

① ~~Least~~ memo
+ Mrs)

②

Sen Tydings

③

cong Brewster - 2nd Dist

Dr Patterson ④

000788

Speech
by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
before
6th National Conference on International
Economic and Social Development
Washington, D.C.
April 30, 1959

What are the moving forces in the history of mankind?

Philosophers and historians have long debated this question.

There was a time - and not so very long ago - when history was written in terms of famous men -- generals, emperors and presidents. In Shakespeare's plays, for example, the common people take the stage only as prosy clowns and buffoons; the timeless poetry comes from royal or noble lips.

But, More recently history has been written in terms of the changes in methods of production - or even of destruction.

The progress from the stone axe to the automated factory - the progress, if one can call it that, from the caveman's club

to the intercontinentl ballistic missile - each has had great effect.

~~More and more, however, I have come to the conviction that the real key to human history lies in the very name of our species - "homo sapiens", or "thinking man."~~

~~A mob without an idea is just a mob; ^{but} with the words "liberty, equality, and fraternity" on its lips it has aroused echoes which still reverberate throughout the world.~~

We are met today to pay tribute to one of those truly great ideas which transform history ^{was} the proposal, put forward in President Truman's Inaugural Address ten years ago, that America and the other industrialized nations should, in his words:

"...help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."

This "bold new program" was the fourth point in President Truman's list of foreign policy objectives for the United States.

It is important to note that "Point 4" was designed to be an integral part of a much broader program. The Point 4 program is not a substitute for adequate military defense. It is not a substitute for sound trade policies. It is not a substitute for any other necessary element in our over-all foreign policy.

But it is a valuable, and indeed indispensable, element to any effective foreign policy, especially in the less-developed areas of the world whose ~~destiny~~ ^{future} may determine the destiny of all mankind.

Mr. Truman's point 4 captured the minds and hearts of men everywhere, both because it was "new and bold" and yet drew its inspiration from our heritage, ~~but~~ ^{like} all great ideas in history, it did not spring full-grown from the brow of one man.

Great ideas emerge from the accumulated wisdom, experience and

000791

aspirations of men, and they have their greatest force when
their time has come.

↳ The Point IV idea is rooted in the humanitarian imperative
of all great religions -- the strong should help the weak, the
rich should help the poor -- *"Do unto others as you would have
them do unto you."*

↳ Point IV was really the projection of our unique historical
experience -- the international application of the lessons that
we learned in the development of the American frontier.

↳ In developing the American West, we formulated a new approach
to training and education -- land grant colleges, vocational
education, the county agents, all the many practices and institu-
tions that were the prototypes for the Point Four projects of
recent years.

↳ At the same time, there was strengthened in the American
character the qualities of optimism, of confidence, of initiative,
and of impatience with obstacles that make up one of our greatest

000792

strengths as a nation.

(D)

What is needed in our foreign policy more than anything else today is that we draw on this great heritage of ours, this well of national strength, to carry through admittedly difficult and discouraging undertakings.

Much of the force of the Point IV idea was its timeliness.
President Truman understood the mighty struggle between totalitarianism and freedom. It was he who launched the Truman doctrine which saved Greece and Turkey from Communism. He knew then, as we all know now, that in the many-faceted world struggle the economically underdeveloped and politically unaligned nations may well hold the balance of power.

We should be proud of the humanitarian roots of the Point IV idea. We should not be apologetic about the fact that rightly used it can be an instrument of greater peace and stability in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. Let us be

000793

grateful that there is a program which is humanitarian and

politically relevant at the same time. *a happy & fortunate combination*

And, speaking of humanitarian values, what is more humani-
tarian than helping to prevent "darkness at noon" from spreading
over areas where new freedom and new hope have just been born?

↳ In retrospect, we can see that "Point Four" was long fore-
shadowed - indeed, was implicit in the United Nations Relief
and Rehabilitation Administration and in the Marshall Plan.

Yet, when President Truman put it forward, it caught even *some of*
his own officials unprepared. As one of them has recalled:

↳ "Messages of surprise and delight poured in from
all over the world, and a hurried meeting of department
representatives was held to consider the practical
problems in meeting the expectations which the
President's words had produced overnight. As we gathered
in the State Department's conference room, the atmosphere

was a curious mixture of excitement and perplexity.

"A senior official of the Department was the first to speak. 'Well, fellows,' he said with a smile, 'what do you suppose he meant?'"

Such was the sweep and the dynamism of the President's idea that even today, after ten years of living with it and working with it, we are still discovering in it fresh meanings and fresh dimensions.

But, An idea is a dazzling, even a blinding thing - and there is every human tendency to dim it down a bit, so that it is more comfortable to live with.

So, for a while, too many of us put on heavily tinted glasses before we dared look this idea in the face.

First, there was a tendency to "sell it cheap." All we had to do, we assured ourselves, was to pass on to other peoples

our so-called "know-how", and then leave them to their own resources. It was the easiest kind of virtue, costing us little more than words.

Second, when we began to realize that "know-how" is paralyzed without some material backing - be it something as simple as fertilizer or as elaborate as a hydro-electric project - we felt a need to avoid even the appearance of generosity. So we began calling much of our economic aid "defense support" and applying the label "Mutual Security Program" to the whole enterprise.

Overseas aid suffered -- and still suffers -- from these heavy military overtones. Too often, we give the impression that our main interest is to buy allies in the cold war.

Third, we seemed fearful that we might not get full credit for the element of genuine generosity which remained in the program. We wanted the tag, "Made in America," fastened firmly

to it.

~~So~~. Although we did join in the UN Expanded Technical Assistance Program, and more recently in the UN Special Fund, we have preferred to keep most of our aid in our own hands.

↳ Unfortunately, this is a game that two can play.

Khrushchev does not hesitate to pick up a good idea when he sees one -- even from the "capitalists" he professes to despise.

The Russians, it's true, were "Ivans-come-lately" in this field - but they are catching up fast. Their loans and their technicians are already at work in many crucial areas of the world.

↳ It is a real measure of the basic soundness of the "Point Four" concept that it has survived ten years of cold war and worldwide turmoil.

(new word or Foreign Economic Aid)
↳ Some progress has been made, particularly in the recognition of the need for more continuity. Two years ago, the Administration

took to climb out, but I will say this -- it is a strange way
 to get out of a well or to put into operation a long-range
 development program.

A curious attitude has developed about this whole overseas
 aid program -- a sort of national inferiority complex. We
 seem to think of Uncle Sam as Uncle Sap, constantly being
 sold a bill of goods by ^{European, African} Asian leaders of dubious loyalty to
 our side. As the Draper Report puts it:

"In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the
 constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may
 be gradually choking this vital feature of our national
 security to death."

Mistakes will be made in any great enterprise, but what
 bothers me more than the mistakes is the way we dwell upon
 them - rather than taking them as lessons to be learned while
 we move forward.

④ Not change of Program
-13-
But change of Heart

We must be for peace and progress -- and not simply against
the evil threat of communism.

000798

Too often our aid programs have been sold to the American
people on the basis of being against Communism, rather than
being for humanity. They have been considered painful
expedients -- hopefully short-term -- rather than the heart of
a constructive American foreign policy designed to build a stable
and enduring peace through the conquests of poverty, disease
and suffering. ~~It is this failure to accurately present~~
to the people the nature of ^{the} competition that we face and the
scope of the problems that mankind is encountering that limits
the effectiveness of our technical assistance and foreign aid
programs.

The motivation
~~Mobilization~~ for these important and valuable programs should
not come from the fear of Communism, but rather from the require-
ments of our political and religious heritage. We must never

✓
Lactamoy
m. M. M. M.
John P. ...
Casper - Johnson

forget that our true strength lies in the moral and political principles upon which our society is based -- the principles of human dignity, equality, and brotherhood. Our own revolution was based upon a belief in the God-given rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is these thoughts and these ideals which should motivate us today. *Just as they inspire others.*

We are indeed our brother's keeper and we must act in that capacity. We are blessed with abundance and we have a moral duty to share it.

Programs and policies that are designed only to resist the evil forces of Communism are never as effective as efforts that are made to help humanity. As President Truman said almost eight years ago -- "The only kind of a war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies -- poverty, disease, hunger and illiteracy."

His words were drawn from the heart and the wisdom and the history of the American people. ~~But they~~ as we

know, that words, however eloquent, are not enough; nor do good intentions, however generous, suffice.

Deeds, networks, are needed.

We must be for Peace and Progress - and not simply Against the evil Threat of Communism

The real trouble is not so much what the Communists are attempting to do in the world, but how much less we are doing than we can and should do. We can be sure that the Communists will be glad to fill in any gaps we leave.

~~It is ten years since President Truman enunciated what became known as the "Point Four" idea - the idea of aiding the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world.~~

And we need to recapture the enlightened enthusiasm that guided American policy in the great days of innovation and daring under the Marshall Plan and the Point Four programs ~~of President Truman~~. These early programs were characterized by imagination, vision, substance and long-term planning.

It is not enough to merely perform the ritual in foreign aid -- there must be faith -- a faith in the importance and *rightness* ~~righteousness~~ of our policies. We need more than the form -- *but* we need the spirit, if our programs of assistance are going to be genuinely constructive and effective.

and We must recognize that the task of helping other nations to help themselves is a continuing task. It will not be finished next year or the year after. Therefore, let us plan ahead. Our struggle against Communism and against man's ancient enemies of poverty, disease and hunger will be a long drawn out battle.

but So let us prepare ourselves accordingly. To be effective our foreign aid programs should be established on a longer term basis, so that both we and those we seek to help can plan ahead and can rely on a sustained effort.

A great country - a great people - should not be embarrassed to undertake noble and disinterested actions. Indeed, we should rather be ashamed that our generous intentions are too often over-taken by petty and unworthy afterthoughts.

So, it seems to me, the time has come to take this bold new idea of "Point Four" out of the dusty by-roads onto which it has meandered, and put it once more on the broad highway, as a major element in our international policy.

Therefore *at least*
 I believe ¹ we must make three major efforts to strengthen the economic and technical assistance programs of the United States:

1. Place our aid programs on a long-term planning basis,
 in order to provide the assurance of continuity to the leadership of developing nations, and to avoid the tremendous waste of stop-and-go, hot-and-cold programming.

*Develop Loan Fund 1 1/2 Bill - for 5 yrs
 at 7.5 Billion
 all!*

2. Seek to supplement bilateral programs at every opportunity
 with multilateral approaches, using existing instrumentalities such as the United Nations and its associated agencies.

3. Design the ~~Aid~~ programs not in terms of defensive stopgaps, but rather as the affirmative, constructive building blocks of a world free of poverty and suffering.

To carry out this program I have proposed what I like to call "the works of peace."

Food
 I have recently proposed a "Food for Peace" program, which will put to use the God-given abundance of our farms - not haphazardly, not as a veiled device for dumping surpluses, not on a hand-to-mouth, year-to-year basis, but as an integral part of our total ^{foreign policy} effort, planned for five years ahead.

HEALTH
 Together with Senator Lister Hill, I have proposed a "Health for Peace" program, designed to mobilize the ^{medical + scientific} resources of America and of all nations for a concerted attack upon the dread diseases which weaken, cripple, and kill millions of persons throughout the world.

Education & Change
 I have called, also, for an "Education for Peace" program of world-wide educational development and expanded East-West

exchanges of scholars - to be financed largely out of the
 several billion dollars of "soft currencies" or "counterpart
funds" being accumulated by the United States in exchange for
 food shipments or as repayment of loans. *We must wage war on illiteracy.*

I can envisage a "science for peace" program, which, among
 other things, would seek breakthroughs in economic development -
 such as a practical process for the de-^{salting}~~salination~~ sea water
 which would make many of earth's deserts bloom. ~~How can~~

And, last week, I was happy to join with two esteemed
 colleagues - Senator Fulbright and Senator Kennedy - in sponsoring
 amendments to the Mutual Security Act which will transform it
 into something much more like the "Development for Peace"
program we all want.

First, and most important, we are proposing that the
 Development Loan Fund be financed to the extent of \$1.5 billion
 a year for a period of five years - \$7.5 billion in all. And we

are proposing - as the Administration, indeed, proposed two years ago - that the Fund be empowered to borrow this money from the Treasury, as the Export-Import Bank already does, so that it will not have to seek fresh appropriations - and risk fresh curtailments - each and every year.

Second, we are proposing to rewrite the preamble and statement of purposes of the Act, to brush away the cobwebs that have gathered on it over the years, and put in in language worthy of our best traditions as a liberal and democratic nation. *with emphasis on Economic progress and Political freedom.*

Third, as a step toward decreasing the present heavily military character of the program, we are proposing increased authority for the President to transfer funds originally allocated for ^{to} military hardware ^{to} economic purposes. And, for the same reason, we propose increased authority for our Ambassadors to

coordinate military aid with economic and political objectives.

~~We do not suggest that the funds thus made available be used just for the sake of using them.~~ ^{W/sek} Indeed, ~~We want~~ to make a clean break with the argument, so often used in Congress, that the mere fact that the funds available for a given year are not fully used is a reason for curtailing next year's effort.

No great business enterprise is conducted upon such a hand-to-mouth, ever-bare-cupboard basis.

Instead, we wish to use the availability of adequate funds - and I emphasize the word availability - as an inspiration to our friends throughout the world to prepare sound, well-considered programs of economic development - in effect, to set their own national goals.

↙ We are now nearing the end of the era of Western colonialism.

and (I wish I could say the same about the new imperialism of the

Soviet Union and Red China.) The great struggles for independence which have characterized our generation have been, for the peoples involved, a challenging and inspiring experience. They have written a heroic chapter in the world's history.

↳ But, after the fireworks, after the celebrations of independence, there comes the letdown. We knew it ourselves,

Then came after the triumph of our own Revolution, ~~There followed a few~~

the equally difficult task of establishing
~~years of buckering and fighting, until the Constitutional~~
orderly & free government.
~~Convention put us back again on the forward road.~~

↳ Nationalism is a steed you can ride to independence - but,

by itself, it does not carry a people further than the first

Fourth of July. The plain truth is that some of the new nations

are floundering badly, and most of them are feeling the chill

gray dawn of the morning after.

Political independence must be ^{related} ~~related~~ to economic interdependence. The passion of nationalism must be translated into hard national goals.

And these goals are incomplete without timetables for achieving them. When I participated as an American delegate at the United Nations, I had occasion to observe how insistent -- and rightly so -- our Asian and African friends were on timetables for the achievement of political independence.

We need goals for tomorrow's kind of independence - independence from poverty - and we need timetables by which the progress toward these goals can be assessed.

These will vary from country to country. Some countries, like India, have formulated their national purposes, set their goals, and are well on the way to achieving them. We - and I include other industrialized nations such as Britain, France, Canada, Western Germany, and Japan - can and do sit down with the Indian leaders and see how we can move towards these goals

in a great partnership of nations.

↳ In other countries, what ~~are~~^{is} needed are the pre-conditions for establishing such goals. The UN Special Fund, under Paul Hoffman's able leadership, is already busy laying the groundwork, making the basic surveys of resources and potentialities which are too often lacking. In many countries it should be possible, after this essential preliminary work has been done, to set both short-term and long-term goals.

↳ There is every reason why some of these goals should be projected on a regional basis. We could take the lead in the Organization of American States, for example, in mounting a a five or seven year development plan for Latin America - spelling it out in terms of miles of roads, kilowatts of electricity, and tons of steel. We could do the same with the Colombo Plan nations, in cooperation with Japan, and in the Middle East, with its tremendous oil resources -- and in emergent Africa, too.

In all these undertakings, we would, of course, look to private investment to do its full share, and I might say that by "full share", I mean substantially more than it is doing now. The conditions ^{suitable} for private investment must ~~be~~ often be created by public funds. And public-financed projects usually cannot achieve their full potential without private investment. There is no essential conflict between those two complimentary sources of development capital.

Thus, we would be building upon the experience of the Marshall Plan - the most spectacularly successful example of our post-war economic policy - which succeeded because it had a goal, and because the participating nations, with wise leadership from the United States, set targets for themselves and mobilized their resources to meet them.

I would go further. There will be a summit conference this summer, and I hope that President DeGaulle will have the opportunity

to repeat - with his grand command of language - what he said
last month:

"In our time, the only quarrel worthwhile is that
of mankind...Why should we not put together a percentage
of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food
products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists,
some of our trucks, ships, aircraft, to defeat poverty,
develop resources, and help the work of the less developed
peoples?

"Let us do this - not that they should be the pawns
of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and
peace."

Let us always remember, however, that King Hussein of
Jordan so wisely said - that the United Nations is the summit
conference of the small nations. If only the Big Four could
go forward from their own summit to mankind's summit at the
United Nations - and could come prepared to work together for

the welfare of all humanity. What clouds of frustration and fear would be cleared from our human horizons!

↳ The United Nations represents one of our great hopes for a just and lasting peace. It should be made a more effective instrument. As a step in that direction I have introduced a resolution in this Congress to strengthen the United Nations' International Court of Justice by deleting the so-called Connally amendment from our declaration of acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction. It is for this reason also that I have joined with Senator Clark and others in sponsoring a resolution recommending that the Charter of the United Nations be reviewed to determine what changes should be made in it to promote peace through the development of enforceable world law.

↳ At the United Nations, the great goals could be formulated - let us call them "Targets for the Twentieth Century". And, each year, its proceedings would be dominated, not by bitter

harangues, but by sober assessment of the progress of its member nations toward these goals.

This is a bold idea - but no bolder than President Truman's was ten years ago. For, all too often, we forget this vital passage in his Inaugural Address:

"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies, wherever practicable. It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom."

4/29/59

COPY

Speech
by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
before
6th National Conference on International
Economic and Social Development
Washington, D.C.
April 30, 1959

What are the moving forces in the history of mankind?

Philosophers and historians have long debated this question.

There was a time - and not so very long ago - when history was written in terms of famous men -- generals, emperors and presidents. In Shakespeare's plays, for example, the common people take the stage only as prosy clowns and buffoons; the timeless poetry comes from royal or noble lips.

More recently history has been written in terms of the changes in methods of production - or even of destruction. The progress from the stone axe to the automated factory - the progress, if one can call it that, from the caveman's club

COPY

to the intercontinental ballistic missile - each has had great effect.

More and more, however, I have come to the conviction that the real key to human history lies in the very name of our species - "homo sapiens", or thinking man.

A mob without an idea is just a mob; with the words "liberty, equality, and fraternity" on its lips it has aroused echoes which still reverberate throughout the world.

We are met today to pay tribute to one of those truly great ideas which transform history - the proposal, put forward in President Truman's Inaugural Address ten years ago, that America and the other industrialized nations should, in his words:

"...help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."

COPY

This "bold new program" was the fourth point in President

Truman's list of foreign policy objectives for the United States.

It is important to note that Point 4 was designed to be an

integral part of a much broader program. The Point 4 program

is not a substitute for adequate military defense. It is not

a substitute for sound trade policies. It is not a substitute

for any other necessary element in our over-all foreign policy.

But it is a valuable, and indeed indispensable, element to any

effective foreign policy, especially in the less-developed areas

of the world whose destiny may determine the destiny of all

mankind.

Mr. Truman's point 4 captured the minds and hearts of men

everywhere, both because it was new and bold and yet drew its

inspiration from heritage. But, like all great ideas in

history, it did not spring full-grown from the brow of one man.

Great ideas emerge from the accumulated wisdom, experience and

aspirations of men, and they have their greatest force when
their time has come.

The Point IV idea is rooted in the humanitarian imperative of all great religions -- the strong should help the weak, the rich should help the poor.

Point IV was really the projection of our unique historical experience -- the international application of the lessons that we learned in the development of the American frontier.

In developing the American West, we formulated a new approach to training and education -- land grant colleges, vocational education, the county agents, all the many practices and institutions that were the prototypes for the Point Four projects of recent years.

At the same time, there was strengthened in the American character the qualities of optimism, of confidence, of initiative, and of impatience with obstacles that make up one of our greatest

strengths as a nation.

COPY

What is needed in our foreign policy more than anything else today is that we draw on this great heritage of ours, this well of national strength, to carry through admittedly difficult and discouraging undertakings.

Much of the force of the Point IV idea was its timeliness. President Truman understood the mighty struggle between totalitarianism and freedom. It was he who launched the Truman doctrine which saved Greece and Turkey from Communism. He knew then, as we all know now, that in the many-faceted world struggle the economically underdeveloped and politically unaligned nations may well hold the balance of power.

We should be proud of the humanitarian roots of the Point IV idea. We should not be apologetic about the fact that rightly used it can be an instrument of greater peace and stability in the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism. Let us be

grateful that there is a program which is humanitarian and politically relevant at the same time.

And, speaking of humanitarian values, what is more humanitarian than helping to prevent "darkness at noon" from spreading over areas where new freedom and new hope have just been born?

In retrospect, we can see that "Point Four" was long foreshadowed - indeed, was implicit in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and in the Marshall Plan.

Yet, when President Truman put it forward, it caught even his own officials unprepared. As one of them has recalled:

"Messages of surprise and delight poured in from all over the world, and a hurried meeting of department representatives was held to consider the practical problems in meeting the expectations which the President's words had produced overnight. As we gathered in the State Department's conference room, the atmosphere

COPY
was a curious mixture of excitement and perplexity.

"A senior official of the Department was the first to speak. 'Well, fellows,' he said with a smile, 'what do you suppose he meant?'"

Such was the sweep and the dynamism of the President's idea that even today, after ten years of living with it and working with it, we are still discovering in it fresh meanings and fresh dimensions.

An idea is a dazzling, even a blinding thing - and there is every human tendency to dim it down a bit, so that it is more comfortable to live with.

So, for a while, too many of us put on heavily tinted glasses before we dared look this idea in the face.

First, there was a tendency to sell it cheap. All we had to do, we assured ourselves, was to pass on to other peoples

COPY

our so-called "know-how", and then leave them to their own resources. It was the easiest kind of virtue, costing us little more than words.

Second, when we began to realize that "know-how" is paralyzed without some material backing - be it something as simple as fertilizer or as elaborate as a hydro-electric project - we felt a need to avoid even the appearance of generosity. So we began calling much of our economic aid "defense support" and applying the label "Mutual Security Program" to the whole enterprise.

Overseas aid suffered -- and still suffers -- from these heavy military overtones. Too often, we give the impression that our main interest is to buy allies in the cold war.

Third, we seemed fearful that we might not get full credit for the element of genuine generosity which remained in the program. We wanted the tag, "Made in America," fastened firmly

COPY

to it.

So. although we did join in the UN Expanded Technical Assistance Program, and more recently in the UN Special Fund, we have preferred to keep most of our aid in our own hands.

Unfortunately, this is a game that two can play.

Khrushchev does not hesitate to pick up a good idea when he sees one -- even from the "capitalists" he professes to despise. The Russians, it's true, were "Ivans-come-lately" in this field - but they are catching up fast. Their loans and their technicians are already at work in many crucial areas of the world.

It is a real measure of the basic soundness of the "Point Four" concept that it has survived ten years of cold war and worldwide turmoil.

Some progress has been made, particularly in the recognition of the need for more continuity. Two years ago, the Administration

asked Congress to approve the establishment of the Development

Loan Fund.

Taking its courage in both hands, it asked for a three-year authorization for the new Fund, totalling \$2 billion - \$500 million for the first year, \$750 million for each of the two succeeding years.

In 1957, it did at least get a two-year authorization.

All last year, high Administration officials were talking of a request this year of \$1 billion a year for a period of five years.

As recently as November 13 our present Secretary of State - whom we all wish well in his tremendous responsibilities - told many of you at the International Cooperation Workshop here in Washington:

-11-
COPY

"If the Development Loan Fund is to be an effective instrument for peaceful development, it must have resources for substantially increased activities on the order of \$1 billion a year. It must have continuity over a period of years."

I am sure he is of the same opinion still. But the Administration's good intentions have been overshadowed by its seeming obsession with a balanced budget. The President has asked for only \$700 million - little more than half of the total of screened applications which the Fund already has on file. And, instead of asking for five, three, or even two years of authorization, he has limited his request to only fiscal 1960.

I am reminded of the old problem of the man who got out of a well by climbing up two feet each hour, then slipping back one. I cannot for the life of me remember how long he

took to climb out, ~~but I will say this~~ it is a strange way

to get out of a well or to put into operation a long-range

development program.

A curious attitude has developed about this whole overseas aid program -- a sort of national inferiority complex. We seem to think of Uncle Sam as Uncle Sap, constantly being sold a bill of goods by Asian leaders of dubious loyalty to our side. As the Draper Report puts it:

"In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security to death."

Mistakes will be made in any great enterprise, but what bothers me more than the mistakes is the way we dwell upon them - rather than taking them as lessons to be learned while we move forward.

We must be for peace and progress and not simply against
the evil threat of communism.

Too often our aid programs have been sold to the American people on the basis of being against Communism, rather than being for humanity. They have been considered painful expedients -- hopefully short-term -- rather than the heart of a constructive American foreign policy designed to build a stable and enduring peace through the conquests of poverty, disease and suffering. It is this failure to accurately present to the people the nature of competition that we face and the scope of the problems that mankind is encountering that limits the effectiveness of our technical assistance and foreign aid programs.

Mobilization for these important and valuable programs should not come from the fear of Communism, but rather from the requirements of our political and religious heritage. We must never

COPY

forget that our true strength lies in the moral and political principles upon which our society is based -- the principles of human dignity, equality, and brotherhood. Our own revolution was based upon a belief in the God-given rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is these thoughts and these ideals which should motivate us today.

We are indeed our brother's keeper and we must act in that capacity. We are blessed with abundance and we have a moral duty to share it.

Programs and policies that are designed only to resist the evil forces of Communism are never as effective as efforts that are made to help humanity. As President Truman said almost eight years ago -- "The only kind of a war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies -- poverty, disease, hunger and illiteracy.

COPY

His words were drawn from the heart and the wisdom

and the history of the American people. But he knew, as we know, that words, however eloquent, are not enough; nor do good intentions, however generous, suffice.

They must result in "Works for Peace".

The real trouble is not so much what the Communist are attempting to do in the world, but how much less we are doing than we can and should do. We can be sure that the Communists will be glad to fill in any gaps we leave.

It is ten years since President Truman enunciated what became known as the "Point Four" idea -- the idea of aiding the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

We need to recapture the enlightened enthusiasm that guided American policy in the great days of innovation and daring under the Marshall Plan and the Point Four programs of President Truman. These early programs were characterized by imagination, vision, substance and long-term planning.

COPY

It is not enough to merely perform the ritual in foreign aid -- there must be faith -- a faith in the importance and righteousness of our policies. We need more than the form -- we need the spirit, if our programs of assistance are going to be genuinely constructive and effective.

We must recognize that the task of helping other nations to help themselves is a continuing task. It will not be finished next year or the year after. Therefore, let us plan ahead. Our struggle against Communism and against man's ancient enemies of poverty, disease and hunger will be a long drawn out battle.

So let us prepare ourselves accordingly. To be effective our foreign aid programs should be established on a longer term basis, so that both we and those we seek to help can plan ahead and can rely on a sustained effort.

COPY

A great country - a great people - should not be embarrassed

to undertake noble and disinterested actions. Indeed, we should rather be ashamed that our generous intentions are too often over-taken by petty and unworthy afterthoughts.

So, it seems to me, the time has come to take this bold new idea of "Point Four" out of the dusty by-roads onto which it has meandered, and put it once more on the broad highway, as a major element in our international policy.

I believe that we must make three major efforts to strengthen the economic and technical assistance programs of the United States:

1. Place our aid programs on a long-term planning basis, in order to provide the assurance of continuity to the leadership of developing nations, and to avoid the tremendous waste of stop-and-go, hot-and-cold programming.
2. Seek to supplement bilateral programs at every opportunity with multilateral approaches, using existing instrumentalities such as the United Nations and its associated agencies.

COPY

3. Design the aid programs not in terms of defensive stopgaps, but rather as the affirmative, constructive building blocks of a world free of poverty and suffering.

To carry out this program I have proposed what I like to call "the works of peace."

I have recently proposed a "Food for Peace" program, which will put to use the God-given abundance of our farms - not haphazardly, not as a veiled device for dumping surpluses, not on a hand-to-mouth, year-to-year basis, but as an integral part of our total effort, planned for five years ahead.

Together with Senator Lister Hill, I have proposed a "Health for Peace" program, designed to mobilize the resources of America and of all nations for a concerted attack upon the dread diseases which weaken, cripple, and kill millions of persons throughout the world.

I have called, also, for an "Education for Peace" program of world-wide educational development and expanded East-West

exchanges of scholars - to be financed largely out of the
several billion dollars of "soft currencies" or "counterpart
funds" being accumulated by the United States in exchange for
food shipments or as repayment of loans.

I can envisage a "science for peace" program, which, among
other things, would seek breakthroughs in economic development -
such as a practical process for the de-salination of sea water
which would make many of earth's deserts bloom.

And, last week, I was happy to join with two esteemed
colleagues - Senator Fulbright and Senator Kennedy - in sponsoring
amendments to the Mutual Security Act which will transform it
into something much more like the "Development for Peace"
program we all want.

First, and most important, we are proposing that the
Development Loan Fund be financed to the extent of \$1.5 billion
a year for a period of five years - \$7.5 billion in all. And we

COPY

are proposing - as the Administration, indeed, proposed two years ago - that the Fund be empowered to borrow this money from the Treasury, as the Export-Import Bank already does, so that it will not have to seek fresh appropriations - and risk fresh curtailments - each and every year.

Second, we are proposing to rewrite the preamble and statement of purposes of the Act, to brush away the cobwebs that have gathered on it over the years, and put in in language worthy of our best traditions as a liberal and democratic nation.

Third, as a step toward decreasing the present heavily military character of the program, we are proposing increased authority for the President to transfer funds originally allocated for military hardware to economic purposes. And, for the same reason, we propose increased authority for our Ambassadors to

coordinate military aid with economic and political objectives.

COPY

We do not suggest that the funds thus made available be used just for the sake of using them. Indeed, we want to make a clean break with the argument, so often used in Congress, that the mere fact that the funds available for a given year are not fully used is a reason for curtailing next year's effort.

No great business enterprise is conducted upon such a hand-to-mouth, ever-bare-cupboard basis.

Instead, we wish to use the availability of adequate funds - and I emphasize the word availability - as an inspiration to our friends throughout the world to prepare sound, well-considered programs of economic development - in effect, to set their own national goals.

We are now nearing the end of the era of Western colonialism.

(I wish I could say the same about the new imperialism of the Soviet Union and Red China.) The great struggles for independence which have characterized our generation have been, for the peoples involved, a challenging and inspiring experience. They have written a heroic chapter in the world's history.

But, after the fireworks, after the celebrations of independence, there comes the letdown. We knew it ourselves, after the triumph of our own Revolution. There followed a few years of bickering and in-fighting, until the Constitutional Convention put us back again on the forward road.

Nationalism is a steed you can ride to independence - but, by itself, it does not carry a people further than the first Fourth of July. The plain truth is that some of the new nations are floundering badly, and most of them are feeling the chill gray dawn of the morning after.

COPY

Political independence must be related to economic interdependence. The passion of nationalism must be translated into hard national goals.

And these goals are incomplete without timetables for achieving them. When I participated as an American delegate at the United Nations, I had occasion to observe how insistent -- and rightly so -- our Asian and African friends were on timetables for the achievement of political independence.

We need goals for tomorrow's kind of independence - independence from poverty - and we need timetables by which the progress toward these goals can be assessed.

These will vary from country to country. Some countries, like India, have formulated their national purposes, set their goals, and are well on the way to achieving them. We - and I include other industrialized nations such as Britain, France, Canada, Western Germany, and Japan - can and do sit down with the Indian leaders and see how we can move towards these goals

in a great partnership of nations.

COPY

In other countries, what are needed are the pre-conditions for establishing such goals. The UN Special Fund, under Paul Hoffman's able leadership, is already busy laying the groundwork, making the basic surveys of resources and potentialities which are too often lacking. In many countries it should be possible, after this essential preliminary work has been done, to set both short-term and long-term goals.

There is every reason why some of these goals should be projected on a regional basis. We could take the lead in the Organization of American States, for example, in mounting a five or seven year development plan for Latin America - spelling it out in terms of miles of roads, kilowatts of electricity, and tons of steel. We could do the same with the Colombo Plan nations, in cooperation with Japan, and in the Middle East, with its tremendous oil resources -- and in emergent Africa, too.

COPY

In all these undertakings, we would, of course, look to private investment to do its full share, and I might say that by "full share", I mean substantially more than it is doing now. The conditions for private investment must be often be created by public funds. And public-financed projects usually cannot achieve their full potential without private investment. There is no essential conflict between those two complimentary sources of development capital.

Thus, we would be building upon the experience of the Marshall Plan - the most spectacularly successful example of our post-war economic policy - which succeeded because it had a goal, and because the participating nations, with wise leadership from the United States, set targets for themselves and mobilized their resources to meet them.

I would go further. There will be a summit conference this summer, and I hope that President DeGaulle will have the opportunity

-26-
COPY

to repeat - with his grand command of language - what he said

last month:

"In our time, the only quarrel worthwhile is that of mankind... Why should we not put together a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft, to defeat poverty, develop resources, and help the work of the less developed peoples?"

"Let us do this - not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace."

Let us always remember, however, that King Hussein of Jordan so wisely said - that the United Nations is the summit conference of the small nations. If only the Big Four could go forward from their own summit to mankind's summit at the United Nations - and could come prepared to work together for

COPY
the welfare of all humanity. What clouds of frustration and fear
would be cleared from our human horizons!

The United Nations represents one of our great hopes for a just and lasting peace. It should be made a more effective instrument. As a step in that direction I have introduced a resolution in this Congress to strengthen the United Nations' International Court of Justice by deleting the so-called Connally amendment from our declaration of acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction. It is for this reason also that I have joined with Senator Clark and others in sponsoring a resolution recommending that the Charter of the United Nations be reviewed to determine what changes should be made in it to promote peace through the development of enforceable world law.

At the United Nations, the great goals could be formulated - let us call them "Targets for the Twentieth Century". And, each year, its proceedings would be dominated, not by bitter

COPY

harangues, but by sober assessment of the progress of its member nations toward these goals.

This is a bold idea - but no bolder than President Truman's was ten years ago. For, all too often, we forget this vital passage in his Inaugural Address:

"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies, wherever practicable. It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom."

4/29/59



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