

the Office of  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
140 Senate Office Building  
Washington 25, D.C.  
Capitol 4 - 3120, Ext. 881

For Release: Friday p.m.  
December 13, 1957

"SOFT THINKING OF LEADERSHIP -- NOT AMERICAN SOFT LIVING -- IS OUR PROBLEM,"  
SAYS HUMPHREY

"It has not been soft living, but soft thinking, which has nearly been our undoing," Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) declared this afternoon.

Rather than the "so-called soft living of the American people" leading to the present crisis in our position in the world, the Minnesota Democrat charged, it has been "the soft thinking of our leadership".

Addressing the Third Student Conference on International Affairs at Texas A & M College today, Senator Humphrey accused the Administration of guiding its foreign policy and its policy toward our own people by a series of superstitions.

"Perhaps the greatest superstition they have today," he said, "is that our military or our scientists can win this great 20th century battle for humanity by sole concentration on missiles and anti-missile-missiles and anti-anti-missile-missile-missiles."

"Our military shield has been shown to have great gaps which must be filled with all possible speed," Senator Humphrey declared. "But the final decision between democracy and communism will depend on what we do behind the shield which the military and scientists provide for us."

The Second Administration myth, Senator Humphrey said, is "that the American people are currently so preoccupied with enjoying their material wealth that they cannot be galvanized into action for the long pull ahead."

"We are said to have become accustomed to soft living," Senator Humphrey observed. "Frankly, I think this is a disgraceful assumption. In the midst of all of our current so-called prosperity, we Americans are still among the hardest working, on-the-job people in the world."

"We are ready to buckle down, once we know the task before us," he declared.

A third superstition now deluding the Administration, Senator Humphrey said is "that the American people want to be fooled, like to be reassured that all is well, wish to be told that minimum effort achieves maximum results."

"Time and again," he said, "we have been given empty reassurances from the highest possible quarters."

"Now it seems to me that these gentlemen have vastly under-estimated the American people," Senator Humphrey said. "They have been superstitious about our ability to absorb the shock of meeting the real challenge facing us."

"There is another superstition which has seemed to immobilize this Administration," Senator Humphrey said. "That is that the political risks required by effective leadership are too great."

"The assumption is that the opposition to foreign aid is so strong, that it is better not to ask for what is really needed, for, say, a sizeable loan to India right now. The assumption is that the pro-tariff forces are so strong that we cannot get, and therefore will not go all-out to enlist support for, the long-term trade policies that our leadership role requires. The assumption is that the strength of ultra-isolationists groups in this country is still so strong that nothing bold should be proposed to consolidate NATO politically or culturally."

"I question the validity of these assumptions," the Minnesota Democrat and member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee declared. "I think they are superstitions chiefly useful as excuses for inaction and timidity by our Government!"

OVER

"Soft Thinking of Leadership -- not American soft living -- is our problem," Says Humphrey

page 2

For Release Friday p.m. December 13, 1957

"For too long our foreign policy has been based on fear rather than hope; on reaction rather than action," Senator Humphrey said. "It is time that we walked confidently with the full stature and strength of our history and our present capacities as a people."

Senator Humphrey went on to set forth "the essential elements of a revitalized foreign policy for the United States". He called for:

1. **Marshalling** and expanding our resources of science and engineering -- not only the pooling of NATO efforts, but also the "vast untapped source of collective strength here in the two American continents."
2. Re-evaluating the defense budget, and assessing "the single-minded concept of massive retaliation" which has had "terribly dangerous implications in reducing our flexibility to meet unforeseen, nibbling actions" by the Soviet nations.
3. While keeping our guard up, also keeping open "the bridges of possible agreement" with the Soviets on specific issues.
4. Adopting a "long-range perspective" on the world. "It will be fatal", Senator Humphrey warned, "if we insist on quick results" in foreign policies.
5. Breaking out of the "holding-operation atmosphere" of our present policy -- joining with "the spirit of independent nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries."
6. Respecting the neutrality of new-born nations.
7. Making greater use of our economic strength. "We still have the capacity to outdo anything the Soviet Union can possibly manage in aid to uncommitted nations," Senator Humphrey warned, "but at the moment the Soviet effort is increasing while this country's effort is **shirking**."
8. Stepping up our Point Four program of technical assistance and helping to expand UN technical assistance programs. "At the NATO conference next week", he said, "we should be thinking in terms of coordinating technical assistance programs for the underdeveloped areas."
9. More active, constructive and imaginative use of our food and fiber abundance. "Food and fiber are a great potential force for freedom today," Senator Humphrey asserted. "They can be an active instrument of our foreign policy."
10. Continuous exploration of "all possibilities for agreements to control armaments," despite the "difficulties of trying to negotiate such agreements."
11. Setting a good standard at home in two areas that "vitally affect our foreign policy" -- immigration and civil rights.

Address on Foreign Policy  
by  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
before

SCONA  
III

Third Student Conference on International Affairs  
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas  
December 13, 1957

Don Mc Ginty —

Ladies and gentlemen, delegates and participants in this

Third Student Conference on International Affairs:

As some of you may know, your program committee asked

me to appear here two days ago to discuss the topic "How Can

The Situation in the Middle East Affect the Rest of the World?"

That is still a good question, and there are many aspects of the

Middle Eastern situation which I should like to discuss before

I conclude these remarks.

However, between the time my topic was selected and

various telephone calls from my office which resulted in re-

scheduling my visit until today, ~~Friday, the 13th~~, much has

happened to divert attention from the situation in the Middle

East to the situation in the United States and how it affects

the rest of the world.

Speaker Rayburn  
Congressman  
Teague

Lyndon Johnson  
Ralph Yarborough



Burke: "I am more worried about our own faults  
than the plans of our enemies"

↳ Perhaps wisdom, like charity, begins at home. So I

should like to begin this afternoon with a brief review of our  
own strengths and weaknesses -- and possibly, since this is Friday,  
the 13th, ~~may~~ allude to some of our national superstitions as well.

Such a review

~~All of this~~ is particularly timely right now because the

people of the United States during the past few weeks have

suddenly become apprehensive, introspective, and soul-searching.

↳ A couple of years ago when our Secretary of State first talked

about conducting agonizing reappraisals, he had in mind something

which we presumably were going to conduct on other governments

and other peoples if they did not behave as we desired. At

the moment, the United States is going through an agonizing re-

appraisal all right, but it is a reappraisal of ourselves, our

basic concepts, our security, our policies, and our place as

a world power.



I suppose~~X~~ that we ourselves have never entertained any real doubt about our basic ideals and objectives. We want to safeguard and enjoy the blessings of democracy, freedom, progress and justice here at home. Wherever possible, we want to join with <sup>like</sup>~~similarly~~-minded people around the world in preserving and extending these same objectives elsewhere.

Following our emergence from World War II in our new and unaccustomed role as the world's major power, we sought to implement these ideals and objectives in certain basic institutions and policies:

1. We took the initiative in organizing the United Nations even before the war was over, conscious of the world-wide, centuries-old yearning for practical organizational efforts toward peace.

2. We took the lead in encouraging and financing a whole host of independent <sup>or</sup>~~and~~ United Nations-connected agencies

to promote man's well being -- the ILO, UNNRA, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, the UN Children's Fund and the UN Technical Assistance Program.

L 3. We took the lead ten years ago in proposing international controls for atomic energy at a time when we were the sole possessors of nuclear power.

L 4. We recognized the postwar economic ~~plight~~ of our friends and allies in Europe and devised dramatic and effective programs of economic assistance through interim aid and the Marshall Plan.

L 5. We recognized, too, that the people of Germany and Japan also deserved our help in their return from dictatorship

and defeat. *to freedom and recovery.*

L 6. We had hoped against hope for continued cooperation with the Soviet Union, but when Kremlin intransigence again appeared, we met it forthright<sup>ly</sup> in Iran, Greece, Turkey, and the Berlin Blockade.

*and tired*

7. We showed that, <sup>sick</sup> as we were of war, we were determined to resist aggression militarily if need be, and to resist it not alone but in concert. We proved this by building NATO in the West and by fighting a bloody and disagreeable war in Korea for  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years.

8. We electrified the world with our Point Four proposal in 1949, not because it was one of several points in a Presidential inaugural message, but because in a meaningful way it put us in direct touch with the hopes and strivings of half a world of needy human beings.

Here were the institutions and policies through which we sought to achieve our ideals and objectives. They were not achieved overnight. NATO and the Marshall Plan took months to build and consolidate. A tremendous amount of detailed, tedious planning and effort went into them. A multitude of decisions had to be made at many levels. But the point is we were making decisions. And we were not either a Mr. Big or a Mr. Busybody.



We were a partner, willing to consult and cooperate on a day-to-day basis for ~~our~~ mutual advantage.

On the surface many of these institutions and policies still remain, but somehow many of them have been drained of the vitality and sense of commitment which they once enjoyed. We have only to look at the world around us to see the extent of the damage.

In the United Nations, <sup>fewer</sup> ~~few~~ countries have been working with us year after year, ~~and~~ On colonial <sup>ism</sup> and other issues, United States policy has been increasing <sup>by</sup> caught in the crossfire between ~~western~~ Europe and the Asian-African nations.

In the United Nations agencies and independent international organizations, we have been preoccupied with budgetary matters. Instead of campaigning to expand the services of these agencies, we have been campaigning for a reduction in our own financial contribution.

NATO

In planning for the crucial NATO conference about to take place in Paris, we have collectively wrung our hands over our own alleged inability to come up with any new non-military ideas, while systematically rejecting many of the imaginative ideas which have been proposed by our NATO allies -- so much so that the London Economist recently described our attitude toward NATO as "hell bent for half measures".

↳ In the field of immigration policy, we have refused to make any basic changes in our discriminatory immigration law. *We are the world's* <sup>but</sup> <sup>left to nations</sup> ~~In the~~ richest country, we have ~~allowed countries~~ far less capable economically, ~~to handle~~ the brunt of the tragic Hungarian emigration. Canada, our good neighbor on the North, has a far better record in this respect than we.

↳ In our role as the world's leading creditor nation, we should surely be applying the lessons we learned from our disastrous trade and tariff policies of the 1920<sup>1</sup>s and early 1930<sup>1</sup>s. Instead everyone assumes that we shall have another

"General Agreements  
on Trade & Tariffs"

tough fight in Congress on reciprocal trade, and the GATT

proposal has only a slight chance of passage. *P* The Administration

to whom we look for leadership on both these issues has, instead,

just raised the tariff on safety pins and clothes pins -- two

new recruits to the growing list of "defense industries" for

*protection*  
tariff purposes.

*Soviet Propaganda of Russia*  
In the vital field of information, the USIA has been

victimized by serious deficiencies of personnel and programming,

as well as by the *uncalled for* unnecessary political activities of its former

director. Tragically enough, this agency has become a political

football just at the time when we need it most.

In the equally important field of cultural exchange, we

have been frightened and timid. We have engaged in modest

experimental programs, *when* ~~and~~ we should be thinking *in* ~~of~~ bold, even

massive, terms.

In competitive exhibits in the field of international

trade fairs, the USSR is about to triumph once more over us.



Summit 24 funds & exhibit  
we - cut-back.!

at the Brussels Fair next spring.

L These are just some among many basic reasons, <sup>selected</sup> ~~picked~~  
at random, for the crisis in confidence from which American  
policy now suffers. Pick up any magazine, any newspaper in  
the months between Little Rock and <sup>the</sup> Vanguard fizzle a week  
ago, and you will find plenty of evidence for this crisis in  
confidence. L The evidence is coming in from all corners of  
the earth, and rightly or wrongly, has come to rest in  
Washington, D.C.

Newsmag

L In the United States itself, so deep is the general  
dissatisfaction with our present overall situation that sober,  
responsible columnists last week end were flooding the nation's  
leading newspapers with outbursts of pessimism and appeals  
for leadership -- directed toward the only place where leadership  
can come, the White House. Let me give you a few examples. I  
shall quote columnists, not politicians, because columnists are  
less suspect and are widely supposed to have fewer axes to grind.

In the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Walter Lippmann wrote: "Why is there no good prospect that the country will close ranks and rally to the President's standard? The answer, I am afraid, is that the President has raised no standard to which the country can rally."

In the Washington Post, Mr. Chalmers Roberts turned to the lines of I <sup>Corinthians</sup> ~~Cor~~ XIV, 8: "If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle?"

Mr. Roberts said: "Seldom short of war, has the mood of Washington appeared so gloomy to so many. It must be said in all candor that the trumpet thus far has indeed given forth an uncertain sound. And what is worse, there are no signs that its sound will change."

✓ In the New York Times, Mr. James Reston also turned to the Bible to begin his column: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Mr. Reston went on to say, "Washington is in trouble

today, not because it has lacked motion, but because it has lacked the vision, imagination, and drive to adjust its policies and institutions to the scientific, political and social revolutions of our time. We are in a race with the pace of history. We are in a time when brain power is more important than fire power. But in the last five years, the President has gradually drifted apart from the intellectual opinion of the country and filled up his social hours with bantering lockerroom cronies."

These are harsh judgments and would <sup>be</sup> suspect if they  
Instead, they now represent a common view,  
came from the President's political opponents. It is also,  
of course, delicate even to raise questions of Presidential  
responsibility at a time when the President himself has again  
suffered a physical setback.

Nevertheless, it is customary for our people to look to  
the President<sup>cy</sup> for leadership in time of crisis. No one doubts



any longer that this is such a time. <sup>finally</sup> Sputnik has brought  
home to us certain hard, inescapable facts. Of course, many  
of these facts have been there for some time. ~~and~~ Voices which previously  
warned about them have been pooh-poohed or ignored. — termed prophets  
of doom + gloom  
<sup>today</sup> ~~The~~ Sputnik symbolizes, as nothing before has done, the  
total Soviet challenge to our free society <sup>in</sup> ~~and~~ all its aspects:  
our educational system, our technology, our economy, our  
political decision-making process, and certainly one of our  
most fundamental assumptions -- that a free people by their  
free choice can mobilize their wills and their resources to  
provide <sup>a</sup> better life than any dictatorship can offer through  
a police state.

It is as if the beep-beep of a Sputnik and the chortles  
of a Khrushchev have combined to say to the world: "Western  
democracy has lost its purpose. <sup>It</sup> is loaded with fat and riches

and is incapable of direction or discipline to meet the challenges of the 20th century."

L It is a ringing, convincing answer to this accusation <sup>the U.S.</sup> that everyone wants and expects from Washington today. All that has been forthcoming so far is a great deal of talk about military missiles and a good many press releases about the need to train a few more scientists and engineers to "catch up with the Soviets". #

deal of both. Our military shield has been shown to have great gaps which must be <sup>repaired + filled</sup> ~~filled~~ with all possible speed.

L Our deficiencies in technology are important, and training more scientists and engineers will help repair them.

L But the final decision between democracy and communism will depend on what we do behind the shield which the military and the scientists provide for us.

Weapons cannot bring peace - only the time that is needed to wage peace.

I said I was going to mention superstitions. My dictionary describes <sup>a</sup> superstition as "an irrational attitude of mind, a belief in magic or chance."

Perhaps the greatest superstition ~~we have~~ <sup>prevailing</sup> today is that our military or our scientists can win this great battle for humanity by <sup>(sole concentration on)</sup> missiles and anti-missile-missiles and anti-anti-

missile-missile-missiles. <sup>In reality, my friends,</sup> ~~Instead~~ they can only hope to provide

us with that advantage which military preparedness has always had -- the time to win by other means.

I think we ought to recognize one thing quite clearly. A tacit mutual suicide pact between us and the Soviet Union is no answer at all to the basic problems the world wants solved. ~~answered.~~

As General Omar Bradley said in a magnificent speech last month: "The central problem of our time is how to employ human intelligence for the salvation of mankind. For 12 years



now we have sought to stave off ultimate disaster by devising arms which would be ultimate and disastrous. . . When are we going to muster an intelligence equal to that applied against the Sputnik and dedicate it to the preservation of this satellite on which we live? If we are going to save ourselves from the instruments of our own intellect, we had better soon get ourselves under control and begin making the world safe for living."

General Bradley has posed in precise terms the overriding question on which our future will hinge. Its answer may well determine not only our ability to lead but even our ability to survive in the decades ahead.

If we are to answer that question helpfully at all, our policy makers must first rid themselves of some other superstitions that have gripped them during the past few years.

Many of these superstitions are superstitions which people in Washington have about <sup>the</sup> people in the rest of the United States.

I have three in mind: \_\_\_\_\_

1. There is the superstition that the American people

are currently so preoccupied with enjoying their material wealth

that they cannot be galvanized into action for the long pull

ahead. We are said to have become accustomed to soft living.

Frankly, I think this is a disgraceful assumption. In the

midst of all of our current so-called prosperity (and, by the

way, that prosperity is not as widespread as some would have

us believe) -- in the midst of it, we Americans are still

among the hardest working, on-the-job-people in the world.

We are ready to buckle down, once we know the task before us.

2. There is the superstition that the American people

want to be fooled, like to be reassured that all is well,

wish to be told that minimum effort achieves maximum results.

Time and again we have been given empty reassurances like these

from the highest possible quarters: - listen -

The President at first told us that he was not bothered "one iota" by the military implications of Sputnik. The Secretary of State has been telling us off and on for years that the Soviet economy was crumbling, that American prestige was never higher, that we were going to liberate the satellites, that the end of foreign aid was somewhere just around the corner, etc.

L The Secretary of Defense for the last few years was a man who could say, "Basic research is when you don't know what you are doing", who once ~~scowled~~ <sup>scolded</sup> at a press conference that the Air Force had no business flying to the moon, and who said when first asked about American research in the satellite field, "I have enough problems on earth".

L The Secretary of the Treasury for the last few years was a man who has left a heritage all over the Administration of budget cutting, trimming, tailoring, scrimping, protecting the debt ceiling, and whistling bravely in the dark to keep



up our courage, while we take the gravest risks with our safety and security.

*L* Now, it seems to me, that these gentlemen have vastly under-  
estimated the American people. They have been superstitious  
about our ability to absorb the shock ~~required in~~ <sup>to</sup> meeting the real  
challenge facing us. So they hid that challenge from us, and

fed us myths and reassurances.

*- or didn't know, which is equally correct.*

*(X)* *L* As far as I am concerned, it has not been soft living but  
soft thinking which has <sup>nearly</sup> been our undoing. It has not been the  
so-called soft living of the American people, but the soft  
thinking of our leadership.

*L* 3. There is another superstition which has seemed to  
immobilize this Administration. That is the superstition that  
the political risks required by effective leadership are too  
great.

The assumption is that the opposition to foreign aid  
is so strong<sub>x</sub> that it is better not to ask for what is really  
needed, for, say, a sizeable loan to India right now. *L* The

assumption is that the pro-tariff forces are so strong that we cannot get, and therefore will not go all out to enlist support

for, the long-term trade policies <sup>that</sup> ~~what~~ our leadership role

requires. The assumption is that the strength of ultra-isolationist

groups in this country is still so strong, that nothing bold

should be proposed to consolidate NATO politically or culturally. <sup>or</sup>  
~~to strengthen the U.N. and expand its role in world affairs~~

X Frankly, I question the validity of these assumptions. I think

they are superstitions chiefly useful as excuses for inaction

and timidity by our Government. *Pause*

*/* My friends, we need a leadership that will brush away

these superstitions, take the risks that may exist, and lead

It is this precious element of decisiveness which we lack and

need. *Pause*

Now my purpose today is to do more than criticize. It

is to discuss with you ways and means to restore the strength

and position of the United States as the free world's leader

in the quest for peace and security.

And this is a challenge for each of us. Building better international relations obviously involves more than action by Government alone. Clearly, we must arouse our Government and awaken the Administration, but we must also dedicate our own personal energies as citizens to the task of <sup>*national security and*</sup> world peace.

We must show that the united efforts of free people can be greater than the enforced, monolithic effort of the Communist system. We must tap, all across the board, our great resources -- to do as your statement of purposes for this Student Conference proclaims -- "to help promote a generation of responsible leaders in international affairs."

There are areas where men and women, including many of you here today, working as individuals and through private organizations, can work constructively and in harmony with our major objective of world peace. The personal dimension remains all important.



There has been a great deal of comment in recent <sup>months</sup> ~~weeks~~ about the qualifications of some of our ambassadors to hold the positions they have. Of course it is outrageous to have a man selected as an ambassador merely because he is a heavy political contributor and without regard to his qualifications or experience. But it continues to happen.

Now for the sake of the record, I want to say that I do not necessarily believe that foreign service career people always make the best ambassadors. Indeed, many of our best ambassadors have been men and women whose lives have been lived within the boundaries of America, close to the everyday life of America.

It is time our Government recognized that our ambassadors should be drawn from the ranks of the leaders of our educational institutions, leaders of our farm and labor organizations, the leaders of our minority and nationality groups, from civic-minded people, with a dedication toward international understanding. I think of people like Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, a housewife of Red Wing, Minnesota, and our former Ambassador to Denmark; and Chester

Bowles, a businessman and politician with a heart, *who represented us so magnificently in India.*

↳ We have talked a great deal in recent years about private investment by American businessmen abroad as a way of strengthening America's foreign policy. I believe in the promotion of that private investment and I want to encourage it. However, there is another kind of investment which can be equally, if not more, advantageous.

↳ I refer to the investment of time and devotion which can come from American citizens traveling and serving abroad. I can think of church leaders and labor union members, engineers, *farm & business managers*, *nurses, doctors*, teachers, <sup>1</sup>scientists, students -- devoting a year or two of their lives, working in Asia and Africa and South America, in satisfying, worthwhile, constructive endeavor. There can be no greater or more effective way to transmit the real America to the rest of the world and to win its friendship.

↳ *yes.*  
A weakness in our foreign policy is that too much attention is paid to the formalities of diplomacy and too little attention to the workers in the factories, to the natives in the villages. *to the*

*Students & Teachers*  
How paradoxical this is.

Our history, our heritage, our experience in self-government, yes, our own revolution, are in fact the sources of our strength.

Our foreign policy is weakened and limited to the degree that we forget, or fail to apply, the yardstick of our own democratic experience to the complex and intricate problems of the world in which we live. We will not enhance freedom by aping the enemies of freedom. Democracy and free institutions are not made more secure by utilizing totalitarian techniques. To be strong we must be true to ourselves.

out  
It is time, therefore, that we walk <sup>and</sup> confidently with the full stature and strength of our history and our present capacities as a people. In a world that is desperately in need of capital, we have the greatest capital resources of all. In a world where people are anxious for the blessings of science and technology, we are richly endowed with these blessings. In a world where the majority of people are ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad, we are privileged to have an abundance of food and fiber and



the knowledge of scientific progress for health and shelter.

In a world where tyranny and cynicism are widespread, we have faith and confidence in our democracy.

out  
For too long our foreign policy has been based on fear rather than hope, on reaction rather than action. Let me use colonialism as an illustration. We have been afraid of revolutions in Asia and Africa, when in actual point of fact we should have helped develop and harness those revolutions, and helped the new nations along the road to independent development.

I am fully convinced that the truly good news of the 20th century is that millions of people in Asia and Africa are repeating in their own way the dramatic story of American independence. This is our message to the world -- the message of self-determination, liberation, faith in human dignity, and human ability. This message of brotherhood and human equality is our reservoir of good will.

Having said this much, let me become quite specific. How should we relate our policies to this world in revolution? What are the essential elements of a revitalized foreign policy for the United States?

First. Certainly we need breakthroughs in the science of energy and space, if only because without them we will be at the merciless whim of the Kremlin. *yes,* We must marshal and expand our resources of science and engineering which we lost by penny-pinching neglect and contempt for basic research.

Second. We must re-evaluate our defense budget and be willing to spend what the situation requires. We must also re-evaluate some of our basic strategic concepts. A single-minded concept of "massive retaliation" has had terribly dangerous implications in reducing our flexibility to meet unforeseen, nibbling actions. A determination to make all wars "massive", or

not to fight them at all, has had the effect of paralyzing

our policy since few, including the Soviets, believe we will

take the massive risk. —

*{ Soviet not blow the world to bits -  
just put it up bit by bit -  
operation nibble*

Third. We must frankly come to grips with the knotty

problem of reassessing our relations with the Communist world.

We must both meet the threat of Communist expansionism, and yet

not let it immobilize us. Somehow we must strive to blunt its

sharp edge, keep open the bridges of possible agreement on

specific issues, and lose no opportunity to demonstrate peaceful

intent. We must decide to do a very difficult thing: keep up

our guard at the same time as we try to <sup>increase</sup> contacts. <sup>Regardless of the recognition issue,</sup> I am convinced

that this <sup>effort</sup> must apply to our relations with Red China as well as

with the U.S.S.R.

Fourth. We must adopt the long-range perspectives on

the world ~~which the Soviet Union already has~~. We cannot expect

changes overnight. Constructive policies in Africa and Asia must



be geared to a long-term effort. History is not written in a day. ~~And~~ It will be fatal if we insist on quick results. If, instead, we could adopt a long-term perspective, our whole psychological approach to issues like foreign aid would take on a more healthy and realistic aspect.

Fifth. We must deliberately seek to break out from the holding-operation atmosphere of our present policy. We need to seek as many outlets as we can find for constructive international endeavor consistent with our basic democratic principles.

Obviously, therefore, we should join with the spirit of independent nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries, remind these people that we too are the children of self-determination, of revolution, and of a will to freedom and independence. Nearly half the people of the world are in nations which have recently emerged or are yet to emerge. They will be a powerful force in decades to come, and we must help them prepare to use their strength in behalf of freedom.

Sixth. We should respect the neutrality of new-born nations. These neutrals are not pro-Communist. They are pro-themselves. I suggest as long as nations remain free, as long as they work for themselves and build their own economies, they are barriers to Communist penetration, strengthening the forces of freedom in the world.

~~Why are we so much more critical of the neutralism of Burma and India than we are of the neutralism of Switzerland, Finland and Sweden? Surely we realize that our friends of Switzerland, Finland and Sweden are pro-democratic, pro-freedom. We admire their qualities, we admire their democracy, we herald their accomplishments. Let us apply the same standards to the Asian nations.~~

Seventh. We must make much greater use of our economic strength to help other free nations develop themselves and bring the blessing of freedom to their eager and impatient peoples. This is a weapon of peace and plenty which the Soviet Union could not match provided we utilized our capacity. At the

moment, the alarming fact is that the Soviet Union is matching us in economic assistance to underdeveloped countries. In fact, the magnitude of the Soviet foreign aid program is startling.

↳ In addition to \$7 billion of economic credits granted to Eastern Europe and China since 1945, the Soviet Union has pledged credits of more <sup>than</sup> \$1.8 billion to the underdeveloped countries outside the Iron Curtain in the two years that its aid program in these areas has been functioning.

↳ In Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan and India the effects of this Soviet assistance are beginning to be felt. In these countries Soviet economic aid is available on highly favorable terms -- long repayment periods and interest rates as low as  $2\frac{1}{2}\%$  per year. (Low enough to curl ex-Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's hair.)

↳ Communist China has also been busy in this field making extensive grants to Cambodia, Ceylon and Nepal.



Moreover, a striking feature in the foreign aid picture at the moment is that the Soviet effort is increasing while this country's effort is shrinking. We can still reverse this trend if we have the will to do it. We still have the capacity to outdo anything the Soviet Union can possibly manage in aid to uncommitted nations. But if this country refuses to use its capacity and seeks its security in "normal" <sup>Balanced Budgets + Budget ceilings,</sup> ~~tax rates,~~ protective tariffs and a Maginot line of missiles, <sup>then</sup> even token Soviet <sup>competition</sup> ~~interests~~ in the vast underdeveloped areas can be enough to turn them toward communism.

The outstanding case in point, of course, is India. This great <sup>free</sup> nation, whatever political differences we may have with it, holds the key to the future of South Asia. If the Indian development plan should fail, it would be an open invitation to the Communists to overrun South Asia as they overran China. And it is in danger of failing, for want of half a billion dollars which we, along with other Western

nations can lend. This is only a very small part of the total capital for the Indian development plan; by far the greatest part the Indians are squeezing from their own hard-pressed economy.

But this <sup>capital loan</sup> ~~small part they need~~ from the outside may be the margin between success and failure, between demonstrating that a free and independent people can develop their country and raise their standard of living, or surrendering to the brutal and ruthless methods of Communist development. We should be grateful we still have the opportunity to help them meet this test. Would we prefer that the U.S.S.R should do it? What would we not give <sup>now</sup> if we could have the opportunity to make such a choice in China! Let us not have to debate a decade from now "Who Lost India".

Eighth. We should step up our own Point Four program, at the same time that we continue to work through the UN and help expand UN technical assistance. No program has been more rewarding or has greater promise for a comparatively small

investment.

Here, too, the Communists have actively entered the field. The Soviet-Chinese block has at this very moment some 2,000 technicians working in 19 underdeveloped countries of the world. An equal number of technicians from these countries are studying in the Soviet Union. Still others are receiving Soviet-financed training at home.

It will be utterly foolhardy if we allow the Soviet Union to usurp what should be good basic American ground. *and western ground,*

We are the people hitherto known to the world as technologists, scientists, engineers. One of the most precious products in the world today is a reservoir of trained technical personnel.

We have always had such a reservoir and we should contribute from it unstintingly to the areas of the world that need our help.

*We need Experts for Export!*



L Indeed, at the NATO conference next week we should be thinking in terms of coordinating technical assistance programs for the underdeveloped areas. This is a concept which could naturally flow from proposals which undoubtedly will be discussed for pooling NATO's training of scientists and engineers.

L This also will be an excellent forum for our own State Department to review its cutback of the number of scientific attaches now being stationed in our own embassies abroad. <sup>In fact,</sup> ~~Indeed,~~ the presently unused assets of soft currency, now owned by the United States in NATO countries, should be considered as a possible source of loans to the countries <sup>deserving + needing to expand their</sup> ~~concerned for~~ scientific and other educational pursuits.

I do not  
~~Nor do I~~ mean to suggest that pooling scientific and technical resources is something which should be restricted to NATO. Delegates at <sup>this very</sup> ~~the~~ conference come from many parts of the Western hemisphere. You know as well as I do that there is a vast untapped source of collective strength here in the

two American continents. When we talk about pooling scientific  
endeavor, I think someone should start to pay some attention  
to another of our failures -- the failure to move ahead in a  
meaningful way to coordinate research activities in the Western  
hemisphere. This can be a two-way street. Our Latin American  
friends not only need and deserve increased capital investment  
and technical assistance from the United States and Canada,  
but the talents and energies of our friends South of the Border  
ought to be <sup>mobilized</sup> utilized far more effectively in this mutual effort.

Ninth. We should more actively, constructively, and  
imaginatively use our blessings of food and fiber as a powerful  
force for freedom. Our abundance is a tremendous asset, not  
the curse some are inclined to make it appear. In a world where  
millions lack enough to eat, we should be humbly thankful that  
we are blessed with abundance -- and we should be wise enough  
to use that abundance for the sake of humanity.

DAS  
+  
Tech Asset

I am proud to have had a part in the formulation of the programs under Public Law 480 by which we can not only use our abundant stocks of foods and fibers to relieve acute emergency shortages elsewhere in the world, but also to help economic development programs where they are urgently needed. We in this country do not know what it means to have to choose between a necessary rate of investment and enough to eat; we must do what we can to help ease that choice for others. A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger is more significant than the conquest of outer space. We have hardly scratched the surface of what can be achieved with our abundance under the concept of Public Law 480, and its full potential must be utilized without further delay.

① Food Policy should be a part of Foreign Policy.

Tenth. While we maintain our armed strength, we must continue to explore all possibilities for agreements to control armaments. And we must manage to convey to the world -- ~~and we~~ ~~have not up to now~~ -- the sincerity of our passion for peace



and for control of arms as a means of diminishing the danger of war. This is a subject on which I, myself, feel very strongly, because as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have followed closely the efforts to reach agreement with the U.S.S.R.

I appreciate the difficulties of trying to negotiate such an agreement with impenetrable and unpredictable <sup>Soviet</sup> ~~Russian~~ representatives. But I appreciate also the need to have a clear, unified policy of our own (which we have not always had) and to convince not only the Russians but the whole world of the earnestness and sincerity of the American people's determination to lift this dark shadow from themselves and from all mankind.

✓ In this connection, it is time that we spent more on disarmament. The best reliable figures on the cost to the United States of the recent London disarmament conference, including salaries, transportation and living expenses of the

entire American delegation was something like \$325 thousand.

To be sure this figure is not to be sneezed at, but we also know something about relative costs. A single B-52 bomber costs \$8 million. A single submarine now costs \$42.5 million.

One General who watched a recent test firing of a Jupiter missile commented that firing rockets is comparable to burning ten dollar bills by the ton.

While we ~~making~~ these massive expenditures, and I do not question the basic necessity to do so, I think that our ~~safety as well as~~ <sup>might be increased, and</sup> our long-run expenditures might be <sup>reduced,</sup> ~~enhanced~~ if we spend a little more on the active effort toward peace.

Eleventh. We must set a good standard at home, particularly in two areas that so vitally affect our foreign policy -- immigration and civil rights. As long as the subject of science and missiles is so uppermost in our national consciousness, we

might pursue the matter a little further and ask: \*How many brilliant scientists have we turned away from the shores of this country because of our restrictive immigration laws? How many promising Negro children during the past generation have been denied an opportunity to develop their skills in this land of the free? Why do we still differentiate among national origins?

These questions go to the heart of American democratic behavior. If over the years our principles themselves have not been strong enough to <sup>control</sup> ~~influence~~ our practice, perhaps Sputnik will again be a blessing in disguise and force us to face up to issues which we should have faced anyway.

Middle East

-39-

Let me now in conclusion attempt to apply some of these principles specifically to the situation in the Middle East.

Here, as the result of the latest Soviet effort to expand, the danger of war has recently seemed most immediate. Here, twice in twelve months, Soviet plotting and mischief-making fanned into flame long smouldering tension and animosities.

This is not what the Middle East needs. The Middle East needs time to <sup>calm</sup> ~~down~~ its passions and develop its resources for the benefit of its people. But the urgent need to preserve the peace, the pressure for change, for social advance, for an end of poverty and ignorance, will not wait for that region to mobilize and exploit its resources on its own. No country in the Middle East -- certainly no Arab country -- has the experience



or the skills to ~~stave off communism by pushing~~ <sup>push economic</sup> development on a scale and at a pace commensurate with the need. The area could be lost to the Communists without a single overt act of aggression, without the Eisenhower doctrine ever being invoked, unless we place at its disposal the wealth of our experience and mobilize the funds required to step up the process of human rehabilitation and social progress.

↳ We should move to strengthen the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East to use on the Turko-Syrian border if necessary. We should initiate proposals in the United Nations to place the United Nations police force on a continuing basis for permanent availability for service elsewhere as the United Nations may direct.

↳ We should initiate proposals to end the arms race in the Middle East by an effective embargo against shipments from any outside source other than under United Nations auspices. To this end, we should seek the establishment by the United Nations General Assembly of a Special Commission on Arms Traffic, which Commission would be charged with responsibility for proposing

early recommendations on regulating all flow of non-United Nations materiel into that region.

↳ We should consider proposing a pilot project, open-skies aerial and ground inspection system over the Egyptian-Israeli-Jordanian-Syrian-Saudi Arabian border areas. Since many of these governments supported the 1955 United Nations resolution giving priority to these proposals on a wider scale, the same governments might be asked to assist in the reduction of tensions in their own areas, as well as help promote the usefulness of this concept for disarmament negotiations generally, by agreeing now to such a pilot mutual inspection system to be conducted by themselves or by outside parties as agreed upon.

↳ We should recognize the critical importance of re-establishing the principle of free navigation on international waterways, specifically including free, unfettered access to the use of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba for the shipping of all nations. To this end, we should be taking the leadership in the

United Nations where already existing resolutions in this matter remain to be implemented and reinforced.

✓ We should propose the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices Commission, whose purpose would be to reduce tensions in the Middle East by promoting direct negotiations between the current antagonists and mediating among them if direct negotiations prove to be impossible. The Commission should be specifically charged with unremitting exploration of the possibility of negotiations on the central problems of determination of boundaries, resettlement of Arab refugees from Israel and of Jewish refugees from Egypt and Syria, and the conclusions of treaties of peace.

✓ We should help break the stalemates of inertia and blockade by promoting dynamic projects to help raise living standards, strengthen economies, and encourage orderly social progress in the Middle East. We should reaffirm our interest and support for long-term regional economic development programs sufficiently broad to encompass multi-national river

development projects for the Jordan, Nile, and Tigris-Euphrates river valley systems. Toward this end, we should take the initiative in the United Nations in proposing a Middle East Development <sup>Agency</sup> ~~Authority~~, as an administering agency for the mutual pooling of capital and technical aid in the region, the Board of Directors of which would contain representatives of all Middle Eastern States as well as of all other states furnishing capital aid technical assistance.

# The Italian government has just proposed a similar project for discussion next week in Paris. Problems and details are assuredly difficult, but I wish our State Department had not rejected the proposal out of hand, as it apparently did.

✓ A Middle East Development Agency could demonstrate to the Arab leaders that they have more to gain by internal and cooperative economic development than from military adventures. Providing constructive channels for Arab energies could eventually lead to institutional and social changes, such as the growth of a middle class with its beneficial and stabilizing influence.



It would provide a means of channeling Arab oil revenue into productive uses which would benefit the entire area, thus utilizing part of the presently existing hard money resources of the Middle East for the financing of regional development.

It would be an international entity with which the states of the area could carry on bilateral negotiations and bilateral economic agreements.

It could work out a solution to the whole Israel-Arab refugee problem. The only long-term solution for the refugees is basic economic development, which will make it possible for the area to support more people at a higher standard of living.

It could encourage international acceptance of the Jordan River plan and similar developments on the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile, involving more than one state.

It could give technical assistance and supervised farm credit to farmers settling on new lands coming into production from river valley development.

The creation of a Middle East Development Agency in the

terms here suggested would emphasize the fact that it is in the interests of all concerned to move from intra-regional feuding to intra-regional cooperation for development.

Most important, perhaps, such an Agency would encourage a regional approach to the problems of Middle East development. Isolated projects here and there, financed by bilateral aid from the United States, obviously offer no real answer to the needs of the region. Even a cursory look at its resources reveals the absolute economic interdependence of the states of the area and the necessity of intra-regional cooperation.

All of the region's major rivers, for example -- the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Jordan and the Nile -- flow through more than one state. Their development for irrigation and power depends on agreement between the states concerned. Oil produced in Saudi Arabia and Iraq must be transported to market across

the territory or through ports controlled by other states of the region. Industrial development hinges upon the opening of mutual markets, a freer exchange of goods, among the several countries of the region as well as trade with the rest of the world. The essential patterns of regional cooperation and development cannot be produced by a series of bilateral arrangements with the several nations of the area.

I consider these proposals to be sound, practicable and indicative of the positive approach which the United States must soon adopt. It will take courage and daring to adopt such an approach in the Middle East. Without these qualities, however, we will continue to muddle, moralize, and probably miss the opportunity to be of constructive use in the Middle East.

With these qualities, we can at least hope that our courage will be rewarded.

Courage after all is probably the quality we need most today. I have tried to outline what I believe to be the task ahead of us. It is a task challenging the energies and enthusiasms of every American who thinks at all about his country's future. [The challenge is an inescapable one for you and me: to go out into this generation to stand for the truths that man's future on earth need not be cancelled; that his political ingenuity can still rescue him from ruin; that his moral and ethical standards still are here; that some things, like war and injustice, may seem everlasting, but that these things are everlastingly wrong.

*End Triumphs when good men fail to Act -*

12/11/57

*~~Spent with Mrs. Krenkel~~  
Star and Bethlehem*





# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)