

Address on Foreign Policy
COPY
by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
before
Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO
October 31, 1957

There is no group in America with whom I would prefer to discuss our role in world affairs than with you, my good friends of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO. You and I approach this subject from the same set of values -- the desire to achieve world peace with dignity, and the conviction that as a nation we can best contribute to that objective by recognizing that our strength is more than military -- it must be the strength that comes from the spirit of human equality, economic equity and political liberty.

I intend to talk frankly. Our national survival is at stake and in danger. We confront this danger in a weakened position:

the social strains of racial tension heightened
by the irresponsibility of unpatriotic demagogues;

COPY
pockets of corruption in labor unions captured
by selfish and morally callous power-hungry men;

tight money, big profits, and inflation mixed
with serious pockets of deflation;

and in the midst of this, a conspicuous absence
of national political leadership.

All these factors tear at the very fibers of democratic purpose
that must unite us as a nation if we are to meet the profound dangers
that threaten us and our welfare.

We must talk frankly with each other because for too long the
facts have been deliberately kept from the American people. There
is even reason to believe that the facts have been kept from the
President himself! Since January 1953, our nation has been governed
by the shoddy principles of public relations.

The Eisenhower Administration has been more interested in press
releases than in deeds. It has been more interested in telling
the American people that "all is well" than in doing anything to

make things well. **COPY** In our dealings with other nations, the same preoccupation with appearances over realities has been present.

The Eisenhower Administration has been more interested in threatening talk than in constructive thought.

The result has been a deterioration of our status in the world and the lessening of our leadership and respect in the community of nations. It is, therefore, time for us to look at the facts -- unpleasant as they may appear -- and to lift our heads out of the sand. The substitution of objectivity for false optimism is essential if we are to retrieve our losses and resume our leadership.

What are the facts? Here are some of them:

1. The Sputnik has revealed for all to see that the United States is no longer the unchallenged scientific leader of the world.
2. It is also now clear to the world that the U.S.S.R. will probably be the first nation to possess the ultimate weapon, the

intercontinental ballistic missile

COPY

3. The recent coup in Syria has given the Kremlin a military and strategic foothold in the Mediterranean which it has sought for years, which the Truman Doctrine once successfully warded off, but which now places the Soviet in a significant position of initiative in the Middle East.

4. Our diplomatic ups-and-downs with Egypt have strengthened a rising dictatorship in that country which controls the Suez Canal and through it the lifeline of the Middle East, and which identifies itself with the anti-American aspirations of the Communist world.

5. Our closest allies, England and France, mistrust our leadership, and fear our shortsightedness and unpredictability.

6. Our influence in the United Nations is today at its lowest ebb as a rising number of smaller nations reject our leadership and question the morality and perspective of our judgments.

COPY

7. Governments in Asia that are friendly to us, either lose elections, as in Ceylon, lose their leaders, as in Thailand and the Philippines, or lose their hold on the future, as in Formosa and perhaps Korea.

8. Instead of working effectively to strengthen our relationship with the few major democratic strongholds that remain such as India, we undermine that relationship. We insist that if an independent, freedom-loving nation like India, is not with us all the way all the time, India must be against us. This is a sure way to have it against us.

Yes, much has happened in the space of five short years to damage our nation and its reputation in the world.

I must admit that when I allow myself to think about it, my emotions well up with indignation. I resent the fact that the Eisenhower Administration has allowed this to happen to our country. I resent the fact that a crescendo of public relations

COPY

slogans has replaced sound and thoughtful public policy. I am shocked that an Administration has allowed itself to be victimized -- even paralyzed -- by its own campaign slogans -- slogan adopted in the first place to please a small, unrepresentative element of right-wing Republicans.

I grieve over the fact that we have had a Secretary of Defense who could say "Basic research is when you don't know what you are doing"; and who, when asked about American research in the satellite field, would flippantly say, "I have enough problems on earth"; and who once scowled at a press conference that the Air Force had no business flying to the moon. I sometimes wonder how General Motors did as well as it did in years gone by. This blind, stubborn, lack of imagination has no place in the ranks of our country's leadership and a President responsible for that selection ought to be held responsible by the American people.

COPY

I am amazed that we have had an Administration during the past five years which has automatically placed greater reliance on budgetary considerations than on considerations of national defense. Defense policy in the Eisenhower Administration has been determined by the Secretary of the Treasury and not by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and you know it.

We are today experiencing the unfortunate results of this muddling and befuddling period in American history.

But my purpose is to do more than chastise. It is to discuss with you ways and means for us to retrieve ourselves and rally once more to the cause of national welfare and world peace.

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 world peace.

COPY

This unity of effort is essential because our Communist

opponents have a unity of effort. We must tap, all across the board, our great resources of individual and business initiative, free trade unionism and our humanitarian concern for fellow human beings.

I know that the organized labor movement of America has been living up to its international responsibilities by exerting its leadership and influence toward supporting the establishment of free labor movements elsewhere. These efforts have been largely successful, and in many parts of the world Communist-dominated labor movements have been stopped in their tracks. More power to you.

But there are other areas where men and women, working as individuals and through private organizations, can work constructively and in harmony with our major objective of world peace.

COPY

There has been a great deal of comment in recent 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 career people 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 farm organizations, leaders of our labor organizations, the leaders of our minority and nationality groups, from civic-minded people, with a dedication toward international understanding. I think of

COPY

people like Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, a housewife of Red Wing, Minnesota, and our former Ambassador to Denmark; and people like Chester Bowles, a businessman and politician with a heart. I think of people like Emil Rieve, of the Textile Workers Union, whose services ought to be mobilized by our Government and who ought not to be allowed to retire to Florida. These are the kind of people who represent the best of America.

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 energy which can come from American citizens traveling and serving abroad. I can think of church leaders and labor union members, engineers,

COPY

teachers, scientists, students - all of them 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.

A successful foreign policy is one that has the support of the people back home as well as the acceptance of the people abroad to whom it is directed. A weakness in our foreign policy is that too much attention is paid to the embassies and the foreign ministries and too little attention to the workers in the factories, to the natives in the villages. How paradoxical this is.

We can win the battle for men's minds. We can win the hearts of the world. We can undermine the cancer of totalitarianism. We can do so if we are dedicated and unpretentious. We can do so if we are true to ourselves and our traditions.

Our history, our heritage, our experience in self-government,

COPY

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.

It is time, therefore, that we walk confidently in the stature and strength of our history and 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
COPY
the knowledge of scientific progress for health and shelter.

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. I am fully convinced that the truly good news of the Twentieth 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. This message of brotherhood and human equality is our reservoir of good will.

To gain respect, we must depend on our ideals and our history and not on our atom bombs and wealth. To the extent that we have lost friends, we have done so because we have forgotten the message of human brotherhood and equality.

COPY

Now is the time to be true to our traditions and to remind

ourselves of our faith. "Time" is an interesting concept.

The one word that seems important to me is time. But this concept of time is meaningless unless it is used, and the question is who will use the time and for what purpose. If there is to be a time period for easing of tensions, will this mean less effort on our part? Are we to assume that the long-range objective of Communism -- namely, to dominate the world -- will be given up or set aside? I see no convincing evidence to lead to that conclusion. Therefore, time is an ally to whomever pre-empts it -- uses it. We can be sure the Soviets will not waste it. Whether we like it or not, "co-existence" will be competitive. We had better plan our future around this fact.

What should we do with this time? Let me make a few specific suggestions:

COPY

First. We should join with the spirit of nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries, reminding these people that we too are the children of self-determination, of revolution, and of a will to freedom and independence.

Second. We should respect the neutralism of new-born nations. These neutrals are not necessary^{ily} 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 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 be equally tolerant with the Asian nations.

COPY

Third. We should engage in greater use of our capital

through international organizations such as the UN, the World

Bank, and other international financial development groups.

We need a new effort, not so much on the basis of gifts, but

on the basis of long-term loans.

Fourth. 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. Let us take the initiative

in this area.

Fifth. Let us use our blessings of food and fiber. We

can proceed through the UN, offering vast quantities of food

and fiber to be placed under the general direction of the UN

Food and Fiber Reserve. Here, too, we can seize the initiative.

We have the food and fiber -- we can call upon others to share.

Sixth. We must set a good standard at home -- revise our

immigration laws, set new standards of morality in government,

COPY

business, and labor. We must implement our new program of civil rights.

Seventh. We should authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchange, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, labor, businessmen, journalists, and others engaged in public communications.

Eighth. We must devise new methods of working in and through the UN, with particular emphasis on the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture, and the Children's Emergency Fund. These programs represent America's compassion and generosity exercised in a spirit of international cooperation.

Let us now specifically apply these principles to a great crisis which faces us today -- the crisis of the Middle East. The Middle East needs time to develop its resources for the benefit of its people. But 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 -- ~~any~~ certainly no

COPY

Arab country -- has the experience or the skills to stave off Communism by pushing development on a scale and at a pace commensurate with the need. The area could be lost to the Communists without a single military move unless we place at its disposal the wealth of our experience and where necessary the funds required to step up the process of human rehabilitation and social progress.

Our first task should be to establish a Middle East Development Agency through the United Nations. It would divert the attention of Arab leaders from military adventures to internal economic development. Turning Arab energies into constructive channels would eventually lead to institutional and social changes, such as the growth of a middle class, which would have a 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 development projects involving more than
one state.

It could give technical assistance and supervised farm credit
to farmers settling on new lands coming into production from
the development of the Jordan, the Litani, the Tigris, the
Euphrates, and the Nile.

COPY

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

COPY

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.

Now, one final word. Food is the common denominator of international life. Food and fiber are a great potential force for freedom today. It can be an active instrument of our foreign policy.

I am convinced that our official policy at the moment is far too shortsighted. A disservice has been done to the American people by creating the impression that our abundance is just an unwanted problem instead of a blessing.

I know from what I have seen that American food and fiber is vital to the very existence of thousands of undernourished

COPY

people in the Middle East -- the brightest ray of hope for building stronger economies and greater political stability in most of the countries I visited.

I wish every Minnesota farmer who has been told he must drastically cut down his production could have walked with me through the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, the orphanages in Greece, or among the masses of unemployed huddled in shanty towns in Spain. I wish they could have seen the young hands outstretched for food, and heard the appeals for milk from haggard, worried mothers.

More of our food and fiber can be marketed for foreign currencies if we expand and extend Public Law 480. Here is an area for positive progressive action and one which vitally affects the people of America.

I close these remarks by restating certain convictions which I am confident you share. Ours is a nation more of compassion

COPY

than of cruelty. Ours is a people more of generosity than
of selfishness. Ours is a tradition more of faith than fear.

If this nation can show the world a way to eradicate the
shame and scandal of poverty, of exploitation, of oppression,
of greed, without resort to social revolution and class
struggle and dictatorship; if we can place these material
values in their proper subordinate place within the context
of a mighty spiritual movement which will be revolutionary
without being subversive, which will draw its substance from
the riches of the Western tradition, then our faith will not
have failed us. It will have sustained us through this
present period of doubt and drift, and it will have led us
on to the achievement of our goals of freedom, justice, and
peace.

10/25/57

PEACE -- OUR MOST URGENT BUSINESS

Address on Foreign Policy

by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

before

Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO

October 31, 1957

It is a singular privilege and pleasure to address the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO. I feel particularly honored in being presented to the delegates by one of America's outstanding citizens and labor statesmen, Mr. Walter Reuther.

The AFL-CIO, under the courageous and honorable leadership of George Meany and Walter Reuther, continues to strengthen the political and economic fabric of America. Our country is a much better nation because of free American labor. The world is a better place in which to live because of the accomplishments and leadership of the American free trade union movement. We are indebted to all of you for your constant vigilance in protecting our nation's political and economic freedom, and at the same time insisting upon a higher standard of living. -- for not only the people of this great nation, but of people everywhere.

These have been troublesome days for all of us. The forces of communism, gangsterism and corruption, both on the international and domestic scene, challenge our courage, our sense of decency and the principles and ideals of democratic institutions. It is the responsibility of all of us to wage a relentless war against these three persistent and evil enemies of freedom and decency.

Let me compliment the AFL-CIO on doing a magnificent job in the field of ethical practices. With great courage -- the kind of courage that very few other organizations have demonstrated thus far -- the AFL-CIO is rooting out the forces of corruption and evil from its ranks, just as it has rooted out the forces of communism and subversion. This should make every member proud of their Federation.

The fearless and principled leadership of men like George Meany and Walter Reuther merits the wholehearted cooperation and support of every liberty-loving and honorable member of this great Federation. The free labor movement was designed to serve the legitimate interests and needs of working people. It must never be the plaything of hoodlums or the sanctuary for gangsters, or a power front for communism and subversion. We can be thankful that loyal, patriotic and courageous leadership has thwarted each and every attempt of the Commies to take over, and that same leadership is now meeting head on the handful, and yet powerful, elements of corruption that have momentarily besmirched the good name of labor.

The labor movement itself can go much further and be much more effective than legislation in dealing with the problem of corruption within the ranks of labor. But there is room for legislation, and it is necessary for the labor movement to cooperate in the adoption of legislation that will protect the legitimate interests of working people and the rights of labor unions themselves.

For example, there is a definite need for legislation to protect health and welfare funds. I favor a comprehensive health, welfare and pension fund disclosure statute which would be applicable to all funds whether administered by unions, management or both. Whenever anyone handles other peoples' money, there is a need for public regulation and public scrutiny. I encourage the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to follow in the footsteps of the AFL-CIO and support such legislation -- legislation like that designed by the Douglas Subcommittee of the 84th Congress.

I have been an early supporter of legislation to protect health, welfare and pension funds, and I shall continue that support until we accomplish that goal.

I would also support legislation requiring disclosure of union finances on the theory of the member's right to know. To be sure, this legislation is necessary for only a small minority of union leaders. But I am afraid this is the only way to reach that small minority. I am against so-called right-to-work legislation. Right-to-work laws are bad and they have nothing to do with corruption. Those who advocate these laws are doing a disservice because they make more difficult the problem of cleaning up the movement from within.

We are beginning to appreciate the full meaning of this kind of climate that the Taft-Hartley law has generated in union-management relations through the Shefferman exposures. Shefferman has developed the science of union-busting to a high degree. This has been made possible in large part by the climate if not the language of the Taft-Hartley Law.

As serious as some of the domestic problems confronting you may be, I want to turn your attention to a subject even more pressing for all Americans.

I want to talk to you today about the most urgent and, at the same time the most difficult, piece of business facing the American people: the business of peace, and the security of the United States and the Free World.

In an age when war could mean annihilation, the maintenance of peace is our most urgent business. It is also our most difficult task, because in Soviet Communism we face an adversary whose aim is domination of the world, if not by war then by all means short of war. This poses a deadly threat not only to the United States, but to all the free world -- our allies and those friendly nations

which, while they are not allied with us, are intent on preserving their freedom and independence. To these we might now add a third category -- those unwilling captives of soviet power who are struggling for independence of Soviet domination.

Except as other free nations are peaceful and secure, we cannot find peace and security for ourselves, even if we were disposed to try. Witness the events in Hungary, and the continuing and terribly explosive crisis in the Middle East.

Faced with the gravest dangers we have ever known, our foreign policy is in a state of confusion and disarray which can only feed and aggravate the dangers. In fact, it would be more accurate to say that we have no coherent foreign policy, but a series of patched-up-arrangements and improvised reactions to crisis situations, many of which could have been avoided and all of which could be more effectively contained if we had pursued a foreign policy that was bold without being brash, imaginative without being impulsive, firm and consistent, without being stubborn or rigid. Formosa, Indochina, Egypt, Suez, and now Syria -- each one has left our position more precarious and our adversaries stronger.

Add to this that after four years and \$150 billion, our defense program, dominated by budget ceilings and business mentality, has been seriously weakened relative to our commitments and to the strength of the U.S.S.R. Is it any wonder that there is a rising chorus of apprehension and criticism, both in the United States and among our friends abroad?

There is no group in America with whom I would prefer to discuss our role in world affairs than with my good friends of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO. You and I approach this subject from the same set of values -- the desire to achieve world peace with dignity, and the conviction that as a nation we can best contribute to that objective by recognizing that our strength is more than military -- it must be the strength that comes from the spirit of human equality, economic progress, political liberty, and social justice.

I intend to talk frankly. Our national survival is at stake and in danger.

We must talk frankly with each other because it is a sad truth that too often the present Administration has not been candid with the American people.

Within the past few weeks, American strength and American prestige have received blow after blow. The successful firing of the first Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile was a rude awakening after the Administration's bland assurances that we were "far ahead of the Soviets." It is not recorded that we have yet fired an American ICBM. And the U.S. Navy has disclosed that the Soviet Union has perfected a 1500-mile missile

which jeopardizes every overseas United States base within range.

Then came Little Rock. The efforts of Governor Faubus to nullify and obstruct constitutional law have been exploited by the Soviet propaganda machine in every part of the world. The effects on American prestige in Asia and Africa have been devastating. Little Rock was for us a humiliating defeat; for the U.S.S.R. an earned propaganda victory. It will take a long time and a long record of positive accomplishments in securing civil rights to repair the damage done by the incredible intransigence of the Governor of Arkansas and by the President's indecision and reluctance to act in the face of insurrection.

The launching of the Soviet Satellite was another stunning defeat. Not only did it advertise to the world that the United States had lost its scientific leadership, it also advertised the progress of the Soviet Union in the development of rockets and missiles. No amount of effort by the Administration to pooch-pooch this great scientific breakthrough -- comparable to splitting the atom and harnessing atomic energy -- can obscure the Soviet success. They succeeded while we were dissipating our energies in conflict and confusion between the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, under the direction -- or lack of direction -- of a Defense Secretary who belittled and derided research and occupied himself with budget cutting, trimming, tailoring, scrimping, and whistling bravely in the dark to keep up our courage. He was not interested, this Secretary, in "what makes fried potatoes brown or grass green", so he said. Well, the Soviets knew the value of research; and while Secretary Wilson was limiting defense expenditures in order to prevent a breakthrough in the debt ceiling, the Soviet Union was expanding and accelerating its defense program and breaking through into outer space!

Ex-Secretary Wilson bears a heavy responsibility for this, and so does Ex-Secretary Humphrey (the other Humphrey). But the man who bears the greatest and ultimate responsibility is an Ex-General, now President of the United States. Did he know, when the Administration was ordering a 25 percent cut in military aircraft and missile production, that United States radar in Turkey had been monitoring test flights of Soviet long-range missiles for more than two years? Did he know about Secretary Wilson's secret order of August 17 cutting research and development by \$170 million, in the face of reports of Soviet missiles and the Soviet satellite? Did he know about the cutback in the funds appropriated by Congress for development work on nuclear-powered rockets?

It seems to me that President Eisenhower owes the American people an explanation. If he knew the facts, why did he permit these short-sighted cutbacks? In any case, it was his business to know and to act accordingly. I am afraid the recent disclosures fit the all-too-familiar pattern of an Administration

so preoccupied with reducing the budget and protecting the debt ceiling that it is willing to take the gravest risks with our safety and security.

The crisis in the Middle East is a matter of the gravest urgency, which I shall speak about in a few minutes. But it is well to remember that the Middle East is only the latest episode in the progressive deterioration of our status in the world and the lessening of our leadership and respect in the community of nations. It is, therefore, time for us to look at the facts -- unpleasant as they may appear -- and to life our heads out of the sand. The substitution of objectivity for Pollyanna optimism is essential if we are to retrieve our losses and resume our leadership.

What are the facts? Here are some of them:

1. Sputnik has revealed for all to see that the United States is no longer the unchallenged scientific leader of the world.

2. It now appears that the U.S.S.R. will probably be the first nation to possess the ultimate weapon, the inter-continental ballistic missile.

3. The recent coup in Syria has given the Kremlin a military and strategic foothold in the Mediterranean which it has sought for years, which the Truman Doctrine once successfully warded off. The Soviet is now in a favorable position to infiltrate its way into control of the Middle East and control Western Europe's oil supply.

4. Our diplomatic flirtation with Nasser, plus our sudden rebuff of the Aswan Dam Project, surely contributed to the Suez crisis, which, which brought the world to the brink of war and has left the lifeline of the Middle East in lasting jeopardy.

5. We have failed to grasp the significance of the great anti-colonial revolutions sweeping over Asia and Africa. We seem hesitant, uncertain and aloof. The surging forces of nationalism cannot be directed or understood by timid and unimaginative men.

6. We have placed too great faith in frail military alliances, which have often divided rather than united free nations; and we have neglected the opportunities to use our matchless economy for substantial, long-range economic and technical assistance. Too often our economic aid has been grudging and galling to those who needed it, a far cry from the idealistic generosity of the Marshall Plan and the original Point Four.

7. At the same time, the cutbacks in our defenses have left us overcommitted and over-reliant on "massive Retaliation"

as our only means of defense.

8. We have turned our backs on the Good Neighbor Policy and dissipated our great fund of good will in Latin America.

9. We have made far too little use of our vast stores of food and fiber as instruments of mercy and economic development.

10. We have joined the arms race in the Middle East while denying arms to our friend, Israel.

11. We have talked irresponsibly of "liberation" of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe, but we have had no policy for encouraging or assisting them in peaceful progress toward independence.

12. We have applied rigid and self-righteous tests of friendship to the neutral nations of Asia and Africa, failing to recognize that their independence and well being are a powerful deterrent to the spread of Communism. A thriving and independent India is more important to us than a paper alliance with a weak India.

13. Slogans and speeches for domestic consumption, inept propaganda abroad, and inadequate diplomatic representatives, have distorted the image of America and the American people and turned a false and unappealing face to the world.

14. Our influence in the United Nations is faltering, as more and more of the smaller nations question our leadership and the wisdom and morality of our judgment.

Yes, much has happened in the space of five short years to damage our nation and its reputation in the world.

When I think what has happened -- that need not have happened-- I become angry and indignant. I resent the fact that the Eisenhower Administration has allowed this to happen to our country. I resent the fact that a crescendo of public relations slogans has replaced sound and thoughtful public policy. I am shocked that an Administration has allowed itself to be victimized -- even paralyzed-- by its own political slogans -- slogans adopted in the first place to please a small, unrepresentative element of right-wing Republicans.

Do you remember the slogan about "unleashing Chiang Kai-Shek", removing the U.S. Seventh Fleet which had been sent to Formosa in the first place not to "leash" Chiang but to protect Formosa from Communist invasion? And the slogan about "liberation" of the Soviet satellites in Europe, which aroused false hopes in Hungary and other unhappy, enslaved countries?

I grieve that we have a Secretary of Defense who could say "Basic research is when you don't know what you are doing"; and who, when asked about American research in the satellite

field, would flippantly say, 'I have enough problems on earth'; and who once scowled at at a press conference that the Air Force had no business flying to the moon. This blind, stubborn, lack of imagination has no place in the ranks of our country's leadership; and a President responsible for that selection must answer to the American people.

I am amazed that we have had an Administration during the past five years which has systematically placed budgetary considerations above national defense needs. Defense policy has been determined by the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury, and not by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and you know it.

But my purpose 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 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 of individual and business initiative, and free trade unionism and our humanitarian concern for fellow human beings.

I know that the organized labor movement of America has been living up to its international responsibilities by exerting its leadership and influence toward supporting the establishment of free labor movements elsewhere. These efforts have been largely successful, and in many parts of the world, Communist-dominated labor movements have been stopped in their tracks. I know you have faithfully and effectively supported the ILO--the International Labor Organization of the United Nations. More power to you! Even when our Government has vacillated and obstructed ILO.

But there are other areas where men and women, working as individuals and through private organizations, can work constructively and in harmony with our major objective of world peace.

There has been a great deal of comment in recent 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 leaders of our farm organizations, leaders of our 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. I think of Walter Reuther, whose mission to India gave such a boost to America's reputation.

I think of people like Emil Rieve, of the Textile Workers Union, whose services ought to be used by our Government. These are the kind of people who represent the best of America.

We have talked a great deal on 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, teachers, 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.

I think of Dave McDonald, who single-handedly fought for an enlightened international trade policy as a member of the Randall Commission; and of Dave Dubinsky and Jim Carey, who have worked unceasingly for free trade unions the world over.

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. How paradoxical this is.

Our history, 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 yearstick 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.

It is time, therefore, that we walk 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 their 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.

For too long our foreign policy has been based on fear rather than on hope; on reaction rather than on 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 Twentieth 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.

What are the essential elements of an international policy to realize our goals of peace and security? Let me suggest some.

First. 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.

Second. 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.

Third: 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 cannot match. The flow of capital must be committed on a continuing long-term basis, from private as well as government sources, increasingly in the form of long-term loans. We should encourage the use of international machinery for economic development, not only the World Bank but machinery of the United Nations, such as SUNFED, which I know many American Labor leaders have advocated.

We must not use our economic development funds to subvert the independence of other free countries by attaching military or political conditions humiliating to them, or by trying to shape them in the image of the United States. We must remember that their independent development, in forms suitable to their people, their circumstances and their resources, is in our interest as well as in theirs.

The outstanding case is India. This great 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 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 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". Let's act now to help!

Fourth. 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.

Fifth. 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.

I am proud to have a part in the formulation of the programs under Public Law 480 by which we can not only use our abundant stocks of food 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.

Sixth. Even as we go forward with programs of international good will, we must remember that we still confront a formidable and implacable adversary in the Soviet Union; and while we work and plan for disarmament, we must keep our defenses strong and commensurate with our far-flung commitments. This we are failing to do. Only this week, the military expert of the New York Times reported from Europe that the cuts in our defense forces were cutting not only into the fat but into the bone and muscle of our overseas defenses. No one wants to see budgets and taxes higher than they need be; but if \$38 billion cannot be stretched with good management to pay for research and development and missiles and forces to man the positions required by our international commitments, then it is better that the budget be increased than that we should thin our defenses to the danger point or -- what is equally dangerous -- leave ourselves with no effective force but "massive retaliation".

If we had no weapons but the ultimate weapons of total annihilation, for use only under the ultimate provocation, we can be sure our adversaries would construe this as weakness and take advantage of it. Yet this is exactly the direction we have been taking.

Seventh. A strong defense, ironically, is also one of the prerequisites to the negotiation of any disarmament agreement, for the Soviet Union will see little incentive to negotiate an agreement if they believe that time and the budget will reduce our defenses unilaterally without concessions on their part. 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 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 live this dark shadow from themselves and from all mankind.

Eighth. We should authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchange, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, labor, businessmen, journalists, and others engaged in public communications.

Ninth. Finally we must set a good standard at home -- revise our immigration laws, set new standards of morality in government, business and labor. We must implement our new program of civil rights. And we must keep our economy fully employed and fully productive to support a rising standard of living as well as adequate programs of defense and foreign policy.

Let us now specifically apply these principles to a great crisis which faces us today -- the crisis of the Middle East. Here, as the result of the latest Soviet push to expand, the danger of war is most immediate. Here, for the second time in a year, Soviet plotting and mischief-making has fanned into flame long smoldering tension and animosities.

The situation is so acute, the danger so immediate, that a broad program of international action is imperative. In this the United States should take the lead to initiate action through the United Nations.

The Middle East needs time to calm 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 to poverty and ignorance will not await 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 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 the Tigris-Euphrates river valley systems. Toward this end, we should take the initiative in the United Nations in proposing a Middle Eastern Development 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 countries furnishing capital aid and technical assistance.

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 bi-lateral 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 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.

Now, one final word. Food is the common denominator of international life. Food and fiber are a great potential force for freedom today. They can be an active instrument of our foreign policy.

I wish every farmer who has been told he must drastically cut down his production could have walked with me through the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, the orchanges in Greece, or among the masses of unemployed huddled in shanty towns in Spain. I wish they could have seen the young hands outstretched for food, and heard the appeals for milk from haggard, worried mothers.

More of our food and fiber can be marketed for foreign currencies if we expand and extend Public Law 480. Here is an area for positive progressive action and one which vitally affects the people of America.

I close these remarks by restating certain convictions which I am confident you share. Ours is a nation more of compassion than of cruelty. Ours is a people more of generosity than of selfishness. Ours is a tradition more of faith than fear.

If this nation can show the world a way to eradicate the shame and scandal of poverty, of exploitation, of oppression, of greed, without resort to social revolution and class struggle and dictatorship; if we can place these material values in their proper subordinate place within the context of a mighty spiritual movement which will be revolutionary without being subversive, which will draw its substance from the riches of the Western tradition, then our faith will not have failed us. It will have sustained us through this present period of doubt and drift, and it will have led us on to achievement of our goals of freedom, justice and peace.

#####

10/30/57

EXCERPTS -- SPEECH BY SEN. HUMPHREY

(Following are excerpts from speech entitled "Peace--Our Most Urgent Business," delivered today by Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.), before delegates to the Second Constitutional Convention of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO. The Convention being held at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., October 31 and November 1, 1957.)

"In an age when war could mean annihilation, the maintenance of peace is our most urgent business. It is also our most difficult, because in Soviet Communism, we confront an adversary whose aim is domination of the world--if not by war, then by all means short of war."

"Faced with the gravest dangers we have ever known, our foreign policy is in a state of confusion and disarray which can only feed and aggravate the dangers. In fact, it would be more accurate to say that we have no foreign policy, but a series of patched-up arrangements and improvised reactions to crisis situations, many of which could have been avoided and all of which could be more effectively contained if we had pursued a foreign policy that was bold without being brash, imaginative without being impulsive, firm and consistent without being stubborn and rigid.

Formosa, Indochina, Egypt, Suez, and now Syria--each one has left our position more precarious and our adversaries stronger."

"We must talk frankly with each other, because it is a sad truth that too often the present Administration has not been candid with the American people. Our national survival is at stake, and in danger.

The crisis in the Middle East is a matter of the gravest urgency. . .

But it is well to remember that the Middle East crisis is only the latest episode in the progressive deterioration of our status in the world and the lessening of our leadership and respect in the community of nations. It is therefore, time for us to look at the facts--unpleasant as they may appear--and to lift our heads out of the sand. The substitution of objectivity for Pollyanna optimism is essential if we are to retrieve our losses and resume our leadership."

"But my purpose 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 world peace.

We just 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 of individual and business initiative, and free trade unions and our humanitarian concern for fellow human beings."

"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 can 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.

It is time, therefore, that we walk 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.

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

--more

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 Twentieth 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."

"What are the essential elements of an international policy to realize our goals of peace and security? Let me suggest some.

First. 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, or revolution, and of a will to freedom and independence.

Second. 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.

Third. We must make much greater use of our economic strength to help other free nations develop themselves, and bring the blessings of freedom to their eager and impatient peoples. This is a weapon of peace and plenty which the Soviet Union cannot match. The flow of capital must be committed on a continuing long-term basis, from private as well as government sources, increasingly in the form of long-term loans. We should encourage the use of international machinery for economic development, not only the World Bank but machinery for the U.N., such as SUNFED--rather than trying to do it all alone. We must not use our economic development funds to subvert the independence of other free countries to attaching military or political conditions humiliating to them, or by trying to shape them in the image of the United States. We must remember that their independent development, in forms suitable to their people, their circumstances, and their resources is in our interest as well as in theirs.

Fourth. 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.

Fifth. We should more actively, constructively, and imaginatively use our blessings of food and fiber as a powerful force for freedom. 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. A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger is more significant than the conquest of outer space.

Sixth. Even as we go forward with programs of international goodwill, we must remember that we still confront a formidable and implacable adversary in the Soviet Union; and while we work and plan for disarmament, we must keep our defenses strong and commensurate with our far-flung commitments. This we are failing to do. If we had no weapons but the ultimate weapons of total annihilation, for use only under the ultimate provocation, we can be sure our adversaries would construe this as a weakness and take advantage of it. Yet this is exactly the direction we are taking.

Seventh. A strong defense, ironically, is also one of the prerequisites to the negotiation of any disarmament agreement, for the Soviet Union will see little incentive to negotiate an agreement if they believe that time and the budget will reduce our defenses unilaterally without concessions on their part. 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.

Eighth. We should authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchange, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, labor, businessmen, journalists, and others engaged in public communications.

Ninth. Finally, we must set a good standard at home--revise our immigration laws, set new standards of morality in government, business and labor. We must implement our new program of civil rights. And we must keep our economy fully employed and fully productive to support a rising standard of living as well

as adequate programs of defense and foreign policy."

"I close these remarks by restating certain convictions which I am confident you share. Ours is a nation more of compassion than cruelty. Ours is a people more of generosity than of selfishness. Ours is a tradition more of faith than fear.

If this nation can show the world a way to eradicate the shame and scandal of poverty, of exploitation, of oppression, of greed, without resort to social revolution and class struggle and dictatorship; if we can place these material values in their proper subordinate place within the context of a mighty spiritual movement which will be revolutionary without being subversive, which will draw its substance from the riches of the Western tradition, then our faith will not have failed us. It will have sustained us through this present period of doubt and drift, and it will have led us on to the achievement of our goals of freedom, justice, and peace."

#



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