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Mr. President:

I had prepared these remarks for delivery in the Senate prior to the launching of our earth-satellite. In the light of that development, I went over the statement to see whether the views which I intended to express should be revised.

In rereading the text, it occurred to me that too often, Mr. President, we tend to be carried away by the events of the moment. Too often, in the narrow perspective of this capital city, we wax hot and cold on the basis of good news or bad. Too often we go from the extremes of excessive assurance to excessive despair.

At the time I prepared these remarks, Mr. President, I tried to view the international situation in broader perspective. Even as other members of the Senate had been away from this city during the recess, so had I. Even as some had travelled through the country, to home states, to other states, so had I. Even as some had been abroad, in Europe, in Asia, Latin America and elsewhere, I had gone to Europe and North Africa. Even as they did, I was happy to rediscover that the sun still rises and sets, not only in Washington but throughout the nation and the world.

I found it useful to see what was going on elsewhere and to explore the interests and sentiments of those who are not immersed in the
day-to-day doings of government. I found it helpful to examine my own thoughts in the light of the hopes and the fears of others.

Foreign Policy and the Domestic Situation

These remarks, then, were prepared in that context, in the context of the time for reflection which the recess permitted. For that reason, I do not feel that the launching of the satellite compels any significant revision in them. On the contrary, that event tends to make it more imperative than ever that we look at our situation not as it may be at the moment, but in a long perspective. That event happened to be, so to speak, one of our "ups". There will be others, I am sure, just as I am sure that we shall have our "downs".

If I dwell at length on foreign policy in these remarks, it is not because that is the only question confronting the nation. I do so because, as Senators realize, foreign policy is among the most compelling, difficult and continuing questions with which we must deal. On the other hand, if I turn first in these remarks to matters other than foreign policy, it is because I do not assume that all of our troubles begin abroad and end at the water's edge or, perhaps I should say, at the stratosphere's limits. The eyes of Washington may be glued to the earth satellites and their hypnotic, symbolic, orbiting of the earth. That is not necessarily the case with citizens elsewhere in the nation. There is an awareness, a growing awareness, that our national problems are larger than a mere matching of some particular Soviet achievement in the realm of science or military techniques.
There is increasing concern not only with this one aspect of our affairs but with the total state of the Union.

I have spoken many times in the Senate in the past on foreign policy. In those discussions, however, I have often prefixed my remarks with this observation: We cannot, in an absorption with what goes on abroad lose sight of what is going on at home.

The point bears repeating at this time. It bears repeating because there are domestic difficulties which adversely affect millions of citizens and they cannot be covered with a gloss of official optimism. It bears repeating because these difficulties, in turn, have a great influence on the position of the United States in the world. They affect our capacity to defend the nation and they affect our capacity to bring about a durable peace.

These domestic difficulties have an international meaning because foreign policy is not unrelated to other aspects of our national life. It is not a thing apart. If we sink at home, sooner or later we shall sink abroad. If the Union is strong, cohesive and dynamic, there is at least a chance that foreign policy will be able to safeguard the nation's security, to advance the welfare of our people and to further the hope of peace. If the Union is weak, divided and fearful, foreign policy can do little to uphold our position as a nation among many nations. In short, to the extent that we face the difficulties within our borders and deal with them, we shall be able to act on the much more complex difficulties that beset us abroad.
Domestic Economic Situation

Let me turn first, then, in these remarks on foreign policy to the domestic situation. I suggest that we shift our eyes for a moment from the distant reaches of space and glance around us, first, at the economic situation. Look at the state of Michigan, at Pennsylvania, the state of Montana, at Maine or Alabama. Look at the mining industry, the steel industry, the aircraft, automobile and farm equipment industries, the textile industry. Look at the unemployment figures. Look at the condition of small enterprise, at the decline of business profits and take-home pay, and look at the level of prices. It does not require a one-hundred inch telescope for this exploration. It does not require a high-speed electronic computer to discover that the economic map of the United States is pockmarked with craters of distress.

These are times, however, in which it is regarded as somewhat vulgar to see situations that have not first been tinted by the reassuring techniques of the Administration's press agents. It is not pleasant political manners to mention unpleasant economic facts. It is much more acceptable to accent the positive and, after all, 1957 was the best year of our history. One can hear reputable economists assure us that six months hence all will be well, and the economy will once again be riding the beam or the boom. As for unemployment, moving now towards the five million mark, these same economists will tell you that that is an inevitable part of the "rolling readjustment". Distress in particular areas and industries? These are merely temporary phenomena connected with the "leveling off" of the boom.
These terms have a kind of painless, inoffensive, almost pleasant, sound. But ask the miner of copper in Butte, unemployed for months, what they mean. Ask the men who manage these mines. Ask a steel worker in Pittsburgh, the timberjack in western Montana, or a weaver in New England. Ask the man who runs a small business, in these and other places. They may very well use that unmentionable word "depression" and speak of their fears of it.

The term may be too strong to describe the situation in which we now find ourselves. Nevertheless, we ought not to ignore the damage which this situation is already doing to millions of citizens. We ought not to underestimate the present and potential impact of this situation, whatever it is called, on our position in the world.

Here in Washington, it may seem logical to give a high priority to foreign policy matters. These are indeed urgent matters. Is it unreasonable, however, for those who have been adversely affected by the economic decline at home to ask why foreign aid takes precedence over their own very real difficulties? Is it unreasonable for those who have been adversely affected by the reciprocal trade program to raise questions as to the value of the program?

It is all very well to talk in abstract terms of long-range national benefits from these and other foreign policies. They can, indeed, provide such benefits. Individual citizens, however, do not live on abstractions. When their personal and immediate problems are overlooked by government,
they are not likely to appreciate abstractions. Sooner or later, this lack of public appreciation will be reflected in legislative action and foreign policy may well suffer in consequence.

In a similar vein, the stability of many other free countries is tied closely to the economic stability of the United States. This nation is at the center of the international financial and trade complex of the non-communist world. Nations heavily dependent on foreign commerce will prosper and falter as this nation prospers or falters. A prolonged lull in economic activity in the United States can only have disastrous repercussions throughout the entire non-communist world.

We may not now be in a period of general economic crisis. It is irresponsible, however, to dismiss the possibility that we might be headed in that direction. It is irresponsible to ignore the plight of those Americans who have already been rolled aside by the rolling readjustment. It is irresponsible to expect human beings to appreciate long-range national problems of government when their immediate and personal plight is overlooked by government.

We had better not wait too long and come forth with too little to reverse present economic trends. We had better make certain that the legal remedies for this type of situation, most of which were set up in the 1930's, are still adequate in this new era of automation.
Let us take the first step now by sweeping aside the cozy optimism that oozes about us and by recognizing honestly and openly that our economic house is not in order. The Russians did not make this situation. The satellites in the sky have nothing to do with it. We made this situation ourselves and it is up to us to correct it.

Social Problems

If there are economic difficulties, which should concern us, there are also social problems which continue to confront the nation. I remind the Senate that we still have a long way to go before the ideal of equal human opportunity is fully realized in this country. I remind the Senate of the appalling crime rate, 315 major crimes per hour during 1957, the highest in the nation's history. I remind the Senate that millions of older people are still without adequate income to live out their years in decency and without adequate opportunities to use their talents, skills and willingness in a constructive fashion. I remind the Senate that too many households in this country still live in legitimate fear of the catastrophic illness with its ruinous medical and hospital costs. I remind the Senate that the price of higher education is going beyond the reach of most families. I remind the Senate of the disturbing situation in general health conditions, in physical and mental fitness. There are now some 16 million Americans - one out of every eleven - suffering from some form of mental illness and few of these are receiving adequate care and treatment.
Mr. President, these are not new problems nor are they problems peculiar to this country. In some cases, they may be more acute in other nations than they are here at home. In others, we have the dubious distinction of holding first place among the principal nations of the world.

There are any number of conscientious people, in private life and in federal, state and municipal governments, giving of themselves with great dedication in an effort to combat these and similar social ills. Nevertheless, the continued existence of these problems, in their present magnitude, approaches the dimensions of a national disgrace that cries out for corrective action. It is an indictment, not against free institutions, but against their neglect and misuse by those who profess to support them. It is a reflection of a social irresponsibility which freedom never licensed.

The Russians did not make these problems. The satellites in the sky have nothing to do with them. We made these problems ourselves or, at any rate, we have permitted them to accumulate through neglect. Their continued existence saps the strength of the nation. It weakens us at home and hence undercuts our position in the world. Let us take the first step now, not by boasting of our achievements in this area, even though they may be many, but by recognizing that our social house is still a long way from being in order and that it is up to us to put it in order.

The Problem of Education

Turning specifically, Mr. President, to education as one of these social problems, here, too, the difficulties lie not with the Russians
or the earth satellites but with ourselves. The Russians do not run our schools. We run them. These who are dedicated to education in this country, on the whole, do an admirable and, in a financial sense, a thankless job.

The shortcomings in education, highlighted in recent months by Soviet scientific achievements, were discussed a short time ago on the floor in an illuminating and a penetrating fashion by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright]. As I understand the problem, Mr. President, the basic difficulty does not lie primarily in the methods of education, although they can stand much in the way of refinement. It does not even lie in the educational plant although that, too, is in great need of improvement.

The more fundamental problem, I believe, lies in our concept of education or perhaps, I should say, in the debasing of these concepts. We have lost sight of the ultimate purpose of the education of free men. That purpose, as I see it, Mr. President, is to open minds to the pursuit of truth. We have lost sight of free education's highest ideal, Mr. President, which is to enrich the spirit of mankind by pushing back the frontiers of his understanding.

Education, in its finest sense, is not for the filling of the pocket, for the production of ever more fantastic military weapons or even for the service of the state and industry. In the age in which we live these may be byproducts of education. They are not, however, the ends that will inspire the few men of genius which this or any other society has in its midst.
For too long we have alternately ignored, ridiculed or hounded these few who think in terms of the finest purposes of learning and have something to give in those terms. For too long we have neglected to search out and encourage young people who might contribute groundbreaking thought and new ideas, not only in the realm of physics and engineering but in all aspects of human endeavor. I tell the Senate that if the well-springs of creativity dry up in this nation, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves.

A billion or ten billion dollar crash program in education may produce new schools and better pay for teachers, both of which are needed, but it will not produce an Einstein, an Edison or a Shakespeare. An understanding and an appreciative society and government, however, may help to bring them forth to pour their unusual talents into the progress of the nation and mankind. A rethinking of the ends and methods of education at all levels may encourage the development of the self-discipline and the talents and skills that are necessary for a life in freedom in the second half of the 20th Century. Let us take the first step now by recognizing that our educational house is not in order and that it is up to us to put it in order.

The Needs of Defense

Mr. President, I turn next to the question of defense. As it presents itself today, this question arises in connection with the Soviet military menace. In my opinion, matters of defense would be a major source of national difficulty even if the Soviet menace were considerably less potent
than it is. The difficulty was with us before we launched our earth-satellite. It was with us before the Soviet Sputniks indicated the potential dimensions of Russian military power. It may well be with us even if that power should be neutralized or should decline.

We have seen reports from time to time, in the press and elsewhere, that all is not well with the policies and organization of the defense services. Distinguished members of the Senate, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], for example, have stressed the seriousness of this matter. A step has been taken here and a step there in the direction of improving the services. Yet in all these years we have followed a policy of inertia, compounded of military and civilian smugness which I trust will not be fed even further by our recent and belated achievement in the penetration of space.

The heart of the difficulty, I believe, is to be found in the fact that we have gone on year after year, handling matters of defense in patterns that were developed largely during World War II and immediately after. Here in Congress, we have in the postwar years appropriated funds approaching 500 billions of dollars for defense. In some years we have appropriated more funds and in some years, less. But despite these vast financial commitments, we have failed heretofore to reexamine defense policies in the light of the rapid advances in science. We have failed to rethink these policies in the context of those fundamental questions which arise in connection with the military in any free society. We have not asked ourselves what part
of the total security of the nation we expect the regular military forces of
the nation to provide. We have not asked ourselves whether the military
establishment is now organized to play that part and to play it effectively.

We have had a limited introduction to these neglected questions
from the President in his State of the Union message. We have heard a
brilliant exposition of the ultimate significance of these questions in a
statement by the distinguished majority leader Mr. Johnson at the outset
of the session. The unanimous report of his Subcommittee on Preparedness
has thrown additional light on the subject and I have no doubt that we shall
hear more from that source during this session.

I want to add only a general comment to the issue at this time.
It seems to me that our security as a nation depends upon multiple sources
of strength, not merely organized military power. That is as true today
in the age of missiles as it was in the age of muskets. If history teaches
us anything, it is this: the extinction of freedom and then of the nation may
well lie at the end of an obsessive search for absolute security through the
military establishment.

I want to say, too, that, in my opinion, the military in this
country functions best when it maintains a high degree of inner discipline
and responds unquestioningly to the control of the President, his civilian
agents and the acts of Congress. If this control is inept, it is for the
people to change it, not for the military to bypass it.
I want to say, further, that in my opinion the military makes its most dedicated contribution to the nation when it concerns itself essentially and quietly with the problems of warfare. The Defense establishment and its military commanders do not belong in politics, domestic or international. It is improper for civilian officials to project these commanders into politics and it is improper for these commanders to project themselves into politics while they are still in uniform.

In matters of advanced scientific and technological research, the Defense establishment may play a distinguished part and research of this kind may have military applicability. Generally speaking, however, it is not the best site for the control and direction of creative scientific research.

I want to say, finally, without prejudging requests for funds, that I am doubtful that the problems of our defense establishment will be corrected by billions more in appropriations. We may find it necessary to vote larger appropriations as an interim measure. However, I shall continue to entertain serious questions as to the efficacy of expenditures until we understand more clearly the role of the military in the total security of the nation, until civilian control is once again firmly and clearly established over the Defense Department and until the undisciplined and unmilitary disorder in the Pentagon is ended.
The Domestic Situation - Neglected Dimension of Foreign Policy

Mr. President, I have gone on at some length discussing what are essentially domestic issues. There are others of a similar nature which might be considered at this time. I do not raise them because they lack importance. I do not do so because, as I noted earlier, my statement today is directed primarily to foreign policy.

My purpose in beginning these remarks as I have was not only to call attention to the persistence of domestic difficulties which have importance in themselves to the people of this country but also to emphasize their significance as a factor in our relations with other nations. These domestic difficulties are in a very real sense the neglected dimension of foreign policy. We have looked without and above for the danger signals and well we should. At the same time, we have overlooked the warning signs within. These inner difficulties do not disappear simply because there may be more complex difficulties confronting us from outside. Internal difficulties cannot be swept out of sight by sweeping the skies with a radar screen. If we are free men, in spirit as well as words, we shall not put them aside. We shall face them and do the best we can to deal with them. We shall recognize them in all humility, for what they are, measurements of our own national shortcomings as a free society. We shall see them, as they are, limitations on our total national unity and strength and, therefore, on our position in the world.

This country shall not survive in recognizable form in the world of today and tomorrow, much less lead it, if we build Maginot Lines out of
alliances and bases around the world and stud the sky with artificial stars, only to permit disunity, inertia and fear to produce decay at the core. We will survive and we may lead if we face honestly our economic, moral, intellectual and military shortcomings at home and act with determination to meet them.

That is the first requisite for the survival and growth of the United States. It is not the only requisite. We shall not remain a nation with hope for future generations of Americans and with a message for the world unless, at the same time, we face the responsibilities and the difficulties of living on this earth of many nations, unless we face these responsibilities and difficulties with quiet courage, with wisdom and with deep human understanding. We will survive, grow, and perhaps lead, in short, only if we keep alive the meaning, the creative and the compassionate meaning, of a free America both at home and in the world.

The Need for Peace

That, Mr. President, is the scope of the total problem which confronts us as a nation at the beginning of 1958. I have already tried to illustrate the domestic aspect of this problem. In the remainder of these remarks I should like to explore some of its international implications.

There is action we must take and which we have not taken in our relations with other nations and in the policies and programs through which we conduct these relations. There is a need for clear-sighted action
based on an awareness of the world as it is and not as we would like it to be or as some may imagine it to be.

What is needed is action that stems neither from a bloated and stupid arrogance or a hesitant timidity. It must be honest action and courageous action. It must be action that seeks in a positive fashion to meet the greatest challenge of these years in which we live. The challenge Mr. President, is to develop and to strengthen the one common interest of all peoples which outweighs their national differences, discords and doctrines. That interest, Mr. President, is the preservation of the human species in a recognizable form of civilization. That interest, in short, is peace, not a peace of conquest or a peace of surrender but a peace with which decent men and women the world over, in Russia no less than in the United States, can live.

The Misleading Concept of Situations of Strength

Let me say that we shall not get that kind of peace unless the Russian leaders as well as our own recognize its urgency for all mankind. Let me say further, however, that we shall not get it in any event unless we ourselves also rethink the basic premises of our foreign policy.

We have operated through the years - through two administrations - on the theory that we might best seek peace by building situations of strength. The premise is valid enough, for weakness will not gain a meaningful peace. Where we have gone astray, however, is in our concept of what constitutes strength in an international sense. Strength is more than military equipment
and alliances. It is more than the loud words, the Pyrrhic victories of the propaganda war; it is more than breast-beating. It is more than money for aid programs.

Strength is, perhaps, more than these tangible things, an understanding of the world and its complexities. It is an understanding of what moves not only the lips of political leaders elsewhere but the hearts of peoples throughout the world. Above all else, it is an ability to apply our total national strength in the light of this understanding for ends that serve both ourselves and the rest of decent mankind.

Through the years, we have had the military strength and the bases and we have had the propaganda and the breast-beating. We have spent lavishly abroad on military and economic aid. Yet what has happened in these years? Once we had a monopoly of the A-bomb and now it is gone. Once we had a monopoly of the H-bomb and it is gone. These presumably were positions of strength and they are no more. Once earth satellites, with their implications of advanced military technology elsewhere, did not swing across our horizons. That, if not a position of strength, was at least not one of weakness. Two devices from elsewhere sped above us before ours finally left the ground.

There was a time when Soviet influence was remote from the vast arc of underdeveloped nations that stretches from Africa to the Pacific and that, too, presumably was a situation of strength. Although we have spent billions of dollars for aid, and we have propagandized and we have had our
breast-beaters in that region, Communist totalitarianism is now much in evidence throughout the area. Once the ties of the North Atlantic Alliance were close and intimate and that, too, was a situation of strength. Now the Alliance founders on rocks of aimlessness and narrow, shortsighted national interest.

We may well ask ourselves, Mr. President, what are the implications of these developments of recent years? Have they not reduced the concept of situations of strength to a catchphrase, to a will-o’-the-wisp? Does the continued pursuit of this concept by the same methods by the same slogans suggest the existence of a sound policy? Or does this pursuit merely serve to cover an unwillingness of our national leadership to face the realities of the world and as an excuse for doing today what we did yesterday and what we will do tomorrow because we know not what else to do?

I suggest, Mr. President, that we have lost sight of the fact that strength is a many-sided thing - that it has not only international aspects but domestic elements as well, that it has military and non-military facets, that it is not only money but methods. I suggest, Mr. President, that in our international relations we have failed in great measure to realize that if men do not live by bread alone, much less do they live by aid, propaganda or missiles alone. I suggest that the desperate but narrow search for situations of strength by ourselves as well as the Russians is leading civilized mankind ever closer to the moment of extinction.
I suggest, finally, that this concept as it is now being pursued is self-defeating. It has left us, in a real sense, weaker than we were ten years ago, although the arsenals are filled with new and more powerful weapons, although the number of alliances and bases have multiplied, although we now have a satellite in the heavens. Ironically, it has also had the same effect on the Russians whose arsenals are also filled with new weapons, who have also managed to make new converts in various parts of the world, and who also have satellites in the skies. I say this because ten years ago it would have been possible for the United States to reduce much of the Soviet Union to fire and ruin by military action. And ten years ago the Russians could have spread great damage in the Western world if not in the United States by military action. But it is doubtful that either side, ten years ago, could have completely obliterated the other, for all practical purposes, as a nation. Today, it is possible for each side to end the civilized existence of the other and to bring down the rest of the world in the process.

Who is stronger in these circumstances? Who has gained from this competition? The truth is that neither has become stronger in the sense of its capacity for national survival. The truth is that both countries in the search for situations of power and strength have ended in situations of profound weakness.

The concept of seeking situations of strength, on our part at least, began as a positive device for building a durable peace. It is ending as a
last-ditch hope of staying alive or at least not dying under a rain of missiles unless our enemies also go into oblivion with us. Today, we, no less than the Russians, are clinging to civilized life by our fingertips.

**A New Concept of Policy: Positions of Peace**

It is time to ask ourselves, Mr. President, whether that is enough for ourselves and mankind. Is it time, perhaps, to move on to a positive concept, to the concept of a policy that seeks to put together not only situations of strength but positions of peace? Let me illustrate, Mr. President, with one highly significant incident, the fundamental difference that this latter concept implies, the difference between what we are now doing and what we ought to be doing in foreign policy. I refer to the NATO conference last December. That was indeed a time, Mr. President, for greatness. It was a time when not only the Europeans, but the peoples of the world awaited a clear reaffirmation of the meaning of a free America. It was a time when our own people looked for a clarification of the doubts that have grown in recent years as to the value of close ties with other nations. Perhaps these expectations were too high. But it was a Summit Conference, Mr. President, called on our initiative and great things are expected of Summit conferences.

At this point I wish to express my respect for President Eisenhower's dedication to duty in going to the NATO Conference. His insistence upon undertaking the mission in spite of the illness that he had suffered just prior to the meeting warrants the gratitude of the nation.
It was fortunate that he went because the President's appearance at the Conference was a contribution to foreign policy that could have been obtained in no other way, by no other man in the Administration. His attendance, rekindling as it did, the remembrances of the close cooperation and the mutual dedication of the war years, served to gain time for constructive action to hold together the North Atlantic Alliance.

Let us not underestimate the importance of that contribution but, by the same token, let us keep it in perspective. What was obtained by this personal act of the President, I repeat, was time for action, not the necessary action itself.

I ask the Senate to recall for a moment the circumstances of the NATO Conference and its results. The western nations met at a moment when the Soviet Union had put a new and radical factor into the international equation by launching the two earth satellites. That demonstration had a profound effect on existing evaluations of Soviet scientific and military progress. It revealed as never before the degree of distortion on which many of our defense and foreign policies had been based. The demonstration, moreover, was coupled by new appeals for peace from the Soviet bloc and by new ideas for achieving it. That we may have regarded these appeals as bogus is beside the point. The fact is that these two acts which linked scientific progress with peace had an enormous appeal to the peoples of the world weary of the constant threat of war.
In these circumstances, what came out of the NATO Conference? The only tangible achievement was a somewhat reluctant re-endorsement of the doctrine of building situations of strength in its narrowest sense. This time it took the form of approval of American proposals to place missile bases in those Western European countries willing to accept them. All else was a repetition in well-known platitudes of general hopes of cooperation.

Mr. President, agreement on the placing of missiles in advantageous defense positions was an important achievement. It was not, however, a cure for the ills of the Western alliance. It did not begin to fill the urgent requirement for constructive and creative leadership. It did not meet the needs of the hour. It did not meet the challenge of the new age, over the threshold of which the Soviet earth-satellites had already passed, and which we have now passed.

It may still not be too late, Mr. President, to take the action which might have been taken at the NATO Conference but was not taken. In the light of our own recent achievement, the moment may be even more propitious. It may be now or never if we are to move from the negative doctrine of building situations of strength to a positive policy of seeking positions of peace. Nowhere is the necessity for this change more clearly indicated than in dealing with the problems of the rapid advance of science and technology and particularly with the exploration of space.

As a minimum, Mr. President, this country might well have proposed at the NATO meeting and, may still propose, the extension of the
International Geophysical year, in which both the Soviet nations and ourselves are participating, into a decade of worldwide scientific cooperation.

That is only the beginning, Mr. President. This country, indeed, all countries must face up to the fact that the unfolding universe beyond the earth presents problems of such vast and challenging dimensions that they call, not for the competition, but for the cooperation of all mankind.

The need of the hour, as I see it, Mr. President, is for a sharing of the genius, the labor and the cost of the exploration of space. The need is not for platitudes on cooperation, while the race for advantage goes on beneath the platitudes. The need is for men and women of many nations working together in the same laboratories, on the same proving grounds and on the same scientific devices.

And it is time now for this common effort to begin. It is an effort which might well start among the NATO members, but no nation willing to participate in good faith ought to be excluded from this great venture.

I realize, Mr. President, that there are immense problems in the way of negotiating agreements for an undertaking of this kind. There are deep fears and suspicions to be overcome. There are dangers of the loss of military or commercial advantages - real or illusory - for us and for others - Yet are these difficulties of any greater complexity than those which will surely confront all nations within a few years if action along these lines is not taken, if instead a pell-mell rush for national advantage takes place into outer space?
A Cooperative Exploration of Space

Mr. President, I do not know whether the Russians will rise to the challenge of this moment in human history and I, for one, hope that they shall. There is every reason to believe, however, that if this nation acts with the boldness, and the positive leadership that the hour demands, other NATO nations at least will be with us. The cost, the effort, the sacrifices will be less to all if we join with them in this great endeavor. And the achievement will belong to all. I believe that this country no less than any other free nation would prefer it, if the scientific devices which from now on in increasing numbers, shall carry mankind beyond the confines of the earth shall bear the label, not of one nation but of all nations willing to contribute to the effort.

The Basic Need

Mr. President, I have cited this one example of a positive policy of building positions of peace. There are others in every aspect of foreign policy in which a similar revision of thinking seems to me to be essential. In subsequent remarks, I may turn to some of these questions, to the question of the divided countries of Asia and Europe, to the question of Eastern Europe, to the question of the Middle East, to the question of negotiations with the Russians.

The first need, the basic need, as I see it, however, was well put by President Theodore Heuss of West Germany a few weeks ago when he said: "The main thing is to get sober and disentangle oneself from the web
of slogans and ideologies." That advice applies to us with no less urgency than it applies to other nations. It applies in the scientific field above all others, because the advance in this field has made most of the slogans obsolete and is compelling a revision of the ideologies. Unless we see the world as it is at this hour, as it is likely to be tomorrow, unless the Russians and others see it, free of self-generated and propaganda-imposed delusions, we shall not make the choices that must be made if human history is not to come to an end. We are faced with choices that involve the life or death of civilization. Each act in foreign relations by every nation adds to one or the other side of the balance. In these acts, we are deciding not only immediate questions. In the last analysis, we are deciding, Mr. President, whether the world is to be a dead planet spinning in swift silence through the endless time and space of the universe or whether this noble but brief human experience on earth shall be carried to the stars.