

000130

Feb 13, 1959

add volume 388
I think that I will quit at this point.

[Applause]

CHAIRMAN COSGROVE: Thank you, Mr. Eilan.

Now then, our next speaker will be introduced by
Dr. Edward J. Sparling, President of Roosevelt College,
Chicago.

[Applause]

DR. SPARLING: Mr. Chairman, and Friends: It is
not by intent that our concluding speaker for this luncheon,
the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, Senior Senator from Minnesota,
is here. Perhaps no United States Senator has shown greater
concern for the basic needs of our country and the world
than he.

He came into the political arena as an egg head.
Now, in this age of Sputniks, an admitted term of reference
is the one I just mentioned, that of "egg head". [Laughter]

He came into the field of political science a
professor with service in three universities, among them
his own famous state University of Minnesota. If the slogan
is right, "We learn to do by doing" then Senator Humphrey
arrived in the membership of the Senate a wise public servant
with experience in war production training, deployment and war

000131

man power needs and with three years as His Honor or Mayor of Minneapolis, preceding the call to the national leadership in the Senate in 1948.

For over ten years we have had a dynamic, courageous and glowing leader in Senator Humphrey.

The varieties of national interest, in addition to those of government operations, range from agriculture and forestry to medical research, public health, fair trade practices and small business.

His experience on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Near Eastern and African Affairs, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, and Subcommittee on International Organizational Affairs and European Affairs; his steady application to the Near East and southern Europe, all of these prepared him well for his appointment by President Eisenhower in 1956 and 1957 as a delegate to the United Nations 11th General Assembly.

His services in 1958 as the United States Alternate Delegate to the UNESCO Conference in Paris and as an advisor to the American delegation at the Conference of Nuclear Testing in Geneva, helped to show the tremendous knowledge of this man.

000132

Senator Humphrey is still a young man. His stature is measured by breadth and depth of his knowledge. His imaginative and creative and democratic approach to local, national and international affairs and by the concern for the welfare of all humanity with which he approaches each aspect of his public service, promises a future of continuing, growing and expanding leadership.

Today we are honored to hear Senator Humphrey speak to us on the subject "Charting a New United States Near East Policy".

I am very happy to present to you the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey.

[Rising applause]

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Doctor. Thanks for such a gracious and generous introduction.

I am sure that the people will forgive me for having this displaced Dr. Cartwright from this platform for the moment, but then she is going to be back and, of course, we always save the best things until last you see.

[I am particularly happy that I can be here today ~~at~~
~~in connection with~~ this Midwest Regional Conference of the

Start

000133

American Christian Palestine Committee.] It is not because I think I contribute so much to your deliberations because I doubt that I can. This, of course, is not said in false modesty -- it is a true statement. I am happy that I can be here because I am so keenly interested in the objectives and the purposes of the American Christian Palestine Committee. In fact, I can tell you that had I really programmed my time properly, I would have rejected out of hand this invitation because I had four meetings today and I had five yesterday and I still have to go to Minneapolis tonight and I have to be in Helena, Montana tomorrow night. Therefore, this is a labor of love in a sense and, should I say, an expression of affection and respect to come here today because I really believe in what we are attempting to do in this fine committee and its work.

[Applause]

I have had a chance to review your program and so I don't feel too badly now because of my inadequacy of performance. You have a galaxy of stars and you have more to come.

Unless I am mistaken, you are having a dinner session tonight and what you will hear from our good friend

000134

Ben Cohen and Representative Hays will be well worth your attendance. That will well be a feast, an intellectual feast that will almost fulfill the biblical description of "My Cup runneth over". [Laughter] Therefore, you are going to have yourselves quite a time tonight, and of course, I want you to give those two distinguished guests my personal warm greetings because I would love to be here, at least to hear them. However, of course, it would also be kind of difficult. Therefore, I regret that I will not be able to share the evening with them.

The topic that I am to speak on should be looked upon as a challenge rather than an accomplishment. I am not capable of charting a new United States policy in the Near East or Middle East but in these few moments that will be ours today, I am, however, going to attempt to lay down certain fundamental premises for such a policy and to see whether or not you in your discussion now and hereafter will be able to embellish those premises or to build on them and share with us some of your detailed observations.

As I said, I am not an expert in this area. When you listened to that introduction, you knew, of course, that nobody could be an expert in all of those fields. However,

000137

of mankind.

Now, if we will live by that or those two fundamental principles, the one God, the oneness of God and the brotherhood of mankind, we at least have a beginning toward any kind of effective policy.

Let me get it down into more day by day current terminology. There isn't doubt but what the incident at Little Rock has cost this nation dearly on the international scene. This is not just a domestic tragedy. This is not merely a challenge to law abiding citizens within the United States -- this is not merely a matter of upholding the Constitution, my friends -- but is the program of working out our difficulties in the social structure of these United States, this challenge of desegregation, integration, all of which is a significant part of the foreign policy of this nation. We have to understand that.

You can spend 25 billion dollars in economic aid in the next five or ten years on Asia and Africa but if we refuse to accept people or put it this way -- if we reject people because of their color, because of their national origin or because of their station in life, the money will be wasted. In fact, it will be received in resentment only to go strong to resist us.

000138

Therefore, as I said at another meeting today, what we need basically is a change of attitude or, should I say, what we really need is the acceptance of the attitude that a democrat always ought to have -- namely that we believe in people and that we accept people on the basis that we are people.

I happen to believe there are three principles in American Foreign Policy that ought to guide us at this stage of our history -- People, progress, and peace. That every policy ought to be directed toward the well-being of people, identifying everything we do -- Whether medical care, food, technical assistance, economic loans, or whatever may be the case, whether it is educational programs -- Identifying all of these things with people, not rulers or not just rulers, not just the institution, but people -- Getting our message to people.

You know, we understand this in America. We politicians understand this at home so why can't we understand it abroad.

We are not content with merely getting the endorsement of the Board of Directors -- We want to go out and see the people and we get up at five o'clock in the morning and

000153

stand at factory gates shaking hands with the people and not merely the heads of the unions, not just the president of the company, but the people -- P-e-o-p-l-e or, if you don't want to spell it that way, you spell it "Peepul." [Laughter]

I regret to say that our Foreign Policy has been derelict in its identification with the people. We get it identified, as I said, in the Middle East with kings and oil rather than people and water.

I am not one of those who doesn't believe that Middle Eastern oil is important. It is very important. The Soviet Union would like it right now. It is very important to western nations -- It is important to economies to those countries. However, our identification becomes with powerful forces in the area, with either the status quo or those who seek to have economic development for most of their own purposes of these resources -- Their own selfish purposes. That is why I have said in the report and I also say from platforms, that we ought to have more identification with people and water. This is for the reason that the water on the land and it means hope for the people.

Progress. Why, we are the apostles of progress. We just don't have any time for anybody in this country if he is

000140

an old stuffed shirt. We constantly condemn people in business, in politics, in education, and all other pursuits if they are dragging their feet, refusing to take advantage of modern technology, improvements, etc. In other words, we insist in America that we embrace progress so that it almost becomes a religion. We even sometimes embrace progress at the expense of principle.

Progress has been our theme but we can't get the people of the world to understand it and I will tell you why.

Too often we have people who are in charge of things who are afraid, first, of the people with whom they are working; who fail to understand the social uneconomic forces that are at work in the area. Then we also have the people who look upon progress as a kind of revolutionary, radical adventure.

Let me give you a classic example of what I speak. There have been two conferences in the last three years relating to Latin America, in which our government has had an active part. Now, you know, we were going to do something about our Latin-American relations. Fortunately, some of the better revolutions have taken place in Latin America of late.

[Laughter] in other words, there have been some dictators that have been deposed but, in our relationships with Latin America

000141

when the former Secretary of the Treasury, I believe, was in Rio, some three or four years ago, Mr. George Humphrey, he spent his time as the representative of the people of the United States and the Government of the United States. He is a fine and good man but he spent his time talking to them about budgetary responsibilities. He spent his time talking to them about the cash balances that they ought to have, about the soundness of their currency.

Don't misunderstand me -- This is important -- It is relatively important -- It is as important as in family life being able to have a house. However, there is a difference between a house and a home. A house is a structure and a home is a structure in which people live their lives in love and affection.

What happened was that Mr. George Humphrey (and I use him only as an example) gave our Latin-American friends proper lectures on economic soundness, on economics, and economic frugalities, but he had forgotten that they wanted to eat. [Laughter] He had forgotten that they too would like to have some schools and some hospitals.

One of the best ways to get people to accept the responsibilities of economic prudence is to give them some opportunity to develop an economy that makes possible economic

000142

prudence.

Now, in connection with progress -- The Soviet Union goes all over the world saying, "Look, we are agents of progress -- Look what we have done in forty years."

However, we go around saying, "Well, you just stole some of that stuff from us."

That is our answer -- That they were able to take up what we developed and apply it. You know, they have been able to apply a good deal of what we have been able to find out. Of course, we said that they didn't amount to anything, they were backward -- How could they amount to anything; they were socialistic, bureaucratic, and so on. We found out that they have been doing a lot with sputniks, enough to frighten the daylights out of some people.

However, let me tell you our story. In the age of revolution, we are the original revolutionaries except we have not people who want to say so. That is a bad word. In the age of progress we are the original progressors but that too is a little sort of left-center, a kind of bad word -- get it back under the rug, you know. [Laughter]

As a matter of fact, we have accomplished more in recent years, in the recent fifty years than have the Soviets

000143

ever dreamed of in their fifty years or in their forty years of progress.

Take, for instance, the past forty years, since World War I -- The accomplishments in the United States of America in terms of employment, in the standard of living, in the expansion of opportunity, industrial development, transportation development, scientific and cultural development, is the miracle of the world. What is more, my friends, no people that mankind has ever known has given so generously and still had so much left over for ourselves as the people of the United States. However, we don't want to talk about that either -- We prefer to talk about the world-wide WPA's. [Laughter] We prefer to talk about ourselves and the good things we do when, in fact, we ought to be heralding the fact that we can work together with people in the world in the Marshall Plan of Technical Assistance, which was bold, which was creative, but which somebody decided had to be put in cold storage.

The main thing that has been done about point four is to change its name rather than give it emphasis and the spark that was needed.

I repeat -- we have failed to identify ourselves with people. We have somehow or other subdued the inspiration

000144

that comes with the word progress. We have been a little worried about that and, finally, we have helped or let ourselves get maneuvered into the position in the mind of too many people in this world of being war-mongers rather than the children of peace.

Every time that I travel overseas, I have to spend time with young people at universities and colleges, in factories, wherever I go, explaining to these young people that we are not really trying to start a war. Of course, you may say that they ought to know better. Well, I suppose my children ought to know better in connection with some of the things they do but then they don't and they are pretty good kids.

You know we say in politics that the truth is important, to be sure, it is all important. However, regretablely, in so many of the political decisions made, it isn't what is the truth, but what people think is the truth that seems to count.

It is true that we are a nation of peace, we are a nation of good samaritans in the sense -- We are a nation of generosity, of compassion. This is our history, this is our tradition, but, do you want to know something? You pick up any newspaper, any journal, you listen to any TV broadcast,

000145

any radio broadcast and I am willing to bet you right now, if you will permit it in this august body, to make any wager with anyone who may so desire that over seventy-five per cent of the news and information will be about war, threats of war, new weapons or new means of alliances.

It is mighty hard to get the message of peace across and yet, in the two days that I was in the Soviet Union, I heard it dinned into my ears day and night. The propaganda that emanated from the Kremlin occasionally mentioned their great weapons as a reminder to the West as we put it. In connection with the people in Africa, Asia, Latin America, North Africa, the Middle East -- Day after day they beam in with radio propaganda the words -- peace, peace, peace. The Atheists are taking on the mantle of a peace maker. What a paradox, what irony.

Now then, why do we let them get by with it -- It is because you cannot be something with nothing. These persons are drowning our allies out with a loud voice and, if we are going to insist on whispering the message of peace, then I am afraid that we will be in trouble about getting our message across.

Therefore I ask all Americans to get busy and have

000146

a little evangelism. I ask us to outline a program of works of peace. I ask us to wage peace. I ask us to believe in peace and I ask us to remember the terrible cost and catastrophe of war in this age of technology and science.

I tell you that we must get on fire with the desire to win a just and enduring peace. This is absolutely essential.

Of course, it takes courage these days to even speak up for peace. We prefer to talk about missiles and rockets and gaps and lags and defenses, all of which is relatively important, but the purpose of all of that should be but for one purpose -- Peace -- Not rockets and missiles that we describe in terms of their destructive power, but rockets and missiles that we describe in terms of a power to save the peace.

Now then, all of this is a far cry from being specific about the Middle or the Near East but all of these are basic principles. You can not lay down a foreign policy my friends, that is going to be meaningful and effective until first we put democracy's house in order at home. Here I have reference, of course, to our relationships with our fellow citizens. We should really be abiding by not only the promise but the mandate of the Constitution, understanding that democracy has a universal appeal. We do not mean equal protection

000147

10
of laws for all except Negroes or Indians or Jews or Catholics or Protestant or whatever it may be -- We mean for all and if we don't mean it, then let's have the courage to get up and say we don't mean it because nothing will erode us and destroy us more than hypocritical pronouncements. You lose all sense of values.

As I said to you, I don't believe you can construct a foreign policy, an effective foreign policy for the 20th century unless you grab hold of what is obvious fact -- Science and technology representing progress -- The same science and technology that offers the hope of progress, offers hope of utter destruction. Not the hope, but the terror and tragedy of utter destruction.

I hope that some of you would write to my sub-committee on disarmament and get those hearings we have recently held. They did not get many headlines. We did not call anybody any names. [Laughter] I forgot to do that I guess. We didn't offer any great panaceas. I did not release the testimony of generals who told us how many people would be killed in the first hour because I like to release ~~the~~ testimony of some doctor telling how many lives we can ~~save~~ next year. It seems to me that is more important.

000148

I hate to believe and I don't want to believe that the American people will only act constructively out of fear. I don't believe that. I think they act constructively out of fear when there is no leadership but I think if the American people are challenged, if specific goals are layed down before them, if they know the measure and the order, if they know the degree of the opposition, the nature of the task that has to be undertaken, then they will take care of it. However, somebody has to stand out and brave the storm with them, in front of them, alongside of these people.

Now then, let's go to the Middle East. What do these things mean in terms of the Middle East?

First of all there is no area of the world, I suppose, in which there are more constructive basis of history than in the Middle East. Remember, this area has been the cross-roads of the world and of every invasion, every struggle between the different societies, religions, and forces that have taken place somewhere in the area.

The area of the Middle East has been literally fertilized with blood and bodies of millions of people as a result of wars. Here is an area of which much too much of it, I regret to say, is the victim of malnutrition, illiteracy, poverty, frustration, disease, hopelessness and I don't happen

000149

to believe you can build any peace in an area until you start feeding the conditions that are conducive to peace.

You get dictators, large ones and small ones; you get demagogues, effective ones and less effective ones out of a particular kind of social political economic climate or environment. Therefore, before we are going to be able to get a peace that is worthy of that beautiful name in the Middle East, then we are going to have to strike some mighty blows against man's ancient enemies.

Much of this will have to be done not by government but by voluntary organizations. The truth is, my friends, that some of our voluntary organizations, sectarian and non-sectarian, can do more good in the Middle East right now than some of our governmental activities, even if they were properly directed.

There is a suspicion on the part of the Middle East toward the West. We have inherited, regrettably, many of the liabilities of yesterday. We have inherited the mantle of colonialism even though we are an anti-colonial society. Of course, we are the original anti-colonialists but then we are also the friends. We also have allies, great allies, allies that we ought to cherish and not scold, but allies who, regrettably, have had a history of colonialism, who are now shedding it and

000150
I pay tribute to our British ally, who have taken the lead in demonstrating to the world how to gracefully give up much of their power and much of their sovereignty over other people.

This is, of course, something we ought to herald and cheer. Therefore, it seems to me that a good deal of effective work needs to be accomplished and undertaken by private organizations.

Now, also having said that, I would also like to say that the most effective governmental work can be done through the United Nations. Why not? We are one of the original architects, I believe, of the United Nations.

In this connection, I can think of no organization in the world that is more properly designed to fulfill the objectives of our ideals. The charter of the United Nations is as American as the Fourth of July. In the sense of principles, it embraces or enunciates the principles of self-government, the principles of human dignity, the principles of social and economic progress. These are, of course, the things we stand for.

America isn't just a piece of land, you know. It is an idea at work -- unfolding itself in new developments and new revelations.

000151

The thing I like best about democracy is that it always represents beginnings, always something new.

When you take a look at the United Nations, you can see how it is tailor made in a sense for some of these more difficult and complex areas because you see, when we say that we ought to be operating in the Middle East and the Russians have also said the same thing, then we find that we are having a tough time recognizing that they are a world power on a diplomatic point. Of course, we know that they are a world power militarily. It is only within the past year that we have begun to find out that they are a world power in terms of trade and economic aid and competition on the economic frontiers and, of course, there are a lot of our people who still don't believe it -- but they will. [Laughter] You know, sometime you have to get hurt awfully bad before you start to believe some things and that will happen because we are ill-prepared. I can tell you we are not only ill-prepared, we are unprepared to meet the Soviet economic offensive. It is as if we disarmed ourselves completely. This is the war they are fighting now, you know. They are not fighting a nuclear war -- that is the one we are ready for and so they have changed the signals -- they are now fighting the economic war.

000152

We are now in a political war and in this area we have to train troops for them or, if we have them, we have not mobilized them. I think we have them but they haven't heard the sound of the trumpet or, maybe, the sound of the trumpet is so uncertain that no one knows when to go to battle.

Now, the United Nations is based on the principle of individual state sovereignty. It gives recognition not only to the big states but also to the little ones.

It gives recognition not only to the physical power but to the moral power.

The United Nations is as adaptable as the mold that we sometimes as children made and played with. It can be designed for many purposes, as long as it stays within the embrace or objectives of its charter.

I have long advocated, as you know, that, through the United Nations, we seek the establishment of a regional economic development agency for the Middle East. Instead of letting the Soviets just get by with this kind of economic competition that it insists on using, which is very unorthodox and unfair, why don't we say to them, as the President did say last August but has not implemented it all -- Why don't we say again and again that we are prepared to place into a fund for the

000153

economic development of the Middle East, certain sums of money, to be administered by members of the Middle East under an undersecretariat -- That we will place in there the same amount of money that we are presently spending upon the so-called Middle East Doctrine and its implimentation.

Of course, somebody is going to ask, "Well, how do you know it will work?" Well, I don't know but I know the other isn't working either. At least it isn't working very well. I don't even know whether anybody would accept it but I know we ought to make the advance because I believe that we ought to call upon the other nations and states of the area in order to make their contributions and when a project just such as West Germany comes up, instead of wondering whether or not the Soviets are going to boycott it, why don't we suggest that this is exactly the type of project that a regional economic development agency ought to first study from an engineering point of view and then from a financing point of view and make the judgement as to financial assistance that may be necessary from the many agencies that are available -- World Bank, international development fund, and regional economic funds.

Now, some people are going to say, "We have suggested that." Well, that's true. However, you know, I am a parent

000154

and the way you generally get things done is not just suggest, you follow through. [Laughter] I am sure some of you have had the same experience.

The world is filled with good suggestions. The trouble is that too few people stop long enough to pick up the suggestions and follow through.

Therefore, we let the last assembly of the United Nations go by without vigorously pursuing a message and a statement of policy which our President laid before the United Nations when we were in trouble in the Middle East over Lebanon.

Apparently the only time we have real ideas is when we get into such a jam that we don't quite know how to get out. At that time the jam was very significant and the trouble was dangerous and the President of the United States gave one of his best messages.

I am going to suggest here most respectfully that if any of you who have contacts in the White House, I think it is your duty and that of every one else to remind people -- Republicans, Democrats, Executive, and Legislative branch of the government, etc. -- That this is something that ought to be implemented -- Regional Economic Development.

Now, what else ought to be implemented? There are

000155
many bilateral arrangements which can surely be undertaken.

We have our programs with the countries of the Middle East and we ought to continue those. We also ought to have arrangements in the Middle East relating to, as I have felt for a long time, internationalization of certain waterways

-- international rights. We went through the Suez Crises once and I am not at all sure that we have followed up on all the suggestions then made by our Canadian people. There were some very practical suggestions there.

I also feel that we ought to recognize that when there is a river, like the River Jordan, which could be better developed regionally -- If they are not going to develop it regionally, then we should help some country develop its share of it. Of course, that isn't very popular among many people but I still feel it is desirable.

Furthermore, I think we as Americans had better recognize for once and for all that one of the great assets that we have in the Middle East and which has brought with it obviously some problems, is that living testimonial of democratic experience, democratic government, and democratic institutions in the state of Israel.

I have heard all about the limitations of this. I

000156

19
am fully cognizant of the animosity which exists because of this state. I am not a Zionist but I tell you this -- looking at it strictly from the point of view as an American, a United States Senator and one interested in peace and tranquility -- I say that we would be a whole lot better off instead of having people occasionally apologizing for what has transpired over there in the last ten or eleven years, of pointing to it and saying, "Look, if you will bend your efforts the same way, with the same vigor, you will have the same kind of cooperation and assistance from the American people and the American government and, therefore, we want less antagonism and more cooperation."

You may say that this would not be effective. Well, maybe not. However, at least it will be what is true and if we put our efforts toward it, then I think it can be reasonably effective.

I would also caution you to remember that other states in the area can do much to help the nation of Israel. You have listed on the program here the subject, "Israel Looks to Asia and Africa." Let me tell you that Asia and Africa should also look to Israel. There are the point four programs, the technical assistance programs, the development of trade and

000157

commerce -- possibly not enough yet -- but it helps. The seeds are there and this way, through multilateral cooperation, we Americans do not have any mandate to save the world alone. When we get that kind of feeling, we get a little self righteous. I would suggest that we Americans think upon our responsibilities of getting others to work in cooperation with us and, also, getting them to perform their part of the responsibility for world leadership and assistance.

This goes for our NATO friends and any of the people and nations with whom we work.

I think that one of the most encouraging signs in the last two or three years is the self restraint and the self discipline of the government and of the people of the state of Israel in the recent Middle East crisis. Somehow, that kind of political maturity is to be commended.

Secondly, there is the initiative of that country, with all of its own financial problems, its own heartaches, worries, to move on out with some of its trained and skilled people to share some of the blessings of modern technology and their own experiences with others. We need to encourage this. This also needs to be commended.

Furthermore, my friends, while I realize that

000158

Tunisia is not considered to be a part of what we call geographically the Middle East, they have been very unhappy with the failure of our government to properly commend, embrace, assist, and encourage men who are their leaders.

Of course, I am not sure that everything their leader does would meet with my approval or yours but I know this -- that, basically, he represents free institutions -- the spirit of democratic living -- the spirit of the 20th Century in terms of free institutions in an area of the world where such is needed.

You know, there is an old axiom in politics -- you cannot beat something with nothing. What I mean by that is that instead of all the worries about what was going to happen in Cairo the next day, why not a little more attention to what ought to happen in Tunisia or Morocco or the Sudan or in other areas.

I am not one that seeks to draw the line on anything. I believe that there are also other things we can do. However, I do want to draw this message to a conclusion.

I said in the beginning that I thought two areas could be helpful -- one through the voluntary agencies -- one through the United Nations activities. This includes

000159

22
1
technical assistance, world health organizations, food and agriculture, United Nations' Special Projects, and we as one of the leaders in the United Nations ought to be inspiring that kind of activity ever more in the Middle East.

Fortunately, fellow Americans, the sign, "United Nations," is acceptable in the Middle East. There are some who do not like it, some who abuse it but then it has more acceptance than any other outside force and so we ought to maximize its effectiveness with the utmost cooperation, not trying to run the agencies but being willing to put in more of our financing to these agencies and letting the agencies be operated as they ought to be operated on a fair and objective basis under United Nations control -- not United States control. I want that crystal clear.

Then, in our own policies, we ought to have, not only for the Middle East but for the whole area of the world of the rising new nations, an economic assistance program that is up to the requirements and the needs and not one that just barely turns the surface.

There is no use, my friends, in trying to put out a fire in a thirty-story building with a garden hose and, as a pharmacist, I have said a number of times -- there is no

000160

use of giving to a patient ten thousand units of penicillin when one hundred fifty or two hundred fifty thousand units is the minimum effective dose. All you have done is develop an immunity by injecting the ten thousand or possibly discovering a sensitivity. Therefore, when you need a quarter of a million units that is what you give him. Of course, sometimes it is best to give a little more than to run the risk of giving too little.

What Hubert Humphrey is attempting to say to you is an international development loan fund program that is on a year-by-year basis, that permits little or no advance planning, is not only inadequate but is wasteful and it never brings into its mechanism the kind of people that can really dramatize, through imaginative, constructive projects, the good works that ought to be accomplished.

Do you know why the Marshall Plan was a success? It is very simple. We knew what we wanted to do and we put it down on paper so that all could see. We knew what the nature of the problem was and with whom we were going to work. We knew how long it was going to take us to get the job done. We calculated that. We also told the American people what the total cost would be. We told them very frankly and then we

000161

went to the recipients of the aid and said, "Now, you plan cooperatively as a group, not individually, but as a group through the office of European Economic Cooperation the use and distribution of funds that are going to be made available.

We did not just come along and say, "Here, try some dollar bills for size." We also did not come along and say, "We are going to have some money this year but we doubt if we will have any next year or we are not sure." We did not come along and say, "We know what's best for you because we are very right and very righteous and very moral and very frugal and very successful." I can think of no way of getting yourself rushed out of any room faster than that.

Do you know what we said? We said, "Look, your security, your welfare is ours; your needs are our needs and our problems. We, fortunately, have the capital that can be helpful to you in the rehabilitation of your economy. We don't know how you can best use it -- you know. Therefore, you get together, design your program, not only on a yearly basis but on the terms of the whole project -- a five-year project. We will have the fifteen million dollars that is required to do it."

Of course, somebody will say that you cannot pledge

000162

each Congress in advance for what it will do. Well, no, you can't pledge it but with leadership it is as good as a pledge. Well, that program was a phenomenal success. It will live in the history books and history of this nation as one of our greatest achievements.

This is exactly what we need on a broader basis for the Middle East, for the Far East, for every area where the new nations are struggling for their place in the sun for a better day. We need to be able to say to many of these nations, for example, in the area of the Middle East, that it will take regional cooperation and regional planning. They should tell us their needs, they should design their programs and then we will be prepared to do our share in connection with the financing.

Of course, this should not be a hundred million dollars a year, but, my friends, I think that we need an economic loan or development loan program for the next five years of not less than a billion and a half to two billion dollars a year. I am going to develop this program in a rather extensive way for the United States Senate.

I think that some of the money that we are presently spending is being wasted because it is inadequate to the task

000163

6
and I can prove, by documentation, fabulous and incredible waste because of inability to properly plan and mobilize the human resources necessary for accomplishments that we have in mind.

The Middle East is tailor-made for what I am talking about because it is a region and, of course, the fact that it is a difficult area doesn't mean that it is any the less important. It means it is all the more important.

May I suggest, too, that we ought to give assurances to the people of that area that we are interested in some of the day by day things.

What ever happened to that proposal of President Eisenhower at Baylor University some six years ago, where we were going to help build vocational and technical schools? I thought it was good. It must be as good now as it was then because nothing has been done with it. [Laughter]

What are you asking to have done about it?

What about a nation that has heard nothing for about a few months now except the terrible expenditures and surpluses in connection with the Department of Agriculture -- The fact that we have eight and a half billion dollars worth of surplus foods. In these Middle Eastern nations there are

000164

more hungry than well-fed. Therefore, why could we not have a food for peace program on a minimum of a five-year basis where we could say to Isreal, Finland, Iran, to any country where they need food and have food deficits, that in their programing of their use of thir use of their limited capital in connection with long-term constructive capital improvement projects, that those countries will not have to spend their hard currency in the purchase of food which is a perishable item -- We are prepared to meet some of those deficits.

Of course, we are also to meet their military deficits and you know it as well as I. As it is, some of them just send us their orders for guns. This is literally not an exaggeration.

My dear fellow Americans, when are we going to understand that what some of these people need today more than anything else is not only the economic, the capital, which is of course vital for the long-term construction in connection with industrial, agricultural, and social needs of the nation but they also need the immediate day to day food and here we are. Do you know what we are doing? I would like to tell you. Khrushchev just said that they had produced more dairy products, more milk in the Soviet Union

000165

than we had in the United States. Well, he is right. They did that but do you know how they did it? They paid their farmers to produce and we pay ours not to produce. [Laughter] That is right.

Why, one of the proudest boasts in the Department of Agriculture today is that we have no more extra butter. Then, of course, the next thing they are going to say is that we have no more powdered milk. How ridiculous can we be? How would you feel if the generals and the Secretary of Defense got up and said, "Now we have finished the fight, we have no more guns, no more weapons."

Well, I'm sure that you would say that this fellow had to go.

However, here we have responsible officials of our government, cabinet officers who announce that we have liquidated the butter surplus, announced that we are presently on the road to liquidating the powdered milk, especially in a world where powdered milk is like life itself, in a world where people need proteins and fats and oils, carbohydrates and we do not have the intellectual capacity and imagination to design a program that is useful to the great multitudes of people.

000166

29

Of course, we have a thousand and one reasons why we cannot do it. It may interfere with our normal markets. It may interfere with this or that. Well, I want to tell you something. Let's have no more talk about this, let's have an international conference on food -- let's call upon the food and agricultural organization, of which we are a member, and ask the FAO to call a conference for the purpose of the surplus food production -- to design an international program of food assistance for the deficit areas. It is just that simple. [Applause]

Now then, what I said about food I also want to say about health. I was pleased to see the other day in the newspaper a small story to the effect that there was a group equipping a ship for a hospital ship. I have been advocating this, I am happy to say, at other meetings -- not only a ship, but I have advocated a great white fleet, an emergency fleet, available for medical use anyplace in the world where there is sickness and disaster -- floating granary of doctors, nurses, a fully equipped hospital ship with pharmaceuticals and modern surgical instruments -- and making all of this available to any group in America who wishes to undertake the administration of such a project -- a great white fleet

000167

of health and health-giving substances and people who are artisans and skilled in the field of health. This would be "Health for Peace."

This is something that I would like to be able to talk about to my sons and daughters. You know, I am happy that my daughter is going to be a nurse. It makes me real happy. This she is doing by her own choice. Of course, I know it is hard work. She could have had it a little easier. In fact, she was encouraged to take it a little easier, but she is now at Northwestern Hospital at Minneapolis, Minnesota taking her course of study so that she can be a nurse.

I would like to have it known throughout the world that not only are we Americans interested in learning how to speak Russian at six o'clock in the morning (as they are doing in Washington) but that we are also interested in going out and helping other people to read, to write, and to learn and to catch up with the 20th Century.

I think that we actually ought to develop a great peace corps in this country. I think that we ought to give some choices to our young people. We don't hesitate in a minute to ask them to spend three years in the army, you know, extend the draft and all sorts of things like that --

000168

but then why don't we have programs in this country, for example, where we have college education made available to the young men and women and where they are made available to them by their government on the basis of them rendering government service two or three years afterwards in connection with overseas duty to help the sick and to teach the illiterate

-- to help the blind and to help those who are tired and weary. I think this is the sort of thing we ought to do. If we have war, you know, we will do it. Of course, there is a war on but then most people have not caught on to it as yet. However, if they could just drop one big bomb which would not hurt anybody, so that we know it was on, then I think we would all be alert to it.

What we need to do is to recognize right now, my friends, that if a war started this afternoon, that there would be a program of medically trained to train those who in like fashion needed to be trained -- that we must have people to train other people so that facilities could be expanded over night.

Well, God's children are being wounded all over the world today in this hour. They are sick, they are miserable, and there is nothing that will do more for us in terms of an

000169

effective policy than to extend the warm hand of compassion and fellowship and understanding and love and care.

I happen to be one of the simple minded people who believe that there are more people in the world who want to live than to die and so, I want to advocate living.

I also happen to believe that there are more people in the world interested in being wanted and needed than in being rejected.

I happen to believe that there is still genuine merit and real truth in the concept of love and understanding. I truly believe it and unless our country can embrace these fundamental and these eternal verities, then I don't think you can design a foreign policy that can overcome the wickedness and power and evil of organized totalitarian efforts.

The only way that I know how to defeat the awful power of totalitarianism is with a program measured in affection, ability and concentration and compassion of individualism, working cooperatively for the common objective.

Thank you very much. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN COSGROOVE: Senator Humphrey, we are very happy for your fine talk. Thank you very much for being with us and delivering such an inspiring message.



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