

Address by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

001910

before the  
United Nations Association, Davenport, Iowa —  
Sunday, November 1, 1959

Scott County  
Chapter

THE UNITED NATIONS - SENTINEL FOR PEACE

We meet today to do honor to the United Nations -- humanity's best political

instrument hope for achieving world order with peace and justice for all.

You have often heard the long and heart-warming tally of the UN's achievements. They are all the more impressive because it has had to function, for nearly all its brief fourteen years, in a deeply divided world.

I could recount these many achievements -- some of which I witnessed myself as a member of the American delegation to the General Assembly. But, because I firmly believe that the UN's brightest days lie before it, I shall take this opportunity to look forward with hope, rather than backward with satisfaction.

The UN, like a giant mirror, reflects the main currents in world politics. Its present session is dominated by the new phase in East-West relations which began with Chairman Khrushchev's visit in September.

U.N.  
MIRROR

my sister  
ASSOC  
4-51-1959

*now* There may be <sup>*some*</sup> delegates to the UN -- just as there may be Americans -- who look upon this visit as a grave diplomatic defeat for the United States. On the other hand, there may even be delegates -- just as there may be Americans -- who fondly hope that peace will break out overnight.

The great majority of UN delegates (and, I am sure, the great majority of Americans) have made <sup>*more*</sup> a sober -- yet ~~severely~~ hopeful -- assessment of the prospects before us.

Both sides have ventured a little out of their Maginot lines of implacable suspicion and hostility. We face a period of movement and maneuver, on a world-wide scale.

I for one welcome <sup>*for*</sup> this new phase -- so, while it holds some dangers, it also offers bright opportunities.

The dangers are obvious. There is the danger of shirking the all-essential task of maintaining our military strength. There is the risk that we might permit divisions within the ranks of the free nations to erode the unity they have so painfully achieved.

(*Western Summit*  
*needed Dec 19*)

001912

I can fully understand those who, in alarm, cry out "On Guard!"

But I believe that, dangerous as it would be to relax in our vigilance, it would be self-defeating folly to stand still in a changing world.

But there are opportunities as well as dangers before us -- and we must make every effort to grasp these opportunities in time.

My mind goes back to the summit meeting at Geneva in 1955 -- which, whether by coincidence or not, also took place a year before an American Presidential election. This meeting produced no lasting results. But it might well have been more fruitful if we had made a real effort to follow it up. We failed to press the Soviets to back up the soft currency of their words with the hard coin of deeds.

This was a mistake we must not repeat.

Today there are a number of directions in which we should probe Soviet intentions. I believe that some of the most promising are open to us in the UN. While the tide of Soviet policy is running toward cooperation, or at least the appearance of cooperation with the world community, we have the chance to establish in the UN a series of significant new beach heads for world order -- and therefore for peace.

World Court - R. J. Connolly Amers

Cessation of Nuclear Tests - Intern Control!

- 4 -

001913

Yes, I firmly believe, for example, that there is a real possibility of progress toward genuine disarmament -- and by "genuine" I most emphatically mean with the vital provisions for adequate inspection and control.

I only regret that we let Chairman Khrushchev get the jump on us here. The "total disarmament" speech he made in the UN was a speech America should have made first -- for disarmament has genuinely been our cause ever since our dramatic and historic offer, in 1946, to give up our monopoly control of the atomic bomb.

need  
CG  
see top  
p 4

But we are allowing the Russians to pose as the main advocates of disarmament. We should now move to reestablish our position before the world. We can still make up in sincerity and dedication what we lacked in promptness. We must press constantly in the current UN debates for real disarmament.

Cessation of Nuclear Bomb Tests!

I am convinced that we shall find as our most eager and attentive audience the people of the Soviet Union itself. They want peace -- and they want the higher standards of living that have so long been denied them.

001914

In September all of you had -- as I had last year -- the opportunity to size up this man Khrushchev. You saw, as I did, a tough, astute, resourceful, and determined politician. But you saw -- and let me emphasize this fact -- a politician.

L The time has passed when the Russian people can be ruled, as Stalin ruled them, by <sup>only</sup> naked, brutal force. If Khrushchev has elbowed aside his formidable rivals, it is because he had the sense to offer the carrot as well as brandish the knout.

L Higher standards of living for the Soviet people -- and that means some slackening in arms production -- <sup>could be</sup> ~~is~~ more than mere propaganda for him. It may be essential to his survival. He has made big promises -- and his people expect him to keep them. So it may be that Mr. Khrushchev himself is beginning to realize that true disarmament is in his own best interests.

L But even assuming the will for disarmament exists, the problems are so complex that there is a constant danger of getting bogged down in technical details. Here the UN could be of immense help.

001915

I should like to see the UN equipped with a "fact-finding" division to conduct an expert, detailed and continuing study of the problems of disarmament.

fact finding

Of course, in the last analysis, a disarmament agreement can only be achieved by patient, hard-headed negotiation between the two sides. But I believe that such a UN agency could fulfill something like the function that "fact-finding" committees do in our own labor-management disputes. It could define the real differences between the two sides and determine what sorts of control will work and which will not.

The more we move toward complete, inspected, and effective disarmament, the more essential -- and the more practicable -- becomes a UN Police Force. I hope that we shall redouble our efforts in that direction.

Police Force

In the best of circumstances, it will take time -- perhaps a great deal of time -- to negotiate disarmament and establish a UN police force. Meanwhile, both to test out Soviet intentions and to strengthen the UN as a safeguard for peace, we should propose interim measures to enable it to carry out its role more effectively.

~~World Court, UN Agency, FNO, LHO~~

*Eyes  
Ears  
Peace*

The United Nations, I believe, should be equipped with what I should like to call "eyes and ears for peace."

By "eyes," I mean special representatives of the UN Secretary-General, stationed permanently in the various potential trouble spots of the world, just as one is already stationed in Jordan.

These should be men of stature and consummate diplomatic skill, enjoying the full confidence of the Secretary-General. They should be constantly on the watch for the sparks of conflict which can at any moment burst into flame, and should recommend timely measures to forestall them.

They should be ready to move immediately -- and I mean immediately, not tomorrow or the day after -- into areas where armed violence has broken out, or is about to. Such a UN presence at the point of conflict can, I believe, be a powerful restraining factor.

If the Soviets are really serious about peaceful co-existence, they should find it to their interest -- it certainly is to ours -- to snuff out such brush fires before they spread and involve the great powers.

Taking a more cynical view of Soviet intentions, such a measure would be a deterrent to the Soviets themselves. And I should think they would find it difficult to oppose such a proposal lest they dispell the very atmosphere of relaxation which they are tirelessly promoting.

Remember the tense days in 1956 when the freedom of Hungary hung in the balance. The UN tragically failed to respond to the desperate appeal of the last free government of that martyred nation -- even though it had time to act before the Russian tanks returned to Budapest.

Would a UN presence in Budapest have deterred the Russians? No one can say with certainty -- but I think it significant that the Soviet leaders themselves hesitated before acting, apparently because of divided counsels within the Kremlin itself. The report of the UN Commission on Hungary says in this regard:

"It may well be that, immediately before the second intervention, the political and military authorities (of the Soviet Union) differed regarding the best way of meeting the unusual circumstances which had arisen..."



We cannot say whether a UN presence in Budapest would have resolved the Kremlin debate in favor of prudence. <sup>But</sup> What we cannot afford again, however, is the heart-chilling realization that Hungary might have escaped its martyrdom if the UN had been in position to act promptly.

✓ L The UN should have <sup>it</sup> ears for peace as well as eyes -- and by that I mean UN monitoring stations which would record and expose before the court of world public opinion the hate propaganda which, like inflammable rubbish, clutters the world's airwaves.

Ears  
for  
Peace

L This is a perennial problem in the Middle East, and not only among the Arab nations. The Soviet Union has, in recent months, been conducting the most vicious sort of radio war against the government of Iran. The recording and publishing by the UN of these vicious tirades would, I feel sure, cause their authors the greatest embarrassment and might lead them to adopt more temperate language.

I know that, by the very fact of belonging to the UN, the member nations accept the Charter obligation to settle their disputes by peaceful means, and to refrain from the threat or use of force.

out

But, if the "honor" system didn't work with our own TV quiz programs, we can hardly, at this stage in history, expect it to work among nations.

As a wise old lady of my acquaintance said: "If we all had angel wings, we'd fly to heaven!"

In our present state of human -- and national -- imperfection, the consciousness of ever-alert UN eyes and ears could give substantial

reassurance to peaceful nations, and discourage others from ignoring the Principles of the UN Charter.

Indeed, out of their day-to-day operation there might evolve, by practice and precedent, a working code of co-existence. It would spell out, like a book of rules, the great principles of the UN Charter.

Principles, by themselves, are not enough. Chairman Khrushchev has acknowledged that the doctrines of Marxism become more palatable with an extra helping of butter and bacon. Even the UN Charter -- morally, so infinitely superior -- needs a firmer economic underpinning.

Recently I wrote President Eisenhower stressing "the particular urgency...of making doubly clear to the entire world that, while we shall strive mightily for a peaceful resolution of Soviet-US differences, our goal has not shifted toward a two-power world."

What I was saying was, in effect, that the Soviet Union and the US could be in complete agreement -- and still be wrong. This may seem most unlikely to you -- but, in fact, it has already happened.

Speaking to the UN General Assembly, Chairman Khrushchev declared that the Soviet Union "would...join with other powers in rendering economic assistance to the so-called under-developed countries" but added that it would do so only "by using a part of the resources that would be made available to the Soviet Union and other countries by the conclusion of an international agreement on disarmament and the reduction of military budgets."

These words echo the United States position so precisely that they might have been written in the State Department.

This talk of <sup>of jelly</sup> "jam tomorrow, but no <sup>of jelly</sup> jam today" comes with

particularly poor grace, in view of September's cross-country  
bragging match, during which Khrushchev and many of his American  
hosts vied in boasting of the high standards of living their  
countries had achieved.

If our tables are groaning so audibly, must we really wait  
until disarmament is achieved before even beginning to share -- through  
the UN -- a fairer portion of our wealth with less privileged nations?

Our attitude is, to paraphrase an aphorism of Talleyrand, even  
worse than a sin -- it is a mistake.

Last month the Director of the Development Loan Fund -- which  
I vigorously supported in the Senate -- declared that future DLF loans  
would be "tied" so that they could be spent only in America.

He justified this ~~backward~~ step by arguing that it would force  
other countries into extending credit to the under-developed nations,  
if they hoped to sell them their own goods.

Great nations demean themselves by such pettifogging actions.

How much better -- and how much more in accord with our own best traditions -- it would have been to invite the Soviet Union to join us in launching a program of substantial economic aid through the United Nations -- now and not hereafter. Together we could challenge the other industrialized nations to share the responsibility with us, in proportion to their means.

*World conf for Peace, Food, Health + Edu for Peace,*  
 Eyes for peace, ears for peace, development for peace -- these concrete ~~bold~~ steps forward which, I firmly believe, will further strengthen the United Nations -- in itself the best hope for peace.

I do not agree with those idealists who believe that the UN, like some miracle of automation, will produce peace without the efforts of its member nations.

*It must be used, not abused  
 UN must be strengthened, not*

But I differ also with those realists who say that we can get out of the UN only what we put into it.

I say that, if we bring to it our wisest and most imaginative statesmanship, we can get out of it much more than we put in. Our own efforts are mightily amplified as they draw upon the great resources

of this world organization, not the least of which is  
the fine intelligence and tireless dedication of its Secretary-  
General, Dag Hammarskjold.

The UN, as I have said, can become even more effective as a  
force for peace. I have suggested some of the means to this end.

They require the cooperation, or at least the acquiescence, of  
the Soviet Union. Now, if ever, is the time when we have the best  
chance to obtain it. — *Press Mr K. — Test him — Try now!*

*But have a Program.*

T Taking the initiative is more difficult, more demanding, than  
brooding, paralyzed with fear, over our H-bombs. It requires a  
bold imagination -- for, while there is only one way of standing  
still, there are many ways of going forward. We shall rise to  
this great -- and perhaps final -- opportunity if we can recover that  
mighty momentum, recapture that spirit of high adventure, which  
have characterized our great nation in its finest hours.



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)