

Marvin Warner

3.

OPENING NOTES

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

HAMILTON COUNTY DEMOCRATS

CINCINNATI, OHIO

SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

John Gilligan  
Chr. Vincent Beckman

U.P.  
enforced Humidity  
Richard M. Johnson  
Marshall Davis

In 1964, we Democrats wrote a national platform.

a Promise - honored - a pledge fulfilled  
That platform has been written into law.

Your party, your Congress, and our President

have, in the last three years, given this country a

program which has meant more opportunity, more freedom,  
more jobs,  
more income, more security for every American than  
he has ever enjoyed before.

There is Medicare for 19 million senior Americans.

There is the one dollar and forty cent minimum  
wage and expanded coverage for  
8 million non workers

There is the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act -- designed to give each American child an equal educational opportunity.

There are new words in our national vocabulary -- VISTA, Project Head Start, Job Corps, the Teacher Corps.

There are Model Cities and rent supplement programs to give local communities the resources they need to confront the problems of poverty, poor housing, inadequate public facilities.

There is new civil rights protection for the Negro American who has for too long been deprived of the dignity of full American citizenship.

There is voting rights protection  
Four years ago those programs were our vision.

They were things we had fought for <sup>for</sup> over a generation.

Today they are a reality!

What happened to the Democratic Program - I'll tell you  
It is the law of the land  
It is at work - It is building a better America

There is consumer protection  
There is food for the hungry

X X X

↳ How do you build that kind of a record?

You do it with vision and determination.

↳ You do it with unrelenting hard work and

know-how.

↳ You do it with the courage to do what is right,  
even in the face of harsh criticism and irresponsible,  
foot-dragging opposition.

*You do it with Democratic Victory*  
↳ You do it because you have the leadership of  
Lyndon Johnson -  
a President ~~such as Lyndon Baines Johnson~~.

X X X

↳ That's all very well, say the critics, but there  
is trouble in the cities. *Crime on our Streets*

↳ But who is it that refuses to pass the  
Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill?

↳ Who is it that won't fund the Model Cities program?

Who is it that holds back on  
rent supplements

Who is it that ~~is holding up~~ <sup>has delayed and held back over</sup> 20 major  
pieces of Administration poverty, education and  
crime control legislation right now?

A lot of Americans know the answer, <sup>you know the answer</sup> and  
all of them are going to know it by next November.

They are going to hear it from a proud and united party  
that knows what social progress means and how

to get it.

<sup>The People will know that</sup>  
<sup>once again</sup> the Republican Party obstructs, delay  
holds back

A nation that knows it must act and move  
forward does not turn to a party that wants to pause  
and look back. It will not, and it must not.

X X X

Nor do the people of a great nation shun  
their responsibilities in the world at large.  
<sup>at home or in the world.</sup>

America has a role <sup>of leadership</sup> in the world today. We  
did not seek it. But it is ours. <sup>If we fail</sup>  
in our leadership, history will  
condemn us + rightly so.

-5-

# That role of leadership

It is ours because of our military and industrial power.

↳ It is ours because of the power of our ideas.

↳ For the rest of the world wants what we already have -- agricultural abundance, material wealth, education, freedom. ↳ We lead because we are followed by the eyes and the dreams of men everywhere.

↳ America is the hope of all who strive in the peaceful revolution begun by Thomas Jefferson (~~a good Democrat by the way~~).

↳ Everything in our history and the natural endowment of this continent has prepared us for our role.

↳ We need not -- and cannot shrink from it.

↳ Nor do I believe the American people want to turn their backs on a world ~~live in a world society~~ where two-thirds of their

fellow men are oppressed by poverty and hunger — and

where want and poverty are a constant threat to peace

↳ They do not want to live in a world where aggression threatens peace and freedom. ~~where~~

↳ They rejoice when a small country -- like South Vietnam -- or a big country -- like India -- practices the human right of self-determination.

↳ And, I submit to you, they are willing to pay the price that their responsibility requires.

↳ They will not reach for the weapons or the strategy that could mean World War III. And they will not timidly betray a tradition of constructive commitment around the world because the going is tough for the moment. o

↳ If we give him our support, they will turn to the man who has borne the terrible responsibility of guiding this country through some difficult times both here and in the world -- <sup>President</sup> Lyndon ~~Baines~~ Johnson.

Yes, as members of the Democratic party, we have reason to be proud of our record in these past years. But our progress -- our progress toward a better America and to a freer and safer world -- carries with it no written guarantee for the future.

Next year we will face another challenge to that progress. And it will be up to us to meet that challenge. It will be up to us to support our President... to support the platform and the programs of the Democratic party....to work toward the kind of America we all want for our children.

Let me share with you these lines by Walt Whitman I ran across the other day.

"The new society at last, proportionate  
to Nature.....

Clearing the ground for broad humanity,

the true America, heir of the  
past so grand,

To build a grander future."

That is what we are working for.

Now let me hear from you.

# # #

Remarks

of

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Vice President of the United States

- - -

Hamilton County Young Dems

Thursday, September 28, 1967

St. Xavier Field House

Cincinnati, Ohio

TODD REPORTING SERVICE

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK BLDG., CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202

TELEPHONE: 241-7087

Remarks

of

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Vice President of the United States

- - -

Thursday, September 28, 1967

St. Xavier Field House

Cincinnati, Ohio

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Father Ratterman. I always feel a particular affinity, loyalty, when I'm introduced by a Vice President; and I noticed that according to my notes Father Ratterman is Vice President of Xavier University. I want to say to you, fellow Vice President, I know what you go through every day.

Just a very brief word of greeting, first to Chuck Penner and to all the officers of the Young Democrats that have put on this. That was a young Republican back there that choked for a moment. I want my young Republican friends to know that I have always taken a strong stand in point of minority rights and we will protect you here tonight.

But to Chuck and the officers, a very hearty thank you from Mrs. Humphrey and myself for this privilege of being in your company.

We have had a very busy and exciting day in Cincinnati. We have been visiting teachers and students and politicians and business people and practically every group in town.

There were two or three things that I had in my mind that I want to speak about in the next hour or so, but I just decided maybe I shouldn't do that.

You know, President Johnson one time said to me when I was going out to a reception, he said, "I just want

to remind you of something, Mr. Vice President. There are three places you ought never to speak." I said, "Is that right, Mr. President? What are they?" He said, "A barbecue, a rodeo and a dance." And I think he's right.

I don't think this is a barbecue. I haven't seen anybody roasted yet. I don't think it's a rodeo. Of course, I haven't seen you dance yet. I know that I ought not to make a speech at a dance, but I do know that this is a wonderful party that you are having, and I'm looking forward to at least sharing it for a very few minutes.

Mrs. Humphrey and I are very interested in colleges. We are supporting several right now through personal contributions, mainly of our young people that are attending these universities and colleges.

I had a note here that said there are seven colleges represented here tonight. Miami and Xavier and Dayton and Cincinnati and Our Lady of Cincinnati and Mount St. Joseph. And I'll repeat that again. Our Lady of Cincinnati, Mount St. Joseph, and Villa Madonna.

Now, I came here tonight to speak on the proposition, is Xavier going co-ed? I haven't made one public statement in recent years that's had that much affirmative response. I'd like to take my stand on this issue. I have friends on both sides and I always like to stand with my friends.

But Mrs. Humphrey knows that I take a very strong stand for co-education, and I think I should tell you that I have been the victim of it for a long time; and I just want to warn you fellows you may think it sounds good, but be ready to be bossed.

But you'll enjoy it. I've been enjoying it for 31 years and it's a wonderful experience, one that you'll always want to remember.

Now, we're not going to take any more of your time. I think I should tell you when I was over at the University of Cincinnati today -- I just wanted to see if the old spirit was here yet. I was told by the Mayor of this City of Cincinnati that he is a graduate of the University of Cincinnati, but each year he presented the trophy to the winning team in the football game between Xavier and the University of Cincinnati; and he said that he had to do this in his role as a public servant, but he continued to have to present that trophy so many, many times to Xavier.

Now, I wish that some way you can transfer all this enthusiasm, this alertness, this pep, this vitality, to the Minnesota Twins. I want that young fellow down here that told me he was for the Twins, stand up, don't leave me alone.

This is our fun night and this is your fun night, and I want to thank you very much for letting us be with you; and I want to especially thank you Young Democrats

for your leadership on this campus. I have been a college teacher in my day. I want you all to know that life as an elective public official means that he may return to those old haunts of his; and in case I should ever return to this part of the world as a college teacher, I want you students to know I'm an easy grader.

I hope, in all seriousness, that you will develop your political clubs. We believe in a two party system at least in this country. I've always believed in a two party system, one the majority and one the minority; and I feel that we Democrats have learned how to be in the majority so much we ought to continue on in our experience.

I do hope that most of the political parties make it their business to equip themselves both by knowledge of the issues and the candidates in the coming months to do a good job. There is no better way to get some experience in the political life of the country than to jump in and head it.

When I used to be a teacher, I used to have my students tell me that politics is a dirty business. Well, if you think so, why don't you get in and clean it up and quit standing on the sidelines and complaining about it? There are always a number of people in the bleachers that are always complaining about the players on the field.

The only way that I know to make American

politics better is to get better people in it, and the only way to get better people into it is for young people to take an interest in it. It's your country and going to be yours for a long, long time. And whatever may be your political preference, that you may make up your mind that you are interested in the political wellbeing of your country, to take a hand in it, to give of your time and energy and talent.

And I trust in the coming months, I expect now because I am the guest here tonight of the Young Democrats, that you will make it your business to carry the message of your party and carry the message of your candidates, whoever they may be, to the people in the manner which is both pleasing, honorable, and in good manners. There is no better way for a college student to show the meaning of education than to conduct himself or herself in a spirit of good fellowship, good humor and good manners.

You do not prove yourself to be an educated person by demonstrating that you have no respect for the rights of others or for the feelings of others. You can argue a case, you can carry a point of view, you can stand by your convictions; and you can do it all as ladies and gentlemen, as honorable people. You can do it all in good taste and good humor and good manners; and when you do it that way, you'd be surprised how many people you may convince and persuade. When you do it

the other way, you don't help yourself or help them.

So I appeal to those that are privileged to have a college experience and a college education, to let the world know that out of that experience comes a sense of social justice, comes a sense of tolerance and understanding, comes a sense of civic participation where you're willing to put yourself on the line, stand up to that which you believe but remember that the other guy may be right, too.

Remember that there may be another point of view that can be proven to be as honorable and as well intentioned as yours. If you do that, I think that the democracy of which we are so very proud will have many more years of progress and success. If we don't do it, I think that we will waste our chance.

That's all I wanted to say to you except that we have a good time in our family. I've felt politics is fun. If I didn't think it was, I don't think I would stay in it. I think you will always make it that way.

It doesn't need to be dirty; it doesn't need to be corrupt; it doesn't need to be unsavory. It can be exactly what you want it, because politics is made up of people, and if the right kind of people have the right attitudes and get into it with the purpose and sense of decency, you can have the time of your lives. And what's more is, you can maybe give

yourselves a little more time in which to enjoy those lives.

Thank you very, very much.

- - -



Remarks

of

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Vice President of the United States

- - -

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Sheraton-Gibson Hotel

Cincinnati, Ohio

Hamilton County Democrats  
Q & A

TODD REPORTING SERVICE

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK BLDG., CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202

TELEPHONE: 241-7087

Remarks

of

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Vice President of the United States

- - -

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Sheraton-Gibson Hotel

Cincinnati, Ohio

MR. VINCENT L. BECKMAN: Mr. Toastmaster Marvin Warner, Vice President Humphrey, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. It's a pleasure to see such a crowd here tonight to welcome our distinguished guests. It's an honor we pay to them because they are here really to honor Cincinnati. They will be here for approximately a day and a half, as you know, and in being here that long they do honor to us; and we here tonight, the civic and political leaders of Cincinnati, do honor to them by our attendance at this dinner.

You know the Humphreys are not new in Cincinnati. The Vice President was here a year ago. In 1964 the then Senator Humphrey was here; and that same year Mrs. Humphrey was here for a meeting of the Hamilton County Women's Democratic Committee, which I remember very well because she was such a gracious person.

Now we are delighted they are back again; and I cannot introduce both of them at once, so I would suggest that we put first things first, especially since there are so many of our wives here tonight. I'm speaking of husbands and wives, you know; and I say that the husbands are heads of households and they are in many ways like pedestrians. Husbands are the head of the household and the pedestrians have the right of way. Each is fairly safe until he tries to assert his rights.

So we are going to put first things first tonight.

and I'm sure that the Vice President will agree. Mrs. Humphrey, as you can see, is a charming, gracious lady, politically dedicated to helping her husband in his distinguished career and in his great work as Mayor of Minneapolis, as a United States Senator from Minnesota, and of course as Vice President of the United States. She's also busy with her own affairs and her family of four children and four grandchildren; her many travels, not only around the United States but to the Near East, South and Central America and Europe; besides all of her great dedication, as you know, to furthering the work that is being done in the field of mental retardation. With all of this she remains a trim, warm and gracious person.

We are delighted that you are with us tonight, Mrs. Humphrey. I am honored to present the wife of the Vice President, Mrs. Muriel Humphrey.

The role of the Vice President is a difficult one, and I suppose there would be no one better qualified to speak on that subject than our guest tonight. The fact that it is a difficult role does not stem from the functions assigned to the Vice President by the Constitution, Article I, Section 3. The Constitution merely says that the Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided. That sounds rather easy but as we well know, that is rarely true in this day and

the history of our country; the role of the Vice President is an emerging one and is becoming more and more important and more and more difficult. The effectiveness of the role of the Vice President depends both upon the ability of the occupant of the office and on the confidence he enjoys from the President of the United States.

At this stage of our national history we are fortunate that we have a Vice President who meets both of these qualifications in the highest degree. Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President of the United States.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Chairman Beckman; and to our good friend Marvin Warner's enthusiasm for the yeoman service that you have been fulfilling here this evening by your introducing the many distinguished leaders of the Hamilton County and City of Cincinnati and State of Ohio, and while Mrs. Humphrey and I seemed to be running from one meeting to another. My, you Democrats are busy around here! I guess if anyone ever thought that the Vice President didn't have anything to do, they seemed to overcome that limitation in one day in Ohio.

To Monsignor Sherry and Reverend Jones; and the members of the County Committee and the State Committee; the distinguished State Chairman, Mr. Knight; and my friend who in my mind will always be, at a minimum, Congressman Gilligan; and

I said at a minimum. You can take it from there; whatever you want to do with it, I'm for it.

It was just a few months ago, it seems to me, that I was here in Cincinnati for a wonderful luncheon that I'll long remember for the enthusiasm of the people that were in attendance, for the dedication and the drive of the loyal workers. I went away from here as convinced as a man could be that, strictly with his belief in the area, I still think we ought to recount those ballots.

Well, I know you have had a big evening; and quite frankly, I'm almost a little disgusted with myself for coming at this late hour because I'm the kind of a person that doesn't like to come at the last moment. I tell my staff I want to be there with them; I want to look at them; I want to taste them before I get up to speak, because just to make a speech is not my idea of a good evening or a good night or a good relationship. Particularly is that the case when we are together as friends in a common cause and when we are together for political purposes, for community purposes, and for what I think is a very honorable and most important purpose, namely, of charting the path to victory in the next year. It will be just a little over a year. Just think, about this time next year, will the fur ever be flying! Will it be flying! I can hardly wait, as a matter of fact.

Well, now I want to get right down to business. We have a rather unusual evening ahead of us. I hope you are going to enjoy it. I have some remarks here that shouldn't take very long, but they'll take a little longer than I planned; they always do. Somebody once said to me, not long ago, "My goodness, that was quite a long speech that you gave." I said, "Yes, you know, I got to liking it better all the time as I went along."

After you've been in public life as long as I have you aren't always sure whether the audience likes what you have to say, and you have to start liking what you have to say in order to keep at it.

We are going to have some questions, I have been told; and I want to compliment the committee for keeping it such a secret. You would have thought that we might have been able to cheat a little bit and let me have one peek or two at those questions, but I guess -- well, here they come; you got them, Joe. We are at least going to have a chance to hear what you have to say in the form of a question; then to hear what I have to say, hopefully in the form of a responsive answer.

Let me just pay a word of respect to the legislators that are here, to the members of the local government that are here, to those that aspire to these important offices, to my friend Frazier Reams that carried on beautifully as the

leader of the ticket here in 1966, to the many others that have given of themselves in an effort to carry the message of social progress in the Democratic party to the people of this state. This is a hard fought battleground for Democrats. It's never been easy and it won't be easy in the days ahead; it isn't easy anyplace.

I don't think we'll ever have, at least in my lifetime, another election like we had in the year 1964 where the opposition was just determined to lose. I just don't believe that is going to happen, so I want to suggest to my fellow Democrats that we be determined to win. That is the only way you are going to win.

Now, it's become somewhat a practice of the day for even Democrats to sort of warm up by taking a few pot shots, lob a few mortar shells over on the President. Everybody else is doing it, they say, so why shouldn't we join in. Well, I'm not here for that purpose.

It's hard enough to be President of the United States, and I've watched a man -- two men who were President of the United States, at close range. I worked, some of you know, very closely with the late and beloved President, John Kennedy, when I was Majority Whip in the United States Senate. I met with him several times a week; I saw the burdens of that office upon him.

I have had, of course, an even more intimate relationship and opportunity to see the President and the presidency at work as Vice President; and there is one thing I became convinced of the first day that I was Vice President: That the least that I can do for my country, that the very least that I can do for this President, was not to add to his burdens, not to add to his worries, not to add to his troubles. I have tried in my role as a Vice President, as a member of the President's Cabinet, as a Democrat and as a fellow American, I have tried to carry the message of this administration and what we seek to do to as many people as possible. I don't come here tonight to apologize; and I don't even come here tonight to eulogize. I come here tonight in the spirit of a great Democrat, Al Smith, to say let's look at the record. Look at the record of this party.

I'm afraid that some of us have failed to look at that record, and I come here tonight to remind every Democrat that no matter what your doubts may be about the Democratic administration, that those doubts will be paled into insignificance if you lose an election. The doubts and the fears will become horribly tame if you have a Republican victory in 1968.

Lest we forget. Lest we forget. What I say goes for worker, for farmer, for teacher, for student, for intellectual,

for journalist, for businessman, for one and for all. Lest we forget. I haven't forgotten three recessions in eight years of Republican administration, from 1952 to 1960. I haven't forgotten that a young man stood on the platform in front of the Capitol in 1961 reminding the people of this nation that we would take our stand, that freedom cannot come cheaply. Nor have I forgotten that he reminded us that we must get this country moving again. "Let us begin" were his three words; and when he was taken from us by the assassin's bullet his successors said, "Let us continue," and we have been continuing.

Now, in 1964 we Democrats wanted a platform, so we assembled and we wrote a national party platform; and we didn't write it just to stand on, we wrote it to work on. It was a promise and it was a pledge, and the unique thing about that platform as a promise and a pledge is that it is a promise that has been kept and it's a pledge that has been fulfilled. Never has there been a record of political accomplishment of pledges and promises in a platform so clearly fulfilled as in the last three years since 1964, when the Democratic Party went to the nation with a program and said give us the chance and give us the men, and we'll make that program a reality.

That platform has been written into law. I'm not a novice at this. I spent 16 years in the United States Senate. Some of those years were literally tearful years trying

to get things done. I spoke this morning to the Catholic Education Association and reminded them that in those 16 years time after time we fought for Federal aid to education. Time after time we were refused; time after time, in the name of racism or state and church relations; time after time bigotry and prejudice held us back; until 1965 when a man from Texas, when a man from that part of the country, a former schoolteacher, said that what is important in this country is the child, what is important is the individual, and we are going to write a law. We are going to develop a program that will enrich the educational experience of children. That educational experience can come through public schools, parochial schools, private schools or secular schools; but it's going to be an education for every boy and girl in this land. Now that's a record.

It didn't come easily; it didn't come by hope and it didn't come by just wishing. Let me tell you how it came. Your party, your Congress; you gave us the party majority. At least you gave us a big one in the 89th; you didn't do quite so well for the 90th. Your party, your Congress, your President and my President have, in the last three years, given this country a program which has meant more opportunity for more people, more freedom for more people, more jobs for more people, more security for every American than he has ever enjoyed before. Now, that is the record of the Johnson administration.

I think I should modify that because my friend the Minority Leader in the Senate, Everett Dirksen, in his melodious voice, one day when some of our friends and neighbors were up condemning the President and heaping abuse on him, he couldn't take it any longer, even as a Republican leader. He said, "I don't think we ought to just heap abuse upon the already overburdened shoulders of the President, Lyndon Johnson." And as I was presiding then over the Senate listening to this man, he looked up at me and he said, "Let's let Hubert share in it a little bit, too."

So if you won't think it immodest on my part, I'd like to pick up where the Republic left off: the Johnson and Humphrey administration.

Now, I made a rather broad statement, and I don't believe that a person should make a statement unless he can verify it. I said more opportunity, more freedom, more income, more jobs, more security for every American than he has ever enjoyed before. I stand on that statement both as a politician and as a professor, both as a legislator and as a citizen.

There is today, for example, Medicare for 19 million senior Americans. I introduced the first bill on Medicare on May 17, 1949, fought for it for 16 years. It didn't come easily. You'd think so now because people say,

"Oh, when did that happen?" Not at all. Last year the hospitals of this country received payment in the sum of two billion dollars; bills paid, not to be paid. Two hundred million dollars in doctor payments, four and a half million senior citizens of this country given hospital and nursing home and medical care; the best, not handouts, not relief care; the best of medical care in the hospital of their choice, the doctor of their choice, in their own community.

That didn't happen under a Republican administration. The Republicans voted to recommit that bill. Recommit is a political term for burial. It's what they call humane slaughter.

There's a \$1.40 minimum wage that applies to workers that never knew \$1.40; eight million more people covered in the greatest single victory in the War on Poverty that we have had. People right in this hotel serving you tonight for the first time in their lives got a minimum wage. It didn't hurt anybody; it helped everybody. As I said, there's a hysterical element.

Secondary education. Marvelous program just beginning, the tool for the whole new venture in education. Over two billion dollars of aid in that one program last year. We have tripled aid to education in less than four years in this country, and America is the better off for it. It didn't

come easily. Why let the opposition make it appear that it just happened? Why let somebody come around and have you believe and have your neighbors believe that it just seemed like manna from heaven? It came from hard work; it came from leadership; and it came from Democrats who fought the good fight.

There are new words in our vocabulary today; new words that mean hope and progress and help; words like Vista, Job Corps, Head Start, Teacher Corps, Rent Supplement, Clean Air, Truth in Labeling, Truth in Packaging. These things didn't happen by accident.

There are model cities and rent supplement programs to give local communities the resources that they need to confront the problems of urban life and poverty, of poor housing and inadequate public facilities; programs that mean the difference between a modern Cincinnati and one that can't keep pace; programs that mean the difference between a wholesome life and one of ever-growing degradation.

There is new Civil Rights legislation, too, for the Negro American who has too long been deprived of the dignity of full citizenship and voting rights. Granted, that was no small task. I was floor manager in 1964 for Civil Rights legislation. We started that debate on the 10th day of February; we ended on the 26th day of June. I know we had

155 quorum calls, 297 amendments; we broke a filibuster, which is a monumental task. Once we passed that comprehensive legislation, which was historic, which made the Emancipation Proclamation not merely a promise but a reality, then we moved on to voting rights.

We are moving on now to other protections; and there is consumer protection, and there is food for our children and supplies for the needy.

Now, four years ago these programs were but a vision. They were things that we fought for, some of us for over a generation, and today they are a reality.

Now, we ask ourselves many times what happened to the Democratic program. I hear this; I read it; I pick up a column. They say, what ever happened to the Democratic program? You have read it. I'll tell you what happened to it. It's the law of the land; it became a reality. It's at work and it's building a better America.

I do think we ought to keep in mind that just because some of it has been achieved, it doesn't mean it's less important. I have met some people who only are happy when they are unhappy, who only feel that they are successful when they fail. I don't think that it's either the mark of a Liberal or a Progressive. I think that we have to move along steadily in the process of social progress, and we have done so. We have

taken a steady forward step and we have many new things ahead of us.

Now, how do you build this kind of a record? Well, you do it with vision, and you do it with determination, and you do it with unrelenting hard work and know-how, and you do it with faith. You can't do anything unless you believe you can do it. You can talk yourself into defeat, you can think yourself into defeat, or you can build the environment of victory by knowing what you are doing needs to be done and having the indomitable faith and will to do it. You can do it with courage to do what is right even in the face of harsh criticism and irresponsible foot-dragging. You build this kind of a record with a victory; not out of defeat, not out of losing elections, but out of winning elections. That is how it happened.

"Oh," they say, "well and good, Mr. Vice President. All right, you have told us now about the wonders of the Democratic administration." So say the critics, "But what about the trouble in our cities? What about the crime on our streets? What about the world in which we live?"

Well, my fellow Americans, there will be trouble in this world and there will be problems in our cities. The question is, what do we do about them? Do we just stand back and say, well, that's the way it's going to be; it's divinely

ordained. Or do we say America can do something about it? Who is it that refuses to pass safe street and crime control bills as they preach pious words about the crime wave and the trouble? Who is it that stands today, and tomorrow they'll be there too, immovable, arguing over petty sentences and details while an important piece of legislation languishes in apathy and really almost in defeat in the Congress of the United States? I'll let you ponder that for awhile. I think you're coming up with the answer.

Who is it that won't fund the model cities program that every mayor across this nation knows we must have, that every responsible city official has asked for? Who is it that drags their feet constantly, says, "Hold up, stop, pause, not now, don't do it"? Who is it that is holding back on rent supplement, and who is it that has delayed and held back on pieces of important administrative legislation directed at poverty and education and crime control?

Well, now a lot of Americans are beginning to know the answers, but I know that you do know the answers. Why keep it a secret? You are going to talk to somebody; why not talk about this? Why not level with the people? The people need to know these answers before next November; and they are going to hear it, if we so will it, from a proud and united party that knows what social progress means and how to get at

it.

My fellow Democrats, remember this. The Democratic Party is pretty much like a well from whence we all drink and dip our cup. Be careful that you don't put poison in the very water that you are going to have to sip next year. That's the important thing to keep in mind.

The people will know and they need to know, and they need to know from your lips, that once again the old Republican Party, the one that Adlai Stevenson talked about had come dragging into the 20th century, screaming and hollering; that the old Republican Party continues to obstruct, continues to delay, continues to drag its feet, continues to say, "Let's wait," continues to say, "Send it back," continues to say, "Not now," and then at the same time points out the inadequacies of American life.

Well, I think a nation knows that it must act and move forward. I think that a nation that knows that does not turn to a party that wants to pause and look back. I told the students at the University of Cincinnati there are two kinds of people today; there are the now people and the pause people.

The now people are the ones like Winston Churchill that said now is the time and reminded us that the beaches are white with the bleached bones of those who said

let's wait.

Then there are the pause people; and I'm not talking about the pause that refreshes. I'm talking about the pause that stifles and chokes, the pause that dries up. We can't have a pause; we have got things moving. We've got social movements under way; we have programs under way; we have problems that confront us and we must join the battle.

I don't think the people of a great nation either shun their responsibility or want to, at home or abroad; and now we hear voices telling us that we must make our choice. Do you want to do some things at home or do you want to just be involved abroad?

Ladies and gentlemen, we do not have that nice choice. This is a smaller world every day. It's a neighborhood and the neighborhood is becoming more intimately connected every day. The Space Age, the age of the communications satellite, the age of science and technology has made this world like a small globular capsule. What happens any place in this world affects us. What happened in the Middle East was much more important to Americans in the month of May and June of this year than anything that happened in the Middlewest; and what happened in Southeast Asia is more important today than anything that will happen in the southeast United States.

We are tied into a world. We can't ignore it and you can't stop the world, as that song said, "Stop the world, I want to get off," even though there are a few that I would just as soon let off. You can't stop them; and not many are going to take that moon trip. We are going to have to deal with the problems we have right here on this earth.

Now let's take a look. America has a role of leadership in the world today. We didn't seek it. We didn't conspire to get it. It isn't manifest destiny. We didn't even plan it, but we have it. Make no mistake about it, if we are willing to relinquish that role of leadership, there are those that are willing to take it. The struggle in this world is over leadership. This nation has always been a great nation, a nation that deserves and earns and merits the title of leader.

Leadership isn't just another word for luxury. It isn't just another word for wealth. Leadership doesn't give you any special privileges; in fact, it adds new burdens, tremendous responsibilities. Any man that has been a leader in civic life, in fraternal life, in church life, in business life, knows that leadership imposes responsibility. I have said many times that it is not a cloak of comfort; leadership is the robe of responsibility. Mark my words. With all that we have and all that we have been given, if we fail in this role and responsibility, history will justly condemn us for

all time to come.

Millions of people, not only at home but millions of people throughout the world, look upon this nation as their only hope; and they are oftentimes much less critical of us than we are of ourselves.

Now, that role of leadership is ours for many reasons. One of them, of course, is because of our vast military, industrial and economic power. Now, we can forfeit that; and if we do, we do so at our own peril. It is our power; more importantly the power of our ideals: the ideal of natural rights; the ideal of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; the ideal of the American Revolution, the great unfinished revolution of the world. The revolutionaries of the 20th century are not Marx, Lenin or Mao; the revolutionaries of the 20th century are Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Adlai Stevenson and Lyndon Johnson. They are revolutionaries.

These are men that have preached human emancipation. They have not only preached it; they have delivered it. These are the leaders that have had the courage to stand up against the forces of tyranny, the forces of bigotry, the forces of intolerance.

Ladies and gentlemen, think of the battles that we are winning even here in our own midst against intolerance

and bigotry. The year 1960, we had to wait for that year before a man of Catholic faith could be elected President of the United States. Think of what has happened these last few years: a Negro American Supreme Court Justice, Cabinet officer, mayor of the city of Washington, D.C., legislators, United States Senators; one after another all through America. It didn't come easily, but it came because there were men and women who took a stand and I'm proud to say that most of them -- not all, most of them -- were Democrats. I'm proud of that record.

It is the power of our ideals put to work that gives us this mantle of leadership, for the rest of the world truly wants what we already have, or at least what it promises to be: our agricultural abundance in a world of the hungry, our material wealth in a world of the poor, our education in a world of illiterates, our freedom in a world where so many have so little freedom.

We lead because we are followed, by the eyes and the hopes and the dreams of men everywhere. Woodrow Wilson once said about our flag, "I look for the day when this will not only be the flag of the United States, but when it will symbolize and represent the flag of all humanity; not as a conqueror, not as an imperialist, but a flag that means hope and social justice and freedom." These things mean something,

and I found it out as I have traveled throughout this world. America is the hope of all who believe in the peaceful revolution begun by Thomas Jefferson; and if you don't mind, I'm just going to say that he was and is a Democrat.

Now, history and the natural endowments of this continent have prepared us for this role. I happen to think we need not and cannot shrink from it, nor do I believe that the American people want to turn their backs on the world, that is, two-thirds of their fellowmen who are oppressed by poverty and hunger.

I remind this great audience tonight of what a beloved peasant priest, Pope John XXIII, said, "Where there is continuous want, there is no peace." Blessed are the peacemakers; not talkers, not walkers, not hoppers, not sign carriers. Blessed are the peacemakers; and you make peace and you build peace as you strike mighty blows against poverty and oppression, as you strike forceful blows against bigotry and intolerance, as you build a structure of opportunity, economic and social. The building of peace is like the creation of a great cathedral. It doesn't come by a magic stroke; it doesn't come even in a decade; sometimes it requires generations. It requires, though, the hand and the plan of the master architect and the work of many. The work of peace-building and nation-building does not come cheaply or easily. Sometimes it comes in the

refiner's fire, even, of war, as we built our own nation.

As we built it, even they had to determine whether or not it would be one nation or two, when we had to decide whether this nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated could long endure; and it was built at that time by a President who wasn't winning any popularity polls.

Let me say a word about popularity. It is a currency that a leader should spend. It's not something to be treasured; it isn't something to take to your grave. Political popularity is like money in the bank to be used, strength to be given. A great leader does it, and I'm happy to say that of the man that I serve with and whom I stand alongside of, President Lyndon Johnson. Tremendous popularity he had as he came as President; a popularity unexcelled, literally never exceeded, in our lifetime. He has had to spend it but he has spent it in the cause of integration; he spent it in the cause of social justice; he spent it in the cause of economic development; he spent it in the cause of the War on Poverty; he spent it in the cause of trying to build a better America; and he spent it in the cause of the resistance of tyranny and aggression, and he's done what is right.

I think the American people rejoice when a small country -- yes, a very little country, even, like South Vietnam or a big country like India - aspires to self-determination,

wants to be something, practices that human right of self-determination; and I submit to you, my fellow Americans, that when the chips are down, when the choice has to be made, the American people are willing to pay the price that their responsibility requires. The American people do not want softies, nor do they want men of confusion. They would rather have a man who works his heart out for what he believes is right than to have someone who is going around testing the political wind to see what you think is right. They want a leader; they want people of conviction.

May I say that it is not difficult for a President to do what is right. As I have heard President Johnson say many times, the only problem he has is to know what is right. Oh, how I wish that the President and the Vice President could be so sure as some are of just every moment what is right. All that we can do is what we believe to be right and be willing to be corrected.

Seek ye the truth -- it's not always easy to find -- and try to act upon the facts that you have. You know, Democracy is more than debate, discussion and dissent, all of which is important, all of which I have practiced, all of which I'd give my life for. Democracy is also decision. The four D's of Democracy: debate, discussion, dissent -- and that's what some people say that it is; but when you are the majority

party, when you are a senator or congressman or governor or mayor or President, you don't just have the enjoyment of debate, discussion and dissent. You have to decide; and when you cast that deciding vote, when you make that decision, that's when you start to have people leave you and maybe, hopefully, some join you; but whatever it is, as Abraham Lincoln said to his Cabinet on the Emancipation Proclamation, "There are eight nays and no yeas, and the yeas have it," because he was for it. He sought the advice of his Cabinet; the advice was don't do it. He then sought the advice of his conscience; and his conscience said do it, and the one voice of conscience was more important in the mind of that beloved great President than the eight voices of advice.

Well, my dear friends, I have said to you that we are willing to pay the price of leadership. I think also that our American people will not reach for the weapons or the strategy that could mean World War III. They would not timidly betray a tradition of construction commitment around the world because the going is tough for the moment; and I submit that if we give our President our support, they will turn to the man who has borne the terrible responsibility of guiding this country through some very difficult times, both here and in the world. I believe this because I have lived to see something that I knew would happen.

Harry S. Truman, at the time of the war in Korea, had a public opinion rating of 26 per cent, the all-time low for any man that had ever been involved in the public opinion poll. Harry Truman was unpopular, Harry Truman was hounded, he was criticized, he was condemned; everything was done to him to make his life miserable; and yet, ladies and gentlemen, if I were to leave this audience and go to the streets of Cincinnati and to ask your fellow citizens -- Republican or Democrat or Independent -- to name me five great Americans, I would bet my life that a majority of them would include in that five the name of Harry S. Truman.

Why do I say it? Because here was a man that took his stand; here was a man that knew what he had to do. He was a man who had to make unpopular decisions, but here was a man of great courage, of great spirit, of indomitable will; and more than that he was a Democrat, and he let everybody know he was proud of his party. He took on his opposition, he fought the good fight, he carried on the good battle; and when the votes were in, despite the headlines of the Chicago Tribune, Harry S. Truman was President of the United States.

I'm happy to think that when the votes are in on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November 1968, despite public opinion or contempt or despite detractors or those people of little faith, I have the view tonight -- and

I'll put my neck on the line -- I'm happy to think that the next President of the United States, if you want him, if you will back him, if you will give him your help, will be Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States.

CHAIRMAN BECKMAN: I have just asked the Vice President if he still wanted to answer some questions, and he said sure.

I have one here that I think is probably pretty dear to your heart, Mr. Vice President. The question is, do you think the Minneapolis Twins will win the American League pennant?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Now, I'd like to give you a totally objective point of view on that. As Vice President of the United States I have to take a national point of view about the American League pennant race, and I take an American point of view about the National League pennant race; but as a Minnesotan I'm here to bet anybody five bucks that the Twins win.

CHAIRMAN BECKMAN: Here's a more serious one; it combines two in the same question, Mr. Vice President. It starts out with a simple one: What about Vietnam? Another part is: Why don't we seek more firmly a nonmilitary solution to Vietnam?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I'm sure that is

the item that the people here are concerned with, so if you don't mind I'll just concentrate on that for a little while with you.

Some way, somehow, we must be able to convince you, above all others, of the commitment and desire of your government and your President, who is the Commander in Chief, spokesman of this nation in foreign affairs, of not only the willingness and the desire but of the commitment of this nation to seek a peaceful solution to that horrible and awful struggle in Southeast Asia.

This past week the President of the United States has received two messages from Hanoi. By the way, there is no lack of contact. There seems to be somebody all the time saying, well, we ought to keep in contact with North Vietnam. There's no lack of contact; there's never been any lack of contact. It's a question of we have to talk to somebody who wants to sit down and negotiate. You can have labor-management relations. You can look at each other, sit down at the bargaining table all day, week, month; but when there is somebody who wants to talk and talk and talk but doesn't want to negotiate, you can't do much.

One of the neutral diplomats of the world recently spent two weeks in Hanoi. He advised your government -- and by the way, this is not particularly a secret except as to

divulging the man's identity. The President of the United States only yesterday, with some of the men -- Mr. Fred Lazarus, one of many of this community that happened to be at the luncheon yesterday at the White House; no use running on about the others that were there. The President read this telegram. This telegram simply said -- from this distinguished diplomat, not American and not even an ally, but from a neutral country -- said that he had been in Hanoi for two weeks, that the government in North Vietnam had hardened its position. They had not changed at all, that they would not negotiate, they had no intention of negotiating and they felt that the time for them to have any thought of negotiation was after the elections of 1968; and that was read to a distinguished audience of about forty people yesterday.

Your government has just said, through Arthur Goldberg, that the United States if willing, if we can even receive some indication that North Vietnam will sit down and negotiate, we'll stop the bombing; but we would like to have some reasonable reason to believe that they would sit down and talk.

There have been those that have said we should stop regardless of whether they would give us any assurance of negotiation. We haven't even asked for Hanoi's assurance to come forth. We have asked that any indication or assurance

could come through any third party. That includes the Soviet Union, that includes India, that includes Yugoslavia, not just our allies. We have not had one single nibble, not one single indication; yet your government, in the United Nations, only within the past weeks, has once again reiterated its stand that we are prepared to cease bombing and to sit down to negotiate on any reasonable indication from North Vietnam that they will sit at the conference table. We didn't even ask them to quit their fighting.

Now, there are those that say, well, you ought to quit all your bombing. We have done that several times. Then they say, well, you didn't do it long enough. Well, we did it for 37 days, when one of the other nations said if you do it for 11 days we think we can at least get them to the conference table. That is a matter of historical record.

We have received many promises of U Thant for what he calls a stand-down, to stop where you are, cease fire, rejected. I think the people of America know what Ho Chi Minh said in his letter to the Pope last February. I think they know what he said in the letter to President Lyndon Johnson. Nobody can understand why he wrote it. It was such a blatant refusal to even be reasonable and even to talk about the possibility of negotiation; but your government cannot stop its military action in North Vietnam when there are two divisions

of North Vietnamese in the demilitarized zone in violation of international law, when there are three full divisions right behind the demilitarized zone, when you have thousands of American men in the First Corps area of South Vietnam that tonight are being slaughtered by artillery bombardment from North Vietnam into South Vietnam.

What's the difference whether it's an artillery shell being lobbed over or an airplane dropping a bomb? What's the difference? A shell is a shell, an explosion is an explosion, death is death; and yet the same Americans that really cry out that we should stop the bombing haven't said one word about North Vietnam stopping the shelling from a demilitarized, protected zone over into South Vietnam. If we were to stop that at this moment without some reason to believe that it might lead to something, your President would be guilty of making a sacrifice of human life, of your sons, that I don't think you'd like.

Now, we may sacrifice lives in the cause of peace if we had some reason to believe that there would be ultimate peace or even the hope of peace; then the decisions, the awful decisions, the difficult decisions of de-escalation, of stopping the bombing, could be made even though it would be a terrible price to exact from men who are in the uniform, who are there not in North Vietnam but in South Vietnam; but we

have had no one that will come and talk to us, so the hope of peace -- I only want to say to you, we'll walk that extra mile.

I went to Asia three times last year. I didn't go there to look at the flowers. I talked to the leaders of 14 Asian countries. I went to the President of India as your representative, as your Vice President on instructions from the President of the United States, to ask him to help us find the path to peace. He told me that he had no influence in North Vietnam; he could do nothing.

I talked with Mr. Kosygin while in India in the cause of peace.

It's an interesting thing that some of us that every day of our lives are compelled by the necessity of our task and responsibility to read hundreds of cables from all over the world, from not just our own Americans but from informed sources all over the world, that we know so little; and that some people who only read the daily newspapers know so much.

I just don't believe that the President of the United States is the kind of a man that wouldn't want peace. I have never known of a President that enjoyed sending men into battle. I have never known of a President that didn't pray for and hope for and serve for a just peace; and that's what we are going to continue to do, but I don't think you're

going to get it by a country divided, by having Ho Chi Minh think that somehow or another we are going to tire, that somehow or another America is going to withdraw, that there's going to be such political dissension in America that he will be able to win. He won the last struggle in Paris; he hopes to win this next struggle in Washington. He hopes to win it through our default, through our weakness, not his strength; and just as I have said to some of my friends, maybe if we could just once give a posture of total unity in this country in the cause in which we are presently embarked, and if that message could get to the enemy, they might understand that even though we have our political differences, our partisan differences, that we are determined to see this thing through. I have a feeling that if they really believe that we meant that, if they realize that we meant it, that this would do more to bring the enemy to the conference table than any one thing we can do. That is my honest belief.

Now, what's happened in South Vietnam?

Remember it isn't only South Vietnam that we are fighting for, ladies and gentlemen. Let's not believe that for a moment.

I don't think three presidents could be so wrong. After all, the commitment to South Vietnam was not made by Lyndon Johnson. He didn't even vote for the treaty that gave commitment to Southeast Asia. The treaty was in the

Senate; he didn't vote for it. I did and so did eighty-some other Senators; and only one voted against it and he is not a member of the Senate today, he is deceased.

We know what that treaty said. Presidents Eisenhower, John Kennedy and Johnson did, and had over twenty -- yes, thirty thousand men in Vietnam; and we had already lost several hundred men in Vietnam. It was Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson.

The decision that President Johnson had to make to escalate air power and send additional troops was forced by the fact that there had been one coup after another in South Vietnam, defeatism had set in, and divisions of troops from the north were being supplied to the Viet Cong by North Vietnam; and we had to make up our minds whether we were going to let it go down the drain or not.

Ladies and gentlemen, this isn't a simple matter. We are not losing this war today in South Vietnam. There are more areas today that are secure under government control than there were a year ago. We have not had a single military defeat. They have had the development of the constitutional processes which are really quite amazing.

I'm a bit of a student of history. I'd like to remind my fellow Americans of something that happened a year and a half ago in Honolulu. The President of the United States,

meeting with leaders of Asia and South Vietnam voted that they'd have a constitutional convention. They went out and had an election for a constituent assembly to write a constitution. What did our people say, some of our critics? They'll never have it, and if they do it will be crooked.

They had the election in September of 1966 and, my fellow Americans, over 80 per cent of the eligible voters in Vietnam -- and they begin at age eighteen, not twenty-one -- went to the ballot box and voted. Four hundred American newsmen were there, and not one of them came back and said it was a fraud. They went over looking for a story and this is the only story they had: The people voted. The Viet Cong did everything it could to disrupt the election.

They assembled last year; that constitutional convention or constituency met for six months. Then the hue and cry went up, well, it will be a rubber stamp; it won't amount to anything; it will most likely break up. But it didn't.

They voted and in six months they voted a constitution; they had minority and majority reports; and strange as it may seem, it was an effective, recognized constitution. And then after the constitution was written, the headlines said the military directorate will never accept it, they have veto power; but the military directorate did

accept it. Another good story worked out, and no sensationalism.

And then the next question was, who will set the election laws? Well, they said, of course it will be Mr. Ky; but Mr. Ky didn't write the election laws. The election laws were written by the elected members of the constituent assembly. And by the way, there were 700 candidates for less than a hundred jobs.

A great election was held for an assembly, the election was all right; and the presidential election took place here in September of this year. And there were spokesmen in America that said it's going to be a hoax; it's going to be a fraud; it's no good. So a commission of 22, some of them bitter critics of this administration policy in Vietnam, clergymen, businessmen, legislators, governors, Republicans and Democrats, went to Vietnam and they went from one end of that country to another and they came back and said that it was a responsible, effective, free election.

Oh, there were also things going wrong. There were some things going wrong in Davenport; there even were a few votes going wrong in Cincinnati. Who are we to talk about occasionally a ballot box being a little out of joint? The important thing is it was a free election.

There were several candidates for the presidency;

and then somebody said, yes, but the man that won didn't get a majority. Ladies and gentlemen, 11 presidents of the United States have had less than 50 per cent of the votes. The first elected president, John Adams, had less than 35 per cent of the vote. The late, beloved John Kennedy didn't get 50 per cent of the vote. There were lots of people that were great presidents in America that didn't get 50 per cent of the vote. Abraham Lincoln never got anywhere close to 50 per cent of the vote; but the election took place for the Senate in Vietnam. You almost forgot they had that election; 60 seats, 484 candidates; a bitter hard-fought election throughout the entire country. Now, coming up in October: the House of Representatives.

The constitutional process is under way; and under what circumstances? War, terrorism. Five hundred candidates and elected officers were killed by the Viet Cong in this last election. Radio Hanoi recently charged the U.S. with having killed over 500 innocent civilians in the last eight months by the bombing attacks. Well, ladies and gentlemen, over 500 elected officials and civilians and candidates were killed by the Viet Cong as the people in South Vietnam sought to have self-determination.

Let's look over our own experiences about our own Constitution, if you want to have a little history. Well, the boys gathered together at Annapolis: Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin

Franklin, James Madison, George Washington. They said, you know the Articles of Confederation are not working. That was our first constitution; that wasn't written by liberal people either. They said, we have got to do something; so they sent out a general letter to these 13 states to the legislators and governors, and said, would you select -- not elect -- would you select representatives from your state to come to Philadelphia for the purpose of reviewing the Articles of Confederation. They didn't say to write a new constitution; nobody would have come. They were too smart for that credibility gap, you know; and the letter was signed by George Washington, James Madison, John Jay and Alexander Hamilton and others.

A hundred men were invited -- selected a hundred, not elected; no elections. Of the hundred that were invited, 55 ultimately came; 45 couldn't accept the invitation. And they didn't arrive on time; they had to wait almost two weeks before they could get a quorum; and of the 55 that came, 39 stayed; and of the 39 that stayed, only 38 signed. Little Rhode Island never did sign.

They didn't have an open meeting, either. They didn't permit the television or the radio. They didn't permit the press to come; they locked the doors; and they put two men on Benjamin Franklin because when the old guy'd get a glass of wine he'd get a little talkative. That's the way we wrote our

Constitution.

I'm not complaining. I think they did a whale of a job, but let's just be factual. The Capitol of the United States was moved 11 times from 1774 to 1790. In the War of 1812 there was open, regional secession in the New England states; and the governors and some of the clergy and the leading professors at Cambridge and Harvard were on their way to Washington to demand that James Madison resign, and they were as far as Baltimore when they got the news of Andrew Jackson's victory down in New Orleans. They had themselves a couple of good belts of wine and came on over and celebrated with James Madison and said hooray. Those are the facts of life.

The first Chief of Staff of the U. S. Army was in the pay of the Spanish emperor. We had a few rascals in our time; and we had people that were every bit as wild as the most rabid Buddhist; and we had dissenters. Why, in the Mexican War the Congress passed a resolution commending the President on going to war and one year later passed a resolution demanding that he quit the war.

There's never been a President of the United States that ever had any popularity during war. Woodrow Wilson was a victim of it. "Son of the Wild Jackass" they called him. He was hated; they broke his life.

Franklin D. Roosevelt saw this nation literally

on the precipice of disaster, with Hitler running wild in Europe; and the vote was 220 to 230 or 240 for the introduction of the draft by volunteering, which was saved by Sam Rayburn, who convinced them that someone had to volunteer or we wouldn't have even had the draft law.

I hope that war is never popular but I'll say this, as I read to some students here today -- I guess I left that little paper. I ought not to do it. I read three quotations out of the papers and left blank a certain word, the name of the country; and the first quote was something like this. Do you have that here? Thank you, David. Listen to this, just to have a little game. Just fill in the name, you know the game. "The American airmen cheerfully machinegunned civilians in North Blank and wiped out villages" and so on. The answer to that is North Vietnam. That is what you read every day, that we just have our boys just going around, just looking for kicks. That is what you hear. You know that's not true, I hope.

The second quotation: "You are inhuman, you Americans, because you are bogged down in the Blank, a war which you are unable to get out of, and you are waging war with a spiteful and cold insensitivity" that filled him with indignation. Have you ever heard that? That's what you read time after time in the foreign press, and even at home some of it.

The third quotation: "Fighting will only prolong

indefinitely the terrible suffering of the Blank people," how "each one of those Blanks is bogged down in a Blank war," "ravaging North Blank," "Wiped out village after village in Blank." In every one the only word today is Vietnam.

These quotations are from the press in 1951 and 1952 about Korea; same words, same language, same sentences.

I was a Senator in Congress during that time; and I have kept every letter that I received; and I'd get mail that read like this -- thousands of them -- "Get out of Korea. Bomb China. Stop the war. Quit the killing. Attack China. Reduce the expenditures," and "Let's lose no more lives." All the same letters. If you can do that, well and good; if you believe that to conduct war is not popular, thank goodness.

My friends, we are in Vietnam for the United States. We think it's as important to be there as it was for Harry Truman to send forces to Greece and Turkey.

I'd like to defend Berlin. We have troops in Berlin, not for the Berliners; for the United States. We have six divisions of troops in Germany; not for Germany, but for the United States.

We have military assistance compacts with 44 countries; not to protect Iran. Not to help some little country elsewhere alone; but for the United States.

We have had to think, from World War II, that

there is a lesson to be learned; that we live in one world, as Mr. Willkie put it, and that whatever happens in any part of the world can be dangerous to us. We think that had Hitler been stopped in 1933 or even 1937, World War II might have been avoided. We think that it was not an act of peace for Neville Chamberlain to appease Adolph Hitler and let him have the Sudetenland and Austria and say that this is all he wanted. We think we have learned that aggression unleashed is a lion unleashed. We think that, whether we like it or not, essentially militant communism, the aggression of communism all over Asia, is the present threat of today. We think that we have to treat that threat very much the same way as we had to treat the threat in Europe; and Europe has learned how to live now in some degree of peace and tranquility.

The Soviet Union understands the message of nuclear air power. There are those that believe that Communist China has not yet learned that lesson; and I think the real test of our position in Vietnam is not what we say about it, but what do the other nations over there say about it.

I have been meeting this week with the foreign minister of Indonesia, which is the sixth largest nation on the face of the earth. Two years ago Indonesia was captive; two years ago it became completely controlled by the Communist Party. Today Indonesia has rid itself of it at the cost of 500,000 lives;

and General Suharto -- and that gentleman I have known for 15 or 20 years, almost 25 years -- has told me and has told the world that they never could have done what they did in Indonesia were it not for our presence in Southeast Asia.

The Prime Minister of Singapore, no friend of the United States, a neutral one who has frequently abused us by his words, said only three months ago, "The only hope for freedom and independence in Asia is America's presence, her stand in Vietnam."

Neh Win, President of Burma, two years ago a Chinese captive and less than a year ago a visitor to Lyndon Johnson, is today a free man; a nation and a leader who is ridding itself of communism, and has said that the reason he was able to do it is because his people had hope and faith knowing that the United States of America had taken a stand against Communist aggression in Asia.

Ladies and gentlemen, I can go down the line and show you that every single country feels that what we are doing there is in the interest of their peace and their independence; and we think it ourselves. Our interests: where will we meet them? Where will you meet this threat? It's not going to go away; it's not going to vanish in thin air. Why do you think it will vanish? What is it that makes you believe that? Maybe they don't mean what they say; what evidence do you have? They

didn't think Hitler meant what he said, either, when he wrote Mein Kampf. He told everybody what he was going to do. Somebody said, well, that man's crazy. That doesn't keep men out of public office, you know. Hitler told the whole world what he was going to do; the whole world; and it sold more copies of his book in America than he sold in Germany.

He went and carried out his plan word by word, paragraph by paragraph, article by article; and the most horrible war that the world has ever known came as a result of people who said we don't have to take a stand.

Ladies and gentleman, we have taken a stand, not for South Vietnam alone; we have taken it for the United States of America. We think that this is a price that we have to pay for freedom in this world. We don't think this will be a better world if all the subcontinent of Asia falls prey to the aggressor. We don't think this will be a better world if Asia is Communist in the future. We don't think this will be a better America and a safer America for coming generations if this generation fails in its duty.

One other generation did fail in its duties; one other generation failed to keep the peace; one other generation failed to beat Hitler before he got far and sacrificed millions of lives. You don't have that right again. We had that lesson; and we think we have learned from it, and whether it is easy or

whether it is hard, the decision has been made; and as long as Lyndon Johnson is President of the United States and Hubert Humphrey is Vice President of the United States, as long as we have anything to say about the policy of this country, the course we are prepared to pursue will be honorable and fearless. We are prepared to make an honorable peace, but we will not retreat one inch in the face of contempt and attack and, indeed, the many faces of those who say that we ought to get out of Southeast Asia. That is our message.

- - -





# 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)