

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES IN 1959

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

A few days ago I had the privilege of meeting with Walter Reuther in my office. He paid me the honor of stopping by for a good friendly chat. We discussed foreign policy and domestic economic policy. We discussed, as you can imagine, some politics. So I'm delighted I can be here to talk to you about what I hope will be of some help in your future planning.

The Problem of Senate Rules

The very first issue that will be before the Congress of the United States is the issue of the rules of the Senate. Now the issue on the rules that is important is not merely whether it will be a majority that can impose cloture after a certain number of days, or whether that it is two-thirds that can impose cloture -- that is, the close of debate -- or whether it is three-fifths. There are all kinds of mathematical formulas. The fundamental issue is whether or not the Senate of the United States with each new Congress shall exercise what I believe to be and what I think most people ought to believe to be its constitutional right of determining its own body of rules. The issue is whether or not when a new United States Senator is elected, such as my colleague, Eugene McCarthy, that he shall have the right to vote upon the rules that will govern his conduct and his participation in the United States Senate or whether or not the dead hand of the past shall determine how he is going to conduct himself today and in the future.

Senator Wayne Morse, who is a great constitutional authority and lawyer, has said many times that procedure often determines substance. And this is another way of saying that the procedural guarantees of democracy are the real guarantees of substantive liberty and freedom. The procedures of the United States Senate are so important that they really can determine the substances of legislation, or whether or not you're going to have any legislation at all. If that's the case then, and if each Senator is supposed to be able to cast one vote uncontrolled and unfettered, then indeed he ought to have a right to say something about the rules by which that vote is going to be cast. He ought to have something to say as to whether or not he's even going to have the opportunity to use a vote upon an issue which he believes is important.

I am rather surprised to see that the advocates of states rights, those who proclaim the loudest about the importance of states rights under our constitutional system, have got themselves now in the position of denying the representatives of the states, namely the senators, the right to establish our own rules.

The great compromise in the American constitutional system is the compromise relating to the election of United States Senators; this is called the Connecticut Compromise, the compromise between the big states and the little states. And you may recall that in the Constitutional Convention there were many arguments as to how senators were to be selected, as to whether or not there would be any such things as senators, and as to whether or not they would be selected on the basis of population, as the members of the House of Representatives, or how they would be selected. According to the Connecticut Compromise there shall be two senators from each state regardless of the size of that state, and every new state that came into the union, regardless of its size or where it was located, whether it was Nevada or California, would have two United States senators, each with one vote. The people in our Congress today who are the so-called advocates of the sovereign rights of states are the very ones today who are leading the opposition to right of the United States senators to have something to say about the rules which will govern their participation and performance in the Senate.

This article is based upon an address given by Senator Humphrey to the U.A.W. Education-Citizenship Staff Meeting at the Hotel Roosevelt, Washington, D.C., January 5, 1959.

I'm happy to lend my efforts to those who believe in what I call constitutional government because in my book the Constitution of the United States requires that these rules be changed and modified along the lines that we're describing. I'm not now arguing about whether it should be a majority, or two-thirds, or three-fifths. I happen to be with Senator Douglas, a proponent of the so-called majority rule principle. I think my position and Senator Douglas' position -- who by the way has taken the lead on this and deserves all the credit -- is valid. But I say again that that is a detail relating to fundamental principle, and I'm delighted that the principle is going to be voted upon in the next few days.

The Senate is continuing in some areas and not continuing in others; but this has nothing to do with the question of rules. Does a new United States Senator such as Senator Hart from Michigan or Senator Hartke from Indiana or Senator McCarthy from Minnesota or Senator Engle from California or Senator Cannon from Nevada -- do these new Senators have a right to vote upon all the rules of the Senate, or are they supposed to inherit the rules from the past? I think they have a right to vote on all the rules of the Senate, and the day to vote on that is before the Senate gets down to conducting legislative business.

Recent Election a Liberal Victory

Most if not all of you here were active participants in the recent election. This election was a liberal victory. The people who were elected were elected on the basis of what we call a reasonably liberal program; they were elected on issues which relate to the economic future of this country. They were not elected on the basis of more hard money, and more tight credit, and more restricted enterprises, I mean more restrictive policies and philosophies of economic development. The people who were elected were elected on the pro-civil liberties, pro-civil rights, pro-economic development program. This is what we mean when we talk about a liberal program or a liberal policy.

It is, therefore, the responsibility of this Congress to fulfill its commitments in reference to the accomplishment of the liberal program. This means area redevelopment. We have areas in America that are dying because of economic attrition; they are suffering from chronic unemployment; they are suffering from seasonal unemployment; they're suffering from lack of economic opportunities and we need to do something about it. We came close to something about it last year except the President vetoed it. Now I think we have enough votes to do something about the veto and we ought to be able to go ahead with a program and if the President vetoes it, then try to do something about the veto.

There are many areas of needed legislative improvement, and none of this is radical. We're not talking about some fantastic new developments; we're really talking about improving the many gains that we've already made, and in some instances, we're talking about just barely holding on to the gains that we've made. But surely if we ought not to leap ahead, we ought to inch forward and with the majority that we have in the Congress now, with any kind of sensible leadership we ought to be able to make substantial gains.

Housing and Urban Renewal

I'm no expert on one of our greatest needs -- housing. There are some in the Congress who are. Senator Sparkman is surely a competent spokesman in the field of housing; Senator Clark, former mayor of Philadelphia, is one of the best informed. The city of Philadelphia has a tremendous program of civic improvement. If there is one area in Congressional action today that has been given far too little attention, it is the problems relating to urban life, the planning problems, the physical and environmental problems, the economic problems, the social problems of urban life. I agree with Senator Clark that we well need a department in our government of urban affairs. We have departments of Agriculture, Labor and Commerce. We need a Department of Urban Affairs. I would hope that you would give some attention to this and give us some of your thoughtful guidance on it. Senator Clark

has introduced a bill to this effect in the past, and I understand that he's going to do so again. I am a co-sponsor of this bill.

The UAW's record in support of housing is second to none, but we surely need more urban renewal; we surely need more public housing; we surely need cooperative housing and middle-income housing; and we surely need reasonable rates of interest and long-term credit and what we just call ordinary housing, FHA housing. Let's quit looking at housing just as a business proposition. Housing, after all, has social values to it. You have a share in your community life once you own a home. The sooner we take a look at it from that point of view, the better we're going to be off.

Unemployment Compensation

We still have problems in the field of unemployment compensation. We didn't do anything about it in the last session. I suppose somebody's going to say: "Well, you don't want to do much about it now, Senator." Employment is picking up so why get yourself all excited about unemployment compensation.

The time to put the unemployment compensation law on a modernized basis that will meet current requirements and the requirements of the future is NOW; in fact, it's already about two years late. We should have done it last year. The bill that was introduced in the House by Congressman McCarthy and in the Senate by Senator Kennedy, of which I was a co-sponsor, ought to become law. It provided for Federal standards, improved coverage, and increased benefits. This is no wild-eyed, visionary scheme; it is just plain, down-to-earth economics. And it's good solid sense. Let's get on the ball and get something done about it. Let's not give this one up because somebody told us that the employment was picking up in the automobile industry or some other industry. We need an improved unemployment compensation law even if we had 100% full employment, just exactly as one needs a good life insurance policy after the doctor says you're healthier than a Shetland pony.

Civil Rights Legislation

We need improvement in our civil rights legislation. We need to have an extension of our Civil Rights Commission. I have advocated, as you know, a permanent Commission. The very fact of a one or two-year extension denies it dignity and authority. The sooner that you get the Civil Rights Commission based upon a longer term basis, the sooner you're going to have more respect for its penal powers and for its other investigative powers. We have to strengthen Section Three in the Civil Rights Act. There are many areas in the civil liberties and the civil rights field that we need to strengthen.

The Federal Budget and National Defense

The federal budget today is something more than paying the cost of post offices and post roads. The federal budget today is something more than financing the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The budget today represents, number one, the security of this country, the basic, elemental military security; the foreign policy of this country; and thirdly, the economic development of this country.

From what I've read in all three areas, security, foreign policy, and economic and social development of the country, the budget falls far short of what is needed. I read in the paper today that we had a billion dollars left over from last year's budget that we hadn't expended for our military security. What's wrong around here? Does anybody in this town really believe that the Soviet Union is weakening? Does anybody really believe that they're not developing their military strength? Has anybody been duped into believing that they're not out to win? Make no mistake about it. The objectives of world Communism are the same now as they were 20 years ago or 40 years ago -- world conquest, but the means may change.

The Soviet Union may well have decided that it is not going to blow the world to pieces -- it's just going to pick it up piece by piece. Operation Nibble. And they're seeking now to put the balance of power in their hands through a powerful military machine, which can be used for outright conquest or blackmail. Under the cloak of blackmail the Communists can use their economic power, their political subversion, their propaganda, their every resource, to achieve a favorable balance of power by winning in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

This Administration saddled the country with a 12 billion dollar budget deficit and then in order to save a penny failed to spend and to properly utilize a billion dollars for security purposes.

The budget represents either an attempt on the part of the Administration to parade before the American people as an economy government and thereby force the Congress to up the amounts in order to take care of elemental services and national security, and then blame the Congress for being a spending Congress, or it indicates economic and political blindness or lack of wisdom. It is either a political budget, or what is worse, it demonstrates the utter lack of understanding on the part of the President and his associates of the kind of a budget this country needs for its national security, its foreign policy, and its domestic economic and social development. I'm afraid it's the latter, because the spirit of George Humphrey is still here. That's a fact. That fellow came in here in '53 and he left a couple of years ago, but the spirit still is here. And the Administration gets a little bit more George Humphreyish each day. Absence makes the heart grow fonder.

And the whole theory here is that we have to cut back on federal expenditures, because that's the way you balance the budget. There's no way that I see to balance this budget by cutting back on federal expenditures without undermining the security of the United States. The true way to balance this budget is to step up the economic development in this country in a long-range program, so that even though we may have to spend more for our domestic and our foreign and our security needs, the resources and the revenues are coming in to take care of it out of an expanded and developing economy. I concur with Arthur Byrnes, Leon Keyserling, Walter Reuther, and others of varying opinions who take this position.

A New Kind of Budget Needed

There are people in the business world, who are prominent industrialists, who are beginning to understand the importance of a federal budget based on two principles: an operating budget and a capital budget. And if I do nothing else this year, I'm going to put a bill in for a new type of federal budget. One is an operating budget to pay for the current costs of government, and the other is what I call a capital budget, the way the telephone company capitalizes itself.

If we'd operated the A T & T and the Bell Telephone System the way that we operate the federal budget, we'd still be communicating with smoke signals.

Now, the governments, local, state and federal, do many things today for people which people themselves, in bygone days, out of sheer necessity, used to do for themselves. The costs of public education, the costs of public health, the costs of modern sanitation, the costs of sewage disposal plants, the costs of transportation, today are public expenditures.

But today we know that we need a fantastically improved highway system in America, from a sheer point of national defense and security, and surely from the point of commerce.

We know today that our cities, that our streams are being polluted, because of inadequacy of modern sanitation plants. We know today that there's a great need of public health; we know today that there must be more hospitals; we know today that we need more schoolrooms and more teachers, and I say to you that as you plan these new private urban developments it is absolutely essential that there be public services that go along with them.

My wife and I were talking about the little school where our youngest son attends. They just finished a school plant that is commensurate with the community as it was five years ago. Last year they built a number of new homes in the area which will antiquate the whole new school plant. Next year when those homes are filled, the school will be half the size that it ought to be for the area.

When are we going to have enough ordinary, plain, common sense, dirt sense, to know that when you put in enough homes to bring in 500 more children, you ought to put in enough sidewalks and schools and playgrounds for them?

Now that's local planning. On the federal level, we know of the necessity for airports. How many more air crashes do we have to have before we get a modern aviation system? How many more automobile accidents do we have to have before we have a modern highway system?

Need for Economic Growth

Public expenditures are vital to the health of a private economy. The greatest weakness in America today is not our scientific weakness. It isn't the failures in outer space or shots at the moon. The greatest single weakness today in the security of the United States of America is the failure of this nation to keep pace in economic growth.

When the Soviet Union progresses at the average rate of seven to eight percent a year in gross national product, and we progress at a rate of about one-and-a-half percent a year as we have since 1953, we're in trouble. They're still somewhat lean and emaciated, compared to our standards, but they're coming up fast. The thing you need to keep in mind is not that we're out here, and they're back here, but it is the rate of advance, and if we're advancing at 1.5, and they're advancing at 7.5, it isn't long before they catch up. That is exactly what they're telling their people they're going to do. They are not only going to catch up, they say, but they're going to exceed us.

Now, from 1947 to 1953, the average rate of expansion in our gross national product was over four percent. In fact, the average rate for the first 50 years of this century in the United States was between three and one-half and four percent.

From 1947 to 1953 it was four percent, and what we need for the future is approximately five percent, and what we have is approximately 1.5 percent.

The greatest single economic factor in the United States today is the growth of population, which proceeds at a rate of about three and a half to four million a year. There are a few people who understand this -- the diaper manufacturers and laundries. It seems to me that people who head the government ought to understand it.

Interdependence of International and Domestic Affairs

There isn't a thing that goes on domestically that doesn't affect our international life and our foreign relations. When there's a recession in the United States, it's bad news for the whole free world and good news for the Soviet Union. All the subversives in America put together, all of those that we've caught, and those we haven't, and all of those that the committees thought they were catching, couldn't possibly do the damage to America's prestige and to our security position that a real first-class recession or depression does. The Soviet Union has predicated its entire program upon the belief that the free world can't take it over the long period of time.

And every time there's trouble on the economic front in America, it affects all the other nations in the world that are closely allied with us as well as all the neutrals. It is not by accident that much of the ill

feeling in Latin America today is due to the fact that raw material prices went down in the last two years. When lead goes down, and tin goes down, and copper goes down, and nitrates go down -- and those are the products that some of our Latin American friends produce -- they start to have unemployment, they start to have low incomes and they blame it on the United States.

This country is so big in the economic world that it isn't just a matter of competition any more. We literally set prices. When we bid, our bid becomes the world price. It's exactly like big steel. When the United States Steel Corporation announces the price of steel, that's the price. It doesn't make much difference what its competitors talk about. The price becomes what the big one sets. And you people at the UAW know what I'm talking about.

Everything that we do, and everything that happens to us, affects our foreign policy. When we have Little Rocks, when we have trouble in neighboring states, when we have trouble over race relations, it makes our whole diplomacy abroad all the more difficult.

There is no amount of money this government can appropriate that can make up for the tragic loss and weakness that comes from having our country fail to live by its standards and its ideals. There isn't any amount of money that we can pour into Africa and Asia that would be as significant as having a good record in treating people as people, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. The United States of America cannot be a morally responsible and politically effective leader of the free world and continue to practice the most vile kinds of discrimination.

Thank goodness that the majority of citizens in our country does not condone abuses of civil liberties and civil rights. When we go abroad we can point out that while there are weaknesses and limitations, the majority of the American people believe in and practice equality. But I remind you that it does hurt us.

On the economic front a recession hurts the whole free world and helps the Soviet Union and her satellites. To justify five million unemployed, as the Administration is doing, is to give credence to a major Communist argument throughout the world. An abuse of civil liberties and civil rights weakens American leadership, and thereby the free world, and strengthens the Communists.

You don't go around trying to compete against a system that is harnessing its capital, and what the Soviet Union has is state capitalism, by tying one arm behind your back. That doesn't prove you're brave; it just proves you're a fool. You don't go around trying to compete against a system that is willing to employ any tactic, without any regard to ethics or morals, by having some of your best people, some of your labor force, totally unemployed, others underemployed, and even as bad, to have part of your capital tools underemployed and underused. I wonder how we can justify in this world having a steel industry operating at about 80 percent of capacity, when we say we're really competing with the Soviet Union.

Competing with the Soviet Union

You know, I want to compete with these people. And I don't like to lose. I've never gotten any joy out of these so-called moral victories from defeat.

If we are going to be restricted by 20-year-old textbooks and if you're going to be restricted by 1920 thinking about budgets, and if you're going to be restricted about a lot of old prejudices and traditions that have long ago been disproved, you're going to lose before you start.

And I don't happen to think that's the way we ought to compete.

One thing I want to tell you about Moscow. I don't know anything about the Soviet Union and I'm not pretending I do. I'm no expert. I think anybody that says he's an expert on the Soviet Union after having been there eight days only proves that he doesn't know what he's talking about.

I intend to know more about it, and I thoroughly agree with President Eisenhower that we ought to know more about it, and we ought to sit down with the people who we don't agree with and talk to them. This is one of the reasons I spoke to the NAM two years ago.

My Moscow Visit

I've read many editorials of late saying that I was being duped by the Communists, that Khrushchev was using me as a tool. I think Mr. Khrushchev is a pretty smart fellow, and I hope that he doesn't think that I'm exactly illiterate, and I don't think he used me, and I don't think I used him. I believe that it is the patriotic duty of every American who can find out even as much as one word about the nature of our opposition, to report it, to bring it back to the responsible officials of government. I believe that this government of ours needs a Soviet evaluation center, in which we evaluate not merely the cops and robbers stuff, you know, just about the nature of the respective intelligence systems, but sociological factors, environmental factors, psychological factors, economic factors, political factors, leadership factors. If I had my way in this government, I'd have a group of Americans that are the most intelligent people I could find, spending 24 hours a day if their health could stand it, studying the top 100 Soviet leaders back behind Mr. Khrushchev, because one of those top 100 is going to be the next premier.

And I'd investigate him from the day of his birth, in fact, even before birth, his family's family, right on up to the present moment, so that whenever a change was made in the Soviet, regardless of what change it was, that we'd know something about it.

Nothing is more distressing to me than when there's a new face that appears in a photograph in the Soviet Union someplace, there's a big scramble around in our government, saying, I wonder who that is, I wonder who he is -- what did he do?

We're dealing with a power system and a group of men reaching for the jugular veins of the United States and the free world. We would be well advised to have the very best talent that this country has, in labor, in management and education and science and technology, every area of our life, spending months, years, trying to find out what's coming up in the Soviet Union.

This is what I have been trying to say since I came back from my Moscow trip. Everything that appeared in the American press two weeks after I saw Mr. Khrushchev on December 1 I reported to our government on December 2 in a six-page typewritten cable. I can say that everything that appeared in the American press ten days to two weeks later, I had reported previously to our government. The Tass News Agency, for example, reported that Soviet tanks were not in Germany to point the way to Berlin. Your government heard about that ten days before it was ever in print.

It's exactly like when you're working out a problem. You've got everything except one little bit that you need to complete the picture. It was not just a coincidence that the information given me relating to a 14,000 kilometer rocket was tied to the recent experiment of sending a satellite out towards the moon. In order to have a 14,000 kilometer rocket that can carry a warhead of well over a ton, you've got to have a propulsion system with tremendous thrust to shoot it out into space. When you talk to scientists about this they understand what it means to have a propulsion system that can send a better than one ton missile over 8,000 miles on a trajectory, not up into outer space, where the force of gravity loses its pull, but where you send it against the forces of the atmosphere with friction restraining it.

That was a little bit of information that we were able to give. We were able to bring back some information relating to a five megaton bomb that used less than one-tenth the amount of fissionable material that had been used in prior bombs of equal size.

What did this add up to? It simply meant that they'd been able to compact, to condense into a small form a five megaton bomb which is five thousand times bigger than the bomb that was used at Hiroshima. They were able to put into that bomb sufficient power to launch an intercontinental ballistic missile. And when you add rockets of 14,000 kilometers and a five megaton bomb that had one-tenth the amount of material in it, to develop the same yield of energy, you arrive at information vital to weapons experts.

But the interesting thing about it all was the nature of the person I interviewed, Mr. Khrushchev, who in a sense also portrays his country. He is a very gregarious type of person.

It would have been very easy to have had a heated argument with Mr. Khrushchev. I asked him about Hungary, and his explanation was fantastic, ridiculous. And I could have got up in outrage and said, "I'll hear no more of this," and that would have been the end of the interview.

But in order to prove that I was a democrat with a small d, in order to prove that I believed in freedom, I didn't have to insult the man at the other side of the table. I listened; I took lengthy notes. I made our position quite clear; about free trade unions, for example; about American elections; about so-called American capitalism, which they don't understand at all. I made our position quite clear on Hungary; on Berlin; and I made our position quite clear in terms of economic development in our country.

But I got a good deal of information from the other man, and I found a great fierce sense of pride on their part that covers up a sense of insecurity. They know that they have many areas of weakness. And the Soviets admit to no weakness. This is why they can't tolerate Pasternak.

I asked Mr. Mikoyan this noon about Pasternak. I said, if your system is so strong, if you're so confident, why can't you stand criticism? We can read The Ugly American and take it. Why can't you? And his answer was quite simple, and yet almost unbelievable. He said, because he attacked the revolution. You see? Dogma. Blind dogma. The power of reason that they say that they believe in is cast aside for prejudice.

Now, this ought to tell us Americans something. Let's not be as dogmatic as they are, because their weakness is their dogmatism. Let's not ape the totalitarian. Let's not be willing to have controversial ideals and convictions sacrificed on the altar of orthodoxy and dogmatism.

The weakness of the Soviet Union is not in its steel plants, it's not in its production mechanism. The weakness of the Soviet Union is not in the Red Army. It isn't in its science. It's in their thinking, their blind adherence to doctrine, dogmatism. The strength of the United States of America is not just in its steel plants, not in its corporations, not in its capital structure, but it is in the freedom of association and the freedom of thought, and the freedom of movement, and the sense of social justice and equality that motivates us.

Further Impressions of the U.S.S.R.

When I arrived in Moscow the airport was literally filled with people from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. Out on the ramp there were five separate sets of microphones -- five batches of them, and stretched out about a block, with television cameras, 10:00 o'clock, 10:30 at night, and they weren't out there to see Hubert Humphrey. They were there to receive 120 and 115 and 130 people that were coming off planes from Indonesia, Viet Minh, North Korea, China, India, Burma,

Ceylon, from Iraq, from Egypt, from Yemen, from every place that you could think of. During eight days and eight nights in Moscow I saw more people from the Asian and African and Middle Eastern and North African areas than I've ever seen in my life, save when I visited those areas.

There are 15,000 students in Moscow alone from the areas I've mentioned, all paid for by the host government. The Soviet Government pays for their education, pays for their upkeep, pays for their room, pays for everything. And how many there are throughout the Soviet Union, I couldn't say. Don't underestimate these people. The first day I was there I asked to meet Premier Khrushchev. I figured I had about as much chance of meeting him as I did of getting to the moon in an American rocket this week. I asked to meet the Foreign Minister. I asked to meet the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Higher Education, and the Minister of Agriculture. I asked to appear on Moscow TV, Moscow radio. I asked to see a factory that was off-bounds.

At 4:00 o'clock on my first day I attended a reception at the Indonesian Embassy for the Indonesian Foreign Minister. Among the Soviet officials present were Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan, Mr. Khrushchev's right arm and part of his brain power; Mr. Kuslov, the second Deputy Prime Minister; and Mr. Andrei ("Nyet") Gromyko, the Foreign Minister. They stayed for two hours and fifteen minutes. They met with this group and that group and they were talking and visiting and holding conferences all over the place, and if you'll pardon me for saying so, I held a few myself.

I got into discussion with Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Kuslov (?). Before it was through, we had quite a crowd around us, and most of them, as you know, can understand English.

Then I went to the Yugoslav reception, the same night. The new Yugoslav Ambassador was there. The Soviets, they haven't quite made up their mind what they're going to do about the Yugoslavs. Each day there's a new point of view about it, and for two hours more, Mr. Mikoyan, Mr. Kuslov and Mr. Gromyko were at the Yugoslav Embassy.

On Monday I was informed that my request for an interview with Mr. Khrushchev had been granted, just fifteen minutes before I was due in his office. I was ushered into the Kremlin at three minutes to 3:00. And it lasted until after 11:00 o'clock.

My total impression adds up to this -- the U.S.S.R. is rich in resources, has determined leadership, and is motivated by a philosophy which has as its central theme the conquest of the world.

Now, conquest, in our minds, has generally meant by force of arms. Conquest to them could be through force of arms, through propaganda, through economics, through subversion -- any way to win. And all I'm saying to you is that we would be foolish to ever think that this is not what they're out to do. But by the same token, we don't need to let them win.

The Berlin Crisis

I hope the UAW will send a message of encouragement to Willy Brandt, Mayor of West Berlin. He is a Social Democrat, in the best sense. He's got a sense of fearlessness about him, and he needs to know that the working people of America are for him, not just the State Department, and the Congress.

Well, I went there just about a day after Mr. Khrushchev had lowered the boom on Berlin, and I happened to be in Western Europe and I changed all my travel plans. So we went to Berlin. When we got off the plane at Tempelhof Airport, Mayor Brandt was at the bottom of the ramp. It was one of the most moving experiences of my life. The Soviets had just threatened the city. Some people were beginning to withdraw some of their money from the banks. There was a restiveness

on the part of some of the people, but the Mayor was down there like a tower of strength. We conversed from 10:00 o'clock in the morning till six o'clock at night. I asked my American friends to leave me alone. I said, I'll see you back in the States. I want to be with the Mayor of Berlin.

The Mayor and I went around alone, from one end of that city to another, in a spirit of friendship, of cooperation, and if you'll pardon the word, solidarity.

We laid a wreath at the monument of the airlift fliers at the Tempelhof Airport. We visited Brandenburg Gate, and we saw the Soviets over there with their cameras and their soldiers and their movie cameras taking pictures of us. By my presence with the courageous Mayor, I was able to express the feeling of what I knew was the feeling of millions of Americans -- that we stand with these people in free Berlin.

But as the Mayor of Berlin said, the crisis is broader than Berlin. It's the whole problem of Central Europe, the whole area of international life.

The Finnish Crisis

From Berlin we went to Copenhagen; from Copenhagen to Stockholm; from Stockholm to Helsinki. I was in Helsinki when the Soviet Union had lowered the boom on Finland, economically, by cancelling a ship-building contract. The Soviet Union was buying, as you know, most of the ships from the Finnish shipyards, buying ice breakers, and there was already a considerable degree of unemployment in Finland.

And 25 percent of the members of the Finnish Diet are members of the Communist Party, and yet the Government of Finland is non-Communist. I met with labor leaders. I met with Social Democratic leaders. I spent two hours with the President of Finland. You can't get that in the American newspapers. You'd think eight hours with Khrushchev through an interpreter was more important than two hours with the President of Finland.

And I met with the President of the Bank of Finland. I met with the cabinet officers of the Government of Finland, and I raised hell with our own State Department because the very day I came into Finland the Soviet Government had cancelled the contracts and threatened the whole economy of Finland. I told our people in the Embassy, if I had my way about it, I'd have a trade mission enroute from Washington, as of this minute, saying to the Finnish people, if the Russians don't want your ice breakers, we'll buy them. We will send them to Saudi Arabia or the Great Lakes, I don't know where, but we'll buy them.

Never leave the Finns, who are the symbol of freedom in that part of the world right up on the side of the Soviet Union, with no alternative. The only alternative they were left with at that moment was to capitulate. For less than 50 million dollars in economic assistance and purchases, we could have given the Finnish Government an out, assuring the people of Finland they didn't have to rely on the Soviet Union.

The Soviet had carefully, since the days of reparation payments, bent the whole Finnish economy over to the Soviet. What the Finns need now, more than anything else, is to have the long-term credits and the economic assistance to bend that economy to the West. This requires some vision and courage in foreign policy. The pro-West, pro-freedom government has collapsed. It was the best government Finland's had, as the Finns said themselves. Now we are getting ready to do something. It breaks my heart. Too little, and believe me, too late.

It takes no statesmanship to get into a war of rockets, missiles and nuclear bombs. This may be forced on us, and if it is, I am not enough of a prophet to know what would be left. But the task of statesmanship, it seems to me, is how we win this struggle without destroying

ourselves; how we win this struggle without literally destroying life. I think we ought to talk less about survival and more about living. I think we ought to talk less about containment and more about economic and political aggrandizement and expansion in the best sense. I think we ought to recognize that every time a nation elects or retains a non-Communist government, it's a defeat for the Soviet Union.

Everybody doesn't have to become a blood brother or a kissin' cousin of the United States of America in order to say that we are winning. India is in the free world; it has a democratic government. India is on our side even if she has not a member on one of our mutual security pacts.

I happen to think, for example, in Latin America, in the Middle East, in India, using that as one country which I think is symbolic of the larger problem, that this year, 1959, is a critical year, and this is why I think the Congress is going to have to take real affirmative leadership.

§§§§§§§

COPY

Remarks

Ceremony Honoring Joseph N. Nicolle

January 5, 1959

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Mr. Ambassador, Dean Lind, _____,

ladies and gentlemen:

I feel privileged indeed to join in this ceremony to do honor to a Frenchman who made such a significant contribution to the settlement of the Upper Midwest.

In this -- perhaps the last official event of Minnesota's Centennial celebration -- we are helping to rescue a very gifted and worthy man from near-oblivion.

Joseph N. Nicolle was indeed an extraordinary man. He exemplified the very significant French contribution to the character and to the growth of our American nation.

With his intelligence and skill -- with his polished and urbane manner -- he combined a typically Gallic enthusiasm and energy --

COPY

page 2

an energy that took him again and again into the virtually uncharted wilderness of the Upper Mississippi and Missouri Valleys in the 1830's.

The Western States -- and particularly Minnesota -- are indebted to Monsieur Nicollet for those early surveys and descriptions of the area which would be opened for settlement soon after the publication of Nicollet's Report to the Congress in 1843.

Mr. Ambassador: cultural exchange between our two nations is an old and rewarding custom. May we take this opportunity to recall the long and continuing succession of French scholars and other professional men and women who have added so much to the American culture.

COPY

page 3

Let us, too, rejoice in the warm ties of friendship between our peoples which men like Joseph Niccollet have done so much to create down through the years of our nation's growth.

Mr. Ambassador, it is an honor to have you with us today. On behalf of the Minnesota Centennial Commission, Dean Lind, and the Minnesota Historical Society, I wish to extend to you our gratitude for joining us this morning.

(Ambassador Alphand's Remarks)



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