

Min Ed Am.
Mr Rockefeller
Stevenson

Don't know how I ever made it!

101613

Mr Kr.
made on
convent

Excerpts from Remarks

by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Minneapolis Rotary Club

September 25, 1959

Luncheon

Kwanis
La Crosse, Wisc
La Crosse
Minn.

Millions of our fellow-Americans have been fascinated and even diverted by the most active and unpredictable visit^{or} to our shores in many years. For ^{Tuesday} ~~ten~~ days, indeed, the Khrushchev visit has occupied the front pages of every newspaper in America, with every minute detail of the visit being faithfully reported. Bathed in the spotlight, the Soviet leader has been followed in great detail by the majority of Americans, and most likely the majority of men and women on the face of the globe.

Alan Lusk

Dr Martin
Mr Phelan
Mr Doyle

Rotary
Kwanis

Roy
Jenkins!
Bill Bryan!

Mr. R. H. Young
no prayer
today!

-2-

It has been a "great show", all right,
but are we now going to be content to treat
the Khrushchev visit as just a major
spectacle -- or are we prepared now to do
some hard thinking about the meaning of the
Khrushchev visit?

what
is it

And, with the new information and
perhaps fresh insight into Soviet tactics,
strategy and purpose, where do we go from
here? What is the American response to
this challenge which we can see through
the dust and glitter and noise of the
whirlwind Khrushchev tour?

what is
our
response

Don't forget Ike going to
Russia!!

Khrushchev's statements have had a
consistent pattern: they demonstrated a
confidence bordering on arrogance; he
repeatedly declared that the Soviet Union
is challenging us to serious competition
in production; and he constantly emphasized
that the Soviet people long for peace.
Indeed, his dramatic appeal for disarmament
seemed to be the keystone in the arch
Khrushchev was trying to build on this
visit.

What do we make of all this?

The pattern of confident near-arrogance,
the cheerful appearance shattered now and
then by flashes of raw sensitivity and
defensiveness, betray something close to a
national inferiority complex. There is a
hungry seeking for recognition and status
in this newly-rich, newly-powerful Soviet
leadership. "We are just as good as you are",
they seem to be saying. There is a great deal
of muscle-flexing, of boasting, of
strutting that indicate a nation not only
proud of what it has accomplished, but also
somewhat unsure of its social status in a

society of even more economically
successful nations.

Let We are ill-advised to ridicule or
to deprecate the headlong drive of the
Soviet nation, nor to rub raw the
sensitive skin of its leadership. I do
not feel that any useful purpose is served
by trying to outboast, outstrut, and
outshout the Soviet leadership. We have a
better system, we are quite willing to
have it stand comparison with the Soviet
system.

Let We should be perfectly willing to give

Let's not
try to
outboast

-6-

credit where it is due the Russian people
for their sacrifices and for their
accomplishments, and while we are under
no obligation to recognize or to accept
the brutal totalitarian methods of the
Soviet Government, we should recognize the
fact of Soviet economic achievement.

*Fact of
Soviet
Power*

Our response to the somewhat
strident challenges offered by the Soviet
leadership should be a calm, deliberate
affirmative -- yes, we are willing to pit
our system and our principles against the
Communist way of life in every arena in which
the Soviet leaders are willing to compete.

Compete

-7-

It is easy to get caught in a name-calling contest. It is more difficult -- but far more effective -- to quietly but confidently pick up the challenge and go to work.

go to
work

in this connection, I wish to emphasize that even ^{*Ten*}~~ten~~ days of intensive press, television and radio coverage of the Soviet leader is not going to give us sufficient insight into the Russian character and Communist purpose.

Khrushchev, we must realize, is a product of historical Russia, as well as a child of revolutionary Communism. He is a combination of Peter the Great and Lenin, with a good

Khrush
Child of
Russia
&
Comm

smattering of Stalin. The USSR today is a combination today, of course, of Czarist Russia -- Russia with all of her traditions -- and the habits of Stalinist rule, doctrine, and discipline. It is a strange fusion of the two. Russia's ancient tradition and habits are still important in the Russian character.

I mention this because it is too simple an answer to describe the USSR as just a Communist country. It is that to be sure, with its police system, with pervasive control by the state over every attribute of life. But that was also a part of Czarism. The difference is that Communism is much deeper,

001701

and International

tighter and more intensive. Nevertheless

the Russians have always lived under

tyranny. There has always been a Siberia *Slave Labor Camps*
even under the Czars.

There has always been some brutality,
purges, and the kind of anti-social contact
that was characteristic of the *Pogroms* ~~programs~~ and
of course of the class warfare between the
aristocracy and the peasant.

What I am suggesting is that Americans
who are called on to deal with the Communists
in any capacity should have a working knowledge
of Russian history, of Russian geography, of
Russian literature, of Russian culture.

*Working
Knowledge*

They also need to have a working knowledge

of Lenin's writings, of Marxism, and indeed
of Stalin's writings, with a good up-to-date
briefing on Khrushchev and what he has been
saying. They need to understand that
Communists are talkers, they are propagandists,
they are trained for this. They are constantly
at the business of agitation, that their whole
life is built upon agitation. They have
agitation centers to keep their people stimulated.
These are things that are all too often not impressed
upon us.

✓ The American press has a great responsibility,
American television and other mass media and
communication too, to train the American people

Respon
Press
&
TV

-11-

to understand the kind of world we live in.

We know so little about Russia. So little
about Communism. For that matter, so little
about Africa. So little about Asia. How can
we ever have policies that are relevant to
the needs of the times if the American people
look upon Asia and Africa as lands of exotic
peoples, peculiar customs, and sort of private
hunting grounds for the rich and aristocrats?

How can we understand what is going on
in the world if we only look upon the USSR as
Communist, when the fact is that the USSR is
Mother Russia, plus international Communism.
It is a two-headed personality with tremendous
power.

-12-

↳ We need to understand the Russian people, their sense of drive, their desire for position in the world.

↳ As to the second clear pattern in the Khrushchev visit, we must take quite seriously the Soviet determination to surpass us economically. It is a fact that Soviet production has been rising at an astonishing rate. It is a fact that most of this production has been hard, fat-free non-luxury production -- unlike our own, which has heavy proportions of luxury production. It is a fact that with still only a fraction of our total gross economic product, the Soviet

001705

-13-

✓ Don't underestimate
Soviet Ec.
ecler
Science

Union has been able to divert substantial amounts of production to economic aid in the underdeveloped countries, to use its economic strength for political purposes beyond its borders.

Here
U.S. Business
Pt 41

⌞ The Soviet leaders are not supermen, and the Russian system is not intrinsically superior. But we have seen what dogged purpose and determination and tenacity have been able to do with a system which has fundamentally less potential efficiency than our own system -- developed as it has been over a long period of trial and error. Yet no system

-- no matter how well engineered and
constructed -- can reach its full potential
without vigorous leadership and coordination.

Let us realize that our superior system
can win the economic competition only if our
political and economic leadership is as
hard-working, effective and tenacious
as the monolithic leadership of Communist
society.

*Some
Planning!*

Education (Rakover)

At this point, I wish to emphasize what
I feel to be a most important consideration:
that the basic issue between our free society
and the Communist world is not whether one
society can produce more than the other. This
is important, but it is not more important than
human dignity and the rights of man.

Values

The true issue is which society can
produce not only a life of material abundance,
but also a life of individual freedom and
dignity.

That is why it would matter little,
for example, if the captive nations of
Eastern Europe were able under Communism
simply to achieve a high living standard.
Without a recognition of Government that men
and women have certain inalienable rights
-- natural rights which cannot be abrogated
by Government -- the achievement of a high
living standard will be only ashes in their
mouths.

-16-

That is why I am not willing to say
to the Communists, "you live under your
system and we shall live under ours."

I am not just about to concede that we
should abandon non-violent attempts to
penetrate the Iron Curtain and to
encourage the peoples under Communism to
seek individual freedom.

Conversely, I would not accept a
regimented society, nor the curtailment
of human rights in our own country, simply
to be able to achieve a higher production
figure than the Communists.

-17-

While we must have planning and coordination -- as every sensible family and corporation insists upon -- our society must under all circumstance hold to the precious freedoms in the Bill of Rights.

We cannot sell our souls for a mess of potage.

Finally, the pattern of the Khrushchev visit has emphasized the announced policy of the Soviet Union to seek peace, and, specifically, to seek disarmament. Khrushchev has hammered away at this theme constantly.

Of course, he has scored a great propaganda triumph in this. Without a doubt he has been successful in many parts of the world in creating the image of a Soviet society bent on "peaceful coexistence" and, by implication, of Western society dragging its feet, reluctantly, unwillingly entertaining the idea of disarmament.

But Khrushchev is perfectly capable of ~~reaping~~ ^{reaping} what propaganda he can out of what could be a serious proposal to get down to cases on the question of arms control and disarmament. Surely the Russian people long for

peace. And -- understanding that Khrushchev is fundamentally a political man preferring to substitute guile and cunning and other non-violent means for brute force wherever possible -- it may well be that Khrushchev himself would welcome the opportunity to shift a good share of the Soviet production now going into arms into other types of production.

It is even possible that he would agree to a rather thorough-going system of inspection and controls to guarantee a disarmament agreement which of course we must absolutely insist upon. At any rate, until proved to be a hollow gesture, I believe that we must give Mr. Khrushchev's proposals serious attention and discussion.

And if it proves true that Mr. Khrushchev would be willing to agree to an enforceable disarmament program, then it is high time, and even overdue, that we begin to think through some of the implications of various types of disarmament.

Ec { For example, what would be the impact on our economy of a radical reduction in Government spending for arms? Would there be severe economic dislocation, unemployment? And what would Government have to do to make the adjustment? These are some considerations which my Subcommittee on Disarmament is preparing to study this fall.

I hope that the first tentative steps can be taken in discussions between our President and the Soviet leader toward an eventual program of effective arms control. Certainly there are far better ways to spend forty billion dollars every year than in arms -- as vital and as necessary as that spending now is. I want to emphasize that it would be the height of folly to settle for an arms reduction program which jeopardized the safety of our people. The only situation more conceivably dangerous than the present possibility of an awesome and catastrophic miscalculation and consequent nuclear holocaust would be the day on which Soviet military power in being would not be effectively deterred by Western power.

001714

-22-

Premier Khrushchev has an opportunity now to demonstrate the sincerity of his bold words about peace -- by taking steps to broaden^{and}/~~the~~ extend the program of international cultural exchange. He can move toward peaceful cooperation by concluding specific agreements to carry on joint medical research programs, and exahanges of scientific information about outer space.

Mr. Khrushchev has had a great deal to say here in America. We have listened, by and large, patiently and courteously. Now let us see what deeds will follow.

#####



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