

001924

SUGGESTIONS FOR HUMPHREY SPEECH AT LEN WOLF TESTIMONIAL DINNER AT LEGION CLUB, DUBUQUE, IOWA - NOVEMBER 2, 1959

~~Revised from Mark Reagin~~

*File SP*

It is a great pleasure to be here this evening to honor our friend, Len Wolf, and it is a great pleasure for me to be back in the Middle West--here in Dubuque, Iowa,

My visit here has given me a chance to find out from you what you think are the basic issues that face us as citizens of the United States, as farmers, as businessmen---not of the General Motors Corporation variety---I might add, and as human beings who have a commitment to ourselves, to our families and to each other

I am happy to be here to join in tribute to a hard-working, courageous Congressman and, by the way, to his wonderfully talented wife, both of whom have done so much to bring before the Congress new ideas, and who have fought so hard to drive out the cobwebs and plodding dullness which has become so much a part of Congressional and national politics. <sup>insert</sup> In a time which seemed to be characterized with complacency and tired, worn-out cliches, Len Wolf asked us to re-think our ways, reformulate our principles and re-examine our basic assumptions.

Let me give you a few examples of what I mean. A scant three weeks after Len Wolf was in Congress, he led the fight against a blanket continuation of the draft. He recommended a two year draft extension rather than the general four year extension. And with this two-year extension he wanted a comprehensive study of our military manpower procurement system in order to find alternatives to military conscription so that every four years the Congress would not act like automatons and vote for a draft extension without knowing or asking whether the draft is necessary and efficient and whether there are alternatives to it.

He said in his speech that we should rid ourselves of the tired habits of the past and be willing to seek new ways. Unfortunately, Len's fight did not succeed in the House, although he emerged from it as one of the outstanding

freshmen and the leader of the 'new look' brought into Congress in 1958. When the four year extension bill came to the Senate, and we tried to amend it, following Len's lead, we were also unsuccessful. But the record was made and it has caused many Congressmen and Senators to stop and think about our military machine. They wonder whether Len was essentially right when he said that our "military machine was giving us the illusion of preparedness without the reality of security." They are beginning to wonder whether our mammoth military machine which eats up over half of the tax dollar is really necessary, as it is presently constituted. They wonder, and I wonder, whether our military machine is flagrantly muscle bound, put together by cabals and factions of men within the Pentagon who have vested interests in programs and devices which may serve no actual objective utility in our defense system. This is something for all of us to think about. It would, indeed, be a distressing thing if, in fact, our military thinking is predicated on a series of assumptions as fallacious as the assumptions of the French Maginot Line were before the Second World War. This is a grave question and its seriousness demand the attention of all of us.

I would like to relate another incident to you which showed to me the kind of courage and forthrightness that Len Wolf represents. Back in June of this year the Congress passed a tax bill. My fellow Minnesota Senator, Gene McCarthy, sponsored in the Senate an amendment to that tax bill which would have plugged the <sup>sofa</sup>loophole that granted tax advantages and preferential treatment to those who receive their incomes from dividends instead of salary and wages. This loophole, which cost the American people about 335 million dollars a year in taxes was finally plugged, or so we thought, when the Senate accepted the McCarthy amendment. But when this bill was considered by the House and Senate Conferees this amendment was dropped. There was only one man in the entire House of Representatives who questioned on the floor of Congress the cancelling out of

this important amendment. That was Len Wolf. I would like to quote to you what he said at that time. His statement makes very, very clear the difference between the kinds of political philosophies in this country. He said on June 29 that "There is a very basic question involved in this amendment. It is this: Why should a person who earns his money through wages or salaries be taxed more than the person who draws his income from dividends? Why should the person who, in fact, works for his livelihood, be penalized for not being able to be in a position to draw his earnings from dividends. There is no reason why a person who receives his earnings <sup>from dividends</sup> should receive preferential tax treatment from the American people over the wage or salary earner." And, of course, this brash new <sup>Congress</sup> man from the second district of Iowa was right. There is no reason why one class of people should be preferred over another <sup>in a democracy</sup>

I have had the pleasure of hearing some of Len's statements and in preparation for this speech I ~~went~~ went back to some of the speeches he made this year to see if I could find why his kind of thinking was my kind of thinking--- why his kind of thinking helped to make America an industrial and spiritual giant. ~~I went back to some of his statements on the farm problem.~~

You do not need to be told about our farm surplus which stands at about 9 billion dollars, or approximately seven billion dollars more than it was when Ezra Taft Benson took over the job of Secretary of Agriculture. Well, many of us in Washington want to use this surplus to feed hungry people. We do not want to see it rot in gigantic storage bins while millions in this world starve. We do not want to present a face to the world which makes the United States appear like the Court of Louis XIV, literally gorging itself on its abundance and affluence while over half of the world looks on amazed, angered, appalled, and hungry.

There are many of us in Washington who do not want to see the dignity of the farmer marred by not using the food he produces when there are people who need the food. You know, and I know, that psychologically the farmer does

001927

not enjoy planting crops when he knows that their only use may be to lie rotting in a storage tank.

This past year I sponsored a comprehensive 5-year food for peace program which would ~~create~~ <sup>take</sup> the position of a Food For Peace Administrator, whose task would be to use our surplus both here and abroad more efficiently and wisely as a positive instrument of our foreign policy. But I do not want to talk about my plan as such. I would like to talk about Len Wolf's plan which puts forward a new idea in the way our food and fiber resources can and should be used. As you know, he is going to the FAO conference and to India and Pakistan in the next few days to explore and explain more fully the workings of this plan.

Len's bill provides for the utilization of our agricultural commodities for the economic and social development in underdeveloped countries through the United Nations or its appropriate agencies. This bill has many purposes: that of aiding underdeveloped areas without tying such aid to the narrow national interest of the donor country, no matter how correct or honorable those interests are; that of building up the United Nations in such a way that it will be more than a political forum, but a meaningful economic instrument that has the power to accomplish important ends. And, finally, from the standpoint of ourselves as taxpayers, there is another important consideration. Len Wolf has shown that it is cheaper to give the food and fiber away than to continue to store it. Over a period of ten years which is the duration of his proposed program, the American taxpayer would save some 1 billion 7 hundred million dollars if 250 million dollars a year of food and fiber resources would be used for this program. This supply would be used specifically for community development projects such as roads, dams, schools and so forth where the recipient country would not have both the capital to pay for the industrial resources and for the labor. One of the uses would then be to make this food and fiber the payment for the workers on such projects.

Again, I wish to quote from Len Wolf when he introduced this bill into the Congress. The words are stirring, for they point up the boldness and

morality in thinking and action which Len Wolf represents.

"We in Congress know that we have lost sight of the fact that people should be aided and helped because they are people, that there is dignity in life, that people should not be aided because we think that is the best way to bribe them into supporting our military and political position as against the Soviet Union. We do not seem to realize that our goals of peace and our national security will be better secured, and our political system will be better secured if we do not constantly tie aid to nations in a way which forces the recipient nation's hand ideologically. By proposing the possibility of an expanded economic industrial development program for the United Nations which will have done much to prove our good faith, our good intention, and our hope that people all over this world, in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, may live in dignity and freedom from want."

Len Wolf closed that speech by saying that "Missiles are only one way of fighting the Soviet threat. It may well be that the best way of challenging the Soviet bear is to return to those basic religious principles which are so much a part of our heritage. It is written in the Book of Matthew, "Feed the hungry, clothe the naked, heal the sick."

(This is the tradition we must defend, remember and apply. It is/this in way that we shall be successful against totalitarianism. It is only in this way that we shall have true national security while preserving the peace."

My friends, it is this kind of thinking that has made Western Civilization great. This is the Humanist, Liberal tradition which has guided us and, if you will, saved us from our enemies and, many times, from ourselves. It is the kind of thinking that tells us that investment in humanity is a capital investment. Investment in schools, dams, harbors, health, education, social security, is a capital investment. It is this tradition which the Democratic Party should and must stand for lest our great nation wither under a false opulence such as that which destroyed Rome.

Since the mantle of leadership for the free world has passed to the United States, it is imperative that we be strong not only militarily, but socially as well. This necessarily means the evolution of what I would call a moral economics.

This last session of Congress was hamstrung by an issue, which, presented as it was, stopped the United States from going forward. This issue, the budget issue, stymied the work of Congress, impeded the passage of liberal and necessary legislation and, consequently, hurt the cause of the free world.

For a few moments I would like to speak with you about ~~the~~ the issue of a balanced budget so that we can make sense out of the jumble of gratuitous rhetoric, sophistry, and outright distortion which surrounded the budget debate. I should point out that we are all for a balanced budget, if it is balanced at the right level. We are all for fiscal responsibility so long as that means more than the protection of the interests of those classes of people who are already well endowed financially.

First of all, let us look at our economic condition. There are a good number of people around who claim that our economy is growing at a steady and satisfactory rate. This, my friends, is just not so. From 1953 to 1957, our economy was growing at an annual rate of 2-1/2 per cent, while the growth rate just to keep up with the increasing labor force and the technological displacement of labor was about 4-1/2 per cent per year. In the last years, the sad truth is that the economy has stopped growing and has been falling behind the increase of population and the availability of the working force. This situation can, and does, entail serious consequences for the American people. The refusal to go ahead, to expand, to grow, is a weakness that we must overcome.

What does a morality of economics entail? To understand my meaning we should take a quick look at our economic prosperity. <sup>Professor</sup> Presently <sup>He said that</sup> This prosperity has been well described by John Galbraith. ~~It~~ <sup>is</sup> based on people buying unnecessary things in order to create or maintain unnecessary jobs. We are a society high-pressured, stimulated, and propogandized to buy things of either dubious or useless value. We buy that second or third television set, that second, or, in some cases, third car. Today we buy things which we don't need or use and throw them away for new things that we again don't need or use. It is as if we are, in our private lives, buying for the sake of buying and not for the sake of using. We are buying because we are caught up in an ugly, unsavory game which traps us into valuing the concept of things without even caring for the thing itself.

So the result of this Roman bacchanal is a nation of individuals that mortgage their lives for things they cannot afford while a socially Neanderthal Administration does nothing to point out where our human and material resources should be going. When it comes to spending for our true needs, we are tight-fisted. When it comes to public expenditures for hospitals, roads, schools, slum clearance, or rivers and harbor development, the American people are told that there is not enough money for such items and many of the selfish interest groups reply back. "Yes, you are right. There is not enough money for schools, teachers salaries, slum clearance or ~~harbor development~~ <sup>harbor development.</sup>" And what do these groups of people do after their pontificating? Why, they go out and buy a fancy new hydromantic, flouromatic, futuramic car with a front and back that are so similar that one does not know which way it is going, or they join a golf club at many hundreds of dollars a year, or they buy mink lined toilet seats in an orgy of frantic spending that not only bankrupts us materially but morally as well.

What kind of society are we that we would rather spend on goods which give us "social status" than on public necessities? What kind of Society are we that we accept the slogan of fiscal responsibility without examining the meaning of this phrase? What kind of Society are we that identifies the business profits of the monopolistic few with the interests of all the people?

As James Warburg so aptly pointed out: "The kind of fiscal conservatism which has governed our public policy in recent years does not conserve the nation's strength. It jeopardizes the nation's security. It permits the nation's assets to waste away, its soil to be eroded and washed into the sea, its natural resources to remain undeveloped for more private gain than for public good, its human resources to remain unused and its children's future to be irreparably impaired. This is not conservatism. It is irresponsible waste, dictated by self-interest pressure groups and sanctified by the bookkeeping ritual of a by-gone age."

001931

It is only the simple minded---or the vicious---who would say that wisely planned public expenditure in basic areas where our nation is suffering so badly would cause inflation. Does anyone who is willing to look at the facts think that schools or slum clearance, roads or hospitals are not capital investments which will bring great return on our investment? Public expenditures planned with discretion and with a sense of purpose, in conjunction with proper incentives to private investment will only result in a larger budget--not an unbalanced one. The increased expenditures on such items as schools could result in more tax revenue plus greater enjoyment and meaning in life. Let me give you an example of what I mean. Back in 1944, President Roosevelt signed into law the GI Bill of Rights. This bill made it possible for millions of young men who would not have been able to go back to school to do just that. Under that program millions of young men and women were given a chance to become educated. Millions of them became doctors, lawyers, engineers, physicists, historians, and men of letters. Others, and just as important, became farm experts, mechanics, businessmen, and skilled machinists. I would venture to say that America, without the GI Bill would have been a cultural and vocational desert today. We would have had even more acute shortages in these important areas of our life. And how much did this program cost? The entire cost of the GI Bill, which included, many non-educational aspects, ran to about 14½ billion dollars. Yet this entire amount will be repaid in full through extra income that these veterans pay as a result of their educational training. One Veterans Administration spokesman has stated that because of the extra educational training, veterans pay a billion dollars a year more than they would have paid. By 1968, the old program will be paid off, in full, and after that the return is pure profit. Such public expenditures are smart business investments. As a matter of fact, such investments are a necessity. By the way, a version of this bill on a much smaller scale was passed by the Senate this last session and is now over in the House where Len is one of the sponsors of it.

These investments fall within the class of what I would call a moral ~~and~~ economics. The monies are not spent for the sake of spending. The monies are spent for those projects and operations which are basic to the continuation of a free and strong society.

We must realize that we cannot purchase a free society by buying the line of the Madison Avenue or Washington huckster who assures us that the world is perfect as it is--and, then adds, "besides the world is getting better daily." We must realize that we must have the courage to be free; and that means the courage to fashion a series of values which do not honor capricious wild spending of the individual over spending on basic necessities in the public realm, <sup>honor</sup> or the values of a Garrison State with the symbols of freedom rather than the substance of freedom.

We Americans must recapture that public spirit of boldness and adventure which has been so much a part of our history and destiny. We must not be like a tired and bored people lingering on the edge of mediocrity, without goals, purpose or meaning.

In the last election the people, sensing a vague uneasiness, sent a new kind of man to Congress---one who could think, act, and do. In this district it was Len Wolf. In other places/<sup>it was other fine, new leaders.</sup> This action on the part of the people has given me faith and hope in an America that is again ready to go forward in peace, prosperity, and happiness. I believe that these goals are possible in the next decade. It is up to all of us to work together to attain them.

\*\*\*

001933

HUMPHREY FOR PRESIDENT COMMITTEE  
Suite 740, Roosevelt Hotel  
Washington 9, D. C.  
ADams 2-3411

No-Go - Go Slow  
not now Veto

FOR RELEASE:  
Tuesday AM's, November 3, 1959

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
LEN WOLF TESTIMONIAL DINNER, DUBUQUE, IOWA - NOVEMBER 2, 1959

Every once in a while a fresh new face, and a fresh new mind hits Washington, and it is just as if a breath of fresh air had blown over the entire city.

And, believe me, Washington can stand a breath of fresh air. For most of the people there fall into two groups: the old-timers, who have fought the good fight and lost a lot of battles and who have lost faith that anything can change or improve very much.

Then there are the newcomers in this Administration who haven't fought the good fight, but they are tired anyway. And they are afraid to get a new idea because it might cost some money and unbalance the budget.

So Washington needs -- which is to say America needs -- some fresh young blood that isn't all tired out and that, above all, is not wedded to the past. Because there is one thing this country does not need -- and never has needed. It is people who are busy looking backwards to see how things were done in the old days. They don't have time to look forward to see how things should be done now and in the future.

So, when Len Wolf and his wonderfully talented wife came to Washington, that precious breath of fresh air came with them.

Len Wolf hasn't been in Washington very long -- but I can tell you he has already made a name for himself as an independent thinker and a courageous advocate of the things he believes in. And there is no better reputation for a man to have.

Pol  
Gustaf

Let me give you a couple of examples.

Only three weeks after Len Wolf came to Congress, a bill to extend the draft came up. Now the draft law is something many people in Washington just take for granted as something needed to keep America prepared and strong. Not many people stop and study the whole concept of the draft.

But not Len Wolf. He wasn't satisfied just to go along with the way the draft has been run in the past. He wanted to have it studied, to see if it was soundly based and soundly framed. He courageously led a fight for a two-year draft extension and an over-all study of the program, instead of just a plain four-year continuation.

Well, he didn't win that fight -- you rarely win that first one. But he started a lot of people thinking about the draft and how it is run and how it is set up.

Let me give you another example of Len Wolf's courage and independence. In June of this year, Congress passed a tax bill. When it passed the Senate, it contained a provision, sponsored by my colleague from Minnesota, Senator Gene McCarthy, to plug up a loophole that gives favored treatment to people who get their income from stock dividends instead of from the sweat of their own brows. This loophole, incidentally, costs the taxpayers some \$335 million a year.

Well, when that bill got back to the House of Representatives, Senator McCarthy's provision had been dropped, and the tax favoritism for the stockholders was destined to continue.

When the bill was debated in the House, there was only one Congressman in the entire House of Representatives who spoke against the dropping of that amendment. That was a brand new Congressman from Iowa named Len Wolf.

To him, it was a very simple question: Why should a person who earns his living by the sweat of his brow be penalized? Why should he be taxed more than the person who earns his living from dividends?

There are other examples of Len Wolf's independent and fresh approach to old problems. There is his program for using our agricultural abundance to help underdeveloped countries improve their lot -- a program which, incidentally, will not only help other countries but will save the United States a lot of money in storage costs.

I could list others, but I will merely say that I am happy to join you in saluting Len Wolf. I wish that every one in Congress -- everyone in Washington -- had just a fraction of the vigor, imagination and independence of a Len Wolf.

John Lagers  
530 Bradley  
Dubuque

Alan J. ...  
to ...  
see you at  
Medlemott's

Mr Belinda  
colorful Peru  
- Hammerish  
Cordier  
Bunches

U.N. ...  
- U.N. - FAO  
UNESCO

- ✓ Eyes - <sup>not</sup> presence
- ✓ Ear - motion
- ✓ 4 Band See Council
- ✓ U.N. Police
- ✓ ~~U.N.~~ Econ Aid

See Council - Norway  
Econ Soc Council - Sweden  
Trusteeship - Denmark

Forum!

territory of  
S.W. Africa  
Union of  
S. Africa

Mary Bradley

Monday -  
no 9th

Murray Hosp

Cedar  
Rapids

Guy Kullitt  
Cherokee

001936



# 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)