

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

FOR RELEASE: Thursday A.M.'s  
February 26, 1959

HOPE MUST BE MAINTAINED BY 'WAGING PEACE,' SENATOR HUMPHREY SAYS

The American people "have not lost hope" for a more enduring peace, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) declared last night in an address before the United World Federalists in Chicago.

"In these dark times when crisis is piled upon crisis, it is easy to lose heart, to give up hope," he warned. "But we must keep hope alive -- not hope based upon wishful thinking, but hope tempered with a realistic understanding of the world we live in.

"The pace of history need not discourage us. If the goal is clear, and if we take genuine steps in the right direction, I am confident that our efforts will be rewarded.

"The many-faceted challenge of Communism today demands bold action to meet the economic, political, and military threat of the Soviet Union and Red China. Only bold steps will be equal to the challenge of the 'revolution of rising expectations' in Asia and Africa. Timidity is the counsel of despair," Senator Humphrey warned.

Calling attention to the "hundred years of peace" between 1812 and World War I, Senator Humphrey asked: "What can we learn from this century of peace, that we can apply to the present?

"Our times are different, in some ways vastly different. Yet, I believe there are three very important things we can learn from the 100 years of peace:

- "1. Power must be exercised with responsibility.
- "2. Peace is possible.
- "3. Peace must be planned.

"The mantle of world leadership which Britain wore in the 19th Century has in this century fallen upon our shoulders. The key to peace and order in our century, insofar as we have control over the situation, is the wise and responsible exercise of United States power.

"I am not suggesting for a moment a new imperialism, an "American century," but rather a recognition that we should have a sense of responsibility commensurate with our wealth and power. This responsibility, in our interdependent world, must be widely shared, through instruments such as the United Nations, NATO, and other multi-lateral arrangements in the political, economic, and military spheres.

"The destiny of western civilization and the peace of the world may well depend upon America's ability to use her wealth and power not only to defend herself, but to create a world of greater peace and justice for all men.

"We must believe that peace is possible. If we believe that peace is not possible, we would be among the most miserable of men.

"Although we are today challenged by a powerful, committed and relentless foe and the spectre of nuclear destruction hangs menacingly over our heads, I still believe we can avoid war and that peace is possible. I have worked and I will continue to work in this belief.

"But peace must be planned, worked for, sacrificed for. Peace is not an accident, a gift from the gods or a happenstance. Peace is a difficult goal, an elusive goal. Peace must be waged.

More

"We must work for peace even as we keep up our defensive shield. Waging peace is no substitute for an adequate defense posture. Nor is an adequate defense posture a substitute for waging peace.

"The world of 1959 does not confer upon us the luxury of choosing between waging peace and maintaining our defensive strength. We must do both, and we must do each task with as much imagination, creativity and wisdom as we can muster.

"Given a world of imperfect men and nations, there is no master plan that will end conflicts of interest and erase all hostility. Nevertheless, there are steps, important steps, which we can take which will move us along on the path to a more secure and peaceful world. These steps will help to accomplish in this century the stability and order which was achieved in the 19th century.

"Some of the greatest opportunities lie in the economic realm, especially in the areas of international trade and economic development. We need present-day counterparts to the gold standard which facilitated trade and the London capital market which provided development funds in many areas throughout the world. The International Monetary Fund, and FATT, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, are in a real sense the counterpart of the gold standard. The International Bank for Reconstruction (World Bank), the Point 4 Program, the Colombo Plan, and other similar instruments are the counterpart to the London Capital Market.

"In the military sphere, NATO and other free world alliances are the counterpart to the balance achieved by British naval power.

"In the political sphere, we can and should take three significant steps:

"1. Work for effective arms control with inspection;

"2. Strengthen the United Nations;

"3. Make fuller use of the world court.

"Steps toward disarmament now are so important to mankind's hopes for peace. We must act, even if only a small step is possible. . . .

"The conclusion of an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests or to install an inspection system to prevent surprise attack in some region of the world would be a small, first-step agreement of great value for initiating a new trend in world affairs.

"The issue of international inspection in the Geneva disarmament negotiations highlights one of the most significant potential contributions of disarmament to the cause of peace and harmony in the world today.

"If I had to single out any one factor as the main barrier to peace in the world today, I would point my finger at the Iron Curtain, or in other words the barrier of secrecy and isolation which the Soviet Union has erected between its own people and the outside world.

"International inspection for suspension of nuclear weapons tests would pierce this barrier in an unprecedented way. The political effect of getting an international authority into the silent and secret land of the Soviets would be inestimable.

"I am dedicated to national security. I believe our defenses should be strong, in order to back up our international negotiations.

"We arm to parley, we develop strength in order to negotiate, as well as to deter attack, limited or general.

"We must arm, and yet at the same time strive to turn back the tide of fear that is engendered by the mounting arms race. We must make a start somewhere in tearing down the veils of secrecy that breed mistrust and suspicion between the Communist and free worlds.

"An agreement to end nuclear weapons tests, backed up by an effectively functioning inspection system within the participating nations, would be a significant step in the direction of world peace and order."

STEPS TOWARD WORLD ORDER

*type*  
*Wed Feb. 25<sup>th</sup>*  
*World Federate -- see card Chicago*  
*and line*

In these dark times when crisis is piled upon crisis,

it is easy to lose heart, to give up hope. ~~We have~~ The

Berlin crisis, ~~which is~~ <sup>bristling with</sup> a complex and knotty ~~as any~~ problems. It is ~~the~~

*serious situation*

*perhaps the most* we have confronted since V-J Day. ~~We have~~ The Formosan crisis, *has quieted*

*down, but has not disappeared,*

And there is always a crisis of one kind or another in the

turbulent Middle East.

With every crisis there are dangers and risks, **B**ut there

are also opportunities, <sup>and responsibilities.</sup>

during peace, <sup>you have not lost hope,</sup> and I believe the American people have not lost

hope. We must keep hope alive. Genuine hope. Not hope based

upon wishful thinking, but hope tempered with a realistic under-

standing of the world we live in.

*It was an unforgettable experience.*

A few months ago I was in Moscow and Berlin. I have a first-

hand knowledge of some of the vexing problems we face. But I

have not surrendered the gift of hope which gives men the

courage to press on, the vision to see beyond the encircling

gloom ~~to~~ a better world.

Genuine hope does not permit us to escape the present into some utopian future of our dreams. Genuine hope helps us to ~~come~~ come to grips with the present in the name of the future and out of respect for the values of the past.

~~I want to talk to the people in this audience tonight (today)~~

~~because you believe~~

tonight

You people here ~~today~~ deserve commendation because you

believe in the future

are among those hearty souls who ~~keep hope alive~~ when many

people ~~are throwing in the sponge~~ around you are giving up hope for a better world.

You ~~are~~ carrying a torch while less hearty souls are throwing in ~~the sponge~~

Tonight I want to talk about some steps we can take toward

peace and

plural,

greater order in the world. I say steps not one giant step.

This may disappoint some of you, but I am convinced that history

~~does not believe in giant steps~~ new institutions and laws are not achieved

~~produced~~ in one giant step. ~~There must be~~ Great preparation <sup>and even suffering</sup> before

precedes the <sup>birth of</sup> new forms <sup>new ways of doing things.</sup> History teaches not to expect ~~apocalyptic~~ drastic

changes overnight.

The pace of history

~~This~~ does not discourage me. If the goal is clear and if

we take genuine steps in the right direction, I am confident that

our efforts will be rewarded.

~~In responding to~~ <sup>T</sup> The many-faceted challenge of Communism  
<sup>demands bold action</sup> to meet  
today ~~we must take bold steps in~~ the economic, political and  
~~security~~ military threat of the Soviet Union, <sup>and Red China.</sup> ~~and we must~~

<sup>Only</sup> ~~take bold steps to meet the opportunities~~ <sup>will be equal to the</sup> challenge of the

"revolution of rising expectations" in Asia and Africa. <sup>Timidity is</sup>  
<sup>the counsel of despair.</sup>

The Hundred Years of Peace: 1815-1914

<sup>H</sup> Before I suggest some specific steps toward <sup>greater</sup> world order,

I would like to say a word about a remarkable period of modern

history, a period which may <sup>hold</sup> ~~have~~ some lessons for us today. I

refer to the <sup>century</sup> ~~100 years of peace from the close~~ of the War of 1812

to the outbreak of World War I, which some historians have referred

to as "the hundred years of peace." More accurately, it was a

century ~~■~~ when there were no general wars and a <sup>considerable</sup> degree of world

order prevailed. The balance of power among the European states <sup>made</sup>

~~maintained~~ a measure of stability, <sup>possible.</sup> No single European power could

aspire to world hegemony. Great Britain, with its firm control of

the seas, acted as a check on the ambitions of any of the European

land powers. England was neither strong enough, nor did she aspire

4

to dominate the European continent. She acted as a balance wheel. Through this delicate balance stability was maintained for an entire century.

On the economic side, this century of peace was a great period of industrial development in many parts of the world. ~~Economic institutions~~ International trade was stimulated by the acceptance of the gold standard. And the London capital market provided the funds through which large portions of the world, including these United States, were developed.

The principles of Anglo-Saxon law and political institutions, based upon the concept of public responsibility, ~~and government~~ ~~by the consent of the governed~~ spread to the far corners of the earth. Everywhere people were beginning to learn, at least theoretically, the meaning of the ~~principles of~~ democratic principle of "government by the consent of the governed."

During this remarkable century wars were limited <sup>both</sup> geographically and in their political objectives. <sup>In this country we had a tragic</sup> ~~We had a great~~ Civil War. <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~

~~this country~~ But there was no general war. And ~~no~~ tyrant rose to conquer the world <sup>or even</sup> ~~any~~ any large portion of it.

World War I shattered the hundred years of peace and economic development, and destroyed the fragile and elementary forms of world order created in the 19th century. This order was never really reestablished in the long week-end between Versailles and Pearl Harbor.

What can we learn from this century of peace? Is it too different from our present century to teach us anything? Our times are different, in some ways vastly different. Yet, I believe there are three very important things we can learn from the 100 years of peace: ~~This~~

- 1) POWER MUST BE EXERCISED WITH RESPONSIBILITY
- 2) PEACE IS POSSIBLE
- 3) PEACE MUST BE PLANNED

First, power must be exercised with responsibility. The key to the 100 years of stability was the responsible exercise of British power. Britain held the balance in Europe and through her navy throughout the world. She carried her power with restraint and with a sense of moral responsibility. She did not seek to enslave or to make the world over in her image. I am not suggesting

6

that her Britannic Majesty was a paragon of virtue, but I am suggesting that Great Britain exercised her decisive power with wisdom and restraint.

~~What Britain~~

The mantle of world leadership which Britain wore in the 19th century has in this century <sup>fallen upon</sup> ~~fallen upon~~ our shoulders. The key to peace and order in our century, in so far as we have control over the situation, ~~is~~ is the wise and responsible exercise of United States power. I am not suggesting for a moment a new imperialism, an "American century," but rather a recognition that we should have a sense of responsibility commensurate with our wealth and power. This responsibility, in our interdependent world, must be widely shared, through instruments like the United Nations, NATO, and other multilateral arrangements in the political, economic and military spheres.

The destiny of Western civilization and the peace of the world may well depend upon America's ~~own~~ <sup>use</sup> ability to ~~relate her~~ ~~exercise her~~ <sup>not only to defend herself, but to create a world</sup> ~~wealth and power~~ ~~is in the interests of~~ <sup>of greater peace and justice for all men.</sup>

Second, we must believe that peace is possible. If we believe that peace is not possible, we would be among the most miserable of men. Although we are today challenged by a powerful, committed and relentless foe and the spectre of nuclear destruction hangs menacingly over our heads, I still believe we can avoid war and that peace is possible. I have worked and I will continue to work on this belief.

Third, peace must be planned, worked for, sacrificed for. Peace is not an accident, a gift from the gods or a happenstance. Peace is a difficult goal, an elusive goal. Peace must be waged. We must work for peace even as we keep up our

(See p. 8)

8

defensive shield. Waging peace is no substitute for an adequate defense posture. Nor is an adequate defense posture a substitute for waging peace. The world of 1959 does not confer upon us the luxury of choosing between waging peace and maintaining our defensive strength. We must do both and we must do each task with as much imagination, creativity and wisdom as we can muster.

### Three Steps We Can Take Now

There is no magic key to world order, no master plan that will assure us of peace in our time. Perhaps I should amend this statement by saying there is no master plan which lies within the realm of the politically possible. Bismark once said that "politics

is the art of the possible." <sup>He is right, although there is room for disagreement on what is in fact possible.</sup> You will recall that in one of <sup>the writer,</sup> the Federalist Papers <sup>Madison,</sup> ~~Madison~~, I believe it was <sup>^</sup> said that

if all men were angles, then we would not need the checks and

<sup>which the Founding Fathers regarded as essential to sound</sup> balances in government. <sup>But since men are men and not angles,</sup> <sup>said Madison,</sup>

we need the checks and balances, <sup>which prevent one interest or one branch of government from taking over.</sup>

Given ~~our present world made up~~ <sup>a</sup> of imperfect men and nations,

I maintain there is no master plan that will end conflicts of in-

<sup>and erase all hostility.</sup>

terest. Nevertheless, there are steps, important steps we can take

which will move us along on the path to a more secure and peaceful world. These steps will help to accomplish in this century the stability and order which was achieved in the 19th century.

Some of the greatest opportunities lie in the economic realm, especially in the areas of international trade and economic development. We need present-day counterparts to the gold standard which facilitated trade and the London capital market

which provided development funds in many areas throughout the world. The

*International Monetary Fund and*

*and* GATT, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, *are real* in a sense the

counterpart to the gold standard. The International Bank for Re-

*the Point 4 program, and the Colombo Plan*

Construction (World Bank), ~~the International Monetary Fund~~, and

other similar instruments are the counterpart ~~for~~ the London Capital

Market. *In the military sphere NATO and other free world allies are the counterpart to the balance achieved by British naval power.*

*H*

~~But so much for the economic aspects in passing. Tonight I~~

*I merely mention the economic and military aspects in passing.*  
*Touquet I* would like to confine my remarks to the political sphere. In the

*P*

political sphere we can take three steps:

1) WORK FOR EFFECTIVE ARMS CONTROL WITH INSPECTION

2) STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

3) MAKE FULLER USE OF THE WORLD COURT

1. Work For Effective Arms Control With Inspection

~~Peace~~ <sup>Stable</sup> peace and a more ~~flourishing~~ world order can ~~ever~~ scarcely be attained if nations are constantly ~~in an attitude of threat and hostility~~ <sup>developing postures of</sup> toward each other. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Demands by one great power that another great power surrender ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ some valuable position, loud and repeated threats of annihilation if demands are not met, all backed up by a feverish race to concoct new weapons and amass them in ever growing stockpiles, - these

<sup>developments</sup> do not create an atmosphere conducive to ~~social progress toward a~~ <sup>a more just and peaceful</sup> higher order of world ~~in law~~ <sup>international order.</sup>

This is why <sup>steps</sup> a ~~start~~ toward disarmament <sup>are so</sup> now is so important to mankind's hopes for <sup>peace.</sup> a better world political system. <sup>we must act, even if only</sup> At the present time only a

<sup>a</sup> small <sup>step is possible.</sup> start is necessary. For years the United States and its allies strove with <sup>comprehensive</sup> for disarmament ~~in~~ grandiose plans that covered the whole range of military defense and that envisaged/machinery of administration and control.

<sup>PP</sup> We gradually learned the ~~futility~~ <sup>futility</sup> of this approach. We lowered our sights to more realistic goals, and we have now arrived at a point where we are seeking to conclude ~~merely~~ a first-stage or a partial disarmament agreement.

Complete ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ disarmament all at one stroke need not and cannot be obtained. What we should have and must have, is a limited agreement, <sup>that will</sup> that is only great enough <sup>the world from its present</sup> to deflect ~~us from the~~ <sup>help</sup> hazardous course. Once course has been changed, there will <sup>ample</sup> ~~then~~ be time and opportunity to pursue the larger goals toward which we aspire.

The conclusion of an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests or to install an inspection <sup>system</sup> to prevent surprise attack in some region of the world would be a small, first-step agreement of great value for initiating a new trend in world affairs. Either one of these agreements would slow down <sup>perhaps even</sup> or halt the forward momentum of the arms race. Once the fever of competition <sup>in our quest for</sup> has been lowered, sanity and reason can then operate more freely ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ <sup>peace</sup>

with justice

~~to aid our search for lasting harmony and peace.~~

first stage agreement,

~~has been made~~

Within the past year progress toward conclusion of a

~~first stage agreement~~

~~an agreement to suspend nuclear arms testing and of an agreement to~~

~~prevent or forewarn of surprise has been~~

Negotiations for

a ~~test~~ ban <sup>on nuclear weapons tests</sup> particularly have advanced to an extent scarcely hoped for

this time a year ago. Last summer the Soviet Union suddenly accepted ~~the our~~

Government's

invitation that ~~was made by the United States~~ the United States had extended

to hold a technical conference on devising methods of inspection ~~for~~ in order

to guarantee fulfillment of any international agreement for suspending

nuclear weapons tests. This conference, consisting of scientific experts

from the Communist ~~side~~ bloc and the principal Western powers <sup>was</sup> convened at

Geneva. <sup>By</sup> ~~at~~ the end of August <sup>last</sup> ~~had~~ <sup>it</sup> issued conclusions <sup>con-</sup> ~~reached~~ in by both

sides. This was an unprecedented step in the history of disarmament

negotiations. ~~since the end of~~ For the first time Soviet and Western

representatives <sup>had</sup> ~~have~~ seen eye to eye, and had agreed on the ~~technical~~ technical

details of an international <sup>arms control and</sup> inspection system.

It is necessary to recognize what these Geneva conclusions were and

were not. They were ~~not~~ not in themselves an agreement to suspend nuclear

weapons tests. They were, however, an aid, a spur, and a necessary basis

<sup>any future</sup> for such an agreement. As you recall, <sup>immediately</sup> last spring the Soviet Union <sup>immediately</sup>

<sup>concluding</sup> ~~right~~ after a very intensive series of nuclear tests, which shot a large

barrage of radioactive debris into the atmosphere encircling the globe, ~~the~~

U.S.S.R.

announced to the world that <sup>she</sup> ~~it~~ was unilaterally suspending nuclear weapons

tests. <sup>she</sup> ~~It~~ further announced that <sup>she</sup> ~~it~~ would continue such a suspension

provided the United States and Great Britain, the other two nuclear ~~power~~ powers,

would do the same. <sup>This</sup> ~~Now this in some respects~~ was a clever maneuver, but it

wasn't clever enough.

*A* Its primary aim ~~was~~ <sup>of this unilateral ~~confession~~</sup> and conditional suspension <sup>was</sup>  
 It was first of all an effort to impress world opinion. To a degree it  
 succeeded, *B* but the more perceptive among people around the world knew that  
 the Soviet ~~plan~~ <sup>plan</sup> initiative would have resulted in what would have  
 been in effect an uninspected, ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>a</sup> suspension of tests <sup>without effective inspection</sup>. Such ~~an~~ suspension  
 would have been worse than no suspension ~~if~~ <sup>at</sup> all, ~~xxxxx~~ because there would  
 have been no guarantee that ~~somebody~~ <sup>one side</sup> was not cheating, ~~and~~ <sup>U</sup> under such  
 conditions, fear, suspicion and tension would have increased and not abated.

The United States wisely pressed ahead ~~xxxx~~ with its endeavor to  
 obtain an internationally agreed termination of testing, backed up and  
 safeguarded by an effective inspection system. Immediately after the close of the

*A* Geneva conference of experts, ~~reached a successful conclusion of their work,~~  
 the United States accepted the conclusions and ~~announced~~ invited the Soviet  
 Union to a <sup>political</sup> ~~political~~ conference, <sup>The purpose of the second conference was to</sup>  
<sup>work out a test ban</sup> ~~to place the political superstructure on the~~  
 scientific foundation reached at Geneva. The United States said that for one  
 year <sup>she</sup> ~~it~~ would suspend tests <sup>her</sup> provided the Soviet Union would do the same. <sup>for one year</sup> This would  
 in order to <sup>allow</sup> ~~give~~ time for the political conference <sup>hammer out</sup> to come to an agreement.

The conclusions of the Geneva conference of experts ~~were what you~~  
 might call conclusions in the abstract for an inspection system, or conclusions  
 that confined themselves strictly to scientific matters of a politically  
 non-sensitive nature. They indicated the number ~~xxxx~~ of inspection stations  
 and the kinds of inspection instruments and procedures that should be adopted  
 for an <sup>effective control</sup> ~~inspection~~ system, but they did not go into such controversial matters  
 as <sup>to precisely</sup> ~~xxxx~~ where the inspection stations should be located, ~~not~~ <sup>who should man them</sup> how they should  
 be ~~xxxx~~ <sup>a</sup> manned in terms of nationality, ~~not~~ <sup>a</sup> into what powers the control  
 administration should exercise. These were questions to be thrashed out  
 at the political conference,

*United States Senate*

The Geneva political conference on suspending nuclear weapons tests has now been at work for about four months. I would ~~just~~ like to review with you a few of the crucial issues that have merged in the course of that conference. When Mr. George Kennan testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament early this month he stressed that one of the main obstacles <sup>domain</sup> ~~to~~ understanding with the USSR <sup>Soviet</sup> in regard to disarmament has been ~~its~~ <sup>into the</sup> or in other words, its stern resistance to ~~any~~ <sup>from getting</sup> allowing any alien influence philosophy and traditions of secrecy. This has been one of the main stumbling blocks <sup>on the road to</sup> ~~in~~ preventing conclusion of any reliable arms control agreement in the post war period, and it is one of the main obstacles to success in the current Geneva negotiations.

*in the way of an arms  
is its*

To be ~~truly~~ <sup>genuinely</sup> reliable, arms control inspection must be ~~truly~~ international.

*National* Self-inspection is not <sup>genuine</sup> inspection, and self-inspection is essentially what the Soviet Union has been insisting <sup>upon</sup> on at Geneva. Control stations under the Geneva experts plan would be located in each participating country to check on its activities. But the Soviet has been saying, "These control stations must be manned by nationals of the country wherein they are located." ~~Essentially~~ Communist Russians would be checking up on Communist Russians, according to this plan, and it is not difficult to see that Americans will not stake their security <sup>or survival</sup> on ~~the~~ <sup>the paper promises.</sup>

*IP* The United States and Britain, ~~on the other hand~~ <sup>in contrast, have</sup> taken the position that stations should be manned by outside nationalities, so that the resulting surveillance is truly <sup>international,</sup> ~~mutual~~ and reciprocal. <sup>These opposing views on in-</sup> Thus the <sup>spection.</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>are responsible for</sup> the deadlock ~~stands~~ at the present moment. This is a point on which the Soviet Union must make a substantial concession, <sup>if</sup> ~~otherwise it is difficult to see~~ <sup>is to</sup> how there ~~can~~ be an effective and dependable inspection network.

*are responsible for the*

Another crucial point of issue in the negotiations is the amount of authority that should be <sup>vested in</sup> ~~possessed~~ by the countries administering the control

*United States Senate*

commission. The Soviet Union insists that there should be unanimity among the major powers on the control ~~authority~~ authority to make ~~any~~ major decisions. In other words, the Soviet negotiators want a veto over the control authority. The American and British position, however, is that at least certain important decisions on the functioning of the control mechanism should not be subject to veto but should be reached by majority vote. <sup>a one-nation</sup>

If, for example, the inspection stations recorded an event that might be an underground nuclear test it would be necessary to send inspectors immediately to the location to investigate. On the spot inspection of this type is very vital to the effective functioning of the entire control system, otherwise the purpose of inspection could be frustrated and a violator of the agreement might readily ~~escape~~ escape the consequences of his violation.

The United States says, "This kind of decision cannot be blocked by a veto."

The Soviet Union says, "This kind of decision must be subject to a veto, or it is a violation of sovereign rights." <sup>Soviet intransigence is again responsible for this deadlock. Here again on this point.</sup>

~~it will be necessary to have a substantially more lenient position by~~

<sup>or modifies this position,</sup> unless the Moscow Government, it will be impossible to have an effective and dependable inspection system.

international inspection  
The issue of ~~the veto~~ in the Geneva disarmament negotiations ~~underscores~~ <sup>one of the most significant potential contributions</sup> highlights/~~the significance~~ of disarmament to the cause of peace and harmony had to

in the world today. If I ~~should~~ single out any one factor as the main barrier to peace in the world today I would point my finger at the Iron Curtain, or in other words the barrier of secrecy and isolation which the Soviet Union has erected between its own people and the outside world. International inspection for ~~any~~ suspension of nuclear weapons tests would pierce this barrier in an unprecedented way. The political effect of getting an international authority into the silent <sup>and</sup> secret land of the Soviets would be inestimable. ~~It is this political goal that outweighs~~

~~Statement of J. Edgar Hoover~~

~~so many of the objections to a nuclear weapons test cessation that have been raised by many sincere Americans in the name of military security.~~ I am

~~dedicated to national security. I believe our defenses should be strong~~

in order to ~~back up~~ <sup>develop strength</sup> our international negotiations. ~~But we arm to~~ <sup>to in order to negotiate as well as to deter</sup> parley, we ~~are strong in order to negotiate.~~ <sup>attack,</sup> We are following a barren <sup>invited a general</sup> course if we become so diverted that we lose sight of those higher goals <sup>more short-sighted considerations.</sup>

~~which transcend immediate considerations.~~ Just as there is danger

in ~~insufficient~~ lack of security there is also danger in the arms race and in the continuing tension between the Communist world and our own. There is

danger in ~~national hostilities~~ a world constantly jarred by national

hostilities, ~~but~~ these dangers can be overcome if we take those steps <sup>arms and at the same time</sup> which lead us to higher levels of order under law. We must strive to turn

~~back the tide of fear and~~ that is engendered by the mounting arms

race. We must make a start somewhere in tearing down the veils of secrecy that <sup>breed</sup> incite mistrust and suspicion between the Communist and

free worlds. An agreement to end nuclear weapons tests, reinforced and

backed up by an effectively functioning inspection system ~~working~~

<sup>within</sup> inside the participating nations, <sup>well</sup> would serve ~~to promote~~ to promote the cause of world peace and order. <sup>to be a significant step in</sup>

*the direction of world peace and order.*

## 2. Strengthen the United Nations

The United Nations is a continuing conference of some 80 sovereign states. It is a limited instrument. But it is a valuable instrument. The United Nations can be used, abused or ignored by its member states, <sup>and</sup> it it would not be difficult to cite examples of these three attitudes toward it.

I believe the U.N. can be strengthened <sup>through a fuller</sup> ~~by a greater~~ use of its peace-making and peace-keeping facilities. The member states can make a contribution to greater world order by participating in the long-range economic and humanitarian activities of the UN which help to weave the fabric of peace and understanding. I refer to the Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, UNESCO, <sup>UN</sup> ~~the~~ technical assistance program, and <sup>and</sup> other essentially nonpolitical activities, <sup>carried on under the aegis of the world organization</sup> I favor the fullest possible cooperation <sup>of by our Government with other nations</sup> in the great problem of assisting economically the less developed areas of the world.

In the ~~peace~~ peace-keeping or political sphere, I believe the present UN is capable of serving the cause of peace <sup>when</sup> the nations really want to use it. ~~But we must never forget that~~ But

there is no way we can force the nations to utilize the UN.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said: "The United Nations is not a cure-all. It is only <sup>capable</sup> of effective action when its members have a will to make it work."

In spite of the Soviet bloc's frequent use of the veto in the Security Council and other obstructive tactics, the U.N. has a solid record of achievement <sup>even in the political sphere.</sup> ~~in some areas.~~ Through the U.N., aggression was thrown back in Korea. Through the U.N., Soviet troops were forced to withdraw from Iran. Through the UN, fighting was stopped in Greece, Indonesia and the Middle East.

<sup>possible</sup>  
This suggests one/area where we can strengthen the United Nations. I refer to the U.N. <sup>Emergency</sup> Police Force now deployed in the Gaza Strip between the United Arab Republic and Israel. This force has limited functions and <sup>no one pretends it is</sup> ~~is not~~ powerful <sup>enough</sup> to hold back a full-scale attack by either side. But it is a beginning, perhaps a symbol of a greater international force which one day may be used to bring stability in trouble areas. It is difficult to foresee <sup>the time when</sup> ~~a situation where~~ a UN force could deal with a <sup>situation</sup> ~~situation~~.

in which the two superpowers are so deeply involved, such as the present Berlin crisis, short of a radical change in the nation-state system in which states would have <sup>already</sup> surrendered their military establishments, the ultimate symbol of their sovereignty. They could not take place

Even if a UN police force is <sup>not</sup> capable of dealing with the major security problems in the world today, it is quite possible that a mobile force dispatched to minor trouble spots

~~would~~ would be capable of putting out brush fires before they blazed into ~~glare~~ a global conflagration. This would be <sup>eminently</sup> worth the relatively small investment.

I believe we should also explore the possibility of creating international ~~rules and~~ rules and machinery for the regulation of outer space. In this area the U.N. can also make a contribution.

I have no illusions. I know the UN can work effectively on any major security question <sup>such as</sup> ~~like~~ arms control, or regulating

outer space only when the Soviet Union is willing to go along with the majority <sup>position.</sup> ~~view.~~ And we have no means of forcing the

Communist bloc to give ~~in~~ in to the majority. But we can try, and in trying we <sup>can</sup> lay bare <sup>the intentions of</sup> any nation which obstructs <sup>the plans of</sup> those ~~is~~ nations

<sup>which</sup> are genuinely working for greater order and peace. Even if the

UN serve primarily as a mirror of our divided world, it is performing a valuable function. For without a clear picture of the world situation, we cannot ~~act~~ with political insight or moral wisdom.

### 3. We Should Make Fuller Use of the World Court

In the United States we live under the "rule of law." This law is written into our Constitution and in the acts of our Congress. We have a Supreme Court which passes on the Constitutionality of state or Federal laws <sup>when</sup> such laws are challenged.

Every American citizen is protected by the "rule of law" and the judicial system <sup>& created upon it.</sup> ~~which settles conflicts between individuals and groups within the United States.~~ Although our system is sound, there are flaws in its implementation. For reasons of color or poverty some of our citizens ~~do~~ do not enjoy the blessing of full equality under the law.

Our system works and works well because ~~there is~~ our Constitution and the derivative laws are supported by the moral consensus of the American people.

Law, charters and judicial instruments, to be politically effective, must embody the moral and political consensus of the community to which they apply. Today there is no adequate consensus among the nations of the world to support a uniform and enforceable body of law dealing with major political and security questions.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States want to see a rule of law in the world. But the Communist conception of law is radically different from ~~the~~ the Anglo-Saxon conception. To the Communists law is one more instrument <sup>with which</sup> ~~whereby~~ the ruling elite suppresses opposition. ~~Thus, in~~ In the Anglo-Saxon tradition no man, not even the President, is above the law.

~~Consequently, the Soviet Union does not recognize the validity of instruments such as the World Court~~

The prospects are not bright for bridging <sup>the</sup> ~~this~~ gap in the foreseeable future. A symbol of the lack of moral consensus <sup>between these opposing concepts of law</sup> is <sup>the fact that</sup> ~~that~~ neither the League of Nations nor the United Nations, after decades of trying, <sup>has</sup> ~~have~~ ~~not~~ arrived at a commonly-accepted definition of the word aggression. If the nations of the world

the word

cannot agree on a legal definition of aggression, how could they possibly agree on ~~the proper distribution of power and authority~~ a body of international law dealing with basic security matters?

If the necessary moral consensus is not present within any community, law is powerless. If the preconditions for effective law are present, law is inevitable. Law and legal structures are largely reflections of existing political and moral consensus; they are not the cause of this consensus.

While there is no ~~fundamental~~ <sup>governing</sup> law to which the nations of the world actually subscribe, there is, of course, a substantial body of "international law" covering technical questions, such as the immunities of diplomats, ~~the rules of the seas~~, navigation, aviation, radio frequencies, ~~etc.~~ and so on. These technical laws are important and are quietly observed by most nations most of the time because it is in their interest to do so.

The Soviet Union, for example, observes the ~~international~~ <sup>treaties</sup> ~~law~~ concerning international radio frequencies. But the observance of this technical law does not prevent her from jamming Voice of

America broadcasts beamed to people behind the Iron Curtain.

Since the Soviet Union recognizes no truth above Communist dogma and ~~not~~ ~~law~~ ~~above~~ Communist law, she cannot possibly ~~take seriously~~ recognize any intrinsic validity in <sup>the</sup> judgments of the United Nations (<sup>e.g.</sup> ~~the~~ Hungarian revolt) or decisions of the World Court, ~~on any question~~, however technical <sup>they</sup> may be. We should not expect her to take <sup>her disputes</sup> ~~things~~ to the World Court.

But why has our Government been so standoffish with respect to the World Court? <sup>We believe in law and impartial judicial decisions.</sup> We have treated ~~it~~ <sup>the Court almost</sup> as if it were a fossil. Let's face it, the Court can be effective only in relatively non-political technical cases like minor border disputes, alleged violations of air space, and the like. But should not our Government make fuller use of the Court than we have, which has been almost nil. One of the barriers is the Connally Amendment which <sup>by forbidding us to submit to arbitration,</sup> restricts our use of the Court's facilities. <sup>This Amendment which</sup> was designed to protect <sup>our</sup> American sovereignty, actually obstructs our use of the Court in certain cases where such use might resolve <sup>quickly and tension-causing</sup> ~~otherwise unresolvable~~ questions. Some people have suggested, for example, that the United States should <sup>ask the Court to rule on</sup> ~~take~~ the incident of American transport plane which was ~~shot~~ shot down by Soviet fighters

Is this correct?  
EHL

several miles inside the Soviet Union from the Turkish border.

It is difficult for me to believe that the Soviet Union would agree to arbitration on this sensitive matter. But what would we lose by proposing <sup>that</sup> it be ~~amixi~~ adjudicated by the World Court?

Incidentally, I believe the Connally Amendment will be stricken off the books in the current session of Congress, and I hope to work toward that objective.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, I return to where I started. I said we must have hope, hope in certain specific small steps we can take in the direction of greater world order. If we invest all our hope in one giant step to a new world, I ~~amixi~~ feel sure that ~~hope will be turned into~~ <sup>we are inviting</sup> disillusionment. I believe peace is possible, and I believe we must work for it in the small and undramatic ways-- through painstaking ~~or~~ arms control negotiations, in the day-by-day business of the United Nations, in all those daily acts of fidelity which help create a fabric of peace, justice and understanding ~~which must be~~ <sup>basic</sup> the substructure of any enduring order.

Do you believe this?  
EWL



# 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)