UNITED STATES, ISRAEL AND THE WORLD CRISIS

Excerpts from remarks prepared for delivery by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) at Jewish National Fund dinner honoring Judge Abraham Marowitz, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Wednesday night, April 1, 1959.

In the past three months the American people have focused their attention on the Berlin crisis, almost to the exclusion of any other international problem. This preoccupation with Berlin is understandable, but it can be dangerous. It can be dangerous because that divided city is not the only potential source of open international conflict.

The war which nobody wants could be sparked in Berlin.

It could also start in Quemoy or Baghdad.

The delicate Berlin situation is the most serious crisis we have faced since the Korean War, and potentially the most serious Communist challenge since the end of World War II.

But it is not the only crisis.

The crisis in the Formosan Strait, although relatively

quiet at the moment, is also full of danger. And matters are boiling up again in the turbulent Middle East. Iraq, our former ally, has renounced her membership in the Baghdad Pact. And what is more important, it looks as though this important Middle Eastern country may be slipping from the twilight zone of neutralism into the share time darkness of Communism. I do not want to be in a position of predicting the future course of events in Iraq, but I think it is fair to describe the situation there as dangerous. Among the other potentially explosive situations in the Middle East are the smouldering struggle between the Arab states and Israel and the vexing problem of almost one million homeless Arab refugees. weard In short, the Inited States is confronted with the possibility of a three-headed crisis -- in Germany, in the Formosan Strait, and in the Middle East. This raises two serious questions: First, are we really prepared to meet a

determined adversary on three fronts simultaneously? Second,

if we are not, what should we do to become better prepared?

Berlin alone may test us to the limit. Many military

specialists of the off covernment as well as some inside the

Administration believe that the United States lacks sufficient

strength in conventional weapons and manpower to support a

strong posture of negotiation at the forthcoming foreign

ministers and summit conferences, to say nothing of the capacity

to deal with a less-than-nuclear show of force by the Russians

But this much we can say for the Berlin situation. We are entering into negotiations with the strength of a united Western position. We have the support of Britain, France, West Germany and our other NATO partners. Our present policy the the support is and grows in the Formosan Strait enjoys no such united support. Our only ally there is Chiang Kai-Shek.

if negotiations should fail.

Tonight, I want to focus my attention on the third potentially explosive situation — the Middle East. I fear that our economic, political, and military policies are not adequate to a serious challenge in this area. Further, I do not think we are doing all we should do to improve our position.

Consider the challenge and the stakes. The Soviet Union is engaging in a massive program of economic penetration into that strategic, oil-rich area. Her aim is not to foster economic development nor to encourage genuine national self determination. Her aim is to expel Western influence and to expand the Communist empire. Testimony submitted by the State Department in recent weeks shows that the U.S.S.R. is committed to lend Egypt and Syria, the United Arab Republic, a total of \$949 million in economic and military aid.

Last week the Soviet Union announced economic aid to Iraq, totaling \$138 million. This is in addition to the \$120 million

in military aid previously disclosed.

The pattern is ominous. The Russians are clearly exploiting
the Arab hostility toward Israel to achieve her political purposes in the Mediterranean world. (Truch - Sarp Israel
Cap talut state)

In the face of this, it is my firm conviction that the United States response has been less than adequate.

Our whole aid program has been inadequate. It does not

meet the Communist threat. This is true not only because

Congress has slashed authorizations and appropriations beyond

the margin of safety; it is true also because the Administration

failed to offer a large enough program to meet the needs in

the first place.

I do not suggest that we should compete with the Russians

in every country where they have established a group foothold,

regardless of the internal political situation.

If we compete wherever the Soviet Union offers an aid program we shall be letting Moscow decide how we shall deploy our aid.

If we did, the Russians might well tempt us into wasteful squander.

I do submit, however, that in countries where the people and government understand our objectives and are struggling to attain political and economic freedom, we should be maintaining and expanding our program fassisfance of Cooffeen There are countries in Asia and Africa, like India and Israel, where the rule of law prevails and where democracy

What happens in these countries is crucial for the free

world. If these countries falter and fail, then other nations

in Asia and Africa may turn the Soviet way.

is cherished and preserved.

to untimed and where our dollars work and fight for freedom.

This means an expansion of the Development Loan Fund, and more effective utilization of our surplus foods; and it also means grant assistance mader certain special eircumstances.

I do not need to tell this audience how important it is to maintain our program for Israel. In 1951 I was one of the 36 Senator who joined in sponsoring legislation in the Senate calling for a grant for Israel.

At that time Israel was struggling to resettle hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from the displaced persons camps in Europe and from the Arab countries in Asia and Africa.

The Congress provided \$63 million as a grant to help

Israel meet a tremendous crisis created by her own humanitarian impluses.

In subsequent years the United States Government has continued aid to Israel, and we are glad to see her tremendous gains. She has tripled her population, absorbed newcomers from

all over the world, provided them with sanctuary, enabled them to work and prosper.

been able to unite and fully employ the three major resources of land, water and people -- is proving to be an inspiration to the new countries in Asia and Africa as well as to free countries in Europe and this Hemisphere. All of us have much to learn from modern Israel. She is serving the cause of democracy on a critical frontier. — a great all

In recent years the United States aid program to Israel has changed. As she has made progress our Government has enabled her to purchase surplus foods and has at ther money from the Development Loan Fund. The amount that we have been granting Israel has declined from a peak of \$70 million in 1953 to \$7½ million in the current year.

This may be an encouraging reflection of Israel's progress. But I hope that we will continue taid to Israel as long as she needs it and can use it as creatively as she has in the past.

I say this because the Administration has indicated that direct and aid to Israel may now come to an end, and that assistance to Israel will consist entirely of surplus foods a serious mistake In my judgment it would be premature to terminate and assistance to this democratic country at a time when she still has massive economic problems growing out of her need to resettle her vast new population, and to build a viable economy.

In addition, Israel stands alone in the area. She must be able to defend herself. I noted a few moments ago the massive aid the U.S.S.R. is pouring into Iraq, Eqypt, and Syria. The Soviet Union is extending this elaborate assistance protectifies act of helligerency,

to Israel's hostile Arab neighbors. On top of this the United States has been furnishing military aid to Jordan, Lebanon,
Saudi Arabia, and until last July to Iraq.

Israel has not received a single penny of military

aid. Thus, it would be wrong from every standpoint to end

our economic aid to Israel now.

I hope the Administration will reconsider any such proposal if that is what is now in its mind.

I do not need to tell this audience what Israel's

development can mean, for you who were pioneers in the Jewish

National Fund were the first to show the Near East how to

reclaim barren and neglected lands.

You may take pride in the fact that you not only helped

to restore the people of Israel to its ancient homeland, you

may derive satisfaction from the significant fact that all

over Asia and Africa today the story of Israel's challenging

only 1/5 of Isual under Cultivation

Dhandledon SME palatin Parpansin Neger, Galile, Judean Hills-Hula Project- Junish Hatturd - Homands of Acres 1-11-

and exciting restoration is being told and is being begulated.

How gratifying it is to know that 70 countries of the world

have now recognized Israel, and that beyond the immediate perimeter of Arab hostility and blockade there are peoples and governments which share our own understanding of Israel's restoration. Many of these countries have offered her sympathy and cooperation.

Israel's growing acceptance in the fraternity of freedom must be recognized eventually by the fraternity who surround her and who still persist in blockade and belligerency.

I have always believed that an Arab-Israel peace will come. It may take time, for the Near East is still tormented and tortured by divisions and tensions. But the internal Arab conflict that now disrupts the region is not an outgrowth of the Arab-Israel tension. It arises from poverty and the inevitable

clash between the haves and the have-nots. Unfortunately,

most of the Arabs are have-nots. They are the victims of frustration and are easily incited by demagogues who play upon their misery.

I hope that country will help the peoples of the Near East to a better life. The answer to the Soviet Union is not in arms, but economic development. We must do as much to help the people to utilize their water resources as we have done to find them oil.

Aveatually, we will make it clear to these peoples

that we have no imperialist interest, and that our major objectives are to help friendly peoples befriend each other, work in cooperation and preserve their own independence and sovereignty.

Let no one in the Near East, whether he be a local ruler or a distant commissar deceive himself into believing that he can dominate this region and use these people to serve his own ambitions for power.

Sealth Education Capital Capital Technology

Let the peoples of the Middle East understand that each nation there is entitled to live its own life and a much fuller life than it leads today, free from the aggression and subversion of enemies, free in the evolution of its own destiny. Our policy in the Near East should continue to help the governments there maintain their political independence and at the same time expand the opportunities for economic development and cultural self-expression for their people.

When the peoples of the Near East come to understand that our policy serves their own best interests they will work with us to resolve conflicts, strengthen democracy and preserve peace.



Excerpts from remarks prepared for delivery by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) at Jewish National Fund dinner honoring Judge Abraham Marowitz, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Wednesday night, April 1, 1959.

In the past three months the American people have focused their attention on the Berlin crisis, almost to the exhlusion of any other international problem. This preoccupation with Berlin is understandable, but it can be dangerous. It can be dangerous because that divided city is not the only potential source of open international conflict.

The war which nobody wants could be sparked in Berlin.

It could also start in Quemoy or Baghdad.

The delicate Berlin situation is the most serious crisis we have faced since the Korean War, and potentially the most serious Communist challenge since the end of World War II.

But it is not the only crisis.

The crisis in the Formosan Strait, although relatively

COPY

quiet at the moment, is also full of danger. And matters are boiling up again in the turbulent Middle East. Irag, our former ally, has renounced her membership in the Baghdad Pact. And what is more important, it looks as though this important Middle Eastern country may be slipping from the twilight zone of neutralism into the sharp noontime darkness of Communism. I do not want to be in a position of predicting the future course of events in Iraq, but I think it is fair to describe the situation there as dangerooms Among the other potentially explosive situations in the Middle East are the smouldering struggle between the Arab states and Israel and the vering problem of almost one million homeless Arab refusees.

In short, the United States is confronted with the possibility of a three-headed crisis -- in Germany, in the Formosan Strait, and in the Middle Bast. This raises two serious questions: First, are we really prepared to meet a

COPY

determined adversary on three fronts simultaneously? Second,
if we are not, what should we do to become better prepared?

Q Berlin alone may test us to the limit. Nany military
specialists outside of Government as well as some inside the
Administration believe that the United States lacks sufficient
strength in conventional weapons and manpower to support a
strong posture of negotiation at the forthcoming foreign
ministers and summit conferences, to say nothing of the capacity
to deal with a less-than-nuclear show of force by the Russians
if negotiations should fail.

But this much we can say for the Berlin situation. We are entering into negotiations with the strength of a united Western position. We have the support of Britain, France, West Germany and our other NATO partners. Our present policy toward the off-shore island groups in the Formosan Strait enjoys no such united support. Our only ally there is Chiang Kai Shek.



Tonight, I want to focus my attention on the third potentially emplosive situation -- the Middle East. I fear that our economic, political, and military policies are not adequate to a serious challenge in this area. Further, I do not think we are doing all we should do to improve our position.

Consider the challenge and the stakes. The Soviet Union is engaging in a massive program of economic penetration into that strategic, oil-rich area. Her aim is not to foster economic development nor to encourage genuine national self determination. Her aim is to expel Western influence and to expand the Communist empire. Testimony submitted by the State Department in recent weeks shows that the U.S.S.R. is committed to lend Egypt and Syria, the United Arab Republic, a total of \$949 million in economic and military aid.

Last week the Soviet Union announced economic aid to Iraq, totaling \$138 million. This is in addition to the \$120 million



in military aid previously disclosed.

The pattern is ominous. The Russians are clearly exploiting the Arab hostility toward Israel to achieve her political purposes in the Mediterranean world.

In the face of this, it is my firm conviction that the United States response has been less than adequate.

Our whole aid program has been inadequate. It does not meet the Communist threat. This is true not only because Congress has alashed authorizations and appropriations beyond the margin of safety; it is true also because the Administration failed to offer a large enough program to meet the needs in the first place.

I do not suggest that we should compete with the Russians in every country where they have established a strong foothold, regardless of the internal political situation.



If we compete wherever the Soviet Union offers an aid program
we shall be letting Moscow decide how we shall deploy our aid.

If we did, the Russians might well tempt us into wasteful
squander.

I do submit, however, that in countries where the people and government understand our objectives and are struggling to attain political and economic freedom, we should be maintaining and expanding our aid program.

There are countries in Asia and Africa, like India and Israel, where the rule of law prevails and where democracy is cherished and preserved.

What happens in these countries is crucial for the free world. If these countries falter and fail, then other nations in Asia and Africa may turn the Soviet way. We must enlarge economic aid where our dollars work and fight for freedom.



This means an expansion of the Development Loan Fund, and more effective utilization of our surplus foods; and it also means grant assistance under certain special circumstances.

I do not need to tell this audience how important it is to maintain our program for Israel. In 1951 I was one of the 36 Senator who joined in sponsoring legislation in the Senate calling for a grant for Israel.

At that time Israel was struggling to resettle hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from the displaced persons camps in Europe and from the Arab countries in Asis and Africa.

The Congress provided \$63 million as a grant to help

Israel meet a tremendous crisis created by her own humanitarian impluses.

In subsequent years the United States Government has continued aid to Israel, and we are glad to see her tremendous gains. She has tripled her population, absorbed newcomers from



all over the world, provided them with sanctuary, enabled them to work and prosper.

been able to unite and fully employ the three major resources -land, water and people -- is proving to be an inspiration to
the new countries in Asia and Africa as well as to free
countries in Europe and this Hemisphere. All of us have
much to learn from modern Israel. She is serving the cause
of democracy on a critical frontier.

In recent years the United States aid program to Israel has changed. As she has made progress our Government has enabled her to purchase surplus foods and has lent her money from the Development Loan Fund. The amount that we have been granting Israel has declined from a peak of \$70 million in 1953 to \$75 million in the current year.



This may be an encouraging reflection of Israel's progress.

But I hope that we will continue grant aid to Israel as long as she needs it and can use it as creatively as she has in the past.

I say this because the Administration has indicated that direct grant aid to Israel may now come to an end, and that assistance to Israel will consist entirely of surplus foods.

In my judgment it would be premature to terminate grant assistance to this democratic country at a time when she still has massive economic problems growing out of her need to resettle her vast new population, and to build a viable economy.

In addition, Israel stands alone in the area. She must be able to defend herself. I noted a few moments ago the massive aid the U.S.S.R. is pouring into Iraq, Equpt, and Syria. The Soviet Union is extending this elaborate assistance



to Israel's hostile Arab neighbors. On top of this the United States has been furnishing military aid to Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and until last July to Iraq.

Israel has not received a single penny of grant military aid. Thus, it would be wrong from every standpoint to end our grant economic aid to Israel now.

I hope the Administration will reconsider any such proposal if that is what is now in its mind.

I do not need to tell this audience what Israel's development can mean, for you who were pioneers in the Jewish National Fund were the first to show the Near East how to reclaim barren and neglected lands.

You may take pride in the fact that you not only helped to sestore the people of Israel to its ancient homeland, you may derive satisfaction from the significant fact that all over Asia and Africa today the story of Israel's challenging



and exciting restoration is being told and is being emulated.

How gratifying it is to know that 70 countries of the world have now recognized Israel, and that beyond the immediate perimeter of Arab hostility and blockade there are peoples and governments which share our own understanding of Israel's restoration. Many of these countries have offered her sympathy and cooperation.

Israel's growing acceptance in the fraternity of freedom
must be recognized eventually by the hostile Arab rulers who
surround her and who still persist in blockade and belligerency.

I have always believed that an Arab-Israel peace will come. It may take time, for the Hear Bast is still townented and tortured by divisions and tensions. But the internal Arab conflict that now disrupts the region is not an outgrowth of the Arab-Israel tension. It arises from poverty and the inevitable clash between the haves and the have-nots. Unfortunately,

COPY

most of the Arabs are have-nots. They are the victims of frustration and are easily incited by demagogues who play upon their misery.

I hope that my country will help the peoples of the Near Bast to a better life. The answer to the Soviet Union is not in arms, but economic development. We must do as much to help the people to utilize their water resources as we have done to find them oil.

Eventually, we will make it clear to these peoples
that we have no imperialist interest, and that our major objectives
are to help friendly peoples befriend each other, work in
cooperation and preserve their own independence and sovereignty.

Let no one in the Near Bast, whether he be a local ruler or a distant commissar decaive himself into believing that he can deminate this region and use these people to serve his own ambitions for power.

COPY

nation there is entitled to live its own life and a much fuller life than it leads today, free from the aggression and subversion of enemies, free in the evolution of its own destiny. Our policy in the Near East should continue to help the governments there maintain their political independence and at the same time expand the opportunities for economic development and cultural self-expression for their people.

When the peoples of the Near Bast come to understand that our policy serves their own best interests they will work with us to resolve conflicts, strengthen democracy and preserve peace.

Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.

