

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.
Capitol 4-3121, Ext. 2424

For Release: Thursday a.m.
February 13, 1958

SENATOR HUMPHREY ASKS ACTION ON INTERNATIONAL "WORKS OF PEACE"

"America's foreign policy needs the inspiration of the 'works of peace'--not merely the words of peace," Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) declared last night.

"Fine words must be backed up by hard work," he told the University of North Carolina World Affairs Conference at Chapel Hill, N. C. "Nothing is so eloquent as a shipment of food, a team of medical personnel, a new factory under construction, a new school, a new library, jobs for the unemployed. This is the kind of language we must speak if we are to be understood by the under developed nations of the world."

Senator Humphrey added that before we can expect to reach lasting agreements with the Soviet Union on such fundamental issues as arms control and political settlements, "mutual confidence must be built up through the acceleration of private and public contacts on all levels, for building better international relations involves more than action by government alone."

"There is an essential role for our country's great voluntary agencies and individual citizens themselves," he said. American businessmen, news correspondents, representatives of voluntary humanitarian and religious organizations, and educators frequently have more contacts with private foreign citizens--and sometimes with governmental officials--that do our official representatives. Each of these people-to-people contacts contributes to the total impression which the United States makes abroad. Let us accept the challenge of competitive co-existence--but let us be sure to compete, Senator Humphrey urged.

Senator Humphrey went on to set forth "the essential elements of a revitalized foreign policy for the United States." He called for:

1. Marshalling and expanding our resources of science and engineering--not only the pooling of NATO efforts, but also the "vast untapped source of collective strength here in the two American continents."
2. Re-evaluating the defense budget, and assessing "the single-minded concept of massive retaliation" which has had "terribly dangerous implications in reducing our flexibility to meet unforeseen, nibbling actions" by the Soviet nations.
3. While keeping our guard up, also keeping open "the bridges of possible agreement" with the Soviets on specific issues. Senator Humphrey called the recent agreement with the Soviet to broaden the exchange programs "a big step in the right direction."

(OVER)

4. Adopting a "long-range perspective" on the world. "It will be fatal," Senator Humphrey warned, "if we insist on quick results" in foreign policies.

5. Breaking out of the "holding-operation atmosphere" of our present policy--joining with "the spirit of independent nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries."

6. Respecting the neutrality of new-born nations.

7. Making greater use of our economic strength. "We still have the capacity to outdo anything the Soviet Union can possibly manage in aid to uncommitted nations," Senator Humphrey warned. "But at the moment the Soviet effort is increasing while this country's effort is lagging."

8. Stepping up our Point Four program of technical assistance and helping to expand UN technical assistance programs. "In NATO," he said, "we should be thinking in terms of coordinating technical assistance and economic aid programs for the underdeveloped areas."

9. More active, constructive, and imaginative use of our food and fiber abundance. "Food and fiber are a great potential force for freedom today," Senator Humphrey asserted. "They can be an active instrument of our foreign policy."

10. Continuous exploration of "all possibilities for agreements to control armaments," despite the "difficulties of trying to negotiate such agreements." Senator Humphrey declared that we "must break up our disarmament package." We should be prepared, he said, "to negotiate on some of our nine points separately."

Mutual Understanding in the Nuclear Age

Mrs. Heber - Mr. Holmes
Speech by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
at the
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
February 12, 1958

Dr. Johnson

President Friday, Chancellor Aycock, and my many good friends
here in Chapel Hill: You have asked me to come to North Carolina
tonight to talk about the basic problem facing ^{our} ~~this~~ country this
year, next year, and for the next generation -- mutual understanding
in the nuclear age. ^P It is a great honor and privilege for me to
be with you ~~tonight~~ because, frankly, there is no place where I would
prefer to discuss such a critical, broad-guaged topic than here
in the enlightened environment of the oldest state university
in the country.

Of course, those of us who count ourselves among the host
of friends of your distinguished former President and former
United States Senator, Frank Graham, always associate him with
^{great educational} this institution. Thousands of Americans - I among them - will

always regard Frank Graham as one of the great teachers and

leaders of our time. As much as any other man I know,

Dr. Graham has ~~himself~~ ^{unselfishly + constructively} contributed to the achievement of mutual

understanding in this nuclear age. He once express^{ed} his concept

for American leadership very movingly in his statement on "The

Faith and Hope of An American."

Sign to his words

"The people of the American dream (must) patiently struggle, in the atomic age, through the United Nations, through regional re-enforcements of collective security, through economic cooperation and technical assistance programs, to end all wars and all depressions and to provide the basis for the self-determination and equal opportunity of all people...With all their faults, frustrations, and aspirations, the people of this youthful nation (must) rise to the responsibility of their power and the opportunity for their greatness to help give fresh hopes to stricken peoples for food and freedom, and to help organize justice under law and peace."

L In a sense this is a challenge which has faced us throughout the first half of this century. But the challenge has taken on new dimensions of urgency during recent months in the context of the new and revolutionary launching of the Soviet earth satellites.

L The Sputniks have caused us to realize that the Soviet Union is exerting tremendous effort to accomplish impressive feats in science and technology. These accomplishments have alerted us to re-examine and re-evaluate our defense policies, our defense organization, and the state of our military preparedness. Sputniks I and II have made us realize that if we hope to maintain our defense capabilities and if we do not want to be out-distanced in the vital area of outer space, vastly increased effort and expenditures of funds will be required.

L Of course, we have the resources to match -- yes even to surpass -- the U.S.S.R. in military might. We are prepared to speed up production of missiles, and to equip our Army, Navy, and Air Force with weapons which can, if necessary meet any type of attack.

We are able to devote whatever is required to defend our shores, our fields, our industries and our cities against the new weapons of mass destruction. But even when all this is done, the world will still be dangerously divided into two highly armed camps.

~~We who have the responsibility for appropriating funds for~~

~~the new weapons of defense must keep reminding ourselves~~ *It is*
therefore,
essential that we search perseveringly for ways and means of
securing a just and enduring peace, so that the terrible reality
of the use of these weapons will never happen. ^{yes,} We need the
same courage and patriotism in our search for peace that would
be required of us in the defense of our nation from hostile
attack.

We know that the nuclear age can be an inferno of death
and destruction or a garden of peace and plenty. This decision
is the difference between good and evil -- man and beast.

the danger is that

~~Success~~ our new efforts in missiles, rockets, and other weapons may, even if successful, become a Pyrrhic victory whose very process of achievement may quench our search for positive approaches to peace, may weaken our endeavors to curb the weapons of war and may cause us to ~~lose~~ lose our sense of perspective.

↳ We must not let our fixation on security through more and bigger armaments lead to a stage where arms alone would control our policy, for this would invite our ultimate destruction.

↳ As General Omar Bradley said in a magnificent speech last November: "The central problem of our time is how to employ human intelligence for the salvation of mankind. For 12 years now we have sought to stave off ultimate disaster by devising arms which would be ultimate and disastrous. . . When are we going to muster an intelligence equal to that applied against the Sputnik and dedicate it to the preservation of this satellite

on which we live? If we are going to save ourselves from the instruments of our own intellect, we had better soon get ourselves under control and begin making the world safe for living."

General Bradley has posed in precise terms the overriding question on which our future will hinge. Its answer may well determine not only our ability to lead but even our ability to survive in the decades ahead.

Let us try to examine, therefore, what we mean by "mutual understanding in the nuclear age" and try to determine what imperatives for action these times demand.

The term "mutual" in a bi-polar world immediately signifies that we are referring to East-West relations, especially our relations with the Soviet Union. On this subject, as on many others, this is a time for re-evaluation.

As far as I am concerned, there is reason to believe that those who conduct and design our foreign policy still make two false

assumptions regarding the Soviet Union.

L The first is that the United States has such political,
military, and economic superiority that it can force the U.S.S.R.
to accept our terms in any series of negotiations.

L The other assumption is that the internal domestic difficulties
of the Soviet regime are so great, that all we need to do is
continue to apply pressure and the collapse of the system will
follow. Both of these assumptions have been stated or implied
many times.

Recent developments have shattered the validity of these
assumptions. The Soviet Sputniks indicate that the U.S.S.R. is,
or will be in the near future, capable of launching intercontinental

and intermediate range ballistic missiles. Reports from Sweden
seem to indicate that the Soviets have, or are in the process
of building, atomic powered submarines among their gigantic
fleet of some 500 under water vessels. *vessels.* May Day parades and

~~public celebrations of the October Revolution reveal highly mechanized and mobile tanks units and artillery.~~ We now have

disturbing evidence of the sizeable expansion of Soviet economic aid, political infiltration, propaganda and cultural offensives.

Indical,

There is evidence that the Soviet system has many weaknesses.

~~Soviet industry is suffering from manpower shortages. Efforts~~

~~to open up and cultivate new land have not been too successful~~

~~to date. Soviet citizens are still relegated to a standard of~~

~~living considerably below the countries of Western Europe and~~

~~some of Eastern Europe as well.~~ But there is little sign

that these problems are about to force any sudden fundamental

changes in the regime. — *But, I repeat,*

Too often, United States proposals regarding the settlement

of political problems and arms control appear to stem from the

assumption that Western military and economic pressure will

produce unwilling compliance on the part of Soviet leaders.

In point of fact, the United States ~~did~~ ^{is} weaken its own strength during the course of disarmament negotiations in London last year with the Soviet Union.

While the U.S.S.R. was making naval sallies into Middle East waters, funneling arms into that area, hurling threats of nuclear annihilation at our allies, and announcing boastfully its achievement of an intercontinental ballistic missile, we were lowering the ceiling on our defense expenditures, cutting back or pulling back our armed forces, and curtailing or slowing down our military aircraft, missile, and Rocket Programs.

It is difficult to see how we could have presented a strong negotiating front to the Soviet Union when we were so busily engaged in unilateral disarmament.

↳ It is essential, therefore, that we reaccess what we mean by "Negotiating from Strength".

↳ A foreign policy designed to meet the realities of

international life requires that we face up to the true power
and political relationships between the U.S.S.R. and the United
States. On the one hand we cannot act as though we have the
strength to force the Soviet Union to accept our terms without
offering reasonable compromises and concessions. On the other
hand, our capacity to defend ourselves and our allies must be
sufficient to discourage the Soviet Union or any of the
Sovietized states from embarking on misguided and miscalculated
military aggressions. While we have allowed ourselves to fall
behind in three crucial areas -- missiles, outer space, and
capacity to deal with limited armed conflicts -- it would be
wrong to assume that we are so weak that we are inviting
Soviet aggression or that the Soviets could force us to accept
their terms in any series of negotiations. We need not tremble
at the thought of sitting face to face with Soviets at the
conference table. Negotiating from strength means not only the

appearance of strength, but the fact and reality of strength. *But,*

By strength we must include military preparedness with modern weapons, alliances that are strong and secure both militarily and politically, and a vigorous and expanding economy.

The Soviet Union too must come to accept the reality of the balance of power existing between it and the free world. It may be under an illusion that its achievements in missiles and rockets have so elevated its power position that negotiations with the United States can only be on Soviet terms. Perhaps this is why the Soviets abruptly broke off the London disarmament talks of last summer and why it is boycotting the newly expanded United Nations Disarmament Commission. Soviet leaders must be persuaded, both through our increased defensive strength and through a broad program ^{of} ~~to pursue~~ works of peace, ^{that it too should be} ~~and a willingness~~ ^{and} ~~to~~ ^{Willing} ~~to~~ conduct negotiations at any time, ^{and} that neither side can force terms on the other. Any agreement reached must serve the national

interests of both countries as well as the many countries allied and associated with us in our search for peace.

Improving the International Climate

To reach lasting agreements with the Soviet Union on such fundamental issues as arms control and political settlements, the international climate must be conducive to the development of mutual confidence. It is somewhat pointless to expect immediate success to result from discussions on disarmament when the Western nations and the Soviet Union are simultaneously exchanging verbal threats of how each can retaliate against and destroy the other.

There are many ways to help build an environment of confidence. It can be improved through an acceleration of private and public contacts on all levels.

The recently announced agreement to liberalize and broaden the exchange programs in order to encourage a greater measure of contact between the people of the United States and those of

the Soviet Union is a big step in the right direction. Such an exchange can do much to calm the fears, and help to create a degree of understanding between our people and those of the

Soviet Union. ~~I wish to commend and compliment the Administration on the recent agreement between the United States and the Soviet~~

~~Union~~. It deserves our continuing attention and support.

L I would go even further. I would like to see us encourage anyone -- and particularly those from behind the Iron Curtain --

to come to the United States on a visitor's visa for a certain limited period of time. By a single stroke of this nature,

we could restore much of our damaged image abroad. By the

same token, I think we should encourage American tourists to go behind the Iron Curtain, ~~encourage them~~ *and* to do so as part

of official policy.

L Soviet education is producing a new intelligentsia in fields of science, literature, music, agriculture and industry.

I am told that the young scientists, engineers, musicians and even publicists are increasingly non-political or apolitical in their outlook. This offers opportunity for association in those broad areas of non-political activities. We must encourage Soviet citizens, yes and others, to come to this country, to visit, to travel, and to study. More of our citizens should be meeting with Soviet experts in all fields and in as many places as they can be found. International fairs, international scientific conferences, and international educational conferences are some of the places United States and Soviet citizens should be meeting and exchanging views and ideas. Let us accept the challenge of competitive co-existence -- but let us be sure to compete. *yes*

↳ The time is ripe to devise and execute extensive programs designed to improve the international atmosphere. We cannot expect progress on arms control and the settlement of major

political problems overnight. ^L Many moons and many earth satellites
are likely to pass over our heads before we see significant agreements
on fundamental issues. ^{But,} If we can expand our efforts in these
many peripheral areas then the possibilities for reduced international
tension and a break in the arms race may be realized. The world
atmosphere needs to be "disarmed" by better human relations.

^L Political problems, just like bacteria, have less chance of
becoming dangerous or fatal if the surrounding environment is
not conducive to their multiplication and contagion.

We should be the exponents of political settlements,
negotiations and peaceful progress.

^L The challenge the Soviet Union presents is a total challenge.
It is military, political, social, economic, cultural and ideological.

We must meet his challenge on all fronts.

three Challenges

¹¹ The first challenge, the immediate one, is to recover from our
delays and mismanagement in the field of military rocketry and
missiles. There is no doubt that Congress will respond with

increased appropriations for these programs, probably more than the President has asked.

(2)

The second challenge is to provide the basic defense in depth which these defense programs need with a new and lively rediscovery of the importance of education, trained minds, basic research, not only in the sciences but in the humanities too. There are signs that people are belatedly awakening to the full dimensions of this challenge, ^{also.} ~~too.~~

Edus
Tech
Heart

(3)

The third challenge is the major one for the long haul. At the moment we have only a sobering and disturbing awareness that our current struggle to regain military parity ultimately will lead nowhere but to increased world problems. We are only vaguely aware that the long-term challenge lies in the competition for men's minds, hearts, and enthusiasms.

Economic
Cultural

We cannot afford to relax on any front, for we can be sure that the Soviet Union's determination to envelop the world with its political and economic system will never let up.

-17-
The Personal Dimension

Now, of course, this is a challenge for each of us. Building better international relations obviously involves more than action by Government alone. Clearly we must arouse our Government and awaken the Administration, but we must also dedicate our own personal energies as citizens to the task of national security and world peace. We must show that the united efforts of free people can be greater than the enforced, monolithic effort of the Communist system. We must tap, all across the board, our great resources to help promote a generation of responsible leaders in international affairs.

There are areas where men and women, including many of you here tonight, working as individuals and through private organizations, can work constructively and in harmony with our major objective of world peace. The personal dimension remains all important.

There has been a great deal of comment in recent months about the qualifications of some of our ambassadors to hold the positions they have. Of course it is outrageous to have a man selected as an ambassador merely because he is a heavy political contributor and without regard to his qualifications or experience. But it continues to happen.

Now for the sake of the record, I want to say that I do not necessarily believe that foreign service career people always make the best ambassadors. Indeed, many of our best ambassadors have been men and women whose lives have been lived within the boundaries of America, close to the everyday life of America.

It is time our Government recognized that our ambassadors should be drawn from the ranks of the leaders of our educational institutions, leaders of our farm and labor organizations, the leaders of our minority and nationality groups, from civic-minded people, with a dedication toward international understanding. I think of people like Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, a housewife of Red

Wing, Minnesota, and our former Ambassador to Denmark; and
Chester Bowles, a businessman and politician with a heart,
who represented us so magnificently in India.

We have talked a great deal in recent years about private
investment by American businessmen abroad as a way of strengthening
America's foreign policy. I believe in the promotion of that *kind of*
private investment and I want to encourage it. However, there
is another kind of ^{private} investment which can be equally, if not
more, advantageous.

I refer to the investment of time and devotion which can
come from American citizens traveling and serving abroad. I
can think of church leaders and labor union members, engineers,
farm and business managers, teachers, nurses, doctors, scientists,
students -- devoting a year or two of their lives, working in
Asia and Africa and South America, in satisfying, worthwhile,
constructive endeavor. There can be no greater or more effective
way to transmit the real America to the rest of the world and to

win its friendship.

Yes, a weakness in our ^{present} foreign policy is that ~~too much attention~~
~~is paid to the formalities of diplomacy~~ and too little attention *is paid*

to the workers in the factories, to the natives in the villages --
to the students and teachers. How paradoxical this is.

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

I am fully convinced that the truly good news of the 20th
century is that millions of people in Asia and Africa **are** re-
~~peating~~
peating in their own way the dramatic story of American independence.

~~This is~~ Our message to the world -- the message of self-determination, liberation, faith in human dignity, and human ability. This message of brotherhood and human equality is our reservoir of good will.

↳ Having said this much, let me become quite specific. How should we relate our policies ^{to} ~~in~~ this world in revolution? What are the essential elements of a revitalized foreign policy for the United States?

ten Proposals

↳ First. Certainly we need breakthroughs in the science of energy and ~~space~~ ^{SPACE}, if only because without them we will be at the merciless whim of the Kremlin. ~~Yes, we must marshal and expand our resources of science and engineering which we lost by penny-pinching neglect and contempt for basic research.~~

↳ Second. We must re-evaluate our defense budget and be willing to spend what the situation requires. We must also re-evaluate some of our basic strategic concepts. A single-minded concept of "massive retaliation" has had terribly dangerous implications in reducing our flexibility to meet unforeseen, nibbling actions. A determination to make all wars "massive", or

not to fight them at all, has had the effect of paralyzing our policy since few, including the Soviets, believe we will take the massive risk. ~~Consequently~~ ^{the} Soviet Union may very probably have come to a deliberate decision -- not to blow the world to bits, but merely to pick it up bit by bit. We cannot afford to let "Operation Nibble" succeed.

← Third. We must frankly come to grips with the knotty problem of reassessing our relations with the Communist world. We must both meet the threat of Communist expansionism, and yet not let it immobilize us. Somehow we must strive to blunt its sharp edge, keep open the bridges of possible agreement on specific issues, and lose no opportunity to demonstrate peaceful intent. We must decide to do a very difficult thing: keep up our guard at the same time as we try to increase contacts. Regardless of the recognition issue, I am convinced that this effort must apply to our relations with Red China as well as with the U.S.S.R.

Fourth. We must adopt ^a ~~the~~ long-range perspective ~~and~~ *strategy.*

~~the result.~~ We cannot expect changes overnight. Constructive policies in Africa and Asia must be geared to a long-term effort.

History is not written in a day. It will be fatal if we insist on quick results. If, instead, we could adopt a long-term perspective, our whole psychological approach to issues like foreign aid would take on a more healthy and realistic aspect.

Fifth. We must deliberately seek to break out from the holding-operation atmosphere of our present policy. We need to seek as many outlets as we can find for constructive international endeavor consistent with our basic democratic principles.

Obviously, therefore, we should join with the spirit of independent nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries, remind these people that we too are the children of self-determination, of revolution, and of a will to freedom and independence. Nearly half the people of the world

live
~~are~~ in nations which have recently emerged, or are yet to emerge *into* freedom.

They will be a powerful force in decades to come, and we must help them prepare to use their strength in behalf of freedom.

I cannot refer to this matter tonight without referring specifically to the tragedy which befell Tunisia and the cause of freedom last Saturday.

In a single act of idiocy the Tunisian market town of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef was the victim of a premeditated attack by French fliers using American-made planes raining death and destruction on the town hall, the post office, a school, 84 shops and two Red Cross trucks carrying Swiss license plates. A total of 68 persons dead, including women and children, and a hundred wounded were left when the B-26s and Corsairs retired across the border into that other scene of terror and death, Algeria.

We have been wringing our hands over French colonial policies for years. We ~~have~~^{wrung} our hands over it during the bloody holocaust of Indochina, and there proved to be no solution for that problem until the French themselves gradually tired of the accumulation

of bitterness and bloodshed, tears and treasure, which that fruitless
holding operation cost.

↳ But the lessons of Indochina apparently have not been learned
in North Africa. Many of us for months have hoped against hope
that a decent basis of close and enduring relations could be
forged by the French and her former North African possessions.

↳ The natural interests of Morocco and Tunisia still lie in a close
association with France. The chances of salvaging anything
constructive from the Algerian crisis also lie, or lay until
last week end, with enlightened compromise from Paris.

↳ The quagmire of Algeria ^{has} seemed unending enough. Against
increasing pressure of world opinion, including the liberal
opinion in France itself, the French government has insisted on
treating Algeria as a domestic matter. ^{But} The desperate and hot-
headed action of the French Air Force last Saturday is almost
a transparent indication that the French are determined to

act against their own best interests.

< The Tunisian market day bombing has done more than anything before to internationalize the Algerian problem, precisely the thing Paris has been trying to avoid.

Like

~~Like~~ a stone dropped into a huge pond, the ever-widening ripples from the Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef bombing are spreading out to ever greater catastrophe for the entire Western position and to ever greater possibilities for Soviet diplomacy *and propaganda.*

The President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba, has been desperately trying to maintain his friendship for the West in recent months. A week ago, before the bombing, he said that he needed something more than "the pretty eyes of Mr. Dulles" to maintain that relationship. Yesterday Mr. Bourguiba's Destour Party newspaper said:

"Hard reality is teaching us each day that to hang on

to the West only produces a harvest of rebuffs and humiliations
and, between gestures of charity ^{and} bombs. For the B-26's and Corsairs
which sowed death Saturday morning were American as much as they
were French. . . One thing is clear. To be respected in 1958
means one must no longer be a friend of the West."

↳ We cannot wring our hands on such matters forever, ~~disagreeable~~
as it always is to talk man-to-man with one of our closest allies
about a problem as explosive and sensitive as this one. Neverthe-
less it is time for such a man-to-man talk with our French friends.
What we must tell them is also, I think, quite clear:

↳ It is always a cruel process to relinquish an empire, but
some ways of doing it are better than others. Indochina proved a
tragic military holocaust. Algeria has ~~■~~ already become another.

↳ France is not the only Western power which has an interest
in the development of stable, peaceful governments in North Africa.
The interests of NATO, and more than that, the interests of the

free world, demand positive constructive steps to solve the
colonial
North African controversy. We in the United States, and the
other good friends of France in the West, do not intend to allow
along with French policy
themselves to be drawn into a descending spiral of hatred and
hopelessness in North Africa.

A famous Frenchman, Clemenceau, once said that war was too
serious an affair to be ^{en} trusted to generals. French generals have
just proved this once more.

↳ The strategic, political and moral position of the West is
far too important a thing to be tied to the kite of French military
decisions for which even the French Foreign Office disclaims
responsibility. We are not prepared to sacrifice the friendship
of a Bourguiba at the whim of a handful of French pilots with
lethal weapons in their hands.

↳ The world is not interested in explanations from Paris at
the moment. It is interested in amends.

The United States in its own best interests, and in the interests of the free world, ^{can} ~~will~~ no longer pull French chestnuts out of the fire at the United Nations on the Algerian question.

L Just as we are interest^{ed} in amends for the Tunisian attack, so we are interested in a fair and constructive settlement of the Algerian issue. We should support inclusion of this item on the United Nations agenda and redouble our efforts to conciliate and mediate.

L I would go further. ~~xxxx~~ Under our NATO arrangements with France, France has no right to use equipment furnished for NATO defense in the manner in which the planes were used last Saturday.

~~xxx~~ I have checked at the State Department this afternoon only to learn that the B-26's used in the attack were apparently purchased by France without any strings attached. The F4U7 Corsairs, however, were apparently donated to France under our Mutual Defense Assistance Program which provides that the equipment shall be used for NATO

purposes.

I am one of those who feels we should have raised this question with the French long ago on the use of NATO equipment in Algeria. The French have always claimed that Algeria was within the NATO sphere, however, and for that reason the State Department has never protested. But Tunisia is not in the NATO area, and I think the question should now be raised.

Under section 511(c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the United States has reserve the right to request the return of NATO equipment donated by us when it is no longer needed for the purpose intended. The use of the Corsairs in the Tunisian attack is prima facie evidence, as far as I am concerned, that this equipment is not considered by the French to be needed for NATO purposes. I respectfully suggest that the President through the Secretary of State inform the French government that the NATO equipment used in last Saturday's attack be returned to the United States for disposition elsewhere in conformance with NATO objectives.

Let me now return to my discussion of basic policy points. Tunisia is an exception in the underdeveloped world. Tunisia has tried to orient itself toward the West. Other great nations in the Middle East and Sout Asia have tried to steer a middle course. There are sufficient and understandable reasons for this as well.

Hence my sixth point:

Sixth. We should respect the neutrality of new-born nations.

These neutrals are not pro-Communist. They are pro-themselves.

I suggest that as long as nations remain free, as long as they work for themselves and build their own economies, they are barriers to Communist penetration, strengthening the forces of freedom in the world.

Seventh. We must make much greater use of our economic strength to help other free nations develop themselves and bring the blessing of freedom to their eager and impatient peoples.

Let me dwell on this point too for a moment. Here is a weapon
of peace and plenty which the Soviet Union could not match
provided we utilized our capacity. At the moment, the alarming
~~fact is that the Soviet Union is matching us in economic~~
fact is that the Soviet Union is matching us in economic
assistance to underdeveloped countries. In fact, the magnitude
of the Soviet foreign aid program is startling.

In addition to \$7 billion of economic credits granted to Eastern Europe and China since 1945, the Soviet Union has pledged credits of more than \$1.8 billion to the underdeveloped countries outside the Iron Curtain in the two years that its aid program in these areas has been functioning.

↳ In Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan, and India the effects of this Soviet assistance are beginning to be felt. In these countries Soviet economic aid is available on highly favorable terms -- long repayment periods and interests rates as low as $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ per year. (~~low enough to curl ex-Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's hair.~~)

↳ Communist China has also been busy in this field making extensive grants to Cambodia, Ceylon and Nepal.

↳ Moreover, a striking feature in the foreign aid picture at the moment is that the Soviet effort is increasing while

this country's effort is shrinking. We can still reverse this trend if we have the will to do it. We still have the capacity to outdo anything the Soviet Union can possibly manage in aid to uncommitted nations. But if this country refuses to use its capacity and seeks its security in ~~balanced budgets and~~ budget ceilings, protective tariffs and a Maginot line of missiles, the Soviet competition in the vast underdeveloped areas can be ~~enough~~ enough to turn them toward communism.

↳ The outstanding case in point, of course, is India. This great free nation, whatever political differences we may have with it, holds the key to the future of South Asia. If the Indian development plan should fail, it would be an open invitation to the Communists to overrun South Asia as they overran China. And it is in danger of failing, for want of half a billion ~~dollars~~ dollars which we, along with other Western nations can lend. This is only a very small part of the total capital for the Indian

development plan; by far the greatest part, the Indians are squeezing from their own hard-pressed economy.

↳ But this capital loan from the outside may be the margin between success and failure, between demonstrating that a free and independent people can develop their country and raise their standard of living, or surrendering to the brutal and ruthless methods of Communist development. *What has been done thus far is not enough.* We should be grateful we still have the opportunity to help them meet this test.

Would we prefer that the U.S.S.R. should do it? What would we not give now if we could have the opportunity to make such a choice in China! Let us not have to debate a decade from now "Who Lost India".

Eighth. We should step up our own Point Four program, at the same time that we continue to work through the UN and help expand UN technical assistance. No program has been more rewarding or has greater promise for a comparatively small

investment.

Here, too, the Communists have actively entered the field. The Soviet-Chinese block has at this very moment some 2,000 technicians working in 19 underdeveloped countries of the world. An equal number of technicians from these countries are studying in the Soviet Union. Still others are receiving Soviet-financed training at home.

It will be utterly foolhardy if we allow the Soviet Union to usurp what should be good basic American and Western ground. We are the people hitherto known to the world as technologists, scientists, engineers. One of the most precious products in the world today is a reservoir of trained technical personnel. We have always had such a reservoir and we should contribute from it unstintingly to the areas of the world that need our help. We need experts for export!

Ninth. We should more actively, constructively, and imaginatively use our blessings of food and fiber as a powerful force for freedom. Our abundance is a tremendous asset, not the curse some are inclined to make it appear. In a world where millions lack enough to eat, we should be humbly thankful that we are blessed with abundance -- and we should be wise enough to use that abundance for the sake of humanity.

I am proud to have had a part in the formulation of the programs under Public Law 480 by which we can not only use our abundant stocks of foods and fibers to relieve acute emergency shortages elsewhere in the world, but also to help economic development programs where they are urgently needed. We in this country do not know what it means to have to choose between a necessary rate of investment and enough to eat; we must do what we can to help ease that choice for others. A breakthrough

in the conquest of hunger ^{can be} ~~is~~ more significant than the conquest
of outer space. We have hardly scratched the surface of what can
be achieved with our abundance under the concept of Public
Law 480, and its full potential must be utilized without further
delay. Food policy should be a part of foreign policy.

Tenth. While we maintain our armed strength, we must continue
to explore all possibilities for agreements to control armaments.
And we must manage to convey to the world the sincerity of our
passion for peace and for control of arms as a means of diminishing
the danger of war. ~~This is a subject on which I, myself, feel~~
~~very strongly, because as chairman of the Subcommittee on~~
~~Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have~~
~~followed closely the efforts to reach agreement with the U.S.S.R.~~

I appreciate the difficulties of trying to negotiate ~~such~~ ^{any}
~~an~~ agreement with ^{intransigent} ~~impenetrable~~ and unpredictable Soviet representa-
tives. But I appreciate also the need to have a clear, unified
policy of our own (which ^{we} ~~we~~ have not always had) and to convince

not only the ^{Soviets} ~~Russians~~ but the whole world of the earnestness

and sincerity of the American people's determination to lift

~~this dark shadow~~ ^{of the arms race} from themselves and from all mankind.

~~In this connection, it is time that we grant some~~
~~disarmament. The best reliable figures on the cost to the~~
~~United States of the recent London disarmament conference,~~
~~including salaries, transportation and living expenses of the~~
~~entire American delegation was something like \$325 thousand.~~

~~To be sure this figure is not to be sneezed at, but we also~~
~~know something about relative costs~~ [<] A single B-52 bomber
costs \$8 million. A single submarine now costs \$42.5 million.

One General who watched a recent test firing of a Jupiter
missile commented that firing rockets is comparable to burning
ten dollar bills by the ton.

While we are making these massive expenditures, and I
do not question the basic necessity to do so, I think that
our safety might be increased, and our long-run expenditures

might be reduced, if we spend a little more on the active

effort toward peace.

Last year the total cost of our efforts at disarmament at the London Conference, about \$325,000

↳ We must rid ourselves of the fallacy that there is a

kind of priority of programs and negotiations. Negotiations

and programs on the most difficult as well as the least complex

need to be pursued simultaneously.

↳ In countless ways we must do all we can to improve the

international climate to make it more conducive toward

successful negotiations on all points at issue. As far as

the disarmament question itself is concerned, I agree completely

with President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message

when he said: "But of all the works of peace, none is more

needed now than a real first step toward disarmament."

↳ Frankly, at the moment, we are presenting as a so-called

first step proposal a large and complicated package of nine

specific ^{points.} ~~proposals.~~ Having studied this matter in detail for many months, I have concluded that to call these nine points a "first step" toward disarmament is inaccurate and unrealistic. No nation, least of all the suspicious, tightly controlled Soviet Union, would agree to such sweeping provisions all at one time. I am convinced that if we are ever to reach a real and genuine first step agreement with the Soviet Union on disarmament we must be willing to break up our disarmament package.

I think, for example, that we have handled very badly the proposal ~~of the Soviet Union~~ to ban nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet offer, on its face, includes the installation of an inspection system within the borders of each testing state and near each testing site. The purpose of such an inspection system would be to verify the observance of a test suspension.

I believe that public opinion in the United States and throughout the world would support the suspension of these tests

provided an adequate inspection and detection system can be installed in all testing countries, ~~and close to all possible test sites.~~

~~It has never been clear to me, all of the explanations and arguments of the Administration notwithstanding, why the United States insists a test suspension with inspection safeguards should not be proposed as a separate measure.~~

↳ I think we should press for an agreement on an inspection system to verify the suspension of these tests. To gain admission to the U.S.S.R. for inspection by an International Agency, would ~~be a political and technological breakthrough second to none.~~

↳ With respect to the requirements for both the inspection system for a cut-off of ^{bomb} ~~production~~ and for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests, I propose that the Executive Branch appoint two teams of prominent and highly qualified nuclear scientists and

weapons experts. One should be charged with making a complete and thorough study of the requirements of inspection for a test ban; the other group for inspection for a cut-off of production. These two groups should offer to meet with comparable scientists and nuclear experts from the Soviet Union in order to devise inspection systems acceptable to both countries. If the U.S.S.R. refuses both of these proposals then we should try such a proposal on the non-governmental level. The United States National Academy of Sciences could appoint two teams of weapons experts. These teams might then negotiate with the Soviet Academy of Sciences to determine whether they could agree on the necessary requirements of an inspection system to verify a test ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

The Administration should also create special groups of experts both in and out of government to study in relation to arms control such problems as posed by the successful testing ~~of an intercontinental ballistic missile~~. of an intercontinental ballistic missile. We should also be investigating to what extent the achievements of the launching of earth satellites will affect present plans for aerial inspection to prevent surprise attack.

↳ In fact, the United Nations should establish a special committee on the joint exploration of outer space -- a committee which should include the scientists of many nations, including those of the United States and the Soviet Union. Such an act would constitute a truly new enterprise in genuine international cooperation. One of the first projects such a committee might sponsor could be a United Nations reconnaissance satellite. A ~~satellite of this nature~~ satellite of this nature would impress all nations that no longer are national borders and countries sacrosanct. It would be a

vivid example of internationalism which by its very existence would require the creation of new concepts of international law and order. Why not let the most important international organization dedicated to peace be the sponsor of a special kind of an earth satellite? This would be science at work for humanity.

L My aim in all of these proposals is to make some headway toward diminishing the threat of a total and terrible third world war, toward achieving some settlements of the major political problems that account for the persistence of international tension, and finally toward reducing the gigantic burden on all peoples of large armament expenditures.

L I firmly believe that we must keep trying to negotiate as long as there is a faint hope of success. The people of this and all countries desperately want and need peace. The nation which by its dedication, persistence, boldness, and imagination persuades people that it is the champion of peace will have

and deserve decisive world support.

↳ America's foreign policy needs the inspiration of the "works of peace" -- not merely the words of peace.

The works of peace are the very heart and core of our tradition and philosophy. Health care for the sick, food for the hungry, jobs for the unemployed, homes and shelter for the needy, opportunity for youth -- these are the concrete works of peace we must do. This great promise of the good life, with "liberty and the pursuit of happiness" is one we can fulfill, and we should move ahead vigorously to do it.

↳ We have an opportunity to recover that generosity, humanitarianism and compassion that in the past won for us the world's admiration and respect, and even turned our enemies into friends.

↳ The challenge is an inescapable one for you and me: to go out into this generation to stand for the truths that man's future on earth need not be cancelled; that his political ingenuity can

still rescue him from ruin; that his moral and ethical standards
still are here; that some things, like war and injustice, may
seem everlasting, but that these things are everlastingly
wrong. Evil triumphs when good men fail to act.

Let us be the people of progress, the people of performance,
and the people of peace. *Let us Act!*

2/12/58



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