

From the Office of:
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
1313 New Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.
Capitol 4-3121, Ext. 2424

FOR RELEASE: SUNDAY A.M.
MARCH 25, 1962

HUMPHREY SAYS U.S. WON RECENT
AND "TOUGHEST" ROUND WITH SOVIETS

HONOLULU, March 24 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) declared tonight that the United States has won the most recent "and the toughest" round with the Soviet Union in international affairs.

The Senator gave credit to President Kennedy and his Administration for "a new note of confidence in the conduct of our foreign policy."

"Despite tremendous pressures from the Soviet Union starting last summer," Humphrey said, "President Kennedy has strengthened our national defense, strengthened the UN, launched the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, sustained and strengthened our position throughout the world and continued his dedicated efforts for peace."

Humphrey spoke at a Fund Raising-Statehood Celebration here sponsored by the Hawaiian Democratic State Committee.

"Because of our readiness to defend our rights and the freedom of Berlin," he said, "the Kremlin backed down on its demand for an East German peace treaty by the end of 1962.

"And now -- thanks to our recent successes internationally, the Soviet Union is willing to consider U.S. proposals for cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space."

The Senator emphasized that a "new round of pressures and conflict" can begin at any time, and added:

"For that round tomorrow, or next week or next year, we will need a stronger and effective United Nations.

"The United Nations cannot continue as an effective instrument of peace unless the United States gives its full support including the purchase of U.N. Bonds."

Humphrey predicted Senate approval of the President's request for authorization to purchase up to \$100 million of the United Nations Bonds, and added a criticism of the move to replace the Bond Purchase with a direct, short term loan to the U.N.?

"The Bond Issue is economically sound; it has already been approved by the U.N. General Assembly and purchase by the United States would symbolize our nation's full support for the United Nations. None of those elements would be true for a short term loan."

Senator Humphrey also added that Hawaii and Minnesota's famous weather is not the only thing they have in common. Both these States supported President Kennedy in the 1960 election.

His confidence in the political wisdom of the people of Hawaii is that it is, indeed, a "New Frontier" State.

Hawaii should be known and recognized "for more than its physical beauty and the hospitality of its people."

"I want to see more citizens in other States fully realize the pioneering, New Frontier character and accomplishments of Hawaii."

"Your agricultural workers are among the highest paid in the Nation and the world".

He went on to add that our "school systems are improving constantly" and we are "properly seeking higher salaries for our teachers".

Further, he stated that Hawaii sets a "magnificent example to the Nation and the world as a state where civil rights and human rights are guaranteed to all citizens -- not just by law, but also -- and more importantly -- by the enlightened attitude of the people."

Senator Humphrey called Hawaii a "magnificent example of a people with a progressive and informed understanding and interest in foreign affairs" and suggested that the nation's government "enlist more citizens of Hawaii in its programs overseas -- particularly in the Far East."

He saluted the East-West Center for its "cultural exchange" as a "brilliant and magnificent step for international understanding."

The Senator from Minnesota stated that "Hawaii can claim great credit for two other great 'New Fronter' steps -- sending Oren Long and Daniel Inouye to Washington."

He called Senator Long a "statesman, and his work in Washington and in the Senate has brought credit to the people of Hawaii." He regrets Senator Long's leaving the Senate but Senator Humphrey and "all of the leaders of the New Frontier are tremendously grateful that Dan Inouye will be the next United States Senator from Hawaii."

###

33 Dems in House (33 out of 100)
11 Dems in Senate (11 out of 25)

Excerpts of Remarks By
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Fund-Raising Statehood Celebration Dinner
(Hawaii Democratic Committee)

Honolulu, Hawaii
March 24, 1962

Dyoshi Nago
Sen. Yoshi Nago
Maui
Mahi Uel

I want all of you to know how honored
and pleased I am to be with you tonight.

This dinner gives me a chance to
thank you for the warm and natural
hospitality you have extended to Mrs. Humphrey
and me during our stay here.

Let me reciprocate with an invitation
to you -- although I cannot imagine anyone
who would be willing to leave this lovely
State of Hawaii even briefly.

I invite you to visit my home state
of Minnesota.

Like Hawaii, Minnesota is famous for
its weather. If any of you had visited my
State during the past few months, you would
have been greeted by 20 degree below zero
temperatures and 20 foot high snow banks.

But don't let me frighten you. Those
Minnesota winters are invigorating and
healthy. They keep a person active and on
the move. In fact, if you don't keep
moving, there is a chance your shoes will
freeze to the ground.

Famous weather is not the only thing

~~Hawaii and Minnesota have in common.~~

I am pleased to remind you that both States supported President Kennedy in the 1960 election by overwhelming margins.

*Man to
Hawaii
1960
Kennedy*

And we will do it again in 1964 -- by even bigger margins.

One reason for my confidence in the political wisdom of the people of Hawaii is that this is, indeed, a "New Frontier" State.

*new
Frontier
State*

I do not refer only to your far-west geographical position, or to your status as the newest State.

Hawaii should be known and recognized

for far more than for those two basic

facts. ^{and,} The State of Hawaii should be

saluted throughout the Nation for more

than its physical beauty and the hospitality

of its people. — Wonderful.

↳ I want to see more citizens in other
States fully realize the pioneering, New
Frontier character and accomplishments of
Hawaii.

Pioneering
New Frontier
Character

↳ Your agricultural workers are among
the highest paid in the Nation and the
world, and -- to my knowledge -- are the
only agricultural workers covered by
unemployment compensation.

You moved long ago to develop progressive
welfare programs based on rehabilitation
instead of relief.

Welfa

✓ Your school systems are improving
constantly, and you are properly seeking
higher salaries for your excellent teachers.

Schools

You stand as a magnificent example to the Nation and the world as a state where civil rights and human rights are guaranteed to all citizens -- not just by law, but also -- and more importantly -- by the enlightened attitude of your people.

You live daily by your State's motto:

"The life of the land is perpetuated in

righteousness."

And Hawaii is a magnificent example of
a people with a progressive and informed
understanding and interest in foreign affairs.
I might add that our nation's government would
do well to enlist more citizens of Hawaii in
its programs overseas -- particularly in the
Far East.

Your new East-West Center for cultural
exchange is a brilliant and magnificent step
for international understanding. I commend
you for it, and join your hopes that it will
be expanded and that its example will be
used elsewhere.

East
West
Center

Jack Byrne,
Delegate

L Hawaii can claim great credit for two
other great "New Frontier" steps -- sending
Oren Long and Daniel Inouye to Washington.

Senator Long is an effective and highly
respected member of Congress. He is -- in
the best sense of the word -- a statesman,
and his work in Washington and in the Senate
has brought credit to the people of Hawaii.

L My regrets that he is leaving the
Senate are strong, but he and I and all of
the leaders of the New Frontier are
tremendously grateful that Dan Inouye will
be the next United States Senator from Hawaii.

L It is not wise in politics to acknowledge

the mere existence of an opponent, but I
must break that rule briefly now. I
understand that the famous public relations
firm of Whitaker and Baxter of California
has contracted to handle the campaign of
Dan Inouye's opponent.

I suggest, immodestly, that there is
another team -- on Dan Inouye's side --

which will be far more effective. It's

Kennedy ^{and Johnson - Humphrey too} ~~Humphrey~~.

^{Inouye}
Congressman ~~Inouye~~ does not need a

high-powered, highly paid public relations
firm, however. His record has more than

enough power in it to carry him to victory.

There is power in his record and
background as a native Hawaiian.

There is power in his magnificent
record as a highly-decorated veteran of
the U.S. Army in World War II.

There is power in his record of service
to his community and to his State of Hawaii.

And there is power for victory in his
record of responsible effectiveness and
influence in the United States Congress.

I think that kind of power is worth
far more than thousands of billboards and
other advertisements contrived by an out-
of-state public relations firm. And I am

confident the people of Hawaii will agree --

In 60 way
and send Daniel K. Inouye to the United States

Senate.

*yes 2 Congressmen
Govt Statistic*

✓ We need men like Dan Inouye in the Senate. Today more than ever we must continue and strengthen our advances in foreign affairs.

✓ No one should realize more clearly than you the new note of confidence in our foreign affairs. ^{President} ~~The~~ Kennedy

~~Administration~~ acts where action is necessary, and is constantly alert to the critical needs of the moment. He knows as much about each foreign problem as does the person briefing him. But even though the President knows what he wants to do, he is open

over /

We need to stgth new frontier -

In States + at Washington -

① Welfare Moved - Domestic - GAAP - Unemploy Comp
Reduce Unempl, Agro Income up!
Housing, minimum wage, Area Reduced

But in Foreign Affairs + Nat Sec

"never Afraid to negotiate, but not neg from Fear"

(1) Foreign Aid - Longterm Reorg

(2) Food For Peace Alliance

(3) Peace Corps Progress

(4) Disarm Agency

(5) Improve Diplomacy

(6) Stgth our Defense

(7) Alliance for Progress

Soviet Problems!

② Berlin Crisis - stgth, get negotiate

③ Nuclear test Soviet -

④ U.N. - Saved stgth Bonds!! U.N.

new Geneva

Outer Space

⑤ Soviet Problems - change food

Cultural Contacts

We are winning East West Center

to advice. He is a receptive, imaginative,
and determined President.

Our country's manifold involvements
around the world are in secure hands. I
think the whole country realizes that our
foreign problems are being tackled with
confidence and vigor. This is a welcome
change from the uncertainty of the past.

It doesn't solve our problems, but it
provides a way to solve them.

Almost 20 years ago this lovely
island was the victim of one of the most
infamous ^{surprise} ~~sneak~~ attacks in history. The
difference between December 7th, 1941,

and today is that not only Hawaii but our

whole nation is vulnerable to surprise

attack. We have to be alert -- as we

were not alert in 1941-to this danger. It

is essential for us to maintain our defenses

at a level capable of repelling aggression.

That is one of the keystones of the President's

policy today.

Over the past 6 or 8 months this country has lived under the daily threat of nuclear war. Last June the President came back from a meeting with Khrushchev, in Vienna. He was in a "somber" mood, as he frankly admitted to the whole country. Since then we have been

under tremendous pressure from the ^{Soviet} ~~Russians~~.

Khrushchev, confident of the alleged superiority of the "Socialist Camp," attempted to press our backs to the wall. In this case he had to build the wall himself -- the prison wall separating East and West Berlin. But under maximum pressure and intolerable provocation, we stood firm. We showed we were ready to fight in Berlin -- to fight for our rights of access and for the right of West Berliners to remain in the free community of the West.

This was an effective lesson for Mr. Khrushchev. As early as the 22nd Communist Party Congress in Moscow, he showed that he

was going to back down from his outrageous demand of a peace treaty with East Germany by the end of the year. When he saw we were ready to meet force with force, he retreated. Yet the mere fact that things had gone to such a pitch, that only a few tanks stood between us and nuclear holocaust, was proof of the tightrope the world walks. Therefore, the President has worked for peace as hard as he is working to build up our military defenses.

 < Indeed, national defense and efforts toward peace are two sides of the same coin --
 our total national security. In today's

world, one is valueless without the other.

As proof of this, the President and

Secretary of State Rusk even at the

worst moments of the Berlin crisis tried

to engage the Russians in meaningful

negotiations. In the midst of the Berlin

crisis, on September 25th, President Kennedy

had the vision and the courage to tell the

United Nations General Assembly that the

nations of the world should substitute the

crippling arms race for a "peace race."

That challenge remains.

Take another example. At almost the very moment that Soviet and American tanks

were muzzle to muzzle in Berlin, President Kennedy seized an excellent opportunity to get his views across to the Russian people. He held an interview with Mr. Adzhubei, editor of the Soviet government newspaper Izvestia. He told the Soviet people things they had never heard directly from a President of the United States. He said in effect that the United States would never commit aggression against the Soviet Union, that the United States was determined to remove any danger to world peace from a rearmed Germany, that the United States recognized the Soviet Union's ageold desire to safeguard its Eastern

frontiers. This message had a profound impact, even though the Soviet press and propaganda organ did their best to contradict the President's assertions.

These are only a few examples of the new, confident tone of our foreign policy. At the moment, the military pressures on us seem to have relaxed. The Russians are still committing flagrant violations of the 4-power accord in Berlin, but there are signs that they have learned the rights of the United States cannot be tampered with. Secretary Rusk has given them this message in no uncertain terms at Geneva. As a

result the more blatant violations in the Berlin air corridors seem to have tapered off. Also, the actual discussions at Geneva at least started in an atmosphere of unexpected harmony.

It is a sad commentary of our times that the most hopeful signs we can see in international relations is civilized behavior at the conference table. But when the Russians draw in their horns then it is indeed a hopeful sign.

When I left Washington, the most encouraging news I had heard in days was a radio report from TASS that Khrushchev had

Kennedy
accepted the President's recent 5-point

proposal for US-Soviet cooperation in

the peaceful uses of outer space. The

Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, of

which I am chairman, has long advocated

international cooperation in outer space,

We made such recommendations in 1956 and

1957. Last year I submitted resolutions

in the Congress to direct our representatives

at the United Nations to promote a program

of international cooperation in outer space

exploration and research. I made similar

recommendations at a conference of experts

in the field of disarmament and arms control

in Switzerland.

Only in this last year has significant progress been made in this all-important area. After months of obstruction, the Russians have finally agreed to the conditions under which they would participate in the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. Then, when Colonel John Glenn made his ^{three} epoch-making orbits around the earth, Khrushchev at long last showed interest in the possibilities of outer space cooperation. President Kennedy, who as I have said, is alert to any means of easing tension in the world, immediately took up Khrushchev's proposal and

in turn offered a 5-point plan of his own.

~~I might say that~~ this offer was not made

out of weakness. ~~As President Kennedy~~

~~himself said, what it probably means is~~

~~that we now have a few more chips on the~~

~~table than we had before.~~ We can talk

with Khrushchev about outer space on terms

of equality.

In brief, the President proposes US-Soviet cooperation in establishing an early operational weather satellite system, in setting up radio tracking services, in measuring precisely the earth's magnetic field, in getting down to specifics on an

intercontinental satellite communication system,
and in pooling the unique knowledge of both
countries in the field of space medicine.

Of course, such cooperation would be on
secondary features of either country's space
program. The President did not suggest that
Astronauts Glenn, Titov, and Gagarin should
sit together in the same moon rocket,
^u
squeezing ham and eggs and beef stroganoff
out of the same toothpaste tube. But it marks
an important beginning. If such cooperation
develops, it will be a real breakthrough --
the first breakthrough in fact since Khrushchev's
visit to the United States in 1959. I hope

it will turn out better than did that so-called mission of reconciliation.

On March 20th, the Soviet Union promised it would give full cooperation to the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The Soviet representative, Mr. Morozov, emphasized that Soviet space scientists are already working with a number of international organizations and will continue to do so. The mere fact of such cooperation is a sign of the progress we have made since the Korean War. It shows that the Soviet Union realizes it won't get anywhere by absenting itself from work that is considered vital by all other members of

the United Nations.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you how much I value the work of the United Nations in carrying forward this vital work for mankind. At the moment, back on Capitol Hill, we are engaged in an effort to save the President's program to buy up to \$100 million dollars worth of United Nations bonds. There is tremendous support for the United Nations throughout the country, but at the same time a vocal minority is peppering representatives in Congress with arguments against the bond issue. The bond issue is the best means available of erasing UN

indebtedness arising out of its vital peace-keeping operations in the Congo and Middle East. At the same time, it is the cheapest method of doing this. It not only gives the United Nations a financial cushion in which to work out sounder fiscal methods in the future, but it spreads the load among all UN members. It asserts the principle of collective responsibility for UN undertakings. This is a matter of extreme importance to us. It saves us in large measure from remaining the sugar-daddy of the world.

One of the ways it does this is by making sure that our contribution to the interest

and principle payments on the bonds is no more than 32.02 percent -- that is, our regular share of the UN budget. Up to now, our contributions to the Congo and the Middle East operations have amounted to nearly 50 percent and there was every prospect that this percentage would rise if the old pay-as-you-go methods were continued.

Some members of the Senate have come up with a 3-year loan proposal which would earn us interest of 3 percent. The UN bond issue would bring in 2 percent interest. On the face of it, the loan looks like a good bargain, but I assure you it is not. It would ruin the

collective responsibility of which I was speaking. It would be a throwback to our old practices of handing over whatever the United Nations needed. Above all, it costs a good deal more than the bond issue would cost us in the long run. And the United Nations would hardly go along with paying us one-third more interest than would be paid under the bond proposal. The loan would be a slap in the face of the United Nations. There is every likelihood that the UN would reject the loan proposal and that it might well go into bankruptcy because its peace-and-security operation could not be

financed. I do not want to see this come about. I do not want to see the death of the United Nations or to have the death of the United Nations on my conscience. I am going to do everything in my power to see that the bond issue is approved.

There is today a controversy over the true value of the United Nations to this country. I am in no doubt that the UN is working for our goals, and not in the interest of the Soviet Union. We stymied the Soviet scheme for a troika. We elected a new, independent, forceful Secretary General. And we prevented Red China from shooting its way into the United Nations.

Much of the credit goes to the neutrals, who have shown that in almost every way they are closer to Lincoln than to Lenin. The neutrals vote according to their own interests. They are not a solid united bloc in opposition to the West. Judging by our success in the last General Assembly session, the United States is far more in tune with the genuine aspirations of mankind than is the Soviet Union.

One of my colleagues, Senator Henry Jackson of Washington, recently said some rather critical things about the United Nations. He said that the United States

attaches too much importance to the United Nations, that we have been unduly influenced by UN considerations, that too much time is spent scurrying around the UN lobbies rounding up votes, that entirely too much talk goes on in the United Nations and so forth. Senator Jackson does not believe that the best hope for peace with justice lies in the United Nations. On the contrary, he believes that our best hope for peace lies with the "power and unity of the Atlantic community and on the skill of our direct diplomacy."

Ladies and gentlemen, I naturally agree with Senator Jackson that the Atlantic community and our traditional diplomatic methods are

indispensable elements of our foreign relations.

But I don't believe that we have placed undue reliance upon the United Nations. Indeed, I believe that sometimes we have neglected opportunities in the United Nations. I believe that the exercise of democratic practices in the United Nations -- whether in the lobbies or on the floor of the General Assembly or in the Security Council is vital to the development of an international community. Senator Jackson is taking a strange time to criticize the United Nations -- just after it has shown how effectively it works in our interests. I know there are others who believe that instead of strengthening

the UN we should concentrate upon Europe, upon NATO, that we should not offend NATO for the alledged purpose of currying favor with the non-alliance countries. In my opinion, they are taking the easy way out. The very future of the world depends upon the economic viability and the political independence of the neutral and non-aligned nations. We neglect them at our peril. If we do not show sympathy with them, the Soviet Union will. In the long run the results will be disastrous to us and to Western democracy. Where Europe is wrong in its relations with these countries, I think we should say so.

Where the opposite is true, we must be equally forthright.

For all these reasons, I put great stress on the value of cultural exchanges in today's world. Cultural exchanges are indirectly a weapon in our diplomatic arsenal. But this is not the direct diplomacy of which Senator Jackson speaks. Rather, it is indirect. It is low pressure. It is the soft sell.

The most valuable exchanges, in my opinion, are what have been called "functional exchanges." Functional exchanges involve mutual contact in the fields of health, technical assistance, agricultural knowledge and assistance, science and research, athletics, music, and so on. Now

our cultural contacts are well established in Western Europe and other countries which are friendly to us or aligned with us. With them we can be entirely informal. Our agencies can make private arrangements with their opera houses, their museums, etc. But as far as the neutrals and the Soviet Bloc countries are concerned, the promotion of cultural exchange must often be on a government-to-government level. As far as the neutrals are concerned, we put the emphasis on helping them cope with their own problems rather than enlisting them as allies in the cold war. We want to improve their health conditions, their standard of

living, their whole economies. They must be given an opportunity to concentrate on their own problems, not become involved in ours.

Our cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union serve a different purpose. They are a bridge between us and the Soviet people. They are the only means at present of getting around the official xenophobia of the Kremlin. And our modest efforts in this respect are succeeding. Soviet youth has become increasingly "corrupted" by the evil influences of the West -- in dress, tastes, and to some degree, in thought. This is our way of prying open the tightly closed society of the Soviet Union. Someday it might be reflected on the political level. There are in

fact signs that younger, more practical and realistic officials are coming to the fore in the Communist party and in the Soviet government. We have no right to exaggerate the meaning of this development, but we should do all in our power to encourage it.

The total picture I have drawn is neither optimistic nor pessimistic. But it is, I believe, hopeful and pragmatic. Khrushchev's problems at home and abroad are sometimes far greater than we imagine. The Kremlin is not going to scuttle us according to some master-plan of subversion and external defeat. Our task is to remain alert to both the dangers and the opportunities in the world today.

(END)



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