

The Economic Club of New York

The Honorable William F. Knowland
United States Senator from California
Minority Leader of the Senate

January 16, 1956
Sheraton Astor Hotel
New York City

The Honorable William F. Knowland

Foreign Policy in a Political Year

Americans regardless of their party affiliation are pleased to have noted the excellent progress toward recovery that President Eisenhower has made and the fact that he is once again able to resume his duties in the nation's capital. The President has already sent the State of the Union, the agriculture, education, and the budget messages to the Congress. All of these documents have recommendations of great importance to our national life. Now the 84th Congress, as the Constitutional repository of the legislative power, will determine how much of the recommended program will be adopted and in what final form.

Events may take place this year in Europe, Asia, Africa, in the Western Hemisphere, or in the Middle East that could set off a chain reaction of far-reaching significance. It is important that in this year when political tensions may mount at home and international stresses may take place abroad, that all those in government should speak with responsibility and with the knowledge that what is said may be distorted to serve the purposes of those who would destroy human freedom throughout the world. Yet, in a free republic it is equally important that those in government speak with frankness. The American electoral result of 1956 may be one of the great decisive events of modern history.

Our international relations have a great impact on our domestic economy as well as upon other

nations. Foreign policy is too important to be left to government alone. It is of concern to 165 million Americans.

The age of colonialism is dead. Our own excellent record in the Philippines and elsewhere has been marred by impressions in Asia and the Middle East that we have allowed ourselves to be compromised by association with the colonial policies of Great Britain and France. Countries could understand us better with our non-colonial record in the Philippines and Cuba and our own successful fight for independence if we would say frankly that our foreign policy is based on what is best for America.

They know we seek no territory and that we have an intuitive national conviction that our own survival as a free nation will be better served by assuring a free world of free men, than by any system which attempts to hold the loyalty of people by force of armed power and against their national will.

In 1858 a young and growing nation faced a great issue of principle over the expansion of slavery beyond its then limits. Abraham Lincoln, at that time a candidate for the United States Senate, said: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." Our aim should be to live in peace with all nations, but to pay tribute to none. Our desire is for a system of international law and order based on peace with honor and justice. A world in which small or large nations would have to live in fear of imminent

violence or to buy a temporary respite by the payment of extortion is not the sort of existence that we or the other free peoples of the world are seeking.

A decade has passed since the conferences of Yalta and Potsdam, the end of World War II and the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco. Today as part of a series of discussions I intend to carry on in the Senate and throughout the country, I desire to review certain aspects of the problem that need to be considered not only by the Executive branch of the government, but by the Congress and the country as well.

In 1945 this nation was the greatest military power in the world and was sole possessor, as the trustee of free men everywhere, of the atomic weapon. In order to help defeat the Axis powers our resources had been placed at the disposal of our allies in Europe, Asia and Africa in astronomical amounts which had no parallel in all recorded history.

From December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor until V-J Day in 1945, our armed forces had made a great contribution to the common effort, and we suffered substantial casualties in helping to bring the war to a successful close.

In all of this mighty effort, costly in manpower and resources, we sought no territory and no reparations. The American people had reason to believe that the terms of the Atlantic Charter would be honored by us, and we expected it to be respected by others. America's prestige and

power were high throughout the world. It was in that year, 1945, when we had the great opportunity to lay a firm foundation for human freedom and for a system of international law and order – for peace based on honor and justice.

When 1945 opened there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Now, just ten years later, we are confronted with the following facts: (1) Over 900 million people are behind the Communist Iron Curtain, and their totalitarian rulers are united in the common objective of making a Communist world. (2) Governments representing approximately 500 million people have determined to follow a “neutralist” course rather than to assume the responsibilities of an effective collective security system. They can afford this luxury because others have undertaken the necessary burdens. (3) In the free world we have approximately 900 million people associated together in a series of interlocking mutual defense pacts. The United States of America appears to be the keystone to the arch, but the columns seem at times to be on shifting sands. (4) The United Nations on its major test as an effective collective security system during the Communist aggression in Korea (1950-1953) had the following record: (A) Only 17 out of the then 60 members supplied any armed forces to resist the aggression. (B) The United States of America alone supplied 90% of the military forces furnished by the United Nations members and 95% of the resources to carry on the collective security action. (5) In the post-World War II period the United States has furnished over 52 billion dollars in grants and loans to allies and former enemy nations. (6) We have a national debt of 280 billion dollars and a budget of 65 billion dollars. Our taxes, personal and corporate, are high and in some instances

confiscatory in character. Many of our citizens have had to borrow funds to meet their income tax bills.

It is not my contention that all the virtues are in one political party or all the faults in the other. Members of both parties can fairly share part of the credit and assume part of the blame. During the decade, 1945-1955, the Democrats controlled the Executive branch of the government for seven years, while the Republicans have been in control for three years. The Administration in power, of course, has the responsibility for the day-to-day formulation and direction of our foreign policy. In this same period the Democrats have had control of both the House and Senate for six years and the Republicans were in control for four years.

I refer to the past not for the purpose of opening old wounds or in any narrow partisan spirit, but with a deep conviction that in the 1955-1965 decade the survival of our country may be at stake and with it the hope for a free world of free men. As long as there is a strong America which stands for principles which free people and temporarily enslaved ones can understand and respect, there is hope for mankind.

This strength is not primarily based on our material wealth, though without it we could not support our own defense nor help others to help themselves. Our real strength is the spirit and courage which, under Divine guidance, allowed a small colony of 3 million dedicated people to rise up and strike off the chains of colonialism despite the opposition of the mightiest empire of

that day.

Our Revolutionary leaders represented the spirit of the song which states: "Start me with ten who are stout-hearted men, and I will soon give you ten thousand more." Whither are we tending?

Will the next ten years show the same progress of Marxian Socialism? Is there any real indication that the Communist leopard has changed its spots? I believe not.

On July 28, 1955, in the Senate of the United States, I said: "Neither we nor the free world must lull ourselves into a "Little Miss Red Riding Hood" belief that, because the wolf has put on grandmother's cap and nightgown, his teeth are any less sharp or his intentions any less menacing."

President Eisenhower, in a great desire to explore the possibility of a changed Soviet policy, agreed to the meeting at the summit. He also knew that a number of the Allied governments, as well as members of Congress (including the distinguished Democrat Senator Walter George, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee), had urged such a meeting.

The President made it clear that the "acid test" of Soviet intentions would come at the subsequent Foreign Ministers Meeting. Results of that meeting clearly showed that the Soviet Union would not: (1) Agree to free elections throughout a free and sovereign Germany or permit a unification of Germany except on terms that would result in Communist domination of the whole country.

(2) Support an adequate system of armament inspection of conventional weapons. (3) Consider the carrying out of their obligations under the Atlantic Charter to permit free elections in the captive nations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Hungary, Esthonia, Roumania, Lithuania, Bulgaria and Albania. (4) Agree to effective safeguards in the matter of the control of atomic weapons.

Stripped of Communist double-talk, their position was and is that tensions can only be released through the Soviet brand of “peaceful co-existence” which would be based on a permanent enslavement of the satellite states of Eastern Europe, a united but Communist Germany, the breaking up of the North Atlantic Alliance and the system of Western defenses.

If there were any so naive, in or out of government at home or abroad, as to have believed that the Communist leopard had changed its spots, such thoughts should have been dispelled by the reported statements of Khrushchev made at the dinner given on September 17th to the East German Communist Premier Grotewohl. He said: “Anybody who takes our smile for withdrawal from the teachings of Karl Marx or Lenin is making a mistake.” “Those who expect this will have to wait until Easter Monday falls on Tuesday.”

At a Moscow gathering of the Kremlin hierarchy, Soviet First Deputy Premier Kaganovich on November 6, 1955, said: “If the nineteenth century was a century of capitalism, the twentieth century is a century of the triumph of Socialism and Communism.”

But perhaps the clearest expression of Soviet immorality in dealing with other nations was expressed by the late Joseph Stalin: "A diplomat's words must have no relation to actions – otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

The test of the accuracy of the Stalin diplomatic doctrine is demonstrated by the broken treaties and subjugated nations along the periphery of the Soviet Union: Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria all had to learn the hard way.

Do vodka toasts change these words and modify these facts? They do not. When the free nations of the world retreat from principle and embrace a "package deal" on membership that a short time ago they designated as "unadulterated blackmail," is not our moral position greatly weakened? When the Republic of China, now reduced to the island of Formosa and the off-shore islands, is told that if they exercise their veto under the United Nations Charter they will likely lose their membership, is not the conscience of free men troubled? When the International Court has ruled that a "package deal" is a violation of the United Nations Charter and the ruling is ignored, is this not nullification of judicial processes?

Is the United Nations now to be governed by expediency instead of principle? At San Francisco in 1945 it was agreed that only qualified nations which assumed the obligations under the

Charter were eligible for membership. At New York in 1955 governments frankly recognized to be without such qualifications were taken in at the adamant insistence of the Soviet Union.

The final test will come later this year, probably after our national elections, as various members connive to bring Communist China into that organization. Munich should have taught the world that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is only surrender on the installment plan.

Do not these events and contemplated actions bring to a focus the need for a re-appraisal? If it is not done by the Executive Department and the Congress, it will be done on the main streets of America.

Can our economic system survive prolonged burdens of building a system of collective security and a system of neutralism at one and the same time? If the neutralists are to receive the benefits and have none of the responsibilities of those in the collective defense system, will not that act as an incentive plan to build up the fence sitters? Certainly we should not endeavor to remake the world in our political or economic image. We should recognize that neither personal nor international friendships can be purchased; they must be earned.

It is not and it should not be our policy to impinge upon the sovereignty of any nation. We do have a right, and I believe a duty, to point out as clearly as we can the dangers we believe are confronting free men everywhere. We can and should point out that we and many of our

associates have believed that our own survival and that of free men elsewhere depends upon an effective system of collective security. Whether or not any nation desires to join that system is for their government and their people to decide.

We could, I believe, properly point out that even the resources of this nation are limited, that our people are bearing heavy burdens of debt and of taxes. We could point out that many worthwhile projects for the improvement of our own nation have of necessity been held in abeyance because of the importance of helping rehabilitate the great damage and dislocation growing out of World War II.

We can, and I believe should, point out that in this country our growth and productivity has come because of the liberties guaranteed under our Constitution and our free economic system.

American enterprise has supplied the taxes or the wages and dividends from which taxes are collected to carry in part the heavy burdens of the war and post-war period. The balance from deficit financing has added to the vast debt confronting ourselves and our children.

So that our own people and our friends abroad may understand the magnitude of this debt, the following should be noted: (1) With principal payments of one billion dollars a year (which was the total cost of all activities of the federal government in 1913) it would take 280 years to retire the national debt. (2) If we had started January 1, 1956 paying off on the debt at the rate of one million dollars a day, it would be the year 2725 before the last payment would be made. (A total

of 769 years!)

We could and should point out, I believe, that in the event of disaster or famine our people, in the future as they have in the past, will generously respond to the relief of human distress, and that in this aid there will be no political commitments expected or required of the nations and people we would be helping.

We can and we should point out, I believe, that we are prepared to help furnish, where requested, technical advice in the fields of public health, agriculture, education or industry to help other free nations of the world in meeting their problems in these and similar fields. We can also, I believe, point out that if the economic and political climate is made encouraging, there is substantial private capital in this and other nations of the world that could help develop the natural resources, the transportation systems and the industry of such countries as such investments helped to develop ours. In this atomic and airplane age in which we now live, this nation can no more return to isolation than an adult can return to childhood. An effective system of collective security will have to be created and maintained as long as the menace of aggressive Communism continues.

In helping our associates who have demonstrated a willingness to do their utmost to help themselves, we will have substantial burdens. Within the policy of building an effective collective defense, the President should have a considerable amount of flexibility in the

allocation of funds appropriated by Congress. But is it wise to continue to pour out billions of dollars of additional American aid over a prolonged period of time to nations: (1) That assume no collective security obligations for the preservation of human freedom, but desire to get all the advantages furnished by such a system on a free ride basis? (2) That have made no reasonable effort to attract private capital to help develop their resources? (3) Whose leaders use their efforts to travel about the world attempting to seduce nations away from collective security into neutralism when such efforts coincide with present Soviet strategy?

As to the latter, I recognize a sovereign right of any government or any people to choose the road of Fabian or Marxian Socialism if that be their free choice. I question their right to expect or to get long-term government-to-government grants and loans which keep adding debt and tax burdens to the American free-enterprise camel to the point where its back is broken.

Every responsible man and woman at home and abroad must recognize that if the United States could be destroyed or impoverished by overt aggression from without, by political subversion from within or by economic collapse, we would likely take the whole free world down with us. There would be no oasis of freedom to which those already enslaved might look for hope, and there would be no international cornucopia upon which we might call for our own rehabilitation.

On these and other issues confronting us, men in and out of government may honestly differ. In a free society there is room for such differences and there are certainly no pat solutions for the

complex foreign and domestic problems that confront us. But likewise in a free society it is important that these matters be brought into the open and that they be discussed.

It is my firm belief that if we win the cold war we can prevent a hot war from developing. I believe that this can best be done from a position of strength.

It is not now, nor has it ever been my belief that we should have a "get tough policy." On matters of principle I believe that we should be firm and should not yield principle for expediency. In the working out of the negotiable issues, I think we should be responsible in our attitudes and recognize that conditions change in the world, and a policy which was wise five years ago or one year ago may need modification today. But I do not believe that we should ever feel it necessary to apologize for either our political system or the economic system which has enabled this nation to grow from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a great nation of 165 million; the most productive the world has ever known.

It is my personal belief that we would command more respect from our allies, from the neutrals and from our potential enemies if we insisted on a fair quid pro quo for agreements entered into. We should stress the point that an alliance is of little value unless the other party has as much obligation to come to our defense in case of attack as we have to go to theirs.

As a Senator of the United States, as well as an American citizen, I have a deep conviction that if

we of this generation will use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe was Divine inspiration gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution of the United States, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free society cannot solve, and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

End of Remarks