

United States Senate

MEMORANDUM

7.12
Speech
London Oct 3, 1961
Chatham House

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D. C.

U.S. Moves to Reexamine Military Position

(1) over \$6 Billion increase -

{ Doubled Polaris, \$1 1/2 Billion Space -
{ Bombs, Full Strength of Armed forces
{ Reserves called.

We are indeed serious!

Kennedy in Charge -

Not Senators -

Noisy "Right" is Not U.S.!

Foreign Aid \$4 Billions | ~~Peace~~
Alliance Program \$500-

1

yo These are somber times, and grave dangers may face us in the coming months. We have found it necessary, in common prudence, to take measures to strengthen our military posture, and particularly our long-neglected capabilities for conventional warfare.

military

I think it important, however, for America's friends to know that -- even while we are preparing for the grave contingencies which may confront us -- we are also planning and acting for peace.

∟ I know that we Americans have been accused of talking too much -- and some of my candid critics have told me that I am all too American in this respect.

I know also that words like "peace" have been sadly, tragically devalued by the way in which the Communists have abused them.

∟ Therefore, I shall not cite speeches and statements to prove America's deep commitment to a more orderly and just world -- although I shall remind you that no one has spoken more nobly on this great subject than President Kennedy himself, notably in his address last week to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I shall cite deeds rather than words. I shall list actions for peace taken by this Administration and this Congress in the past eight months.

I speak as a Democrat, proud of the record of this Democratic Administration. But I recognize that the passion for peace transcends party lines, and I freely acknowledge the leadership and support that many of my Republican friends in Congress have given.

First and foremost in our planning for peace I put the central importance we are giving to the United Nations in American policy.

~~I think~~ this trend was already evident in the closing year of the Eisenhower Administration, but it has broadened and deepened

Remain
Defense

Kennedy
U.N.

in the past months.

First of all, we have shown the great significance we attribute to the United Nations by sending to it as our Ambassador one of the ablest and most eloquent spokesmen of America and (indeed) of the free world -- Adlai E. Stevenson.

In his major speeches in the UN and in his day-to-day dealings with the delegates of other nations, Governor Stevenson has done much to spell out America's commitment to peace and to ~~democracy~~ *freedom*.

He and other American officials - notably Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations affairs - have set forth clearly our American view of the road to a stronger and more effective UN.

We believe that the United Nations will grow stronger as it expands its capacity to act. We believe that organizations, like people, develop their muscles by using them.

We therefore welcomed the historic breakthroughs in action for peace which Dag Hammarskjold achieved during his years as Secretary-General.

On this issue, we are happy to find ourselves in agreement with the great majority of the Afro-Asian nations.

Much that the unaligned leaders did and said at their recent conference in Belgrade left a rather sour taste in American mouths. But one thing that thoroughly pleased us was the depth of the commitment to the UN which they expressed.

We fear that, in contrast, the Soviet Union wants to make the UN a ~~forum~~ forum for debate rather than a working instrument for

peace. That is why we reject the troika and all it stands for.

We think that a UN with three helmsmen and three rudders would, sooner rather than later, drift like the League of Nations into the limbo of mankind's lost hopes.

This is not mere lip service. For, when the UN recently undertook its unprecedented military action in the Congo, our government promptly and publicly supported that action.

The position of our government was strongly criticized -- here, I understand, as well as elsewhere. On the floor of the United States Senate, it was attacked by Senators of both parties.

I had the privilege of speaking in support of this action. In so doing, I emphasized what I have always considered one of the most important functions of the United Nations -- its role in helping the new nations and new leaders of ~~Africa~~ find their place in the world.

One thing we must always remember -- these leaders are new and they are inexperienced.

We cannot expect them to behave like veteran statesmen.

Some of them do most of the time, and most of them do some of the time. But we should be pleased when they do rather than disappointed when they don't.

Likewise, I think that we have been mistaken in too readily applying the label "Communist." Some Americans, I regret to say, pinned this label on the late Patrice Lumumba.

This is sheer nonsense. Communists are supposed to accept discipline. And anyone with a nodding acquaintance with Mr. Lumumba could see that he was quite incapable of accepting discipline, even

from himself.

Indeed, I told my fellow-Senators that it was a gross error to identify the Congolese leaders with one side or another in the cold war. They are interested in it only to the extent that they can exploit it in the struggle for political power -- which goes on in the Congo as it goes on in much older nations.

I think that the leaders of the new African ^{and Asian} nations have benefited greatly from their membership in the United Nations. Sitting there as equals, they have learned much -- and without any sacrifice of their dignity -- about the orderly conduct of international affairs.

I am told that you have a phrase here about "a good House of Commons man." I have been delighted to see how many African ^{Asian} delegates very much want to become known as "good United Nations men."

The United Nations must live and it must grow. It has suffered a heavy blow in the sudden and tragic death of Mr. Hammarskjold.

The faint of heart are already writing it off. I notice, for example, that Earl Russell -- Bertrand Russell -- has said:

"The UN is finished."

We in America do not agree -- any more than we accept the narrowing of mankind's choices to the grim alternatives: "Red or dead."

At the UN headquarters in New York, we are working in close cooperation with the greatmajority of nations who want the UN to live. We are seeking a solution which will increase, not destroy, the UN's

capacity to act.

I have dwelt at length on the UN because of its central place in American policy. But I should now like to move on to another initiative for peace -- a unilateral initiative, if you please -- which we have recently taken in the United States.

Just over a week ago Congress approved the establishment of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This will be the first government agency in any nation -- and in all of recorded history -- to dedicate its efforts to the study and promotion of disarmament.

In a very real sense, it will be a peace agency.

We believe that this agency will bring to bear on the highly technical and complex problems of effective disarmament some of the most creative minds of our country. Its staff will be drawn from a wide range of disciplines -- scientists as well as soldiers, political theorists as well as experienced diplomats.

We in Congress have been working toward this goal for several years, and it was one of my own chief objectives as Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament.

Last year we achieved partial success with the establishment, by President Eisenhower, of a Disarmament Administration within the State Department.

When President Kennedy took office, one of his first acts was to appoint Mr. John McCloy as his adviser on disarmament. He gave Mr. McCloy and the Disarmament Administration two major tasks.

One was to put together a new and fresh American program for disarmament -- the program which President Kennedy last week presented to the UN General Assembly.

Peace Agency

*JFK -
DISARM
ADMINSTR*

The second was to prepare proposals for a new, permanent, and at least semi-independent agency to continue and expand our efforts for general and complete disarmament, under effective controls.

Those of us in Congress who were especially interested in disarmament worked closely with Mr. McCloy and his staff. I myself had the privilege of introducing the bill in the Senate and I was joined by many distinguished colleagues from both parties.

We faced an uphill struggle. The hasty but perhaps understandable reaction of some of my Congressional colleagues was that this was sheer impractical idealism -- that it might become, as one witness warned, "a mecca for crackpots" or even "a bureau of beatniks."

Others, who recognized the solid merit of the proposal, considered it ill-timed. They feared that, in the face of mounting Soviet pressures, the very creation of such an agency might be taken as a sign of weakness.

During the weeks and months this proposal was under discussion in Congress, the international situation grew steadily worse. President Kennedy himself -- whose enthusiastic support for the disarmament agency never wavered -- said to me the other day:

"There was a time when I thought we had about as much chance of getting it as we have of getting to the moon next week."

It speaks strongly, I think, of our real American dedication to peace that -- despite all this and in the very eye of the hurricane, so to speak -- the proposal was endorsed by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress.

The people of the world need peace -- but they also need bread. Here, too, I think we have real progress to report.

Regional
 Arms
 Control

Peace
 +
 Bread

FOOD - Abundance

For many years, our American farmers have produced an abundance of food and fibers.

Please note that I said "abundance" instead of the more commonly used term, "surplus."

~~I~~ ^{But} think there is no real surplus of food so long as anyone in the world goes hungry -- nor any surplus of fiber so long as anyone goes ill-clad.

The people who use the word "surplus" describe it as a "problem" or a "burden." I prefer to call our abundance an opportunity to help our fellow human-beings. ^{or a challenge}

I understand that the contrast between American abundance and starvation elsewhere in the world is one of the standard indictments which some ultra-leftists here and elsewhere like to make against American capitalism.

For the past seven years, such indictments have ignored one massive fact -- we have been sharing our abundance.

During the past seven years, ^{over} \$1,400 million ^{each year} worth of American food and fibers have been shipped abroad -- either given away, or sold for local currencies.

I am frank to confess to you that, in the beginning, our motives were mixed -- as human motives so often are. Some of us always thought of this program mainly in terms of feeding the hungry. ^{social and economic development} But, in the beginning, many Senators and Congressmen supported it as a means of disposing of what they chose to call "suppluses."

Whatever the mixture of motives, the food did get through to millions of hungry people.

By now, however, a broader and more positive view has prevailed.

Sharing

It has crystallized this year in President Kennedy's "Food for Peace" program, headed by my good friend George McGovern. This program marks a clean break with the original idea that our abundance was merely a "burdensome surplus," to be dumped wherever we could get rid of it most easily.

Instead, we are gearing the program to the real needs of the recipient nations -- not only for mere survival, but for economic growth as well. In some countries, such as Tunisia, the people employed for public works are paid partly in American food. In others, the local currencies which we receive are loaned or given back to the countries concerned, and are used for all sorts of constructive purposes, from the building of libraries in Austria to vast river valley development projects in India.

In size alone the program has been greatly stepped up, with 2 1/2 billion ~~\$2500 million~~ shipped abroad in the first six months of the year. And, with the new and more positive shape we have given the program, each dollar yields more lasting benefits than in the past.

I shall conclude this list (and it is by no means a complete one) with the smallest and yet the most imaginative of our new programs for peace -- the Peace Corps.

Here we built upon the rich experience of many voluntary organizations which have sent young people out to work in the developing countries -- and I know of the good work which British organizations have done in this field.

What is new about the Peace Corps is that -- so far as I know, for the first time -- the resources of government are being put behind it, in modest but I am confident in steadily growing measure.

*U.N. Program
Freedom from Hunger
FAO*

Peace Corps

alliance for Progress

The mere proposal of the Peace Corps banished forever an ugly myth which too many Americans believed -- that our young people had become "soft," and were interested only in their comfort and their security.

The Peace Corps proposal blew like a fresh wind through our schools and universities. Many of our finest young people accepted its challenge to service for humanity, and volunteered for the Corps.

The first contingents, after thorough and intensive training, have already departed for their posts of duty. By the end of this year, something like a thousand will be at work overseas.

There will be heartaches and there will be bitter disappointments. But these young people have been carefully selected, and I am sure that the overwhelming majority will measure up to the tests ahead -- not only physical hardships but the even harder cultural and psychological adjustments required.

They will be helpful to the countries where they serve, and the experience will be helpful both to them and to the United States. I claim no great gifts as a prophet, but I venture to predict that many of the young people now serving in our Peace Corps will go on to significant and responsible leadership in international affairs.

Words about peace are cheap, and become cheaper all the time. That is why I have talked today about actual, tangible works of peace. I felt that you would want to know that the American people and their government are looking beyond this year's series of crises, beyond even the somber issues of Berlin. I want to put before you solid evidence, in deeds and not in talk, that we are planning and acting for peace.

Needless to say, I claim no American monopoly on works of peace. I know and value highly the many significant contributions to world order that the British people have made throughout history. If I cite only one outstanding example here, it is because it has been much in my mind lately.

I refer, of course, to the progress you have made since the war in converting the British Empire into a Commonwealth of free peoples, uniting men and women of many races and all continents. I believe that this has been, and will be, a priceless asset to the democratic world.

I know that you are now debating the decision of Prime Minister Macmillan to apply for British membership in the European Economic Community. I understand that this issue cuts across all party lines -- indeed, I find good British friends of mine on both sides of it.

I shall not intrude my American voice in this debate. But I shall express one profound wish and hope -- one that I am sure every thoughtful American shares.

I hope and trust that nothing which is done with regard to closer British association with Europe will in any way loosen the ties which bind the Commonwealth together.

The sun may be setting on the old British Empire. But it is rising over the new Commonwealth -- and this new sun, I hope, will never set.

I conclude with some words to the Russian people and their leaders -- and I speak to them over the Iron Curtain and over the infamous wall which divides Berlin.

I hope that they will come to join us in the great works of peace. I even dare to suggest that they may have something to learn from us.

Indeed, they have already done so. When we launched our Point Four program of aid to the developing countries, they began by ridiculing it -- but they ended by imitating it.

So, also, I shall be delighted when Tass brings us word of a Soviet Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I hope their experts and ours will sit down together and pool their ideas.

When the Soviet delegates to the United Nations come forward with proposals to strengthen rather than weaken it, I'll be the first to applaud.

If Mr. Khrushchev finally finds the solution to the problem which has baffled all previous Communist leaders -- how to achieve an abundance of food -- I'd welcome his contribution to an expanded food for peace program.

And I'm sure that I speak for all the young Americans in our Peace Corps when I predict that they'll roll out the carpet for the first contingent of Soviet youth -- and it will be a red carpet, so that they'll feel thoroughly at home!

This is the kind of competitive existence I like. Let the two worlds compete in every kind of bold and generous enterprise, all the way from putting men on the moon to banishing poverty from the earth. But let us, for the sake of our common humanity, find some way out of this ghastly competition in weapons of mutual annihilation.

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D. C.

① Nato

Germany Strong - needed for Western Europe
+ forces of democ in Germany need
Assoc with U.S., Brit, France etc

② Germany Neutrality is Soviet Aim -
then Deal

(3) Nato Needs Stgthing
Militarily - close Pol. Consult
+ Economic Consultation

OECD = High Command for Stgthing
econ. cooperation +
to meet Soviet of financial Econ
+ to Aid underdeveloped

④ Need closer Informo Propoganda
Cooperation

① <u>Common Mkt June 6</u>	<u>U.S. Stgth ARMS</u>
② <u>EFTA - autu 7</u>	<u>U.S. Moves on AID</u>
③ <u>Commonwealths -</u>	↓

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D. C.

- Soviet Objectives - (1) Communist Expansion
+ Domination
- (2) Divide U.S. from Allies
 - (3) Weaken & Destroy Nats
 - (4) Weaken, or rule U.N. (Troika)
 - (5) Discourage & prevent Western European
pol. & Ec. Integration
 - (6) aid & abet revolution & disorder
 - (7) Penetrate & control L. Amer.
 - (8) Use of propaganda & threats to
terrorize & thus immobilize
the moral strength of Neutrals

Specifies (1) U.N. - Troika - Our Response
Do not let - Soviet Disarm U.N. & cripple

Congo

(2) Nato = Soviet promote fear of
Germany.
= Germany vital to Nato

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Royal Institute of International Affairs
① Lord Strang - chr.

Meeting Sect.
Frank Logan

② New frontiers in American Foreign Policy -

Our objectives = Freedom - Peace - Social Progress

but specifically = (1) Stgth support the U.N.

(2) stgth support NATO

(3) Encourage and support the
Pol. & Econ. Integration
of Western Europe

(4) assist and support the
emerging nations for
orderly & steady social &
Economic Progress

(5) Self-determination and
national independence

(6) the strengthening of the OAS
Alliance for Progress

(7) Respect for genuine Neutralism

Scotland yard
Lodis Moore
t. file - Committee
Investigation
& Interrogation!

Statements
a plenty!



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