

001721
From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
1311 New Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D.C.
CApitol 4 3121, Ext. 2424

talk not short
negot - not recommendations
for Release: Monday, p.m.
September 28, 1959
Commandful Regulation
Berlin
Spring
Exchanges

SENATOR HUMPHREY WARNS OF DANGER IN SOVIET 'LIVE AND LET LIVE' CONCEPT

America must not be lulled by the Khrushchev visit into blindly accepting his doctrine of "live and let live", as attractive as the Soviet Premier has made it sound, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) warned today in a luncheon address before the National Stationery and Office Equipment Dealers Convention at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago.

no accept live & let live
"The danger of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's visit is our tendency to accept the 'live and let live' doctrine," ~~Senator Humphrey said~~. "This is just another way of accepting the concept of so-called co-existence, which in reality means accepting the status quo in the world today."

no
"I reject this attitude and policy, both as unrealistic and as unbecoming our great nation as a leader of the free world."

Manning
Coexist
"To accept co-existence as a policy is to be slowly chipped and whittled to pieces, because to Communist imperialism, co-existence means the growth of Soviet power through propaganda, subversion, economic penetration, trade wars, and the expansion and development of the Soviet satellites' economies."

"Khrushchev has declared war on us, but a strange and new kind of war."

"This is a total war, fought with the weapons of political maneuver, economic competition, science, technology, propaganda -- and all directed

Khrushchev - Not merely to U.S. Audience!! To World
Used C.I.N. ! Propag or Proposal!

toward making Moscow the center of world power, with Asia, Africa, and Latin America the new frontiers to be explored, exploited and controlled. Yes, Khrushchev meant it when he said: 'We (The Soviets) have declared war on you in trade, in production, in education.' We had better man the ramparts and move on the offensive.

"Khrushchev may not intend to blow the world to pieces -- he prefers to pick it up piece by piece. This is Operation Nibble.

Compete
"How do we meet this challenge? Surely not by merely hoping and wishing that it would disappear! We should readily, willingly, and courageously compete. Yes, the only kind of co-existence worthy of our traditions and future is competitive co-existence. We should seek to spread our ideas; we must furnish hope and reassurance to those who seek freedom, and to those searching for liberalization of policies in communist controlled states.

X
"We should never, either officially or informally, indicate acceptance or approval of totalitarian methods, policies, governments or principles. We should maintain, in concert with our allies, a modern, balanced defense force second to none. The Soviet leaders respect power. We should always be prepared to negotiate -- but it must be from a position of strength on our part.

yes, "Our goal must be a safeguarded system of disarmament to relieve mankind of the crushing arms burden. We should launch and maintain a works of peace program. Our abundance of food in a world where starvation, miserable poverty and disease surround us could enable us to bring succor

and assistance, while the Soviet Union can furnish such people only discontent.

"We can feed our friends with our surplus food instead of slogans. We can furnish medicines and training programs rather than wait for the necessity to send military missions.

"We can demonstrate to fellow human beings that in the areas where it counts the most, the free world can help them while the slave world can not. We can do this in the areas of education, health, economic development and relief of hunger and famine.

US +
others!!

"We have the resources to do all these things. The Soviet Union does not. We have the weapons of peace to win the cold war, if we will but use them.

"Khrushchev's visit gives us an opportunity to take stock of both our strengths and weaknesses. Surely the visit of the Russian dictator will remind us of the importance of the Bill of Rights -- and sometimes we forget this. The visit can and should remind us that freedom includes not only rights and privileges, but also duties and responsibilities.

"Maybe Mr. Khrushchev's visit will compel us to examine our shortcomings, the inadequacies of our education system, the need for more classrooms and more and better teachers. Khrushchev will see the slums of our cities, and he will tell the world about them. Our answer is not to accuse him of false propaganda, but to clean out the slums. Khrushchev will see some unemployment. Our response is not to deny it, but rather to promote economic growth that will give full employment."

A LOOK AT THE U. S. AND RUSSIA

*The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey
Senator From Minnesota*



I couldn't help but think, when I saw the initials "NSOEA," that this was another of those New Deal agencies, but I gather that is not the political persuasion of the group. However, I met a good friend from Georgia a while ago and he said: "Senator, there are a few Democrats here. You're not without friends." So—rally around the flag, boys, we're going to need your help!

I've looked your program over hurriedly, and I surely do want to extend to the general manager and to Mr. Brain, Mr. Stewart, and all the other officers and the Washington staff (and I know how hard staff works—believe me, without staff, fellows, let's face it, we don't amount to much), I want to commend you on a wonderful program. I understand it started off in a big way this morning with talented speakers, with important messages, and that you have two or three more days of real fine activity, both of a professional nature and of entertainment. And I want to wish you the best.

Not long ago I was addressing the Rotary Club in Minneapolis, Minnesota. And when I was being introduced, a very dear friend of mine who likes to chide me a little bit about my politics and some of my many utterances, said, looking me over (and I had been traveling considerably through some very turbulent weather.) "You look kind of tired, Hubert." I said, "I am! We've had a tough session of Congress; we didn't know how to close it off, and it's been hard work." And when he got up to introduce me, he said: "I want to present a fellow that's too old for castor oil and too young for Geritol!"

I thought that was a rather unusual introduction, but then I recalled—as has been indicated here today—I am a pharmacist, I do not practice pharmacy as such, but my brother does. We have

a store and I know something about your problems. And I mention this because my work in politics has a precarious tenure; you never quite know when it will end!

And 1960 is the end of my second term in the Senate. I'm up for contract renewal. And I just thought (in case you're looking the place over) there is, you know, need for good, hard-working employees . . . just take a good look at me. I'm not going to file any personal applications, but I do it in a rather general manner. I'll be glad to give you my address.

I want to talk to you very seriously today, my dear friends, about matters that weigh heavily on your mind, and matters that face our country. My topic was very general for which I am grateful, because these are changing days and it's rather difficult to select a topic that may not be out of date by the time you arrive to deliver the message. The topic, "A Look at the U. S. and Russia" was selected a long time ago, and I want to say it turns out to be a right timely topic because we've been having a look at Russia. Rather, we've been having a look at the leader of the Communist forces of the world, of Communist Russia and of Russia; they're all different and yet they're all inter-related.

I'd like to share with you just a few personal observations about this man, Nikita Khrushchev. First of all, I think we ought to do a little brainwashing of ourselves, and I say that in the most friendly and positive manner. By that, I mean we ought to cleanse our minds of some of the misinformation that we've had.

We've been going around for years in this country assuming that this Soviet Union was weak, made up of nothing but rather untidy peasants. We never really tried to understand what the

meaning of the word "proletariat" was. We've look upon Russians for a long period of time as if they were about 3-foot high, incompetent, having an unwieldy bureaucracy, a system of enterprise that quite obviously (because it was socialistic) would be a failure.

Why, I've heard prominent members of our government (in fact, only three years ago, I heard one of the leading officers of our government before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) tell us of the obvious, glaring weaknesses in the Soviet system that were about to "tear it apart": that there was dissension, division, weakness. And he hadn't more than got the words out of his mouth when there were indications to the contrary: Sputnik! Sputnik was more than a rocket. Sputnik was a dramatic demonstration of Soviet power, Soviet coming-of-age. Sputnik, my friends, was Soviet power spelled in capital letters across the horizon. And Lunik is Soviet power in the universe across the heavens in neon lights. That's advertising! Every stationery and office equipment manager and owner ought to know what that means.

This is a part of the psychological struggle. Sputnik not only got us to thinking what is going on, but, believe me, it shocked the rest of the world. The rest of the world DID believe that we were far ahead in everything; the rest of the world DID believe in the majestic power of the United States.

Then came that shock, the shocking news that we had not been the first to launch an outer space object, that, in fact, we'd had many failures. I'm sure the Soviet had some, too, but, despite the failures, they got one up. And then our efforts came along with a "Mousenik" and they had a "Mutnik"—and now it's the rocket to the moon.

Now I'm not just pointing this out

continued on page 30

to frighten anybody, but what I'm trying to point out is that the first law of life, a competitive life, is never to underestimate the opposition. Many a good stationery and office equipment store has gone broke because it didn't stay up-to-date, didn't compete and underestimated the opposition and didn't analyze the market. And one can do the same thing in politics.

Now, what sort of a man is this Nikita Khrushchev? I spent 8 hours and 25 minutes with him, and I spent many more days in the Soviet Union. When I first arrived at the Soviet Union, I can tell you that it seemed like I had fallen into another world, and I had. It was even more vividly pointed up when I left—returning out from behind the Iron Curtain to Oslo, Norway and Copenhagen, Denmark—was like coming out of the shadows into the bright sunlight of freedom.

But having said that, let me tell you that when I left the Soviet Union, I was more concerned about Soviet Russia, than ever before. I have been a fighting, hard-working anti-communist all my life and not just in the Senate. Why, we've got our guards on the door, our police on the watch. It really doesn't take any courage in the United States to be an anti-communist.

But I want to tell you something. It's a little different to get in one of their cars and go through the gates of their Kremlin, inside their Kremlin offices with THEIR guards on the door, with THEIR Secret Police prowling the neighborhood, and with their Dictaphones and tape recorders in the wall. And then to sit across the table for 8 hours and 25 minutes, knowing that every word you say is being taken down—across the table from the leader of international communism.

It was physically and emotionally exhausting, but, my friends, I wouldn't let that experience go by again for all the world. It was a great experience; it was a revelation. And ever since then I've been on a one-man crusade to arouse people in this country to the nature of our competition. I've been trying, as one individual, to tell the people about this fellow, what he represents, what he is.

You have seen him, too. He's tough! T-O-U-G-H. There isn't a bit of softness in him. He's vigorous, he's vital, he's speaking right now in Moscow to a

couple hundred thousand people in the Moscow Stadium. He flew back in 10 hours and 45 minutes—5,160 some miles; he got off and made a speech the minute he got into the airport and he's been talking ever since.

You think American politicians talk? We look like silent sphinxes compared to him! And this is the Communist, this is the leader. He's subtle, he's able, he's informed, he has a disciplined mind, he's a calculator. All these outbursts, they're well planned. He has a sense of the drama, he's a bit of an actor, and, what is more, he has perfect political timing.

Can you imagine what he's going to say? "They wouldn't let me see Mickey Mouse!" Now, Mickey Mouse is the most popular American character in the world. And, as Bob Hope said, he knew why they wouldn't let him in to Disneyland. . . . Oh, I know, there's good reason to believe that the Soviet Police didn't want him to go, that they put thumbs down on it.

But the world's not going to believe that, I can tell you that. He was OUR guest and Disneyland is something that is known all over the world. Everybody reads the funny papers on Sunday and it was on Saturday that he couldn't see Disneyland. And he couldn't see Mickey Mouse. Bob Hope says the real reason they wouldn't let him in there is because that's the only place we've got a rocket that will work! Now, I don't think that's true.

I'll tell you something: I think it's good that we laugh at ourselves once in a while. We do have some rockets, by the way, that work. We need more.

Mr. Khrushchev is not only all that I've said—he's informed, he's quick. You watched him on television—he's a propagandist and he's on the offensive every minute of the day. He exudes confidence, and he's been exuding that confidence ever since that Sputnik business. He's been working on that ever since. He talks competition. He says he wants competition; he wants to compete in everything; he wishes to wrestle with everybody he meets.

This is a very different kind of a political dictator. He's a political man. He enjoys telling the world he doesn't liquidate his opposition; he may not liquidate them, but I surely can tell you he incapacitates them. He has a

following throughout the world, and he surely has one in the Soviet Union. If you think the Soviet Union is about to collapse, then you've been smoking political opium. It isn't about to; it's a going system. And the regrettable truth from our point of view, but not from their point of view, is that it is getting stronger; they are producing more goods and services for their people.

Now remember what kind of a country this is. And I want to tell you that one of the things I felt when I was there, was that I knew so little about it. I spent a few years in college, I do a good deal of reading (not enough), but I realized all at once how little I know about Russia, and Russia is only part of the Soviet Union. Russia is Russia. And I noticed in the paper sometime ago that the Russians do not like to have their Mother Russia called the Soviet Union, and I can understand that.

So what is this man Khrushchev? He's Peter the Great and Lenin and Stalin. He's Mother Russia and Marxism and Leninism and Communism. He's a complex man. He's a combination of all these forces. And the Soviet Union today is Russia with her great artists, her great musicians, her great scientists, her great doctors, her great educators, her strong and vital people, her peasantry, her great sweep of land, her fabulous resources. And it's all of this: Russia of the Czars, Russia of the Secret Police of the Czars, plus Communism—disciplined, monolithic, doctrinaire Marxist Communism.

And this puts power on their masthead.

I think you can summarize the U.S.S.R. by saying that today it is ruthless planning, it is production, and it is power. We have to understand this, because what Mr. Khrushchev tried to accomplish here, he did. He established that he must be dealt with as an equal. No longer will it be the United States, France, Great Britain and Canada AND the Soviet Union in conference. Now it will either be the United States and the Soviet Union, or the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union AND Czechoslovakia. In other words, they'll add one of their satellite states every time we add a Free World ally.

continued on page 34

Fortunately, from our point of view, and fortunately for the world, the weakness in the Soviet armor is the satellite system. As important as our own military power today is the fear of the Kremlin and what will happen in their satellites if they ever launch an attack. For mark my words: the Poles could rise up like a man, as one individual, to strike back, and this could be true of country after country. . . Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the other countries.

It's this weakness in their structure, which Mr. Khrushchev himself sees and is trying to repair. This is why they're not cracking down as hard as they did in Hungary. Hungary took a toll out of the Soviet Union. It revealed again their tyranny. Khrushchev wants respectability, acceptance. This is why this trip meant a great deal to him. He got some of it.

Now, my friends, what did we learn from this trip? Well, I think we learned one thing. If you're going to compete with the Soviet Union, you're going to have to understand politics in depth. There are no briefings in Russia, my friends. In America, everytime you hear about somebody going to make a speech, going to have a conference, they say: "He has to be briefed." That's a lazy man's way of doing full-time work. And it needs to be said.

You can't be briefed in economics, my friends. You cannot be briefed in world politics. You have to be immersed in it, soaked in it. It has to come to you by the process of repetition. If all you're going to have is a 15-minute or 30-minute briefing, you are going to be severely limited. Khrushchev lives his work. All of his life he has been a professional, trained, disciplined political leader. There are hundreds like him in the Soviet Union. This is why it would be well for some of you to ask your sons and daughters to take a professional interest in politics, rather than looking upon it only as a necessary evil, rather than telling them: "For goodness sake, don't get involved in it."

Because make no mistake about it, my friends, no mistake about it: The great decisions of *this* world are going to be political decisions. Now do you want the second team making them, or the third team, or do you want a first team? If we spent as much time train-

ing our politicians as we do quarterbacks for college football teams, we'd be doing better. And I can add we could better train our foreign service.

Therefore, I recommend that our government through our schools, through our journals of mass media—television, the radio, the press—start to teach the American people in depth something about Russia, something about communism, something about the Soviet leaders. If I had my way, my dear friends, our government would be spending ten times more to get detailed, documentary information on the top one thousand communist leaders of the world, particularly in the Soviet Union and China.

We need to know about this opposition. What we do know is a well guarded secret insofar as many members of the government are concerned. I think every member of Congress needs to know about all of this in depth, not just some little article he has a chance to read on the airplane. Now I like *Reader's Digest*, it's a good publication, but it's not a substitute for the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. And the *Encyclopedia Britannica* is not a substitute for 10 years, 15 years of study. I'm advocating today that this nation go to school, learn something, study, before it's too late. And after we study, learn how to make decisions, which requires knowledge, courage and determination.

One line of Mr. Khrushchev's left me fully cognizant of what he was up to. He spoke at the National Press Club on the second day he was in Washington—that was quite a scene. He was confident to the point of being arrogant; he talked about the supremacy of his system. He never once, in this entire trip, except on two things—corn and hot dogs—admitted that we had something better. That's all. And not even quite so much on corn! But he did agree that our hot dogs, our frankfurters, were better than their Russian sausages.

What did he say at that speech? He said: "We are a persistent people." He revealed part of their strength. They're no more brilliant than anybody else; the Russians are not 3-foot high, nor are they 9-foot high. They're not supermen, they're not pygmies; they're people. Their system is far behind ours in terms of overall production. But they've learned how to establish

priorities; they've got a disciplined system, a dictatorial system. But, fellow Americans, let's never admit that a free system can't compete, because the day that we admit that, we are defeated.

I've heard many people say, "Senator, of course the Russians can produce Sputniks because they can order people to do it."

Well, my friends, we don't have to order anybody to do it, but we can voluntarily and democratically establish goals in this country and ask people to cooperate to get it done. There can be a healthy cooperation between government and private industry. There can be a wholesome and healthy cooperation between individual citizens and government to get things done. Or do we want to fritter away our lives? The answer, it seems to me, is *to make our democracy work!*—to make it work on time—and it can.

People need inspiration; they need direction; they need leadership; they need to be challenged. The Scripture says something to the effect that if the trumpet is uncertain, who shall heed the call? Well, if in one week we think the Soviet is about ready to collapse and the next week we're worried that they're going to take over the world, if we keep people running between fits and fevers, who is going to heed the call? You can't have overdoses of tranquilizers all the time saying: "Everything is just jolly—don't worry—it's wonderful." Because all at once we can find out that the roof has fallen in or somebody has pulled a rug out from underneath us.

Mr. Khrushchev said: We're a persistent people. And by that he meant (he kept talking about coexistence, you know) "Live and let live." He said, "You have your system and we have ours." Doesn't that sound wonderful? Why, I'll bet most of us said, "Well now, that's rather reasonable. They have their system and we have ours!"

Khrushchev would like to peddle that. I reject it. It's just another way of permitting ourselves to be slowly chipped and whittled to pieces. To the communist—and particularly to the communist imperialist—coexistence means the continued growth of Soviet power, through propaganda, through subversion, through economic penetra-

continued on page 36

tion, through trade wars, through expansion and development of the Soviet's satellites' economies.

Mr. Khrushchev says they're persistent. They are. How persistent do you think we really are today? All Mr. Khrushchev is asking is that he be permitted to stay on the job and we folks take a nap. The tortoise and the hare; we could be the tortoise and they the hare. I want to warn you: that Soviet tortoise is getting long ears! And beginning to move awfully fast!

We ought to remember that Mr. Khrushchev has frankly declared war on us. He said this morning a very truthful thing—that the Cold War is a long way from being over.

I think there was some value in this visit. I was one of those who supported it. The President made the decision and I think he made the right decision. I told him so. . . I'm of the opposition party, but I think there's no room for petty politics and partisanship in these matters. I think possibly out of this we may determine to quit shouting at each other and start to talk; that will be something. We'll start to negotiate instead of recriminate; that will be something. But we had better know what we are talking about and we had better know what we are negotiating for. And we had better understand that this is a total war, fought with the weapons of political maneuver, economic competition, science, technology and propaganda, all directed at making Moscow the center of world power. With Asia and Africa and Latin America the new frontiers to be explored, exploited and controlled.

Yes, Khrushchev meant it when three years ago he said over American television, "We have declared war on you in trade, in production, in education." Now Khrushchev may not intend to blow the world to pieces; in fact, I don't think he does. I think they fully realize the tremendous power of nuclear weapons, and I think they realize how one can use military power as just an extra lever, an extra force in diplomacy. They know how to apply the pressure, we are always worried that they may be trigger-happy, and therefore there is always a tendency on our part to agree when we should not agree, out of fear that something might happen and go wrong. Khrushchev doesn't intend to blow this world to pieces, fellow Ameri-

cans. He intends to pick it up piece by piece—Operation Nibble—the biggest real estate operation the world has ever known.

How do we meet this challenge? Well, surely not by hoping that it didn't happen and that it will just disappear because it's bad. Remember what that great British statesman, Edmund Burke, once said, "Evil triumphs when good men fail to act." And if you're just going to go around satisfied that communism is wrong, that you don't like it, that it's atheistic, it's socialistic, it's therefore evil and it's going to collapse, you are not going to get the job done.

There is no proof that will happen. Communism will only be stopped; it will only be modified; it will only be altered; it will only be changed *if good men act*. Action, competition is needed. If Khrushchev says he wants competition, I'm for giving it to him—plenty of it—across the board. But I want to warn you: you are not going to give him competition by having an economy that creeps along when it should be moving along at a more rapid pace. You're not going to give him competition if you're more worried about inflation than you are nuclear conflagration.

You can talk yourself into a mental sickness, you know, a national sickness. This country has everything in the world that it needs to win this struggle—everything. We have overwhelming resources. In a world in which people are hungry, we have an abundance of food—and complain about it. In a world in which most of the people are sick, we have an over-abundance of modern drugs, the finest medicine, the finest pharmaceuticals in the world. In a world in which most of the people are illiterate, we have the greatest educational system that mankind has ever known (it needs improvement and it needs to be increased and expanded—but it's still the greatest). But we're not putting them to work.

What we have done thus far is not enough. Our work is cut out for us. We should never either officially or informally indicate acceptance of totalitarian methods, policies, governments or principles. And we should maintain in concert with our allies a defense establishment that is second to none, that will permit us to bargain from strength. And once we have done that, then let

us seize the initiative with some of the great concepts of peace for which the world hungers.

What was the one word that Mr. Khrushchev repeated more often than any other word in his 12 days in America? I'd like to have it tabulated by some good researcher: the word was "Peace." And if you listened to it in Russian, it was "Mir." Every other line—Peace, Competition—Peace. What the Soviets are attempting to do is to usurp the mantle of the peacemaker. Remember his speech at the United Nations, his 4-year universal disarmament proposal. Many people branded it as propaganda; possibly so, but I think it ought to be studied very carefully, and then we should ask Mr. Khrushchev for some deed of good faith, and not merely some words of good faith.

Finally, I believe we have learned something from the communiqué given by Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower following their meeting at Camp David. That communiqué was brief, but like many things there's much between the lines. That communiqué emphasized negotiation, Berlin, exchanges and Spring.

Now let's just take a quick look at them. Both leaders said we must negotiate rather than use force. I believe both leaders mean that, but I believe that for the Soviet "negotiate" means to nibble, nibble, nibble, nibble and nibble. . . delay, delay, delay and delay. And there's only one answer to that: Be prepared when you move to the negotiation table.

Be ready in depth; have your best people there—this isn't a partisan matter; call upon Democrats and Republicans and Independents alike, mobilize the talent of the nation. And do not rely entirely upon massive retaliation in a world, my friends, where there'll be many peripheral struggles. We must have a balance of forces. The Soviets understand power, and they have no respect for people who do not have it or do not know how to use it.

The next item was Berlin. I don't know exactly what was meant by the announcement that they will reopen negotiations on Berlin. I hope that those negotiations will be reopened, but I hope we make it manifestly clear that it is not going to be a negotiation which

continued on page 38

results in jeopardizing the security of that city, or in any way permitting the loss of the freedom of those courageous people who have been a symbol of courage and freedom for many years since World War II.

Exchanges? I'm for them: educational, cultural, scientific exchanges. I've been advocating for months, ever since I returned from Russia, that we expand the Exchange Program. Doctors, teachers, engineers, electricians, businessmen . . . the more contacts we have with the Russians, the more we can get behind the Iron Curtain, the better it is for us. I am not worried about the United States going communistic if some communist comes over here.

To say that is cheap, pettifogging demagoguery. This country is never going to go communistic because somebody visits us from the Soviet Union! If it ever goes totalitarian, it will only be because we have lost our sense of values and our sense of decency and have let our economic and political system rot and corrupt. It won't come, my friends, just because a leader of Russia came into this country. But I'll tell you this: the Soviets who have lived behind the Iron Curtain for years are hungry for contact with the West. I found more inquisitiveness, more interest among the young people of Russia about America than among any young people in all of Europe. I did not sense one note of hostility. I talked to hundreds of them—thousands of them—and they were interested in our country; they liked us, despite the poisoned propaganda from the official political sources of the Soviet Union. They have been over-poisoned. The only fear they had was that we were going to start a war. This has been sold to them.

Exchanges? More of it. Mobilize the medical resources of the world in a mighty war against disease and let us take the lead. Mobilize the educational resources of the world against illiteracy; let us take the lead. Mobilize the great food and fiber resources of the world against hunger and famine; let America take the lead. Let us recover the mantle of the peacemaker, of the just, the kind, and the humanitarian. This is what I mean by exchanges and taking the initiative.

And when Mr. Khrushchev indicated

that our President was going to come to the Soviet Union in the Spring. I'm sure many of you felt as I did at first. Well, something went wrong. Things are in a bad state of affairs. The talks at Camp David must have been miserable; they must have been bitter. And then on second thought, I realized that maybe it is better this way because the world can only take so much of this at one time. How much more do you think you could take? Twelve days of Khrushchev—then comes the World Series—and then President Eisenhower going to the Soviet Union!

To put it in the simplest words, we need to digest what has happened. We need to clean out the chaff from the grain. We need to see whether there are a few things here which were said and done which were meaningful. We need to discount the clichés (and I heard two hours of them yesterday over the television from Mr. Khrushchev). Get rid of the generalities, get rid of all the propaganda words and see whether or not there was some little germ of an idea, some little seed of a hopeful idea that is left. This is going to take time, careful analysis too. It might be well to see what happens when Mr. Khrushchev talks to his own people.

So I feel that the delay in the return visit may be a good omen: it possibly means that for a period of time there will be negotiations and talks at the lower levels of government which can lend themselves to some relaxation of tension.

We are not only Republicans and Democrats and Independents, we are Americans. But we're not only Americans, we're people. And we're people of the Western culture, Western civilization. We're people—every single one of us in this room, possibly—of Judaic-Christian concepts and traditions.

What is the difference between Communism and freedom? What is the difference between Khrushchev and Eisenhower, or Khrushchev and Stevenson, or Khrushchev and any other American? What's the difference? Well, I'll tell you, the difference just isn't in production and capacity. That's one of the differences. But there is no guarantee, my friends, that state capitalism, communist-capitalist-socialism (that's what they have) cannot produce as many tractors as we pro-

duce. They may produce someday as much steel as we produce. They surely can train as many doctors, as many engineers. And if all we're going to do is to argue Communism versus freedom on the basis of production, or even education, or the ballet . . . if that's all we're going to do, then we may come off no better than equal.

Because the whole world can receive money, goods and services, training and technicians—from communists just as well as from capitalists. They know how to produce steel; they know how to produce technicians; they can put up rockets, they can build roads, hospitals and schools. They've done a tremendous job in education. And if all we're going to do is to argue this case in that frame of reference, then I don't think we're going to be very successful. And never let Mr. Khrushchev trap us into that mistake!

But do you know where the real difference is and where we should be arguing the case? We should argue this case on the basis of ideals, principles, values, morals, ethics. The difference between freedom and communism is the difference between the message from Sinai and from Lenin, Marx and Engels. The difference, my friends, is the difference between the New and Old Testaments and the difference between the Communist Manifesto and Lenin's writings. The difference is between individual dignity, on the one hand, and "the masses" on the other, human rights, on the one hand, and the state on the other. The difference is between having free speech, free press, freedom of religion, freedom to assemble, freedom to participate in government—and being used, ordered, and told by a system of centralized power.

Fellow Americans, let us never get confined to the statistical argument about tons and bushels and pounds. Let us never rest our case upon the material argument of goods and services. I think we can out-produce them, but even if we could not, I'd rather live our way, because our way is the way of justice, of compassion; it is the way of free men—working out their problems in a free society working to make mankind better, to fulfill the charge, and the promise that man was created in the Image of His Maker. . .

That is the difference, and let's never forget 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