

*End May
Victor Butler*

Speech by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

UNITED AUTO WORKERS UN APPOINTMENT CONFERENCE

New York City -- January 27, 1963

71hr

It always warms my heart to speak to an audience made up of labor leaders and rank-and-file labor union members. When talking on the floor of the Senate, one rarely feels that more than a third of those present is on one's side of any given issue. When speaking to a labor audience, on the other hand, I sense an instinctive rapport. With people like you there is no need to mince words or to clothe one's innermost concern for the needs of humankind in decorative language.

The United Auto Workers, which counts a huge U.S. and Canadian membership, has always been at the forefront of the American labor movement in its concern for international peace and worldwide human betterment. The entire merged labor movement in

America has amply demonstrated its recognition of the
free trade union as a seedbed of democratic practice
in an increasingly industrialized, ^{and} ~~technocratized~~,
automated world. As a member of the International
Confederation of Free Trade Unions and as a driving
force in the International Metalworkers Federation,
the UAW has revealed its solidarity with the peaceful
democratic struggle of international labor. You
have helped to organize new unions in Asia, in Africa,
and in Latin America. You have helped to establish
and support union leadership schools in a number of
underdeveloped countries. I see from your Resolution
on International Solidarity--adopted last spring at
Atlantic City--that you have cooperated in an
intensive education and organization campaign in
more than 30 countries around the world. Your efforts

on behalf of these and other tasks, including your work for the all-important International Fair Labor Standard, deserves commendation and support from all of us. In the great confrontation between totalitarianism and freedom, the voice of international *Free* labor is going to be decisive. You and your leaders, understandably concerned as you are to find solutions for our domestic needs, have never ignored your obligations and opportunities on the international scene.

My good friend Walter Reuther is not only President of the UAW, he is also President of the Automotive Division of the International Metalworkers Federation. When he speaks of labor's interest in a peaceful world with social justice for all, his words deserve to be remembered and acted upon. Here is what he said almost two years ago at the Seventh

National Conference on World Disarmament and

Development in Washington:

It seems to me that we've got to get people to understand that the answer to the ultimate peace question is a world society in which we can get total disarmament, where the power of automation and the potential of our developing technology can be applied to the only wars that we can truly win--the war against poverty, the war against ignorance, the war against disease.

This philosophy--that we must concentrate our efforts on the war against tyranny, against poverty, against ignorance and against disease--this is the philosophy that some of us in Congress have been trying to get across year after year since the end of World War II. It is the theme of my remarks today. There is no need to establish a ^{study} special committee in order to determine that this simple thought ranks first among our national goals.

But What may not be so obvious are the vast implications

and ramifications of this thought when applied to specific challenges before our nation and the free world.

↳ The world, as organized labor knows so well, is in the throes of an unfinished revolution. I do not speak of the counter-revolution of Communist totalitarianism, but the democratic revolution that seeks greater freedom and greater opportunity for all mankind. In recent years we have seen the mounting fury of the revolution against the tyranny of autocratic government, against the lash of poverty, against the fear and prejudice of ignorance, and against the savagery of the exploitation of man by man. ↳ We in this country have been fortunate in having solved the worst of these scourges of humanity in the course of our relatively short history.

We fought our War of Independence; we fought and won our war against slavery; during the peaceful revolution of the twentieth century our workers and farmers succeeded, through democratic processes, in achieving a government responsive to their needs.

But our success -- and we can all think of ways in which our success is incomplete -- ~~could~~ ^{can} not guarantee us peace and security as long as evils ^{and troubles} ten times as virulent continued to stalk the earth and prey upon innocent men. We have learned that our unequalled military strength, essential as it is to the survival of freedom, cannot bridge the chasm between representative government and totalitarianism, between unparalleled wealth and hopeless poverty, between the ^{"have"} ~~status quo~~ society and the ["] have-not society.["]

We have had to realize that the competition between

the totalitarian forces and we of the free world cannot be measured solely in terms of military strength or gross national products. Each of these is only one factor subordinated to the all-inclusive contest between two views of the world--one dedicated to the quasi-military mobilization of society, the other to the maximum development of man's infinite capacity for good.

History indicates that our adversaries can achieve their goal only with the ultimate application of military force. History indicates just as conclusively that our goal will slip through our fingers if military power becomes the be-all and the end-all of our national effort.

Nikita Khrushchev, of course, tells his people every day that the Communist world is so strong that war is no longer necessary for worldwide triumph of *Communism*

communism. While his missiles and armies keep ~~the~~ ^{his} ~~the~~

what he calls "bloodthirsty imperialists" in check, the *idea* "idea"

ideas of communism will do their insidious work among

the workers and peasants of the world. *We won't dare*

to make war on them, and although they don't dare to

make war on us either, the ground will have been

prepared for the triumph of their ideas. This is, according to

Khrushch how our grandchildren will ^{all} be communists.

Khrushchev's doctrine of peaceful coexistence is a mixed blessing. On the one hand, we can be grateful to Khrushchev for recognizing the almost total destruction that nuclear war would bring to the civilized world. Khrushchev tells us that nuclear war would inevitably mean the end of the capitalist world, but at the same time he makes it unmistakably clear that the USSR and its satellites

would suffer unacceptable damage; indeed, he clearly implies that nuclear war would be suicide for both capitalism and communism. ~~From our standpoint~~
~~this is progress.~~ The Chinese Communists seem to have a ~~more sanguine and therefore~~ more irresponsible view of nuclear warfare--somehow they think it possible to survive its ravages--but theirs is at present the minority view in the doctrinal dispute that has ~~split~~ ^{split} the Communist bloc. ^{But,} Let there be no mistake about it: neither the Soviet Union nor Communist China is in fact reconciled to indefinite peaceful coexistence, ~~with capitalism in its present form.~~
~~form.~~ The differences between them boil down to a dispute--~~albeit~~ a highly significant dispute--over means. As President Kennedy said in his State of the Union message to Congress, China and the Soviet Union are arguing over the best way to bury us.

What ought to concern us here is that the Soviet Union professes confidence in its ability to change our system of values through means short of war. This ought to disturb anyone who has watched, as I have, the chronic shortcomings of the American economy under two administrations. Ours is a country with vast reserves of material and human resources, with an unequalled technology, with a history of leadership in education, with a highly developed social conscience. Even today we are not standing still--far from it. But what matters is that our growth rate is sputtering. *Sluggish* We are trying to accelerate on six of our eight cylinders. Other countries, with lightweight motors and chassis, are running at full capacity--although their total performance is less than ours. The communist countries, patched together

Barbed wire
with spare parts and ~~chewing gum~~ and belching diesel exhaust, are struggling upward against terrific odds. We are the shiny Lincoln Continental; the European countries individually may be Volkswagens, Renaults, Fiats, or Morris Minors; the USSR is a heavy Mack truck -- with no frills, no gleaming chrome or push-button windows, a minimum of comfort for the man who drives it, but the driver has limitless ambitions and a definite plan as to how to get where he wants to go. The challenge of the century is whether our Lincoln Continental way is going to prove superior to the narrow-minded doggedness of the Mack truck. Until now our society has tried to accommodate both vehicles, both concepts of progress; but, I ask, can it do so without discarding some of its happy-go-lucky, devil-may-care attitude in the

~~economic sphere?~~ How much longer are we going to assume that we can enjoy tax cuts without tax reforms?

How long can we tolerate an unemployment rate of 5 or 6 percent? What makes us think that corporations, our country clubs, can continue to break spending records while the needs of the public sector of American society continues to take second place?

In connection with these points, there are two significant quotes which I would like to share with you. The first is by Nikita Khrushchev, a man whose intelligence and willpower I ~~respect~~, ~~Khrushchev~~ DO NOT UNDERESTIMATE

has every successful dictator's ability of artfully mingling the big lie with a frank statement of his intent, as in the following passages of a speech which he made in Moscow two years ago:

Whereas in 1950 the Soviet Union produced less than 30 percent of the industrial output of the United States, it now produces roughly

60 percent. As shown by the calculations of economists, by 1965 the USSR will outstrip the United States in volume of production, and will outstrip the United States in per capita production by approximately 1970.

. . . The time is approaching when . . . capitalism will have been dealt a defeat in the decisive sphere of human activity--the sphere of material production.

The victory of the USSR in economic competition with the United States . . . will be the biggest turning point in history, will exert a still more powerful, revolutionizing influence on the workers movement all over the world. Then, even to the great skeptics, it will become clear that it is only socialism that provides everything necessary for the happy life of man, and they will make their choice in favor of socialism.

Khrushchev's performance to date has not measured up to his words, and there is no prospect of his timetable's being met. Nevertheless, it

would be the height of foolishness to assume that the overall Soviet plan of industrial advance is a matter of indifference to us. On the contrary, let us remember that we are in the grips of a contest which may extend for decades to come. The Soviet Union already has what in parliamentary terms might be called a "blocking third" in international affairs.

Soviet and American military power are comparable in that each deters the other from taking ill-considered military moves which might be interpreted as being aggressive. When one or the other miscalculates, as the Soviet Union did in Cuba, the balance is upset and a world crisis results.

We have a great deal to lose; the Communist powers continue to have a great deal to gain. If only we, too, had the fervent sense of mission which too many people in the world associate only with

~~communism~~. Under these circumstances, it is a sin for us to be content with the status quo while Khrushchev and his advisors are doing everything in their power to tip the balance in their favor. This is why President Kennedy was so wise to point out in his State of the Union address:

"I am convinced that the enactment this year of tax reduction and tax reform over-shadows all other domestic problems in this Congress. For we cannot lead for long the cause of peace and freedom if we ever cease to set the pace at home."

*Interdependence
Domestic
+
International*

What are some of the components of our domestic program if we are to rise to the challenge in a manner worthy of this great nation? The list is a long one, but it need not be discouraging in view of our resources and demonstrated skills.

- First, we must give every member of our working force the opportunity for full-time employment.

- Second, we must put our entire industrial plant to work at or near full capacity.
- Third, we must concentrate on jobs for unemployed youth just as surely as we seek jobs for their elders. (Youth Conservation Corps)
- We can no longer shirk our responsibility to give all our youth the schooling required to permit them to participate in and contribute to the highly specialized, highly technical society of the future.
- Intimately connected with each of these goals is the task of removing the last shackles of racial discrimination from ~~the South and Northern~~ ^{our nation} ~~Negro.~~ As North Carolina's Governor Sanford recently pointed out to the citizens of his State, equal opportunity for the Negro means better economic health for the whole community. He needs the full benefits of union membership. It is the only way of breaking a vicious circle that for too many years has impaired the vigor of our nation.
- ✓ Without a systematic, workable plan for the development and the exploitation of natural

resources (including parks and wilderness areas) we can have no confidence that the abundance of the present can be drawn upon in the future.

all important
~~Ladies and gentlemen, I fear that~~ we are living *at a time*
~~through~~ *must*
~~through one of the last periods~~ when we ~~can~~ concentrate

with almost equal force upon our staggering foreign,

military, and domestic problems. We have just gained

an historic victory in the Caribbean. A threat to

the very heartland of the United States was removed

through executive firmness backed up by our military

superiority. Thanks to the Cuban crisis, we now

have *Some indication* ~~reasonable assurance~~ that the Communist adver-

sary seeks a relaxation of the military contest.

Of course, he would like us to relax twice as much

as he relaxes -- which we are not about to do --

but the fact remains that Soviet pressure, for the

moment, on Berlin and on Cuba, is less intense than that 6 months or a year ago. There is also an air of cautious optimism around the nuclear test negotiations. None of these problems is solved and none is likely to be solved soon. But now is the time to consolidate our gains, to build the sinews of our national strength -- ~~and I am not speaking solely in terms of military hardware or manpower~~ -- while seizing the opportunities which may exist in the field of our international relations.

all A. Hacked

The labor movement has always recognized the urgency of disarmament. As Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, I would like to discuss this subject briefly from two points of view which are of interest to you. First, there is the problem

of the arms race as it affects the ~~small~~ underdeveloped countries. Second, there is the more hypothetical but no less urgent problem of the adjustment of the American economy to a disarmed world.

At a recent conference on arms control at the University of Michigan, one of the speakers pointed out that the \$120 billion spent annually on the war industry throughout the world is greater than the *Total* annual income of the poorer half of the world. This is a shocking waste of resources, the more so as none of the smaller, underdeveloped countries can buy with its military dollar more than passing security against another small neighbor. It certainly cannot buy security against large-scale aggression in the nuclear age.

What alternative is there for the underdeveloped country which wishes to avoid being drawn into the arms race, which wishes to devote its resources to the economic and spiritual welfare of its people?

I submit that part of the answer lies in the encouragement of arms control agreements in specific parts of the world. For over four years the major nuclear powers have attempted to bring nuclear weapons under control by negotiating first among themselves to ban nuclear testing, hopefully to be followed by other parties participating in whatever agreements are reached. This approach is only now on the threshold, perhaps, of bearing tangible fruit.

Regional

Nuclear
Test
Ban

A second, virtually untested way of controlling armaments is one of special agreements among countries in a particular region. It is not necessarily superior to the first approach, but the point is that

the path of regional arms control remains untrodden *- untrod -*
although in my view, ~~as I have stated repeatedly~~
it offers much promise.

Indeed I am disturbed that the regional arms
control approach has received so little attention
from our government, other governments, students of
arms control and the public at large. *It is high*

time to study the feasibility of regional arms
control agreements and following up on those lines
of approach which seem fruitful. With all due respect
for the contention that the policy of this adminis-
tration should be disarmament, not arms control,
we would be guilty of gross neglect if we were to
pursue the objective of worldwide disarmament while
ignoring the potential of arms control in a smaller
spectrum. We were certainly not deterred during the

We were certainly not deterred during the

19 fifties from concluding ~~a plethora of~~ regional

defense pacts in all areas of the world. With just

as much zeal we should pursue the goal of regional

arms control.

To my mind this is the only readily apparent remedy to the situation in which we find ourselves too often: that of trying to hold down a local arms race with one hand while helping to feed it with the other. The Middle East has been a notorious focal point of such ill-advised actions. I hardly need remind you that once arms have been supplied to a country it is never easy to stop the demand even if the need is no longer present or if there are other ways to meet it. Military assistance to one country means arousing the avarice of another. U.S. arms are sometimes used for the

wrong purposes: to suppress internal freedom or to
confer a special kind of prestige upon the recipient.

These are wrong uses. A regional agreement to limit
arms production and acquisition, to limit the size
of standing armies, to ban certain types of armaments--
this is one of the best conceivable means to cure an
illness which gnaws at the vitals of international
stability and progress.

Where do we start? For some time I have been
a staunch advocate of an arms control agreement to
which the whole of Latin America would subscribe.
During a recent visit to the Caribbean countries,
where the memory of the Cuban crisis seemed indelible,
many conversations convinced me that the overwhelming
majority of the governments and people of Latin
America do not want nuclear warheads and delivery

vehicles stored on their soil or readied for use in any other part of their continent. The conclusion is inescapable that the United States, in concert with its sister republics in this hemisphere, has a solemn obligation to encourage a hemisphere-wide agreement banning the manufacture, storage, testing, and combat use of nuclear arms and delivery systems in Latin America. I would hope that this type of agreement could be extended to the armies, navies, and air forces of these countries.

~~Needless to say,~~ ^Any agreement along these lines must be subject to adequate verification. This could be negotiated and supervised through the ~~agency of the~~ Organization of American States, a functioning regional consultative body which is fully capable of handling any such responsible task.

No one knows better than do the members of the UAW what are the problems that confront Latin America today. The current situation, in which smaller countries compete for military forces which are too large for their immediate needs and too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance, is deplorable.

There is an urgent need for the creation of sound and expanding economies as envisaged by the Alliance for Progress. Agricultural production alone must increase several times in order to feed a population growing at an unprecedented rate. The entire foreign exchange savings of a country can be eliminated overnight by a sudden drop in the price of a basic commodity, such as tin, coffee, copper, or bananas. The longer the list of problems, the more this observer is convinced that every penny spent for

*Rural
Educ
Human Resources*

offensive armaments detracts from the solution of critical economic and social tasks. What is needed is a total effort to cure the multiple ills afflicting Latin America and similar underdeveloped regions.

See

*Stop
Attacked
on
Cuba!*

Arms control seems to be a basic ingredient of the best medicine now available for a very sick patient. If the patient takes it and lives, then we may look forward to conquering the fatal diseases which have plagued mankind: the diseases of tyranny, war and poverty.

H

In the United States, the questions of disarmament and arms control raise different problems of implementation and adjustment. Yet in every study of the question thus far, there is convincing evidence that with proper planning, adjustments to arms control and disarmament present no insuperable difficulties. Why even Soviet spokesmen these days

are going so far as to say that recent studies published in the United States "prove that general and complete disarmament is feasible from the point of view of the American economy."

This statement is particularly interesting as coming from the representative of a totalitarian regime. Totalitarian regimes have never experienced voluntary disarmament. After both world wars the democracies disarmed but were quickly forced to rearm, ~~at a frenetic pace.~~ Totalitarian regimes, on the other hand, have never produced solely for peacetime consumption or peacetime construction.

Totalitarian
Regimes
never
disarm

The Soviet Union has always tried to build up its armed forces against real or imagined foes while neglecting or forcibly depressing the living standards of its people.

I myself have never subscribed to the notion
that our economy depends on defense spending or that
powerful groups in the economy oppose disarmament
because it would entail financial loss and unemployment;
nevertheless, I have detected an uneasiness in some

circles whenever these subject are mentioned.

With automation proceeding at a fast pace and causing dislocations among the unskilled and untrained, every lagging element of the economy has a harmful effect in the absence of prompt and effective corrective measures. Moreover, the United States defense establishment has now become so concentrated that some communities, areas, and companies are all too dependent on a continuation of defense contracts. Since I remain convinced that with proper planning by government, industry,

Panning

labor, and the communities involved, these adjustment problems can be met and solved, the time has come to remove whatever economic uneasiness remains.

X / Both the Executive and Legislative branches of our government have been derelict in not sitting down to study these problems in detail. With detailed studies and planning, I am confident that any doubts about our ability to adjust favorably can be shown to be groundless. We must overcome our reluctance to plan ahead.

One of the main reasons why studies of the economic adjustment to arms control are needed now is that some of the adjustments will require substantial innovations. Let me illustrate.

/ Many defense companies, even some with large defense contracts, are basically commercially oriented.

They grew up serving a market where the customer
was king and they are familiar with competition.

Under an arms control situation, these companies could be counted on to renew their concentration on the commercial market. They would undoubtedly get into new lines of products; expand abroad; increase production of regular commercial items in high demand. In the event of a substantial loss of military contracts, their main problem of adjustment would be that of making a smooth transition from defense to commercial projects. Their experience would be essentially a repetition of the adjustment which many companies underwent following the Korean War.

Many other defense companies, however, have had little or no experience with commercial sales.

Created almost solely to fill defense contracts,

they are not commercially oriented and their genius
has ^{been} ~~been~~ in amassing impressive intellectual talent
and resourcefulness to solve major technical and
developmental problems associated with the missile
and nuclear age. Such companies could not easily
be left to sink or swim in the free market place.

L In fact, the entire management of many of these
companies is geared to serving only one, or at
most a few, customers.

There are not many of these companies, but
their size is so great, I submit, that about the
fifteen largest of them receive some 45 percent of
the entire defense procurement, research and
development allocations of the government. In other
words, and I am using as my source information
collected from a recent study conducted by my

Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, about 15
companies did over 10 billion dollars worth of
defense work in 1959. Moreover, they did little or
no commercial business on the side. What solution
is called for in these circumstances?

If these companies are geared to serving only
a few customers, then a large part of the answer is
to create a few new customers to substitute for the
loss of defense work. Where might such customers
come from? In what fields of endeavor, other than
the commercial market, might these companies find a
welcome need for their talents? A few have occurred
to me, and we must find many more.

First, there is space. The space effort will
expand greatly in the coming years. Planets such
as Venus and Mars will enjoy far less privacy in

the years ahead than they enjoy today. Already there is keen competition between the civilian requirements for space exploration and the military demands for better, more reliable vehicles of destruction. Time will tell whether the unsatisfied demands of NASA, Telstar and the like will ever take precedence over the legitimate necessity for improved military space technology. But in any event there are too many unmet needs on earth to have all of these resources directed outside our atmosphere.

✓ A second area is atomic energy. Today, over seventeen years after the first nuclear explosions over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the then heralded peaceful applications of nuclear energy have still not proved economically feasible. Why has there been only N/S Savannah to date? One of the reasons

I would suggest, is that a concentrated effort to develop widespread peaceful uses for atomic energy has been a comparatively low priority. With the elimination of over-riding defense needs, the peaceful application of nuclear energy should rank high among the tasks to be assigned our defense-oriented industry.

h A third area is water. Not only the United States, but almost every country and region in the world has water problems. Floods wreak their destruction in some areas. There are water shortages in others. Elsewhere there are problems of pollution; there are recreation and power needs. Disputes over water have created grave political problems between nations.

h One thing we can be sure of: no matter what solutions are devised, there is going to be no panacea for the defense industry when arms control

is upon us. Uncle Sam, I am sure, will be most anxious to help those who help themselves. He will be less anxious to help those who act as though they regard themselves as wards of the government.

In conclusion, it is clear that we are in far greater need of planning, of devotion, intelligence, insight and realism than we are of material resources and techniques.

THE 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