

DISARMAMENT AND PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT

001082

(Remarks to accompany Resolution Prepared at the
Request of Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey)

This year the Congress is being asked to appropriate some forty-five billions of dollars for national security programs. It is a tremendous amount, yet for most of us the principal question about this staggering sum is not whether it is necessary, but whether it is adequate. As long as the Soviet Union poses a threat to the free world and until we can achieve an effective agreement on the control and reduction of armaments, the foundation of peace will be, as it is today, the strength of the free world. In the present circumstances we must have the armed forces and the military equipment which will convince the Soviet Union that it has nothing to gain either from piecemeal nibbling or from a nuclear assault. Both peace and freedom may well depend upon our determination to maintain our military strength, whatever the cost, as long as necessary.

Just as it is essential that we make this huge defense appropriation this year, it seems to me that it is also essential that we make clear to the peoples of the world our true feelings about this appropriation. The defensive nature of our armed services is apparent to us, but it is not always clear to others. A constant barrage of propaganda from the Soviet Union and Red China seeks to distort our motives and intentions and to convince peoples elsewhere in the world that we are the instigators of the arms race. The Soviets would like the peoples of the world to believe that we enjoy making these defense appropriations and that we are war-mongers.

The truth is that we do not like to devote some 60% of our national budget to defense. We do not like to spend billions of dollars on weapons which will quickly become obsolescent, which we hope will never be used, and which, if they were used, would ultimately mean great destruction to us as well as to our enemy. We do not like the high taxes which

expenditures of this magnitude require. We do not like any aspect of the arms race. The aims of our foreign policy are peace, freedom, and security.

These truths are so obvious to us that it is easy to forget that they may not be understood in other places. It is easy to forget that propaganda masters in the Soviet Union are working day and night to build a false image of the United States in the minds of millions. If we do not want them to succeed, we must take every opportunity to fight back with the truth, to challenge the Soviet Union with constructive proposals which show our devotion to peace, and to demonstrate that we have the interest of others at heart, as well as ourselves. If such proposals are accepted, the foundation of peace will be strengthened. If they are rejected; the Soviet Union will be unmasked and its true face will be displayed.

It is with these considerations in mind that I wish to introduce a special resolution today. The purpose of this resolution is to assure the people of the world of our desire to end the arms race so that more resources can be devoted to constructive works of peace. It would make clear to the world that we appropriate these funds not because we like to do so, not because we want a huge defense establishment, not because we have nothing else to do with this money, but solely because the high levels of Soviet armed forces and the constant threat of Communist aggression requires that we do so. It contains our solemn pledge that as soon as the Soviet Union is willing to enter into a reasonable, safeguarded disarmament program, we will take part of the savings which accrue and apply them to the constructive international programs which this nation already pursues - such as our programs of technical and economic assistance.

001086

As we who appropriate these funds cannot help but know, the cost of modern weapons is fantastic. By comparison, the works of peace cost almost nothing. According to reports which have appeared in the press, it cost a billion dollars to develop the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile. The Aswan Dam, designed to add 2,000,000 acres of cultivable land to Egypt will cost 1.3 billion. The Titan and Atlas missiles have been estimated to cost \$10 million each with ground support. One Titan and one Atlas then would pay the budget of the United Nations Children's Fund for more than a year. An atomic submarine capable of carrying 16 Polaris missiles has been estimated to cost \$100 million. One of these would buy thousands of new homes for families now living in crowded tenements or dilapidated shacks. The 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ foot long Genie Rocket is reported to cost about \$250,000 - \$7,000 for the rocket and \$243,000 for the nuclear warhead. Just one of these would buy thousands of textbooks for people eager to learn to read and write or improve conditions in their own countries.

001087

Again let me emphasize that in the absence of a safeguarded arms control agreement, we must have these weapons if we do not wish to place our country in grave danger. I am not in favor of unilateral disarmament. On the other hand we must not forget, nor allow the other peoples of the world to forget, that we hope the maintenance of a high level of armed forces is only a temporary necessity and that eventually we will have a far more satisfactory security system. Our goal is the achievement of an international arms control agreement which would allow us to devote the major portion of our national budget, not to defense, but to constructive, peaceful pursuits. If we could reduce our defense expenditures by as much as half we could increase our contributions to works of peace throughout the world, increase our efforts to improve public works, welfare and education in our country and still have funds left to permit the tax reduction we all would welcome.

Proposal of two Presidents

Mr. President, this resolution embodies the expressed hopes of leaders of both political parties and the aspirations of millions of people in this country.

Two Presidents of the United States have promised to use the savings from disarmament to fight poverty throughout the world.

President Truman said in a speech of October 24, 1950:

If real disarmament were achieved, the nations of the world, acting through the United Nations, could join in a greatly enlarged program of mutual aid. As the cost of maintaining armaments decreased, every nation could greatly increase its contributions to advancing human welfare. All of us could then pool even greater resources to support the United Nations in its war against want.

In this way, our armaments would be transformed into foods, medicine, tools for use in undeveloped areas, and into other aids for human advancement. The latest discoveries of science could be made available to men all over the globe. Thus we could give real meaning to the old promise that swords shall be beaten into plowshares and that the nations shall not learn war any more.

Then man can turn his great inventiveness, his tremendous energies, and the resources with which he has been blessed to creative efforts. Then we shall be able to realize the kind of world which has been the vision of man for centuries.

001089

This is the goal which we must keep before us - and the vision in which we must never lose faith.

President Eisenhower, in an address on April 16, 1953, pledged:

We are prepared to reaffirm, with the most concrete evidence, our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous.

This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the undeveloped areas of the world; to stimulate profitable and fair world trade; to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.

In a resolution passed on July 29, 1953, the Senate endorsed the disarmament principles spelled out by President Eisenhower--

To the end that a greater proportion of the world's productive capacity may be used for peaceful purposes and for the well-being of mankind.

In February, 1950, the late, beloved Senator from Connecticut, Senator Brien McMahon, made a stirring speech in which he proposed that the major portion of our defense expenditures be used for works of peace. At that time our appropriations were only fifteen billion dollars. Senator McMahon said:

001090

Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum, or \$10,000,000,000, and instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spread the annual \$10,000,000,000 over three programs: President Truman's Point IV proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia? Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit. In exchange for our own contribution of \$10,000,000,000 annually, which we would save from the military budget, we would ask, first, general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and second, an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. . .

Such a proposal, if advanced by our Government, might vividly bring home to all the world's population - in a manner far more successful than we have so far used - the profundity of our desire for peace.

The next year Senator McMahon introduced a resolution calling for the use of the savings from disarmament to be used for the development of underdeveloped countries. The fact that he was not a man who could be accused of being unaware of the necessity for military strength is dramatically illustrated by another resolution introduced simultaneously to the effect that this country was not spending enough on nuclear weapons and that "the United States must go all-out in atomic development and production."

Again the bipartisan support for this idea is apparent in a resolution introduced by another beloved colleague, Senator Ralph Flanders, to the effect that this Government pledge, when the burden of armaments has been lifted, to devote part of the resources released to raise the living standards of people everywhere. Many of us, from both sides of the aisle, joined in the sponsorship of this resolution.

Support for Proposal Throughout the World

Proposals that funds now used for armaments be used for peaceful purposes when an arms control agreement permits have not been confined to this country.

Throughout the world hope has been expressed that the economic lot of all peoples might be improved if funds could be released by disarmament. At the Geneva Conference of 1955 France put forth a proposal that states agree to a reduction in the amount of their military expenditures and that the

financial resources thus made available should be allocated in whole or in part to international expenditure. The French proposal envisioned the use of military funds for peaceful purposes not only as a result of disarmament but as a method of disarmament. The following session of the United Nations General Assembly called upon the states concerned to study this proposal. In 1957 the General Assembly invited the states concerned

to consider the possibility of devoting, out of the funds made available as a result of disarmament, as and when sufficient progress is made, additional resources to the improvement of living conditions throughout the world and especially in the less developed countries.

The most recent proposal for a vast new war on world poverty was made by Premier Charles de Gaulle at a news conference on March 25 of this year. He stated:

001093

We, who live between the Atlantic and the Urals, we, who are Europe, disposing, with America, her daughter, of the principal sources and resources of ourselves, lodge ourselves, keep ourselves warm, we, who possess mines and factories in full activity, well cultivated countrysides, railways where numerous trains run, roads choked with cars, ports filled with ships, airdromes peopled with aircraft, we, all of whose children learn to read, who build many universities and laboratories, who form armies of engineers and technicians, who can see, hear, read what is of a nature to satisfy the mind, we, who have enough doctors, hospitals, medicaments to ease suffering, to care for the sick, to assure the life of the greater part of the newly born, why do we not establish, all together, the fraternal organization which will lend its hand to the others?

Why should we not put together a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft, to vanquish misery, develop the resources and help the work of less developed peoples?

Let us do this - not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of live and peace. . .

It seems to me that this should be a primary subject for the agenda of possible East-West Conferences. In cases of agreement, it would evidently be necessary to draw up a common plan of organizations and implementation.

Premier de Gaulle also said that if there were a summit conference later this year, he was ready to speak about this important proposal to the other heads of government. I heartily commend the French President for this courageous and statesmanlike proposal. Our Government should be prepared to join with him in promoting it. And we should be prepared to work for it at the United Nations.

001094

Why do I give my attention to an oft-made proposal which has never been acted upon? The answer is simple. Every year we appropriate billions of dollars for arms. Every year we ought also to clarify our national goals. The statements by President Truman and President Eisenhower, and the earlier Senate resolutions, are now history. Let us make it clear to the world that their offers still stand. Let us accept the challenge of Premier de Gaulle.

Nuclear Test Ban Offers Starting Place

The achievement of a disarmament agreement which would be comprehensive enough to permit a substantial reduction in our defense expenditures is going to require many years of hard work. The free world must convince the Soviet Union that it has nothing to gain by the use or threat of military force. There are numerous complex political problems such as the division of Germany, Korea, Indochina, and China, which must be resolved. The international tensions which cause nations

to arm themselves and are in turn increased by armaments must be reduced. There are knotty technical problems involved in controlling modern weapons which must be worked out. All of these take time.

We have reason to hope, however, that this year it may be possible to take the first step on the road to disarmament, a suspension of nuclear weapons tests with safeguards, adequate controls, and inspection. We do not yet know whether the Soviet Union will agree to the on-site inspection rights necessary for a total test ban, or whether it will agree to the President's proposal for a ban of atmospheric tests which requires less inspection. Nevertheless, negotiations for this purpose have been going on for seven months and the door to agreement is still open.

If a first step toward disarmament can be achieved this year, we can use this first step to prove that our offer to use the savings from disarmament for works of peace throughout

the world is sincere, and applies now, not in some Never Never Land of the future. We can do this by saying that, if a test ban is achieved, we are willing to use any savings for peaceful international purposes. Because of the cost of establishing an inspection system, any monetary saving may be slight.

However, we can propose that the nuclear powers dismantle those nuclear weapons which would otherwise have been exploded in a test series in some remote location and contribute the fissionable material in them to the International Atomic Energy Agency. This would speed atomic development in underdeveloped countries, for it would allow the International Agency to sell it to the underdeveloped countries at low prices which they could afford and use the proceeds for training scientists in these countries in nuclear technology. Moreover, it would be a promise of the many more good things which could be done if further steps toward disarmament were possible.

Aid to Underdeveloped Areas Essential Now

Let me make it clear that this resolution is not intended to substitute for works of peace which we should carry on now. We are fortunate to be a rich nation. ~~Our borders~~ ~~are overflowing.~~ Many other nations are not so fortunate. They are hungry, ridden with disease, and lacking in the resources, educational facilities and technology which are necessary to improve their status. At the present time we can afford both to maintain the defenses necessary for our safety and to contribute some of our abundant production, some of our skilled technicians, some of our capital to countries which are now in a stage of economic development through which we have safely passed. If we fail to do this, we can be sure the Communists will fill the vacuum and do everything they can to direct the development of new nations into Communist channels.

001098

No, we cannot defer our works of peace into the future. We must continue and increase our technical and economic assistance and other works of peace even if it should also become necessary to increase our expenditures for defense. However, we can make it clear that we would much rather use some of our financial resources now devoted to defense, for a vast new attack on the enemies of all mankind - hunger, poverty, and disease. We can pledge that if the Soviet Union will join in a realistic program of arms control which will enable nations to reduce their armaments, we are ready to devote a large portion of the resources thereby freed to the good of the world. We can challenge them to do their part in bringing peace and prosperity to the whole world.

Mr. President, I hope that the Members of the Senate will give this resolution their earnest and favorable consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that my resolution appear in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

(Exhibit A)

Peaceful
DISARMAMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 99

SAVINGS FROM ARMS CONTROL EXPENDITURES

(Remarks to accompany Resolution Prepared at the
request of Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey)

This year the Congress is being asked to appropriate some forty-five billions of dollars for national security programs. It is a tremendous amount, yet for most of us the principal question about this staggering sum is not whether it is necessary, but whether it is adequate. As long as the Soviet Union poses a threat to the free world and until we can achieve an effective agreement on the control and reduction of armaments, the foundation of peace will be, as it is today, the strength of the free world. In the present circumstances we must have the armed forces and the military equipment which will convince the Soviet Union that it has nothing to gain *either from a nuclear assault.* *from an attack.* Both peace and freedom may well depend upon our *piecemeal nibbling on* determination to maintain our military strength, whatever the cost, as long as necessary.

Just as it is essential that we make this huge defense appropriation this year, it seems to me that it is also essential that we make clear to the peoples of the world our true feelings about this appropriation. The defensive nature of our armed services is apparent *but it is not always clear to others,* to us, *but* ~~A~~ constant barrage of propaganda from the Soviet Union *and Red China* seeks to distort our motives and intentions and to convince peoples elsewhere in the world that we are the instigators of the arms race. The Soviets would like the peoples of the world to believe that we enjoy making these defense appropriations and that we are war-mongers.

The truth is that we do not like ^{to devote} ~~devoting~~ some 60% of our national budget to defense. We do not like ^{to spend} ~~spending~~ billions of dollars on weapons which will quickly become obsolescent, which we hope will never be used, and which, if they were used, would ultimately mean ^{great destruction} ~~death~~ to us as well as ^{to} ~~our~~ enemy. We do not like the high taxes which expenditures of this magnitude require. We do not like any aspect of the arms race. The aims of our foreign policy are peace, ~~and freedom~~ ^{and security}.

These truths are so obvious to us that it is easy to forget that they may not be understood in other places. It is easy to forget that propaganda masters in the Soviet Union are working day and night to build a false image of the United States in the minds of millions. If we do not want them to succeed, we must take every opportunity to fight back with the truth, to challenge the Soviet Union with constructive proposals which show our devotion to peace, and to demonstrate that we have the interest of others at heart, as well as ourselves. If such proposals are accepted, the foundation of peace will be strengthened. If they are rejected; the Soviet Union will be unmasked and its true face will be displayed.

It is with these considerations in mind that I wish to introduce a ^{special} ~~the following~~ resolution ^{today}. ^{The purpose of this resolution} ~~Its purpose~~ is to assure the people of the world of our desire to end the arms race so that more resources can be devoted to constructive works of peace. It would make clear to the world that we appropriate these funds not because we like to do so, not because we want a huge defense establishment, not because we have nothing

else to do with this money, but solely because the high levels of Soviet armed forces and the constant threat of Communist aggression requires that we do so. It contains our solemn pledge that as soon as the Soviet Union is willing to enter into a reasonable, safe-guarded disarmament program, we will take part of the savings which accrue and apply them to the constructive international programs which this nation already pursues -- such as our programs of technical and economic assistance.

As we who appropriate these funds cannot help but know, the cost of modern weapons is fantastic. ~~In~~ ^{cost almost nothing,} comparison, the works of peace ~~are bargains.~~ According to reports which have appeared in the press, it cost a billion dollars to develop the Minuteman inter-continental ballistic missile. The Aswan Dam, designed to add 2,000,000 acres of cultivable land to Egypt will cost 1.3 billion. The Titan and Atlas missiles have been estimated to cost \$10 million each with ground support. One Titan and one Atlas then would pay the budget of the United Nations Children's Fund for more than a year. An atomic submarine capable of carrying 16 Polaris missiles has been estimated to cost \$100 million. One of these would buy thousands of new homes for families now living in crowded tenements or dilapidated shacks. The 8 1/2 foot long Genie Rocket is reported to cost about \$250,000 -- \$7,000 for the rocket and \$243,000 for the nuclear warhead. Just one of these would buy thousands of textbooks for people eager to learn to read and write or improve conditions in their own countries.

Again let me emphasize that in the absence of a safeguarded arms control agreement, we must have these weapons if we do not wish to place our country in grave danger. I am not in favor of unilateral disarmament. On the other hand we must not forget, nor allow the other peoples of the world to forget, that we hope the maintenance of a high level of armed forces is only a temporary necessity and that eventually we will have a far more satisfactory security system. Our goal is the achievement of an international arms control agreement which would allow us to devote the major portion of our national budget, not to defense, but to constructive, peaceful pursuits. If we could ~~even~~ ^{as much as} reduce our defense expenditures by half we could increase our contributions to works of peace throughout the world, increase ^{our efforts to improve public works,} ~~our attack on poverty within our own~~ ^{and Education in our country} country, and still have funds left to permit the tax reduction we all would ~~all enjoy.~~ welcome.

Proposal of two Presidents

Mr. President, this resolution embodies the expressed hopes of leaders of both political parties and the aspirations of ~~hundreds~~ ^{millions} of people in this country.

Two Presidents of the United States have promised to use the savings from disarmament to fight poverty throughout the world.

President Truman said in a speech of October 24, 1950:

If real disarmament were achieved, the nations of the world, acting through the United Nations, could join in a greatly enlarged program of mutual aid. As the cost of maintaining armaments decreased, every nation could greatly increase its contributions to advancing human welfare. All of us could then pool even greater resources to support the United Nations in its war against want.

In this way, our armaments would be transformed into foods, medicine, tools for use in undeveloped areas, and into other aids for human advancement. The latest discoveries of science could be made available to men all over the globe. Thus we could give real meaning to the old promise that swords shall be beaten into plowshares and that the nations shall not learn war any more.

Then man can turn his great inventiveness, his tremendous energies, and the resources with which he has been blessed to creative efforts. Then we shall be able to realize the kind of world which has been the vision of man for centuries.

This is the goal which we must keep before us -- and the vision in which we must never lose faith.

←
President Eisenhower, in an address on April 16, 1953, pledged:

We are prepared to reaffirm, with the most concrete evidence, our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous.

This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the undeveloped areas of the world; to stimulate profitable and fair world trade; to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.

In a resolution passed on July 29, 1953, the Senate endorsed the disarmament principles spelled out by President Eisenhower--

To the end that a greater proportion of the world's productive capacity may be used for peaceful purposes and for the well-being of mankind.

In February, 1950, the late, beloved Senator from Connecticut, Senator Brien McMahon, made a stirring speech in which he proposed that the major portion of our defense expenditures be used for works of peace. At that time our appropriations were ^{only} fifteen billion dollars. ¹
Senator McMahon said:

Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum, or \$10,000,000,000, and instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spread the annual \$10,000,000,000 over three programs: President Truman's Point IV proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia? Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit. In exchange for our own contribution of \$10,000,000,000 annually, which we would save from the military budget, we would ask, first, general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and second, an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. ...

Such a proposal, if advanced by our Government, might vividly bring home to all the world's population -- in a manner far more successful than we have so far used -- the profundity of our desire for peace.

The next year Senator McMahon introduced a resolution calling for the use of the savings from disarmament to be used for the development of underdeveloped countries. The fact that he was not a man who could be accused of being unaware of the necessity for military strength is dramatically illustrated by another resolution introduced simultaneously to the effect that this country was not spending enough on nuclear weapons and that "the United States must go all-out in atomic development and production."

Again the bipartisan support for this idea is apparent in a resolution introduced by another beloved colleague, Senator Ralph Flanders, to the effect that this Government pledge, when the burden of armaments has been lifted, to devote part of the resources released to raise the living standards of people everywhere. Many of us,

from both sides of the aisle, joined in the sponsorship of this resolution.

Support for Proposal Throughout the World

Proposals that funds now used for armaments be used for peaceful purposes when an arms control agreement permits have not been confined to this country.

Throughout the world hope has been expressed that the economic lot of all peoples might be improved if funds could be released by disarmament. At the Geneva Conference of 1955 France put forth a proposal that states agree to a reduction in the amount of their military expenditures and that the financial resources thus made available should be allocated in whole or in part to international expenditure. The French proposal envisioned the use of military funds for peaceful purposes not only as a result of disarmament but as a method of disarmament. The following session of the United Nations General Assembly called upon the states concerned to study this proposal. In 1957 the General Assembly invited the states concerned

to consider the possibility of devoting, out of the funds made available as a result of disarmament, as and when sufficient progress is made, additional resources to the improvement of living conditions throughout the world and especially in the less developed countries.

The most recent proposal for a vast new war on world poverty was made by Premier Charles de Gaulle at a news conference on March 25 of this year. He stated:

*comment de Gaulle
let's be ready to join
with him*

We, who live between the Atlantic and the Urals, we, who are Europe, disposing, with America, her daughter, of the principal sources and resources of ourselves, lodge ourselves, keep ourselves warm, we, who possess mines and factories in full activity, well cultivated countrysides, railways where numerous trains run, roads choked with cars, ports filled with ships, airdromes peopled with aircraft, we, all of whose children learn to read, who build many universities and laboratories, who form armies of engineers and technicians, who can see, hear, read what is of a nature to satisfy the mind, we, who have enough doctors, hospitals, medicaments to ease suffering, to care for the sick, to assure the life of the greater part of the newly born, why do we not establish, all together, the fraternal organization which will lend its hand to the others?

Why should we not put together a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft, to vanquish misery, develop the resources and help the work of less developed peoples?

Let us do this -- not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace...

It seems to me that this should be a primary subject for the agenda of possible East-West Conferences. In cases of agreement, it would evidently be necessary to draw up a common plan of organizations and implementation.

Premier de Gaulle also said that if there were a summit conference

later this year, he was ready to speak about this to the other heads of government. ^{important proposal} I heartily ^{commend} the ^{President} French ^{President} for this courageous and ^{manly} Statesman-like proposal. Our Government should be ^{prepared} to ^{join} with him in promoting it. ~~If the question is raised as to why we should restate an idea~~

~~which has been proposed by two Presidents, endorsed in a Senate Resolution,~~

Why do I ~~not~~ give my attention to ~~an~~ ^{an off-made proposal} and proclaimed throughout the world, let me only say this. Every year which has never been acted upon? The answer is simple. ^A we appropriate billions of dollars for arms. Every year we ought also

to clarify our national goals. The statements by President Truman

and President Eisenhower, and the earlier Senate resolutions, are now

history. Let us make it clear to the world that their offers still stand.

Let us accept the challenge of Premier de Gaulle.

And we should be prepared to work for it at the United Nations.

Nuclear Test Ban Offers Starting Place

The achievement of a disarmament agreement which would be comprehensive enough to permit a substantial reduction in our defense expenditures is going to require many years of hard work. The free world must convince the Soviet Union that it has nothing to gain by the use or threat of military force. There are numerous complex political problems such as the division of Germany, Korea, Indochina, and China, which must be resolved. The international tensions which cause nations to arm themselves and are in turn increased by armaments must be reduced. There are knotty technical problems involved in controlling modern weapons which must be worked out. All of these take time.

We have reason to hope, however, that this year it may be possible to take the first step on the road to disarmament, a suspension of nuclear weapons tests, ^{safeguarded by adequate controls and} with inspection. We do not yet know whether the Soviet Union will agree to the on-site inspection rights necessary for a total test ban, or whether it will agree to the President's proposal for a ban of atmospheric tests which requires less inspection. Nevertheless, negotiations for this purpose have been going on for ^{seven} ~~six~~ months and the door to agreement is still open.

If a first step toward disarmament can be achieved this year, we can use this first step to prove that our offer to use the savings from disarmament for works of peace throughout the world is sincere, and applies now, not in some Never Never Land of the future. We can do this by saying that, if a test ban is achieved, we are willing to

use any savings for peaceful international purposes. Because of the cost of establishing an inspection system, any monetary savings may be slight. However, we can propose that the nuclear powers dismantle those nuclear weapons which would otherwise have been exploded in a test series in some remote location and contribute the fissionable material in them to the International Atomic Energy Agency. This would speed atomic development in underdeveloped countries, for it would allow the International Agency to sell it to the underdeveloped countries at low prices which they could afford and use the proceeds for training scientists in these countries in nuclear technology. Moreover, it would be a promise of the many more good things which could be done if further steps toward disarmament were possible.

Aid to Underdeveloped Areas Essential Now

Let me make it clear that this resolution is not intended to substitute for works of peace which we should carry on now. We are fortunate to be a rich nation. Our larders are overflowing. Many other nations are not so fortunate. They are hungry, ridden with disease, and lacking in the resources, educational facilities and technology which are necessary to improve their status. At the present time we can afford both to maintain the defenses necessary for our safety and to contribute some of our abundant production, some of our skilled technicians, some of our capital to countries which are now in a stage of economic development through which we have safely passed. If we fail to do this, we can be sure the Communists

001109

will fill the vacuum and do everything they can to direct the development of new nations into Communist channels.

No, we cannot defer our works of peace into the future. We must continue and increase our technical and economic assistance and other works of peace even if it should also become necessary to increase our expenditures for defense. However, we can make it clear that we would much rather use our ~~appropriations for~~ ^{Some of our} ~~financial resources~~ ^{now devoted to} defense for a vast new attack on the enemies of all mankind--hunger, poverty, and disease. We can pledge that if the Soviet Union will join in a realistic program of arms control which will enable nations to reduce their armaments, we are ready to devote a large portion of the resources thereby freed to the good of the world. We can challenge them to do their part in bringing peace and prosperity to the whole world.

Mr. President, I hope that the Members of the Senate will give this resolution their earnest ^{favorable} consideration.



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