

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL SERVICE

~~from~~ Speech by

THE HONORABLE HUBERT HUMPHREY, SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA

I am pleased to be here to give you a word of thanks from an individual, a citizen, a public official. You know of my personal interest in the participant program which we call the people-to-people approach in our foreign relations. People are involved. To me this is, of course, the very heart and the very center of what should be our foreign relations.

The foreign policy of this country is not merely in the hands of the Executive, or the President, or the State Department. The foreign policy of this country is conditioned and modified time after time by the laws passed by the Congress, amendments added to AID bills - foreign aid bills - and also conditioned by the words of the members in Congress. We have one of the highest defense budgets of our history this year. It is needed for the kind of world in which we live. I must say that when you can pass a fifty billion dollar defense budget with scarcely a dissenting vote in the Senate, it indicates you don't have to do much lobbying on that here. But I would like to have you sit in on the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations, both of which I serve on, and see how difficult it is to get any money for training, how difficult it is to get money for community development, how difficult it is to get money for human resources. It is almost impossible. And I know why - because people have not been brought to understand that these are important.

Somehow or another we think that it is more important that country X has a steel plant, or that country X has a military mission.

Both have their importance. I do not want to be misunderstood. Country X can get a steel plant from the Soviet Union and it will work just as well as one that we build, and they can get a military mission from the Soviet Union, and it will work too. But they cannot get an expression or an experience of freedom from the Soviet Union. They can't really find out what it means to have voluntary action.

I believe that the greatest contribution the United States has to offer to the world is our pragmatic, down-to-earth practical experience in self-government, citizenship responsibility and voluntarism. No other country in the world has even approximated our achievements in that area. And yet, strange as it may seem, as we preach freedom throughout the world, we do not equip our agencies of government with the tools to do the job of extending freedom or helping build freedom -- the real freedom of political and personal expression and economic expression within the respective communities.

Sometimes, I believe as we talk to our friends who come to visit us, we need to remember that they really are not "foreigners." We are the victims of habit. They are really neighbors, a part of our total world community. We ought not to speak of them as "foreigners" because the word "foreign" has negative connotations. We ought to change the names of the committees of Congress. Instead of calling them Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs, we ought to call them International Relations and International Affairs Committees. Foreign relates to a period in American history which has passed. We never saw other people. We weren't really involved with them. There were oceans that separated us -- physically and intellectually.

But today nothing really separates us -- not a thing, except our own blind spots and our own attitudes. We need to demonstrate to people, as they come into our environment, into our neighborhoods and to our universities, what this experience in freedom as we know it really amounts to, without preaching it. Sometimes there needs to be just gentle, considerate, practical explanation.

For example, I have heard our own native citizens, as well as those who are our visitors, unfavorably compare the foreign aid program of the United States with the Soviet Union. What they fail to understand is that the foreign aid of the United States is only a small part of what the people of the United States, the communities of the United States, do in the field of foreign activities or international activities. Our Government is only a section, a part, of the total strength of this country.

Our Government has a responsibility to seek to coordinate, not to dominate -- to seek cooperation, not coercion; yes, to help design plans without dictation. This is a difficult assignment. Government needs to draw the big picture, and to leave room in that picture for many faces and many scenes. And those faces and those scenes will be the individuals, the voluntary groups. There are thousands and thousands of them in the total American picture.

People who visit us need to understand that the United States of America is not in Washington. There is a part of it here. It is a fact that a part of our Government is here, and only a part. Much of our Government is in the 50-State capitals and much more in 185 thousand self-governing jurisdictions of local government. The United States of America

can honestly claim to have the greatest expertise in the field of self-government of any people on the face of the earth. We have more practice there.

While we may lack some of the finesse required for international diplomacy, we know a great deal about group organization, community development, community organization. Everybody belongs to a dozen and one groups -- sometimes too many. A vast number of our people have had some experience in programming, in leadership, in organization, in persuasion, and action programs. This may be from a PTA to a political party. It may be from a little cooperative to a credit union to a powerful corporation. Or it may be from a social group, a local club to some great organization, like International Rotary. But millions of people in this country have experienced what we call citizenship participation, involving a community program or a set of social institutions in which and by which we live. This is something that people need to understand.

They need to understand that Congress doesn't lay down all the laws of behavior, that most of the law of America is the law of consensus, of community acceptance. When I was Mayor of Minneapolis, I used to talk to the police department about law enforcement and law observance. I said law enforcement, yes. A club, a gun, a badge, a union, the power of the state, yes. You can have enforcement. But what we seek is not just enforcement. What we seek in this community is observance of the law. Because when you have observance of the law, then it is a willing, voluntary expression on the part of citizens to cooperate with the standards that are

established and accepted in the community.

We need to try to get this over to people who come and share their time and experience with us. Because, mark my words, if this struggle in the world today is only a matter of who can establish discipline, who can lay down the order, we will come in second best. The totalitarian state knows a great deal more about the application of discipline, and the application of force. They know more about blind obedience than any free society.

What we ought to be encouraging other people to do is to develop those tactics and those attributes of personality and of citizenship that support community organization, community development -- self-discipline that promotes the observance of the standards of a community of order and of freedom and of progress. We have something to offer here. It's difficult -- you can't always write it out. It's like some of the things we experience in Congress, where each day it's something different.

You have to be pragmatic - yes, even expedient. You have to know how to deal with people. Human relations are the key to foreign relations. If we'd spend a little more time on the understanding of human relations we might have a better end-product of foreign relations.

We are trying to build the conditions in this world, or contribute to the building of the conditions, that are conducive to peace and freedom. As you already know, this is a difficult, long, and sometimes tedious task. We need patient perseverance in our efforts. We are going to live on the precipice of disaster from now until -- I don't know how many years -- the indefinite future. And people who do not have emotional stability -- that quality of calm nerve to take this kind of tension -- should get out of the

way and let other people get up closer into the front line. Because, make no mistake about it, the contest that we find ourselves in today is going to endure for years.

The question to keep uppermost in our mind is: Is the world changing to a pattern that we would like it to take from our experience in freedom, or is it changing into the mold that the totalitarian wants? And this sometimes is very difficult to judge, because the changes are so slight and so imperceptible, day by day, and year by year. You don't write history in one hour. A great historical event may take place in one hour or in one minute, but history is the report of decades and generations and centuries.

I believe that international training and education programs fit into the category of what we call "patient perseverance." This means trying slowly, but surely and constructively, to change patterns of human activity -- so that those patterns will tend toward a freer and a more progressive and humane society. At least that's my belief. Therefore, the participant program to me is a very worthwhile endeavor. It's one of the ways that we have of ensuring that countries which are slowly emerging from backwardness or attempting to overcome what seem to be almost insurmountable problems, will have the trained leadership to make slow but positive and constructive advance.

What I'm trying to say is that if you're expecting some dramatic improvement in the world, you're wrong. I don't think it's going to come. There is going to be many a cold winter, and many a dry summer, before we see the kind of world that we have dreamed about and hoped for. But so what!

This has been the case for thousands of years. It has only been in the last two to three hundred years that human beings as individuals have been looked upon with the degree of dignity and respect of which they are worthy. Great spiritual concepts have been applied politically, economically, and socially. Dignity of the individual -- this quality of soul and character and mind and spirit that we now talk about so freely -- has been politically embraced and has been given meaning only in the last three hundred years -- maybe four hundred. That's a very small period out of the total history of man.

It has been my view that long before any of the political problems of our world are settled, we will have to produce an environment in which mankind can be rational, rather than emotional, in which it can be constructive rather than destructive.

This is why, speaking for myself now only, I have encouraged the broadest exchange, for example, of scientists and of teachers, of engineers, of students -- yes, of common, ordinary citizens -- with people in other parts of the world, no matter what their political persuasion. If I had my way, I would have this Government announce today that we would readily accept every year 50,000 exchange students, if we could get that many from behind the so-called Iron Curtain. I'm not worried about what they'd do to this country, but I tell you I would like to study what this country could do to them in terms of their thinking.

I wouldn't say that it would make a great change at once, but the experience of freedom of inquiry on the part of any scholar from any part of the world is an experience that he will never forget -- even if he

won't admit it publicly. The opportunity to roam throughout a library and pick any book and read it without somebody looking over his shoulder, for any scholar no matter what part of the world he may come from, would be an amazing experience. Deep in the recesses of his heart and mind it would leave an indelible impression.

I should like to see the opportunity for people from abroad to come and see the controversy that rages in our local communities over many local issues, and how people can disagree politically and still be friends and speak to one another with respect -- which is one of the accomplishments of mature, representative government. I surely disagree with many of my colleagues: I have never been afraid that we would be overwhelmed by the ideology of totalitarianism if we had a free and open confrontation. Never! I have a lot of confidence in our system.

I believe that the exchange of doctors, scientists, professional people of all walks of life, of students, slowly but surely fractures the so-called monolithic structure. And, by the way, we may learn something too. We have no monopoly on scientific knowledge. These exchange programs are not just a benefit to the nationals who come here. We, too, can benefit. We learn a great deal from the men and women, from the exchange students, from the leaders of all walks of life who come to us. We are not being overly generous when we provide them with stipends or scholarships so that they can visit us. In fact, we find out that there are many faces in God's world and they don't all look alike. We also find out that there is a fermentation -- an intellectual fermentation -- in this world, and it isn't all here. We discover that other nations have a history and culture too.

We are beginning to learn that about Africa, for example. What we knew about Africa before was that it was an exotic area, where you could go on a safari, and there was little or nothing but just "natives." And we had a pretty low view of the natives. Now we are beginning to see that there is a great history amongst the peoples of Africa, that there are many peoples -- they are not all just "Africans," any more than we are just all "Americans." We have many facets to our American personality -- religious, cultural, educational, and sociological.

A nation that wishes to lead needs to do more than just read books about leadership, or take Dale Carnegie's course.

When the Communist leader goes around the world, first thing he demonstrates that he's a very astute politician. The first law of politics is to be able to count. Now I'm not talking about algebra or geometry -- just simple counting -- addition, and occasionally some subtraction. But addition! Some people get even to the point of division! That helps sometimes, too. But to be able to count is important. And the Communists have learned that there are more poor people in the developing countries than there are rich. They've learned that there are more hungry than there are well-fed. There are more illiterates than there are educated. And there are more sick than there are well. Now those are the naked, simple, fundamental political facts of the world.

And so what do we do? We know it. We preach it. We read it. We believe it. But we don't want to act that way. If we give them food, we say (up in Congress, I'm speaking of), "We're not giving them food, we're dumping our surpluses." Instead of saying that we're calling upon

the people of our land to produce the kind of food that is needed -- the proteins, for example, instead of cereal; instead of having a real program of helping to feed the hungry because we love people, because it's spiritually right, because it's morally right, we have a P.L. 480, a Food-for-Peace Program, that is explained by many people as just a way to get rid of surpluses.

There needs to be a climate of opinion in this country that recognizes that for years to come there will be privation, famine, and starvation in the world; that we have been blessed with an abundance and we ought to put it to work systematically instead of going around talking ourselves out of what we're really trying to do. Our people want to help. Our people are compassionate. This country gives more, it has more charitable activities than any country on the face of the earth. Except when it comes to the government, then the talk goes around that it's "evil." It's just wonderful for the family service groups to take care of needy families, but if the government starts to care -- a government of the people, by the people, for the people, a representative government, an elective government, then all of a sudden, it's evil! Bad! I don't agree at all. I think that since the Government is the image of the nation, is the reflection, the face, of the nation, it wouldn't be a bad idea to have the face look kindly, clean, bright-eyed, optimistic and hopeful.

We extend foreign aid and we really just simply say that the only reason we extend it is that it is good for us. I suppose that's the way we think we've got to get the votes in Congress. I don't think that's the way it ought to be. I don't think so. I think that ministers, teachers,

community leaders ought to be telling their congressmen that we have foreign aid not only because it's good for us, but because it helps build a better world, and that we're citizens of the world, and that we're going to have to live in this world for a long time. Very few people are going to get to the moon, or into outer space.

And let me tell you something else: we have the most progressive, the most liberal, the most radical economic system in the world, the most generous benefits for our workers, the finest housing for our people. We have the most enlightened management. And we have some of the most skilled, capable and competent workers that the world has ever known. All of these are community people. They are not divided up into some kind of a dogmatic doctrinaire organization. So what do we do? We go around the world trumpeting that we don't believe in a lot of these things that are actually going on here. We never project ourselves as the liberal, progressive, even radical economic society that we are. We let the Communists do that. And they're the most reactionary outfit you ever heard of.

What do the Communists talk about? The Communists say to the lesser developed nations, "You're poor. We were poor. Forty-five years ago we were weak. Today, we're the major power in the world." They say: "Look, 80% of our people were illiterate in 1920, 40 years later 95% are literate. We believe in literacy. We don't get up and argue about it in the supreme Soviet -- we believe in literacy."

Now what do we do? We have a literacy bill up in Congress, and we can't even pass it. We sure make ourselves look good. The Communists talk about human dignity, which they don't practice. They talk about a

people's republic. It's neither people nor republic. They've taken every good word we have, and they've made a mockery out of each one -- out of the whole lexicon of democracy.

They've identified themselves with the poor, the unwashed, the sick, and the illiterate. You know what we've done? In many instances, too often, we've identified ourselves with those in power who have frequently been the exploiters. We have been afraid to launch a mass movement against hunger. We were one of the last nations to really get behind the "Freedom from Hunger" campaign. Can you imagine that! And here is a nation that prides itself that every boy and girl can have an education. We ought to be known in the world not just as the nation that had the biggest atom tests. If that's necessary -- and I think it is -- it ought to be submerged in a whole galaxie of other news. We ought to be known as the nation that is fighting disease with everything at our command, instead of having a fight over Medicare. We ought to be known as the nation that's out to get education, not only for our own people, but for every boy and girl who wants to learn.

Our task is to try to put the real image of this nation before the world -- the real voice of America, the real spirit of the nation.

And who can do it better than you? You're just going to have to be a little firmer with some of us who represent you. That is one of your main tasks of international service.

P. atrow, Kelly: good HHH language/Bill

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Washington 25, D. C.

JUL 28 1962

Sp file: July 1962
JUL 27 1962
Washington
R

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey
United States Senate
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Senator:

Enclosed for your files is a clean copy of the edited version of your talk before the National Conference on the International Training Programs of A.I.D. down here recently. I will see that you get copies of the printed version of the conference proceedings as soon as they are available.

I thought you might get a chuckle out of the note which was attached to the transcribed speech. Mr. Rosen is right -- it really was a "Humphrey gem".

Sincerely,

Herbert J. Waters
Herbert J. Waters
Assistant Administrator
for Material Resources

Enclosures

(FOLD ON THIS LINE)

TO:				INITIALS	DATE
NAME OR TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ROOM NO.	BLDG.		
1. Mr. Robert I. Biren		A/PS	4915	NS	
2. Mr. Herbert J. Waters, AA/MR			4942	NS	
3.					
4.					
5.					

APPROVAL		PREPARE REPLY
COMMENT		SIGNATURE
NECESSARY ACTION		SEE ME
INVESTIGATE		AS REQUESTED
NOTE AND RETURN		FOR YOUR INFORMATION
INITIAL FOR CLEARANCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PER CONVERSATION

REMARKS OR ADDITIONAL ROUTING

Mr. Waters:

The attached has turned out to be a Humphrey gen. In sending the Senator this final version, we would appreciate your writing him a few words of thanks on behalf of all of us.

S. McK. R.

Attachment

FROM (Name or Organization)	ROOM NO.	DATE
S. McKee Rosen, PS/ITD	402 SA-1	
	PHONE NO.	
	7431	7/19/62

AID-5-50 (7-55) ROUTER

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1961 O-616149

MISC - 646 Signed to W.

SELF-DETERMINATION: WATCHWORD OF LIBERTY

Excerpts from Speech by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Award Dinner of the Washington Assembly of

Captive European Nations, July 18, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen: In proclaiming Captive
Nations Week this year, President Kennedy invited the
American people to "observe this week with appropriate
ceremonies and activities" and to "give renewed
devotion to the just aspirations of all people for
national independence and human liberty."

It is therefore fitting that all of us here
tonight--those who are citizens of the United States
by birth and those for whom the United States is a *new home*—a
refuge from the storms of exile--should reflect upon
the democratic ideals which we hold in common. We
are united through our love of liberty, our respect

for the individual, and our undying insistence upon
the triumph of justice in this imperfect world.

Of all the words expressing this spiritual
bond, perhaps none evokes such an unequivocal response
in the hearts of Americans as does the phrase,
"national self-determination." To us and to all
honest men, this simple concept sums up a whole
philosophy of democratic nationhood in an inter-
dependent world.

The American people know the meaning of
national self-determination. The two greatest
internal crises of our history sprang from the
conflicting claims of individual political entities
to determine their own institutions, associations,
and practices.

In our War of Independence, thirteen separate colonies

struggled for eight long years to rid themselves
of a rule which they considered foreign, arbitrary,
and ~~insupportable~~ *despotic*. Less than a century later
hundreds of thousands of Americans died to preserve
a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the
proposition that all men are created equal." Despite
the radically different characters of these wars,
each was a legitimate expression of the American
will to self-determination.

Some people, weighing only the cold facts of
history, will argue that the American experience is
contradictory and misleading. If it was all right
for the disgruntled colonists to sever their ties
with George III, they will ask, why should Lincoln
have opposed the secession of the Confederacy from
Union? How could a democratic state refuse the

right of secession and remain true to its ideals?

These arguments, I submit, ignore a basic lesson of American history, namely, that a body possessing all the attributes of nationhood has an inherent right both to win and to defend its separate national identity--to struggle for its rights against all external and internal enemies. Those patriots who stood for a United States of American were doubly strengthened by the fact that they also stood for a national dedicated to liberty and progress. Both the American Revolution and the American Civil War are rightly hailed as landmarks in man's continuing effort to secure the blessings of liberty and justice.

The right of self-determination, therefore, is not one that is idly or indiscriminately conferred.

But once justified through history, tradition, or through an international concensus, it is inalienable. This simple proposition, ladies and gentlemen, is something which the Communist powers have ignored or distorted ever since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.

Since World War II, many proud and historic nations have been deprived of the full national existence to which they are entitled. The ~~nine~~ Captive Nations of East and Central Europe, not to mention the divided peoples of Communist-dominated Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, have endured a virulent form of colonialism for which there is no parallel in world history. Acting on the pretext that a "friendly" neighbor must be a ^{so-called} "socialist" state, the Soviet Union has commandered the economies, foreign

Colonialism

relations, political institutions, and the armed
forces of its East and Central European satellites.
Virtually no aspect of these countries' internal
affairs has escaped the naked intervention of Soviet
Russia. Some delegations to the United Nations are
prone to argue that this is only the domination of
European over European, of white man over white man,
even of Slav over Slav. They say this is not true
colonialism. To me the man who beats his wife or
robs his brother is no more immune from prosecution
than is the ordinary criminal. In this ^{discipline of the law} ~~modern~~ day and age
he is even more contemptible.

Colonialism in any form--but particularly the
brutal colonialism of the Sino-Soviet axis--is a
vicious survival of ^{a cruel} ~~an anachronistic~~ system repugnant
to civilized man.

The contrast between Communist and Western practice is a glaring one. Since 1945, forty-one nations with a population of well over 800 million souls have won their independence (usually peacefully) from the Western colonial powers. In that same period the boundaries of the Communist empire have ~~reached~~ ^{moved} far beyond the borders of Imperial Russia; Communist rule now covers approximately 840 million human beings. Not even ^{the} ~~a~~ monumental events--such as the death of Stalin in 1953, or the revolutionary upheavals of 1956 in Hungary and Poland--could loosen the grip of the Red Army in East and Central Europe. The captive nations have struggled for centuries against the Turks, the Hohenzollerns, the Habsburgs and the Romanovs. They were used to both active and passive resistance in order to

defend their national, cultural, and religious
heritage. In the wake of the first World War, the
victorious powers explicitly recognized these
nations' right to ^{the} self-determination. As an American
I am proud that one of our greatest Presidents,
Woodrow Wilson, made the principle of self-
determination an enduring monument to his memory.

Unfortunately, the national boundaries of
Europe were not etched deeply enough upon the
consciences of the ^{World War} postwar dictators and the leaders
of democracy. Criminal violence was done to the
nations of East and Central Europe. Adolf Hitler
obtained a free hand from the shortsighted statesmen
of the West until they, too, realized the full extent
of his megalomania. Munich was enough to break the
spirit of any small country, even one as sturdy as

Czechoslovakia. Caught between the twin menace of Nazi Germany and Stalin's Russia, the East European regimes did not know where to turn for help; some countries foolishly concluded unholy pacts with the Nazi devil; others wavered between appeasement of the aggressors and pursuit of collective security. As a result of these mistakes, for which no country, East or West, was solely to blame and from which none was immune, the chance to present a timely united front to Hitler was lost. Stalin--not Hitler and not the Western Allies--became the arbiter of Eastern Europe's destiny.

Now only the memory of these painful prewar years remains. They are overshadowed by the fact of a dictatorship supported by bayonets and stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. The

Soviet colonial empire is worse than any other form of oppression which Eastern and Central Europe has suffered since the dawn of nationalism. The imperial dynasties of the nineteenth century may have suppressed nationalist stirrings, but they did not--and could not--transform the entire social and economic structure of the area. At the beginning of their postwar rule, the Soviets disguised their plans for total domination of each European country. Fake coalitions were formed with non-Communist parties. An appearance of normal democratic political life was briefly maintained. In Rumania the monarchy limped on until 1945. The fiction of the "People's Democracy" was advanced as a kind of sham alternative to complete identification with the Soviet Union--the implication being that in a People's Democracy

even the bourgeoisie had something to contribute.

But this so-called "creative" stage of East European Communism had short shrift. All outcroppings of independence--including the independence of a few local Communists--were quickly smashed by a jealous dictator who equated diversity with reason. Eastern Europe was subjugated to Stalinism. Politics dictated theory and were in turn subordinated to the personal whims of the autocrat. Eastern and Central Europe became a carbon copy of the Soviet Union; only lip service was paid to national sovereignty and to the fiction that each subdivision of Communism had the right to divorce itself from the Communist system. In each country the Soviet ambassador became the virtual ^{pro consul} satrap of Moscow, taking orders from Stalin and passing them on to national officials. In

country after country, the only state organ with any degree of independence was the secret police.

The honor roll of Eastern Europe's casualties during the Nazi and Soviet reign of terror should be indelibly written upon the consciousness of all free men. We must never forget the massive deportations and hideous losses of Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians in 1941 and after. Nazi atrocities and Soviet deportations together accounted for a 30 percent drop in the Polish population-- a higher percentage of loss than was suffered by any other combatant in World War II. The legitimate Polish regime was betrayed by the Soviet Union, and the great patriot Mikolajczyk (pron. Mik-o-ly-chick) barely escaped with his life from the Polish "Peoples' Republic" . We cannot forget the

Miko-ly-
chick

Communist rape of Czechoslovakia or the suicide of
Jan Masaryk. Among us tonight is a man who embodies
the freedom-loving spirit of democratic Hungary. My
good friend Ferenc Nagy (pron. ^{Nazh} FAIR-ents Nazh), leader
of the progressive Smallholders Party and the last
prime minister of free Hungary, was treacherously
deposed in 1947--an act which ushered in one of the
most oppressive periods in European history.

Every country has its martyrs and its
heroes. Bulgaria had its Nikola Petkov--executed
in 1947; Rumania and others had its trials of "war
criminals" and "alien class enemies." The lists
are endless; the injustices--irrevocable.

What probably concerns us most today, however,
is the fact that time has not significantly smoothed
the roughest features of Communist rule. To be sure,

the borders of the Communist Empire in Europe have
not advanced since 1947, and indeed (owing to
concessions in Austria and Finland) they have even
receded slightly. Nevertheless, despite the events
of 1956, despite the exodus of millions upon
millions of refugees, despite talk of "polycentrism"
and "many roads to socialism," policy for the Soviet
Bloc is still set in Moscow. Perhaps there has been
a degree of decentralization; perhaps life is more
bearable under Gomulka than it was under Bierut and
Stalin. But the fact remains that the Poles and
the Czechs would find it no easier to join the
European Common Market today than they found it to
join the Marshall Plan in 1947. That is why many
people look upon time as the enemy of liberation.
Many of us here tonight think that the most urgent

problem of the day is somehow to sustain the morale of the Captive Peoples, somehow to give them the hope of redemption ^{and} ~~if not of concrete~~, physical liberation.

No one has expressed this dilemma better than has George Kennan, now our ambassador to ~~Germany~~ Yugoslavia. Ambassador Kennan wrote in his Reith lectures of 1957, following the Polish and Hungarian upheavals:

If things go on as they are today, there will simply have to be some sort of adjustment on the part of the peoples of Eastern Europe, even if it is one that takes the form of general despair, apathy, demoralization and the deepest sort of disillusionment with the West. The failure of the recent popular uprisings to shake the Soviet military domination has now produced a state of bitter and dangerous despondency throughout large parts of Eastern Europe. If the taste or even the

but

hope for independence once dies out in the hearts of these peoples, then there will be no recovering it; then Moscow's victory will be complete. Eastern Europe will then be permanently lost to Europe proper and to the possibility of any normal participation in international life.

Ambassador Kennen at that time conceived of "no escape from this dilemma that would not involve the departure of Soviet troops from the satellite countries."

Bitter, ominous words--but wise in their considered judgment of the situation. Ambassador Kennan and others knew that it was false to offer the Captive Nations the hope of liberation either through military action or some kind of sudden diplomatic breakthrough. Our diplomats are only

too keenly aware that the confrontation of East and West is the gravest physical threat to mankind since the anthropoid ape evolved into homo sapiens. They know that the resolution of this conflict, however imperative it may appear, cannot be achieved overnight. They realize that there is little or no hope of progress in Europe as long as the present generation of Soviet rulers remains in power. American policymakers are convinced that the changing circumstances of the 1960's and 1970's will compel an adjustment of Soviet policy, but no one is so foolish ^{as} to predict when and how this change might come about.

The absolute certainty of change in our world leads me to think that time is perhaps not

the great enemy of national self-determination that we may imagine it to be. Surely there are few of us who believe that the status quo ante 1939 can be completely restored. It is inconceivable that every vestige of the Communist experiment can be made to disappear into thin air, any more than the Communists have been able to eliminate every feature of "bourgeois" institutions and cultures.

But if we have the courage to work for the gradual liberalization of Communist rule under the impact of modern reality, then I do not think that we shall be disappointed. This is not a naive prophecy. Obviously the United States cannot and will not accord the slightest degree of recognition to the status quo in Eastern Europe. We can never legitimize the territorial seizures of Stalin and

the Red Army. ~~On the other hand, the best~~ ^{One great} service we can perform for the captive nations is constantly to remind the world of their plight and to guard the frontiers of freedom against any further expansion of Communism. If we are determined to win the war of attrition against totalitarianism, and we are capable of winning it, then the Communist leadership will have no choice but to relax their rule or find themselves wallowing in the backwash of history.

In 1959 I proposed that the West adopt a CHARTER OF HOPE to ~~bring up~~ ^{lift} the spirits of the captive peoples. The principles I suggested then are as valid today as they were three years ago:

No East-West conference on Europe can be allowed to ignore the fate of the Captive European Nations. The same principle is true with regard to

the Far Eastern captive nations: Korea and South Vietnam.

At every opportunity the West must demand the withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from Eastern

Europe and the ~~belated~~ holding of free and democratic

elections.

— Self Determination our Banner!

At every opportunity the West ~~will~~ ^{must} expose the monstrous hypocrisy of Soviet colonialism,

namely, that the Soviet leaders who shed crocodile

tears over the remnants of Western colonialism

have subjected Eastern Europe to the most savage

and brutal colonialism the world has ever known.

The West ~~will~~ ^{must} stand by the unwritten assurance of its good faith and courage: it will never yield

in the face of terror; it will never bargain for

peace at the expense of a people's freedom; it will never yield to terror, submit to blackmail, or

compromise its democratic, humanitarian principles.

U.N.
Forum

U.N.

Power

The U.S. & Allies
At the same time the West has certain
logical obligations which cannot be
ignored and which if honestly received
should facilitate a relaxation of the
dangerous tensions in Europe. Foremost
among them is an absolute guarantee that
the Soviet people shall never again be the
victims of an unprovoked attack across
their Western borders. Secondly, although
we hope that the ^{Russian} ~~Soviet~~ people too shall
one day receive the right of self-determination,
the West will never associate itself with a
campaign aiming at the violent dismemberment
of the USSR. In my personal opinion, we

would be making a grave mistake if our hostility to Communism were to pass over into irrational Russophobia. Not only do we seek to regain ^{freedom for} the Captive Peoples for Europe, but we also hope to bring the Russian people back into the mainstream of Western civilization. This, I believe, is the thought behind President De Gaulle's stirring concept of a Europe stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals. If genuine peace is ever to come to the battered continent of Europe, then this wider conciliation -- though never at the expense of anyone's freedom -- must be our aim.

Western Alliance - Military Strength -
Strengthened free nations everywhere

- 23 -

✓ All of our hopes, of course, depend
upon the maintenance of world peace.

Liberation through nuclear warfare would

be a contradiction in terms. ~~It would be~~
~~criminal insanity.~~

Berlin

Of all the stumbling blocks to peace,
the most dangerous is the problem of Berlin.
Contrary to certain appearances, we are not
going to trade an orchard for an apple in
the heart of Europe. If the status of Berlin
is "abnormal" -- which it most certainly is --
the abnormalities can only be removed in
accordance with the acknowledged rights of
the Federal Republic of Germany and West Berlin.

This means no "free city" of West Berlin
and it means no "internationalization" of
West Berlin alone. When the Communists are
willing to talk about the city of Berlin as
East + West
a whole, then there may be some basis for
negotiations. Mr. Khrushchev must ^{come to} realize
that in Germany he has a bear by the tail.

He does not know how to let go without
either unleashing nuclear war or bringing
down his artificial empire. One thing is
clear: Berlin will not be another Munich.

The Allies will continue to use the air
corridors and highways in accordance with
wartime and postwar agreements. ~~We may not~~

~~be able to harass the Russians, but~~ we will stand
up without retreat to ^{Soviet} ~~their~~ harassment. ^{the Soviets} ~~They~~ must

learn that there can be no progress while this
harassment continues.

Another immensely important factor is that
Mr. Khrushchev is seriously overextended and he
knows it. Not only does he have to meet the
enormous and conflicting demands of his agriculture,
his space and military programs, and the need of
proper allocation of resources for economic
development; he also must find some rational
means of combatting the tremendous force of the
European Common Market, with its wider implications
for Western European unity and trans-Atlantic
interdependence. The Common Market is going to
present a greater challenge to Communism than did ^{The}

Soviet
Troubles!
|
Soviets
not
giants

postwar European Recovery Program. Already
Khrushchev has found it difficult, if not impossible,
to forge a united Communist front against the
un-Marxist vitality of the free world's economies.
His Comecon meeting in June was to all appearances
a failure; reportedly the Poles and to some extent
the Czechs and Hungarians resisted his proposals
for Soviet bloc economic integration. Judging by
the invective suddenly being ^{unleashed} ~~lavished~~ upon the
Common Market, Khrushchev fears that Western
economic growth will make a mockery of his utopian
20-year prosperity program.

~~Criticizing U.S. policies, many people
have said that it is foolish to rescue a hostile
and tyrannical regime through foreign aid. We
have seen this argument applied to the remote~~

~~Confidential~~

possibility of sending food to Communist China.

The argument was also used in the Senate with regard to our very limited aid to Communist Poland and Yugoslavia. Frankly, I cannot accept this point of view. Here in a nutshell is why.

In the first place I consider our aid to Poland and Yugoslavia--and any other Communist country which should choose to request aid--a heaven-sent opportunity to maintain contact with the Captive Peoples of Europe and Asia. Our sales of agricultural products must go to the people behind the Iron Curtain, who must learn that they have not been forgotten and consigned to political purgatory.

Secondly, any aid to Communist countries must not permit the bankrupt Communist leadership

to recoup its mistakes. It must not allow the Communists to divert their resources to other urgent economic demands which could not otherwise be met. Food, in my opinion, is an answer to the distress that comes about through natural causes, not through Communist mistakes. This is the way our agricultural assistance has been used in Poland and Yugoslavia, and this is how it should be used in China if the unlikely appeal for aid should ever be made. We cannot bring down a hostile regime through refusing its people the means of livelihood. The Germans intended to do this in occupied Soviet territory during the war, but they failed. Let us remember that in 1921, after three years of bitter civil war, the Russians emigres in the West responded immediately to cries for help when famine swept the

steppes of their native land. Perhaps they were unwise to help bail out the Communist overlords, but their thoughts were with the Russian people-- not with Lenin and Trotsky. We too have a duty to help people who are in need of it. Politico-strategic considerations must never overcome our basic humanity.

✓ A third consideration is that any contribution,
however slight, to the inherent disunity of the
Communist international system is in our interest.

✓ National Communist leaders are preferable to automatic
puppets of Moscow. Molotov is reported to have told
the Supreme Soviet in 1939 that the function of
diplomacy, as he understood it, was not to increase
the number of one's enemies. I agree with this reasoning,

and I disagree fundamentally with those who
demand complete surrender to the Free World
position at the United Nations, or who object
on principle to any aid given a Communist. This
view dangerously ignores the potential for
diversity within the Communist system, and it is
too sanguine about the extreme menace to us of a
solidified Communist Bloc. Undeniably the
diversity of national interests within the Bloc
is making itself felt as time goes on. Poland
is a relative oasis of liberalism within the
Soviet system and it has an unsettling effect upon
its less liberal neighbors. The same is true of
Yugoslavia, which has maintained its independence
and is unceasingly denounced by the Chinese ^{Communists} and
other militants as a "lackey of imperialism."

Naturally all aid to a Communist regime must be given with extreme caution and the way must be open for its withdrawal at any time. But it is so clearly in our national interest to continue giving the President the power to decide when such aid is called for that I cannot conceive of any rational objections to this policy. Everyone knows that Tito and Gomulka are Communists. No one can expect them, fervent nationalists that they are, to accept Western political dictation as the price of aid.

Whatever the case may be, our present policies should ^{must} give the inhabitants of East and Central Europe the best and most enduring reasons for hope.

We will never admit to their being inextricably embedded within the Communist system. We cannot

promise that they will achieve liberty completely or suddenly. But we are convinced that they together with the rest of mankind have a stake in a sensible reduction of world tensions. I cherish the faith that in my lifetime and yours the Captive European and Asian Nations will once more find themselves fully privileged members of the worldwide community of nations. President Kennedy's Declaration of Interdependence on July 4 should mean as much to them as it does to the non-Communist West. We shall never forsake them.

*Freedom, Self-determination,
Justice will win.*



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