

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Dyckman Hotel
Minneapolis, Minnesota

For Release: Saturday a.m.'s
Oct. 25, 1958

SENATOR HUMPHREY CALLS FOR MORE EMPHASIS ON 'WORKS FOR PEACE' THROUGH UN

The "price of survival" in the second half of the 20th Century may well be the degree of our national devotion to "works of peace", Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (DFL-Minn.) declared last night in a United Nations Day address to a Regional Collegiate Conference and Dinner at Coffman Memorial Union, University of Minnesota.

Speaking on the subject, "The United States, the United Nations, and Peace", Senator Humphrey said, in part:

"'Works for peace' is not just my phrase. It is a phrase used, among others, by the President of the United States in his State of the Union Message on January 9, 1958. His words were eloquent and encouraging, when he spoke of cooperation for a better world.

"But words without deeds are useless, just as 'faith without works' can be barren.

"While our Chief Executive has spoken of works for peace, America has not sufficiently acted to bring into being these works of peace.

"There has been promise, but small fulfillment; great expectations, but few results.

"We are all familiar with the old saying, 'What you do, speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say'. Today, many of the peoples of the world might say to us of America: 'What you don't do speaks so loudly, that we cannot hear what you say.'"

"it is our errors of Omission, almost as much as our errors of Commission, which serve to limit the effectiveness of what we say to the world.

"What are these works of peace so urgently needed?

"They are both ancient and modern devices, which have been used in part for 2,000 years -- the weapons against mankind's real enemies.

"They are the weapons used to 'clothe the naked, feed the hungry, heal the sick'.

"They are the weapons of great ideas, the weapons of love and devotion and self-sacrifice which can span vast space and time.

"They are weapons which must be aimed, principally, at the third of the world which is underdeveloped, but not limited to that area. I mean weapons against pain and suffering, ignorance and superstition and idolatry and illiteracy, hunger and malnutrition, and disease and disability.

"We want to overcome misunderstanding, fear, envy and want. Suffering and privation are widespread, a fertile field for the growth of communist influence. But these works of peace are deeds we should be doing because they are right to do, because it is in our heritage to do them, regardless of whether a communist existed in the world. They are deeds we must do if we really want the world to know us as we are: Good Samaritans, not Warriors."

"We cannot win the battle for men's minds with machine guns and mortars, aping the terror of the Communists. We must win it ultimately with superior ideas -- and really being ourselves, living and acting in the spirit in which this great democracy was founded.

"'Food for Peace' is one such 'superior idea'. Giving food generously represents the real America at work. Working through and in cooperation with the UN and its specialized agencies, our food abundance can be put to work effectively, in meaningful ways, consistent with our foreign policy objects. Equally promising is the field of health, and the field of education. Doctors and teachers may be able to point the way to peace far better than Generals and warriors.

"Just as the United Nations has been of great service to the world in promoting an atmosphere of peace, so, too, each successive work of peace has both a direct and an indirect effect.

"The direct effect is to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, heal the sick, and teach the illiterate. But the indirect effect is to create a climate of understanding and friendship, and to contribute to an atmosphere of peace. Nowhere is such a climate and atmosphere more important than in the strained relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

"There is such a wall of suspicion and misunderstanding between us that anything that can be done to hurdle the wall and enable our citizens to work side by side with Russian citizens is to the good. The more Russians and Americans can work fruitfully side by side,

on common problems, the more they can decrease the likelihood of nuclear fallout and increase the chances -- everywhere in the world -- for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness", Senator Humphrey said.

United States Senate

MEMORANDUM

11/10/58

For Speech given on
UN Day at the University

See Chicago Executive

Club file of same
date

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

*Memorandum
for Executive
Club in
Chicago
Oct. 24
1958*

Ladies and gentlemen. I have come here today with a kaleidoscopic impression of events and trends both at home and abroad derived from weeks of rapid movement around the country in this pre-election period. Perhaps I should have begun with Dickens' opening words from A Tale of Two Cities, "It was the best of times; it was the worst of times...", and I would add -- it was the busiest of times. But I would also have to pursue my story under the title, A Tale of Twenty Cities.

What I really would like to do ~~tonight~~ ^{today} is to sort out with you some of my thoughts as tempered or stimulated by my many contacts with the American people during the last few weeks. The chosen central theme -- "United States Foreign Policy and the United Nations" -- is most appropriate, since this is UN Day, but it would be worthy of the utmost attention regardless of the occasion.

proceeding,
Before ~~going on~~, I must say frankly that I have thoroughly enjoyed my crowded schedule. It has been purposeful activity. This is an idea which has much relevance to ~~the~~ *my* central theme, for the times are too complex and serious for any relaxation. Our policy makers and our people should be giving intense thought to the ways in which we can take energetic action through the UN to meet the grave challenges confronting us. Yet I cannot avoid the impression that, except for sporadic bursts of activity, we have generally been sitting back waiting for things to happen -- which they have done with a vengeance. When we have acted, as in Lebanon, it has almost seemed like action for action's sake, rather than for a definite and long-range purpose. And we have *face-saving* turned to the UN almost as an afterthought.

Nevertheless, thirteen years after the creation of the United Nations Organization I find it very gratifying that support for the UN in this country has clearly been on the rise. Our representative in New York, Ambassador Lodge, has recently noted that in a nation-wide

opinion poll the number of Americans expressing satisfaction with the progress of the UN has increased from 43 to 72 percent over the past few years. In a recent survey, only six percent of those questioned did not support our participation in the United Nations. A goodly majority of our citizens thus appear to appreciate the usefulness of the UN to the world, and specifically to the United States.

At the same time, however, I have an uneasy feeling that at least some measure of this support is not based on a sound appreciation of the true merits and possible future role of the United Nations. This could mean that many Americans might applaud the UN as solely measured by the pragmatic test of its utility in terms of our short-term or operational interests. Certainly the UN would pass such a test at present, especially in connection with developments in the Middle East over the past two years or so. But those same Americans might sit on their hands, or worse, turn to the attack, if the United States suffered a limited tactical reverse in the UN at some future date.

Another problem is that changes in the world balance of power and in relationships between nations and peoples are naturally being reflected in the UN. I need only mention one enormously significant factor to illustrate that point: the ability of the Soviet Union to achieve a position of approximate equality with the United States in possessing increasingly frightful instruments of destruction. This is resulting in greater emphasis on the potential of the UN for preventing local disputes from turning into broad conflicts directly engaging the interests of the two greatest powers. The United Nations needs constant reappraisal As it reflects changing world conditions in order to insure that we utilize its capacity to further the cause of international peace and progress.

The UN has outlasted many of the early criticisms of it in this country. These largely grew out ^{of} the disillusionment suffered by ^{many} ~~numbers~~ Americans whose fine idealism had imposed an impossibly heavy task on an organization which cannot develop contrary to the facts of international

life. Now changes in the framework and operation of the UN are being accompanied by new criticisms which may be further stimulated, rather than muted by developments ⁱⁿ ~~over~~ the near future. Some charges are justified; some are not. Some criticisms may bring about worthwhile changes in the UN; others may not lend themselves to remedial actions. What is vitally important is to see these criticisms in the proper perspective of the broad meaning and potential of the UN.

I would like to try to achieve that perspective in discussing the United Nations with you ^{today.} ~~tonight.~~ Let us consider the subject together under three main headings: First, the concrete record of the UN; second, the ~~salient~~ ^{levied against} criticisms ^{of} the organization; third, the opportunities it affords for the satisfaction of this country's broad objectives, and the degree to which we have capitalized ^{on} ~~on~~ those opportunities.

But before I begin, I want to stress that no artificial connecti^{on}~~ve~~ is needed to link the two parts of our theme, "United States Policy and the United Nations". There is, I think, overwhelming agree-

ment both in and outside official circles in this country that our two most important long-range objectives are peace and the well-being of mankind. ~~Peaceful more simply,~~ ^tthe former involves not merely the physical security of our nation, but progress toward a system of international law and order; ^o_the latter requires immediate action directed toward narrowing the great and dangerous gap between the living standards of the industrialized countries, and those areas -- largely in Asia and Africa -- where the majority of the earth's population exist on a bare survival basis. These twin objectives are equally those of the United Nations Organization and are so stated in Article 1 of the UN Charter. We should, therefore, keep them constantly in mind as we assess the performance and potential of the UN.

The greatest tribute to the United Nations is the number of prominent international figures, including our present Secretary of State, who have expressed the view that the world might well have been plunged into the holocaust of a third general war by now had there been no UN. If we were only concerned with justifying the existence of the

United Nations, we could stop right here. But that is not our sole purpose.

You are all familiar with the way in which the UN gave the sanction of world opinion, as well as considerable material support, to our successful effort to prevent a Communist take-over in South Korea. There are those who scoffed at the military contribution of the UN allies without realizing that in terms of comparative resources many of them matched the United States performance. Indeed, the monetary equivalent of the effort of other UN members -- there can be no equivalent for ~~our~~ ^{our} 17,000 casualties -- was several times more than membership in the UN has cost this country since 1945.

On the other hand, you probably do not remember the full scope of the activity of the United Nations in promoting peace around the world. The UN was instrumental in bringing ~~about~~ the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran soon after World War II, in mediating the conflict which led to an independent Indonesia, in arranging for the continuing truce in Kashmir, in bringing an end to Communist action in Greece, and in providing means for ~~Russia~~ ^{the Kremlin} to talk privately about ending the Berlin blockade.

In the Middle East alone the United Nations has created and upheld the armistice agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors. After its activity in the Suez crisis, it has provided an Emergency Force to patrol the most sensitive Israeli border areas. It has sent observers to Lebanon and other parts of the region. Note, too, that 15 of our fliers were released from captivity in Communist China in 1955 after a UN General Assembly vote demanding that they be freed. Finally, even now there are unconfirmed newspaper reports that the UN informally provided a channel for the relay of information from Red China that it was prepared to make a start on mutual compromises on the Quemoy problem. Remember, too, that I have not given an exhaustive list of UN accomplishments in this field.

Obviously, one very important function of the United Nations has been ^{the} ~~its~~ effective ^{providing} ~~offer~~ of a setting where representatives of virtually all the countries in the world can meet to communicate their grievances and their disagreements. This diplomatic forum has done a great deal to crystalize world opinion on particular issues and on

the over-all issue of preventing general war. In this connection, even though the Soviet Union keeps tossing monkey wrenches into the UN machinery at every opportunity, its membership is an enormously significant element in our attempts to prevent war by miscalculation because of lack of ~~lack~~ of communication. Another significant point, which is often overlooked, is that the European satellite countries find UN membership helpful in preserving their national identity even in the shadow of the gaping maw of the USSR.

There are, in addition, two excellent reasons why this country should not succumb to justifiable indignation over the brutal and insulting behavior of the Soviet Union and agitate for its expulsion from the UN. In the first place, there is good reason to believe that its behavior would be far worse if it were not assured of being accepted as a great -- if distasteful -- power in world councils; it might well take the sort of measures Communist China is now adopting to call attention to itself and its burgeoning power. Secondly, and even more important, unless we wish to regard nuclear mutual suicide as inevitable,

the free world must maintain a channel through which it can continue to offer alternative courses of action that the USSR some day may consider attractive and acceptable.

This latter point leads logically to the great service the United Nations is rendering to mankind by promoting free-world efforts to gain control over the means of destruction and convert nuclear energy to peaceful uses. The United States and its allies are continuously urging the Soviet Union through the UN to join in disarmament agreements covering a multitude of projects. Indeed, I happen to believe that our "package approach" is making an awesome task even more difficult. The USSR has yet to give any evidence that it is willing to accept an effective system of inspection without which we dare not and must not let down our nuclear guard. On the other hand, the UN has recorded a great achievement in securing Soviet participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency which originated from President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" program. Moreover, under UN auspices free-world and Communist bloc scientists this summer reached an unprecedented accord on the requirements for a system which would detect violations of any prohibition of nuclear

weapons tests. We must all hope profoundly that the representatives of the major powers will soon be meeting to translate this technical success into an historic agreement, and that this will lead to accords on other United States proposals, such as safeguards against surprise attack.

As for the efforts of the United Nations in the field of raising world living standards and reducing disease and illiteracy, I will not weary you with a long description of the many specialized UN agencies that are carrying out a magnificent fight against these problems. Deserving of special mention, however, are the World Health Organization, the Children's Fund, the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, and the New Special Projects Fund. These two latter programs, as well as the UN Economic Commissions for various geographic regions -- Africa has just been added to the list -- constitute a vital but a very modest beginning on the tremendous task of providing economic aid to the underdeveloped areas.

A very great deal more could be said about the past and present performance of the United Nations, but I hope I have said enough to indicate that it has a number of vital functions which the world

today would dispense with only at its peril.

II - Criticisms

Let us now turn to some of the more reasonable criticisms that
been
have/made of the United Nations, especially in recent times. I assure
you that I am not a blind partisan of the UN, and I am quite will-
ing to admit that there are many weaknesses and flaws. But, at
the same time, I urge you to remember that the organization is what
its members make of it; that absolute standards are as difficult to
apply to the UN as they are to individuals and nations.

First, there are the long-standing charges that the United
Nations on the one hand is a powerful supranational body trespassing
on the sovereign rights of individual countries, and, on the other
hand, is a weak and futile organization which acts only as an irrita-
ting minor obstacle to the fulfillment of strong and wise U.S. foreign
policies. It would seem rather obvious that both charges cannot be
simultaneously valid. The truth, as usual, lies somewhere between the
extremes. I think I can give no better answer than to quote Secretary-
General Hammorsrskjold to the effect that, "We should recognize the
United Nations for what it is -- an admittedly imperfect but in-

dispensable instrument of nations in working for a peaceful evolution toward a more just and secure world order. At this stage of human history, world organization has become necessary. The forces at work have also set the limits within which the power of world organization can develop at each step and beyond which progress, when the balance of forces so permits, will be possible only by processes of organic growth in the system of custom and law prevailing in the society of nations."

More valid objections to the operations of the UN concern the tendency of members to vote by blocs, the existence of what is usually called a double standard of morality, the abuse of the veto power in the Security Council, and the proportionate financial contribution of the United States to the UN.

With regard to bloc voting, a recent press story gave the information that certain State Department officials are much concerned over the possible future shift in voting patterns in the

General Assembly because of the prospective entry of several new African states. It is quite true that one-fourth of the present members of the UN were colonies when World War II began. They generally have certain inherent anti-colonial biases and even sometimes anti-western and anti-white prejudices. Above all, they generally share an intensely nationalistic outlook, which in many cases also implies a neutralist attitude toward the world power conflict. [#] There has been a marked tendency for most of these new countries to vote in a bloc. Thus we hear constantly of the Afro-Asian bloc, the Bandung bloc, and the Asian-Arab-African bloc. It now appears that many officials in the West are apprehensive lest the entry of more newly independent countries give the underdeveloped countries the balance of power in the UN. There is something to be said for this view, but in my opinion, not very much -- unless we display no understanding and less sympathy for those new countries.

Remember, first, that the industrialized Western countries have their own set of prejudices and a propensity also to vote in a bloc. Remember, too, that the United States, equally with other

powers, more or less openly seeks to influence the votes not only of its allies but of other members. It is a tribute to the UN's future possibilities that its members take them seriously enough to engage in politics on an international scale.

I personally do not believe that there is or will be -- barring inept Western actions -- such solidarity among the newly independent countries that we need fear a vast Asian-Arab-African bloc which would deliver votes with machine-like precision. Indeed, Tunisia's current break with the United Arab Republic illustrates the fact that even the Arab states alone are far from a united status. Again, note that one regional premier in Nigeria, which is expected to become independent in 1960, has already spoken up forcefully for close future cooperation with the West.

Rather, I believe that the important point is that the UN can provide a constructive focus for the intense nationalism of the new states. The UN does not control nationalism, but it does provide a framework in which nationalism can find its proper and responsible place in a world society that is becoming increasingly interdependent.

The problems of a so-called double standard of morality and of an abused veto power are also closely related to the present organization of the UN, but even more to world realities which the UN Can only reflect and not control. An instance of the double standard is found in comparing the withdrawal of the British, French, and Israelis from the Suez area with the refusal of the USSR and the Hungarian Communists to heed the General Assembly's 60 to 10 condemnation of their actions. By the way, many Asian and African countries were included among those 60 votes. In fact, what this example shows is that there really is only one UN code of conduct. Most members comply with that code, but the Communists do not. There is no way to force them to do so short of war. Yet they paid a heavy price in world opinion -- which even they recognize as important -- and in general prestige.

The ability of the USSR to abuse the veto power again is an unpleasant fact of life in the present-day world. It seems to me that the only way to mitigate this fact is through acceptance of some limitation on the area of subjects which can be vetoed. This move,

which should be attempted, despite its obvious difficulties, could also have the beneficial effect of moving some UN operations back to the Security Council from the less potent General Assembly. We should not forget that the United States quite rightly is no more ready than the Soviet Union totally to abolish the veto power.

The final charge that I want to mention is that the United States carries an undue proportion of the financial costs of the UN. That may have been strictly true in past years, but our percentage of the cost has dropped to about one-third in the last two years. This is not too unfair an assessment in terms of our relative share in the world's wealth. In any event, I think Ambassador Lodge has the correct rejoinder to this criticism in noting that our total expenditure in the UN this year is about equal to what 10 hours of World War II cost us.

III -

I am now eager to move on to the more positive side of the picture, namely, what can be done to fulfill our foreign policy objectives through the UN. Frankly, I believe ~~strongly~~ that we have missed many opportunities in the past, and that we are not at present adopting the sort of posture that supports our long term world objectives. ~~would insure our not doing so in the future.~~

~~As a background to this subject,~~ Let me emphasize that the revolution in military weapons in the last few years has had a profound effect on the world power scene. The de facto dividing line between the Communist bloc countries and the free world has become even more clear. It is much easier for world opinion to recognize when that line is crossed in strength and thus to condemn such action as a violation of UN principles. Now we have considerable evidence that the USSR has understood this and therefore has shifted from moves entailing the risk of military action to the offensive use of economic, political, and psychological methods. On the other hand, until recently, we have had very little evidence that our own Administration has absorbed the lesson which Khrushchev so blatantly announced by declaring "economic war" on the West.

I remember how, a short while ago, it was a cliché in Washington circles that France was over extended and therefore unable to realize its potential as a major power. It wouldn't surprise me one bit if the French now employed the same common phrase to describe our world position. I wonder if our complex of defense bases abroad,

our many military arrangements, and our bilateral political commitments are not becoming obsolete in terms of the present nature of the Soviet threat to the free world. I feel quite certain, for example, that this overextension of our commitments is at the root of our predicament with regard to the offshore islands in the Taiwan Strait. For there is good reason to believe that world opinion sees an imaginary line cutting through that Strait, with Taiwan and the Pescadores Islands a part of the free world and the offshore islands a ~~legitimate~~ ^{part of} ~~objective for Communist China.~~ ^{the Chinese civil war}

In this broad context, it appears to me that we ~~have~~ failed to adopt an imaginative approach to the potential of the UN for the advancement of free world interests. You will remember that earlier in this talk I emphasized the twin objectives which the UN and this country held in common. Let us see just how we have reacted to our opportunities with regard to the UN and these objectives.

First, in the field of working for United States security and world peace, I have already mentioned my belief that ~~we have not~~ ^{for many precious} ~~months and years we did not go~~ ^{Soviets} ~~far enough~~ toward adopting and pressing upon the ~~Russians~~ a

clear, simple and ^{practicable} ~~and~~ first step disarmament project. We have, *lately*,

~~indeed~~, made ^{some} ~~many~~ sound proposals looking toward armaments control,

~~but we have also made them so interrelated and even unnecessarily~~

~~complex that they have had virtually no chance of acceptance by the~~

~~USCF. There is evidence that we have belatedly changed our task~~

~~in this regard~~, and I hope this praiseworthy approach will be developed
in the new bomb test cessation talks which will open in Geneva
~~even if the Russians insist on playing "dog in the manger" over the~~
on October 31.

~~coming bombs.~~

Our record is even poorer with regard to taking forehanded measures to prevent the outbreak of local conflicts which could have flared into full-scale war. One American scholar has epitomized our past attitude in one sentence: "In the case of Suez we underestimated the preventive capacity of the UN before the crisis became acute, overestimated its capabilities when the crisis arrived, and again lost interest when the crisis had passed." Here in a nutshell is the reason *why* the Senate has been well in advance of the Administration in urging the remedial measures in the Middle East which were finally enunciated in President Eisenhower's recent UN speech.

We have tended either to ignore the UN or to overload it with responsibility by using it as a crutch when a particular US policy came to a dead end. We have failed to give it the strong, energetic leadership which is expected from the head of the Western alliance. We have just recently compounded our errors by not using it to good effect in advance of the Quemoy crisis. If the UN eventually again pulls our chestnuts out of the Far Eastern flames -- as has been urged by that Republican stalwart, Mr. Dewey, by the most responsible of American newspapers, and by the Democratic Advisory Council among others -- surely we can expect the lesson to be learned this time.

In terms of our second broad objective -- closing the gulf between the living standards of the industrialized and underdeveloped nations -- once again we have been inexcusably slow in acting and stodgy in our thinking. I have noted above the small but vitally needed multilateral economic assistance programs being pursued in

the UN. This is honestly just a drop in the bucket compared with *other expenditures and with*
the needs of the world. We are now taking a number of measures to

expand United States contributions to world economic development and to promote international trade. But essentially these necessary and enlightened steps are bilateral moves which will gain neither the results nor the confident support of world opinion that could be won by the bold attempt to enlist the entire resources of the free world in a vast multi-lateral program. The necessary organizing talent and the administrative framework for such a venture exists both in the UN and in NATO through its economic right arm, the OEEC. An extremely interesting proposal for a multi-lateral economic aid organization for Africa has come from the Center for International Studies at MIT. I believe that we may expect similar proposals as a result of the overall survey of American foreign policy which is about to be undertaken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I am sure that similar plans exist or could be undertaken with regard to other regions. What is really lacking is American government initiative that would match the vigor of American private enterprise.

Perhaps you doubt the urgency of such programs. Let me assure you that many Americans believe, as I do, that if this country had helped inaugurate a truly effective economic development program through the United Nations a few years back, Russia would not have undertaken its "economic offensive" since it would have had nothing to offer not already available via free-world sources.

Let me also point out that the present Administration in a relatively tranquil period made it clear that such a multilateral program could not sensibly be undertaken in Latin America. Following the tension and regrettable incidents south of the border last spring, the Administration has reversed itself -- not a totally unprecedented spectacle -- and advanced just such a program.

Will it take constant pressure and a growing Soviet threat to bring forth other imaginative proposals? Or, will we continue to bump along from crisis to crisis and fail to provide the leadership which could bring out the full

potential of the United Nations? Failure can well mean a nuclear devastation of this planet. In all seriousness, I say today that the price of survival in the second half of the twentieth century may well be the degree of our national devotion to the works of peace.

"Works for peace" is not just my phrase. It is a phrase, used, among others, by the President of the United States in his State of the Union Message on January 9, 1958. His words were eloquent and encouraging, when he spoke of cooperation for a better world.

But words without deeds can be barren, just as "faith without works" can be barren.

And the near tragedy has been that while our Chief Executive has spoken of works for peace, America has not sufficiently acted to bring into being these works of peace.

There has been promise, but small fulfillment; great expectations, but few results.

We are all familiar with the old saying, "What you do, speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say."

Today, many of the peoples of the world might say to us of America: "What you don't do speaks so loudly that we cannot hear what you say."

It is our errors of Omission, almost as much as our errors of Commission, which serve to limit the effectiveness of what we say to the world.

What are these works of peace?

They are both ancient, and modern devices, which have been used in part for 2,000 years -- the weapons against mankind's real enemies.

They are the weapons used to "cloethe the naked, feed the hungry, heal the sick."

They are the weapons of great ideas, the weapons of love and devotion and self-sacrifice which can span vast space and time.

They are weapons which must be aimed, principally, among the third of the world which is underdeveloped, but not limited to that area. I mean the weapons against:

- pain and suffering
- ignorance and superstition and idolatry and illiteracy
- hunger and malnutrition
- disease and disability.

We want to overcome misunderstanding, fear, envy and want.

Suffering and privation are vast.

The average life expectancy in South Asia is still only 33 years or so. Infant mortality is 50% and higher in much of the underdeveloped world. Per capita income is only \$50 per year. To help relieve this enormous need is the challenge facing us.

Why us? Because it is we Americans who have the wherewithal to fulfill mankind's needs.

Because "every one to whom much is given, of him, will much be required."

What solid works of peace can you and I and our government perform: I have already mentioned two -- loans for peace and disarmament for peace. Let me refer to two more: Food for Peace and Health for Peace.

FOOD FOR PEACE CAN BE A DECISIVE INFLUENCE

One of the most important jobs which we can better perform is to use food for peace.

Fortunately, we in America are blessed with the bounty of a highly productive agricultural economy.

Our vast supply of food is a blessing -- a priceless asset to ourselves and to the world.

Yet, far too often, the efficiency of our farmers and the fruitfulness of our soil have been considered as if they represented a "curse".

We cannot win the battle for men's minds with machine guns and mortars. We can win it basically only with superior ideas.

"Food for Peace" is a superior idea.

Giving food generously represents the real America at work.

Working through and in cooperation with the U.N. and its specialized agencies, our food abundance can be put to work in effective, meaningful ways consistent with our foreign policy objectives.

Equally promising is the field of health.

During this session of Congress which has now concluded, it has been my pleasure to help write into the law of the land four pieces of legislation which may contribute, if only in small part, to improving mankind's health.

For example, we wrote into the Mutual Security Act a Declaration that the Congress states it to be the policy of our land to help further in the research task of eradicating mankind's diseases. The Congress declared it to be our goal to help find ~~an~~ the answers to such major killing and crippling ailments as cancer and heart disease, together with other scourges.

Secondly we wrote into that same Act a new provision whereby the sales of American farm products overseas under Public Law 480 may be utilized henceforth for the purpose of translating scientific works and supporting scientific, including medical, research.

We enacted a separate resolution which "took a cue" from the current successful International Geophysical Year, in which 60 nations are cooperating in studying the earth, the waters and the skies.

In this resolution, the Senate invited the President to assemble representatives through the World Health Organization, and other means, so as to consider the possibility of setting aside an International Health and Medical Research Year sometime in the future.

Finally, the Senate approved a Resolution under which the Senate Government Operations Committee will make a study of world-wide health activities.

We will look, not only at America's health assistance, but at additional medical research work which might be performed overseas. As Chairman of this study, which will be made by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, I have initied the great voluntary organizations of this land to assist us. I mean:

a) the church groups -- with their vital overseas medical aid programs.

b) the professional groups - such as the American Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Dietary Association.

c) the voluntary health groups - such as the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, the National Foundation (formerly the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis), the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation.

d) other private foundations - such as the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Near East Foundation.

We shall ask their best judgment concerning international medical research, assistance and rehabilitation.

We will ask the great private pharmaceutical industry of America to come forth with its ideas and suggestions.

I may say that there are tens of millions of dollars of private drug supplies which are relatively ~~surplus~~ surplus on the American market. Such drugs have been surpassed by newer developments. Yet they are perfectly useable and could be put to invaluable service in relieving foreign distress.

I would like to see a fleet of surplus American ships, carrying surplus American drugs, and with surplus jeeps and trailers dispatched to the four corners of the world. I would like to see them visit the port-cities of underdeveloped areas, with American doctors dispensing these healing medicines and thereafter,

proceeding into the interior lands, as well.

This, to me, is a "work of peace".

Let me conclude on this note: Just as the United Nations has been singularly valuable to the world in promoting an atmosphere of peace, so, too, each successive work of peace has both a direct and an indirect effect. The direct effect is to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and heal the sick. But the indirect effect is to create a climate of understanding and friendship and to contribute to an atmosphere of peace.

Nowhere is such a climate and atmosphere more important than in the strained relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

There is such a wall of suspicion and of misunderstanding between us that anything which can be done to hurdle the wall and have our citizens work side by side with Russian citizens is to the good.

The more Russians and American can work fruitfully side by side, on common problems, the more they can decrease the likelihood

of nuclear fallout and increase the chances - everywhere in the
world - for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

10/17/58



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