

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
1311 New Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.
Capitol 4-3121, extension 2424

For release: Sunday, a.m.
July 9, 1961

ONE AMERICAN'S CASE FOR DISARMAMENT

Excerpts of Remarks by
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

European-American Assembly
Lucerne, Switzerland

July 8, 1961

I come tonight to present one American's case for disarmament. There are two situations -- the avoidance of war and the practice of freedom -- which are related fundamentally to the problem of disarmament. To an American, disarmament has no meaning if it does not contribute to the prevention of war and to the development of free societies.

My remarks are directed first to the urgent need to demonstrate progress toward complete and universal disarmament, second to some of the measures on which we ought to try reaching agreement, and third to some of the ways my own country seeks success in this large, complex, difficult, and worthy endeavor.

The constant buildup of fantastically powerful modern weapons is a monstrous waste of human and material resources. We have not been able to construct conditions that make for peace. Enemy states and rival political systems exist, and it is pressing our fortune too far to hope that this condition can last indefinitely without the entire world being catapulted into a full scale, planet-shaking, holocaust from which few will survive.

Although the prevention of war constitutes the overriding reason why progress in controlling the arms race is urgent, there are other reasons. We must not let ourselves get into the habit of thinking that an arms race is the natural state in international relations. If we begin to think this, then there will be even greater difficulty in persuading the leaders of nations to adopt new policies. I see often the tendency in many governments, including my own, to view defense strategy as sanctimonious; to think that disarmament policy must "fit into" a defense policy, rather than establish it as an integral part of national security policy. We must not come to believe that an arms race and all that flows from this state is the natural and hence the only course to follow.

The Soviet Union's position on disarmament is "all or nothing." That is what the Soviets seem to argue most of the time. That is the argument they give for permitting the test ban talks to be stalemated. Sometimes the Soviets talk as though they might accept partial measures, but we have not yet been successful in drawing them out in fruitful negotiations.

I wonder if we cannot stop beating around the bush in disarmament and get down to real negotiating. There are several measures and policy changes that ought to be explored.

1. The test ban negotiations should be given every encouragement. The Soviet Union wants them to die. The Soviets have decided that they are no longer interested in an agreement. They have refused to accept the amount of inspection contemplated by the agreement. They have lost interest because to them the test ban will not restrict the nuclear club the way they thought it would. China refuses to join the agreement until at least it becomes a nuclear power. Finally, the Soviets have adhered to the concept of the three-headed administrative council as the substitute for an administrator for all international organizations. They act as though this concept must be followed without the slightest deviation. They are wrong about this, and one of our duties in the coming months is to persuade them that they have adopted the wrong solution to the problem which faces them and us -- the problem of how to live in peace in a disarmed world where hostile states continue to exist side by side.

The United States, I believe, ought to take its case for a test ban treaty to the United Nations. We should ask for over-whelming assistance to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that both its own short and long range interests are consistent with an effective test ban treaty. As part of our case we ought to get the support of the United Nations, and its supervision, for the conduct of underground

nuclear tests for research purposes, to perfect the techniques of inspection and control. We should not allow the present impasse to kill all our efforts for the success of the test ban negotiations. In addition to obtaining the support and supervision of the United Nations for tests to improve detection, we should also ask the United Nations to support a resolution outlawing all tests in environments in which national detecting networks have become adequate. A ban on all future tests in the atmosphere and underwater would make testing more difficult and it would reduce greatly any hazards from radioactive fallout.

2. The United States should seek now an agreement on other aspects of the nuclear weapons threat. These include: a cut-off of production of all fissionable material; a beginning on the transfer from weapons stockpiles to peaceful purposes, and particularly for the use by the International Atomic Energy Agency; an agreement not to transfer nuclear weapons to non-nuclear powers; an agreement stating the conditions under which no country would be first to use nuclear weapons should warfare break out; and a beginning reduction on some of the more easily disposed of nuclear delivery vehicles. These measures would not go into effect unless adequate control and other safeguards were also agreed to. I believe all could be negotiated without any prerequisites, other than control features.

The above measures should be in the interest of the United States, its allies, the Soviet Union, its allies, and all neutral states. The negotiation of such an agreement would not be simple. But there are some aspects of disarmament on which we must be willing to negotiate even though every last answer has not been found.

3. We ought soon to make some progress in the field of outer space. My country and my government ought to share what it learns from space projects with the United Nations. We need a greater sense of urgency to keep outer space free of military adventures. I suspect the military interests in both the United States and the Soviet Union are stronger than their civilian counterparts in this field. Obviously the military can make valid and compelling claims to the use of outer space -- to locate weapons, for secret spy satellites, and for crucial communication systems by which weapons could be used more effectively. But must the civilian interest give way here to the military? I think not.

At least we can make a distinction between actual weapons activities in space and activities such as the reconnaissance satellite which have definite constructive purposes.

We ought to share knowledge gained from our satellites with the United Nations and urge the Soviet Union to do the same.

We should also institute an International Space Year with the object of keeping outer space cleared of weapons and weapons testing. An agreement should be modeled after the Antarctica Treaty.

I wish to place special emphasis on this suggestion.

We cannot allow the arms race and the cold war to penetrate outer-space. Let us move now to build international cooperation instead of national competition in exploring the mysteries of the universe.

An international Space Year could be patterned after the successful International Geophysical Year in 1958, during which the United States, the Soviet Union and other nations shared information and findings from geophysical research projects.

The International Geophysical Year paved the way to the present international agreement on Antarctica. The Antarctica Treaty guarantees freedom of scientific investigation, but forbids new national claims on Antarctica. Most important, the treaty forbids any military projects or weapons testing on the Antarctica continent.

We can and should launch an International Space Year with the hope that it would lead to the same type of treaty. We must begin now to seek the conclusion of an agreement that would forbid military activities in outer space or national claim to any bodies or portions of outer-space.

Time is running out for the possibility of securing international agreements and cooperation for outer-space exploration.

The successful orbiting of a man in space by the Soviet Union and the successful manned-space flight by the United States are dramatic reminders that space technology is plunging ahead at a bewildering pace.

We are coming ever closer to a time when space technology may pass beyond the possibility of international political control.

A treaty to demilitarize outer space should prohibit the orbiting of any nuclear-bomb bearing satellites.

We should also strive for safeguarded agreements to forbid any other means of destruction, such as biological or radiological weapons. This agreement would require an international system of inspecting each satellite or space capsule before it is fired into orbit.

In this age of nuclear weapons, it would be suicidal for us to allow the chance of war between space-power nations because of conflicting claims in space.

An International Space Peace Agency should be established under the auspices of the United Nations, but as a separately-functioning organization.

The agency should include political, legal and scientific representatives of all nations concerned with the peaceful exploration and use of outer-space.

We need such an agency -- to work toward space control agreements, to develop safeguards and inspection systems, and to utilize new space vehicles as instruments of peace instead of weapons of war.

4. Communist China should be part of all future multilateral disarmament negotiations. Communist China is part of the wrecking crew that is tearing down the test ban negotiations. There are not many people in my country or here in Europe who will say that comprehensive disarmament could be achieved without Communist China's participation. We say this privately. Let us now seek it publicly. Undoubtedly Communist China's participation will bring on problems. But it would be far better to know these now, discuss them in the open, and subject the Chinese Communists to the rules other nations are asked to follow in the cause of peace.

5. Because disarmament affects the security and defense of many countries, disarmament negotiations should have a close relationship to the United Nations. It is not just the Soviet Union and the United States that are affected, nor is it just the NATO powers and the countries of the Communist Warsaw Pact that have an interest. All people are involved and we must not neglect their interests.

But to say that all people have an interest in disarmament does not mean that all countries must be participants in the actual negotiations. If this were to happen, little negotiating would be accomplished. Even in the case where the NATO and Warsaw Pact Powers have special concerns, this does not preclude the United States and the Soviet Union having serious discussions about disarmament measures and the areas which might produce fruitful negotiations.

6. One of the ways in which the United Nations may pursue a constructive approach in disarmament discussions is by facilitating possible negotiations for regional disarmament measures. What has worked in one region might be adapted for others. The Organization of American States has an admirable record in settling disputes that might have led to a regional arms race and which could have resulted in war. Some of the methods followed here perhaps could be utilized in Africa or in other areas.

The United Nations can help in other respects. It could facilitate the establishment of regional peace forces in various sections of the world. In many respects such forces have greater merit than the establishment at this time of a single force under United Nations auspices and supervision.

In stressing what can be done in the United Nations to speed the development of a peaceful world without the need for national arms, I do not want to omit what the United States itself is undertaking to do. Collective efforts are essential, but they can be disappointing if the individual participating states are not prepared to carry out their responsibilities.

The President of the United States sent to our Congress a proposal to create a new agency entitled "The U. S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security."

This proposal represents in a tangible manner the restatement of a fundamental objective of our national policy -- the securing of a just and enduring peace.

Preparations for disarmament negotiations must be made in all kinds of political atmosphere. In other words, we can waste no time. We must be prepared under all circumstances. If we want to make progress toward curbing the weapons of war our efforts must be continuous. They must be grounded in solid research and study of all kinds -- the technical, military, and the political. The world outlook may change. The Soviets may show a genuine interest in real and substantial disarmament with adequate controls and a willingness to settle disputes peacefully and without a resort to threats and to the use of force.

So many changes take place. I say that in the world we live in, where new powers are surging to the front, we must be prepared for any eventuality. Certainly we hope there will be a change of attitude on the part of some of the intransigent and belligerent and arrogant powers. I am hopeful that the Soviets may some day show, as I said, a genuine interest in real, substantial arms control.

Disarmament is not merely a matter for diplomats at a negotiating table; it is a subject for scientists and technicians also. Let that be clear. Disarmament that involves modern weapons will require an intricate system of inspection and international controls requiring the most sophisticated electronic, acoustical, magnetic, and other scientific devices.

Disarmament brings into full focus the inter-relationship and the inter-dependency of diplomacy and science. Therefore, our preparations must be continuous, constant, up to date, and ever more reliable. Therefore, disarmament is a demanding task. Disarmament is full-time work. It cannot be undertaken by half-hearted part-time efforts.

We must have engaged in it the best people that all nations can provide. We must have the finest minds, and we must have complete and total preparation. All too often we have gone to disarmament conferences poorly prepared technically, without an adequate position of our own or our allies, and uncertain as to our objectives, and even more uncertain as to the procedures to be followed.

We cannot afford the luxury or the confidence of discussion and preparing for disarmament only while nations and people seem cooperative and peaceful. We must prepare for disarmament in the stormy days as well as in the balmy days. The urgency for disarmament is even more evident when the world teeters on the precipice.

(End)

Romania JFK

One American's Case for Disarmament

Statement

Hubert H. Humphrey

Senator

July 8, 1961

European-American Assembly

Burgenstock, Switzerland

(Rt Honorable David
Dymally Gore
Jake Moch
Dist. of
Represent of
France)

Mr. Winston
all in London
single file

I come to present an American's case for disarmament.

There are two situations - the avoidance of war and the prac-

tice of freedom - which are related fundamentally to the pro-

blem of disarmament. ~~for~~ ^(and I'm sure to all of you) to an American disarmament has no real

meaning if it does not contribute to the prevention of war

and to the development of free societies.

(1) My remarks are directed, first, to the urgent need to demonstrate progress toward complete and universal disarma-

(2) ment, second to some of the measures on which we ought to

(3) try reaching agreement, and third to some of the ways my

own country seeks success in this large, complex, difficult,

and worthy endeavor.

.../...

Urgency of the Situation

↳ The constant buildup of powerful modern weapons is a monstrous waste of human and material resources. ^{Despite great effort,} We have not been able to construct conditions that make for peace. Enemy states and rival political systems exist, and it is pressing our luck too far to hope that this condition can last indefinitely without the entire world being catapulted somehow into a full scale, planet-shaking, holocaust from which ^{untold} ~~few will survive.~~ *millions will die.*

↳ As a politician, I know something of the folly of human nature, the prejudice, the greed, the ignorance, the fear, and the hate that can on occasion becloud the vision and the goodness of many people. But I have also experienced the most generous, the most foresighted, the most courageous, and the most forgiving acts of my fellow man. ^{therefore,} I refuse to concede that we have neither the desire to live in peace with each other nor the will and the devotion to reach this ideal.

To be sure,

There are deep cleavages in the world today: between the Communist ^{bloc} and the democracies; among the followers of some of the leading religions; among the members of different races; between some of the newly independent countries and their former colonial powers. There are countries that are

rich in resources and also blessed with a combination of talent and history which have enabled them today to realize a high standard of living. And there are other countries

which have not been so fortunate: climate, history, resources, and geography have placed whole regions into a less favored

position. However, the people in these areas are now determined to change - to cast off the Past. They demand a new

day. ^{yes,} The problems that beset many areas of the world are as old as recorded history. ^{But} What is new, is the insistent demand - the urgency to do something about these problems.

Although the prevention of war constitutes the overriding reason why progress in controlling the arms race is urgent,

there are other reasons. We must not let ourselves get into the habit of thinking that an arms race is the natural state

in international relations. ~~If we begin to think this,~~ *And*
there is already some indication that this is the case, ~~then~~ *Such thinking*

~~there will be even greater difficulty~~ *makes it even more difficult* in persuading the

leaders of nations to adopt new policies. I see the tendency in many governments, including my own, to view defense strategy as sacrosanct; a disarmament policy must "fit into" a defense policy, rather than have it be an integral part of national security policy. We must not come to believe that

an arms race and all that flows from this state is the natural

and inevitable hence the only course to follow. *Defense and disarmament are two sides of the same coin - the coin of National Security and international Peace.*
What we can and should do now

↳ The Soviet Union's *position* ~~case~~ in disarmament is that it must be all or nothing *now!* Or, at least that is what the Soviets

seem to be saying most of the time. Such is the argument they give for permitting the test ban talks to be stalemated.

progressive

Sometimes the Soviets talk as though they might accept partial

measures, but we have not ~~not~~ been successful in drawing them

out in fruitful negotiations along such lines.

I wonder if we cannot stop beating around the bush in disarmament and get down to real negotiating. There are several measures and policy changes that ought to be explored.

My suggestions are not necessarily the ones which should be pursued, but I ~~would stress~~ ^{now are they all new -} that they be given careful thought ^{do hope} ^{continued}

by all of the countries concerned ~~about this problem~~.

Now let me outline in broad strokes some of the suggestions

1. The test ban negotiations should be given every en-

couragement even though the Soviet Union seems to want them

to die. The Soviets have ^{apparently} decided that they are no longer

interested in an agreement. They have refused to accept the

amount of inspection contemplated by the agreement; they may

have lost interest because to them the test ban will not

restrict the nuclear club the way they ^{had hoped} ~~thought~~ it would;

.../...

It appears that China either refuses or has little interest in
~~China refuses to join the~~ *joining in an* agreement until at least it becomes

a nuclear power. Finally, the Soviets have latched on to the concept of the three-headed administrative council as the substitute for an administrator in the running of all international organizations; they act as though this concept was strict dogma, a doctrine which must be followed without the slightest deviation. They are wrong about this, and one of our duties in the coming months is to persuade them that they have adopted the wrong solution to the problem which faces them and us, that is the problem of how to live in peace in a disarmed world where hostile states continue to exist side by side.

↳ The United States, I suggest, ought to take its case for a test ban treaty to the United Nations. We should ask for over-whelming assistance to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that both its own short and long range interests are consistent with an effective test ban treaty. As part of our

.../...

case we should seek the support of the United Nations, and its supervision, for the conduct of underground nuclear tests for scientific research purposes in order to perfect the techniques of inspection and control. We should not allow the deadlock at Geneva to paralyze our efforts to have the test ban negotiations succeed. In addition to obtaining the support and the supervision of the United Nations for tests to improve detection, we should also ask the United Nations to support a resolution outlawing all tests in environments in which national detecting networks have become adequate.

A ban on all future tests in the atmosphere and underwater would make testing more difficult and it would ~~reduce~~ ^{virtually eliminate} the hazards from radioactive fallout.

2. The United States should seek now an agreement on other aspects of the nuclear weapons threat. These include; a cut-off of production of all fissionable material; a beginning on the transfer from weapons stockpiles to peaceful purposes,

and particularly for the use by the International Atomic Energy Agency; an agreement not to transfer nuclear weapons to non-nuclear powers; and a beginning reduction on some of more easily disposed of nuclear delivery vehicles. These measures would not go into effect ^{of course,} unless adequate control and other safeguards were also agreed to. I believe all these proposals could be negotiated without any prerequisites, other than control features.

And these measures ^{I believe are} ~~should be~~ in the interest of the United States, its allies, the Soviet Union, its allies, and all neutral states. Negotiating of such an agreement would not be simple. ~~Some of the problems that would be revealed, the interested governments have not yet solved.~~ But there are some aspects of disarmament on which we must be willing to negotiate even though complete answers have not been found.

(3) Communist China should be part of all future multilateral disarmament negotiations. Communist China is part of the wrecking crew that is tearing down the test ban negotiations. There are not many people in my country and here in Europe who will say that comprehensive disarmament could be achieved without Communist China's participation. We say this privately. Let us now seek it publicly. Undoubtedly its participation will bring on problems. But it would be far better to know these now, discuss them in the open, and subject the Chinese Communists to the rules other nations are asked to follow in the cause of peace.

(4) One of the ways in which the United Nations may pursue a constructive approach in disarmament discussions is by facilitating possible negotiations for regional disarmament measures. What has worked in one region might be adapted for others. The Organization of American States has an admirable record in settling disputes that might have lead to a regional arms race

and which could have resulted in war. Some of the methods followed here perhaps could be utilized in the Middle East, Africa or in other areas.

The United Nations can help in other respects. It could facilitate the establishment of regional peace forces in various sections of the world. In many respects such forces have greater merit than the establishment at this time of a single force under United Nations auspices and supervision.

(5) Much more ^{could be} done through the United Nations as a result of limited experiences during recent years. A major contribution to world peace would be the presence at the trouble spots of the world of UN observers on location ^{as} ~~at~~ work--reporting regularly to the Assembly and Security Council. The United Nations peace and security machinery should emphasize prevention and interception along with policing and direction.

UN observers acting as the eyes and conscience of those nations committed to the Charter of the United Nations

Speaking of DISARM - Soviet Seeks to DISARM U.N. ! Either Cripple it, rule it, or bend it to its own interests
DISARM U.N. - Veto Sec. Genl Budget Agencies BUT

is an essential requirement of peace keeping machinery
in a world situation that is filled with danger and
uncertainty.

(6) The recent developments of space programs require a major, dedicated, and immediate effort to secure safeguarded agreements on regulation of outerspace activities. I therefore propose that my government, (and I would urge other countries,) to share what it learns from space projects with the other members of the United Nations. Outer space must be immune from military adventures. I suspect the military interests in both the United States and the Soviet Union are stronger than their civilian counterparts in this field. Obviously the military can make valid and compelling claims to the use of outer space--for the locating of weapons, for secret spy satellites, and for crucial communication systems by which weapons can be used more effectively. But must the civilian ^{Scientific + Political} interest give way here to the military? I think not!

At least we can make a distinction between actual weapons activities in space and activities such as the reconnaissance satellite which have definite constructive purposes.

yes, We ought to share knowledge gained from our satellites with the United Nations and urge the Soviet Union to do the same.

Urgent - Priority - get on top of this!

We can not allow the arms race and the Cold War to penetrate outer-space. Let us move now to build international cooperation instead of national competition in exploring the mysteries of the universe. I therefore urge that at the coming session of the UN Assembly, we propose an International Space Year.

An International Space Year could be patterned after the successful International Geophysical Year in 1958, during which the United States, the Soviet Union and other nations shared information and findings from geophysical research projects.

↳ The International Geophysical Year paved the way to the present international agreement on Antarctica.

The Antarctica Treaty guarantees freedom of scientific investigation, but forbids new national claims on Antarctica. Most important, the treaty forbids any military projects or weapons testing on the Antarctica continent.

↳ Yes, we can and should launch an International Space Year with the hope that it would lead to the same type of treaty. We must begin now to seek the conclusion of an agreement that would forbid military activities in outer space or national claim to any bodies or portions of outer-space.

and Time is running out for the possibility of securing international agreements and cooperation for outer-space exploration.

The successful orbiting of a man in space by the Soviet Union and the successful manned-space flight by the United States are dramatic reminders that space technology is plunging ahead at a bewildering pace.

↳ We are coming ever closer to a time when space technology may pass beyond the possibility of international political control.

at a minimum, or a beginning

↳ A treaty to demilitarize outer space should prohibit the orbiting of any nuclear-bomb bearing satellites.

We should also strive for safeguarded agreements to forbid any other means of ^{mass} destruction, such as biological or radiological weapons, ^{being shot into space.} This agreement would require an international system of inspecting each satellite or space capsule before it is fired into orbit.

The development of the reconnaissance satellite--the Samos-- is a momentous step into the Space Age which requires basic long-range decisions. We must decide now whether we are going to carry the arms race from earth into space or whether we are willing to adopt space arms control before it is too late. America's first reconnaissance satellite--the Samos--should be used as a peaceful eye-in-the-sky and not as a militaristic spy-in-the-sky. It is true that a reconnaissance satellite can be sent orbiting over any country to relay information back to the military command which launched it. Thus, it can have extremely high value as a military weapon but the Samos reconnaissance satellite can also be employed as a working instrument of peace.

↳ Under proper international management, it could be used for monitoring some forms of disarmament and provide warnings of preparations for surprise attack. Whatever can be done to remove the possibility of surprise attack will represent a major contribution to peace and world order.

In this age of nuclear weapons, it would be suicidal for us to allow the chance of war between space-power nations because of conflicting claims in space *over-zealous National Pride,*

(8) An International Space Peace Agency should be established under the auspices of the United Nations, but as a separately-functioning organization.

This agency should include political, legal and scientific representatives of all nations concerned with the peaceful exploration and use of outer-space.

We need such an agency--to work toward space control agreements, to develop safeguards and inspection systems, and to utilize new space vehicles as instruments of peace instead of weapons of war. *Such an Agency would, of course, be seriously hamstrung by a Trakka type Administ.*
 Because disarmament affects the security and defense of many countries, disarmament negotiations should have a close relationship to the United Nations. It is not just the Soviet Union and the United States that are affected, nor is it just the NATO powers and the countries of the Communist Warsaw Pact that have an interest. All people are involved and we must not neglect ^{the} ~~the~~ interests *of the uncommitted world.*

But to say that all people have an interest in disarmament does not mean that all countries must be participants in the actual negotiations. If this were to happen little negotiating

would be accomplished. Even in the case where the NATO and Warsaw Pact Powers have special concerns, this does not preclude the United States and the Soviet Union having serious discussions about disarmament measures and the areas which might produce fruitful negotiations. What is important, from the point of view of United States' commitments to its friends, is that in any substantive discussion with the Soviet Union, our allies be kept continually informed and ^{be} consulted frequently.

Many of the countries of NATO, and of Europe, have recommended that the United States and the Soviet Union should have a serious, quiet, and substantive dialogue about disarmament, and about maintaining peace in a disarmed world. This can be done. Any agreements that may be reached as a result of such discussions must be subject to the additional concurrence of other interested powers.

UNITED STATES EFFORTS

In stressing what can be done in the United Nations to speed the development of a peaceful world ^{where there would be no} ~~without the~~ need for national arms, I do not want to omit what the United States itself is undertaking to do. Collective efforts are essential, but they can be disappointing if the individual participating states are not prepared to carry out their responsibilities.

a little less

DISARM Agency

The President of the United States sent to our Congress a proposal to create a new agency entitled "The U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security."

This proposal represents in a tangible manner the restatement of a fundamental objective of our national policy--the securing of a just and enduring peace.

Preparation
 Preparations for disarmament negotiations must be made in all kinds of political atmosphere. In other words, we can waste no time. We must be prepared under all circumstances. If we want to make progress toward curbing the weapons of war our efforts must be continuous. They must be grounded in solid research and study of all kinds--the technical, military, and the political.

Be Prepared!
 The world outlook may change. The Soviets may show a genuine interest in real and substantial disarmament with adequate controls and a willingness to settle disputes peacefully and without a resort to threats and to the use of force.

yes So many changes ^{do} take place. ~~I say that~~ ^{in which} in the world we live ~~in~~, where new powers are surging to the front, we must be prepared for any eventuality. Certainly we hope there will be a change of attitude on the part of some of the intransigent, and belligerent, and arrogant powers. I am hopeful that the Soviets may some day show, as I said, a genuine interest in real, substantial arms control.

Disarmament is not merely a matter for diplomats at a negotiating table; it is a subject for scientists and technicians also. Let that be clear. Disarmament that involves modern weapons will require an intricate system of inspection and international controls requiring the most sophisticated electronic, acoustical, magnetic and other scientific devices.

Disarmament brings into full focus the interrelationship and the interdependency of diplomacy and science. Therefore, our preparations must be continuous, constant, up to date, and ever more reliable. ~~Therefore,~~ Disarmament is a demanding task. Disarmament is a full-time work. It cannot be undertaken by half-hearted, part-time efforts.

We must have engaged in it the best people that all nations can provide. We must have the finest minds, and we must have complete and total preparation. All too often we have gone to disarmament conferences poorly prepared

Perservering
Patience

technically, without an adequate position of our own or our allies, and uncertain as to our objectives, and even more uncertain as to the procedures to be followed.

We cannot afford the luxury or the confidence of discussing and preparing for disarmament only while nations and people seem cooperative and peaceful. We must prepare for disarmament in the stormy days as well as in the balmy days. The urgency for disarmament is even more evident when the world teeters on the precipice.

The Cause of a just peace ~~knows~~
~~no time~~ is the unceasing, all-important
business of all nations. "Blessed are
the peacemakers" is ~~to be met~~
 not only an honored biblical admonition,
 it is also a call to duty and
a challenge!

Burgin Stock
Switzerland

(Handwritten initials)

Statement
Robert N. Humphrey
U.S. House
July 5, 1961

Draft Speech

H.A.
Mupke

One American's Case for Disarmament

H.S. Senator
July 8th
European-American
Assembly

I come ~~tonight~~ ^{on} to present ~~one~~ American's case for disarmament.

There are two situations--the avoidance of war and the practice of freedom--which are related fundamentally to the problem of disarmament. For to an American disarmament has no meaning if it does not contribute to the prevention of war and to the development of free societies.

My remarks are directed, first to the urgent need to demonstrate progress toward complete and universal disarmament, second to some of the measures on which we ought to try reaching agreement, and third to some of the ways my own country seeks success in this large, complex, difficult, and worthy endeavor.

URGENCY OF THE SITUATION

The constant buildup of ~~fantastically~~ powerful modern weapons is a monstrous waste of human and material resources. We have not

been able to construct conditions that make for peace. Enemy states and rival political systems exist, and it is pressing our ~~luck~~ ^{luck} too far to hope that this condition can last indefinitely without the entire world being catapulted somehow into a full scale, planet-shaking, holocaust from which few will survive.

As a politician ~~knowing~~ I know something of the folly of human nature, the prejudice, the greed, the ignorance, ^{the fears} and the hate that can on occasion ~~obscure~~ ^{becloud} the vision and the goodness of many people. But I have also experienced the most generous, the most foresighted, the most courageous, and the most forgiving acts of my fellow man. I ~~shall never~~ ^{refuse to} concede that we have neither the ~~desire~~ ^{desire} to live in peace with each other ~~nor~~ ^{nor} the will and the devotion to reach this ideal. There are deep cleavages in the world today: between the Communist and the ~~democracies~~ ^{democracies}, among the followers of some of the leading religions; among the

members of different races; between some of the newly independent countries and their former colonial powers. There are countries that are rich in resources and ~~that have been~~ ^{also} blessed with a combination of talent and history which have enabled them today to realize a high standard of living. And there are ^{other} countries which have not been so fortunate: climate, history, resources, and geography have placed whole regions into a less favored position.

~~However,~~ ^{these are} ~~which~~ the people in ~~them~~ are now determined to change ~~to cast off the past.~~
They demand a new day. The problems that ~~These cleavages can and must be mended if the world is to live in~~
~~peace.~~ ^{beset many areas of the world are as old as recorded history.}
^{What is new, is the insistent demand - the urgency to do something about these problems,}
Although the prevention of war constitutes the overriding

reason why progress in controlling the arms race is urgent, there are other reasons. We must not let ourselves get into the habit of thinking that an arms race is the natural state in international relations. If we begin to think this, and there is already some

indication that this is the case, then there will be even greater difficulty in persuading the leaders of nations to adopt new policies. I see ~~often~~ the tendency in many governments including my own to view defense strategy as ~~safer~~ ^{Sacrosanct}; a disarmament policy must "fit into" a defense policy, rather than have it be an integral part of national security policy. We must not come to believe that an arms race and all that flows from this state is the natural and ^{invariable} hence the only course to follow.

WHAT WE CAN AND SHOULD DO NOW

The Soviet Union's case in disarmament is that it must be all or nothing. Or, at least that is what the Soviets seem to be ^{Saying} ~~arguing~~ most of the time. ^{Such} ~~That~~ is the argument they give for permitting the test ban talks to be stalemated. (Sometimes the Soviets talk as though they might accept partial measures, but we have not yet been successful in drawing them out in fruitful negotiations.

I wonder if we cannot stop beating around the bush in disarmament and get down to real negotiating. There are several measures and policy changes that ought to be explored. My suggestions are not necessarily the ones which should be pursued, but I would stress that they be given careful thought by all of the countries concerned about this problem.

1. The test ban negotiations should be given every encouragement ^{even though} ~~the~~ Soviet Union ^{demands} ~~wants~~ them to die. The Soviets have decided that they are no longer interested in an agreement. They have refused to accept the amount of inspection contemplated by the agreement; they have lost interest because to them the test ban will not restrict the nuclear club the way they thought it would; China refuses to join the agreement until at least it becomes a nuclear power. Finally, the Soviets have latched on to the concept of the three-headed administrative council as the substitute for an

administrator in the running of all international organizations; they act as though this concept was strict dogma, a doctrine which must be followed without the slightest deviation. They are wrong about this, and one of our duties in the coming months is to persuade them that they have adopted the wrong solution to the problem which faces them and us, that is the problem of how to live in peace in a disarmed world where hostile states continue to exist side by side.

The United States, I ^{suggest} ~~believe~~, ought to take its case for a test ban treaty to the United Nations. We should ask for overwhelming assistance to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that both its own short and long range interests are consistent with an effective test ban treaty. As part of our case we ^{should seek} ~~ought to get~~ the support of the United Nations, and its supervision, for the conduct of underground nuclear tests for ^{scientific} research purposes, ^{in order} to perfect the

techniques of inspection and control. We should not allow ~~this to~~

the deadlock at Geneva to paralyze
1 ~~set back~~ our efforts to have the test ban negotiations

succeed. In addition to obtaining the support and the supervision

of the United Nations for tests to improve detection, we should

also ask the United Nations to support a resolution outlawing all

tests in environments in which national detecting networks have

become adequate. A ban on all future tests in the atmosphere

and underwater would make testing more difficult and it would reduce

~~the~~ *the* hazards from radioactive fallout.

2. The United States should seek now an agreement on other aspects of the nuclear weapons threat. These include: A cut-off of production of all fissionable material; a beginning on the transfer from weapons stockpiles to peaceful purposes, and particularly for the use by the International Atomic Energy Agency; an agreement not to transfer nuclear weapons to non-nuclear powers; ~~an agreement stating the conditions under which no country would~~

~~be first to use nuclear weapons should warfare break out;~~ and a beginning reduction on some of more easily disposed of nuclear delivery vehicles. These measures would not go into effect unless adequate control and other safeguards were also agreed to, I believe all ^{these proposals} could be negotiated without any prerequisites, other than control features.

← And these measures
~~The above measures~~ should be in the interest of the United States, its allies, the Soviet Union, its allies, and all neutral states. ~~The~~ Negotiating of such an agreement would not be simple. Some of the problems that would be revealed, the interested governments have not yet solved. But there are some aspects of disarmament on which we must be willing to negotiate even though ~~every last~~ ^{complete} answer has ^{to be} not been found.

~~It is important that we make some~~

~~testing. An agreement could be modeled after the Antarctica Treaty.~~

(B) Communist China should be part of all future multilateral disarmament negotiations. Communist China ^{is} ~~was~~ part of the wrecking crew that ^{is tearing} ~~is~~ down the test ban negotiations. There are not many people in my country and here in Europe who will say that comprehensive disarmament could be achieved without Communist China's participation. We say this privately. Let us now seek it publicly. Undoubtedly its participation will bring on problems. But it would be far better to know these now, discuss them in the open, and subject the Chinese Communists to ~~some~~ of the rules other nations are asked to follow in the cause of peace.

4 One of the ways in which the United Nations may pursue a (10)
constructive approach in disarmament discussions is by facilitating
possible negotiations for regional disarmament measures. What
has worked in one region might be adapted for others. The Organization
of American States has an admirable record in settling disputes
that might have lead to a regional arms race and which could have
resulted in war. Some of the methods followed here perhaps could
be utilized in Africa or in other areas.

The United Nations can help in other respects. It could facili-
tate the establishment of regional peace forces in various sections
of the world. In many respects such forces have greater merit than
the establishment at this time of a single force under United
Nations auspices and supervision.

(11)

Much more can be done through the United Nations as a result of limited experiences during recent years. A major contribution to world peace would be the presence at the trouble spots of the world of UN observers on location--on work--reporting regularly to the Assembly and Security Council. The United Nations peace and security machinery should emphasize prevention and interception along with policing and direction. UN observers acting as the eyes and conscience of those nations committed to the Charter of the United Nations is an essential requirement of peace keeping machinery in a world situation that is filled with danger and uncertainty.

~~We ought soon to make some progress in the field of outer~~

space,

~~my country, and my government ought to share what it learns~~

(P. 11)
~~activity.~~ (6) The recent developments of space
programs require a major, dedicated,
and immediate effort to secure
safeguarded agreements on regulation of
Outer Space Activities.

FD

I therefore propose that my government, and I would
urge other countries, to share what it learns
the other members of the

from space projects with the United Nations. There is not suffi-
cient urgency to keep outer space immune from military adventures,
must be

I suspect the military interests in both the United States and
the Soviet Union are stronger than their civilian counterparts
in this field. Obviously the military can make valid and com-
pelling claims to the use of outer space--for the locating of
weapons, for secret spy satellites, and for crucial communication
systems by which weapons can be used more effectively. But must
the civilian interest give way here to the military? I think not.

At least we can make a distinction between actual weapons
activities in space and activities such as the reconnaissance
satellite which ^{have} definite constructive purposes.

We ought to share knowledge gained from our satellites with
the United Nations and urge the Soviet Union to do the same.

~~(6) We should propose that
We ought further to institute an International Space Year with
the object of keeping outer space cleared of weapons and weapons~~

(70)

We can not allow the arms race and the Cold

War to penetrate outer-space. Let us move now to

build international cooperation instead of national

competition in exploring the mysteries of the

universe.

*I therefore urge, that at the
Request of the U.N. Assembly, We Propose
to ~~the~~ ~~U.N. Assembly~~
an International
Space Year.*

An International Space Year could be

patterned after the successful International

Geophysical Year in 1958, during which the United

States, the Soviet Union and other nations shared

information and findings from geophysical research

projects.

The International Geophysical Year paved the

way to the present international agreement on

Antarctica.

The Antarctica Treaty guarantees freedom of scientific investigation, but forbids new national claims on Antarctica. Most important, the treaty forbids any military projects or weapons testing on the Antarctica continent.

yes We can and should launch an International Space Year with the hope that it would lead to the same type of treaty. We must begin now to seek the conclusion of an agreement that would forbid military activities in outer space or national claim to any bodies or portions of outer-space.

Time is running out for the possibility of securing international agreements and cooperation for outer-space exploration.

The successful orbiting of a man in space
by the Soviet Union and ~~the~~^{the} successful
manned-space flight by the United States are
dramatic reminders that space technology is
plunging ahead at a bewildering pace.

We are coming ever closer to a time when
space technology may pass beyond the
possibility of international political control.

A treaty to demilitarize outer space should
prohibit the orbiting of any nuclear-bomb bearing
satellites.

We should also strive for safeguarded agree-
ments to forbid any other means of destruction,
such as biological or radiological weapons. This
agreement would require an international system
of inspecting each satellite or space capsule

before it is fired into orbit,

~~Page 8~~

The development of the reconnaissance satellite--the Samos--is a momentous step into the Space Age which requires basic long-range decisions. We must decide now whether we are going to carry the arms race from earth into ~~space~~ space or whether we are ~~go~~ willing to adopt space arms control before it is too late. America's first reconnaissance satellite--the Samos--should be used as a peaceful eye-in-the-sky and not as a militaristic spy-in-the-sky. It is true that a reconnaissance satellite can be sent orbiting over any country to relay information back to the military command which launched it. Thus, it can have extremely high value as a military weapon but the Samos reconnaissance satellite can also be employed as a working instrument of peace. Under proper international management, it could be used for monitoring some forms of disarmament and provide warnings of preparations for surprise attack. Whatever can be done to remove the possibility of surprise attack will represent a major contribution to peace and world order.

~~_____~~

In this age of nuclear weapons, it would be suicidal for us to allow the chance of war between space-power nations because of conflicting claims in space.

(8)

An International Space Peace Agency should be established under the auspices of the United Nations, but as a separately-functioning organization.

This agency should include political, legal and scientific representatives of all nations concerned with the peaceful exploration and use of outer-space.

We need such an agency -- to work toward space control agreements, to develop safeguards and inspection systems, and to utilize new space vehicles as instruments of peace instead of weapons of war.

~~Because~~ Because disarmament affects the security and defense of many countries, disarmament negotiations should have a close relationship to the United Nations. It is not just the Soviet Union and the United States that are affected, nor is it just the NATO

~~15/11~~ 818

powers and the countries of the Communist Warsaw Pact that have an interest. All people are involved and we must not neglect their interests.

But to say that all people have an interest in disarmament does not mean that all countries must be participants in the actual negotiations. If this were to happen little negotiating would be accomplished. Even in the case where the NATO and Warsaw Pact Powers have special concerns, this does not preclude the United States and the Soviet Union having serious discussions about disarmament measures and the areas which might produce fruitful negotiations. What is important, from the point of view of United States[?] commitments to its friends, is that in any substantive discussion with the Soviet Union, our allies be kept continually informed and consulted frequently.

Many of the countries of NATO, and of Europe, have recommended that the United States and the Soviet Union should have a serious, quiet, and substantive dialogue about disarmament, and about main-

~~12~~
P 20

taining peace in a disarmed world. This can be done. Any agreements that may be reached as a result of such discussions must be subject to the additional concurrence of other interested powers.

121

~~13~~

UNITED STATES EFFORTS

In stressing what can be done in the United Nations to speed the development of a peaceful world without the need for national arms, I do not want to omit what the United States itself is undertaking to do. Collective efforts are essential, but they can be disappointing if the individual participating states are not prepared to carry out their responsibilities.

The President of the United States sent to our Congress a proposal to create a new agency entitled "The U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security".

This proposal represents in a tangible manner the restatement of a fundamental objective of our national policy--the securing of a just and enduring peace.

Preparations for disarmament negotiations must be made in all kinds of political atmosphere. In other words, we can waste no

~~SECRET~~

time. We must be prepared under all circumstances. If we want to make progress toward curbing the weapons of war ~~our~~ ^{our} efforts must be continuous. They must be grounded in solid research and study of all kinds--the technical, military, and the political. The world outlook may change. The Soviets may show a genuine interest in real and substantial disarmament with adequate controls and a willingness to settle disputes peacefully and without a resort to threats and to the use of force.

So many changes take place. I say that in the world we live in, where new powers are surging to the front, we must be prepared for any eventuality. Certainly we hope there will be a change of attitude on the part of some of the intransigent and belligerent and arrogant powers. I am hopeful that the Soviets may some day show, as I said, a genuine interest in real, substantial arms control.

123

~~123~~

Disarmament is not merely a matter for diplomats at a negotiating table; it is a subject for scientists and technicians also. Let that be clear. Disarmament that involves modern weapons will require an intricate system of inspection and international controls requiring the most sophisticated electronic, acoustical, magnetic, and other scientific devices.

Disarmament brings into full focus the interrelationship and the interdependency of diplomacy and science. Therefore, our preparations must be continuous, constant, up to date, and ever more reliable. Therefore, disarmament is a demanding task. Disarmament is a full-time work. It cannot be undertaken by half-hearted, part-time efforts.

We must have engaged in it the best people that ^{all} ~~the~~ Nations can provide. We must have the finest minds, and we must have complete and total preparation. All too often we have gone to disarmament conferences poorly prepared technically, without an adequate position

~~SECRET~~ P 24

of our own or our allies, and uncertain as to our objectives,
and even more uncertain as to the procedures to be followed.

We cannot afford the luxury or the confidence of discussing
and preparing for disarmament only while nations and people seem
cooperative and peaceful. We must prepare for disarmament in the
stormy days as well as in the balmy days. The urgency for disarma-
ment is even more evident when the world teeters on the precipice.



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