

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

at

SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.
Saturday Evening, May 23, 1953

More than six years have passed now since the dark days that followed the Congressional elections of 1946, when a group of people, sometimes referred to as the New Deal Government in Exile, founded an organization known as Americans for Democratic Action. Skeptics observed at the time that "never before in history have so few been led by so many." These skeptics perhaps didn't realize how close they were to the truth.

The members of the new organization had no select leadership, they didn't follow a party line laid down by the Politburo or by the inner circle of the National Association of Manufacturers. For better or for worse the members of ADA were all "prima donnas," each following the leadership of his own conscience. While this may at times, perhaps, have detracted from our political efficiency, it made it possible for us to practice in our own organization the democratic philosophy which we preach.

Few of us would have thought in the summer of 1948 that four years later President Harry S. Truman would address an ADA Convention Banquet. Few of us would have thought that five years later the man who to some of us was the great hero of the moment would be steering a course in domestic politics, or -- should I say -- drifting a course in domestic politics, of which we would take a dim view indeed.

I will, however, resist the temptation to talk about that tonight. We are in a crucial period in the struggle for our national survival. Difficult as it may be for a politician to do, therefore, I feel it is essential that we cast aside for the moment, partisan wrangling and discuss maturely, conscientiously, and dispassionately, the crisis which both liberalism and our nation face today.

I am not going to spend your time proving that Communism is evil, or that the Communist threat to the United States is serious. That is not necessary before this audience, and it ought not to be necessary before any American audience. Those who believe in the democratic faith - in its traditional rights and liberties, responsibilities and privileges - can never cease in their struggle against Communism. Democracy and totalitarianism are mortal enemies. It is to us to be

the brave and the strong. It is our privilege and sacred obligation to be the champions of liberal faith, and never to compromise our principles with the subtle but ruthless foes of human liberty.

We must be ever on guard. The modern totalitarian is a cunning and devious character. The strategy and the tactics of this worldwide Communist conspiracy shift and change constantly. Now the word has gone out from the political bosses of worldwide Communism to make friends wherever they can, to infiltrate, to lie low, to join any and all groups, and again to re-establish their popular Communist front, phoney organizations. We, as members of the ADA, are morally bound to be the first to expose this treachery. Likewise, we are morally bound to make it absolutely clear to ourselves and the American people that never will permit this organization to be infiltrated or in any way be identified with or sympathetic to principles or persons or causes of Communist ideology. Make no mistake about it, our enemies are clever people and devils at heart. They know the influence of this organization and they would like nothing better than to wreck it. We have learned our lessons, and let us remember them. Now, let us be teachers for others who may not have learned as well.

We might even help our Republican friends by reminding them that Communist foreign policy at times sounds strangely similar to nationalist, isolationist policy. It is on this theme that infiltration, even into the most conservative organizations, is a threat and a possibility.

Our society is deeply concerned about Communism -- and rightfully so. There is no greater threat to our political and moral standards. There is no greater threat to the peace of the world and to the hope and future of all mankind. ADA came into being in 1946 and 1947 because it was so concerned about Communism -- and rightfully so. The main stream of American liberalism has been fighting Bolshevism and Communism ideologically and politically before many of the self-styled anti-Communists of today were even aware of the nature of the threat. And they have been doing so without adopting the methods and attitudes of totalitarianism.

The pages of history may, in fact, tell us that perhaps one of the greatest tragedies of recent years is the fact that liberals lost the initiative of anti-Communism to the irresponsibles. Knowing full well the most effective antidote to the poison of political Communism was the development of a mature, healthy, dignified political economy for the American people, the American liberals emphasized social reform as a way of undermining the appeal of Communism. The American liberal community, acting in partnership with the New Deal and Fair Deal, worked to strengthen the fabric of democracy by knitting and weaving into a pattern a program of improved educational facilities, better housing, human equality, health care,

insurance, abundant public power, and many other programs.

These bold and progressive policies have so effectively strengthened our democracy and economy that the threat of political Communism in the United States is at an all time low. The Communist Party is shrinking to a noisy and neurotic group of politically ineffective die-hards.

With this emphasis on deeds rather than words, American liberalism succeeded in virtually destroying the appeal of Communism as an internal political threat to the democratic institutions of the United States. But in this emphasis of deeds rather than words, we allowed others to usurp for themselves the title of anti-communism. Knowing as we do that the most effective anti-Communist program is a pro-democracy program, many American liberals tended to shy away from the over-simplified use of the term "anti-Communism." Thus, we abdicated the term and the title to the irresponsibles.

This has created serious problems for us and for the nation. It has allowed the irresponsibles to distort the meaning of terms and the meaning of truth by identifying Communism with its arch enemy liberalism. And it served to identify in the minds of too many American people anti-Communism with irresponsibles who had no real understanding of Communism and hence could not effectively oppose it.

The fact that men in the United States Senate who assume for themselves the mantle of anti-Communism can ask our nation to abandon its allies and go it along is a sign of the political immaturity and political danger of abandoning anti-Communism to those who have no real understanding of its operations.

The challenge to the liberals of today is to once again reassert the initiative in developing, fostering and strengthening a program of anti-Communism and a program for democracy which is mature, realistic and effective.

The basic threat of Communism to our democratic institutions today is international. We have the tools and the willingness and the determination to meet the internal domestic threat. The true spirit and strength of American represented in the philosophy expressed in our Declaration of Independence, our Bill of Rights, in our system of law and Constitutional government,

have already proved themselves a far stronger appeal to the hearts and minds of our people than the appeal of Marxist ideology. We also have the determination, the understanding, and the expertness required to handle Communism as a sabotage, subversion and espionage threat in the United States. The basic threat, I repeat, is the international.

I am deeply and seriously concerned because I am not fully persuaded that the American people or the government of the United States sufficiently understand the nature and strategy of international Communism, and thereby be able to effectively oppose it in the years to come.

Part of my reason for this concern is the apparent consternation and lack of understanding as to the nature of the recent ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Soviet "peace movements".

Communism, it is true, is an ideology. It is also a system of power. And it is also particular people --- people wielding power in Russia and behind the Iron Curtain and people manipulated by that power in our own country and in other free nations.

Our task is to understand that ideology --- to understand the nature of its power --- and to adequately identify both the personalities and the role of people who are leaders in that system of power and ideology.

I

One of my old Serbian friends in Minnesota is fond of recalling a favorite expression of his motherland which seems to be particularly ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ appropriate this evening. His father, he said, used to tell him: "Son, remember a wolf, he may change his fur, but he never changes his mind". The pages of our newspapers have told the American people that the Communist Party is in the midst of once again changing its line and its tactics. We in ~~USA~~ are already alert to the fact that the Progressive Party has been abandoned and that the few loyal bands of Communists are prepared once again to infiltrate and attempt to destroy the American labor movement and the American liberal movement by hiding their identity and working from within. I am confident that with proper vigilance we will defeat these tactics. We came into being thoroughly sophisticated as to the evils of Communism and we will be vigilant in throwing them out if they attempt

In these chapters Stalin made two main points. The first was that war between Communism and Capitalism was not inevitable -- immediately at least. Communism could still look for competition for markets between the capitalist nations, and for the trade wars and shooting wars which follow this competition, according to Marxist theory. Stalin also stated that the economic war waged by the west upon the Iron Curtain countries had in fact brought those countries closer together and expanded their economies.

Stalin's second point followed the first -- Soviet foreign policy, he said, should seek to aggravate the economic differences of the western world in order to split off certain areas from it. The areas which Stalin mentioned specifically were western Europe and Japan. Soviet foreign policy should seek to isolate the United States from its allies, and Stalin indicated that a revival of German and Japanese military power would be one way to do this. In other words -- attempt to neutralize Germany and Japan.

For us of the west, the irony of this article is that Stalin was tipping his hand -- he seems to have been indicating precisely the move which the Kremlin has now made.

It is entirely possible that the Soviet leaders realized, xxx late in 1952, that the politics of violence was not so effective as the politics of peace. The Communist answer to the Marshall Plan was the brazen seizure of Czechoslovakia. But this wanton violation of democracy served better than anything else to teach the western world the real nature of Communism.

The war in Korea also produced consequences not expected by the Soviet leaders, as it mobilized America's military and productive resources out of lethargy and complacency and into fighting form. The result is that we are now in the act of confronting the Kremlin with an integrated Western defense system backed by the will and resources to man it.

It is therefore, entirely possible that the Soviet leaders may choose to abandon temporarily the politics of violence in favor of the politics of peace.

Let me suggest some further reasons for the apparent temporary shift in strategy that we see in soviet foreign policy.

While our will is strong when the danger is stringent, Stalin and Malenkov may well have believed that our will would fail should soviet pressure seem to falter. Neutrality is strong in western Europe, where the burdens of defense have cut heavily into economic recovery, where many people are understandably tired of war and crisis, and where the desire to retrench on military preparedness is strong.

No doubt the russians have also kept abreast of public opinion in this country. The American people are, thank God, an outspoken people, and Moscow knows what they are thinking, just as Washington does. Moscow knows what they are thinking, just as Washington does. Moscow knows that the American people are anxious to cut military spending, and thereby cut taxes.

(more)

It knows that the American people are traditionally opposed to violence in international affairs.

As I speak now, the Communist peace offensive has slowed down somewhat. Real conciliation in Korea has not been forthcoming, and the recent drive in Southeast Asia has certainly been out of step with the march toward peace. Communists, of course, explain the recent military offensive in Laos by saying that they always stand ready to help nationalistic revolts in colonial countries. But to send your troops into a peaceful neighboring country is not exactly assisting nationalistic aspirations.

History may, therefore, record that the Communist peace offensive was a passing thing -- that it was perhaps promoted primarily by the coming of American elections and the results of those elections. Or that the internal politics of Communism made necessary a brief change of tactics abroad.

Or, it may be that, in a qualified manner, the "peace offensive" will continue. I am sure this will depend in large degree upon the resolve of Americans to maintain their economic and military preparedness.

That resolve is now being tested in the Cabinet and in the Congress of the United States. Nothing could be worse than to do too little - and do it too late. We are at the critical period: the organization of NATO and the European defense community is in the balance. The testimony before the Committees of the Congress by General Ridgeway, General Gruenther and the key witnesses of the Administration reveal no easing of Soviet military pressure. Indeed, the testimony reveals that the Soviet and her satellites have improved greatly their military position with new equipment and highly trained combat troops. I have listened to the testimony, and I can say now for the record that our position in terms of air power, as contrasted with that of the Soviet and her satellites, is tragically weak. The desire to fulfill misguided and misdirected political promises of balancing the budget and reducing the taxes could very well undermine our whole position of security and defense. This may be the last mistake we are permitted to make.

It is clear that the strategists of the Kremlin are expecting us to lower our guard. They are fostering discontent and anxiety among our allies. They are playing a desperate and cruel game of dividing us and enticing us into a position of weakness. Now, if ever, there is a need for statesmanship -- statesmanship that may necessitate criticism and complaints in and out of the Congress. But the safety of the world is at stake -- yes, the peace of the world. To falter now will make it impossible to gain the initiative. To permit our great system of mutual security and defense to be split asunder and weakened, will put us in the tragic position of being unable to negotiate. We will be compelled to bargain from weakness - an indefensible position. The only hope for any success out of high level discussions and negotiations is for the western allies to be strong.

Clearly, Moscow hopes to gain a Western let-down and from a Western let-down, the Iron Curtain area has other things to gain -- chiefly time and trade.

Communist economies need to buy time if they are to challenge the west. Last fall, at the 19th Communist Party Congress, the Soviet Union launched a new Five-Year Plan. In that connection, the then General Secretary of the Communist Party and now Premier Adenkov gave a five-and-a-half hour speech, in which he reviewed the state of the Soviet economy.

The Soviet economy today is at the highest point in its history. Experts believe that Soviet military production today may very well exceed United States military production. There can be no doubt as to the direction of the Soviet economy. And, under the new Five Year Plan, the Russian economy will turn still more sharply to military production.

Two months ago FORTUNE Magazine published an extremely valuable and revealing account of this plan -- a Five Year Plan of which two years are "retroactive", and which is scheduled to end in 1955!

This article reveals that the Soviet Union plans "to increase military expenditure until it at least doubles that of 1950, and surpasses the heaviest Soviet World War II outlay." It reveals that the Soviet plans an army of perhaps double the size of the American army today. It reveals that the Soviet plans to increase gross industrial output by 70% over 1950. It reveals that the satellites are to double their output over 1950.

It also reveals that this cannot be done without some severe strains. The Plan has led to extreme conflict between the need for military goods and consumers' goods in the Soviet Union.

Russia is short of some essential raw materials, such as tin, nickel, rubber, and oil. The satellites are much worse off for several raw materials. If they are to fulfill their production plans they will have to get raw materials and labor from somewhere. But where?

The answer is, trade with the West, if such trade can be made possible. The West European countries, in particular, miss the trade which they have historically carried on with Germany. Communist China also, has suffered from the loss of historic Chinese trade ties with Britain and Japan. Russia is caught in a squeeze in trying to supply both Western Europe and the Far East, and she finds her transportation system unable adequately to bridge the vast distances between industrial Western Russia and her Chinese dependent.

Communist trade with the West can help the Soviet solve her difficulties. And, what is more important, Communist trade with the West can be the Communist's most effective weapon of economic warfare. For -- let us make no mistake about it -- the Soviet "peace offensive" means simply that Soviet leadership will be turning to actions on other fronts. And the most important front, according to Stalin's last opus, is the economic front.

It is on the economic front -- and this is traditional Marxist theory -- that the United States can be separated from its allies. When Stalin said that competition for markets would lead to economic and perhaps shooting wars between the capitalist nations of the West, he was giving voice to a fundamental tenet of Marxism-Leninism.

If this analysis is correct, then Communism will now seek, by every means at its command -- and there are many -- to promote disunity among the free nations. This means, primarily, economic warfare.

It would be well for us to keep our eyes on the international economic headlines, and not only on the military headlines. The headlines I have reviewed to date tell but one story, namely, that the Soviet Union is making desperate and all too often successful efforts to drive tough trade bargains and agreements: In South America, Central America, Asia, and, hopefully, in Western Europe.

The headlines tell one other story -- that there is a growing suspicion and distrust of America's policy -- an uncertainty as to our policy, a fear that we will again enter upon a period of protectionism and high tariff. If we are to face the Communist threats, we must face up to these clear realities.

Only last month, at conferences in Geneva, the Soviet Union made a real bid for trade with the West. And it is worth noting that she directed her offers at those very areas where American tariffs are most sorely felt. We should learn a valuable lesson from this. I hope we shall.

The lesson of Soviet economic policy for the West is that the problems of free enterprise are truly international -- that our security and survival depend upon our working out solutions for these problems together with the other nations of the free world.

One way we can do this is through a more liberal trade policy. If we close our doors to trade, the nations of western Europe may have to turn to the West for markets, food, and raw materials. If we close our doors to trade, the nations of Asia -- in whom we have invested millions in foreign aid, and on whom we depend for strength on the borders of Communism -- these nations may have to turn to their Soviet neighbor for trade, and they will then be swallowed up.

Trade with the Soviet Union inevitably leads to economic infiltration -- an even more powerful weapon than political infiltration. The economies of the countries that trade with the Soviet inevitably will be distorted toward Soviet needs and ultimately controlled by Soviet power. This could spell the death of free enterprise -- even the kind of free enterprise that Western Europe maintains. Our nation has expended billions to liberalize the trade and economic practices within Western Europe. May I call your attention to the Benton and Moody amendments to the Mutual Security Act of last year. We believe in Free economy, in free trade unions, the free movement of goods and people. We do not ask that every economy be an American stereotype, but we do ask that it be an economy that is compatible with free political institutions.

During this period of the Soviet peace offensive, our foreign trade policy is an absolutely vital aspect of our entire security program. An adequate foreign trade policy, and adequate provision for our military defense should be the twin arms of our foreign policy. This is so because the two main arms of Soviet policy are economic warfare, and vast military expansion. We must counter the Soviet at these points.

And it is at this point that we must have the initiative. And why shouldn't we? Who knows more about trade than the United States? Who has more to lose if we should fail? But the initiative cannot be seized just by slogans. American foreign policy cannot be based upon trick phrases or popular slogans. It is one thing to call for a foreign policy that is dynamic, creative, imaginative, positive -- or whatever else you may have. But it requires leadership -- firm, determined leadership -- to realize this objective. It is easy to talk of "trade not aid". It satisfies those at home who wish to see the aid slashed and it gives a kind of semantic pleasure to those who love to say the word "trade". But the slogan "Trade Not Aid" will require painstaking, long-range, determined effort by the Administration and the Congress. It will necessitate a mature understanding of our political and economic responsibility by the American people and by their representatives in the

5

Congress. It is much easier to win elections with slogans and promises than it is to translate those promises into policies and programs. This the President is finding out.

These are the reasons why we need a liberal trade policy. Within a few weeks we are to make a vital decision on the course of world trade. The Congress must decide whether to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, or to enact the Simson Bill, which will utterly emasculate that Act.

The Simson Bill will deny the President and the Secretary of State the freedom of movement and flexibility of policy in foreign trade which is so essential to a dynamic foreign policy. It will tie one arm -- the Economic arm -- of America's foreign policy.

The decision we make on American trade policy this year will be a decision actually on world trade policy -- and it will likely be irrevocable.

(1) Our decision will ~~profoundly~~ profoundly affect world trade because American trade today totals 35% of world trade. Our decision ~~cannot~~ cannot help but effect world trade and economics of the entire world -- including the Soviet bloc, which is watching us carefully. The free world, and to a large extent the entire world, is an economic unit today. This means that our decision will not be a decision of this moment alone --- it will bind us and will affect us for years to come, for the effects of commerce are endless and the consequences far-reaching. They will return to us again and again.

(2) Our decision will likely be irrevocable. For the past years particularly, the other commercial nations of the world have been watching our leadership, waiting for our lead. If we do not ourselves lay the foundations on which stability of trade can be built, they will reluctantly turn elsewhere to trade. They will make adjustments in their economies. These adjustments will be fundamental. So let me say soberly that the markets we lose will not be easily regained. They may never be regained. Many of our trading partners feel that it is now or never for them -- if they are to adjust to new avenues of trade they must do it now.

We will have to consider our future trade policy dispassionately and soberly. But there is also a sense of urgency behind our decision; for this may be a real turning point in world trade.

Now, let me conclude with some reflections. What are the problems which the Communist peace offensive has raised for Americans. What have we been doing about those problems? What can ARA and other liberal Americans do about these problems?

Faced with an opponent whose tactics shift from day to day, and whose knowledge of our power and our plans is comprehensive, the Congress has nonetheless done very little to increase its own understanding of that opponent. The 19th Congress of the Communist party last fall was one of the most significant events in recent years, but there has not been one committee of the Congress which has studied what transpired at that Congress. What does the Congress really know about the economic and military strength of the Soviet Union -- of the satellite states? How much attention do we give to the frequent public ^{pro} ~~announcements~~ announcements of Communist leaders, many of which have resulted in important changes in Communist Policy.

The ~~present~~ current shift in Communist strategy has faced our government with tremendous problems in planning to meet that change and future changes. We are faced with the problem of changing our whole diplomatic strategy to meet the new threat, not of immediate war, but of Communist infiltration and fifth column movements. Our foreign policy in Germany, for example, has been built chiefly on the need to build up and counter military strength. We have not planned in such detail for political and economic warfare.

We may have to plan for a domestic economy geared, not to immediate war, but nevertheless to the ever-present danger of war. That means making difficult decisions in the allocation of military and consumer ~~goods~~ production, in the breadth of our defense base, in the location and dispersal of industry, in the place of economic controls in our economy, in planning the size and disposition of our armed forces, in determining the amounts and types of foreign aid to be appropriated.

We shall have to constantly and carefully with regard to increasingly involved and difficult problems

(more)

of international trade, of tariff reduction, of our increasing materials shortages revealed in the Paley Report, of our relationships with the underdeveloped areas which have many of the raw materials on which we are dependent.

And overshadowing all our planning and all our decisions is the hard fact of the steady growth of the Soviet economy.

We ought, in the committees of Congress, to be gathering information on some of these problems. We ought to be making a real study of Russian policy, and its background. We ought carefully to be studying the needs of the armies and the economies of the Free World.

Instead, I am afraid we have been giving too much attention to investigations of individuals, to looking for scapegoats and oversimplifications, and to raging at our allies across the sea.

Let me also say, that our present seeming disagreements with our allies would be vastly simplified, and might never have occurred, if Executive leadership in the field of foreign policy were stronger today. It is said that the President's popularity in the nation is high at this moment. But our allies -- and Americans themselves -- do not know what to expect from American foreign policy.

In the American Constitutional system the President of the United States is the spokesman on foreign policy. The Congress, to be sure, implements that policy and can either weaken or strengthen it.

A thorough grasp of the problems that confront us, therefore, is essential to the Executive and to the Congress. But there is no escaping the fact that if we are to have a positive and dynamic foreign policy, it must come from the President.

The free world was heartened and encouraged by the President's dramatic message before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Here was a forthright and moving statement of American foreign policy, its course, its direction, its objectives, and goals. The President's speech was roundly applauded.

Presidential leadership, however, calls for more than speeches, important as they are as policy statements. Leadership calls for a follow through. The foreign policy of our President needs the support of Congress and of those in the Administration. It is not good enough to declare for reciprocal trade renewal and then appoint to the Tariff Commission an arch protectionist.

Firm Executive leadership involves the recognition that every American President who has ever been a leader in the field of foreign affairs has had to make up his mind to be unpopular with a very vocal minority of the Congress.

I, for one, am delighted to learn that we are now going to sit down together with the British and the French and talk out our common problems. I am sure that

These talks will demonstrate that the

these talks will demonstrate that the politics of the free world are free politics. They will show the world once again that constructive solutions and new unity can come from momentary disagreement.

I think we shall once again achieve agreement and united action with our allies.

Leadership calls for courage, integrity and determination. The liberal opposition today is determined to put aside partisan politics in support of a mature program which understands the nature of Communism and is prepared to meet its threat to democratic institutions and to the democratic way of life. The President can have our support for his foreign policy as

That policy is stated in his speeches. He will not have our support, however, for the foreign policy represented by some of his spokesmen in the Congress and too frequently represented in the deeds of those who claim to represent him.

If the President places the unity of his own party as the number one objective of his Administration, then the kind of leadership that the Democratic world needs today will not be forthcoming. Party unity within the Republican Party on the issues of foreign policy can only come at the cost of a positive and effective foreign policy. The President must be willing to pay the price of alienating the irresponsibles of his own party in order to rally the support of the American people and of the free world. This is not too dear a price for so important a cause. The unity of a political party is, indeed, a little thing as compared to the unity of free men in their struggle against the oppression of totalitarian power.

Therefore, tonight, let us dedicate ourselves to a program of enlightenment - enlightenment as to the nature of Communism and its threat to the world. But equally important, enlightenment as to the true meaning of democracy and the hope that it offers to the world.

Hackneyed as the expression may seem, this is the time for greatness. We can survive with no less.



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