

## STRATEGY FOR A NEW PEACE OFFENSIVE

By: Hubert H. Humphrey  
(United States Senator  
for Minnesota)

The present struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery is more than a military struggle. The free world must arm itself, but arms are not enough for the goals of democracy. Any strategy of the free nations which seeks to achieve a goal in this world must be designed to win the mind, heart, and soul of men everywhere. One loyal friend in France is worth six bazooka guns. One committed ally inside the Ukraine is probably equal to five American tanks. The more friends we have the less arms and soldiers we need. The fewer our friends the greater must be our reliance on arms. Free men need guns, but more than guns, they need friends.

This truth is obvious and generally recognized. What is not so obvious is what we should do about it. American attitudes range from a sulk rejection of Europeans and Asiatics to elaborate psychological schemes to win friends and influence people.

Thus, we have frequent analysis of the "mind" of Europe, and the "mind" of Asia. We are presented with varying proposals to quote bathtub statistics, stress the concept of freedom, hammer at Communist tyranny and others. We hope that our programs of information and persuasion will have the greatest possible success. But I am firmly convinced that all our Voices of America will be weak and

ineffective unless we do now what we have woefully failed to do: come to terms with the greatest need and aspiration of men everywhere -- the desire for peace.

The twentieth century desire for peace is universal, transcendent, compelling, and overwhelming. We don't have to be psychologists to understand this. Just talk to your next door neighbor. Like all men, he has an abhorrence of any kind of war. But unlike men of earlier centuries, he has a stark, deep dread of the consequences of atomic war in the twentieth century. Over and over again, he has been told that the next war will spare no one, soldier, civilian, man woman or child. Scientists and non-scientists have used such phrases as "destruction of all mankind," and "the end of civilization," with such telling effect that the thing he dreads most above everything else in this world is an atomic war. In this, your next door neighbor is universal. His mind and heart is like that of every other man everywhere else. The dread of atomic war and the desire for peace is the single most important psychological fact of our time.

It is this elementary fact, this simple, universal desire for peace, for survival, that American foreign policy has not understood, met, or satisfied. It is this fact, above all others, which the Comintern has manipulated and exploited with brutal brilliance.

The most important word in Communist propaganda is the word, "peace." By their mere repetition of the word, the Communists show that, although we do not, they do understand the most important

psychological fact of our time. The Communists and fellow travelers are always sponsoring "peace meetings," "peace Conferences," and "peace petitions." I am told that the pro-Communist artist, Pablo Picasso, made a special contribution to the party by painting a dove of "peace." All these uses of the word "peace" do not lack a purpose. International Communism, which takes the offensive on all fronts, wants to be very sure that it secures all the advantage of a "peace" offensive.

We may laugh, or better, cry to see that this ruthless system of slavery parades before the world as the partisan of peace. But it is they, not us, who have taken the "peace" offensive; and from it, they have secured a maximum advantage because there have been no counter peace movements to oppose their offensive.

It is a fact that, except for our few and noble pacifists, anti-Communists do not hold "peace" conferences. Our public debates discuss the question how best to defend ourselves if, and when, war comes. Our leaders say things like, "we want peace, but," or, "we will have peace, if." The accent in American speeches is always on the "but,if and nevertheless." The accent is always on the likelihood of war. The accent does not suggest to a waiting world of men who yearn for peace that we are about to launch a "peace offensive."

Is it any wonder that the rest of the world which sees us through the mist of propaganda and fourth hand reports gets the impression that we have warlike aims? Part of the world thinks we want war, another part, that we are a clumsy giant lumbering into war, still another that we will not be able to avoid war. Is it any wonder that in many parts of the world there is little enthusiasm for American policy?

If you are a European and you believe that the next war means the destruction of everyone, including yourself, how can you bring yourself to choose sides? Most Europeans can distinguish between Communism and Democracy, and most of them prefer Democracy. But why should they exercise their preference in a war which will destroy them? If you are going to die perhaps it is better to choose to die with your friends, but it is not a choice which will stir men to enthusiasm.

We speak a great deal today about creating a will to survive, but how can we create the will, when, from the start, it is agreed that there is no prospect for survival? Men do not welcome advice about how to die, but they would eagerly accept some words about how to live. War means death, peace means life. Men want to live, they will struggle heroically for life; what they want is a program for life, a program for peace. It does not have to be ironclad, one hundred per cent certain, but it must offer the possibility that it can achieve and maintain peace: it must bring them what they so sorely lack -- hope.

The desire for peace can depress or arouse; it can be the cause of apathy and despair or the source of powerful political dynamism. When men want peace and feel that war is inevitable, they fall into despair. When they have a tangible hope for peace, they are aroused to great effort and activity.

Our country does not appear to have a program for peace and it reaps the bitter harvest of hostility, neutralism, and despair -- even among its own people. Talk to your neighbor, again, this time about the "Great Debate." If he supports the Hoover policy, he does so because it recommends itself as a military strategy. The Hoover proposal anticipates a war and argues that the war it anticipates could best be conducted from the Western Hemisphere. It is a policy aimed at winning a war, not avoiding one. It offers little consolation to Americans, and much less to non-Americans, who want desperately to escape a Third World War.

If your neighbor supports the administration's foreign policy, he may perhaps be a little more hopeful -- but not much. Militarily, the containment policy argues that the best strategy is to defend ourselves in Western Europe and at various other points around the Soviet Eurasian perimeter. Politically, the containment policy expresses the hope that if the Soviet rules are contained for a period of time, they will "slow down" and let the rest of the world live at peace. Yet we know that there is little likelihood that the Soviet



rules will slow down. So for us and the people of the world, the containment policy is a grim proposal to hang on, hope for the best, all the while waiting for what is much more likely -- the worst.

Whichever he supports, isolation or containment, the man next door will do so with little hope that either policy will avoid war. Should he still possess the faintest glimmer of hope, it will be buried under the knowledge that both proposals in the Great Debate call for turning the world into armed camps -- with long military service and meager civilian consumption -- which face each other in a state of terrible tension that blights all plans for the future.

If Americans are not inspired by the Great Debate how much less so are the Europeans whose countries are less able to afford military expenditures, who suffered the most in the last war, and whose fields will be the battleground of the next one?

The "Great Debate" may clear the mind, but it does not lift the heart. It only furnishes further ground for apathy and despair. Both proposals make the great mistake. Both fail to harness the world wide energies latent in the universal desires for peace. Neither strike the true note of a valid program for peace. Both surrender the peace offensive to Stalin and the Politburo.

The fault does not lie with Mr. Hoover, Mr. Taft, nor Mr. Acheson. They earnestly and devoutly desire peace. Each of them speaks for a large section of the American people who share the same sentiment. The fault lies with the whole Western mind which has so anxiously desired peace that it has submitted to the blackmail of

international Communism.

It is not easy to do otherwise. Our dilemma is this: the only conditions which might bring a permanent peace to the world are those conditions which might cause the Communist elite to threaten war. Thus we must either pronounce the true conditions and provoke the threat -- or -- ignore the true conditions of peace and be precisely in the position where Stalin wants us. We are thus left without a peace offensive.

Let me explain in more detail why I believe that the Communist elite has blackmailed the Western World.

"Peace" is the most important word in the Communist arsenal. It is put to many uses by Communist propaganda. Many make the mistake of believing that the Communists use the word simply as a snare for the gullible. No greater error could be made. If the Communists used the word "peace" simply to convince gullible people of their peaceful intentions, they would be as stupid as we foolishly suppose them to be. The world is not so gullible and the Communists know it. They use the word to convince, and where they cannot convince to neutralize, and where they cannot neutralize to terrify.

Take the word "peace." On one side of it there is the desire for peace; on the other side there is the dread of war. THE COMINTERN CRY FOR PEACE ALWAYS CONTAINS THE THREAT OF WAR. Both are together in Communist propaganda. While Pravda screams "peace" it shouts boasts about what the Red Army will do when it gets its hands on American soldiers. In his latest interview on the prospects

for world "peace," Stalin insinuated the threat of war.

The comintern which talks incessantly about the war hysteria of the West has with its brutal genius created an hysteria of its own -- a peace hysteria.

No hysterical attitude is likely to achieve its goal. And "Peace hysteria" will not bring peace.

The Comintern object in its campaign of "peace hysteria" has been to create in the Western world a blind, hysterical desire to avoid war -- at any cost.

Now "peace" is an elliptical word. It should always contain the question, "at what price?" This the Communists never say; but their meaning is quite clear. It is: "Peace at our price."

Thus the Stockholm Peace Petition wants the peace in which there is no killing by American atom bombs, but in which there is killing by Soviet tanks.

The Communist line is always the same. The strategy was and is quite clear: "want peace," says the Comintern. Want it hysterically, says the Comintern, and when you are hysterical enough, when we have terrified you sufficiently, you will accept peace on our terms -- peace through appeasement and then peace through surrender.

The peace of slavery -- that is what we are offered. It is a sickening bargain, but at least it contains a verbal offer for peace. And since war is so terrible in the atomic age, many people all over the world seem willing to pay the bitter price.



Anything besides appeasement means war, and war is what you must avoid at any cost, says the Comintern.

This is the Stalinist blackmail, brilliantly successful in the atomic age. All of us who have desperately desired peace have paid the blackmailer -- and the blackmailer always returns.

In the year 1951 the road to hell is paved in a very special way with good intentions. The Comintern supplies the paving, the peace loving peoples supply the good intentions.

The major victims of Stalinist blackmail have been the anti-Communists and the various supporters of the neutral "third camp." This should not surprise. The Comintern has no problem in using its friends. It demonstrates its genius in dealing with its enemies.

The Communists and fellow travelers all over the world believe that the Soviet elite wants peace, and so they work night and day to accomplish its peaceful aims. They believe, they do not despair. They are, therefore, a source of powerful energy. With them, international Communism has created the attitude necessary to conquer the world.

The third camp is not pro-Communist, but it has been terrorized by Communist propaganda. It has not been taken in by the Communist peace line, but neither will it take up arms against Communism. It is neither for nor against Communism, and it is neither for nor against democracy. The third camp will not choose, because it believes that choice means war, and war, destruction. In vain, we

tell the third camp that we are ethically superior to Communism. Most of them know that, and all of them would know it, if they were not so terrified at the prospect of war. The third camp does not want to die for justice and freedom, it wants to struggle for peace. Since we have no program for peace, the third camp remains neutral.

Communist propaganda has achieved exactly the effect it desires in the third camp. The third camp will not resist, and those who will not resist Communism are easily conquered by it.

But what of the anti-Communists, how have they been victimized by the Comintern. Here the story is a little more complicated, and to tell it, we must go back to the end of World War II.

When the war ended, the fact which was uppermost in our minds was Hiroshima. We were horrified and guilty and determined that there would be no Third World War. The principal obstacle to peace seemed to be the Soviet Union -- for the Soviet Union, alone of all other nations in the world, presented the threat of war. But in 1946, neither the obstacle nor the threat seemed very large. In the warm afterglow of our war-time alliance and our enthusiasm for the sacrifices of the Russian people, we made allowances for the Russian regime. We knew that it was strange, clearly a dictatorship, brutal and oppressive, and we knew that it would cause the world some difficulty, but not too much, because we wanted to get along with the Soviet Union. We had to get along with the Soviet Union. For we were determined to have peace.

At that moment of world history, a curious and fateful thing happened in the psychology of the West. The overwhelming post-war desire for peace became the exact equivalent of the desire to get along with the Soviet Union. A reading of the editorials of many conservative American newspapers will demonstrate how widespread this attitude was.

Peace was equated with an adjustment to international Communism. We, the free peoples, had to get along with Communism -- the slave system. We became the variable in international politics, the Soviet Union was the constant. We could be reasoned with, but not the Communists. The pressure of the desire for peace was turned against us, the variable. A great part of the energy in the desire for peace was spent in criticizing American policy and blaming us for the approach to war.

This was mistake No. 1 -- the mistake we made at Yalta, Teheran, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and at Berlin, where we should have resisted not avoided. This mistake is still being made, especially today by some conservative leaders who urge that the way to get along with Communism is to leave Europe defenseless.

Mistake No. 2 was a companion error. Getting along with the Soviet Union came to mean for many getting along with the Russian dictator and the Communist elite. This was very strange because history and political science show quite clearly that dictators are

inevitably warlike. We had every good reason to suspect that the Communist dictator would be especially so.

Our attempt to get along with the Communist elite was even more strange because in every free nation in the world Communist parties were at war with legitimately elected democratic governments. We respected the legitimacy of an inhuman dictatorial government, while the international movement of the dictatorship showed its disrespect for the legitimacy of democratic governments.

When stated so baldly, it sounds fantastic. It shows the enormous power of the Stalinist blackmail. Missing was the daring suggestion that since Communism had opposition movements within democratic countries, the democracies ought to have opposition movements within Communist countries.

There is something even stranger still in our servent effort to get along with the Russian Communist elite. In the name of our desire for peace, we elected to deal with a warlike dictator and cut ourselves off from the peace-loving Russian people.

One more point must be added to the history of this error. The Western World which is always measuring the possibilities of war has always assumed that if war came, we would fight against a Russian people united behind Stalin. Since we are doing nothing to separate the Russian people from Stalin, we will make our assumption valid. In other words, by cutting ourselves off from the Russian people, we are increasing the strength of Stalin's hand, and effectiveness.

Mistake No. 3 is a crude companion of 1 and 2. Since we must get along with the Soviet Union, and since that means getting along with the Soviet dictatorship, the problem becomes, how can we get along with the Soviet dictator. This leads to all kinds of guessing about what Stalin is really like and what he really wants. The guessing is helped along by the newspaper cartoons and certain eminent men who at some time in their lives were given an audience by Stalin. These men claim to have the answer to the problem of peace, because they claim to know what Stalin really wants for Soviet security. This guessing plays directly into Communist hands. Since no one has access to Stalin's mind, the number of possible guesses is infinite. After each new Czechoslovakia the guesses are revised. The Comintern encourages the guessing by having Stalin issue a periodic mysterious statement. As long as we keep guessing, we keep believing that we will have peace if only we can find out what Stalin wants. We wish to find out the blackmailer's exact price because we foolishly believe that we can pay him off once and for all.

The fourth mistake is also a companion of 1 and 2. It is dictated by hearts terrified by Communist threats. It says: since we must get along with international Communism in order to have peace, then international Communism must be the kind of system we can get



along with. This leads to a variety of interpretations of Communism ranging all the way from the specious rationalizations of the fellow travelers to, I am sorry to say, the forlorn hope expressed by the containment policy. Containment rests upon the wish that, even though we know the leopard to be what he is, Communism will somehow change its spots, settle down and let the world live at peace. The containment policy is built upon the thin air of a pious myth. It does not face up to the truth about Communism.

What is the truth about Communism? The truth is that Stalin is not a whimsical and capricious dictator with a mysterious mind. There is nothing mysterious about him. He is an orthodox fanatic who is the head of a religious movement. The movement is Marxist-Leninism. It came to power in Russia in 1917. It has been at war with the rest of the world ever since. It is at war with the whole non-Communist world today.

If we will only look at what the Communists say, this will all be clear to us. Leninist-Marxism is officially proclaimed as the only true ideology -- in Russia and everywhere else. It is not a theory, but a religion. Its theology is historical-dialectical materialism. Its high priests are the members of the Communist Party. Its God is Stalin; its mission, to midwife the birth of the Communist world; its goal, an earthly paradise ruled by the Communist elite.

The Communist religion divides the world into two classes: believers and non-believers. To the believers, it promises earthly

paradise; to the non-believers, eternal damnation. The Communists mean to establish the paradise; they mean to be alone on this earth.

All this the Communists say. But one does not have to rely upon their words. Their record is clear;

Inside or outside the Soviet Union, wherever the Communist movement has held power -- in labor unions, in governments, in political parties, in front groups -- it has never tolerated opposition, disagreement, or even mild dissent. It makes no difference whether the opposition comes from the right or left. Socialists, social democrats, anarchists, liberals, conservatives, -- if they oppose Communism then they are heretics, infidels, and enemies of the truth; and all have been suppressed wherever the Communists hold power.

Ours is a bitter and painful lesson: There will be no peace as long as the Soviet dictatorship continues in its present form and there will be no peace until the international Communist fifth columns all over the world are withdrawn, abandoned, or destroyed.

To work for peace today, therefore, means to work for the destruction of international Communism and the alteration of the Soviet dictatorship. To do otherwise is to ignore the true conditions of peace.

What are the true conditions of Peace? I do not wish to be dogmatic on this point. They appear to me, however, to be something like this:

The Soviet Union must agree to a program of international control of atomic energy under United Nations' supervision; it must agree to a similar program of disarmament under United Nations' supervision; it must agree to the free interchange of people and ideas between Russia and the rest of the world; it must agree to the withdrawal of all Red soldiers and Communist agents from other countries; it must agree to free elections in Czechoslovakia and the Balkan countries -- elections supervised by the United Nations; and it must agree to disband the Comintern -- the international Communist movement -- once and for all.

We must announce these conditions -- the true conditions of peace -- to the world, again and again and again. We must announce, moreover, that all these conditions are bilateral; any conditions we impose upon the Soviet Union are conditions we are willing to impose upon ourselves. And we should be willing to give tangible evidence of our honor and goodwill.

Should we lay down these conditions in the form of an ultimatum to the Soviet elite? No, it wouldn't do any good. We are interested in changing the minds of the Russian people, the third camp, and our own despairing allies. The Russian people may be interested in our bathtubs, but they are more interested in what will happen to them if they overthrow Stalin, or, if war comes, what help and justice will be given to those who sabotage Stalin. The third camp may believe in the writ of habeas corpus and freedom of speech, but it believes more in the overwhelming necessity for peace. It

wants a program for peace. Our own despairing people and allies arm themselves for defense with the grim conviction that they are on the side of justice, but they want to know isn't there one last chance for peace.

There is one last chance, if we have the honesty to face the facts and the courage to state them. Let us refuse to pay the Soviet blackmailer any longer and state the true conditions of peace, to ourselves, to our allies, to the third camp, and, above all, to the Russian people. Let us tell the Russians that we want neither their lives, their land, nor their goods. We want only to live at peace. And we have a program for peace whose conditions we solemnly swear to fulfill. Let them turn their eyes on those who will not fulfill them. Let the eyes of the world be turned on the Soviet dictator and the Communist elite. We will have stated a program for peace which can bring peace. What is their program?

Let us take the offensive, the peace offensive. Let the conditions of peace be the constant and the Soviet dictatorship the variable. Let us change the categories of the world mind. Let us lead the world to ask, not how can we get along with the Soviet dictatorship, but how can the dictatorship get along with the conditions of peace?

Let us state the conditions again and again and again. Let us hold peace conferences all over the world. Let us harness the dynamic power of the desire for peace until it exerts an overwhelming

pressure on those who can give the world peace. Let us release the despairing energies of the men and women all over the world who pray each night for peace. Men and women will be heroes for a great goal. The great goal in our time is peace. Let us state the conditions. Let the peoples of the world find their own way to heroism.





# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)