

THE BIG ISSUES FORUM

(Gov. Meyner)

Thank you very much^M Mrs. Sharp, Mrs. White and Mrs. Schiff. I first want to say how pleased I am to see so many ladies here today to participate in this discussion of The Big Issues, and I want to compliment Mrs. Kuser and the Women's Division for circulating the information that the distinguished panelists on either side of me are to discuss these issues and I want to congratulate you on the response. I haven't quite determined what the role of a moderator is, but I think about 3:30 this afternoon I could give you a better definition. But I am most pleased to be associated with the six people who are participating in this panel. The general discussion is defined as "How can the United States meet the challenge of today inherent in the needs, rights and aspirations of its own people and the people of all nations in a shrinking world on the threshold of the space age." In developing party principles, in developing a program, I think occasionally we're apt to look for our conclusion first and^{then} try to find some facts to justify it. I've often felt that some of the vehemence in arguments is predicated more on a lack of knowledge of the facts than on an appreciation of the facts. And consequently, a forum such as this, where we're to get the facts from authorities, from people who hold opinions should enable us, as the sinew of our party, to bring these issues to our friends and neighbors and those people whom we hope to enlist in our party's cause^{and} so that we can better discuss the issues in our respective neighborhoods. I'm so glad again to see so many of you have responded. The format will briefly be this. Each of the speakers will be expected to speak from ten to fifteen minutes. At the end of fourteen minutes there'll be someone stand up, someone known as a Timer, and that person will warn the speaker that fourteen minutes have elapsed and that the speaker is expected to try to terminate his remarks at the end of one additional minute. The speakers this morning will give their presentation, the six speakers who are with us. Then we'll adjourn for lunch and when we return from lunch there will be questions as between the panelists and then we'll have questions from you from the floor. I would hope that during the course of this discussion you would try to think up questions which would clarify these issues. Those who ask the questions will be expected to restrict their question to one minute, and being a lawyer I would suggest that you avoid the leading question--those that suggest the answer--and that you have searching questions.

At this time-I might say we have further broken up the topics into The Economy, Education, Civil Rights, Government Standards, Defense and Disarmament and Foreign Policy. The first of the panelists will be Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling, who will address her remarks to the Economy. She is the author of numerous economic studies, former Chief of the^{International} Economic Division of the Department of Commerce, Director of Research and Analysis, Division of the Office of Civilian Defense,

Chief of the Liberated Areas Division of the Foreign Economic Administration, Executive Director of the National Consumers League. She is currently engaged in private practice as Consulting Economist and Associate Director of the Conference on Economic Progress, a non-profit organization in Washington engaged in economic research and education. I'm very happy to present Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling. (APPLAUSE)

Governor, friends, I've been asked to talk about the economic issues today. There are so many of them and they are so vital that this is almost an incredible assignment to try to get through in fifteen minutes. But there is one underlying issue that is so vital and is so important and to which all of our other economic issues, it seems to me, today are related that I am going to take almost all of my time to talk about this one fundamental issue, and the issue as I see it is simply this: Do we in the United States today have the good sense and the moral responsibility, the moral vigor to rise to the economic issues, to meet the problems which are the challenge of our time. Now this is an incredible moment for you and me to be living in in history. It's absolutely unique. Do you realize that for the first time since man has been struggling with his environment that we in the United States can say this: We have the resources, all the resources that we need. We have the equipment, we have the materials, we have the skill to cope with all of our economic problems. No one has ever been able to say that before. They can't say that in India, they don't have the resources, they don't have the skill. We do. But the question, I repeat, is, "Do we have the sense, do we have the moral responsibilities to make use of these resources and these abilities and this equipment to rise to the challenge of our times?" This, I think, is our main, our major economic issue. This isn't a time when we can afford complacency. We have a great deal of unfinished business at home, and these are some of the things I want to talk about today. But even more, we have a great deal of unfinished business in terms of the challenge of our times, around the world and I want to talk about that a little later. These are perilous times in which to live and we are called upon to rise to the challenge.

Now, if we look back over the last five years objectively, or the last six years from the economic point of view I think you will have to agree that our record is not very good. We have more manpower every year, more people looking for jobs. Each year our skills improve. Our economy has got to grow and grow a good deal if we are going to maintain full employment and full production. And our economy has not been growing. An objective study of the facts shows that it's been virtually stagnant. The actual record is that over the last six years our economy

has grown an average of less than one and one-half percent a year, and this is the reason why, according to the latest figures, unemployment has risen to the highest level since 1941. We have the resources, we have the skills, we have the ability. We haven't been making full use of them. Because we have been negligent and because we have failed to grow, because we have not made full use of our resources, we had serious losses. The difference between what we should have done, could have done and what we actually did do in these last six years alone, can be computed at a cost of about \$120 billion in production. That's the production that we could have produced and didn't. And when we fail to produce what we can, we default, we don't do the things we should in terms of building our national security. We don't do the things we should in terms of fulfilling our international responsibilities. We don't meet our school shortages. We don't meet our health needs. We don't do the things that we need to do. We don't make income progress. Now, that's water over the dam. One could talk about it at some length. But let's look ahead. Let's look ahead to the next six years from now until 1964. We have a number of alternatives, but let's just take two. Let's ask ourselves: What could we do just in six years--which is a terribly tiny time in history. If we maintain full employment and full production, use our resources, not strain them, not over-use them, but just use them wisely and well, let's ask ourselves what would happen if we do that and compare it with what would happen in these six years if we did better than we did in these last six, when as I said we did less than one and a half percent in growth a year, but let's say we'll do better. Let's say we'll have only one recession instead of two in the next six years. Let's say that our average rate of growth is 2%. Now I'm going to contrast full employment and full production, which requires a growth of nearly five percent a year with a slow rate of growth--better however than what we have done in the last five years, and ask ourselves what this would mean to us in the five years if we choose between these two alternatives. Now when I say to maintain full production and full employment we have to grow about five per cent a year I say that this is a modest target. I know it's modest because this was about our average in the years 1947 to 1953.

also

And the recent Rockefeller Report on our economy/agrees with this and says that the United States should and must set itself a growth target of about five per cent a year. So that I think this is not a strain. It compares to about three percent, three and a half percent over the last fifty years, and that factors in depressions and recessions, bad years with good. Surely if we set ourselves and resolve that we will not have recessions and ups and downs, then four and a half to five percent is a modest rate. Now what's the difference between that kind of growth and slow growth, or hardly any growth, well not hardly any growth, but let's say, a better re-

cord than we've had in the last five years. Do you realize that the difference in production in this accumulated six-year period would be a total of \$400 billion? Now that's just plain arithmetic. It can be shown that that's the difference if you accumulate growth at five per cent a year as against two. Four hundred billion - about equivalent to our current production, just a little bit less. Now, think of what you could do if we had \$400 billion more in the United States over these next six years. It would be enough to give every family in America an additional \$6000 over the year. That would make a big difference in standards of living. But I think you would agree with me that we wouldn't want to see that go just to every family on an even basis. Some of our people have much greater needs than others. And I ask you to remember that we have some unfinished business with respect to the standards of living of our people. Do you know that twelve and a half million of our families have annual cash incomes of less than \$2,000 a year? Do you know that about twenty-five million of our consumer units, of multiple person families and single person families have cash incomes of under \$4,000 a year? Now, I couldn't support a family with an adequate standard of living--a minimum adequate standard, at that level, but that's nearly half of the families of America. They tell us we're in an affluent society, that we can lean back and be complacent. These figures tell us clearly we have a lot to do. We can't afford to be complacent. We have a big job. The experts tell us that it takes \$4,500 to \$5,000 a year to provide a minimum adequate standard of living, and about half of our families are not up to this level. Well now, what else could we do then with a high rate of growth, a resolve to maintain full employment and full production. At the high rate of growth we could cut down the number of families at this low income level by two-thirds and bring that two-thirds up above the minimum standard. Quite an accomplishment, wouldn't it be, in a six-year period, but it could be done. And that isn't all that could be done. I'm going on to some of the other things that we could achieve. If we grow at the slow rate could we do it? We couldn't do half as well. We could make a little dent but a very small one indeed. Now, what are some of the other things that we could do? If we grow at this proper rate and have full employment and full production, as I said, our incomes would be higher, and as our incomes rise, we'd all pay more in taxes. We could, because you pay more if your income is \$10,000 instead of \$5,000. But, and here's a point, the federal government could reduce the tax rate and under the high rate of growth as compared to the low rate of growth our public agencies, the federal, state and local governments, could collect at a lower tax rate \$70 billion more in public revenues. It would hurt less because we'd all be more able to pay, and this

as I said, includes a reduction in the rate of taxation. Now, could we do something with \$70,000,000,000 in public monies over the next few years? I'd say we could. I think everyone in this room would say, "Well for heaven's sake let's get busy and improve our national defense. We need it." And I think everyone in this room, all of us, as women especially, who have a feeling for this particular issue, would say we ought to be doing a good deal more by way of foreign assistance. Do you realize how little we are doing for foreign assistance? We're spending only about \$750 million this year-- 1/6th of 1 per cent of our total output, and two-thirds of the people of the world today are going to go to bed tonight hungry. Now, unless we rally to this immense and challenging need, we are going to lose out, as you and I know, in the great struggle that's going on between us and the countries behind the Iron Curtain for the minds of men in the uncommitted nations. And so I think with the high rate of growth we could easily double ^{even} or triple our foreign assistance.

What else could we do? We could do more than defense and more than foreign assistance. We'd have enough money to lick the classroom shortage by 1964 completely. These are provable calculations. We could rehouse 10 million of our families, and don't forget that about a quarter of our families are living in sub-standard homes today. We could double social security benefits, and I think this needs doing mighty badly. Remember that our average monthly payment for social security to our aged people is only \$65 a month--less than \$800 a year--and I wish there were time to tell you of the income distribution of those of our families who are 65 and over. It's a really shocking piece of unfinished business, which should challenge us. This isn't all that we could do. We could meet the problems of our distressed areas. We could have the kind of resource development that we need so urgently, and we could provide many of the other services that are equally important. Now a lot of people have a way of saying, when some of us talk this way, "You're talking about extravagant spending!" No I'm not, I'm not talking about extravagant spending. If you have a high rate of growth, you have full employment and full production and your income rises, do you realize that you could cut the federal budget relative to the total economy, and that's what counts, and be able to do all these things. Now what's

the other alternative? Grow at about 2% a year as we have, a little better than we have done in the last five years? And what's going to happen? I think I can promise you that if we move ahead in that way we'll have eleven and a half million more man-years of unemployment. We'll have higher prices--I wish I could tell you why that would follow inevitably, but I haven't time to elaborate on it, perhaps we can later on. We'd have low imports. I think world market prices would fall--the impact of a low level of our economy on the other nations of the world would be frightening, and would be an invitation to even further Soviet penetration. Remember that the Soviet economy is growing today at about ten percent a year. I ask you to think of what the consequences would be if we grow at only a fifth of this rate. We have, as I've said, we are in a struggle for the minds of men. Over a billion of the uncommitted people of the world are going to be making a choice. Pose a ten percent growth on the one hand against a two percent. Surely we are challenged to use our resources to show, in fact, what our system is capable of. What are we going to do, then to avoid a two percent growth rate; to see to it that we don't have another period in our economic life such as we've had in the last five years? Because, for my money, this is a matter of life and death for all of us in the world scene. You can see why in the things that I've said, I feel that this is the essential economic issue of our time. We have a choice. We have the resources. Do we have the will, do we have the moral responsibility? What are we going to do, what can we do to reverse this low level of activity and get back, move ahead on full steam? We can spell it out fairly objectively. We need to set goals for economic growth. We need to revise our tax and our monetary policies to balance production and consumption at advancing rates. We need to have the kind of leadership in our country that cares deeply about the needs of our people, about the unfinished business that we have here at home. A leadership that cares more about people than the interest rate. A leadership which rejects the trickle down theory of prosperity. A leadership which knows that, as production advances, purchasing power has got to keep pace, and that means wages keeping pace with productivity. It means adequate minimum wage laws at high enough minimum levels and covering those who need the protection. We need a leadership that doesn't try to meet the farm problem by pulling out the farm price props and letting income fall

so low that it drives farmers into the cities where there aren't jobs. We need a leadership that is aware of the problems of small business and doesn't force them to the wall. We need a leadership that's proud to champion the social gains that we can and we must afford. We need above all, a leadership that knows that our destiny is inextricably linked with that of other nations of the free world, and cares what's happening; knows that we can and must lift, help lift the standards of living of the people who are now so depressed that they can fall easy victims to the easy promises and blandishments of the Soviets. That we must have a leadership that lends a hand to lift living standards around the world, not just as a barrier to communism, important as this is, but because it knows that the people of the free world must go together, must go forward together or meet disaster. (APPLAUSE)

(Gov. M.) Thank you, Mrs. Keyserling, for that excellent affirmative presentation. And now we shall hear a discussion directed to the topic of education by the distinguished Democratic Representative from the Fourth District of New Jersey, who was elected to the 84th Congress in 1954 and re-elected to the 85th Congress two years ago. He's a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor. He's author of the Thompson bill for federal aid to school districts, champion of the federal aid for school construction and sponsor of the recently enacted legislation creating a cultural center in the nation's capitol. It's my pleasure to present Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr., Congressman from the Fourth District. (APPLAUSE)

(Cong. T) Thank you very much, Governor Meyner. A discussion of the elements most necessary in education for our children, for the world of tomorrow, and a discussion of the level of education in nations of the free world compared with that in communist nations, and the objectives which we should strive for to improve the quality of education which we provide, is a topic which is almost beyond me, I'm afraid. I will preface my statements by saying that, unhappily, I am not an educator. I'm a lawyer. My experience in the field has been relatively recent. I've had the benefit, however, in four years of Congress of hearing almost innumerable people who are educators and who have given a lifetime of work to the subject. I think that per-

haps the greatest element needed for the education of our children in the world of tomorrow is freedom--the freedom for all of our people, especially for our young people, to think, to study, to search and to express themselves, to read without moving their lips, and not be suspected for the ability to read without moving their lips. They need facilities. They need good buildings from the kindergarten through the graduate school. They need equipment, they need textbooks for research, for study and for their everyday classwork. And they need to be healthy and happy. The level of education in the free world as compared with the communist world is something which is under constant study, and only recently have groups of qualified Americans been able to get into the Soviet and observe well enough to come back and report the progress of the Soviet system. Anyone who thinks of the Soviet as a nation of people wearing babushkas and carrying wooden rakes is a little bit behind the times. Anyone who doesn't realize that theirs is an ancient civilization and a great culture is foolish. Any of you who have read great books--Dostoyevsky, listened to great music--Shostakovitch, seen the Russian Dance, the Russian Theatre, and heard Russians in various fields of activities, realize they are not an entirely a peasant country by any means; that they have a very deep culture, that they have an educational system of merit. Their educational system began many, many years ago. Its great impetus was under the Czar Peter the Great, when typical of the European system of the day, the most talented and wealthy children were given the opportunity for an exceptional education. They broadened their base now, however, and are exerting great effort in terms of expenditures and in terms of teaching facilities to improve their system. The gifted child in the Soviet today is identified fairly well, we're told, at an early age; is allowed to seek the level of his or her ability. The system, of course, is totalitarian, and under it those who are not as well qualified as others are shoved off to trade schools, taught manual skills and are shunted aside from those with greater ability who will get to the college level and beyond. The system which they have, I think for them is working very well. There's been a heavy concentration on the physical sciences, on mathematics and on languages. In this connection I might point out that in the Foreign Service of the United States only one or two percent of our Foreign Service officers speak more than one or two languages, as compared to the Soviets where

almost everyone in their consular offices and their ambassadorial offices throughout the world speaks several languages. I think that the crying need in the United States today is to start with school construction. This is a controversial subject, but despite the controversy, we know that more than 60% of our people favor federal aid for education in several forms. We have in this fine city here several schools which have been antiquated for many, many years. We have in the United States a situation under which the Federal government has taken some of the taxing powers from the states, which in turn have taken some from the municipalities, leaving the homeowner to pay for an educational system out of ad valorem taxes - a totally unrealistic situation. We have a positive and a proven need for federal aid for school construction on the broadest possible level. The United States of America with its tremendous resources, as pointed out by Mrs. Keyserling, spends only \$15 billion total for all of the education activities in the United States. This includes school construction, the maintenance, the operation of schools, the purchase of textbooks, of laboratory equipment, college education, college facilities--everything. We spend \$8 billion on advertising alone, and yet only \$15 billion on education. I think that it's a great tragedy that so many members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives are so implacably opposed to federal aid for school construction. The reasons for the opposition go across the whole spectrum. Our southern representatives are afraid in any way of a federal school construction program because of the race issue there. Our conservatives are afraid that the budget will be unbalanced and that the federal government will intervene in the affairs of operating the schools--something which is traditionally left to local boards of education of which there are some 40,000 throughout the United States.

It's a wonderful thing to be able to sit here today and to report that finally, after 92 years since the enactment of the Land Grant College Act, the Merrill Act, the 85th Congress passed a general federal aid for education bill in the form of the so-called National Defense Education Act. This is a very necessary addition to our educational needs but it's just a tiny step in the right direction. It will provide an education for thousands of worthy students who would not otherwise have money available to borrow to get that education. In the course of the discussion of the legislation and

the debate on it, scholarships were eliminated from it, an unfortunate thing which must be remedied in the future to offer incentives to the very best of our students. The humanities were neglected in favor of the temporary fear which we have had through the Sputniks, so that there's an undue emphasis on mathematics, science and the modern foreign languages. There are, however, monies provided and methods provided in the legislation by which our gifted students can be identified at an early age. And from that step, one step further: Our teachers will be better trained in the future to guide and to counsel the children who are so identified. Then the federal government will assist the universities and colleges throughout the United States in improving the laboratory facilities for the use of the students who are identified and who will study in those colleges and universities. There is money provided, in very modest amounts however, for educational research into the use of the new media available--television and radio, visual aids, film, and other such things. There is no provision, as there should be, for special help for the exceptional child, the gifted one, the blind one, the deaf one. These things are all things which must be done in the future. I think that the crying need aside from the physical facility aspects of the educational problem in the United States is to eliminate interference of those who would demand conformity in education. To eliminate the influence of superpatriotic groups who object to the presentation of facts in the teaching of history. To improve the teaching of languages from the earliest grades throughout the school, as is done in the European system, so that our youngsters growing up will better be able to understand the minds and the hearts of the other peoples throughout the world, especially those who speak different languages than we do. It's a tragic thing, I think, that we've fallen so far behind in the teaching of languages and in the appreciation of the humanities. I think that we have interrelated subjects, Mrs. Keyserling and I, because surely she will agree, and I hope that we can discuss it later, that we don't spend anything like what we should for education. But we have to clear away some of the myths--the myth of the federal government intervening wherever the federal government spends money; the lack of realization on the part of the American people that the federal government is as much theirs as is their local or the state government, and that they shouldn't be afraid of it simply because it's called the "federal" government. I think that we're

going to have to convince a great number of people that we can't destroy ourselves by spending several billions of our dollars each year more than we do now to improve our facilities. I think that we have to give much greater freedom to our teachers, and to pay them better, in addition to having better training at all levels of teaching. The certification of teachers in New Jersey is far advanced over most states. In some of the southern states there are as few as ten or fifteen percent of ^{the} teachers who are qualified by our standards. In a mobile economy, in a nation where the people move from one place to another, there should be much greater uniformity in educational standards. And this should be achieved, as should the construction of school buildings, as should college aid, as should the whole problem of education, by the federal government which has a responsibility to the education of all of its citizens. I can't be convinced by anyone who has talked to me about it yet, that a local, elected, quasi-political Board of Education or School Board is as competent to handle the affairs of a school district as is, for instance, the chief state school officer or, as for instance, are the educational experts in the colleges and universities. I'm not an advocate of standardized class-books, schoolbooks or textbooks, but I am an advocate of better ones. I am an advocate of infinitely more freedom in teaching, in expression and in the whole educational system than we enjoy now. These, I think, are our great needs. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

(Gov. M) Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson, for your excellent presentation of the topic of education. There is, I believe, a feeling and a program in our Party which subscribes to the idea of equality of opportunity and related to this topic is Civil Rights. What we do with respect to Civil Rights in no small way affects our ability to put into operation our ideals and affects very much our foreign policy, and we are pleased to have an expert on this topic today. He was formerly commissioner of Public Welfare for the Government of the Virgin Islands. He was the housing manager of the Atlanta Housing Authority; a member of the Board of Directors of the Southern Regional Council; a member of the National Manpower Council; member of the executive committee of the National Conference of Social Work.

He is presently President of Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia.

I am happy to present to you Dr. Alonzo G. Moron. (APPLAUSE)

(Dr. M) Governor Meyner, my good friends. I'm sorry I cannot lay claim to being an expert on civil rights. I wouldn't if I could. I don't know why I was invited but I'm very happy to accept the invitation for two reasons: First of all it gives me an opportunity to say how pleased I am with the progress you've made here in New Jersey since the adoption of the new constitution. I knew that you had my good friend, Harold Lett, here who I think is an expert in civil rights and human relations, but it's most gratifying to know that someone had sense enough to use him for the advancement of intercultural and interracial understanding. I came also, I was happy to accept also, because I want to learn as much as I can about progress in civil rights in order to take back with me something across the line....I started to say the Mason Dixon Line, but I think it's really now the Faubus-Almond Line. If you've been reading the newspapers or looking at television or simply if you've been alive in the last few weeks you can see why I need to learn, in Virginia, how you here in New Jersey made a transformation from a house divided between North and South Jersey to the United State where equal opportunity within the state is no longer a matter of the right combination of race and geography, but rather a privilege enjoyed by all who are prepared and who are willing to take advantage of these opportunities. I must confess that I was a little bit facetious when I said I would like to take something back to Virginia, because I'm sure that you know as well as I do that in these matters, the sovereign Commonwealth of Virginia brooks no assistance, particularly from Negroes. The truth of the matter is that under the present administration of Virginia Negroes may pay taxes, in fact they had better pay taxes; they may be counted, both for purposes of determining the number of representatives we have in Congress, as well as for the various federal hand-outs that are allocated on a per capita basis. Negroes are useful also in Virginia as an excuse for closing the schools, and as a stable supply of unskilled labor. The longer we postpone integration in Virginia, especially by closing down the public schools, the bigger the guaranty becomes that we will continue to have a good supply of unskilled labor, preferably black labor, and preferably la-

that's
bor / willing to work in the apple orchards and the furniture factories of the Byrd-Stanley machine. Negroes are not useful in Virginia as voters, even when they are allowed to vote it is impossible to tell when the votes are counted. They are not useful in Virginia as elected or appointed officials, and they are not consulted except insofar as that consultation can take place within the master-servant relationship. And that's why it's difficult for one who comes from Virginia to talk to you about civil rights today at this most critical era in our history. I'll try my best, however, to share with you some of my thinking on what I think to be the critical issue in this particular area. Because if I could be heard in Virginia, I would say ^{it} / there as I say ^{it} / here; The time is running out on gradualism. Time is running out on democracy that is not color-blind. Time is running out on the racial bigotry and race hate. Time is running out on the denial of equal opportunity under the guise of protecting states' rights. ^{The} / promises of full freedom, of full citizenship that have been held out to the Negro people and to the Indian people and to the Spanish-speaking people, if they would only be patient, if they would only be industrious, if they'd only be law-abiding--all these promises have proven to be false and misleading. And now Negroes are beginning to realize that they, too, have to share some responsibility for the posture that the United States presents to the world. They've begun to realize that we cannot discharge our responsibilities adequately if we continue to accept second-class citizenship. We see this not only in the domestic scene, but we see it even more dramatically in the area of foreign relations, because today one of the characteristics of our time is the fact that no nation, no people can live in privacy. The extent to which our communications are developed means that each nation lives its most intimate portions of its life in a goldfish bowl. What happens today in Greenville, Mississippi or Greenville, South Carolina can be heard about almost immediately in the remotest part of Russia, Burma, Ceylon and Darkest Africa. What we need to remember, however, is that what is happening now is cumulative. Margaret Deland, the distinguished writer I think, from New Jersey, in a small pamphlet called "Confession", tells of a conversation she had with a Frenchman who said something to this effect: "Can you call yourself a democracy, you who gave the colored man the ballot so that he could take part in making the laws

of your country and now lynch him without giving him a chance to appeal to these same laws? A sham democracy, madame." This conversation took place in 1918. Last year a survey was made of popular music in Southeast Asia. The survey was made at the height of the popularity of Rock-n-Roll music, and the song that came out ahead was a song called "Rock Around The Clock". But an information officer of the United States Government confided to a visitor that in his area that song was known as "Little Rock Around the Clock". About eight years ago a group of diplomats arrived at Miami enroute to a meeting of the General Assembly. When they disembarked from their plane they were all escorted to the airport dining room except for one obviously Negro delegate. Instead of being taken to the dining room he was escorted to a corner of the waiting room, seated in a canvas chair and given a box lunch and coffee in a paper cup. We needed the support of his country on a critical issue in that session of the United Nations Assembly. Needless to say, we did not get it. When the distinguished Ambassador from India was refused service at a Houston airport this insult to a foreign ambassador was known almost immediately in every major capital of the world. These are dramatic examples of how we build the contours in the social map that represents the United States in the minds of the uncommitted peoples of the world. But the tragedy is that for each of these examples which become a headline, there are hundreds of others that never get publicity or extend beyond the painful moment of embarrassment for hundreds of our visitors of color who travel through certain sections of our country. The tragedy is heightened by the fact that all of these incidents of embarrassment do not take place when we entertain visitors. They take place also when we send people and accredit them to foreign countries. ^{It's a} standing joke in the Republic of Haiti that whenever there is a downfall of the government--of the Haitian government--no matter for what reason, the first place that's attacked or stormed or burned is the ^{United States Embassy, not the U.S. Embassy, I'm sorry, the} country club patronized by the American diplomats. At the Bandung Conference Carlos Romulo, the distinguished representative from the Philippines spoke with great feeling about the searing experience of being demeaned in his own land, of being systematically relegated to subject status, not only politically and economically and militarily but racially as well. And that's why it

is so terribly important that our national government assume leadership in safeguarding the civil rights for its own citizens. Because when these incidents occur it is not enough for us to say by way of explanation, by way of apology, that the person involved was from Mississippi, or from Georgia or from Alabama. To the foreign national ~~he~~ is a United States citizen and he represents us either here or abroad. And whether we come from Minnesota or New Jersey or Massachusetts we must take responsibility for this kind of embarrassing conduct. It is only when people here in America, regardless of race or creed or color, enjoy the same privileges and share equally the same responsibilities that we can be sure, that we can be positive, that we can be certain that the proper light of understanding and equal partnership can shine through our relationships with people from abroad.

During the last few years, particularly since the 1954-1955 decisions of the United States Supreme Court, particularly in the North, we've been hearing some talk that race relations have improved in this country; that today more people enjoy full civil rights than at any time in our history. And many people move from this assumption to the conclusion that the Supreme Court decision of 1954 has stopped the progress that was being made in race relations in this country. If we are to recognize this issue for what it is, we must recognize that there is a question as to the quality of that adjustment which was taking place prior to 1954. I'm sure that many people who say this, that the Supreme Court blocked progress, the Supreme Court decision blocked progress, say this in good faith, but I'm also positive that they speak from only limited knowledge of the actual situation or with a limited appreciation for what full freedom and full responsibility can and must mean, not only to us in this country, but to everyone of color in the nations of the world. Those of us who are closer to the situation and who have been studying the changes that have occurred prior to 1954, were not satisfied with the quality of change. It is true that we were moving in the direction of wider participation in the ballot in urban areas; it was true that in some areas, particularly again, urban areas, better physical facilities for the education of negro youth. It is also true that there was a great decline in the number of lynchings re-

corded each year. What was not so evident, however, was that all of this was being done within the rationale of agreement that in America we could have degrees of equality, and that the majority had the right to grant or to withhold the privileges of full citizenship. In other words, we were believing, we were being led to believe that freedom was divisible and that democracy could trickle down and members of minority groups could be satisfied with the left-overs from the harvest made more abundant by equal taxes, and equal sacrifices. The horrible thing is ^{that} lynchings declined when it was found that they were inconvenient, they were nuisances, that the same ends could be achieved by increasing the number of incidents when negroes were shot while attempting to escape or were shot while resisting an officer.

Much has been accomplished by way of slow and steady progress towards the goal of full equality under the law for every American citizen. And though much has been done, much remains to be done if we are to convince two-thirds of the world that democracy is not color-blind; and that the Judaeo-Christian ethic has enough vitality to make brothers of all mankind. I think that a distinguished anthropologist from South Africa, a white anthropologist, said it better than I could say it, and I'd like to close with a quotation from a speech that she made recently in this country in which she said that if we're going to make real progress in this area of civil rights, human relations, we must learn to be true to ourselves, and as she puts it: "I'm going to suggest to you that our greatest inner truth is that we are human beings --not negroes or white men. Unless we set aside our sectional racial thinking, it seems to me there is little we can positively contribute to the problems of our society, our community and our world. As long as I think and act myself white, and you across the tracks do the same thing, think and act Negro, we shall never come together. We shall continue to stress our differences, one from the other, and with time, we'll forget the common humanity we share. We can far more positively fight this outmoded monster of racialism by fighting it with like-minded people, than we can by fighting it with like-colored people. We are then demonstrating democratic action in our fight for the extension of the democratic way of life, and nothing can be more steadfast." Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

(Gov. M) Thank you very much, Dr. Moron, for that excellent presentation concerning the topic of civil rights. Now we move on to another topic, Government Standards, and I'm happy to present our distinguished guest who is the daughter of David Mannes, violinist and conductor and founder of the Mannes School. She was a script writer for documentary films on American life, including "This is America" series, she is an analyst of alien problems for the United States Government. She was author of "Message From a Stranger" (1950) and "More in Anger", a collection of essays on aspects of living in the United States, to be published in October. She's a staff writer for THE REPORTER. I'm happy at this time to present Miss Marya Mannes. (APPLAUSE)

(Miss M) Governor Meyner, ladies and gentlemen. Government standards is a pretty big issue; it's an enormous issue for a citizen who is not an expert, in other words, myself. But as a citizen I think the most crucial of the many standards of government is the question of how much should a people know, how much should a government tell a people. In other words, it's the education of ourselves, as a people. And the ideas I am about to express are not my own, I have a very able ghost writer called Richard Milhous Nixon (LAUGHTER) and you are doubtless by now very familiar with his deathless statements about the mail about Quemoy and Matsu that he delivered a few days ago. But I would like to refresh your memory upon one particular phrase that I cannot get out of my head because it's the significant one. The whole statement was that the Administration could not let its foreign policy be developed "on the basis of what random letters show the people will support in the light of the minimum and often misleading information available to them". I do not know a greater indictment of a government by a government official than that! If we have been misled and if we are misinformed, as Mr. Nixon believes, whose fault is it? Well, I think there are a lot of people responsible, or rather reasons, but obviously fault number one and dereliction number one is the government itself. And this goes from the top down to the bottom. So let us start with the top and say that President Eisenhower, although he has appeared to talk to us, the people, a number of times, has indulged in generalities and sedation.

He has said noble things, he's said general things, he's expounded fine principles. But I do not remember a single time when the President has clearly and specifically told us what was ahead of us--I mean in real terms, not in the desire for peace which obviously goes without saying, not in amity with our allies--I mean the hard facts of our future. I do not remember having that come from the President. We haven't learned it. Let us go from the President to that filter of information, Mr. Hagerty (LAUGHTER). It is a two-way filter. He filters the information for us, the people--in other words he screens it for us so that we get a sort of gruel--He also appears to screen information from the President. We then have Mr. Dulles who, most of the time, keeps his policy under his hat--until he tips his hat over the brink....It's a mixed metaphor but I think you know what I mean. The State Department, I understand from people in it, a great deal of the time does not know what the Secretary of State has in mind until it is out of his mind and in the press. They therefore perhaps cannot be criticized too sharply for being caught with their suspenders down on a number of occasions. In other words, I think we learn remarkably little from the State Department which is the most crucial organ of our government at this point, or at least one of the most. Now, another villain in this business, another misleader, a misinformer, I am sorry to say, is the Press--not the Press as a whole, but the 90% of the Press which, alas, is, has been, and I don't know how long will be, strongly Republican. This is not unusual because the owners of newspapers are businessmen primarily, and it is a big business. It is therefore Republican. I wish to exempt immediately the working members of the Press who, I think, regardless of the policies of their editorial writers and their owners, are perhaps 80 % Democratic in instinct. But the editorials are Republican and even so-called objective papers like the New York Times have, in the past years, indulged in a kind of weaseling of which they should be ashamed--they are much better than that. We then come to the magazine world, and we find two of the most powerful organs of opinion and information (if you can call it that) are TIME and LIFE, who are, of course, tremendous apologists for the Republican Administration. You also have the leader of both these publications, Mr. Luce, one of whose major aims has been, of course to see that Chiang is "on top". Pos-

sibly even on top of us. (LAUGHTER) I'd like to throw a passing bouquet--I'm accused of being a very harsh critic of television, about which I write often--but I find that perhaps the serious television commentators on both networks--Huntley, Murrow . . . Seavareid--have done more to inform the people than the government itself or I am sorry to say, the press, with very few exceptions.

Now, when it comes to a matter of security, as to how much a people should know, I am the last person to define this. I can understand that military intentions cannot be spread abroad for very obvious reasons. (Katzenbach interrupting: Watch out on that- it's what I'm going to talk about) I'll keep off of that entirely, because I know nothing, (LAUGHTER) but I do think that what we must be told, must, is the long-range goals of our policies--where we are heading, what we want, what we need, what we are proposing, how we're going to achieve the ends we want. By what means, and again, I do not mean specific military means, I mean the means of government action.

I also say that in this whole business of informing a people I do not understand how a people can react to urgency of a crisis if the head of state does not reflect this urgency in his daily life, and is away from the White House as much as our President is, alas. Now, another tremendous standard which has been dumped in my lap, and again I don't think I am capable of talking about, but will anyway, is: How can we be assured of ethics in government of the heads of department. Now that's really a big one. I have only two suggestions, to offer. One is^a/very long-range one: that from grade school up we be taught a new, or rather an old kind of morality which we seem to have gone away from to a frightening degree. The whole ethics of our nation I think have been incredibly blurred in the last twenty years or more. . . the line between right and wrong being so faint that it's practically invisible. I also think that we might borrow something from our English allies and see that the heads of our departments in government are directly and wholly responsible for the actions of their inferiors; that they take this responsibility. Because if they do, then the whole chain will purify itself, At least it has proved successful in England, as has the questions in Parliament. We need more debate, we need more responsibility. Now, number three is about our representatives abroad as to how the standards of representation can be raised. Are we adequately represented

in our Foreign Service. I think they suffer, our Foreign Service, under four terrible handicaps at the moment. One is, as I said before, that they really have no long-range policy to interpret. I have met a number of them posted in various spots and they wring their hands and say: We are asked daily, "What do you plan to do with foreign aid? What are you going to do about your racial situation? We can't answer because we don't know." It is a terrible humiliation to be unable to tell people what your own government thinks and plans. Second thing is, and this has been ably represented by Representative Thompson, the lack of language which is enormously important in order obviously to know what other people are thinking, to read their newspapers, to mingle with them, and the fact that an enormous majority of our representatives do not speak any language except English means that they spend most of their time with English-speaking people at the country club, at cocktail parties, and usually the upper echelon of society. They never really get down to the bases of life, to the people of the country they are in, because they can't understand them, they can't communicate with them, and that I think is a tragedy. I think a third thing is that high ranking career officers who spent twenty or thirty, twenty at least, years in the service of their country and were highly expert, are very often bypassed on the most important posts in ^{the} foreign service by rich businessmen who may be honorable and able but who are not experienced or expert, and who have been sometimes given their jobs very often, out of political patronage, and not for the basic reasons of ability. The fourth thing I think our foreign service still suffers from is the residue of McCarthy. I realize that he is fortunately receding into the distance, but his work of destruction remains in that they are still timid, unwilling to commit themselves, anxious to conform--it's the old thing of "play it safe, don't stick your neck out--- it will be chopped off!"

Now the whole question, which again is an enormous one, How can the average citizen, housewife or householder, become part of the world struggle. Really, there is only one way to do it. The first thing is self-education--to read both sides of every major issue, to form your own conclusions about what you believe, and then to shout, to talk, to write--and regardless of Mr. Nixon's feelings about mail from citizens, I can't tell you how important this mail can be on qualitative as well as quantitative terms. I'll never for-

get seeing a large sampling of the mail, for instance, years ago on the Murrow broadcast about McCarthy. And it wasn't just the volume, it was the enormous difference between those who wrote attacking Murrow, which were largely illiterate, obscene, violent, insensate, and the quality of the mail what was for Murrow, in other words against the Senator from Wisconsin, which was with an enormous plurality of letters that were obviously intelligent, controlled, and decent. And I would say that government officials should have a better way of evaluating mail. Obviously, you cannot make policy on the letters that come in but you must keep an ear to the ground for the voice of the intelligent and the responsible citizens of the country. Really, here^{I think}/is where we must and can have an enormous lead over the Soviet--this is the area in which our great advantage lies, and that is: knowledge. We must be told, we must know, we must be trusted, because I personally think the American people can take almost anything. (APPLAUSE)

(At this point the recording was interrupted. Governor Meyner introduced Dr. Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., who was Associate Professor of History, and Research Associate with the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia from 1952 to 1955. He served as Director of the Defense Studies Program at Harvard University. He is a lecturer at many leading universities and Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force colleges, and is the author of numerous articles for newspapers and magazines, including the New York Times, American Historical Review, and The Reporter.) (Dr. Katzenbach spoke on Defense and Disarmament.)

The following portion is not verbatim, as Dr. Katzenbach opened his remarks informally and they were not recorded. However, he did preface his presentation by calling our attention to the general question of our Health--to the casual and often irrational way we, individuals, abuse our health by fad diets, overeating, not enough exercise, pills and sedatives, and the recklessness of our motoring habits which result in thousands of us endangering and very often losing our very lives each year. Since life and health are the most priceless possessions we have, this is surely irrational behavior on our part, and in fact one would be tempted to say we were a bit mad. Why, he asked, should we then expect persons who are in office or in a position to make government policy to suddenly change

their habits of a lifetime and lapse into sanity? We shouldn't expect them to, really, and they don't. All of which is reflected in the fact that our present defense policies, upon which the health and life of our collective nation depends, are incautious, risky, irrational and give evidence that we are all a bit mad.)

(recording resumes):

....when people get into very high positions it doesn't necessarily mean that their judgment has materially improved.

I'd like to take, if I may, a couple of different ways of looking at a present military situation to indicate, if I may, the tremendous differences in alternatives which one can see in looking at defense problems. Specifically, I'd like to talk about Quemoy and Matsu. First I'd like to draw my image of the problem from a military point of view in Quemoy and Matsu, and then I'd like to take Mr. Dulles' point of view, and try^{to do it} for him as well as myself as honestly as possible.

When I look at Quemoy and Matsu, the way I see the situation is this: In the first place I see batteries of Red artillery, and less distance away from the Chinese mainland than Staten Island is from New York I see these islands of Quemoy and Matsu. I know that during the past few years we have not in fact been putting any money into improving artillery. I know that whatever guns we give the Nationalists that they will be out-gunned by the Communist guns. This I know. I also know that the Communists haven't gotten very rough in this area lately, and the reason I know this is because I know of the capabilities of the Communists--the Chinese and particularly the Russians--in the use of mines. That is to say things that are put under the water and blow up as you pass over them. I know that they could keep shipping out of that area virtually entirely by the use of sea mines and that these mines would be almost impossible to sweep, or to get rid of, because they could be covered by shore batteries and these sweeping vessels would have thus an enormously difficult time getting rid of them. I also know that when it comes to putting air-dropped materiel, food, ammunition and all the rest of it, on Quemoy and Matsu, that what we're doing is taking a fairly large quantity of something which is very scarce, which is air transport, and putting it over into that particular situation. The situation I also know is not like Berlin because in Berlin we were supplying food

and we were not supplying arms, which are much heavier. And therefore, from a military standpoint, I would say this is really a rough situation. What are the alternatives? Well, one of the alternatives which we have quite clearly in this area is that we can use what are called small nuclear bombs--tactical nuclear bombs. Nobody can define exactly what a tactical nuclear bomb is but for sake of argument it's something roughly below 20 kilotons down to something on the order of 1/2 kiloton, that is to say from the size bomb which destroyed Hiroshima down to something that could destroy this building and the State Capitol in one fell swoop. I also know that if we used these against the shore batteries that it would get rid of the shore batteries, that the Chinese Communist batteries would then be at an end. I also know that if we used these weapons that two possible alternatives could occur: In the first place the Chinese Communists could say to themselves, "All right, we'll let the propaganda take care of this particular battle", they would withdraw their troops and from the point of view of the rest of the world and particularly of the Asian countries, we would quite literally be damned from here on out for using atomic bombs once again against Asiatics.

This is one alternative. The other alternative of course is that they ^{could} use them against us because they have them in roughly the same quantities as we do. This being the situation, I wouldn't fool around with Quemoy and Matsu. I'd get out no matter how much it hurt. Now let's (APPLAUSE) take a look at this image of this same situation in Mr. Dulles' mind and I'll make this as accurate as I can. In the first place, of course, from his published statements we know that he looks upon this as an essentially moral issue, that is to say, that we have to stop the Communists and that that's all there is to it so to speak. He also has one other piece of information which is not generally booted around **very** much but which you would get if you bothered to look at any of the aviation magazines, and that is, he knows that the Russians have ceased building their long-range bombers, and therefore have so to speak skipped over that to a considerable extent and have gone rather into the missile field. And he knows that at the present time we have a great deal more military power from the point of view of total war than they do, and he feels therefore, that they will not create a situation which might put them onto the brink of war because from a military point of view they'd be

in very bad shape--in terms only/^{though} of a total war, note, not in terms of anything else. Now here are two quite different points of view with the same information available to me as is available to him and he simply evaluates the thing quite differently.

Now, my point here is, and the reason why I started off with Health, is simply this: that there are three ugly little words that are spoken all the time and those three little words are, of course, "he (or she) knew better". Now the fact that these three words are used as often as they are in common parlance would suggest to me that people somehow or other can't really act on the best information -- that we're all of us just a little bit mad. Now then, what we have to do--and here's the problem--is to realize on the one hand that we're not all of us always responsible and we have to link this with megaton bombs. That's the dimensions of the military problem in our time. And not only do we have to link these two things--people and total destruction--but we also have one other/^{rather} ugly fact to deal with in this same connection: The megaton weapon is not necessarily dangerous. Arms races do not necessarily lead to war. We could, for example create armaments from now throughout our lifetime in the same proportions that we're producing them now and have these all defensive weapons. That is to say we could be building more and more anti-aircraft weapons of whatever size, and this would still not be a direct threat of war. What turns an armaments race into a great threat for all of us is the fact that we and the Russians together are building forces which are primarily, and not only primarily, but are most useful when they attack, and not only that, but when they attack first. ---first.

There is no question or doubt /^{given} the vulnerability of forces on both sides that despite the fact that disaster will be delivered anyhow, so to speak, I mean to whoever starts the war, the fellow who gets the first strike has a tremendous advantage. What's the problem then? Well the problem is somehow or another to, how will I put this, to prevent us from killing ourselves, and this of course means preventing the Russians from killing themselves as well. What we have to do is to create military forces which somehow or other can be used without destroying everything. Now, how's this done? What would I suggest?

Well, the first thing that I would suggest is, that the

smaller nuclear weapons are not the alternative that lot's of people seem to think they are. The gentleman, Dr. Kissinger, who was substituting for me on this program before I was asked to be on it, (LAUGHTER) takes the position--and it's a sort of Hegelian position if there are any of those interested in philosophy--in the audience--that is to say he feels that conventional weapons are old-fashioned, total war is unthinkable, and therefore somehow or other we have got to fight with smaller nuclear weapons. However, and my criticism of his position is this: That it's perfectly possible perhaps to fight limited wars with nuclear weapons, but only in a world which is inhabited by people as intelligent, as forthright and as philosophically oriented as Mr. Kissinger himself. I don't think that there are very many places on earth where we can use smaller nuclear weapons, aside from our own Southwest, I suppose with Las Vegas taken out, the Sahara Desert, the Gobi and Tibet. Because these weapons are simply--I can imagine a few of them being used but I can't imagine very many of them being used. Therefore, what we've got to do if we want to communicate our intentions to the enemy is not only to pick our battle ground better than Quemoy and Matsu, but also to have forces which will show the enemy that we mean business, and this, it seems to me, is the old force, with conventional weapons which can actually be moved with some rapidity from one place to another. This we simply do not have at the present time. We have an airlift capacity for getting troops from this country to somewhere else with some rapidity of somewhere between 1/2 and 3/4 of an infantry division. That's all that we can move at the present time. The few divisions that we have in other words are almost totally immobilized today. This is a fact. It's on the record. Anybody can read it that wants to. It's not in any way secret information. The Russians of course know it as well. So that's the first thing that we have to do--is to create some kind of force simply in order to be able to communicate with the enemy by throwing it into battle if this is necessary. This means the spilling of blood, but it also means that perhaps we can get away with not spilling all of our blood. That's number one.

The second is the problem of candor. The second thing that we need is candor, because information is one of those things which if you spread it around enough, lets everybody know where everybody else is and therefore creates more stability so to speak, in the world.

In this connection, Miss Mannes stole most of the last part of my speech. This most always happens/ ^{to me.} I don't know why it is that somebody doesn't want to put me first on a panel so that I can say my say and let it go at that. (LAUGHTER) This information business is really the wierdest, the wierdest. For example, we knew nothing about the failure of our missiles when the pictures were being shown abroad. Let me put it right on the line. I don't think that there is anything, anything with the exception of certain tactics on the part of the Strategic Air Command and certain tactics with respect to our continental defense, that it wouldn't be a good idea to trot out in the open. I noticed the other day that Gen. Trudeau, who is now the Army's Chief of Research and Development, before that had been Army Intelligence, made the claim that the Russians had made the advances that they did because they'd stolen so much from ourselves. Well I suggest that the trouble with Gen. Trudeau is ~~he's~~ spent too much time in that five-sided ivory tower the Pentagon, because any-
^{to} one who sits at a faculty table and listens/people talking about Russian advances in sciences knows that they are perfectly capable, as the Congressman has told you, of doing their thinking for themselves. In this country what's happened is that secrecy has prevented us from making the kind of advances we should have been--there's plenty of evidence on this from the scientific community--. In addition to that, it's made us unable to understand the dangers of the times in which we live because we haven't given enough rational publicity to the new weapons and the problems thereof. It's also made us almost impossible to get along with our allies, who are supposed to be helping us, because we haven't made available to them the information which they need simply in order to co-operate with our forces abroad. I heard one horrible instance the other day in which we were unable, we were unwilling to give a piece of information to the ally simply to prevent him from going into a research and development program that he was going into, and which made no sense in view of the information which we had. We even refused to let this ally of ours know enough so as to prevent him from spending a great deal of his time and energy on essentially useless research.

I have, I brought along just to illustrate what I mean about this candor business, what I call the "All-Purpose Pentagon Speech". (LAUGHTER) This is a series of true quotations taken

during the past three years from our officials--military and otherwise--giving public speeches and testimony before Congress. This doesn't quite compare with Mr. Nixon's speech, but it makes much the same point:

"Our nation has been making great strides in assuring a modern defense."

"Today our security force is the most powerful in our peacetime history"

We don't have any horses any more. (LAUGHTER)

"More efficient weapons are being constantly created and the combat power of our divisions, wings and warships has increased. Our Air Force is at the highest state of readiness it has yet achieved in its history."

"The combined total of the nation's armed forces represents a dynamic military power of true substance."

I like that one.

"We have a margin of qualitative superiority over the potential enemy in certain fields." (LAUGHTER)

"We have a sufficiency of Air Power for the military scheme of things in this atomic age." (GENERAL LAUGHTER)

Well I've got a batch of them. I've been collecting these things for years, but the point is that we aren't told what kind of alternatives we have from a military point of view in Quemoy and Matsu, and this is awfully important for all of us I think to know. I say that our largest problem today is not organization, which the President believes is so important, because organization can only help carry out a policy better if a good policy is already created. What we've got to do, it seems to me, is to do some new thinking about a new weapons system. It seems to me that there's a serious time lag in our thinking about new weapons and what they mean and what they will mean over the next ten years.

And in order to achieve anything like the kind of thought that's necessary, the very first and the most essential thing we can do is to be more candid. There aren't military secrets involved in this to anywhere near the extent that they're claimed. What's secret is policy decisions, not military stuff. There hasn't been any leaks of military information. You can't give me a one--not a one. And the basic thing that I have to say, and this simply supports your position, madam, is that secrecy is the most deadening thing in the world. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

(Gov. M) Thank you very much, Dr. Katzenbach. I am sure the applause indicates how much we appreciated your homecoming address.

Now we shall hear from the Democratic Senator from Minnesota and he's been that since 1948. He was a former professor of Political Science and former Mayor of Minneapolis. He's the Vice President of the American Political Science Association, a member of the distinguished Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Chairman of the sub committee on Near Eastern and African Affairs. He's Chairman of the Special Sub-Committee on Disarmament. And it's my pleasure to introduce to you the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator from Minnesota. (speaking on our Foreign Policy)

Thank you very much, Governor Meyner and my fellow panelists and ladies and the few brave gentlemen ~~that~~ are here with us this morning. To get right down to the topic that is assigned to me and see if we can't complete this morning's discussion and then come back to working each other over in an effort to probe out a little more information. I believe that in order to understand the adequacy or the inadequacy of our so-called Foreign Policy that you have to measure it pretty much in the terms that have been utilized here this morning. First of all, you must discuss Foreign Policy, measure it and evaluate it in terms of the Military struggle with the Soviet Union. I don't say that has top priority but that is one of the areas of judgment. Secondly, the ideological struggle or the ideological contest, and in that area I would put the matter of how we compare educationally in terms of the candor of our public officials, the degree of information that is available to us to properly understand what is going on in our government. The civil rights aspect surely comes into the ideological struggle and thirdly, I would put down the adequacy or inadequacy of our Foreign Policy on the economic and social and possibly cultural front and this has been alluded to and referred to this morning in considerable degree and detail and it is in all three of these areas that I think there is too little real hard candid thought and planning. We are today the victims of national myths. We need, for example, if we are going to have proper Foreign Policy to know ourselves. What kind of country are we, what have we got to offer, what are the wells of our strength and I'm speaking now of the economic strength, the political strength, the cultural, the heritage--our political heritage. Do we really know ourselves and once that we do really know ourselves, if we ever make that evaluation, what do we do with this knowledge in terms of international relations, and let me digress to say that one of the weaknesses of American Foreign Policy today is that we keep calling it Foreign. This is a negative term and comes from the Victorian or the better to say -- even the Machiavellian age. There is nothing Foreign about Foreign Policy anymore. This is international interdependent policy because everything relates to the other. We also need to know the alleged enemy and know him objectively and that we refuse to do. We learn about the enemy after he reveals himself. We refuse to do honest research and report it to the people. I've heard the Secretary of State say several times in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that we could look forward to the collapse of the Soviet

political and economic system. He lives in this kind of a dream world. Well, it's a pleasant thought but of course there is little or no fact to substantiate it but it makes good open hearing testimony like the good professor told us ~~Ref~~ the sort of general speech of the Pentagon, I've heard that too. When I say know our enemy, we should have known about the Sputniks and we did, some people did but if you're going to know the enemy you have to really believe what you learn and I want to pay tribute here at this moment to the Central Intelligence Agency of our Government, it told ~~in~~ the Cabinet of the U. S. including the President, the National Security Council that within the last week of September and the first week of October 1957 the Soviet Scientists, the Soviet Union would launch, ^{and} put into orbit into outer space a space satellite of substantial size. I think the Central Intelligence Agency is worthy of a pat on the back for having acquired that information. Of course, the truth is that nobody wanted to believe it and not only that but if they had of believed it, if they did believe it they surely acted peculiarly because they proceeded immediately to cut budgets on research and development and we were much more concerned about the home front political implications and impact of worshipping at the budget altar than we were facing up to the ~~crue~~ facts of science and Soviet achievement. Now when I say know the enemy I don't mean to overemphasize or exaggerate, I mean to know ~~him~~ and we're generally judging the Soviet Union either as a crowd of mangy peasants or supermen. They're ~~neither~~, they have great qualities, they have some weaknesses. We also need to know the situation in which we find ourselves and I want to address myself briefly to that. The World situation, the one that really exists, not the one that people like to pretend that exists, ^{but} the one that's here. It's nice to think that every day is sunshiny, but occasionally it rains and if you happen to be at the North Pole it's wonderful to dream that you're down on the beaches in Miami but ~~it's cold~~ up there, don't dress that way, as if you were in Miami because if you do you'll freeze to death. Now what I'm getting at is that we have all too often looked upon the world situation not as it is but as we thought it ought to be, and have designed policies on that basis. And finally, I think we need to know our objectives. What are our objectives in Foreign Policy? What are we really trying to do? Are we just trying to prove that Khrushchev is a liar, if you're doing that that's not difficult. Are we merely trying to out debate in the United Nations the Soviet Union? Are we merely trying to alert the world that communists are tyrants? You don't need to do that. Most everybody in the world already knows it, and we've spent a good deal of our time it seems to me winning debates like a corporation lawyer, winning detailed debates and never ^{ever} stating our affirmative case or outlining some recognizable and ascertainable objectives. Now let me go back number one to when ^{I believe} I won't take anytime on knowing ourselves because that's what we've

been talking about here this morning, what we need to do. I won't mention again about knowing the enemy because I think this has been pretty well developed in terms of our ~~adequacies~~ ~~our~~ inadequacies and the Soviet strength and weapons and education. Knowing ourselves includes some of our weaknesses in the field of civil liberties, of civil rights, it includes also knowing that we're the original revolutionaries and here's where I get down to--downto cases. What's the matter with we Americans? Are we afraid of ourselves? Are we ashamed of our heritage? We are the original radicals and revolutionaries and we are by tradition literally made to order for this day and age because this is a Revolutionary epoch and there's a great social Revolution under way throughout the world. Now you can pretend it isn't ~~under~~ way but it is and our whole area of diplomacy needs to be oriented toward that revolutionary situation. Our Foreign Service officers need to understand that there are great labor movements growing in Algeria and Tunisia and Morocco and that's it's maybe more important to know the young man that's going to be in charge of the labor confederation than it is to know the fellow that you met at the last saloon or salon, I guess they call it. What I'm attempting to say is that the niceties, the form of diplomacy today is not nearly as important as the substance. I recall not long ago when the Secretary of State let out an anguished cry that the Soviet were violating diplomatic rules in this terrible propaganda war that they were waging. And I appreciate his feelings. It's true that the propaganda rules, I mean the diplomatic rules, of a Metternich, Lord Castlereagh and the diplomatic rules of early American diplomacy were being violated, but this is a different kind of a world. Propaganda is a part of a nation's arsenal and the fact that ours isn't very good doesn't mean that you shouldn't use propaganda. It means that we should improve it, just like we attempt to improve weapons, that are designed for particular objectives, so you need to improve your propaganda or your information and you'd just as well make up your mind that we have to have a propaganda program just as well as the other side only it needs to be better and it needs to be not general but designed for the specific situations. Now I said we need to know the situation and I want to point out as I said ~~that the first~~ thing in the situation is that there's a revolution on and here's why we're failing in our foreign policy. Because of that single fact. I have a few statements here that I made not long ago in a speech down before a group of business men in Chicago, so I'll make it to you. I said one of the reasons that we lack a comprehensive, integrated foreign policy which I say we do. We treat with separate problems, we treat momentarily with the Formosan situation, now. Nobody's talking about the Middle East any more, now, you know, that one is all locked up apparently, except only to break out again. Mr. Eisenhower's

speech at the U. N. didn't solve it a bit, and I submit to you that one of the weaknesses is revealed right here, that after the headlines were obtained the speech was made, the so-called program was laid down, not a single thing has been done to implement it, not one. And the Congress was in session over three weeks and could have stayed in session if it needed, if there was a need of additional statutory authority. Not a single move ~~has~~ been made, in terms of the economic, the social, the political forces that ought to have been set in motion to do something about this area. Well, then, one of the reason's that we lack a comprehensive and integrated foreign policy is because a conservative government is incapable of coming to grips with a world-wide revolution, and of devising bold, creative, flexible policies. I ask this question, How can conservative leaders or politicians who oppose a TVA in the United States really sound true-blue by asking for more little TVA's in the Middle East? Who do you think you're kidding? How can conservative politicians who really oppose planned public works, regional river development, really, really and truly, advocate sincerely and make people believe that they're sincere in their advocacy, of massive public works that are required in Asia, Africa and Latin America? Which the people of these areas want. In other words, how can conservative politicians who oppose these things really have their hearts in flood control in Africa and village development projects in India or in Asia? It just doesn't ring true, you see. In other words, how can political leaders who can disregard the fact of a recession at home, and this is a good case in point, you know. About a year ago, some of us were saying that the recession was under way and people in government said, no, there isn't any recession. You're just a prophet of gloom and doom. Well, after while when it became perfectly obvious that even the Department of Labor that was taking a statistical count, found that there was four and a half to five million unemployed, the President said, yes, that's true, momentarily this is just a seasonal thing and it'll be over in March. Well, it didn't get over in March, and so they said well maybe in April, and it didn't get over in April, it got a little worse in June. But now it never existed. Now, the theory is that it's all over and if it were really here it got over in a hurry. First, it didn't exist. Then, it existed. And now, it's over. Now, this kind of thing, may I say, doesn't really qualify you for international leadership, where people have grave economic problems. How can conservative politicians who belittle economic and social planning to which Mrs. Keyserling was directing her attention this morning, resist and object to ^{economic and} social planning at home, here in America, really cooperate with the governments of many new countries where national economic and social planning is a must, where the limited amount of capitol must be carefully utilized and the plans must be meticulous, where government planning is an

absolute requirement and where you cannot rely upon just private initiative. How can generals, corporation lawyers, and, in fact, some big business men, really get in tune with this world revolution. And until you get in step with it and in tune with it you can't do much about it. Well, it seems to me the essence of conservative government is dedicated to the preservation of the status quo. What's happening is that the status quo is being blown to bits. And so we're waging a kind of--what I'd like to term, and I don't like to term it, but I must term it--we are becoming the Metternich of the twentieth century. We're trying to have a kind of Holy Alliance of our own to put down certain views, and I suggest that that, within itself, will lead to very unfortunate results. Now, in the moment that's left, what can we do about it? What should we be doing? Well I think there's been too much emphasis upon the military aspects of our foreign policy. I am not one who believes that you must not have power. As a matter of fact, foreign policy is the use of strength and power and the maximization of it. Maximizing it, through allies, through combines, through associations of like-minded people. I think that at times we have weakened ourselves by overaddiction to anti-communism, even in places where we couldn't find communism. Now that doesn't mean that one shouldn't be aware of the communist threat. But there are some things in this world, fellow-Americans that need to be done if there had never been a communist. And I believe that we lose a great deal of our effectiveness by always having to do something or that we're required to do something because if we don't do it, the communists will get us, or get them. I believe we'd be much more effective if we just did it because it needed to be done. I would also suggest that we should utilize the United Nations a great deal more than we do. And I don't mean to use it as an international dumping ground for the hot potatoes. I mean to really develop economic policy through the U.N., multilateral economic programs, to really develop even greater, the multilateral technical assistance programs, to really take the leadership and not come in with our feet dragging, take leadership in Health, and Education and Food, and I propose here for example that one of the things we ought to be doing is to develop a World Food Bank into which we literally would make deposits on a long-term basis of foods and fibres, and call upon other surplus food-producing areas to do the same thing, and thereby be able to give some assurance to peoples in India, in Burma, peoples in Africa, people where there may be deficit food areas. That there will be food available for their economic planning, so that their economic planning will not have to be held back by the sheer fact of impending starvation. And I submit to this audience that a nation that has the food surpluses that we have ought to be ashamed of themselves for not being able to use it more constructively. I also believe that our country ought to take the lead in Health

and in Education, rather than constantly bickering with the Soviet. May I suggest that it may be a long time before we will ever be able to negotiate anything with the Soviet. What about developing areas of strength around the Soviet. What about taking the functional approach on the scientific front, the educational front, the food front, the health front, the cultural front. In other words, developing through our foreign policy stronger and better contacts, more meaningful contacts on these areas, and by so doing, rather than encircling the Soviet with airbases which are going to be useless in a few years, if not months, you, in a sense encircle the Soviet with an atmosphere and with a social system and with a set of social and political values that are much more effective in holding back the Soviet if she becomes obstreperous, and yet much more effective in penetrating the Soviet if there's even a little crack in the Iron Curtain. And I think that's the front we ought to be on. But we'll talk a bit more about it I guess this afternoon.

(APPLAUSE)

* * *



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