

Joe Rauh -

Bob Nathan

Key Note -
NEW FACES

Some Guidance
Some Direction
Some Inspiration

000872

"TARGETS FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY"

⊙ 104 p 110
chman

Keynote Address by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey to the 12th Annual Convention of the Americans for Democratic Action, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 9, 1959.

⌞ We hear a great deal these days about "firmness" in our international affairs, and especially in our dealings with the Soviet Union.

I am for being firm. There is no way to deal successfully with Khrushchev and Company except to be constant in principle and resolute in purpose. But a policy of firmness does not require us to stand pat and to stand still while our principal adversary carries on a campaign of maneuver and subversion against the free world. To sit tight behind a Maginot Line of stubborn complacency while our adversary grows stronger and bolder is not firmness; it is folly and suicide.

⌞ And make no mistake about it: The Soviet Union is growing stronger -- and therefore bolder. The evidence is abundant,

week in DC
- 4/24 - 4/25
- India
- WHO
- Pappas

not in the windy boastfulness of Comrade Khrushchev but in the fine print of the solid and substantial performance and plans of the Soviet economy and the Soviet military.

Just three months ago, while we Americans were listening to the latest unemployment figures and fighting the Battle of the Balanced Budget, the 21st Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was proclaiming the Soviet goals -- economic, political, and ideological -- in the cold war. To any who bothered to listen, this was sobering news.

The Soviet goals were stated, of course, in the propaganda-tinted phrases of the Communist jargon. In plain English they add up to a declaration of Soviet strategy for the cold war.

In plain English they mean that the Soviet Union has set out to arm itself with such massive economic, political, and military power that it will be able to force an end to the cold war on terms of its own choosing. This is the Soviet

version of victory without nuclear war.

∟ Their chosen instrument for this victory is the expanding Soviet economy, controlled and directed by the Communist hierarchy for this overriding purpose of victory.

∟ The Soviet economy must provide the material base for continued expansion of Soviet arms.

∟ It must provide the base for the economic invasion of the underdeveloped neutrals, for yoking them to the Soviet economy.

∟ It must provide the means of persuading the political and intellectual leaders of poverty-stricken Asia, Africa, and Latin America that Communism is capable of lifting them by their economic bootstraps.

yes ∟ The 21st Party Congress has put us on notice: "The fundamental problem of the coming seven years," it said, "is to make the most of the time factor in socialism's peaceful

competition with capitalism. Fast rates and the necessary proportions must be insured in developing the national economy."

"Fast rates and the necessary proportions" like these:

Increases in the capital goods industries of 85-88 per cent -- in seven years!

Increases in consumer goods industries of 62-65 per cent -- in seven years!

Raising the productivity of industrial workers 50-55 per cent -- in seven years!

Increasing total output 86 per cent -- in seven years!

Let's not kid ourselves that they do not mean this, or that they are incapable of doing it. They may not fully meet these goals; but they mean business, and they have enormous resources and a record of getting things done.

We have laughed off five-year plans and seven-year plans in the past -- and to our sorrow. We will laugh this one off to

our peril. We have it on the authority of the chief of the CIA, Mr. Allen Dulles, that for the past seven years Soviet industry has grown at the annual rate of 9.5 per cent. This is about four times the rate of growth of our own economy in the same time!

*4 times as many machine tools,
1/10 the number of cars.*

↳ We have little cause for comfort in comparing our own economic progress with the spectacular performance of the Soviet Union.

↳ While the economy of the USSR has been growing at an annual rate of 9.5 per cent, the economy of the U.S. has been growing at an annual rate of 2 per cent. And the gap in total output has been steadily narrowing.

↳ While the USSR has been racing forward, we have been wallowing in our second unnecessary recession in five years.

During one quarter of last year, for the first time, steel production in the Communist bloc exceeded production in the United States.

Steel is Power - Steel is Strength!

While the USSR speaks of increasing the productivity of labor by 7 or 8 per cent a year, our productivity has been increasing by less than 2 per cent.

The Russians are laying their bets on the proposition that our production will continue to grow at the rate of 2 per cent a year while theirs will grow at the rate of 8 or 9 per cent. If this happens, as Mr. Allen Dulles says, "the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide."

The answer rests not with them, but with us.

I am not arguing for a competition of keeping up with the Soviet Joneses. It may or may not be necessary to match them stride for stride, industry for industry.

But, I do say that we need to know our goals as clearly as they know theirs. And we need to manage our affairs as effectively for our purposes as they manage their affairs for their purposes.

000878

And moreover, we must do it by the means of democracy,
and to take full advantage of the enormous productive potential
of our ^{free} enterprise economy. ~~---~~

< I have dwelt in some detail on the economic competition
because it is basic. But this is not the only field in which
we have failed to set our goals high enough, or where we are
in danger of falling behind in the competition.

< In spite of the President's soothing words, there are
well-documented doubts about our military strength, now and
in the future.

< In international politics and diplomacy, by our dogged
defense of the status quo we have allowed ourselves to be out-
maneuvered in Europe, leapfrogged in the Middle East, and
seriously challenged in Asia and even in our own hemisphere.

< In the ideological competition we have frittered away
the priceless assets of our heritage. We have been silent
on the revolutionary implication of our Declaration of Independence

and our Constitution, with their universal appeal to mankind. Because we have been so inept in translating these timeless principles into the times and places of the 20th Century, we find ourselves on the defensive against the glittering sophistry of Marxism and Leninism with its perverted appeal to those who have never really known freedom.

Whether we talk in terms of economics, or politics, or arms, or ideas, the conclusion is the same: It is not for want of resources and capacity that we are falling behind in this competition, but because we lack a sense of purpose, a sense of direction, a sense of disciplined action. And this is the massive failure of our national leadership.

(DISCUSSION, DISSENT, DECISION)

We all remember that it was this same failing which cost us so dearly in the days of the great depression of the 1930s.

Franklin Roosevelt's greatest service to this country was his gift of leadership, his ability to understand the capacity of the country, to express its purposes, to set its goals and to marshall the richest of our resources -- our people -- for their fulfillment.

There is much that we need to recall and to learn from the history of those years. Arthur Schlesinger's latest volume of the Age of Roosevelt recounts how in 1933 the President and the devoted team who drew their inspiration from him, faced the country's terrifying problems frankly and without illusion, and how they set themselves to rebuild the country's resources and put them to work.

There were false starts and mistakes. But over all there was a sense of purpose and direction, as they sought not only to relieve the ills of that depression but to make another one impossible. Before they were finished, they had

laid a foundation for national and individual security; they had reshaped the banking system; they had built the framework of a Social Security system; they had established the rights of labor and safeguarded the rights of home-owners and investors. And most important, they had restored to the country its confidence, its vitality and its belief in the ability of free people to use the processes of democracy to rescue themselves even from the depths of chaos.

↳ We should recall, too, that in the war against fascism, F.D.R. once again saw clearly where the destiny of the American people lay and called them to meet it. And once again the country responded. |

↳ The contrast with the present is inescapable. Where is the vision now, and the leadership that is both dramatic and realistic? Now, when we should be doing more, we are restrained by timid cautions.

000882
Just this week it was my privilege to take part in

a most important conference on India, which brought together many experts on the massive problems confronting that country. We discussed ways in which the United States could cooperate in the solution of these problems . At the climax of the conference, what does our leader say? He is "massively interested" in India, he told the press, but "fearful" of a massive program of aid. If this is the attitude at the top, how is the country to understand that these are times when massive problems require massive solutions?

How different it was with F.D.R.!

Who can ever forget his goal of 100,000 planes, which all "practical" people knew was "impossible". Only the visionaries like Bob Nathan knew how to plan and bring them into being.

Even during the war, with its stern military priorities, the President kept before us not only the military but the economic contribution

and the political goals. Beyond the goal of military victory he raised the banner of the Four Freedoms and the vision of the United Nations. The American people responded with sacrifice and discipline and an outpouring of energy and devotion. This is what made victory possible, even though Franklin Roosevelt himself did not live to see it.

“Well,” you may say, “that was different. We were in a war.” Well, my friends, let me tell you this: like the war against fascism, the contest with Communism is a total competition for the survival of our system of freedom and our existence as a free nation. It is not a shooting war, thank God! But in its totalness, in its perils, in the imperative tasks it lays on us, and in the frightful consequences if we lose -- it is a war.

“Fifteen years ago we were in a war and we knew it.”

Now we are in a war but we don't want to believe it. Those who should summon us to its task refuse to recognize it.

Instead they dope us with tranquilizing pap which dulls us to the dangers and saps our strength to defend ourselves.

The war against fascism was bloody and tragic and filled with sacrifice. But it was our salvation that it was the kind of war which gave us time to mobilize resources which in the end proved decisive.

The cold war is a different kind of war -- a mortal struggle between two ideological and political systems. In this war also our resources can be decisive, but only if they are mobilized in time. And that time is now before there is any shooting. After will be too late.

Our national leaders warn us of the evils of international Communism. They profess to recognize its dangers. But when it comes to fighting this war, they tell us we can

fight it with one arm tied behind our backs. They propose to fight the balance of terror with balanced budgets, with business-as-usual, with politics-as-usual.

Those who are in a position to make the decisions of leadership shrink from decisions. They refuse to acknowledge that this struggle requires more than we are putting into it, that it should have first priority on our energies and resources.

Yes "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to battle?"

Comrade Khrushchev says, "We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade. We will win over the United States." He boasts that our grandchildren will live under his brand of socialism.

I say we should take up that challenge, not only in trade, but in ideas; in works for peace, and in food for peace; in showing by example that the ways of freedom can build more

stately mansions for soul and body than tyranny ever could.

∠ I propose that we launch a grand design for peace --
a Seven Year Plan of our own -- beginning right now, or if
that is too much to hope, then on January 20, 1961.

∠ I propose that we set the goals which are the price
of survival and that we set ourselves to meet them.

∠ I do not propose that we imitate the Soviet Union --
either its goals or its methods.

∠ I propose that as they have set their goals for the
triumph of Communism, we set our goals for the preservation
of peace and security and for the extension of human freedom
and individual welfare everywhere on earth.

∠ They have set authoritarian priorities by dictate. We
must set our goals by consent through democratic processes.

∠ We must demonstrate the superiority of the methods as
well as the goals of freedom and democracy.

and, The highest goal is the winning of a just and durable
peace.

< But, my friends, this is not a goal that can be
reached by wishing, or by recoiling from the unspeakable
horrors of war in the nuclear age. It requires cool nerves,
but also endless patience and the ability to keep ourselves
at the peak of our strength for decades -- perhaps for a
generation.

L We have had enough of nerve-wracking take-offs and
crash landings. We need to gear ourselves to a fast cruising
speed. - *Sustained Power!*

L We must seek the way to disarmament, to remove the
terror of nuclear extinction and release the productive
energies of the world for the works of peace. But even as
we seek it, we must maintain our defenses at the peak of
efficiency and effectiveness. There is no future for those

who undertake to negotiate with the Soviet Union from a

position of weakness. They understand and respect power.

and Strength for us is not strength of the United States alone, locked in a fortress America, but strength in a community of free nations -- with our allies and friends. Our contribution to that strength is not only the strongest military defense of which we are capable, but equally the strongest political, economic and ideological counterattack against international Communism. *and to build a better world.*

L We should make and take every opportunity to negotiate agreement with the Communist bloc. There is only one test of the usefulness of an agreement: Will it enhance the strength and security of the free world and the chances for peace? We should encourage and seek opportunities to relax tension by working together on matters like health and science, and through cultural and personal exchanges.

✓ We should move steadily to build the United Nations as an instrument for nations to work effectively together and as a framework of international relations in which law and order are respected.

✓ Our second goal is to realize the American dream of dignity and well-being -- life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness -- for every American.

✓ I propose that we dedicate the decade of the 1960s to the realization of that dream.

✓ This unfinished business of democracy is necessary to do for its own sake. It is even more imperative now because the rest of the world is watching to see whether democracy can really do it. We must succeed.

✓ To make equality of rights and opportunities for all Americans a living fact. To wipe out the last vestige of discrimination under color of law.

To end forever the poverty which still afflicts, young
and old, one-sixth of the richest nation that is or ever was.

To erase slums and banish hunger from our land.

↳ To bring the best of education to every American child.

To bring the blessings of medical knowledge and medical care
within the reach of every American.

↳ To secure the future of small farmers and small business-
men.

↳ By these fruits shall we be known.

|| This is our
Charter of Hope!

#3

Our third goal is to cooperate with free people anywhere
in technical and economic progress -- in industry, in agri-
culture, in health, in education.

In this "only war we seek" food and science, medicine
and education, and skills are our megaton weapons of "massive
rehabilitation."

For this "War" we should plan to set aside \$2 billion each

year, and as time goes on, maybe even more, for as long as
the need persists -- for years certainly, maybe for decades.

∠ We must export our know-how carried by a peaceful army
of technical missionaries.

(Egypt - Ague Exports lost in Nile)
ask Pres. to Send Ag. Gpts.)

∠ We must export our capital, because without it, the
revolution of rising expectations may be frustrated and
violent, instead of peaceful and beneficent.

∠ We must use the blessings of our agricultural abundance
in the war against hunger and malnutrition.

∠ Instead of the Ugly American, we must turn the face
of ["]America the beautiful, ["]through our art, our music, our
books, our theater, our orchestras.

∠ If we do not do these things, it is possible, even likely,
that some nations, including some which hold the key to the
future, may turn to the Communists in desperation. But that is
not our sole reason for doing these things.

∠ We must do them because they are required in this war
of interests and ideologies. But we must do them also because
this is our mission in this last half of the 20th Century.
This is our call to greatness, our call to leadership. If we
were to fail in this, we would forfeit our claim to greatness;
we would forfeit democracy's appeal to mankind.

∠ These goals are no idle dreams. They are the stark
necessities of our times. But they will not come easily. And
if we choose to live ⁱⁿ in fat and comfortable complacency, they
will not come at all.

∠ They will test our moral and political fibre. They will
test our leaders and our capacity for self-government. And they
will test our economy.

If we continue as we have for the past 6 years, our economy
will grow just about as fast as our population. We will just
about stand still.

000893

If that happens, only by rigorous controls of our economy will we be able to give priorities to national defense, to foreign economic development, to education, health and welfare here at home.

On the other hand, if we reach and maintain the 5 per cent rate of economic growth that is necessary and possible, there will be enough for the priority purposes and for the free functioning of the enterprise economy.

In our purposes, too, the national economy is basic. Khrushchev is betting everything that we can not make it. I am betting that we can and will.

The Soviet goals are directed to Communist domination of the world. Ours are directed to the reign of freedom throughout the world.

We are called on to show that a democratic society can mobilize its resources and that a free people can accept the

~~rigorous~~ disciplines of planning and performance without losing their freedom. We are called on to show that a free people can compete successfully with a totalitarian system that uses the disciplines of dictatorship to achieve its ends.

∟ We demonstrated this once before, in the competition with fascism, but not until we had been forced into a shooting war. The challenge is much greater now than it was 20 years ago. Communism, with its massive military and economic power and its sugar-coated ideology, is a more formidable enemy than fascism ever was. Moreover, this time the fate of mankind rests on our being able to win without falling into a shooting war.

∟ This kind of challenge requires the concentrated efforts of all areas of our national life, dovetailed together in coherent, well-planned whole.

∟ I have proposed that the Congress create a Joint Congressional

Committee on National Strategy, to consider overall our
national goals, our national resources and our national
strategy.

And I have proposed that the Executive Branch of the Government have a National Policy Planning Staff, responsible for devising and recommending plans to express the national purposes in terms of the realities of the world situation and our own capabilities. The Department of State has long had such a staff to advise the Secretary on foreign policies. We have a Council of Economic Advisors to the President. We have a maze of interdepartmental coordinating committees. We have competing and conflicting policies and priorities -- from State, Defense, Commerce, CIA, Treasury, and the Budget Bureau, which often mistake control of the purse for control of policy. Nowhere is there a staff of competent thinkers and planners, undistracted by administrative

responsibilities, able to think through plans and priorities of national goals and an integrated strategy for the total of our national effort in all its aspects. I propose that such a staff be created. It is time we took planning out of the dog house and put it in the White House.

< My friends, this country has a glorious future. It has an opportunity which history has offered to no other people, anywhere, anytime. But it is an opportunity that only liberals can grasp. We have seen for 6 years that the conservative mind and the conservative spirit are unequal to it. At best the conservative is dedicated to the constructive preservation of the status quo. At worst he is mired down in the dogmas of things as they were. This kind of challenge takes the boldness, the inventiveness, the imagination, the creative political and economic risk- taking which has been the characteristic of liberals in this

000897

country from the times of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln,
to the days of Wilson, the two Roosevelts, and Harry Truman
-- whose Diamond Jubilee we joyfully celebrate this week.

It is a job for you and me. Let's get on with it.

May 8, 1959

"TARGETS FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY"

Keynote Address by

Senator Hubert Humphrey

to the

12th Annual Convention
of
AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.

May 9, 1959

We hear a great deal these days about "firmness" in our international affairs, and especially in our dealings with the Soviet Union.

I am for being firm. There is no way to deal successfully with Khrushchev & Company except to be constant in principle and resolute in purpose. But a policy of firmness does not require us to stand pat and to stand still while our principal adversary carries on a campaign of maneuver and subversion against the free world. To sit tight behind a Maginot Line of stubborn complacency while our adversary grows stronger and bolder is not firmness; it is folly and suicide.

And make no mistake about it: the Soviet Union is growing stronger -- and therefore bolder. The evidence is abundant, not in the windy boastfulness of Comrade Khrushchev but in the fine print of the solid and substantial performance and plans of the Soviet economy and the Soviet military.

Just three months ago, while we Americans were listening to the latest unemployment figures and fighting the Battle of the Balanced Budget, the 21st Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was proclaiming the Soviet goals -- economic, political and ideological -- in the cold war. To any who bothered to listen, this was sobering news.

The Soviet goals were stated, of course, in the propaganda-tinted phrases of the communist jargon. In plain English they add up to a declaration of Soviet strategy for the cold war.

In plain English they mean that the Soviet Union has set out to arm itself with such massive economic, political and military power that it will be able to force an end to the cold war on terms of its own choosing. This is the Soviet version of victory without nuclear war.

Their chosen instrument for this victory is the expanding Soviet economy, controlled and directed by the communist hierarchy for this overriding purpose.

The Soviet economy must provide the material base for continued expansion of Soviet arms.

It must provide the base for the economic invasion of the underdeveloped neutrals, for yoking them to the Soviet economy.

It must provide the means of persuading the political and intellectual leaders of poverty-stricken Asia, Africa, and Latin America that communism is capable of lifting them by their economic bootstraps.

The 21st Party Congress has put us on notice: "The fundamental problem of the coming seven years," it said, "is to make the most of the time factor in socialism's peaceful competition with capitalism. Fast rates and the necessary proportions must be insured in developing the national economy."

"Fast rates and the necessary proportions" like these:

Increases in the capital goods industries of 85-88 per cent -- in seven years!

Increases in consumer goods industries of 62-65 per cent -- in seven years!

Raising the productivity of industrial workers 50-55 per cent -- in seven years!

Increasing total output 86 per cent -- in seven years!

Let's not kid ourselves that they do not mean this, or that they are incapable of doing it. They may not fully meet these goals; but they mean business, and they have enormous resources and a record of getting things done.

We have laughed off five-year plans and seven-year plans in the past -- and to our sorrow. We will laugh this one off to our peril. We have it on the authority of the chief of the CIA, Mr. Allen Dulles, that for the past seven years Soviet industry has grown at the annual rate of 9.5 per cent. This is about four times the rate of growth of our own economy in the same time!

We have little cause for comfort in comparing our own economic progress with the spectacular performance of the Soviet Union.

While the economy of the USSR has been growing at an annual rate of 9.5 per cent, the economy of the US has been growing at an annual rate of 2 per cent. And the gap in total output has been steadily narrowing.

While the USSR has been racing forward, we have been wallowing in our second unnecessary recession in five years. During one quarter of last year, for the first time, steel production in the communist bloc exceeded production in the United States.

While the USSR speaks of increasing the productivity of labor by 7 or 8 per cent a year, our productivity has been increasing by less than 2 per cent.

The Russians are laying their bets on the proposition that our production will continue to grow at the rate of 2 per cent a year while theirs will grow

at the rate of 8 or 9 per cent. If this happens, as Mr. Allen Dulles says, "the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide."

The answer rests not with them, but with us.

I am not arguing for a competition of keeping up with the Soviet Joneses. It may or may not be necessary to match them stride for stride, industry for industry.

But, I do say that we need to know our goals as clearly as they know theirs. And we need to manage our affairs as effectively for our purposes as they manage their affairs for their purposes.

And moreover, we must do it by the means of democracy, and to take full advantage of the enormous productive potential of our enterprise economy.

I have dwelt in some detail on the economic competition because it is basic. But this is not the only field in which we have failed to set our goals high enough, or where we are in danger of falling behind in the competition.

In spite of the President's soothing words, there are well-documented doubts about our military strength, now and in the future.

In international politics and diplomacy, by our dogged defense of the status quo we have allowed ourselves to be outmaneuvered in Europe, leapfrogged in the Middle East, and seriously challenged in Asia and even in our own hemisphere.

In the ideological competition we have frittered away the priceless assets of our heritage. We have been silent on the revolutionary implication of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, with their universal appeal to mankind. Because we have been so inept in translating these timeless principles into the times and places of the 20th Century, we find ourselves on the defensive against the glittering sophistry of Marxism and Leninism with its perverted appeal to those who have never really known freedom.

Whether we talk in terms of economics, or politics, or arms, or ideas, the conclusion is the same: It is not for want of resources and capacity that we are falling behind in this competition, but because we lack a sense of purpose, a sense of direction, a sense of disciplined action. And this is the massive failure of our national leadership.

We all remember that it was this same failing which cost us so dearly in the days of the great depression of the 1930s. Franklin Roosevelt's greatest service to this country was his gift of leadership, his ability to understand the capacity of the country, to express its purposes, to set its goals and to marshall the richest of our resources -- our people -- for their fulfillment.

There is much that we need to recall and to learn from the history of those years. Arthur Schlesinger's latest volume of the Age of Roosevelt recounts how in 1933 the President and the devoted team who drew their inspiration from him faced the country's terrifying problems frankly and without illusion, and how they set themselves to rebuild the country's resources and put them to work.

There were false starts and mistakes. But over all there was a sense of purpose and direction, as they sought not only to relieve the ills of that depression but to make another one impossible. Before they were finished, they had laid a foundation for national and individual security; they had reshaped the banking system; they had built the framework of a Social Security system; they had established the rights of labor and safeguarded the rights of home-owners and investors. And most important, they had restored to the country its confidence, its vitality and its belief in the ability of free people to use the processes of democracy to rescue themselves even from the depths of chaos.

We should recall, too, that in the war against fascism, F.D.R. once again saw clearly where the destiny of the American people lay and called them to meet it. And once again the country responded.

The contrast with the present is inescapable. Where is the vision now, and the leadership that is both dramatic and realistic? Now, when we should be doing more, we are restrained by timid cautions.

Just this week it was my privilege to take part in a most important conference on India, which brought together many experts on the massive problems confronting that country. We discussed ways in which the United States could cooperate in the solution of these problems. At the climax of the conference, what does our leader say? He is "massively interested" in India, he told the press, but "fearful" of a massive program of aid. If this is the attitude at the top, how is the country to understand that these are times when massive problems require massive solutions?

How different it was with F.D.R.!

Who can ever forget his goal of 100,000 planes, which all "practical" people knew was "impossible". Only the visionaries like Bob Nathan knew how to plan and bring them into being.

Even during the war, with its stern military priorities, the President kept before us not only the military but the economic and the political goals. Beyond the goal of military victory he raised the banner of the Four Freedoms and the vision of the United Nations. The American people responded with sacrifice and

discipline and an outpouring of energy and devotion. This is what made victory possible, even though Franklin Roosevelt himself did not live to see it.

"Well," you may say, "that was different. We were in a war." Well, my friends, let me tell you this: like the war against fascism, the contest with communism is a total competition for the survival of our system of freedom and our existence as a free nation. It is not a shooting war, thank God! But in its totalness, in its perils, in the imperative tasks it lays on us, and in the frightful consequences if we lose -- it is a war.

Fifteen years ago we were in a war and we knew it. Now we are in a war but we don't want to believe it. Those who should summon us to its tasks refuse to recognize it. Instead they dope us with tranquilizing pap which dulls us to the dangers and saps our strength to defend ourselves.

The war against fascism was bloody and tragic and filled with sacrifice. But it was our salvation that it was the kind of war which gave us time to mobilize resources which in the end proved decisive.

The cold war is a different kind of war -- a mortal struggle between two ideological and political systems. In this war also our resources can be decisive, but only if they are mobilized in time. And that time is now before there is any shooting. After will be too late.

Our national leaders warn us of the evils of international communism. They profess to recognize its dangers. But when it comes to fighting this war, they tell us we can fight it with one arm tied behind our backs. They propose to fight the balance of terror with balanced budgets, with business-as-usual, with politics-as-usual.

Those who are in a position to make the decisions of leadership shrink from decisions. They refuse to acknowledge that this struggle requires more than we are putting into it, that it should have first priority on our energies and resources.

"If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to battle?"

Comrade Khrushchev says, "We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade. We will win over the United States." He boasts that our grandchildren will live under his brand of socialism.

I say we should take up that challenge, not only in trade, but in ideas; in works for peace, and in food for peace; in showing by example that the ways of freedom can build more stately mansions for soul and body than tyranny ever could.

I propose that we launch a grand design for peace -- a Seven Year Plan of our own -- beginning right now, or if that is too much to hope, then on January 20, 1961.

I propose that we set the goals which are the price of survival and that we set ourselves to meet them.

I do not propose that we imitate the Soviet Union -- either its goals or its methods.

I propose that as they have set their goals for the triumph of communism, we set our goals for the preservation of peace and security and for the extension of human freedom and individual welfare everywhere on earth.

They have set authoritarian priorities by dictate. We must set our goals by consent through democratic processes.

We must demonstrate the superiority of the methods as well as the goals of freedom and democracy.

The highest goal is the winning of a just and durable peace.

But, my friends, this is not a goal that can be reached by wishing, or by recoiling from the unspeakable horrors of war in the nuclear age. It requires cool nerves, but also endless patience and the ability to keep ourselves at the peak of our strength for decades -- perhaps for a generation.

We have had enough of nerve-wracking take-offs and crash landings. We need to gear ourselves to a fast cruising speed.

We must seek the way to disarmament, to remove the terror of nuclear extinction and release the productive energies of the world for the works of peace. But even as we seek it, we must maintain our defenses at the peak of efficiency and effectiveness. There is no future for those who undertake to negotiate with the Soviet Union from a position of weakness. They understand and respect power.

Strength for us is not strength of the United States alone, locked in a fortress America, but strength in a community of free nations -- with our allies and friends. Our contribution to that strength is not only the strongest military defense of which we are capable, but equally the strongest political, economic and ideological counterattack against international communism.

We should make and take every opportunity to negotiate agreement with the communist bloc. There is only one test of the usefulness of an agreement: Will it enhance the strength and security of the free world and the chances for peace? We should encourage and seek opportunities to relax tension by working together on matters like health and science, and through cultural and personal exchanges.

We should move steadily to build the United Nations as an instrument for nations to work effectively together and as a framework of international relations in which law and order are respected.

Our second goal is to realize the American dream of dignity and well-being -- life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness -- for every American.

I propose that we dedicate the decade of the 1960s to the realization of that dream.

This unfinished business of democracy is necessary to do for its own sake. It is even more imperative now because the rest of the world is watching to see whether democracy can really do it. We must succeed.

To make equality of rights and opportunities for all Americans a living fact. To wipe out the last vestige of discrimination under color of law.

To end forever the poverty which still afflicts, young and old, one-sixth of the richest nation that is or ever was. To erase slums and banish hunger from our land.

To bring the best of education to every American child. To bring the blessings of medical knowledge and medical care within the reach of every American.

To secure the future of small farmers and small businessmen.

By these fruits shall we be known.

Our third goal is to cooperate with free people anywhere in technical and economic progress -- in industry, in agriculture, in health, in education.

In this "only war we seek" food and science, medicine and education, and skills are our megaton weapons of massive rehabilitation.

For this "war" we should plan to set aside \$2 billion each year, and as time goes on, maybe even more, for as long as the need persists -- for years certainly, maybe for decades.

We must export our know-how carried by a peaceful army of technical missionaries.

We must export our capital, because without it, the revolution of rising expectations may be frustrated and violent, instead of peaceful and beneficent.

We must use the blessings of our agricultural abundance in the war against hunger and malnutrition.

Instead of the Ugly American, we must turn the face of America the beautiful, through our art, our music, our books, our theater, our orchestras.

If we do not do these things, it is possible, even likely, that some nations, including some which hold the key to the future, may turn to the communists in desperation. But that is not our sole reason for doing these things.

We must do them because they are required in this war of interests and ideologies. But we must do them also because this is our mission in this last half of the 20th Century. This is our call to greatness, our call to leadership. If we were to fail in this, we would forfeit our claim to greatness; we would forfeit democracy's appeal to mankind.

These goals are no idle dreams. They are the stark necessities of our times. But they will not come easily. And if we choose to live in fat and comfortable complacency, they will not come at all.

They will test our moral and political fibre. They will test our leaders and our capacity for self-government. And they will test our economy.

If we continue as we have for the past 6 years, our economy will grow just about as fast as our population. We will just about stand still.

If that happens, only by rigorous controls of our economy will we be able to give priorities to national defense, to foreign economic development, to education, health and welfare here at home.

On the other hand, if we reach and maintain the 5 per cent rate of economic growth that is necessary and possible, there will be enough for the priority purposes and for the free functioning of the enterprise economy.

In our purposes, too, the national economy is basic. Khrushchev is betting everything that we cannot make it. I am betting that we can and will.

The Soviet goals are directed to Communist domination of the world. Ours are directed to the reign of freedom throughout the world.

We are called on to show that a democratic society can mobilize its resources and that a free people can accept the rigorous disciplines of planning and performance without losing their freedom. We are called on to show that a free people can compete successfully with a totalitarian system that uses the disciplines of dictatorship to achieve its ends.

We demonstrated this once before, in the competition with fascism, but not until we had been forced into a shooting war. The challenge is much greater now than it was 20 years ago. Communism, with its massive military and economic power and its sugar-coated ideology, is a more formidable enemy than fascism ever was. Moreover, this time the fate of mankind rests on our being able to win without falling into a shooting war.

This kind of challenge requires the concentrated efforts of all areas of our national life, dovetailed together in coherent, well-planned whole.

I have proposed that the Congress create a Joint Congressional Committee on National Strategy, to consider overall our national goals, our national resources and our national strategy.

And I have proposed that the Executive Branch of the Government have a National Policy Planning Staff, responsible for devising and recommending plans to express the national purposes in terms of the realities of the world situation and our own capabilities. The Department of State has long had such a staff to advise the Secretary on foreign policies. We have a Council of Economic Advisors to the President. We have a maze of interdepartmental coordinating committees. We have competing and conflicting policies and priorities -- from State, Defense, Commerce, CIA, Treasury and the Budget Bureau, which often mistake control of the purse for control of policy. Nowhere is there a staff of competent thinkers and planners, undistracted by administrative responsibilities, able to think through plans and priorities of national goals and an integrated strategy for the total of our national effort in all its aspects. I propose that such a staff be created. It is time we took planning out of the dog house and put it in the White House.

My friends, this country has a glorious future. It has an opportunity which history has offered to no other people, anywhere, anytime. But it is an opportunity that only liberals can grasp. We have seen for 6 years that the conservative mind and the conservative spirit are unequal to it. At best the conservative is dedicated to the constructive preservation of the status quo. At worst he is mired down in the dogmas of things as they were. This kind of challenge takes the boldness, the inventiveness, the imagination, the creative political and economic risk-taking which has been the characteristic of liberals in this country from the times of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln to the days of Wilson, the two Roosevelts and Harry Truman -- whose Diamond Jubilee we joyfully celebrate this week.

It is a job for you and me. Let's get on with it.

* * * * *



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org