

The Task of American Leadership 1850

Strengthening the International Order

Excerpts from Address
by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
before
Sunday Night Forum
Tucson, Arizona
October 25, 1959

Univ of Arizona

Dr Robert Nugent
Dr Robert Humphrey

World
Peace
&
Under
Law!

The dream of a world living at peace and under law is as old as civilized man. I share this dream, and I believe you do, too. Yet we would be foolish indeed if we confused our dream of one world under law with the tragic reality of two worlds divided by Communism.

2 worlds

Nevertheless, we dare not surrender the dream. And we cannot fail to take steps toward the ultimate goal of freedom, peace, justice and human dignity for men and women everywhere.

our goal

There is no giant step that will take us where we want to go, but there are small steps we can take.

Steps
Close

and others

Such along
our own

Many such steps can be taken through greater use of the United

Nations and its related agencies, such as the World Court.

Programs
Cultural
Mexico
L.A.
DLF

U.N.

functional

3 Goals:

- (1) Realize our full Economic Potential
Goals - Plans
- (2) achieve full dignity, freedom, opportunity, & justice for all
- (3) Just & enduring peace

001851

U.N. = Nationalism + Interdependent
ener

In fact, the U.N. and its agencies are the best bargains

in American foreign policy!

FORUM for U.S. Policy

We should be pressing for safeguarded disarmament through

DISARM

the U.N. We should be working for a well fed and healthy world

FOOD

through the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health

HEALTH

Organization. We should be channelling more of our efforts to

Plus our own

Educ

help underdeveloped nations through the economic agencies of the

Technical

Econ

United Nations.

World Court

Educ

We should be taking the lead in strengthening and broadening
the powers of the World Court in solving disputes between nations.

And yet it is right here, in our relationship with the World Court,
that we have perhaps failed more significantly than in any other
area of international activity.

The so-called Connally Amendment, written on the Senate floor
in 1946 during debate, drastically limits our participation in the
International Court of Justice. By adding the words "as determined

Objectives
and
ask others
USSR - to help!
Also Europe //

and >L

LAW

by the United States" to the reservation of "disputes which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States," the amendment made our high-sounding words about the "rule of law" a hollow mockery.

10 Cases in
13 years -
15 Judges

↳ This reservation is entirely unnecessary, because the Court's Statute itself denies the Court jurisdiction in the domestic affairs of its participating states. Two-thirds of the States which adhere to the Court have not adopted such reservations.

↳ In order to remove this road block to our fuller participation in the World Court, I introduced last March Senate Resolution 94 to repeal the Connally Amendment. The Resolution has not been acted upon, and I want to tell you why.

↳ President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message last January said that our relationship to the World Court should be re-examined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule

001853

of force in the affairs of nations." He implied that the Congress would

receive a more specific proposal along this line. No proposal

has been forthcoming.

↳ Vitally important support for the Resolution has come from the

American Bar Association, which indeed has led the fight to strengthen

the Court.

ABA
Chas
Rhyme and ↳ Both the Department of State and the Department of Justice

have reported favorably on my Resolution to abolish the Court-

crippling amendment.

The President's words about "the rule of law" were followed

by other important statements addressed by the Vice President

and the Attorney General on this same subject. But while both

of these high Administration spokesmen reaffirmed the President's

concern with the problem of the Connally Amendment, neither

mentioned the Resolution before the Senate designed to solve the

problem.

And in order to secure the two-thirds majority of the Senate needed to repeal the Connally Amendment, it is absolutely necessary that the great prestige and power of the Presidency be thrown behind a specific resolution.

!!

It must have bipartisan support.

Without very strong backing from the President and the Administration we cannot muster the needed votes. And this means that we must have far more than speeches in general support of the idea, as important as such addresses may be.

I have, therefore, recently addressed a letter to the President commending him for his words in support of a strengthened World Court, and requesting his personal support of Senate Resolution 94.

^{saying}
I wrote the President that I felt it "particularly urgent now, after the recent visit of the Soviet Chairman, to make it doubly clear to the entire world that, while we shall strive

001855

mightily for a peaceful resolution of Soviet-U.S. differences,
 our goal has not shifted toward a two-power world; rather, we
 continue to look resolutely toward an international system in which
 the rights of all nations will be respected, regardless of size
 or military power."

We must take every opportunity, for example, to use not only
 the World Court, but also other related agencies of the United
 Nations in carrying out the objectives of American foreign policy.

It is quite true that the more we utilize the machinery of the
 United Nations, the more we strengthen the international "family
 of nations." Consistent use of the machinery of the World Court
 would build up in custom and practice acceptance of a world
 guided by the principles of justice rather than brute force.

I do not suggest that the time has yet come when we can
 expect the Soviet Union to submit to the rule of law, despite
 the protestations of peace and friendship now emanating from the

*But a nation which is based on the principle
 of law and the rule of law, rather than the rule of men,
 surely should take the lead in establishing an International
 Court of Justice with the power of law. We in the U.S.
 should act to remove the shackles which restrict the U.N. Court.*

*enforcement
 (1) sanctions
 take
 credit
 census*

001856

On the contrary -- despite the possibility of coming to
 some kind of agreement on a safeguarded arms control program
 with the Soviets -- we can expect an ever fiercer economic and
political competition from the Communists.

*page 2
step 4*

We need to understand the Russian people, their sense of
 drive, their desire for position in the world.

As to the second clear pattern in the Khrushchev visit,
 we must take quite seriously the Soviet determination to surpass
 us economically. It is a fact that Soviet production has been
 rising at an astonishing rate. It is a fact that most of this
 production has been hard, fat-free non-luxury production --
 unlike our own, which has heavy proportions of luxury production.

*Es
compet*

It is a fact that with still only a fraction of our total
 gross economic product, the Soviet Union has been

(40%)

001857

able to divert substantial amounts of production to economic
aid in the underdeveloped countries, to use its economic
strength for political purposes beyond its borders.

The Soviet leaders are not supermen, and the Russian
system is not intrinsically superior. But we have seen what
dogged purpose and determination and tenacity have been able
to do with a system which has fundamentally less potential
efficiency than our own system -- developed as it has been
over a long period of trial and error. Yet no system -- no
matter how well engineered and constructed -- can reach its
full potential without vigorous leadership and coordination.

Let us realize that our superior system can win the economic
competition only if our political and economic leadership is as
hard-working, effective and tenacious as the monolithic
leadership of Communist society.

001858

Basic Issues

~~At present~~, I wish to emphasize what I feel to be a most important consideration: that the basic issue between our free society and the Communist world is not whether one society can produce more than the other. This is important, but it is not more important than human dignity and the rights of man.

The true issue is over which society can produce not only a life of material abundance, but also a life of individual freedom and dignity.

↳ The pattern of the Khrushchev visit has emphasized the announced policy of the Soviet Union to seek peace, and, specifically, to seek disarmament. Khrushchev has hammered away at this theme constantly.

Of course, he has scored a great propaganda triumph in this. Without a doubt he has been successful in many parts of the world in creating the image of a Soviet society bent on

001859
"peaceful coexistence" and, by implication, of Western society
dragging its feet, reluctantly, unwillingly entertaining the
idea of disarmament. (This morning's Press)

But Khrushchev is perfectly capable of reaping what
propaganda he can out of what could be a serious proposal to
get down to cases on the question of arms control and disarmament.
Surely the Russian people long for peace. And -- understanding
that Khrushchev is fundamentally a political man preferring to
substitute guile and cunning and other nonviolent means for
brute force wherever possible -- it may well be that Khrushchev
himself would welcome the opportunity to shift a good share of
the Soviet production now going into arms into other types of
production.

It is even possible that he would agree to a rather thorough-
going system of inspection and controls to guarantee a disarmament
agreement -- which, of course, we must absolutely insist upon.

At any rate, until proved to be a hollow gesture, I believe that we must give Mr. Khrushchev's proposals serious attention and discussion.

And if it proves true that Mr. Khrushchev would be willing to agree to an enforceable disarmament program, then it is high time, and even overdue, that we begin to think through some of the implications of various types of disarmament.

For example, what would be the impact on our economy of a radical reduction in Government spending for arms? Would there be severe economic dislocation, unemployment? And what would Government have to do to make the adjustment? These are some considerations which my Subcommittee on Disarmament is preparing to study this fall.

I hope that the first tentative steps can be taken in discussions between our President and the Soviet leader toward

an eventual program of effective arms control. Certainly
 there are far better ways to spend forty billion dollars
 every year than in arms -- as vital and as necessary as that
 spending now is.

Emphasis

But,

I want to emphasize that it would be the height of folly
 to settle for an arms reduction program which jeopardized the
 safety of our people. The only situation more conceivably
 dangerous than the present possibility of an awesome and catastrophic
 miscalculation and consequent nuclear holocaust would be the
 day on which Soviet military power-in-being would not be
 effectively deterred by Western power.

Premier Khrushchev has an opportunity now to demonstrate
 the sincerity of his bold words about peace -- by taking steps
 to broaden and extend the program of international cultural
 exchange. He can move toward peaceful cooperation by concluding



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