

*Summary*

*DISARM Report  
for Rel. Reports*

Address by  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
before the  
The Executives' Club of Chicago  
Friday, Oct. 24, 1958

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Ladies and gentlemen: I have come here  
today with a kaleidoscopic impression of  
events and trends, both domestic and  
international, derived from weeks of rapid  
movement around the country in this pre-  
election period. Perhaps I should begin  
with Dickens' opening words from A Tale  
of Two Cities, "It was the best of times;  
it was the worst of times...", and I  
would have to add -- it was the busiest  
of times, and my story <sup>should</sup> would be pursued  
under the title, A Tale of ~~Twenty~~ Fifty Cities.

*B. Partisan*

*U.N.  
growth  
in support*

*Agencies*

*as well as  
develop*

Today I should like to sort out with you some of my thoughts as they have been tempered or stimulated by many contacts with the American people during the last few weeks.

The chosen theme -- "United States Foreign Policy and the United Nations" --

*and Peace  
changing  
7+6  
a new emphasis!*

is most appropriate, since this is UN Day.

But this theme would be worthy of discussion regardless of the occasion.

~~Before proceeding, let me say that I have thoroughly enjoyed my crowded schedule. I have been engaged in purposeful activity, in keeping with the times that are themselves too complex and too serious for any relaxation.~~

Our policy makers and the American people should be giving prayerful consideration to the ways in which we can take effective action through the UN to meet the <sup>many</sup> challenges that confront us. Yet I get the impression that, except for sporadic bursts of activity, we have generally been sitting back waiting for things to happen. And things have happened with a vengeance! When we have acted, as in Lebanon, it has almost seemed like action for action's sake, rather than for any definite long-range purpose. After trying to resolve crises by ourselves, we have sometimes turned to the UN as a face-saving afterthought.

Despite our failure on occasion to use this instrument to full effectiveness, I find it very gratifying that support for the UN in this country has steadily been on the rise.

Our <sup>UN</sup> representative in New York, Ambassador Lodge, recently noted that in a nation-wide poll the proportion of Americans expressing satisfaction with the progress of the UN has increased in the past few years from 43 to 72 percent. In a recent survey, only six percent of those questioned did not support our participation in the United Nations. ~~A goodly majority of our citizens thus appear to appreciate~~

~~the UN's usefulness both to the world and  
our own country.~~

I have an uneasy feeling, however, that some of this support is not based on a sound appreciation of the real merits of the UN and its possible role in the future. This could mean that many Americans might applaud the UN because it happens to fit our short-term needs, especially in places like the Middle East. / But they might sit on their hands, or worse yet, turn to the attack, if the United States suffered a limited tactical reverse in the UN at some future date.

One of the problems that the UN faces is that changes in the balance of world power and in relationships among nations and peoples are naturally being reflected in the United Nations. One significant

development clearly illustrates the point:

the Soviet ability to achieve a position of approximate equality with the United States in the possession of frightful instruments of destruction. This shift in the world balance means that there is, as there must be, greater emphasis on the potential of the UN to prevent local disputes from turning into broader conflicts that will directly engage the interests of the two biggest powers.

Since the UN constantly reflects the changing international situation, it needs continual reappraisal to make sure that we are using the organization to full capacity in furthering the cause of international peace.

Reappraisal

Page 22 Hammerhead  
What is U.K.

The UN has already outlived most of the early criticisms leveled against it, ~~in this country~~. These criticisms had largely grown out of the disillusionment suffered by many Americans whose fine idealism and expectations had imposed an impossible burden on an organization which is naturally limited by the facts of international life.

Criticisms

At the present time new criticisms are being leveled against the UN, and world developments in the immediate future may stimulate rather than mute this criticism.

Some charges are justified; some are not. Some criticisms may bring about worthwhile changes in the UN, ~~while others may not lend themselves to remedial actions.~~

But it is vitaly important for us to view these criticisms in the proper perspective, within the broad meaning and potential of the UN. My aim today is to examine with you the record of the UN, the salient charges frequently hurled against it, the opportunities it affords for the

realization of our foreign policy objectives,  
and the degree to which we have capitalized  
or failed to capitalize on those opportunities.

~~It is necessary to stress at the outset  
that the two parts of our theme, "United  
States Policy and the United Nations"  
are quite naturally linked together.~~ There  
is, I think, overwhelming agreement throughout  
our country and in official circles that the  
two most important long-range objectives of  
the United States are peace and the well-  
being of mankind.

A lasting peace involves not merely the  
physical security of our nation, but progress

toward a system of international law and order. The well-being of mankind demands that we, in concert with our friends, take immediate steps designed to narrow the dangerous gap between the living standards of industrialized countries, and those areas -- largely in Asia and Africa -- where the majority of earth's population live at or below a minimum subsistence level. So long as this remains a serious problem, peace itself will be in constant jeopardy.

The United States shares these twin objectives with the United Nations Organization which lists them in Article I of its Charter.

-I-

Let us turn now to the record of the United Nations.

Poverty  
Disease  
Illiteracy

Perhaps the greatest tribute paid to it is the number of prominent international figures, including our present Secretary of State, who feel that the world might already have been plunged into another world war if the UN had never existed. If our purpose were merely to justify the existence of the organization, this in itself would be sufficient. But our purpose today goes beyond justification on these grounds alone.

The United Nations, you will recall, gave the sanction of world opinion, as well as considerable material support, to our successful effort to prevent the Communists from taking over all of Korea. Some people scoffed at the military contribution of our UN allies without realizing that in terms

*Korea*

*Korea*

of comparative resources many of them  
*gave generously*  
~~matched the performance of the United States.~~

*Krua* ~~Although there can be no equivalent to our  
17,000 casualties, the monetary contribution  
of other UN members was several times more  
than what our membership in the UN has cost  
us since 1945.~~ Moreover, the British and  
the French should be given credit for having  
engaged the Communists in Malaya and  
Indo-China.

*L* The UN's role in promoting peace in  
other areas is more easily forgotten.

*Krua* The Un helped bring about the withdrawal  
of Soviet troops from Iran in 1946, in  
mediating the conflict between the Dutch and  
*Krua*

the Indonesians, in arranging the continuing truce in Kashmir, in putting a stop to the Communists in Greece, and in providing means for private talks with the Kremlin that led to the breaking of the Berlin blockade.

↳ In the Middle East, the United Nations has brought about and upheld the armistice agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors, providing, after the Suez crisis, an Emergency Force to patrol the sensitive Israeli border, and sending observers to Lebanon and other parts of that troubled area. It will be recalled that 15 of our fliers were released from captivity by Communist China.

in 1955 after the UN General Assembly had demanded their freedom. And in the present Far Eastern crisis there are unconfirmed newspaper reports that the UN informally provided a channel for relaying information from the Red Chinese that they were prepared to discuss possible solutions of the Quemoy problem. The list of UN accomplishments in solving other explosive problems is an imposing one, but unfortunately time does not permit further elaboration.

~~h~~   One important function of the United Nations is to provide a setting where representatives of virtually all nations can express their grievances and disagreements. This diplomatic forum has been effective in

---

crystallizing world opinion on particular issues and in creating a climate hostile to the breakout of a general war.

↳ Although the Soviet Union keeps tossing monkey wrenches into the UN machinery, her presence in the UN keeps the channels of communication open, keeps her in touch with reality, thereby making a war by miscalculation less likely than would otherwise be the case.

↳ It is well to bear in mind also that the European satellite countries find UN membership helpful in preserving their national identity even in the shadow of the gaping maw of the USSR.

↳ Although the Soviet Union constantly taxes our patience, there are other reasons why we should not ~~succumb~~ <sup>yield</sup> to justifiable indignation over her insulting, often brutal, behavior and agitate for her expulsion from the UN.

↳ In the first place, Soviet behavior might be far worse if she were not assured of being accepted as a great -- if distasteful -- power in world councils; Soviet leaders might resort to the same tactic adopted by Commie China to call attention to herself and her burgeoning power.

↳ Secondly, and even more important, unless

we wish to regard nuclear mutual suicide  
as inevitable, the free world must maintain  
a channel through which it can continue to  
offer alternative courses of action that may  
one day be attractive for the USSR to follow.

↳ To a world ~~that hovers~~ under a nuclear  
cloud, the UN has rendered great service  
promoting the efforts of the free world to  
gain control over the means of destruction  
and to convert nuclear energy to peaceful  
uses.

↳ The United States and its allies are  
continuously urging the Soviet Union to  
join through the UN in disarmament agreements  
covering a multitude of projects. I happen  
to believe that our "package approach" is

making this awesome task even more difficult. The USSR has yet to give any evidence that it is willing to accept an effective system of inspection without which we dare not and must not let down our nuclear guard.

On the other hand, the UN has won a major victory in securing Soviet participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency which grew out of President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" program. This summer, under UN auspices, from both the free world and the Communist bloc, scientists reached an unprecedented accord on the requirements for a system that would detect violations of agreements prohibiting nuclear weapons tests.

*See Sub  
Comm 1*

It is to be hoped that the representatives of the major powers will get together to translate this technical success into an historic agreement, and that this will lead to accords on other American proposals, such as safeguards against surprise attack.

↳ In considering the UN efforts to raise living standards and reduce disease and illiteracy, I shall not weary you with a long description of the many specialized agencies that are waging a magnificent struggle against these problems. Deserving of special mention, however, are the World Health Organization, the Childrens Fund, the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, and the New Special Projects Fund. These

two latter programs, as well as the UN Economic Commissions for various geographic regions -- Africa has just been added to the list -- constitute a vital but modest beginning in the international attempts to provide economic aid for the underdeveloped areas.

Much more could be said about the past and present performance of the United Nations, but I hope that this will be sufficient to indicate that it plays a vital role, performing functions which the world today could dispense with only at its peril.

- II -

#### Criticisms

Let us now turn to some of the more

reasonable criticisms that have been made of the United Nations, especially in recent months. I assure you that I am not a blind partisan of the UN; I am quite willing to admit its many weaknesses and flaws. But, we must remember that the organization is what its members make of it; that it is forced to function in an imperfect international world of highly competitive nation-states.

First, there are the long-standing charges that the United Nations on the one hand is a powerful supranational body trespassing on the sovereign rights of individual countries, and that it is, on the other hand, a weak and futile organization

which acts only as an irritating obstacle  
to the fulfillment of strong and wise  
American foreign policies.

Both of these charges, of course, cannot be simultaneously valid, and, as usual, the truth lies somewhere between the extremes.

The best answer to this charge has been given by Secretary-General Hammorsrskjold:

"We should recognize the United Nations for  
what it is -- an admittedly imperfect but  
indispensable instrument of nations in  
working for a peaceful evolution toward  
a more just and secure world order. At  
this stage of human history, world organization

has become necessary. The forces at work have also set the limits within which the power of world organization can develop at each step and beyond which progress, when the balance of forces so permits, will be possible only by processes of organic growth in the system of custom and law prevailing in the society of nations."

The UN is continually being criticized because its members tend to vote by blocs, because it has a double standard of morality, because the veto power in the Security Council is abused, and because the United States makes a disproportionate financial contribution to the organization.

With regard to bloc voting, a recent press story reported that certain State Department officials are concerned about the possible shift in voting patterns in the General Assembly when several new African states gain admittance to the UN. It is true that one-fourth of the present UN members were colonies when World War II began, and they have anti-colonial biases that frequently find expression in anti-Western and anti-white behavior. These nations share an intensely nationalistic outlook, which is often converted into a neutralist approach to the world power conflict. There has been a marked tendency for most of these new countries to vote in a bloc, the Afro-Asian bloc, the Bandung bloc, and the Asian-Arab-African bloc. Many Western

officials are apparently apprehensive  
lest the entry of other states which have  
recently won their independence would give  
the underdeveloped countries undue power  
in the UN.

There is something to be said for  
this view, but in my opinion, not very much  
-- unless we display no understanding and  
a complete lack of sympathy for these new  
countries.

We must remember that the industrial  
nations of the West have their own prejudices  
and that they also tend to vote in a bloc.

The United States, equally with other powers, understandably seeks to influence the votes of its allies as well as other members. Political maneuvering is an indispensable part of every legislative organization, and one must expect it in the UN as much as in Parliament or Congress -- indeed, even more so, for the stakes are higher! It is a tribute to the UN's future possibilities that its members take them seriously enough to engage in politics on an international scale.

Personally I do not believe that there is or will be -- barring inept Western actions -- such solidarity among the newly independent countries that we need fear a

vast Asian-Arab-African bloc that would deliver votes with machine-like precision.

↳ Tunisia's current break with the United Arab Republic shows that even the Arab states themselves are far from united.

↳ One regional premier in Nigeria, which is expected to become independent in 1960, is already on record for close future cooperation with the West.

① ↳ The United Nations, it seems to me, can provide a constructive focus for the intense nationalism of these new states.

↳ Although the UN does not control nationalism, it does provide a framework in which nationalism can find its proper and responsible

outlet in a world society that is becoming increasingly interdependent.

↳ The problems of the so-called double standard of morality and of the abused veto power stem not only from the present UN structure, but even more from the international situation which the UN reflects but cannot entirely control. An instance of the double standard is found in comparing the withdrawal of the British, French, and Israelis from Suez with the Soviet refusal to heed the General Assembly's 60 to 10 condemnation of Communist actions in Hungary. (By the way, many Asian and African countries were included among those 60 votes).

What the Hungarian episode demonstrates is that there really is only one code of conduct in the UN. Most members comply with that code. But the Communists do not, and there is no way to force them to comply short of war. Yet the Communist bloc paid a heavy price in world opinion -- which even they recognize as important -- and in general prestige.

The ability of the USSR to abuse the veto power is again an unpleasant fact of life in the present-day world. The only way to reduce this evil is for the big powers to accept <sup>some</sup> limitation on the subjects that can be vetoed. Such a move, despite

its obvious difficulties, would have the beneficial effect of moving some UN operations from the less powerful General Assembly back to the Security Council where they were originally. The United States, we must not forget, is no more ready - and rightly so - than the Soviet Union to abolish the veto power.

cost

↳ The final charge hurled against the UN is that the United States carries an undue proportion of the financial costs. While this may have been true in past years, our percentage of the cost has dropped to about one-third in the last biennium. This is not an unfair assessment in terms of our

share of the world's wealth. In any event, Ambassador Lodge has the correct rejoinder to this criticism when he points out that our total expenditure in the UN this year is equal to what 10 hours of World War II cost us.

- III -

I am now eager to move on to the more positive side of the picture; namely, what can be done through the United Nations to fulfill our foreign policy objectives.

Frankly, it is my belief that we have missed opportunities in the past, and that we are not at present adopting the sort of posture that supports our long-term goals in foreign policy.

Let me emphasize that the revolution  
in military weapons in the last few years  
has had a profound effect on the international  
scene. The de facto line dividing the  
Communist bloc countries from the free  
world has become even more clear. It is  
much easier for world opinion to recognize  
when that line is crossed in strength and  
thus to condemn such action as a violation  
of UN principles.

*Economic*

There is considerable evidence to  
indicate that the Soviet Union understands  
this and has therefore shifted from moves  
entailing the risk of military action to an  
offensive involving the use of economic,  
political, and psychological methods.

But, until recently, our own Administration gave little indication that it understood what Khrushchev meant when he blatantly announced a declaration of "economic war" on the West.

Not long ago it was a cliché' in Washington circles that France was over extended and was therefore unable to realize its potential as a major power. Ironically enough, the French might now be able to describe our own position in the world in roughly the same terms.

I wonder if our complex of defense bases abroad, our many military arrangements, and

our bilateral political commitments are not becoming obsolete when we consider the nature of the present Soviet threat to the free world.

I feel quite certain, for example, that our over-extended commitments are at the root of our current predicament in the offshore islands of the Taiwan Strait. For there is good reason to believe that world opinion sees an imaginary line cutting through that Strait, with Taiwan and the Pescadores Islands a part of the free world and the offshore islands a legitimate objective for Communist China.

In this broad context, it appears to me that we have failed to see that the UN can be of inestimable service in advancing the interests of the free world.

You will remember at the beginning of our discussion I emphasized the twin objectives which the UN and this country held in common. Let us see just how we have seized the opportunities which the UN offers in the realization of these objectives.

First, the goal of maintaining American security and the establishment of world peace.

I have already mentioned that for many precious months and years we did not go far enough toward adopting and pressing upon the Soviets a clear, simple and practicable first step disarmament project. We have, lately, made some sound proposals directed toward armaments control, and I hope this praiseworthy approach will be developed in the new bomb test cessation talks which will open in Geneva on October 31.

Our record is even poorer in taking the necessary steps to prevent the outbreak of local conflicts which could flare into full-scale war.

↳ One American scholar has epitomized  
our past attitude in one sentence: "In  
the case of Suez we underestimated the  
preventive capacity of the UN before the  
crisis became acute, overestimated its  
capabilities when the crisis arrived, and  
again lost interest when the crisis had  
passed."

↳ Here in a nutshell is the reason why  
the Senate has been well in advance of  
the Administration in urging the  
remedial measures in the Middle East  
which were finally enunciated in  
President Eisenhower's recent UN speech.

↳ We have tended either to ignore the UN or to overload it with responsibility by using it as a crutch when a specific American policy has reached a dead end.

↳ We have failed to give it the strong, energetic leadership which is expected from the head of the Western alliance.

↳ We have just recently compounded our errors by not using the organization to good effect in advance of the Quemoy crisis.

→

↳ If the UN is eventually able to pull our chestnuts out of the Far Eastern flames -- as has been urged by that Republican stalwart, Mr. Dewey, by the most responsible of American newspapers,

and by the Democratic Advisory Council among others -- surely we can expect the lesson to be learned this time.

In terms of our second broad objective -- closing the gap between the living standards of the industrialized and underdeveloped nations -- once again we have been inexcuseably slow in acting and stodgy in our thinking. I have already noted the small but vitally needed multilateral economic assistance programs being sponsored in the UN. This is just a drop in the bucket compared with other expenditures and with the needs of the

world.

2 We are now taking a number of measures to expand United States contributions to world economic development and to promote international trade. But these necessary and enlightened steps are essentially bilateral moves that will gain neither the results needed nor the confident support of world opinion that could be obtained by bold attempts to enlist the entire resources of the free world in a vast multi-lateral program.

2 The necessary organizing talent and the administrative framework for such a venture

exists both in the UN and in NATO through its economic right arm, the OEEC. An extremely interesting proposal for a multi-lateral economic aid organization for Africa has come from the Center for International Studies at MIT. I believe that we may expect similar proposals as a result of the overall survey of American foreign policy which is about to be undertaken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure that similar plans exist or could be undertaken in other regions.

initiative  
What is really lacking is/on the part of the American government ~~initiative~~ that would

match the vigor of American private  
enterprise.

Perhaps you doubt the urgency of such  
programs.

U.N. - Ec. Assent

Let me assure you that many Americans  
believe, as I do, that if this country  
had helped inaugurate a truly effective  
economic development program through the  
United Nations a few years back, Russia  
would not have undertaken its "economic  
offensive" for it would have had nothing  
to offer that had not already been made  
available through the resources of the free  
world.

Let me also point out that the present Administration in a relatively tranquil period made it clear that such a multilateral program could not sensibly be undertaken in Latin America. Following the tension and regrettable incidents south of the border last spring, the Administration has reversed itself -- not/<sup>a</sup>totally unprecedented spectacle -- and has now belatedly advanced such a program.

Will it take constant pressure and a growing Soviet threat to bring forth other imaginative proposals?

Will we continue to bump along from

crisis to crisis and fail to provide the leadership which could bring out the full potential of the United Nations? Failure can well mean a nuclear devastation of this planet.

In all seriousness, I say today that the price of survival in the second half of the twentieth century may well be the degree of our national devotion to the works of peace.

"Works for peace" is not just my phrase. It is a phrase, used, among others, by the President of the United States in his

in his State of the Union Message on January 9, 1958. His words were eloquent and encouraging, when he spoke of cooperation for a better world.

But words without deeds are useless, just a "faith without works" can be barren.

While our Chief Executive has spoken of works for peace, America has not sufficiently acted to bring into being these works of peace.

There has been promise, but small fulfillment; great expectations, but few results.

We are all familiar with the old saying, "What you do, speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say."

Today, many of the peoples of the world might say to us of America: "What you don't do speaks so loudly that we cannot hear what you say."

It is our errors of Omission, almost as much as our errors of Commission, which serve to limit the effectiveness of what we say to the world.

What are these works of peace?

They are both ancient, and modern devices, which have been used in part for 2,000 years -- the weapons against mankind's real enemies.

They are the weapons used to "clothe the naked, feed the hungry, heal the sick."

They are the weapons of great ideas, the weapons of love and devotion and self-sacrifice which can span vast space and time.

They are weapons which must be aimed, principally, at the third of the world which is underdeveloped, but not limited

to that area. I mean the weapons  
against:

- pain and suffering
- ignorance and superstition and  
idolatry and illiteracy
- hunger and malnutrition
- disease and disability

We want to overcome misunderstanding,  
fear, envy and want. Suffering and privation  
are widespread, a fertile field for the  
growth of communist influence.

The average life expectancy in South  
Asia is still only about 33 years.

Infant mortality is 50% and higher in much of the underdeveloped world. Per capita income is only \$50 per year. To help relieve this enormous need is the challenge facing us.

Why us? Because if it is we Americans who have the wherewithal to fulfill mankind's needs.

Because "every one to whom much is given, of him, will much be required."

What solid works of peace can you and I and our government perform?

I have already mentioned two -- loans for peace and disarmament for peace. Let me refer to two more: Food for Peace and Health for Peace.

#### FOOD FOR PEACE CAN BE A DECISIVE INFLUENCE

One of the most important jobs which we can better perform is to use food for peace.

Fortunately, we in America are blessed with the bounty of a highly productive agricultural economy.

Our vast supply of food is a blessing-- a priceless asset to ourselves and to the world.

Yet, far too often, the efficiency of our farmers and the bounties of our soil have been treated as though they were a "curse".

We cannot win the battle for men's minds with machine guns and mortars. We must win it ultimately with superior ideas.

"Food for Peace" is a superior idea.

Giving food generously represents the real America at work. Working through and in cooperation with the UN and its specialized agencies, our food abundance

can be put to work effectively, in meaningful ways consistent with our foreign policy objectives.

Equally promising is the field of health.

During the session of Congress just concluded, it was my pleasure to help write into law four pieces of legislation which may contribute, if only in a small part, to improving the health of mankind.

For example, we wrote into the Mutual Security Act a Declaration that the Congress considers it to be the policy of our land

to help further in the research task of eradicating disease. The Congress declared it to be our goal to help find the answers to such major killing and crippling ailments as cancer and heart disease, as well as other scourges.

Secondly we wrote into that same Act a new provision whereby the sale of American farm products overseas under Public Law 480 may be utilized henceforth for the purpose of translating scientific works and supporting scientific, including medical, research.

We enacted a separate resolution which

"took a cue" from the current successful International Geophysical Year, in which 60 nations are cooperating in studying the earth, the waters and the skies.

In this resoltuion, the Senate invited the President to assemble representatives through the World Health Organization, and other agencies in order to consider the possibility of setting aside an International Health and Medical Research Year sometime in the future.

Finally, the Senate approved a Resolution

under which the Senate Government Operations Committee will make a study of world-wide health activities.

We will look, not only at America's health assistance, but at additional medical research work that might be performed overseas. As Chairman of this study, which will be made by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, I have invited the great voluntary organizations of this land to assist us. I mean:

- a) the church groups -- with their vital overseas medical aid programs.

- b) the professional groups - such as  
the American Medical Association,  
the American Nurses Association,  
the American Pharmaceutical Association,  
the American Dietary Association.
  
- c) the voluntary health groups - such  
as the American Heart Association,  
the American Cancer Society, the  
National Foundation (formerly the  
National Foundation for Infantile  
Paralysis), the Arthritis and  
Rheumatism Foundation.

d) other private foundations - such as  
the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller  
Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation,  
the Near East Foundation.

We shall seek their best judgement  
concerning international medical research,  
assistance and rehabilitation.

We will ask the great private pharmaceutical  
industry of America to come forth with its  
ideas and suggestions.

I may say that there are tens of millions  
of dollars of private drug supplies which are

surplus on the American market -- drugs that have been superseded by newer discoveries. Yet they are perfectly useable and could be readily employed in relieving distress in other lands.

I would like to see a fleet of surplus American ships, carrying surplus American drugs, and with surplus jeeps and trailers dispatched to the four corners of the world. I would like to see them visit the port-cities of underdeveloped areas, with American doctors dispensing these healing medicines.

This to me, is a "Work of Peace" that will

build up resources of good will for the United States in foreign countries.

Let me conclude on this note: **Just** as the United Nations has been of great service to the world in promoting an atmosphere of peace, so, too, each successive work of peace has both a direct and an indirect effect.

The direct effect is to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and heal the sick.

But the indirect effect is to create a climate of understanding and friendship and to contribute to an atmosphere of peace.

Nowhere is such a climate and atmosphere more important than in the strained relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

There is such a wall of suspicion and of misunderstanding between us that anything that can be done to hurdle the wall and enable our citizens to work side by side with Russian citizens is to the good.

The more Russians and Americans can work fruitfully side by side, on common problems, the more they can decrease the likelihood of nuclear fallout and increase the chances - everywhere in the world - for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

#####



# 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)