underdeveloped areas abroad, the Negro's struggle against second-class citizenship at home, the farmer's fight for agrarian reform both at home and abroad. We can think of other examples, all of them grounded in the fight for equality of status and opportunity.

Even the tourist observer at the United Nations must be struck with the overtones of equality of status there. No one should underestimate the prestige and psychological importance which new young states like the Sudan and Ghana derive from this situation.

But it is not only the new and underdeveloped states which benefit from equality of status at the United Nations. It just happens that during the last few months the familiar old bipolar cold war world has become unfrozen a bit. The U. S. S. R. and the United States are still the world's great super powers, the great icebergs of the cold war age. But under the impact of recent events, the icebergs have melted a little even above the surface. And in the thaw, lesser icebergs have on occasion split off from the two superblocks, to go their own way and serve their own purposes.

Not only the so-called uncommitted nations, but the allies of both superpowers are becoming more independent. During the

single month of October 1956 voting alliances were splintered before our very eyes in the United Nations General Assembly over the double crisis of Suez and Hungary. Situations arose which required a softening of the rigid positions and the adoption of new alignments. The difficult and delicate maneuvering involved in such transformations was eased by the United Nations framework of equality. The very competition for votes among ostensible equals put a high premium on political persuasion and diplomatic imagination, even on the part of the representatives of the larger powers.

3. Exposure of fakery: While there is a tendency among some people to decry the United Nations as a debating society which can do no more than adopt pious resolutions, my own observation and participation in the work of the General Assembly convinced me that the United Nations is performing an invaluable service in the sheer exposure of doubledealing.

Even the Soviet Union is not wholly insulated from the force of world public opinion. Frankly, the Soviets took a considerable beating because of their actions in Hungary. It just happens that many of the nations of the world, particularly the young uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa, make a practice of sending to the United Nations their most capable public officials. To a degree not always appreciated outside the United Nations, these participants are in a position to mold opinions in their home countries.

The repercussions of Soviet brutality in Hungary are still seeping into the minds and hearts of Asians and Africans through the reports of their delegates at the United Nations.

Even during the General Assembly debate on the Hungarian question, more and more so-called neutralists shifted from a position of abstention to a position of voting against the Soviet Union. Soviet doubledealing and doublecrossing were clearly exposed. The success of the Bulganin-Khrushchev smile campaign came to an abrupt halt with the news from Budapest last fall, and the Kremlin is now working overtime to recover lost ground. Khrushchev and his henchmen are now busy applying deodorants to Soviet policy everywhere.

Once more they are trying to capitalize on one of their major assets—you start by being so bad that people will compliment you when you show any improvement. In a race for that kind of credit, the Kremlin is unbeatable. But never again will they enjoy the same kind of openminded reception which was theirs a year ago in many parts of the world before Hungary.

4. Pressures for progress: I have already mentioned that something tremendously important is happening to two-thirds of mankind living on three underdeveloped continents. Today the whole underdeveloped world is seething with what Arnold Toynbee has called a revolution of rising expectations. This revolution centers on a worldwide demand for economic development and economic dignity, concepts which after all should not be very alien to Americans.

A few years ago Henry Luce announced that we were entering the American century. Although there is a self-righteous overtone to the phrase, this is indeed the American century in many ways. Wherever I have traveled, and almost every day in one form or another, from coca cola to steel plants, I have found America coming back. Today it is coming back not only in the terms of intense desire of other peoples to repeat our economic achievements, but in the equally intense desire to practice in responsible Jeffersonian terms the democratic ideals which we once let loose upon the world.

Hopes have been raised for progress in both of these areas—hopes for economic ad-

vance and human dignity. These hopes cannot now be stifled without bitterness, disillusionment and enmity. Of course, these hopes may be exaggerated. Undoubtedly many of them are. Even if the United States and other countries which have been blessed with many technological advantages were to pour out their talents and resources in a gigantic effort to develop the rest of the world, many of these hopes would still be dashed.

Nevertheless, here as elsewhere, the facts are not always as important as what people believe the facts to be. The world is on fire for progress and one only has to sit in the General Assembly of the United Nations day after day to appreciate how deep and burning this desire can be.

I have already mentioned the recent weakening in cold war alignments, a weakening which was reflected most dramatically in United Nations votes. But even before Suez and Hungary, I had felt that in the public conduct of our policy abroad we had about reached the end of our capacity "to flog the anti-Communist political horse." Both in State Department press conferences and at the United Nations, the statement of many great international issues seem to be badly posed. We had fallen into a deep and dangerous rut.

As a matter of fact, we are still in it. We wait to see what the Communists will do. If they are for it, we try to be against it. The discussion of relations between the Communist and non-Communist world has become routinized on our part, just at the time when the Communists themselves are showing greater flexibility and are stepping up their own effort to appear pleasant and reliable.

Now the important thing is that there are 2 billion men, women, and children on earth who are neither Russian nor American. A large percentage of them profoundly distrust both Soviet and American policy. What do they think? It might matter.

A large percentage of them, of course, are too sick to think. Their days are totally absorbed with malaria, cholera, intestinal parasites, or some other disease. Many of them are too hungry to think except about food. Many die when they are babies, so they never have to think at all.

The overwhelming bulk of them are colored black, brown or yellow, and the motto of many if not most of them, based on centuries of experience with imperialism is, "Never trust a white man."

It seems to me that we have failed to understand in recent years how misleading and disrupting and self-defeating it is to enter this real atmosphere of the world with essentially military glasses. In the midst of our own critical military rivalry with the Soviet Union, we have tended to look out upon the world and to see basically only two kinds of people: Russians and potential manpower that we and the Russians must compete for. This is a highly dangerous and unrealistic view of the actual condition of mankind.

How dangerous and unrealistic it is can be brought home to us any day we care to visit the United Nations General Assembly. The interests of the rest of the world are not basically concentrated on the Soviet-American struggle. The delegates representing the rest of the world have, of course, a profound stake in the outcome of our competition with the Soviet Union. But they have far more immediate and desperate problems facing them than that, problems which result in pressures for progress—pressures for survival.

Nowhere are these more in evidence than at the United Nations. These pressures exert themselves in the tremendous and absorbing interest in which the rest of the world has in the constructive agencies and affili-

ates of the United Nations—the World Health Organization, the United Nations Technical Assistance Program, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Children's Fund, UNESCO, the International Labor Organization, the Human Rights Commission, and all the others.

It is these agencies which people on three continents look to to satisfy their high hopes for progress. Indifference or callousness toward these agencies on our part inevitably means that much of the world looks at us with suspicion and distrust.

5. The multilateral approach: Through these various agencies, the United Nations is a living demonstration of another great truth about the world today—the truth that a multilateral approach to help underprivileged peoples to help themselves is a more efficient and satisfactory approach than many of the bilateral methods of medical, technical, and economic assistance which we have also used. Millions of children have received supplementary feedings, vaccinations, and clothing as a result of United Nations activity. Hundreds of thousands of people today are benefiting from the expert advice and training of technicians operating under U. N. auspices. Food production in widely scattered areas of the world has been increased dramatically by new agricultural methods.

The United Nations specialized agencies give us an opportunity to reach people in ways most meaningful to them. We can reach them under the auspices of the world's society itself, thus saving ourselves the onus of excessive responsibility when things go wrong, as well as the disagreeable aspects of a difficult donor-beneficiary relationship. In many instances it is easier to give and easier to receive under United Nations auspices.

Not only should we utilize these specialized agencies which already exist under the United Nations structure, but we should press for the formation of new United Nations agencies which can go right to work. Later I shall refer to two of these agencies which I have recently proposed: A Middle East Good Offices Commission, and a Middle East Development Authority. In recent months I have proposed at least two others which I repeat again today. The first is SUNFED, the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, which has been repeatedly requested by a majority of United Nations members only to be repeatedly rebuffed by the United States. The second is a new International Waterways Commission to help avoid jurisdictional crises over waterways like that of Suez, yes, and Panama.

6. People-to-people in microcosm: We should not underestimate the United Nations as a practical working symbol of another important dimension of international relations today. We are going to have an increased emphasis on people-to-people exchange, international trade fairs, cultural exhibits, student and professor transfers, etc. The United Nations itself offers a special kind of forum for interpersonal exchange. Together, with the dignity and security which United Nations membership brings them, the representatives of many new nations are developing a stronger sense of responsibility earlier than they might otherwise.

At the United Nations they are in daily contact with the representatives of older and more experienced powers. Even the latter representatives find the U. N. an encouraging forum for effective action. Indeed, this last point is worth stressing. The fact that delegates of the U. N. take it seriously enough to engage in politics there—call it, if you like, a special kind of personal diplomacy—this is one of the most encouraging signs we have. We engage in politics and political maneuvering when we feel strongly about something. It is highly encouraging that U. N. delegates feel strongly enough about the U. N. to en-

gage in politics there. The friendships formed around the council tables, in the cloakrooms, and in the delegates' lounge may be of great importance in years to come. Indeed, no one can guess just how important those contacts may be.

I cannot imagine any delegate to the United Nations who has taken his duties seriously who would henceforth be blind to the fact of cultural exchange. As far as I am concerned, this program should be dramatically increased. If the Soviet Union wants competitive coexistence, we should compete and compete with the best that we have. I am ready to engage them in any area they choose. Contrary to some of the critics of the exchange program, I am convinced we have far more to gain than we have to fear in our whole people-to-people program.

Last year I was pleased to be the author of Public Law 860, which placed what was formerly the President's emergency program for international trade fairs and cultural participation on a permanent basis. I regret that the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, and other agencies concerned have not grasped the full significance of this program. Much remains to be done, and I shall continue to insist that we do it.

7. Disarmament: As a delegate to the United Nations I had a dual role on the issue of disarmament. Because of my work as chairman of the Senate's Special Disarmament Subcommittee and the extensive hearings which that subcommittee had held, I was asked to represent our U. N. delegation in disarmament discussions in New York.

It was interesting to compare the relative sense of urgency inside and outside the United States on the disarmament issue and related matters. My Senate subcommittee has held widespread hearings on all aspects of this complicated disarmament problem. We have found intense interest on the part of scientists, professors, and laymen in communities across the country. We have had important and sometimes startling testimony in the hearings which we have conducted in Washington; but, nevertheless, I should say in all fairness that I have not felt a tremendous sense of involvement or urgency on the part of Congress itself.

My experience at the U. N. convinced me that the intense concern on this question which I found in grassroots America is shared around the world. There was general acknowledgement of the difficulties, obstacles, and uncertainties involved in this challenging effort. But at the U. N. there was absolute insistence that the disarmament effort be persevered in. There was a preoccupation with the matter.

The issue of bomb tests and fallout dangers were uppermost in the minds of the majority of my fellow delegates to the United Nations. The hearings in Washington currently being held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are now for the first time giving the American people an inkling of the kind of concern which I found at the U. N. months ago.

I must say in all frankness that our official position on bomb tests is not a popular one abroad. It is fast becoming an unacceptable one. If we persist in it, we could easily find ourselves isolated and alone, with the Russians claiming cheap and false credit for being interested in ceasing tests while we are left in a militaristic posture with Admiral Strauss and his suspiciously reassuring arguments. This is highly serious business, and I for one do not intend to equivocate about it. I think we must press for an immediate agreement on the cessation of large H-bomb tests. Bomb tests above a certain magnitude, according to competent scientific evidence, can be monitored anywhere, and the agreement would be in this sense self-enforcing. The actions of the United States should set the pace, not bring up the rear.

If we fail in our responsibility, others will do the same. Leadership imposes a responsibility to lead. America had better get on with the job on this issue of bomb testing in particular and disarmament in general.

This is all the more important at the moment because there are indications coming from the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee in London that the Soviet leaders may have decided to take the whole arms control question more seriously. Certain pressures have exerted themselves on Soviet leaders inclining them to consider the possibility of serious negotiations. In part these pressures are:

1. Soviet awareness that new weapons are so destructive that in an all-out war all nations, including their own, might perish;

2. Soviet recognition that neither external blandishments on the part of the U. S. S. R. nor internal dissension has resulted in the disintegration of NATO and other free world alliances. These remain intact and the Russians know that with our strength in Europe and with our bases located in key spots in the world we are prepared to help defend free countries against aggression, and if a Soviet attack is launched, we can respond with devastating counter attacks from many bases;

3. Soviet concern that the United States will achieve a ballistic missile that can reach the Soviet Union from overseas bases before the Soviet Union develops the intercontinental ballistic missile necessary to reach the United States from its territory;

4. Soviet realization of the danger that other nations, not now in possession of atomic weapons, may begin to develop nuclear weapons;

5. Soviet fear that uprisings of the peoples of Eastern Europe might bring about conflict with the United States and other Western nations;

6. Soviet concern over loss of prestige and acceptance due to their ruthless suppression of the revolt of the Hungarian people;

7. Soviet doubts about the reliability of satellite troops or even of their own troops;

8. Internal Soviet economic pressures resulting from a labor shortage, the high cost of modern armaments and the need for drastic reorganization of the Soviet economy.

While these pressures may combine to promote new interest in a limited arms agreement between the Soviet Union we should not expect the Soviet leaders to drop their imperialistic aims. On the contrary, we should expect them to continue and increase and emphasize all political, economic, and psychological competitions. The Kremlin may have decided against blowing the world to bits, but its strategy continues to stress picking up the world bit by bit.

Disarmament like many of the problems I have already mentioned is a tough and difficult one. We Americans have too often tended to believe that each defined problem carries with it a possible ready solution. We have had a certain complacency toward extremism, a persistent demand for total solutions, and an impatience that fails to consider our increasing necessity to accept the hazards and inconveniences of being a great power. To the extent that this is still true of us, we need to mature. Unless we do, we shall not be equipped for the complicated new challenges that will face us for perhaps the next generation.

I have just given you in a rather haphazard way some of my basic impressions from the United Nations. I could give you many more, for the U. N. represents in its personnel, its membership, and its agenda the best index we have to the problems presently tormenting people everywhere.

The United Nations should not be a strange place for an American who comes from a country built from different backgrounds, races, creeds, and national origins, or for a Minnesotan whose very State is a United

Nations in miniature. The U. N. today costs us a little money, but our total annual share of the U. N. bill, including the specialized agencies is equal to what 10 hours of World War II cost us. And yet in the U. N. we have an instrument which not only gives us all of the opportunities to focus our attention on all of the problems which I have already mentioned, but it is an instrument which can chalk up to its credit the practical achievements of a large collective victory effort in Korea, the Declaration of Human Rights as a code for conduct for the rest of the century, and the atoms-for-peace proposal which can open up vistas of productive man-saving energy for the future and much more.

MIDDLE EAST

Let me now make an abrupt change of pace in order to give you the second report I promised you today. For a few minutes I should like to summarize my conclusions after an intensive 1 month, on-the-spot study of the Middle East. I have just returned from a visit to that part of the world in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on the Middle East. I spent several days each in Egypt, Israel, and Lebanon, and flew over much of the entire area. I talked to statesmen, politicians, church and welfare workers, soldiers, and refugees. Let me give you my frank analysis, distilled from many interviews and observations.

The foreign policy of the United States has failed to keep pace with our obligations and responsibilities in the Middle East.

In an area of the utmost strategic importance to ourselves and our allies, we have for too long pursued a policy of drift and improvisation.

We have confused our friends, and we have not retarded our enemies.

Without further delay, the United States must formulate and implement a policy which comprehends the dimensions of our role in the Middle East and which responds realistically to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of the region.

The fact is that we have been increasingly engaged in the Middle East since 1947 when the Truman doctrine committed us to halting the Soviet military menace to Greece and Turkey. Since then, as the British and French relinquished their positions inevitably we have inherited new responsibilities. But because we have shown no real initiative in dealing with the region's problems, we have also inherited the enmity and suspicion once directed toward the colonial powers and we have failed to build on the residue of goodwill they left in the region.

To put it bluntly, our policy has concerned itself too much with kings and oil, too little with people and water.

We have conceived of the security of our interests in the Middle East in terms of military pacts, arms agreements and advance bases, when it depends in fact on our ability to win the support and friendship of the region's 40 million people.

The Eisenhower doctrine has served an important purpose in notifying the Russians of where we stand. It can be a framework for a policy. But it cannot of itself undo the fact of Russian penetration in the Middle East or avert the danger of increasing Communist influence.

Only a policy which satisfies the demands of the peoples of the region for an improved standard of life in a decent social order can do this.

The United States, in other words, must now bolster the Eisenhower doctrine by a policy which comprehends and attacks the real causes of the social and political turmoil that threaten to destroy free world interests in the Middle East.

These are the realities with which such a policy must deal:

1. That since the 1955 arms deal with Egypt, the Soviet Union has been in the Middle East waging an all-out campaign to subvert the region with arms, propaganda, commercial missions, military technicians, and agents of every kind.

2. That the masses of the Middle East are in revolt against poverty, serfdom, ignorance, and disease.

3. That the legitimate aspirations of the Arab peoples are being diverted and exploited by Nasser and by the Communists into a xenophobia which fixes responsibility for every ill, fancied or real, on the imperialism of the West.

4. That the Arab refugee problem and the lack of Arab-Israel peace are being exploited by the Communists to their own advantage.

5. That the influence both of Nasser and of the Communists reaches out across national boundaries and over the heads of government to infect millions of people, with the result that the security of every Arab regime depends on the support of its army.

These are the political facts of life in the Middle East today. Whether we like them or not, we can no longer afford to ignore them.

The Middle East needs time to develop its resources for the benefit of its people. But the pressure for change, for social advance, for an end of poverty and ignorance will not wait for the region to mobilize and exploit its resources on its own. No country in the Middle East and certainly no Arab country has the experience or the skills and few the funds to stave off communism by pushing development on a scale and at a pace commensurate with the need. The area could be lost to the Communists without a single military move unless we place at its disposal the wealth of our experience and where necessary the funds required to step up the process of human rehabilitation and social progress.

The imperatives of an effective American policy, therefore, are:

First, to attack the basic causes of economic instability which lie in the deprivation of the masses;

Second, to remove the causes of political instability which lie in the rebellion against poverty, in the existence of 900,000 refugees whose hopelessness makes them readily susceptible to Communist agitation, and in the lack of peace between the Arab States and Israel.

It is of the utmost importance, however, to pursue these objectives without lending credence to Communist and Arab nationalist charges of imperialism. We must take cognizance of the importance of the nationalist psychology in the new states of the Arab world which insist upon self-expression, freedom from any kind of foreign domination and the right to work out their own destinies as independent nations. We need to cooperate not to dominate.

MIDDLE EAST DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

For this reason, as well as for many others, the idea of creating a Middle East Development Agency, composed of all the states in the region and in the Mediterranean area plus other states contributing to its capital, has much to commend it. Such an institution could be a decisive new element in the Middle Eastern situation and a catalytic agent which might precipitate solutions for many of the most vexing problems of the region.

Such a Development Agency could undertake projects itself, lend money to either private or public agencies, and participate in equity financing, in the manner of the International Finance Corporation. It could manage projects. It could carry on scientific research in such matters as soil fertility. It could make basic engineering surveys and contribute to the drawing up of

overall regional development plans. Furthermore, it could carry on long-term technical assistance.

Its advantages would be political and psychological as well as economic.

It would divert the attention of Arab leaders from military adventures to internal economic development. Turning Arab energies into constructive channels would eventually lead to institutional and social changes, such as the growth of a middle class, which would have a beneficial and stabilizing influence.

It would provide a means of channeling Arab oil revenue into productive uses which would benefit the entire area, thus utilizing part of the presently existing hard-money resources of the Middle East for the financing of regional development.

It would be an international entity with which the states of the area could carry on bilateral negotiations and bilateral economic agreements.

It could aid in the solution of the Palestine-Arab refugee problem. The only long-term solution for the refugees is basic economic development, which will make it possible for the area to support more people at a higher standard of living.

It could encourage international acceptance of the Jordan River plan and similar development projects involving more than one state.

It could give technical assistance and supervised farm credit to farmers settling on new lands coming into production from the development of the Jordan, the Litani, the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile.

The creation of a Middle East Development Agency in the terms here suggested would emphasize the fact that it is in the interests of all concerned to move from intraregional feuding to intraregional cooperation for development.

Most important, perhaps, such an agency would encourage a regional approach to the problems of Middle East development. Isolated projects here and there, financed by bilateral aid from the United States, obviously offer no real answer to the needs of the region. Even a cursory look at its resources reveals the absolute economic interdependence of the states of the area and the necessity of intraregional cooperation. All of the region's major rivers, for example—the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Jordan and the Nile—flow through more than one state. Their development for irrigation and power depends on agreement between the states concerned. Oil produced in Saudi Arabia and Iraq must be transported to market across the territory or through ports controlled by other states of the region. Industrial development hinges upon the opening of mutual markets, a freer exchange of goods among the several countries of the region as well as trade with the rest of the world. The essential patterns of regional cooperation and development cannot be produced by a series of bilateral arrangements with the several nations of the area.

PEACE

The lack of peace between the Israel and Arab States is still a major source of tension and political unrest in the region, forcing the states of the area to divert funds which could be used for human welfare to non-productive military purposes. American policy should maintain a constant and unremitting pressure on all of the states of the region to resolve this conflict once and for all through direct negotiations through an intermediary such as a U. N. Good Offices Commission. Not since 1952 has the United States, either in or out of the United Nations, made a determined effort to bring about a peace discussion between the parties. Not even the recent crisis was utilized persistently to press for peace objectives in the region. After 10 years of temporizing with this situation, it is time to insist that the

nations involved come to terms—and the only way of producing a settlement acceptable to both sides, and therefore durable, is by insisting that they reach a settlement themselves.

REFUGEES

Nor can the United States or the West afford to temporize further with the problem of Arab refugees.

Living on a bare subsistence level in wretched camps maintained by the United Nations, rootless, jobless, disillusioned, and embittered, these hapless people, now nearly over 900,000 strong, are a challenge to the conscience of humanity.

The refugee camps have become hotbeds of political intrigues deliberately fomented by Communist and anti-Western Arab agitators. They are breeding grounds of hatred for the United States and sources of political instability for the countries that harbor them.

Half of the refugees are now under 15 years old, a fact of tremendous significance in terms of an ultimate solution of this problem. It means that, despite the clamor of professional refugee leaders for a return to Palestine and the insistence of the Arab Governments on repatriation of all to their former homes, half of the refugees have in fact no roots in Palestine at all. They were either less than 5 years old when they left that country, or were born in the refugee camps in Arab States. To return them now to an alien society they have been taught to despise would be as unthinkable as abandoning them to nature in the appalling atmosphere of hopelessness which pervades the refugee camps. The destiny of these young Arabs clearly lies in the opportunity for a productive and self-reliant life in an Arab environment and culture.

Since the responsibility for creating the Arab refugee problem derives from the Palestine War and the United Nations Partition Resolution, the world community must share the blame for letting the problem go unsolved for 10 long years. In the United Nations we have salvaged our conscience by contributing to the support of these unhappy people without coming to grips with the real problem of assuring them the opportunity for a decent way of life. It is high time that the United States took the initiative in and out of the United Nations to bring about a final and effective solution of the problem.

The facts of the situation themselves point to the only possible solution—the provision of permanent homes and decent livelihoods in the Arab States for the vast majority and a recognition and willingness by Israel to accept and repatriate a limited number on a yearly quota basis.

Iraq is desperately short of people. Rich in resources of oil, land, and water, Iraq needs additional population to exploit its potential productive capacity. Experts estimate that the country could absorb at least 3 million, and perhaps as many as 5 million additional people. Iraq, moreover, has shown a disposition to accept immigrants from the refugee population. Five thousand have already been taken in without any appeal for United Nations assistance by the Government of Iraq. With help from the international community to defray costs of resettlement, the entire refugee population could readily be absorbed in that country alone, with benefit to the indigenous population.

Syria, while less richly endowed with natural resources, is also underpopulated. With some help, it could assimilate a substantial number of refugees with benefits to itself.

As many as 200,000 of the refugees could be settled in the Jordan Valley if the proposal advanced by the United States for developing the Jordan River Valley were accepted by the Arab States. Syria's objection, based on its determination to retard Israel's progress even at heavy cost to itself and Jordan, is all that holds the project up.

The fact is that the Arab States have for 10 years used the Palestinian refugees as political hostages in their struggle with Israel. As a matter of concerted policy, these people have been kept penned up in the camps in conditions of wretched hopelessness in order to embarrass Israel before the eyes of the world. While Arab delegates have shed crocodile tears in the United Nations over the plight of their brothers in the refugee camps, nothing has been done to promote a final settlement lest political leverage over Israel be lost.

This is not to say that Israel has no responsibility for cooperating in an ultimate solution of the problem. The Government of Israel has already disclosed its willingness to compensate the refugees for property left in former Palestine; the United States has offered to lend Israel the money. All that is necessary is to set up the machinery and establish the procedures under which just compensation would be paid.

Repatriation of all, or even a large number, of the refugees by Israel, on the other hand, is no longer possible. In the first place, Israel has accepted and settled some 900,000 immigrants, half of whom were in fact refugees from Arab States where repressive measures have made their lives intolerable. Furthermore, surrounded by nations which insist upon exercising rights of belligerency against her, it would be suicidal for Israel to admit a large group of immigrants whose whole indoctrination for the past 10 years has been one of hatred for the Jewish State. To do so would be to establish a fifth column inside the country. Finally, from the viewpoint of the refugees themselves, repatriation to Israel would result in bitter disillusionment. They would necessarily have to live in a society foreign to their own background and culture and assume all the obligations of citizenship in a state which they have been taught to despise.

Nevertheless, as Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion told me, the Government of Israel would be prepared, in the context of a general settlement of the problem, to admit a limited number of refugees who would pledge to become constructive and productive Israeli citizens and not subversives. Hence Israel should be willing to recognize the principle of repatriation, provided that principle is implemented only by token numbers of refugees, perhaps admissible on a quota basis.

All of these things should be carefully explored by a new United Nations Good Offices Commission. It should be the duty of this Commission to press unremittingly for a breakthrough on this critical refugee problem.

As we look at the whole Middle Eastern situation, it seems to me that it has been clear for some time that the only realistic basis for an effective American policy toward the Middle East is one which rests on the following assumptions:

1. That Israel is an integral part of the region and is there to stay;
2. That the 1949 armistice boundaries constitute inviolable political boundaries subject to change only by the joint agreement of the states concerned;
3. That resettlement in Arab lands, with compensation for property left in Palestine, is in fact the only effective and realistic way of solving the Arab refugee problem;
4. That the stability and security of the region demands an early settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict.

But these basic premises of any reasonable American approach toward the Middle East have been obscured by a policy characterized by ambivalence, vacillation, and expediency. We have, in fact, often encouraged opposite suppositions. It would be healthy both in terms of our relations with the region and in terms of our relations with the Soviet Union now to reassert and re-

emphasize the fact that this is where we stand.

By moving simultaneously toward regional development and social progress, toward a final disposition of the refugee problem and toward a negotiated Arab-Israel peace, we can make our position unequivocally clear.

When we have done that, we will be better understood, and therefore better liked and trusted by the people and the natives of the Middle East.

In the context of a clear and positive policy, there are many other steps which can be taken to improve understanding between ourselves and the people of the Middle East.

1. We should improve the signal of the Voice of America. In an area which is 80 percent illiterate, Radio Cairo, Radio Damascus, and Radio Tashkent put forward a Nasser, and/or Communist line, and are heard and believed by millions. Our Voice of America does not begin to reach this vast audience, nor is its program geared to meet the realities of the present situation.

2. We need more conferences on a regional level by American Foreign Service personnel in the Middle East. Not only do we need more frequent conferences between American Ambassadors assigned to the Middle East countries, but we need similar conferences for second- and third-level personnel. This is the best way I know to broaden viewpoints and to save our own Foreign Service personnel from the dangers of overzealous advocacy in the interests of the particular country to which they are assigned.

3. We should enlarge the exchange of our military personnel. The military plays a role in the Middle East which is perhaps larger than any other single element in the society. We should not overlook the role which American military, naval and air training schools can play in the general picture. Incidentally, I was shocked to learn that Israel is not included in our military exchange program. I have recommended to the Secretary of State that Israel be included and I am told that plans are now underway.

4. We must increase the ordinary student exchange between the United States and the Middle East. American-sponsored colleges and universities in Beirut, Cairo, Tel Aviv, and Jerusalem are positive and constructive forces for freedom and progress. They are in desperate need of new sources of endowment. Their situation could be eased by a new injection of American public and private funds for faculty and student scholarships and facilities assistance.

5. We should do much more to encourage the operation of voluntary agencies like CARE. I was startled to discover in Egypt that CARE has been deprived of access to our food surplus storage despite the need in Egypt following the British and French attack.

This leads me to a sixth and final point which is perhaps the most important single recommendation I would make following my survey in the Middle East.

6. Food is the common denominator of international life. Food and fiber are a great potential force for freedom today. It can be an active instrument of our foreign policy.

I am convinced that our official policy at the moment is far too shortsighted. A disservice has been done to the American people by creating the impression that our abundance is just an unwanted problem instead of a blessing.

I know from what I have seen that American food and fiber are vital to the very existence of thousands of undernourished people in the Middle East—the brightest ray of hope for building stronger economies and greater political stability in most of the countries I visited.

I wish every Minnesota farmer who has been told he must drastically cut down his production could have walked with me through the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, the orphanages in Greece, or among the masses of unemployed huddled in shanty towns in Spain. I wish they could have seen the young hands outstretched for food, and heard the appeals for milk from haggard and worried mothers.

More of our food and fiber can be marketed for foreign currencies if we expand and extend Public Law 480. Here is an area for positive progressive action and one which vitally affects the people of Minnesota. When I return to Washington on Monday, I shall open 3 weeks of hearings on this particular problem—the expansion and extension of Public Law 480. The possibilities are enormous and I intend to do something about it.

And, now let me conclude.

One of my most cherished friends at the United Nations was the great Foreign Minister of Lebanon, Dr. Charles Malik. I had a long and rewarding visit with this world statesman in Beirut only a few weeks ago. He is a sincere and devoted friend of the West and has been heavily criticized for it by some of his fellow countrymen. Dr. Malik once wrote:

"If the habits and institutions of the West are not adapted for the production of a ringing message, full of content and truth, satisfying the mind, appealing to the heart, firing the will, a message on which one can stake his life, then in the present world the West cannot lead. The world prefers a false prophet to no prophet at all. Leadership must pass to others, no matter how perverted.

Dr. Malik continued: "If your only export * * * is the silent example of flourishing political institutions and happy human relations, you cannot lead. If your only export is a distant reputation for wealth and prosperity and order, you cannot lead. Nor can you really lead if you send forth to others only expert advice and technical assistance. To be able to lead and save yourself and others, you must above everything else address their mind and soul. Your tradition, rooted in the glorious Greco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian human outlook, supplies all the necessary basis for leadership. All you have to do is to be the deepest you already are."

How completely I agree with Dr. Malik. Whatever may be the weakness and shortcomings of this Nation, let us hope that we still have one saving glory: the liberal and liberalizing faith that there is more of compassion than of cruelty in this land; more of generosity than selfishness; more of faith than fear.

If this Nation can show the world a way to eradicate the shame and scandal of poverty, of exploitation, of oppression, of greed, without resort to violent revolution and class struggle and dictatorship; if we can place these material values in their proper subordinate place within the context of a mighty spiritual movement which will be revolutionary without being subversive, which will draw its substance from the riches of the Western tradition, then our faith will not have failed us.

Friends, if these things are not the elements of the liberal tradition to which this conference and our Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party is dedicated, then I do not know what those elements are. If I were not sure that these are the ultimate and indispensable underpinnings of American policy, I would not feel that we would be entitled to have much hope for the future. As it is, I do.

THE REPUBLIC OF PERU

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor for June

1 and June 3, 1957, there appeared two articles relative to the present situation in Peru. One of the articles has to do with the contributions made by Dr. Pedro Beltran, owner and editor of La Prensa, which is published in Lima.

Dr. Beltran is one of the hemisphere's great democrats. The Americas—North and South—can well be proud of this man for his courage, his understanding, and his tolerance. As a newspaperman, he is trying to bring the truth to his people, and, as a Peruvian of the first water, he has tried to bring about reforms to keep his country on an even economic and political keel. It is hoped that Mr. Beltran and the present President of the Republic of Peru, Dr. Prado, will have success in their efforts. It is my opinion that the Government of Peru at the present time is operating on a democratic basis. As one who has visited there in recent months, I want to report to the Senate how tremendously I was impressed with both the country and its people. We are indeed a fortunate people that the Peruvians call us friends.

So far as investments from overseas is concerned, the Government of Peru has welcomed American capital and has welcomed it from other sources on a reasonable and fair basis and in a way which will accrue to the benefit of the Peruvian economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles to which I have made reference may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 1, 1957]

EDITOR SPARKS PERU'S PENAL REFORM (By Robert M. Hallett)

LIMA, PERU.—One way to reform a penal system is to send newspapermen to jail.

That is what Peru found out anyway. Largely as the result of the imprisonment of Dr. Pedro Beltran, owner and editor, and other members of the staff of La Prensa during the Odría regime, fundamental changes in the physical plant and operations of the penal system here are planned.

Although Dr. Beltran, one of the most influential publishers here, had been personally close to Gen. Manuel Odría when he came to power, he broke sharply with him when the general began to become more and more totalitarian. Toward the end of the regime the paper was the most outspoken foe of the regime.

Its constant criticism began getting under the skin of the regime. One midnight about a year ago the downtown block in which this morning paper is published was besieged by a small army of police. Unable to get past the newspaper's iron gates, the police lobbed tear gas shells into the plant.

Dr. Beltran and other members of his staff withdrew into the interior of the building. The police then brought firemen to the scene in the hope of using their ladders to invade the upper stories. The firemen refused to be a party to this and withdrew.

ANTHEM CHECKED POLICE

Finally the policemen broke a window in the plant and poured into the building. The final recourse of the editor and his staff was to sing the national anthem which forced the police to stand at attention. After about a half hour of this, however, their voices gave out.



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