

**News****from ENGLE for UNITED STATES SENATOR**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

August 19, 1958

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota will make a six county swing of Northern California in behalf of Clair Engle, Democratic candidate for U. S. Senator, September 4, 5, and 6. Flying by private plane, Humphrey will speak for Engle and other Congressional candidates at dinners, receptions, and rallies in Monterey, Merced, San Joaquin, Solano, Fresno and San Mateo counties.

Key foreign policy talks will be given at two of the stops.

Humphrey, often mentioned as a 1960 Democratic presidential candidate, is chairman of the Middle East Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate, on its economic development committee and head of the Senate disarmament subcommittee.

"As an integral part of our foreign policy we must use surplus and stockpiled food to fight hunger and disease in the Middle East," Humphrey said from Washington yesterday. "One of my talks in the Bay Area will be devoted to this important issue."

The whirlwind air tour, sponsored by local Engle-for-Senator committees, will open with a Monterey luncheon followed by a Stockton dinner on Thursday, September 4. Senator Humphrey will then fly to a lunch at Merced's Tioga Hotel and wind up Friday with radio, TV appearances and rally in Fresno. Saturday's schedule calls for a luncheon in Vallejo and a major address, together with Engle at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in San Mateo. He will leave for Minnesota directly after the dinner.

[Sept. 2, 1958]

FOLLOWING ARE EXCERPTS FROM SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S  
MAJOR FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS ON 'WORKS OF PEACE'  
(September, 1958)

*San Diego - only copy  
Jefferson Jackson Day Review*

ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

"It is the Soviet economic challenge that requires great stress if we are to understand and try to win a peaceful competition, which even now may be of more significance than the arms race," Senator Humphrey declared.

"The world of tomorrow will be shaped in large measure by what we do -- or fail to do -- now to give the underdeveloped countries assurance that we want to help them achieve economic progress and human dignity.

"Of course, we have a profound interest in keeping those countries from falling under the control of the Sino-Soviet bloc. We also want to insure that frustration and misery in those areas are not ignored to the point where they might explode in violence which could provoke general war. Having recognized these motives, however, let us put them in the backs of our minds."

MORAL OBLIGATION

"Above all, we have a moral obligation to help -- not to compel -- our underprivileged fellow men to fulfill their aspirations for political and economic self-determination. Unless we concentrate on expressing the American ideals of individual freedom and worth, we will risk forfeiting our moral and physical influence by tying strings to our aid and demanding short-term recompense.

"To accomplish this great and urgent task will require the reversal of many of our present habits and practices which contradict the very things we stand for.

"We should not be concentrating national and world attention on our development of new and more frightful weapons of destruction. Rather, we should be laboring mightily and noisily in the peaceful fields of international economic development, cultural exchange, and education, while working very quietly but strenuously to stay abreast of the U.S.S.R. in military preparedness."

WORKS OF PEACE

"It is a not inconsequential program. Even though I have been unable to refrain from indicating some inherent limitations, I have sought to give it full credit. The burning question now is whether this program is enough, or anywhere near enough.

"My answer is an emphatic 'No'! What should be clarion call for peace is more like the grumbling of a water-logged tuba.

"The headlines alone in this country will tell you that we have failed to give adequate expression or effective implementation to our concern for peace.

"This is true despite our very good intention. It is not only our enemies who question our motives and our capacity for leadership. A casual reading of the foreign press will inform you that even old friends are losing confidence in our good intentions, not to mention faith in our capacity for leadership of the free world."

WHY HAVE WE FAILED?

"Why have we forfeited so much of our prestige and influence at an accelerated pace in recent years?

"Unquestionably, the Soviet achievements in technical and missile fields have won new respect for the Communist system among the underdeveloped and uncommitted countries. After all, sheer power does compel respect. Our peculiar reaction to the event, a blend of shrugged shoulders and helter-skelter alarm, did nothing to recoup the net loss to our side. However, the launching of Sputnik I, significant as it was, was really one of a series of body blows -- events in the Middle East and Latin America were others -- to a competitor who'd wasted his strength shadow boxing and verbally flailing at his opponent in the earlier rounds.



"I would say that there are two basic reasons why we have wasted our strength and mistaken our true interests since the beginning of this decade.

"First, we have permitted military policy to dominate or even to substitute for foreign policy.

"Second, we have concentrated on combatting the Sino-Soviet bloc to such a degree that we have fought Communists where they did not exist -- or were not the main problem -- and have failed to appreciate other trends and forces in the world. The latter failure is costing us dearly in the Middle East."

#### OVEREMPHASIS ON MILITARY SOLUTIONS

"In Western Europe, we have permitted military considerations to weigh ever more heavily since the outbreak of the Korean War. Our obsession with the need to rearm West Germany led to the debacle of the European Defense Community Treaty, which came close to marking the end of the European integration movement....Our European allies have become increasingly willing to explore any measures (short of ones placing them in jeopardy) to achieve a relaxation of military tension in order to meet what they consider the more important Soviet economic and political challenge. We, on the other hand, have held rigidly to the military status quo. Not only have we failed to initiate any proposals -- no matter how unacceptable they might be to the Russians -- we have also failed to counter Soviet propaganda moves.

"An image has been created of us in European minds which certainly does not stimulate them to look westward for leadership in promoting peace. We have placed ourselves in a position which makes it seem that we have to be dragged to a conference table."

#### DISARMAMENT RIGIDITY

"We have also been basically inflexible in the field of disarmament. It is true that we have a few debating points to our credit, notably the proposal for mutual aerial inspection of the Arctic regions. However, the real propaganda coup in this vital field went to the Soviet Union with its unilateral renunciation of nuclear tests. No matter that it was an empty and phony gesture following an exhaustive series of explosions and that it was not accompanied with any provision for inspecting its validity. It worked in the propaganda field as intended. We have now responded with a really heartening proposal for a temporary suspension of tests linked to negotiations on an agreement providing inspections. Again and again, I have insisted on an effective nuclear inspection system as the key to a first step toward disarmament. Now that the President has taken this constructive initiative, I hope we will persevere to successful, safeguarded, agreements".

#### LACK OF FAR EAST POLICY

"What of our policy in the Far East? What policy? Is it a policy to try to ignore the government of 600,000,000 Chinese? Is it a policy to shovel arms to a few allies who cannot defend themselves without our help, and whom we can not defend without using nuclear weapons? It may be part of a policy, but it may even be one which, taken alone, increases the odds on a nuclear holocaust. Frankly, I am concerned about the aggressive attitude of the Chinese Communists, an attitude which thrives on our intransigent opposition. I find the Communist leaders no more attractive than does our Secretary of State. But I do not think the bogeymen will go away if we ignore them. They are more likely to try harder to get our attention. Some day they will, especially if we ever hope to find solutions to some of our many unresolved problems in the area."

#### MID EAST WEAKNESS

"I need not rehearse the many criticisms that have been leveled at United States policy in the Middle East over the past few months. I would like to emphasize, however, that many of my colleagues and I consider the area a prime example of our military "pact-itis", and of our ascription of all revolutionary violence to Communism. It is not very pleasant to find ourselves pushing weapons into the hands of tottering autocrats to maintain them against the wishes of their people. Nor is it pleasant to find the inheritors of the American Revolutionary tradition trying to prevent political agitation in countless areas of the world. I suggest that our policy makers would be terrified to plaster our own Declaration of Independence on mud huts in the Middle East."

### WHO'S RESPONSIBLE

"Who is to blame for these policies, obsessions, and cavalier attitudes -- for our inflexibility, caution, and lack of imagination?

"The American people and their government must bear the blame. The people get the government they deserve...

"The Congress must accept its share of the burden, though my personal opinion is that its leadership and its record looked quite good in recent sessions. We are directly elected by you, and can be removed the same way.

"The Executive Branch of your government poses a much more difficult problem. In order to achieve a consensus and give it momentum...there must be strong, energetic, wise, and consistent leadership.

"It is up to the people to provide that leadership -- the only way they can -- through wise choices during our national elections.

"We have to blame our own reluctance to take a deep and abiding interest in world affairs when we consider our foreign policy failures. Let us not compound our error by continuing to abdicate responsibility for taking the initiative in peacefully revolutionizing the condition of man".

### NEED FOR A CHANGE

"One of the reasons why we lack a comprehensive, integrated foreign policy for the United States today is because a conservative government is incapable of coming to grips with a worldwide revolution and devising bold, creative, flexible policies.

"How can conservative politicians who oppose TVA, public power, health insurance, and even unemployment compensation, really have their hearts in flood control in Africa and village development projects in Asia?

"How can politicians who disregard a recession at home appreciate human need abroad?

"How can conservative politicians who belittle economic and social planning here at home cooperate effectively with the governments of many new countries where national economic and social planning is required? How can our generals, corporation lawyers and big businessmen really get in tune with a world revolution? How can the Hollisters, the Hoovers, and the George Humphreys possibly symbolize the hopes and aspirations of the millions of people who for the first time are experiencing national independence and personal freedom.

"After all, it is the essence of a conservative government that it is dedicated to the status quo and the conservatives who are directing United States foreign policy have dug in behind the policies of their predecessors, retrenched on some of them, and in any event have been unable to either understand or adjust with the movement of events.

"It is this status quo, too little, too late, containment, Maginot line mentality of the Eisenhower-Dulles Administration that has enabled the Soviet Union with all of its limitations to outflank our positions on the political front, on the economic front, on the technological front, and leave American foreign policy seriously exposed and weakened.

"Men who jeer at and oppose the philosophy of a welfare state are the wrong people for the responsibilities of leadership in a world where 3 out of 5 persons are the have-nots of the underdeveloped nations. Where more than half of the population live in hunger, disease, poverty and insecurity -- where a majority of mankind seeks immediate answers to old problems.

"How can a nation that is governed by timid, cautious, and tired old men give the kind of dynamic, fearless, and imaginative leadership that is required if we are to match and outstrip the wily, cunning, strident and vigorous tactics and challenge of Soviet power?



"All too often we Americans view our foreign policy in terms of legislation, treaties, compacts and public pronouncements. We have failed to properly emphasize the attitudes and the philosophies which are necessary to give life, meaning, and spirit to these policies and programs. We tend to be more interested in the forms of diplomacy than in the understanding, approach, and spirit which is required in these times of tension, doubt, and insecurity. To put it simply, it is not only what we do but how we do it. It is not only what we prescribe, but how it is dispensed. It is not only the dollars that we spend, give, and loan, but even more basically, the spirit in which the gift is given, the loan is made, or the exchange is accomplished."

"The Executive Branch of your government poses a much more difficult problem. In order to achieve a consensus and give it momentum... there must be strong, energetic, wise, and consistent leadership."

"It is up to the people to provide that leadership -- the only way they can -- through wise choices during our national elections."

"We have to blame our own reluctance to take a deep and abiding interest in world affairs when we consider our foreign policy failures. Let us not count our error by continuing to abdicate responsibility for taking the initiative in peacefully revolutionizing the condition of man."

#### NEED FOR A CHANGE

"One of the reasons why we lack a comprehensive, integrated foreign policy for the United States today is because a conservative government is incapable of coming to grips with a worldwide revolution and developing bold, creative, flexible policies."

"How can conservative politicians who oppose TVA, public power, health insurance, and even unemployment compensation, really have their hearts in flood control in Africa and village development projects in Asia?"

"How can politicians who disregard a recession at home appreciate human need abroad?"

"How can conservative politicians who belittle economic and social planning here at home cooperate effectively with the governments of many new countries where national economic and social planning is required? How can our generals, corporation lawyers and big businessmen really get in tune with a world revolution? How can the Hollisters, the Hoovers, and the George Humphreys possibly sympathize the hopes and aspirations of the millions of people who for the first time are experiencing national independence and personal freedom?"

"After all, it is the essence of a conservative government that it is dedicated to the status quo and the conservatives who are directing United States foreign policy have dug in behind the policies of their predecessors, entrenched on some of them, and in any event have been unable to either understand or adjust with the movement of events."

"It is this status quo, too little, too late, containment, Maginot line mentality of the Eisenhower-Dulles Administration that has enabled the Soviet Union with all of its limitations to outflank our positions on the political front, on the economic front, on the technological front, and leave American foreign policy seriously exposed and weakened."

"Men who fear at and oppose the philosophy of a welfare state are the wrong people for the responsibilities of leadership in a world where 3 out of 5 persons are the have-nots of the underdeveloped nations. Where more than half of the population live in hunger, disease, poverty and insecurity -- where a majority of mankind seeks immediate answers to old problems."

"How can a nation that is governed by timid, cautious, and tired old men give the kind of dynamic, fearless, and imaginative leadership that is required if we are to match and outstrip the wily, cunning, ardent and vigorous tactics and challenge of Soviet power?"

# COPY

The Works Of Peace  
Address By  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

In a world which has a growing capacity to blow itself up, there is surely no more vital subject than peace.

It is most appropriate that I should speak on "The Works of Peace" before a group which, I know, believes in those works as strongly as I do. For my part, as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and as Chairman of its Disarmament Subcommittee, and its Subcommittee on the Middle East, I have the privilege of being able to labor in a field which is devoted to promoting the works of peace. As you know, the goal of

# COPY

our foreign policy is to contribute to the twin objectives of peace and well-being for mankind. These are two words which, either individually or together, constitute essential themes for the conduct of our foreign policy.

~~Let~~ Let us approach this subject under three headings. First, let us examine what this nation has been doing to promote peace in the world. Secondly, let us ask ourselves if we are doing enough. Finally, if the answer is no, let us try to discover ways to narrow the ~~unfavorable~~ gap between what we are doing and what we should do.

## I. - WHAT WE ARE DOING Marshall Plan

Let me begin by saying that I am immensely proud of many aspects of our country's conduct of foreign relations



# COPY

in the period since World War II. Perhaps I am proudest of the Marshall Plan, which pulled Western Europe back from the brink of chaos almost certainly leading to communist domination. It was a resounding success by every standard of measurement, including the self-interest of the United States. But do not let anyone tell you that only strategic and economic American interests were responsible for the Marshall Plan. It was an unprecedented historical act which both political parties supported as an expression of the highest principles of the American people. It fulfilled a moral obligation to ourselves and to our fellow men.

Sometimes it appears expensive for us, as

# COPY

citizens of a great and fortunate nation, to protect ourselves and to do our duty toward less well-endowed peoples.

Yet while the entire cost of the Marshall Plan amounted to roughly 13 billion dollars over a period of several years, we are now spending three times that amount in a single year for military preparedness. I do not suggest that armed vigilance should not be maintained, whatever the cost, as long as the security of this nation is gravely threatened. I do suggest that in the Marshall Plan an equally vital force for peace was acquired without any decline in the economic well-being of the American people -- quite the reverse. And I think it would have been well worth any sacrifice that might have been necessary.

# COPY

You may be wondering why I stress the Marshall Plan ten years after it began. My answer is that it remains a constant inspiration - an example of what this country can accomplish when it really gets down to the business of working for peace.

The American people were clearly and fully informed on the European recovery issue. The best minds and talents in the United States shaped and carried out the program. The total effort was brought to fruition by drawing on the nation's great reservoir of constructive idealism. This kind of total effort more than ever needs to be applied to a search for peace in a world situation far more dangerous than



# COPY

that of the Marshall Plan years.

## DISARMAMENT

~~so~~ What are we currently doing to give full expression to our national concern for peace?

As President Eisenhower said in his State of the Union address last January, ... "of all the works of peace, none is more needed now than a real first step toward disarmament." Our scientists have been meeting with those of the Soviet Union in Geneva, obtaining a heartening agreement on an inspection system which would check for violations of a possible negotiated suspension of nuclear weapons tests. I cannot overemphasize my *support for the President's new*  ~~fervent hope for a~~ readiness ~~on our part now~~ to negotiate a ban on nuclear tests in concert with the Soviets. Not, mind you, on a

# COPY

basis of mutual trust -- which at the moment does not and cannot exist -- but with confidence in an effective inspection system.

Another area in which we are belatedly making some ~~limited~~ progress is in utilizing the United Nations framework as an instrument to help <sup>effectuate</sup> our foreign policy. The President, quite rightly, has been congratulated for going before the UN General Assembly with broad proposals for the settlement of a number of Middle East problems. Many of us in the Senate had been urging just such proposals, and urging the President personally to present them. We were very gratified to see them advanced in the UN forum. We now hope that these broad suggestions will

# COPY

be followed up with precise, detailed plans -- plans which only the Executive branch of our government has manpower enough to develop. Such plans, if realistic and if pushed with vigor and boldness, will contribute to peaceful evolution in the Middle East and will signalize a new willingness to work through the councils of the UN. Specifically, we look for the creation of an effective UN military standing force, and a Middle East Development Authority, particularly since such moves have strong support in both houses of Congress.

## TRADE

I think one of the most significant aspects of our peaceful endeavors has been the painfully slow



# COPY

progress toward more sensible measures to increase world trade.

The USSR some time ago blatantly declared war on us

in the field of economic competition, but only now

do we seem to be tentatively moving in the right

direction. ~~A~~ Congress has just authorized the absolutely

essential Reciprocal Trade Extension without crippling

amendments. This should permit us to cooperate with

other countries -- notably those which have launched

the European common market scheme -- in removing

barriers to the flow of trade in both directions.

~~A~~ Fortunately, the Development Loan Fund will receive

the sums necessary for its continued operation.

Unfortunately, these sums represent a rock bottom

minimum. In this connection, we should all realize

page 10  
COPY

by now that the creditor and the recipient are both benefited more, psychologically and materially, by the use of loans rather than grants whenever possible.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE-CONTACTS

Some time ago, we made an advance in principle toward freer communications and exchanges between peoples. This is the sort of work for peace that offers a chance for us all to participate directly. In general, however, only limited progress has been made in translating principle into practice. The major stumbling block has been a tendency for narrow motives of political retaliation to prevail in a sort of "tit for tat" subversion of our desire for contact between peoples.

page 11  
COPY

RECENT NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Nevertheless, we are persevering with our attempts to broaden the field of international cooperation. The International Atomic Energy Agency has been a noble achievement, for which the United States can take much of the credit. In a related endeavor, we may soon be able to help expand the scientific reserves of the free world by assisting Western Europe with the Euratom program for developing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The International Geophysical Year has been a real success. It should be extended until its accomplishments and further aims can be embodied in a permanent institutional structure. Finally, there



# COPY

is a subject very close to my heart, and one on which I am expending much effort. We are trying to bring about a concerted attack on crippling and enfeebling diseases in the world through the designation of an International Health and Medical Research Year.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have tried to enumerate briefly our current "works of peace." It is a not inconsequential program. Even though I have been unable to refrain from indicating some inherent limitations, I have sought to give it full credit. The burning question now is whether this program is enough, or anywhere near enough.

## II - Are We Doing Enough?

My answer is an emphatic NO. What should be a clarion

# COPY

call for peace is more like the grumbling of a  
water-logged tuba.

The headlines alone in this country will tell  
you that we have failed to give adequate expression  
or effective implementation to our concern for peace.  
This is true despite our very good intention. It  
is not only our enemies who question our motives  
and our capacity for leadership. A casual reading  
of the foreign press will inform you that even old  
friends are losing confidence in our good intentions,  
not to mention faith in our capacity for leadership  
of the free world.

Why have we forfeited so much of our prestige  
and influence at an accelerated pace in recent years?

Unquestionably, the Soviet achievements in

# COPY

technical and missile fields have won new respect for the Communist system among the underdeveloped and uncommitted countries. After all, sheer power does compel respect. Our peculiar reaction to the event, a blend of shrugged shoulders and helter-skelter alarm, did nothing to recoup the net loss to our side. However, the launching of spautnik I, significant as it was, was really one of a series of body blows -- events in the Middle East and Latin America were others -- to a competitor who'd wasted his strength shadow boxing and verbally flailing at his opponent in the earlier rounds.

I would say that there are two basic reasons why we have wasted our strength and mistaken our true interests since the beginning of this decade. First, we have permitted

# COPY

military policy to dominate or even to substitute for foreign policy. Secondly, we have concentrated on combatting the Sino-Soviet bloc to such a degree that we have fought Communists where they didn't exist, and have failed to appreciate other trends and forces in the world. The latter failure is costing us dearly in the Middle East.

Let us take a brief look at how these two factors have adversely affected our global policies.

## OVEREMPHASIS ON MILITARY SOLUTIONS

In Western Europe, we have permitted military considerations to weigh ever more heavily since the outbreak of the Korean war. Our obsession with the need to rearm West Germany led to the debacle of the

page 16  
COPY

European Defense Community Treaty, which came close to marking the end of the European integration movement. Yet, that movement was -- or should have been -- the touchstone of our policy toward the area. I doubt that integration would have achieved its current successes had the fiasco at Suez not shown the Europeans the need for cooperation to deal with their trade problems and power shortage.

Our European allies have become increasingly willing to explore any measures (short of ones placing them in jeopardy) to achieve a relaxation of military tension in order to meet what they consider the more important Soviet economic and political challenge.

We, on the other hand, have held rigidly to the military status quo. Not only have we failed



# page 17 COPY

to initiate any proposals -- no matter how unacceptable they might be to the Russians -- we have also failed to counter Soviet propaganda moves.

An image has been created of us in European minds which certainly does not stimulate them to look westward for leadership in promoting peace. We have placed ourselves in a position which makes it seem that we have to be dragged to a conference table.

## DISARMAMENT RIGIDITY

We have also been basically inflexible in the field of disarmament. It is true that we have a few debating points to our credit, notably the proposal for mutual aerial inspection of the Arctic regions. However, the real propaganda coup in this vital field went to the Soviet Union with its unilateral renunciation of nuclear tests. No matter that it

# COPY

page 18

was an empty and phony gesture following an exhaustive series of explosions and that it was not accompanied with any provision for inspecting its validity. It worked in the propaganda field as intended. We have now responded with a really heartening proposal for a temporary suspension of tests linked to negotiations on an agreement/<sup>providing</sup>~~xxxxxxx~~ inspections.

Again and again, I have insisted on an effective nuclear inspection system as the key to a first step toward disarmament. Now that the President has taken this constructive initiative, I hope we will persevere

# COPY

page 19

to successful, safeguarded agreements.

## FAR EAST

What of our policy in the Far East? What policy?

Is it a policy to try to ignore the government of 600,000,000 Chinese? Is it a policy to shovel arms to a few allies who cannot defend themselves without our help, and whom we cannot defend without using nuclear weapons? It may be part of a policy, but it may even be one which, taken alone, increases the odds on a nuclear holocaust. Frankly, I am concerned about the aggressive attitude of the Chinese

# COPY

page 20

Communists, an attitude which thrives on our intransigent opposition. I find the Communist leaders no more attractive than does our Secretary of State. But I do not think the bogeymen will go away if we ignore them. They are more likely to try harder to get our attention. Some day they will, especially if we ever hope to find solutions to some of our many unresolved problems in the area.

MID EAST *many*  
I need not rehearse the ~~various~~ criticisms that have been leveled at United States policy in the Middle East over the past few months. I would like to emphasize, however, that many of my colleagues and I consider the area a prime example of our military "pact-itis", and of our ascription of all revolutionary

# COPY

violence to Communism. It is not very pleasant to find ourselves pushing weapons into the hands of tottering autocrats to maintain them against the wishes of their people. Nor is it pleasant to find the inheritors of the American Revolutionary tradition trying to prevent political agitation in countless areas of the world. I suggest that our policy-makers would be terrified to plaster our own Declaration of Independence on mud huts in the Middle East.

## OBSESSION WITH COMMUNISM

Our obsession with Communism and its corollary, our casual attitude toward trends in "safe areas", were largely responsible for the recent boiling over of

page 22  
COPY

Latin America/resentment. Notice that our first reaction to the treatment accorded Vice-President Nixon in several South American countries was just to blame "a bunch of Commies." Sober reflection has caused us to admit that a small number of Communists could not have provoked such a storm of protest had there not been some grounds for resentment.

Now let me say that we are doing many excellent things in Latin America. There is much more to do -- particularly to give greater assistance to those countries caught in a vicious balance of payments squeeze, and to try to help hold commodity prices reasonably stable. But basically I think it has been our insensitive attitude which has caused trouble



# COPY

in the area.

Well then, who is to blame for these policies, obsessions, and cavalier attitudes -- for our inflexibility, caution, and lack of imagination? Let me change one word of a famous quotation and say, "the fault, dear [friends] is not in our stars, But in ourselves ...". The American people and their government must bear the blame. The people get the government they deserve.

q The Congress must accept its share of the burden, though my personal opinion is that its leadership and its record looked quite good in recent sessions. We are directly elected by you and can be removed the same way.

The Executive Branch of your government poses a much more difficult problem. It is a huge and complex

# COPY

bureaucracy -- there is no opprobrium intended in that description -- which is highly impersonal and which has only a tenuous relationship with the electorate of the country. This bureaucracy for the most part consists of very devoted and able public servants with many different points of view about their generally rather specialized tasks. In order to achieve a consensus and give it momentum in this impersonal collection of organizations, there must be strong, energetic, wise, and consistent leadership. It is up to the people to provide that leadership. — The only way they can -- through wise choices during our periodic national elections.

COPY

page 25

### III - WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

And now, bear with me a little longer as I try to outline what I think we should be doing for peace and the well-being of mankind.

#### THE MILITARY CHALLENGE

Of paramount importance is the two-fold challenge thrown at us by the Soviet Union: its growing military threat, and its martial call to us to engage in economic competition. With regard to the arms race, I have already stressed my intense conviction that we should ~~immediately prepare~~ <sup>persevere in</sup> a fresh and vigorous new disarmament policy. To my mind, this policy should hinge upon going before the UN with <sup>our</sup> ~~a~~ first-step proposal which the USSR would be called upon to accept, or to veto in a world forum.

# COPY

We have offered to negotiate a separate, safeguarded, inspectable agreement for cessation of bomb tests. Hereafter, as we profit from the lessons derived from our experience in negotiating that agreement, we should broaden our efforts in other, more important aspects of arms control.

Meanwhile it is absolutely imperative that, as our disarmament efforts continue, we also keep abreast of the USSR in our military strength. We must make any sacrifice necessary to assure that we will not invite attack through lack of preparedness. Even as I stress the importance of progress on the disarmament front, I worry over the increasing imbalance of our preparedness vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. We must maintain parity of armament at the same time as we work for peace.

COPY

PAGE 27

Even parity of armament and progress toward disarmament,  
however, are not enough, since the former course  
could dictate division of the world into armed camps  
for an indefinite period, with the ever-present  
threat of war by miscalculation.

28

# COPY

The Economic Challenge

It is the Soviet economic challenge that requires great stress if we are to understand and try to win a peaceful competition, which even now may be of more significance than the arms race. We must not forget that the Soviet system, abhorrent though it is to us in the West, has brought about spectacular economic development in the U.S.S.R. In only forty years it has virtually passed through the industrial revolution which lasted four or five times longer in the West. The backward peoples of the world can remember when the Soviet Union was in their category; they cannot remember a time when the United States was not rich and powerful. It is thus hardly surprising that they should think they have something to learn from the Soviet experience.

The world of tomorrow will be shaped in large measure by what we do -- or fail to do -- now to give the underdeveloped



29  
COPY

countries assurance that we want to help them achieve economic progress and human dignity. Of course, we have a profound interest in keeping those counties from falling under the control of the Sino-Soviet bloc. We also want to insure that frustration and misery in those areas are not ignored to the point where they might explode in violence which could provoke general war. Having recognized these motives, however, let us put them in the backs of our minds. Above all, we have a moral obligation to help -- not to compel -- our underprivileged fellow men to fulfill their aspirations for political and economic self-determination. Unless we concentrate on expressing the American ideals of individual freedom and worth, we will risk forfeiting our moral and physical influence by tying strings to our aid and demanding short-term recompense.

# COPY

To accomplish this great and urgent task will require the reversal of many of our present habits and practices which contradict the very things we stand for.

We should not be concentrating national and world attention on our development of new and more frightful weapons of destruction. Rather, we should be laboring mightily and noisily in the peaceful fields of international economic development, cultural exchange, and education, while working very quietly but strenuously to stay abreast of the U.S.S.R. in military preparedness.

Specifically, we should reverse the military emphasis in our foreign aid program. Because we do not separate funds for economic development from the military aid -- something which should be done without delay -- Americans have little knowledge of the limited extent of our foreign economic assistance. They believe we are doing a great deal when we

COPY

are actually slighting the issue.

Let us put an end to the practice of creating more and more military pacts as a supposed answer to the Soviet threat which increasingly is taking non-military forms. Let us not feel we must have a southern tier to match the northern tier, or eastern and western ones to make it all tidy. This practice has already dangerously over-extended our commitments and hampered our foreign policy by loading it with new military considerations.

Public Relations Diplomacy

Perhaps our worst habit is our substitution of epithets and slogans for independent creative thinking. Some of our leaders are the greatest offenders in this respect. They should be striving for clarity of thought and expression, instead of hurling charges of "indirect aggression," --- which

has not yet been defined after two years of effort.

COPY

The words, "socialism" and "neutralism", have become dirty words in the American popular lexicon, and often, I'm afraid, in State Department utterances. What nonsense! Just because we do not consider socialism a proper system for our country does not mean that it is applicable to other countries which might want it. Anyway, what is meant by the word? I know of no place in the world where it is practiced in its pristine sense. England and the Soviet Union, which have absolutely antithetical political and social systems, both possess some elements of socialism.

As for neutralism, it is not susceptible to the delicate shade of definition accorded it. Why should we demand that everyone be with us or against us? Does it increase our self-

# COPY

respect or the respect of the world for us if we play a game of semantics? We should acknowledge the right of India, equally with Sweden, and Ghana, equally with Switzerland, to hold aloof from the "cold war". To do otherwise is to display an armed-camp mentality.

Why is this so important? Because it is probable, for example, that the majority of newly emerging independent countries in Africa will adopt socialist and neutralist policies. Unless we are prepared to respect their right to pursue such policies and to deal with them openly and courteously, we could alienate most of the continent and increase its vulnerability to Soviet domination.

## Development Loan Funds

What concrete measures should we take to counter the Soviet economic challenge and to promote peace? For a start, I believe we should greatly expand the Development Loan Fund, increase the lending authority to the Export-Import Bank,

COPY

approve a larger capitalization for the World Bank, and do more to stimulate the flow of U. S. private capital and enterprise into the underdeveloped countries.

#### U. S. Special Fund

Above all, however, we need a concerted effort through the U. N. to create the organizational means for extending help to the underdeveloped and uncommitted countries of the world. We need multilateral arrangements through which to contribute a major share of that help without arousing suspicions that we intend to dominate the recipients. An initiative has already been taken to set up a Special U. N. Fund for Economic Development, but little interest has been shown in it so far in this country. Thus, we clearly need to create interest and support among the American people for an approach to this vital problem comparable to that which launched the Marshall Plan and made it such a success.

Doing it through the U. N. will be symptomatic of the increased use I think we should make of this unique institution



# COPY

in many far reaching aspects of our world policy.

This will not be an easy task. It will take sustained effort in terms of money and energy over a number of years. It will not show the quick results of the European Recovery Plan. It will require a major program to inform the American people.

But this is something that we can afford in the material sense of the word, and something that we cannot afford not to do if we wish to work for peace in this troubled world.

We have to blame our own reluctance to take a deep and abiding interest in world affairs when we consider our foreign policy failures. Let us not compound our error by continuing to abdicate responsibility for taking the initiative in peacefully revolutionizing the condition of man.

We can start accepting personal responsibility at the coming election.

# COPY

By speaking out at the ballot box, America can show

the world it wants and desires a more positive, more constructive, more aggressive approach to peace.

We need a sweeping Democratic victory, to stimulate that change of attitude.

One of the reasons why we lack a comprehensive, integrated foreign policy for the United States today is because a conservative government is incapable of coming to grips with a world wide revolution and devising bold, creative, flexible policies.

How can conservative politicians who oppose TVA, public power, health insurance, and even unemployment compensation, really have their hearts in flood control in Africa and village development projects in Asia?

How can politicians who disregard a recession at home appreciate human need abroad?

How can conservative politicians who belittle economic and

# COPY

social planning here at home cooperatè effectively with the governments of many new countries where national economic and social planning is required? How can our generals, corporation lawyers and big businessmen really get in tune with a world revolution? How can the Hollisters, the Hoovers, and the George Humphreys possibly symbolize the hopes and aspirations of the millions of people who for the first time are experiencing national independence and personal freedom.

After all, it is the essence of a conservative government that it is dedicated to the status quo and the conservatives who are directing United States foreign policy have dug in behind the policies of their predecessors, retrenched on some of them, and in any event have been unable to either understand or adjust with the movement of events.

It is this status quo, too little, too late, containment, Maginot line mentality of the Eisenhower-Hulles Administration that

# COPY

has enabled the Soviet Union with all of its limitations to outflank our positions on the political front, on the economic front, on the technological front, and leave American foreign policy seriously exposed and weakened.

Men who jeer at and oppose the philosophy of a welfare state are the wrong people for the responsibilities of leadership in a world where 3 out of 5 persons are the have-nots of the underdeveloped nations. Where more than half of the population live in hunger, disease, poverty, and insecurity -- where a majority of mankind seeks immediate answers to old problems.

How can a nation that is governed by timid, cautious, and tired old men give the kind of dynamic, fearless, and imaginative leadership that is required if we are to match and outstrip the wily, cunning, strident and vigorous tactics and challenge of Soviet power?

# COPY

All too often we Americans view our foreign policy in terms of legislation, treaties, compacts, and public pronouncements. We have failed to properly emphasize the attitudes and the philosophies which are necessary to give life, meaning and spirit to these policies and programs. We tend to be more interested in the forms of diplomacy than in the understanding, approach, and spirit which is required in these times of tension, doubt, and insecurity. To put it simply, it is not only what we do but how we do it. It is not only what we prescribe, but how it is dispensed. It is not only the dollars that we spend, give, and loan, but even more basically, the spirit in which the gift is given, the loan is made, or the exchange accomplished.

This, then, is the challenge facing every American in November of 1958 -- the challenge to show the world that the American people want to breathe new life and spirit, new attitudes and philosophies, new blood and new courage, into our national

COPY

leadership.

It can be done -- by a resounding Democratic victory  
in November.

It can be done -- and it WILL be done -- in California  
by choosing progressive, militant, Democratic leadership -- by  
sending Congressman Clair Engle to the United States Senate, and  
"Pat" Brown to your Statehouse as Governor.



# 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)