

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

4-12-1957

### Foreign Policy

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Foreign Policy" (1957). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 118.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/118](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/118)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

FOREIGN POLICY

Address of Senator Mike Mansfield (D. Mont.)  
EXECUTIVES CLUB, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
12 Noon, Friday, April 12, 1957

I shall open my remarks today by violating a basic principle of effective public speaking. I shall remind you of a somewhat unpleasant matter. In three days your federal tax returns are due. It is still uncertain what Chicago's bill for income taxes will be in 1956. In 1955, however, it was about \$1.3 billion.

You may wish to contrast that total with the experience of this city a little more than a century ago. In the year 1834, all taxes levied on all citizens of the town of Chicago amounted to \$48.90. Lest the urge to return to the good old days grows <sup>irresistible</sup> irresistible, I hasten to add that while taxes were low, life in Chicago in those days was not without some minor inconveniences. It was not, for example, until ten years later, in 1843, that pigs were officially banned from the public streets.

But I have not come here today to collect your income taxes. A Senator's responsibilities involve many unusual assignments but tax collection is not yet included among them. I have been asked by constituents to stop grizzly bears from crossing the Canadian border. I have been asked to change the light bulbs in the federal building in Butte. I have even been asked to provide the correct answers for TV quiz programs.

And most frequently, I have been asked to "do something about taxes". The phrase - it is a phrase in very common usage in Washington these days - is subject to varying interpretation. When a constituent demands that a Senator

"do something about taxes" he may mean many things. I am convinced by a long experience in Congress, however, that there are two things he emphatically does not mean. He does not expect the Senator to raise taxes or to collect them.

I have opened my remarks on this matter of taxes because it relates very directly to the subject which we have under discussion today.

What we pay in federal taxes is of course determined by the budget. This year, the budget submitted by the President to Congress is the highest peace - time budget in our history. What are the really big items? First of all, there is the cost of present national defense, \$41.7 billion, almost 60 per cent of the total budget of \$71.8 billion. There is also a charge of \$4.3 billion for foreign aid. To a large extent this foreign aid is military assistance; it is also linked to our own national defense needs. Other major items in the budget stem from the still unpaid price of past wars. Our obligations to veterans of these wars, for example, will require about \$5 billion during the next fiscal year.

When we put these charges together we find that the preponderant cost of government and, hence, of the high tax rate, is closely associated with national defense, past, present, and future. The extent of the need for national defense, in turn, is tied to the state of our relations with other nations. And foreign policy is the principal mechanism which guides those relations. Foreign policy and taxes, in short are inseparably interwoven. If our foreign policy can move the international situation towards greater stability and security for all nations, the cost of national defense in time can come down and so too can the tax rate. If it is unable to do so, if instead world tensions and the danger of aggression increase, then the cost of national defense must inevitably increase and so too will taxes. The alternative is to toy with the future of the nation. I do not

believe there is a person in this room who would knowingly do that regardless of how onerous the tax burden may be.

Taxes, I am sure, constitute one reason for the growth in public and congressional interest in questions of foreign policy during recent years. There are others, beyond taxes. Scientific achievements at the University of Chicago and elsewhere a few years ago ushered us into a new era of human history. An effective foreign policy can help to make this new age, this age of nuclear power one of ever-widening horizons of progress for the people of the United States and for all mankind. An ineffective policy, however, opens up the possibility, not merely of vastly higher taxation, but of the sudden death of tens of millions of our citizens. It is not overstating the situation to say that an ineffective policy could act to bring about the end of recognizable civilization everywhere on earth.

These are not remote possibilities. These are the realities of the world in this second half of the 20th century. These are the facts which confront us today and will continue to confront us throughout all of the tomorrows that it is possible to foresee.

We need not fear these facts. We need fear only ignorance of them or indifference to them.

The principal method for dealing with these facts as they affect our national survival and interests is foreign policy. It is the first-line of defense of the nation. It is the one hope in this nuclear age of keeping the price of national security somewhere within the limits of our capacity to pay. And I might point out that in contrast to the cost of past wars, current defense and foreign aid, it takes less than \$250 million a year to run the Department of State, the agency

that is responsible for foreign policy.

Let me make clear that I do not mean to suggest that foreign policy is the answer to all the problems which confront us in the world. Foreign policy, no matter how effective, is not a panacea. It is not a cure-all for the ills of mankind. It is a highly imperfect world in which we live. Our foreign policy is a major factor, but only one factor, in determining what happens in it.

Recognition of the limits of foreign policy is not, however, an invitation to deprecate its importance. It is not a call to retreat into a citadel of isolation. No matter how thick the walls, that citadel will not insulate us against the powerful tides of the 20th century.

Recognition of the limits under which foreign policy operates, is a warning to use the great but not unlimited power of this nation with restraint, with economy and with perception, to safeguard the interests of all the people of the United States. It is, in short, an urgent reminder of our need to develop and to maintain the most effective policy possible.

There are no ready-made formulas for such a policy. An effective foreign policy cannot be pulled out of the magician's hat. It cannot be had for the wishing. It is possible, nevertheless, to detect the elements which must underlay a policy that will serve our national interests to best advantage.

One of these elements is an informed citizenry. In the last analysis, the people of the United States by their ballots, determine the broad direction of foreign policy. Sooner or later, foreign policy must reflect their basic sentiments. Unless it does so, it will rapidly become a rootless policy, a sterile policy. It will command neither support at home nor respect abroad.

That is why the people must have the facts on world affairs, as those facts affect the interests of the United States. The greater their knowledge and concern with these facts, the more effective will be the broad direction they give to foreign policy.

Foreign policy can be irresponsibly short-sighted or it can be concerned not only with the needs of the hour but with the long future of the nation. It can deal only with the immediate problems or it can take cognizance of the kind of world in which we want our children and our children's children to live out their lives. Foreign policy can focus on one problem such as communism or it can, as it should, put this problem in the context of the many problems which confront us abroad. Foreign policy can be penny wise and pound foolish or it can be as economical as possible, commensurate with our long-range national security. Foreign policy can be wavering and fearful or it can be consistent and courageous in keeping with the finest traditions of the nation. Ultimately, responsibility rests with the people of the United States to determine what form foreign policy shall take. That is why, I repeat, the people of the United States must have the facts.

Where are we to get them? The press and other media of communication of course perform a distinguished public service in this connection. So, too, do organizations such as yours and educational institutions which stimulate interest in foreign policy questions.

Most important, however, the people of this country have a right to expect the facts from their government. They have a right to expect honest information rather than smiling assurances that the government, like father, "knows best".

Those of you who may have teen-aged children, I am sure, have long since been disabused of that idea, even as I have been.

The point that I am trying to make is that the national administration whether it is a Republican or Democratic administration has an obligation to take the nation into its confidence in matters of foreign policy. It has an obligation to make clear the good and the bad in international situations, the successes and the failures of our policy. The people of this country are wise enough not to expect perfection in the conduct of foreign policy. They are also wise enough to discount foreign policy by cant.

Most of all, the administration in power has an obligation to spell out where it is that we are headed in foreign policy and what it is likely to cost to get there. This point brings me to the second element of an effective foreign policy. Just as we must have an informed citizenry we must also have clear and continuous leadership from the President.

Under our system of government, the system of separate powers, the President is not a dictator but neither can he be a figure-head, nor a mere agent of Congress. The President is an independent representative of all the people of the United States and his is the function of national leadership. Nowhere is this leadership more essential than in matters of foreign policy. The Vice-President, the Secretary of State and others can assist him in discharging this function. In the end, however, if the nation is to speak to other nations with an undivided voice, it must speak through the President. If we are to concentrate our national strength to meet the challenges which roll in upon us from abroad, it is the President who must serve as the focus of our national power.

The President can be neither a Republican nor a Democrat in foreign relations. He must be the President of all the people. All of us - Republicans and Democrats alike - gain if the President and his Secretary of State conduct our foreign policy well. All of us lose if they conduct it badly.

Mr. Eisenhower is in a unique position to give the nation the kind of national leadership we must have in foreign policy. In the first place, he is a Republican but his reputation was largely established under Democratic administrations. He is well-acquainted with the situation abroad and his stature is high throughout the world, even in the communist countries. His last election, in which he ran far ahead of his party, was a great personal tribute from the American people of both parties. He is not eligible for reelection and is therefore in an excellent position to keep the office of the Presidency out of politics in questions of foreign policy. He has, in short, an unparalleled opportunity to lead the nation towards greater security in a more stable and peaceful world.

This brings me to the third of the basic elements which is essential to an effective foreign policy. I refer to the role of Congress and particularly the role of the Senate of the United States.

The President has the responsibility for conducting foreign policy, but there are Constitutional limitations on his power in this respect. Under our system of government, he must have the cooperation of the Legislative Branch. The reason for this is obvious. It is Congress which provides the funds for the Defense Establishment, for the Department of State, for foreign aid and for numerous other purposes related to foreign relations. Beyond these



ordinary legislative functions, moreover, the Senate has a special Constitutional function. It is the function of advising and consenting in major matters of foreign relations. In recent years this function has been used with great vigor.

A case in point was the resolution passed a short time ago on the Middle East, the legal basis for the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine. You will recall that in that instance, the President sought special military and financial authority to deal with the crisis in the Middle East. The Senate gave the most careful attention to the request as indeed it should to any major foreign policy matter in which the President seeks Congressional cooperation. Before passage, however, the resolution was amended by the Senate in many important respects. What the Senate did by these amendments was to safeguard the constitutional power of Congress to declare war and at the same time it reaffirmed the President's power to command the armed forces. The Senate also made other changes, designed to prevent a misuse of public funds in the Middle East and to sustain the United Nations Emergency Forces which is trying to keep peace in that region.

If I may digress for a moment, I should like to say this about the United Nations and our relationship to that organization. The United Nations is what the member-states, including ourselves, wish it to be. It is no more, no less. To regard it as a supergovernment is to ignore the realities of the present world and to do a disservice to ourselves and to peace. To regard it as a body without any function in the relations among nations is equally a disservice to ourselves and to peace.

The United Nations is not a substitute for sound foreign policies on our part. It ought not to be made a scapegoat for inadequate policies of the Administration. If the United Nations is to serve our interests and the interests of other free nations it ought not to be assigned nor should it seek responsibilities which it is powerless to discharge. But when the United Nations does ~~make~~<sup>make</sup> a genuine contribution to the cause of peace among nations - as the United Nations Emergency Forces are doing in the Middle East - then by all means, in our own interests, the organization ought to have our full support.

Those UN forces are made up of the troops of several small nations. By maintaining the truce in the Middle East, they may well be the major factor in forestalling an outbreak of a third World War in that region. They are performing a great service to humanity and in this instance deserve the backing of this nation and the entire world.

If I may now return to the role of Congress, the point I wish to stress is that Congress must see eye to eye with the President on the main questions which confront us in foreign policy. If there are significant differences, they must be reconciled under the leadership of the President. Unless they are, policy will break down in dissension between the two branches of the government. We shall face the rest of the world, not as a united people, steadfast and perservering in direction, but as a divided nation halting and indecisive in purpose.

How are we to obtain this reconciliation of views between the President and the Congress in matters of foreign policy? A similar problem of course presents itself in domestic matters. In that connection, our government

operates largely on the principal of sponsorship of legislation by the President and his <sup>party</sup> part in Congress and responsible opposition from the other party. I suggest that this formula is inadequate in foreign policy matters, particularly when the opposition party happens to be a majority in Congress. That is the case now with the Democratic Party in control of both Houses. In this situation, something more is needed than Presidential proposition and responsible opposition. What is needed is active, "responsible cooperation" between both political parties and between the Executive and Legislative Branches of the government.

What this entails is first of all mutual restraint. Neither party can seek to make political capital out of foreign policy without grave risks to the safety of the nation. Responsible cooperation also entails close, frequent, and frank consultation between the President and the leadership of both parties in Congress. It entails the use of men of outstanding ability, regardless of party, in the State Department. It entails the acceptance by both parties of the supremacy of their national responsibilities over their party loyalties in dealing with matters which affect the safety and the well-being of the nation.

Let me make clear what responsible cooperation in foreign policy does not mean. It does not mean a pretended unity when none in fact exists. It does not mean a bipartisanship of silence when conscience urges us to speak out in questions of foreign relations. It does not mean blind and unquestioning Congressional acceptance of the dictates of the Executive Branch of the government.

Every member of Congress owes to his constituents an obligation to think for himself on matters of foreign policy no less than on other public questions.

By the same token, however, he has an obligation to place the national interest above party interest when the stake is the future of the nation itself.

To sum up, these three elements - an informed public, Presidential leadership and responsible cooperation between the President and Congress and between the parties - these three elements provide the foundation for an effective foreign policy.

What of the structure which rests on this foundation? What of the policy itself? A sound foundation is essential to a sound policy. It does not in itself guarantee such a policy.

Foreign policy results from the major decisions which the nation takes or fails to take with respect to situations abroad involving our interests. These decisions are or ought to be made ultimately by the President, largely on the advice of the Secretary of State. The wisdom of his decisions will determine whether foreign policy is more, or less effective, whether in the long run the cost of national security will be higher or lower, whether we shall move towards international peace and stability or towards international conflict and chaos.

The problem of decision in foreign policy does not differ greatly from the same problem in business or in the professions or even in our personal lives. In any given situation we are usually confronted with a number of possibilities. The doctor must decide whether or not to operate. The business man must decide whether to buy or sell. We weigh and assess the pertinent factors and then choose what we believe to be the best possible course of action.

This process of weighing the factors in foreign policy can be a very complex one. Let me illustrate just how complex by reference to the situation which confronts us now regarding Poland. As you know, the Polish government has a mission in Washington at the present time. The Polish government is headed by Communists. Yet the Poles are seeking aid from this country. If this were the only factor in the situation - a communist government seeking aid, the decision would be a simple one.

It is not, however, the only factor. Here are some others. The Republican Administration, for example, came to power in 1952 on a platform supporting liberation of the Eastern European satellite countries. How is this pledge to be fulfilled? By force of American arms? By words? By tears shed over martyrs to liberty as in the case of Hungary? Or are we to try some other method? Does the Polish request for aid offer any possibility for contributing to peaceful liberation? In this connection, we should note that Poland has recently moved into a more independent position with respect to the Soviet Union. Its capacity to maintain even that limited position of freedom may well depend on whether or not some measure of interim economic support can be obtained from the Western nations.

The aid the Polish mission seeks is largely in the form of loans to purchase agricultural surpluses from this country. I need hardly remind you that we have those surpluses in great abundance. If the Poles do not get food from us they have two alternatives - to turn back to a <sup>greater</sup> ~~great~~ dependency on Russia or to let their people starve. If they choose the latter we may be sure, moreover, that it is not likely to be the Polish Communists who will go hungry.

Further, all reports indicate that there has been some liberalization of political life inside Poland under the present Gomulka regime. The recent election was freer than any Poland has had since the war. The Gomulka regime has made peace with the Catholic Church in Poland - the church of the great majority of the Polish people.

And what of the broader implications of a decision on aid to Poland? What of the impact of the decision on other Eastern European countries - on the liberation of Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria? Any decision will certainly influence them either to draw the strings with the Soviet Union tighter or to seek to loosen them. What of its effect on a divided Germany? German unification, one of the critical questions of peace in Europe and in the world, is closely related to what happens in Poland.

There are other factors that I might mention which have to be considered in this seemingly simple decision of whether or not to provide aid to Poland. I think, however, that I have said enough to make clear that we cannot pose the issue simply in terms of "should we give aid to Communist Poland?" We might well rephrase the question in these terms: "Will aid to Poland contribute to international stability and security and hence serve our own national security? Apparently, the President believes that such might be the case, for the Polish aid-mission is in this country on his invitation.

I began my remarks on the subject of taxes and I should like to revert to that matter before concluding. I wish I could hold out the promise of a return to the good old days of a tax rate for Chicago of \$48,90, without of course restoring the right of way to the pigs in the city streets. I believe most of us, however, would be satisfied with a considerably higher

rate than that provided it were considerably lower than what we now have.

I believe further that we can have a lower tax rate. The key to significant reduction, as I have stressed throughout my remarks today, is a more effective foreign policy. And there are steps to that end which can and should be taken promptly. Here are a few. We need to restore and strengthen our relationships with democratic countries abroad on the basis of mutuality of interests and mutuality of sacrifice. Unless the free nations maintain their defense in common, each will pay an enormously increased price to try to maintain it alone and most may not be able to maintain it at all.

With respect to foreign aid, these programs are now under careful scrutiny in the Senate. From personal observations in many parts of the world, I am convinced that substantial savings can be made in foreign aid not only without detriment but with positive benefit to our interests and to the interests of other free nations.

There is a desperate need to streamline and coordinate the activities of the many governmental agencies which are now engaged in foreign activities. Not only is this diffusion of responsibility in itself wasteful of public funds, but it can also result in grave damage to our relations with other nations. The key factor here is to restore responsibility for foreign policy to where it belongs - to the President and his Secretary of State.

These are the first steps. They can lead, in time, to others. Most important, they can lead, in time, towards an effective foreign policy, a policy that will yield more security for the nation in a more peaceful world. That is the only kind of policy which will serve the interests of the people of the United States. That is the only kind of policy which is worthy of the people of the United States.