



# Congressional Record

United States  
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 104

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 8, 1958

No. 136

## THE ROLE OF CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY: A TEST OF BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have listened with attention and interest to the remarks of the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

I must say it would be very pleasing and satisfying if everyone in the world—in fact, if the majority in the world—could look upon the American foreign policy as being as effective, as generous, and as constructive as the Senator from Indiana has painted it. I am sure the motivation behind our foreign policy is good. I am sure the purposes are peace, justice, and freedom. I am sure those who conduct our foreign policy try hard to make those policy objectives come true.

But, Mr. President, the world of today is not one which is quite as willing to accept the value judgments we make of our own efforts as we ourselves seem to be willing to accept.

I was intrigued by the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana that we should not criticize, because this is a difficult hour. Mr. President, criticism simply for the sake of criticism is indeed to be frowned upon. Carping criticism, with no constructive approach or proposal, lends little or nothing to public understanding. I would accept that kind of admonition. If there is merely criticism to be partisan, criticism to be critical, or criticism to obstruct, then indeed criticism is damaging.

I might cite, however, that the same kind of deep concern did not exist in these halls all the time. I recall bitter criticism of our action in Korea as "Mr. Truman's war," while men were dying on the battlefield. I recall speech after speech in the Senate by men who thought they were better generals than those in command of our troops, judging, at least, by their proposals as to how the war should be fought. I can recall the most vituperative and vitriolic condemnation of our action in Korea even as men died by the thousands—where was the Senator's complaint about criticism, then?

But one wrong, of course, does not justify another, and I shall not be guilty of that.

I have said that this is no time for re-cremations. I spoke my piece about what should happen in the Middle East prior to the intervention in Lebanon. I asked on the 26th day of June 1958, that we move in the General Assembly and in the Security Council for a United Nations police force for Lebanon. I said that we had an obligation to Lebanon and that we ought to try to fulfill the obligation through the international community, if that were humanly possible.



Mr. President, it is an interesting thing to me to note, while we are being admonished in the Senate not to be critical of the administration, editors, and publishers, who have long supported the administration, today, out of patriotic duty, out of love of country over love of party, and out of respect for the Nation more than partisan support for an individual in public office, are speaking up. I have in my hand an editorial from Life magazine of 2 weeks ago. The lead editorial is "A Plan To Make Sense in the Middle East."

It is surely fair to say that Mr. Luce, the publisher of Life magazine, has been a supporter of this administration. His very distinguished wife was one of our great Ambassadors who did a wonderful job. But Mr. Luce, or at least his editor, has this to say:

A clear conscience—

That is a reference to the motivations of our foreign policy, to which the Senator from Indiana has alluded. I repeat:

A clear conscience, however, does not let Americans off the hook. It leaves us still to repair the omissions of a Middle East policy that has staggered around like a lost camel for 10 critical years.

Then, Mr. President, the editorial goes on for a full page to outline not only criticism, but much more importantly, 3

constructive proposals—yes, 3 proposals—which have been advanced again and again on the floor of the Senate by Members of this Chamber. They are three proposals which I believe should have been embraced by the Government of the United States.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has performed a patriotic service second to none by pointing out the inadequacies, the limitations, and the weaknesses not only in the substance of our foreign policy but in its execution. The time is at hand, Mr. President, for a thorough, objective reexamination not only of what has happened in foreign policy, but, more importantly, an examination of the question, Where do we go from here?

I believe a Member of the Senate has a right to ask—and in fact the duty to ask—what, if any, plans have we for the United Nations General Assembly. We are now going to a special session of the General Assembly. Are we merely going to have an argument with the Soviet Union. Are we merely going to act like boys in the back lot who say, "You're one, too"? Are we merely going to have a display of vituperative debate to prove to the world that the Soviets are tyrants, to again prove to the world that the Soviets are conducting a conspiratorial activity, and that the Soviets enjoy the confusion and disorder which prevail in many parts of the world, and profit therefrom?

We do not need to prove those things. Every reasonable person knows them. If our effort at the United Nations is merely to show that the Soviet Union is governed by dictators, and that its policies are inimical to the legitimate interests of people who wish to be free, then, indeed, our case and our cause is a futile one. This is not diplomacy, it is adolescent debate.

I am asking what we are going to propose at the United Nations. What is our program, and what is our policy? Day after day in the Foreign Relations Committee, in the briefing sessions, we have been told, as Senators know, that our policy is inadequate, that we must do something else. Day after day we have been told that we do not know how we are going to get our troops out of Lebanon, but that we want to get them out.

Day after day we are told that there is trouble coming in other areas. For example—and I said Wednesday, so it is no great secret—the state of Jordan is in dire trouble and may not long survive. The sheikdom of Kuwait is in dire trouble. Then there is Saudi Arabia, Libya, and others—they too face an uncertain future.

What are our policies? What happens to the British if they lose their

interests in Kuwait oil revenues that bring 300 million pounds sterling into the Bank of England. This capital is vital to the British.

It is the patriotic duty of responsible citizens and Senators alike to discuss constructively, thoughtfully, and hopefully what our foreign policy can be

and should be. Some of us have said—as did the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—that we have a tendency all too often to blame everything that goes wrong on the Communists. That admonition was long overdue. Indeed, we have a tendency to lay all our troubles at one doorstep. To be sure, the Communist conspiracy is the source of much trouble, but not necessarily all of it.

To take one example which was cited today, when the Iraqi revolt took place, it was condemned as being a Communist conspiracy. Only 3½ weeks later it is now viewed by the administration as an indigenous revolution. We have recognized the new Government. The morning newspapers tell of the plans of the Government for the expansion of private enterprise, the expansion of certain welfare activities for its people, land reform, and other things. What kind of consistency is this. It reveals a weakness and uncertainty that is very damaging to our prestige.

We have been told that we are in Lebanon because of the Eisenhower doctrine. We are not. There is no member of the executive department who agrees with the Senator from Indiana that we are in Lebanon because of the Eisenhower doctrine. The Eisenhower doctrine does not apply to Lebanon in this instance. The President and the Secretary of State have said it does not apply. There was no Communist control of a government or Communist attack—both being requirements for action under the doctrine.

We are in Lebanon because of a personal commitment by the President of the United States to the President of Lebanon, relating to the territorial integrity of that country.

That is a matter of testimony and not a matter of conjecture. My colleagues know that I speak the truth.

I have heard today from the Senator from Indiana how cooperative we are. Indeed, we have been cooperative.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I continue?

We pay one-third of the cost of the United Nations, says the Senator from Indiana. That is very true. We pay a large share of the military costs of NATO. That is true. We have taken the lead in the World Bank. We have taken the lead in SEATO. We have taken the lead in NATO. We took the lead in the creation of the United Nations.

So what does this prove. We are talking about what more can be done that should be done, and what should have been done that we did not do. Something has gone wrong. We are in dire trouble.

This is not a matter of castigating anyone. The situation concerns everyone. The life of every person is at stake. The fate of the Republic and the free world alliance is at stake.

I point out that in other parliaments there has been very serious debate. In the Bundestag in Germany the halls have been ringing with caustic debate. In the House of Commons of Great Britain there has been open discussion and debate, and great difference of opinion. The same is true of the Scandinavian countries, and of Japan. In every country in the world there has been at least some difference of opinion, not only as to our foreign policy, but their own foreign policy. Free people do, at times, disagree. The right to dissent is a privilege of a free society and at times a moral obligation.

Bipartisanship does not mean being blind to reality. Bipartisanship does not mean slavish adherence to the folly and the mistakes of those who lead. Bipartisanship means at least constructive thought and contribution in an effort to design policies that are workable and effective, stronger and better.

I voted for the Eisenhower doctrine. I voted for the SEATO Treaty. I voted for the treaty with Formosa. My record of bipartisan participation in behalf of what I felt were some of the significant developments in foreign policy will stand careful scrutiny, but I reserve the right to disagree.

Nor is it so much a question of what we have done as how we have done it. It is not so much sins of commission that plague us today, but rather sins of omission. The Secretary of State himself said, when the Middle East doctrine was before us 2 years ago, that it was a stop-gap. He then went on to tell the joint committee before which he testified that a new comprehensive program would be developed for the Middle East. I submit that none has been developed.

The recommendations of the United States Senate for a United Nations police force were ignored. The argument of the State Department in support of its refusal to act upon the recommendation to plead that case in the United Nations was based upon the assertion that it was "too expensive."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] so reported to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from Alabama wrote to every member of the United States delegation in the United Nations, and to the State Department, urging that the action of the Senate in recommending a permanent United Nations police force be heeded. Again there was no action.

There have been those of us who proposed to the State Department the desirability of the creation of a United Nations Middle East economic development agency, which now seems to be gaining support. What was the response last year? "No; we will do it bilaterally. We will not do it through a multilateral agency."

Yes there are plenty of things to be critical about, but in the process there

are suggestions which can be made. Have my colleagues forgotten the suggestion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for an Arms Traffic Commission in the United Nations, which suggestion was added to the Mutual Security Act as a recommendation 2 years ago? Have our colleagues forgotten the suggestions which have been made for a modified, open-skies pilot project over the Middle East, and a modified type of regional disarmament? These, too, were rejected by the administration.

These suggestions have been made again and again. All we are saying is that when we find ourselves in a critical situation such as that which now exists, we should seek not merely to out-debate the Soviets, not merely to expose Nasser, not merely to prove to the world for the thousandth time that Soviet communism is a tyrannical dictatorship, but rather, to prove that we understand the world in which we live, to prove to the world that we understand the political and social forces which are at work, and that we are prepared to give them a sense of direction into healthy, constructive paths.

That is what the argument is about. The time is late. We would have been better citizens and Senators had we been debating these issues a year ago and 2 years ago, particularly after the Suez crisis.

We started to debate Mid East policy after the Suez crisis. Then we were led to believe that the answer was the Middle East doctrine, which now its own authors admit is not applicable to the present crisis, and which the Secretary of State himself says fails to meet the threat of indirect aggression. I call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that our Government now says that the problem in the Middle East today is not overt aggression, but, rather, indirect aggression. So now we find that a year and a half ago we had again been given political tranquilizers.

Mr. President, when someone says now that perhaps we ought to take another look, and perhaps we ought to see whether what we are doing is right, we are told, "This is no time to be critical." When we suggest that this would be a good time to see if we are doing the right thing in connection with the oil contracts, to see if more generous settlements could not be made, or whether we should not look into the use of a UN emergency police force, or the settlement of the refugee situation, we are told, "You are rocking the boat." We are told, "This is no time for arguments." To stifle honest debate is to strangle constructive action.

I insist that this is the time for thoughtful and constructive and positive arguments. I believe this is the time for a reexamination of our relationship with other nations in the area of the Middle East. It is time to find out whether there is any way out of the situation short of the use of troops and military intervention. I believe there is.

I can say with a clear conscience that for the past 3 years I have made constructive suggestions, both before the American people and in the Senate. I have made what I considered to be thoughtful suggestions. I find now that a great many of them are being endorsed by people who only a short time ago would have nothing whatever to do with them.

I spoke to the Italian Foreign office when I was in Italy. I knew of their interest in a multilateral economic development program. It is no secret that other nations also had something to contribute to the solution of these problems.

I say again, as I said earlier, that we have insisted on using our own methods and money, instead of seeking the help of others, particularly in connection with the great economic development cooperation. We have insisted on using our own fleet, alone, rather than urging the use of a United Nations police force, about which we could do something. Then too, we have insisted on pretending at times that some of these problems really did exist. We have felt that if we were friendly with Israel, we could not be friendly with the Arab countries; that if we were friendly with the Arab countries, we could not be friends with Israel. I can say we can be friends of both. It is time to reassure our friend, the State of Israel.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to agree in part with the Senator from Minnesota, and disagree in small part with him. Perhaps we can come to a fruitful conclusion on this matter.

I believe this is a time to criticize. I could not agree with the Senator more completely about that. I think this is the time to discuss the weaknesses in our policies, which have been shown. I believe this is also the time to show resolution on the question of our landing troops in Lebanon. That was one way of getting going. We should take advantage—and this is my point—of the resolution which was shown by the landings in Lebanon. We should remember that there is also a third party involved. First, there is the administration. I agree that it is subject to a great deal of criticism. Secondly, there is ourselves. We too are subject to some criticism. The third party, of course, is the American people, the taxpayers, from whom we get many letters. We must remember that they have their own problems, too, which they must solve. We must realize that if we are to be a power in the world for peace, we must also be ready to run risks, and that when we are willing to spend our treasure, we must sometimes also spend blood. If we can communicate to the American people the sense of resolution which was shown by the landings in Lebanon, then we can take the criticisms and put them to tremendous use.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the article I placed in the RECORD entitled "Chronology of Failure," I did not limit myself merely to a criticism of the past 6 years. I started 10 years ago. I pointed out what I thought were weaknesses in our foreign policy. There is no need for further recrimination. The question is, "Where now?"

As the Senator himself has raised the question in previous discussions, "What about Jordan?" What, if any, plans do we have for the Sheikdom of Kuwait? What about Libya? That country is being infiltrated every day. We have vast military installations and a great responsibility there. What about our friends in Ethiopia? What about Ghana? What about Morocco? What about Tunisia? Do we have a coordinated program and policy for these areas? If so, what is it?

I am of the opinion that there is a great deal for us to build on and to work on. I do not believe that the whole world is collapsing. What men like Bourguiba of Tunisia want to know and what the leaders in Morocco and other leaders in that area of the world want to know is more than assurances of our military strength; they want to know what is our course of direction. What do we have in mind for Africa and Asia?

I say we are headed for trouble in Iran. I want to be on record now. There will be trouble there, because there are in that country vast social problems which must be solved. Every observer of Iran knows that there are serious problems in that country which must be solved. This does not mean that we are not interested in Iran. Indeed we are. However, the time to be interested is before the crash, before the catastrophe. I am prepared to cooperate. I plead with our country to look to the future.

We must not let the Soviet Union talk us down in debate in the United Nations over the issue of troops in Lebanon. We must literally move to higher ground. If the Soviet will not come to the summit, then let us put our arguments on higher ground—on the higher ground of constructive proposals—and broadcast them to the millions of people throughout the world who are fearful of Communist infiltration, Communist conspiracies, and of the great powers and power politics.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Minnesota think the United States is responsible for the situations he has just described? Does the Senator think that we, and we alone, can solve all the problems of every country in the world? Does not the Senator realize that, although he has been criticizing the lack of a United Nations police force, there cannot be a United Nations police force unless Congress approves of it by legislation?

What I think the Senator from Minnesota and many other Members of Congress ought to do is to go home and take a look at themselves in the mirror. They

will find many reasons for our not doing the things about which they are complaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's knowledge of forensics exceeds his knowledge of constitutional law. It is possible for the President of the United States to propose at the Security Council and the General Assembly the creation of a United Nations police force. In fact, a resolution of this body includes the presentation of such a matter before the United Nations.

The United States already, in the instance of UNEF, in Gaza and Aqaba, joined to encourage the United Nations emergency force, after the attack upon Suez. The President did not ask Congress for such authority. He has it as Commander in Chief.

The Senator asks, "Are these all our troubles?" I wish they were not. As a matter of fact, a disease which did not start in my home may be said to be not my problem. But it is. My children have been vaccinated against polio. The danger is not that polio has been in my home. Thank the Lord, it has not. But polio is abroad in the world. What do we do about it? We take steps to counteract it. We take on a responsibility.

There are times when a community is plagued with disorder and violations of the law. Do we take the position that those conditions are not our problem? Do we live in isolation? No; we join in a constructive program to combat delinquency and crime and to punish the perpetrators of violence.

The question as to whether we started these troubles and whether they are our fault is beside the point. We are not living alone in the world. America cannot live alone in the world. We must accept our responsibility for world freedom and order. I do not want our country to be a victim of the maladies which infect the world social order. I want America to be healthy. I want America to be kindly, and yet strong. I want an America which will give guidance and direction. That is my interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Minnesota think it is really constructive and in the interest of the United States for Senators on the other side of the aisle to try to suppress all constructive criticisms and suggestions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not. I say candidly that most Senators on the other side of the aisle are usually receptive to such discussion and helpful. While we may not always agree in these matters, at least the discussions are worth while.

As I said to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] the other day, I do not agree with his resolution. I believe the premises of his resolution are wrong. I thoroughly disagree with the conclusions of his resolution. But whether we like what he had to say or not, many people were thinking it, and somebody said it. Once it was said, it came to the floor, where we could talk about it as gentlemen, where we could reason, debate, and

argue about it. I think constructive arguments were made.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] performed a singular service in challenging the basis or the premises of the argument of the Senator from Vermont. But did anyone say we ought not to argue about it? If that had been said, it would have been a disservice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember, in the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, when the United States was engaged in the Korean war, the drumfire of criticism and bitterness which came from many Senators on the other side of the aisle when Secretary of State Dean Acheson had to meet all kinds of charges which were made about President Truman?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember it with sadness and pain. I am not going to call the present Secretary of State any such names.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one has.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No one has. Certainly no one will call the President of the United States any such names. All I will say is that there is need for more imagination and leadership. There is a lack of understanding on the part of this administration as to the real issues which are developing in many areas of the world, and our willingness to do something about them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Minnesota heard any Senator on this side of the aisle criticize the motives of the Secretary of State or the President?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not recall it. I have said some time ago that I thought the Secretary of State should resign, that I thought his usefulness had come to an end. But I do not in any way impugn his motives. I think this has happened many times in government. While it may seem unkind at the moment, it may be also necessary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But there has been no such criticism of the motives of the President and the Secretary of State of this administration as were indulged in by our friends across the aisle when Mr. Truman was President, and when Dean Acheson was Secretary of State.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. I imagine every American would say proudly that the President is the greatest of all patriots and that Mr. Dulles is a dedicated, hard-working, devoted public servant. I know that. Frankly, I like him. But a time comes in the affairs of men and in the development of public policies when the usefulness of a particular point of view, or even of a particular individual, may have come to an end.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since when has it become unpatriotic to suggest, in a constructive manner, alternative suggestions about policy?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It never has. It seems to me that the first obligation of a free citizen is to make constructive suggestions. I have said personally and privately, and I say so publicly, that I pledge my help and support to the Secretary of State and the President of the United States in any way I can be of service.

I suggested in the Committee on Foreign Relations that we should have an abstract of all the many proposals which have been suggested by Members of the Senate, and to have the staff—and we have a very competent staff, one of the most able staffs in the Government—digest the suggestions which have been made by Members of the Senate. Indeed, it could be a digest of suggestions which have been made by Members of the entire Congress. Such a digest could then be presented to the State Department without evaluation, without rhetoric, without any attempt to embellish them. They could be presented as suggestions which have been made for the use and study of the Secretary of State. I think we owe it to him.

I do not believe we should criticize the Secretary of State unless we are willing to offer him at least alternative proposals. He needs our cooperation, and he will receive it.



# Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



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