

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

10-25-1957

America's Role in World Affairs

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "America's Role in World Affairs" (1957). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 257.

https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/257

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.

File Copy

AMERICA'S ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Address of Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana
Central District Montana Education Association Convention
Great Falls, Montana
Friday, October 25, 1957

I have been in Great Falls three times this year. I have spoken three times. And three times some aspect of foreign policy has been the subject of my remarks. Some of you may recall the commencement at the College of Great Falls last May at which I discussed questions involved in "A Foreign Policy for Peace". In August, the subject to which I addressed myself at the Conference of the State Press Association was "A Time For Decision in Foreign Policy". Today, I shall consider with you educators "America's Role In World Affairs".

I have turned frequently during the past few years to the theme of foreign relations in public statements not only in Great Falls but elsewhere in the state and nation. I have done so, not so much as a matter of personal choice but because of the interest of the people who were kind enough to invite me to meet with them. This interest, as I am sure you are aware, is more than simple or casual curiosity. It is a measure of the significance which foreign relations has attained in the affairs of the nation. It is an indicator of the deep concern with which citizens view the international situation and its implications for them

and their children.

Judging by the issues before the Senate during the past session I can attest to the fact that this public concern is well-directed. Matters other than foreign relations, of course, absorb a great deal of the energies of the Federal Government, matters which cannot and must not be ignored. During the current session, for example, the Senate had under close consideration such questions as civil rights, education, drought relief, agricultural surpluses, power, flood control and irrigation for the Northwest and other parts of the nation. A great deal more work also went on in Senate Committees on issues like the high cost of living, inflation, taxes and better roads and communications, much of which may find expression in legislation during the second session of the present Congress. Within each Senator's office, moreover, there were problems of particular concern to his state. In the case of ours these involved the serious decline in copper, manganese, tungsten, lead and zinc prices with consequent unemployment in the mining industry and questions like the loss of a coal contract with the Atomic Energy Commission at Roundup or the financing of the Benton Lake Wildlife Refuge.

All of these and countless other domestic problems affect the interests of the state. Many of them have a deep and personal meaning for the people of Montana. Because they do they must have the continuing attention of the State's Congressional Delegation. Yet are these problems any closer to us, any more important, than a military appropriation of \$33.7 billion which Congress also voted this year? The size of this appropriation, which amounts to about \$700

for each household or about \$200 for every man, woman and child in the United States in the coming year, has a direct relation to world affairs and foreign policy. It is paid for in taxes out of your pockets. That is, it seems to me, of very direct concern to the people of this state and every state. Are domestic issues any closer, any more important, than the danger of a nuclear war of annihilation from which the people of Montana would have no greater immunity than those of any other state?

Is it any wonder, then, that the people of Great Falls, of Missoula, of Butte - people throughout Montana and the nation want to know what is going on in foreign relations? They sense, as you sense, that the whole subject of foreign relations has a great and direct connection with their well-being and the future of their families.

Because the questions of peace or war, of mutually beneficial or mutually harmful contact with other nations has assumed this great importance to all Americans, it is of particular significance to you as educators. It has implications with regard to what you teach and how you teach the youth of the land. Because of the changing nature of world affairs, for example, the nation badly needs and will need increasingly in the years ahead, linguists skilled in all the tongues of the world. We need professionals in science, labor, commerce, industry and in the arts, who are capable of communicating, of dealing effectively with the peoples of other nations.

Nor do your responsibilities end when you deal with the new problems of training specialists of this kind in the classrooms. All students now require

some background in foreign relations if they are to participate effectively in later years in the democratic processes of the nation.

You share, moreover, with the press, the churches, elected officials and civic organizations, in foreign relations as in other questions, an obligation of community leadership. There is, as I have already noted, a deep current of interest in this subject. For sound and substantial reasons, Americans want to know about foreign affairs. Those who are engaged in public service, certainly educators, can do much to provide enlightenment on the kind of world in which we now live. They can do much to clarify the problems and possibilities which the modern world poses for the nation. They can do much to enable the people of the United States to understand and to exercise wise guidance and effective control over the foreign policies of their government. In short, they can help to illuminate the state of international affairs and point the way to a sensible role for America to play in the world.

What is the look of world affairs at the present time? Do they hold the promise of international stability and the prospect of a broadening of mutually beneficial cultural, commercial and other ties between ourselves and the rest of the world? Do they portend at least a lessening of the danger of war, if not positive progress towards a durable peace so that the cost of defense can be kept within tolerable bounds? Can your students plan their lives for the next five or ten years with some assurance that they shall not be swept up in a new wave of international chaos? Indeed, can any of us do so? Can we be reasonably certain that what we build today will not be blasted into extinction tomorrow?

I know these questions are on the minds of Americans when they ask about foreign policy, as they have done with increasing frequency in recent years. It seems to me that at this moment in history a meaningful peace, a lasting peace, a peace worth having, is still a hope rather than a probability. If peace is ever to become anything more than a hope it will take work, devoted, painstaking work directed to increasing its probability. In this connection, we will have to look at the world situation as it is with all the honesty and intelligence we may command. We will have to try, with patience and courage to adjust our foreign policies in a way that will move that situation, not overnight to peace, but over the years towards a greater stability for ourselves and all mankind. That is all we can do. Beyond that, the fate of mankind is in other hands.

If we view the present world situation as a whole in this light, I believe we will find that it is neither black nor white, but many shades of gray. The panorama gives reason both to hope and to despair for the future.

Across the Atlantic in Western Europe, in the island nations across the Pacific - Australia, New Zealand and the Philippines and to the South in Latin America, we find a substantial measure of political stability, intense economic activity and, for the most part, a high degree of political freedom. These regions together with the United States and Canada are of the world's inner core of liberty.

Compared with the situation that confronted us in World War II and in the years immediately after, the basic strength of this core has vastly increased. The creative foreign policies of the United States during the postwar decade have

done much to promote this strength. Without these policies, there would not have been an economic recovery in Western Europe. Without that recovery there would be neither the flourishing trade that now links the free nations, nor would there have been in many of these countries the degree of political freedom that presently exists.

Without creative policies there would not have been devised the defenses which fuse Canada and ourselves in a common effort to forestall attacks over the Arctic regions. Without these policies there would not have been a North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a NATO guarding the Atlantic and Mediterranean frontiers of freedom. In the Pacific there would not be an Anzus Treaty linking us in defense with Australia and New Zealand or the ties with the Philippines. There would not have been a strengthened Organization of the American States to contribute to the defense, the peace and progress of the Western Hemisphere.

Much has been achieved in our relations with these other free nations. Yet it would be easy to overestimate the achievement. The inner core of freedom is not without its weaknesses; it is not without patches of uncertainty.. And trouble in any part of the core, whether it be political, economic or military is bound to have repercussions elsewhere.

There are, for example, economic difficulties in many of the free nations with which we are closely associated. Chile, for example, has suffered from the fall in world copper prices, even as we have in Montana. Countries in Western Europe and Latin America are experiencing a serious inflation and the effect of living costs run rampant. Canada is having trouble with exports. In some free

countries, the gap which separates the "boom" from the "bust" is not very great.

Nor are the difficulties confined to economics. We have had and will continue to have for sometime in this nation serious problems of social and political adjustment related to civil rights. Others have their own unique stresses in trying to live by the ideals of freedom. In Latin America there are some countries in which democracy is still honored more in the breach than in the practice. The French have tied down a force of several hundred thousand men in Algeria in an effort to maintain their position in the face of the persistent demands of Algerian nationalists for independence.

As far as our relations with other free nations are concerned, we must face the fact that for whatever the reason, there has been some erosion of NATO. Our ties with Canada also stand in need of repair. The same is true of Latin America where we have slipped away from the very close association of the Good Neighbor Policy.

If we sum up the international situation as it involves the inner core of free nations we obtain this picture. The core still maintains its basic cohesiveness on which the security, the peace and progress of the free nations in large part rests. There is no major threat within this region, of one part to another at the present time. Nor is there any threat posed by the whole to the rest of the world although others may not always see or wish to see that reality as we see it.

Yet, there are no grounds for complacency. On the contrary there are the danger signals, to which I have already referred. Some arise from internal conditions in other nations about which we can do little or nothing. Others, however,

involve our foreign policies, about which we can and ought to do much.

When we look beyond the inner circle of the free nations, the world situation darkens rapidly. In the Far East, we are still confronted with the forbidding enigma of a hostile China. We still face unsettled situations in Korea and in Formosa, however much some may seek to forget them. In both of these countries, military forces of the United States are on the firing lines. The danger remains that a slip, an incident, may suddenly upset the tenuous truce in the Far East.

Much of this nation's policy with respect to the other side of the Pacific is pinned to the stability of Japan and the cooperation which we have had with that country since the war. That cooperation is all to the good. We can hope that it will continue and we must work at its continuance. Yet this cooperation is not automatic. It cannot be taken for granted. That such is the case is evident from the dangerous tensions which arose over the Girard case a few months ago - tensions which subsided but did not necessarily disappear - only after Girard had been turned over to the Japanese for trial.

The Girard case, moreover, was not without its parallel in Formosa. On that island, a similar incident unleashed one of the most violent displays of anti-Americanism that has taken place since World War II, an outbreak among people to whom United States aid has flowed in vast amounts for many years.

These occurrences, it seems to me, constitute a warning against accepting at face value the surface calm of the Western Pacific. Political typhoons, no less than atmospheric typhoons are not at all uncommon in that region. We shall

do well, therefore, to obtain as full and complete a picture as possible of what is going on in all parts of the Far East. The better that picture, the better the chance we shall have of maintaining intelligent policies which safeguard the interests of this nation.

The vast region of so-called underdeveloped nations in Asia and Africa constitute another gray area of the international situation in which we now find ourselves. This region includes nations such as the Philippines, India, Pakistan and Malaya, nations such as Laos, Cambodia and Viet Nam in Indo-China, and nations such as the Sudan and Ghana in Africa. These are nations which have joined the ranks of the independent states of the world only in recent years. The underdeveloped areas also contain other entities, still dependent on the European nations, in which the force of nationalism is growing and sooner or later is likely to find expression in the demand for independence, social equality and more rapid economic progress.

We cannot take for granted this region of newly independent nations or nations moving to independence anymore than we can the present truce in the Far East. We cannot assume that the peoples who compose it will automatically become permanent adherents to the cause of freedom or constructive elements in the world situation. The only thing that we can reasonably assume is that there will be change, deep and far-reaching change. Some of the Afro-Asian nations, the Philippines, Viet Nam, India and Pakistan, for example, already give reason for hope that this change will yield great and increasing contributions to the common progress and the peace of mankind. Elsewhere, however, developments are not nearly as reassuring.

What, for instance, are we to expect from the unstable situation in Indonesia? Even more ominous, what of the political volcano in the Middle East? Despite months of the Eisenhower Doctrine and the commitment of millions of dollars under that doctrine, that region smolders with a potential violence that could shake the entire world. No one knows where the developments of the past few months in Syria will lead. No one yet knows to what provocations free nations in that region may be subjected by neighbors with aggressive and arrogant tendencies. No one yet knows how much longer the repressed millions throughout the Middle East will continue to accept their miserable fate without outbursts of turbulent protest. One thing is certain, armaments are being shipped into the region at a rapid rate by the Soviet Union and by ourselves to counterbalance them. Unless something is done to curb this traffic, this arms diplomacy, sooner or later the weapons are going to be used. What the consequences will be to the peoples of the Middle East, to ourselves and to other great powers is not clear but they may well be disastrous consequences.

I should like to say at this point that the world owes a debt of gratitude to the small nations whose armed forces make up the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. That force has performed a superb service for peace. It is too small in a physical sense to stand against the armies of any of the so large
bristling nations in the region. Yet, it has proved/as a symbol of the determination of the world's people to have peace that so far it has been able to exercise a quieting influence on the entire situation. When the Eisenhower Doctrine was before the Senate early this year I introduced an amendment to that Doctrine

which subsequently was adopted as a part of it. The amendment makes clear that when the United Nations makes a genuine contribution to peace - as the Emergency Force in the Middle East is doing - this nation stands fully behind its efforts.

I should like to turn now before concluding to the principal remaining area of world affairs with which the United States is concerned - to the Soviet Union and to the communist-controlled nations of Eastern Europe. No part of the globe has been more widely discussed in this country in the past few years. Yet with scarcely any part of the globe, except China, have we had less contact, fewer sources of direct factual information. The peoples of those countries are in a similar predicament about the United States. Diplomatic relations between ourselves and the Eastern European countries, where they exist at all, have been kept to an absolute minimum. There has been little trade. Few tourists have visited the region. Few exchanges of educators and other specialists have taken place. We have had excellent, if limited, reporting by our newsmen from the Soviet Union. Until recently, however, few American journalists have entered the satellite nations of Eastern Europe, having been forbidden to do so by our own Department of State. That strange policy, I may say, has now been changed and it has been changed, I believe, largely by the efforts of members of Congress. In the Senate men like Senator Knowland, Senator Fulbright, Senator Humphrey and Senator Aiken have seen clearly the dangers of placing limitations on the movement of legitimate American correspondents abroad and they have spoken out on the matter in no uncertain terms. I have had occasion to do so myself.

Despite severe limitations which remain on access to first-hand information, it is clear that a great ferment is in progress throughout the Soviet empire. This ferment began with the death of Stalin and it is continuing. It touches every aspect of Soviet life-ideology, politics, industry, the arts, the military establishment, foreign policy and even relations among the communist states. Occasionally, we are able to see manifestations of the ferment. It erupts in sudden changes in the political leadership of the Soviet Union - as occurred recently when Molotov, Malenkov and others were banished from the high command. It shows in the changing tones of Soviet foreign policy - from the soft line to the hard line - from the boasts of military strength and achievements to the soft-peddling of nuclear tests. It is revealed in the evolving relationship between Moscow and the Polish government in Warsaw. It explodes in the fury of a Hungarian revolt.

These changes do not mean that communism is coming to an end. They are not even necessarily signs of weakness within the Soviet empire. On the contrary, they may be merely reflections of a readjustment of the totalitarian tenets of Stalin in a Soviet system that is actually increasing in power. What emerges from the ferment, in short, is likely still to be totalitarianism and it may be totalitarianism of a more powerful type because it finds greater acceptability not only in the Soviet Union but elsewhere in the world.

Whatever the outcome of the turmoil within the communist enclave it is bound to have an influence on the prospects for peace. It will either enhance those prospects or detract from them. From the point of view of our national

interests, it is essential that we watch the changes as carefully and closely as possible. It is essential that we be prepared to adjust our policies to the changes whenever there is an opportunity by doing so to increase any tendencies toward genuine peace which may appear within the Soviet empire. I believe the President is aware of this need and as he seeks to meet it, he deserves the support of all the people of the United States.

In short, we need a policy of the open mind with respect to the changes that are taking place within the Soviet bloc. One of the best ways to achieve it, I believe, is by as much first-hand observation and contact as possible with developments in Eastern Europe. Let me make clear that I am not suggesting that any policies we may pursue will bring about overnight changes within the Soviet empire. What we do or do not do will have at best, only a marginal influence on the internal affairs of that region. What I am suggesting, however, is an encouragement of exchanges of mature persons - of educators, scientists, diplomats, farmers, industrialists, newsmen and others. Let the peoples of this country be free to see and report on what is going on in Eastern Europe. And let us not be reticent to show to the people of that region what is going on here. We need not fear this contact, if we maintain intelligent vigilance against illegitimate activities. For, as I have said on other occasions it is time to recognize that if the Soviet Union is strong in a material sense, this nation is and can remain stronger, provided it is united and properly led. It is time to recognize that if there are dangers to freedom in the ideology of communism, there are even greater dangers to communism in the doctrines of liberty.

To conclude, let me say that in the checkered affairs of the world - in this world of neither peace nor war - there is only one role for America. It is a role that serves the best interests of this generation of Americans and the generations to come. It is a role that keeps faith with the traditions of human compassion, human freedom and human constructiveness that constitute our finest heritage.

It is not the role of isolationism nor can it even be called the role of internationalism. Certainly, it is not isolated internationalism. Rather it is the role of seeking with an open mind and an open heart a perceptive understanding of the changing realities of the world of which we are a part. It is the role of intelligent and sympathetic action, together with others, with regard to those realities; action to increase step-by-step the probabilities of peace, to build stone-by-stone a world-wide structure of liberty from which no nation, no people is forever banished. These are difficult tasks. But if all of us meet the responsibilities which they repose in us, God willing, we shall not fail in them.