

Geo Meany
al Barkat

Leonard Sadoff
Neil Shyburn
Dau Red

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

AFL-CIO COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

OCTOBER 24, 1967

Today I want to talk about our country -- and what is at stake in 1968.

I want to visit with you about the programs for social progress that organized labor and the Democratic party have supported over the years.

For what is at stake next year is this: Our record of unbroken prosperity and of declining unemployment . . . our commitment to offer every American the best in education . . . our determination to provide cleaner, safer cities for the 70 per cent of the American people who live in them . . . our assault on the roots of poverty in

America both rural and urban . . . our ability to work for a more peaceful and prosperous world.

All of this, and more, is on the line in 1968.

now, Let us take a quick look at what has happened in the past few months.

↳ We knew that our effective working majority in Congress had been cut in the 1966 elections. But, many of us had not realized until now how serious the implications of that cut would be.

↳ Today, we see all the great Kennedy-Johnson programs for social and economic progress in America under attack by the old coalition of doubters, -- the coalition we had temporarily outnumbered in the 89th Congress, only to see it regain its power in the elections of 1966 . . . the Coalition of Retreat.

↳ This coalition knows the American people want a War on Poverty, Model Cities, rent supplements, and

aid to elementary and secondary education. / But the Coalition of Retreat also knows that by withholding or *drastically* cutting appropriations it can leave those programs standing hollow and empty.

/ And there are growing indications that the Coalition of Retreat would impose a new isolation -- or maybe it is the same "old isolation" -- on America in a shrinking, hungry, troubled and dangerous world.

/ The hard truth is we cannot turn back to the past. We can either press on toward the American dream of full and equal opportunity for every man, or we can slip -- back into an abyss of social tension, irresponsibility and depression.

/ The warning flags are up today.

/ Take the case of fiscal policy -- the Administration's tax bill.

↳ Taxes are never popular unless they are reduced.

This Administration has reduced federal taxes twice in the last three years.

↳ If the same tax rates prior to President Johnson's Administration were in effect now, your federal government would have an additional 24 billion dollars in revenue.

↳ We would have no financial problem and no fiscal crisis.

↳ Those tax rates, however, were reduced in order to move our economy forward when it needed it -- to provide maximum employment and to stimulate new investment when the economy was operating on ~~only a few cylinders.~~ *far below capacity.*

↳ I fully appreciate the desire of those who want tax reform. I fought for tax reform all my years in the Senate.

and, This Administration is committed to sending to this Congress a tax reform program.

↳ But now we face immediate and pressing need.

↳ We face some hard choices.

As I said, none of us likes taxes.

↳ But if the Administration's tax bill fails and government is forced to borrow ^{25 Billion} in the money market, interests rates will soar. They are already on the rise. We will risk a new depression in housing, a new surge in imports, deterioration in our balance of payments, a price rise of four to five per cent in 1968 and the danger of more in 1969. ↳ And we will lack the money to pay for the programs of social progress America so urgently needs.

↳ Let me emphasize: The President's tax bill would mean no additional tax for a family of four with an income of 5 thousand dollars; but inflation at the rates now predicted would cost ~~them~~ ^{that family} 147 dollars next year.

↳ A family of four with an income of 10 thousand dollars would pay 111 dollars in additional taxes -- or with no tax bill, 285 dollars in inflated prices.

↳ Of course, inflation would mean that the cash incomes of some Americans would increase -- not the millions on fixed incomes, not those who got no raises ... and not the organized worker whose wage increase always follows price and profit increases.

↳ I know there are some who would prefer other ways to meet this need. But I challenge outright the members of the Coalition of Retreat who simply oppose for opposition's sake, with no program of their own but cut ... cut ... cut.

↳ Then there is the effort to drastically cut federal spending on our critical domestic programs of education, of health, and opportunity.

↳ This is a danger signal not to be ignored.

Just last week the House of Representatives passed a Continuing Resolution on funding for the Office of Economic Opportunity -- home of the War on Poverty. That resolution arbitrarily specified an inadequate ceiling for War on Poverty funds.

↳ I am confident the Senate will not accept that ceiling, but let me tell you what it would mean.

↳ One hundred and fifty thousand children would have the Head Start classroom door slammed in their expectant faces.

↳ Two hundred and fifty thousand fewer needy youths would have employment and job training in the National Youth Corps.

∟ Sixty Job Corps centers would be closed and 20 thousand enrollees would be sent home to live on welfare.

∟ Half of the Vista projects would be liquidated.

∟ Twelve thousand fewer potential productive citizens would reach college under Project Upward Bound.

∟ There would be no federally-supported programs for disadvantaged young people during the explosive summer months. ∟ Our youth opportunity program would go down the drain.

∟ If proportional cuts were applied to the budget of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it would mean a reduction of over 30 per cent in all present education and health programs.

In Housing and Urban Development, it would mean a half-billion dollar reduction for low-income housing, sewer and water projects, and many others.

Do you think this country is ready to go backwards on programs like those? I don't.

The War on Poverty has non-partisan support from 22 Republican mayors of major U.S. cities. Every church group in this country has supported it. Life Magazine editorialized in favor of full funding. Businessmen are buying ads to support it.

The Urban Coalition composed of business leaders, labor leaders, church leaders, and public officials, spoke up strongly this fall for a program that will do whatever it takes to make urban America livable and give every American citizen the skills and the opportunity he needs to work and earn.

* * *

The danger signs are up in foreign policy as well.

The achievements of the Kennedy Round trade negotiation are under attack -- risking our overwhelmingly

favorable balance of trade with the outside world and inviting retaliation by other nations against domestic jobs, industry and agriculture.

And there are new attacks on foreign aid. This is the country that helped put Europe back on its feet with the Marshall Plan. This is the country that took the lead in the Alliance for Progress. This is the country of Food for Peace - The Peace Corps -

This is the country whose own security depends on the stability and economic growth of independent, non-Communist nations around the world.

This is the country where a bare-bones foreign assistance request is now in danger of being cut deeply . . . where our whole constructive, post-war work of nation-
building is in jeopardy.

* * *

Then there is another danger signal. It is in the arguments we now hear being put forth for withdrawal from other international commitments -- specifically in Vietnam.

Those arguments are increasingly being made as if the whole course of pre- and post-World War II experience could be overlooked.

Our commitment in Vietnam and Southeast Asia is the same kind of commitment this nation undertook after World War II when it faced down Soviet pressure in Europe. It is a commitment to see that Communist aggression and subversion in Asia -- of the kind we have plainly seen in Korea, in India, in Tibet, in Indonesia, in Burma, in Malaysia, and now in Thailand, in Laos and in Vietnam -- does not succeed.

Nor should the objective of this commitment be difficult to understand.

↳ It is to prevent World War III. It is to stop aggression before it becomes a pattern of international conduct.

↳ It is to allow the nations of Asia to develop freely and independently, just as the nations of Europe have done, so that aggression may not have fertile ground in which to grow.

↳ It is to convince the leaders of militant Asian Communism that time and history are not on their side and that peaceful coexistence is a far more profitable path.

The importance of our commitment in Vietnam is certainly clear in the eyes of free Asians.

Here are the words of Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand, speaking in Bangkok earlier this year:

"Thanks to the wisdom and courage of the

President of the United States . . . we are

now succeeding in putting out a small fire.

It was a decision that will go down in history as the move that prevented the world from having to face another major conflict."

Here are the words President Park of Korea said last year:

"For the first time in our history, last year we decided to dispatch combat troops overseas . . . because in our belief any aggression against the Republic of Vietnam represented a direct and grave menace against the security and peace of Free Asia and therefore directly jeopardized the very security and freedom of our own people."

That is why both the Republic of Korea and Thailand are standing with us, along with others, in Vietnam.

↳ That is why the combined military contribution of Asian and South Pacific nations in Vietnam now far exceeds the contribution of our allies in the Korean War.

↳ Yes, they understand our commitment. And I urge that every American take a good hard look at it.

↳ It is a commitment that is advancing the world toward peace and stability in a nuclear age.

This democracy can surely debate the tactics and timing we use to realize that commitment, and such a debate can be healthy.

↳ But let us announce to the world, as one people, that we share a basic, unshakeable commitment to stability, to growth, and self-determination, without which there can be no peace.

↳ And let us make clear to the world that we have the patience, courage and wisdom to see it through.

∟ I believe the American people will stand fast.

~~But they must hear the facts debated in a responsible and realistic fashion, not in a frame of reference long since proved wrong by history -- by the history of nations . . . or the history of all human behavior.~~

∟ You know it and I know it: You don't discourage a bully -- or an aggressor -- by giving him what he wants. You have to prove to him he can't have his way by force. Then, and only then, he begins to see the light and moderate his behavior.

~~*/~~*

Finally, let me offer some plain talk about our two American political parties and the job that lies ahead.

First, the hard-core of the Coalition of Retreat -- I mean the Republican party.

I know, you know, and they know what they really want -- or more accurately, what they don't want -- even though they may be understandably hesitant in spelling it out clearly for the American people.

They don't want a War on Poverty.

They don't want new laws and programs for education.

Never in platform or in conscience have they been able to support Medicare.

They were opposed to the birth of Social Security and have done everything possible to obstruct its growth.

They have consistently supported the rich and privileged above the poor and deprived.

When they lacked the votes in Congress to build their fortress against progress, they have always bid for the support of the reactionary, backward-looking forces in America -- wherever they could find them.

Yes, they have made their cause the building of a cold-hearted fortress against social progress at home and a narrow-minded Fortress America mentality toward our relations with the outside world.

You know our opposition for what it is. Let America know it.

Then there is the Democratic party.

As Will Rogers once said, he belonged to no organized party. He was a Democrat.

My friends of the labor movement: Over the years you have helped give the Democratic party its vital cement.

You, above all, have known that in unity, there is strength . . . in division, there is only defeat.

You have put into practice in national politics the lessons you have learned the hard way as free men and women in a free labor movement.

You have known that a union, or a political party, does not strengthen its cause or its purpose by breaking

ranks or by conducting flank attacks against its leadership.

You know that policies and decisions should be exposed to every measure of discussion and debate before they are reached.

You also know that, once they are made, men and women who believe in those policies and programs must stand up for them -- disciplined, facing outward united.

You have learned that true leadership flows upward from a rank-and-file, working together in trust and pride.

Today I call on you, as leaders of the American labor movement . . . as men and women who care about the future of this nation and peace in the world, to help the Democratic party once again unite.

I ask you to stand up for the programs . . . for the policies . . . for the President that have moved this nation forward as it has never moved before.

President Lyndon Baines Johnson -- a man who knows what poverty means . . . a man who has earned his bread with the work of his hands . . . a man who has always stood up for the working man, for the farmer, for the Mexican-American, for the Negro . . . a man who all his life has spoken out for those who had no voice . . . a man who is working 24 hours a day for peace and safety in this world -- this is the man who deserves our support and our unity.

President Lyndon Johnson is the best friend the American labor movement has.

He is the best friend the vital, growing free enterprise system has.

He is the best friend of the child reaching out for a chance in life . . . of the grandfather asking for help and understanding.

Is there anyone in this room who doesn't know that?

I am proud to say it: He is my President and he is yours.

He is the American who can keep moving this nation forward until we finally fulfill that dream of ours -- the dream where every man stands up free and proud and equal next to his neighbor . . . where hope and justice are not anyone's empty slogans, but clean and shining realities.

Lyndon Johnson needs your help and your support. Will you give it?

#

EDITED TRANSCRIPT

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
THE DECISIVE DOZEN CONFERENCE
COPE, AFL-CIO

WASHINGTON, D. C.
October 24, 1967

I intend to talk to you today about our country, and about what is at stake in 1968.

RECORD AT STAKE

What is at stake this coming year, as I see it, is our record of unbroken prosperity for more than 80 months and of declining unemployment.

What's also at stake next year is our commitment to offer every American the best in education; our determination to provide cleaner, safer cities for the 70 per cent of the American population who live in those cities; our assault on the roots of poverty in America, both rural and urban; and on all of these, we're beginning to make progress; we're beginning to show results.

But, all of it is on the line in 1968.

Let's just take a quick look at what has happened these past few months.

We knew that our effective working majority in Congress had been cut in the 1966 elections. But I doubt that many of us realized until now how serious the implications of that cut would be.

COALITION OF RETREAT

Today, we see all of the Kennedy-Johnson programs for social and economic progress in America under attack by the same old crowd, the coalition of the doubters and the retreaters -- the "pause generation," I call it -- the coalition we had temporarily outnumbered in the 89th Congress, only to see it regain its power in the elections of 1966.

This coalition, which is at work in Congress, knows the American people want a War on Poverty, Model Cities, rent supplements and aid to education through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. But the Coalition of Retreat also knows that by withholding or drastically cutting appropriations it can leave these programs standing hollow and empty -- commitments with no resources.

And there are growing indications that the Coalition of Retreat would impose a new isolation -- or maybe the same old isolation -- on America in a shrinking, hungry, troubled, dangerous world. I'm talking to men and women in this room

who have resisted the isolationist tendencies of some political leaders for more than two generations.

The hard truth is that we cannot turn back as some want us to. We can either press on towards the American dream of full and equal opportunity for every man, or we can slip back into an abyss of social tensions, irresponsibility, recession, and depression.

WARNING FLAGS

The warning flags are up today, the storm signs are out. I'm going to talk to you about two or three of them.

There's fiscal policy -- high interest rates, inflation, the Administration's tax bill. I know that taxes are never popular unless they're reduced. This Administration has reduced federal taxes twice in the last three years. If the tax rates in effect before these cuts were still in effect now, the federal government would have an additional 24 to 25 billion dollars in revenue, and we'd have no financial problems, no fiscal crisis, no budget problems.

But those tax rates were reduced, and they were reduced for good purpose, in order to move the economy forward when it needed it -- to provide maximum employment, to stimulate new investment when the economy was operating far below capacity. And the labor movement was in the forefront of support for these tax reductions.

I fully appreciate the desire of those who want tax reform before they have any additional taxes. I fought for tax reform all of my days in the United States Senate, and I believe in it now as I believed in it then. I can tell you that this Administration is committed to sending this Congress a tax reform program. We're willing to make the fight.

HARD CHOICES

But we face some immediate and pressing needs, and we face some hard choices right now. As I said, none of us likes taxes. But if the Administration tax bill fails and government is forced to borrow in the money markets, interest rates will go up. They're already on the rise.

I think we risk a new depression in housing unless we take some steps to put our financial house in order. We will see a new surge in imports as inflation increases the cost of domestic goods, a deterioration in our balance of payments, and a rise of 4 to 5 percent in the cost of living in 1968 -- with the danger of more in 1969.

Let me emphasize, the President's tax bill would mean no additional tax for a family of four with an income of five thousand dollars. But inflation at the rates now predicted would cost that family an additional 145 dollars next year, an inflation tax on those who can least afford to pay it.

A family of four with an income of ten thousand dollars would pay 111 dollars in additional taxes under the Administration's tax bill -- or, with the inflation tax, at least 285 dollars in inflated prices.

Of course, inflation would mean that the cash incomes of some Americans would increase, but not the millions on fixed incomes, not those who get no wage raises, and not the organized worker whose wage increase always follows price and profit increases.

NO PROGRAM BUT "CUT"

I know there are those who would prefer other ways to meet this situation but I challenge outright the members of the Coalition of Retreat who simply oppose for opposition's sake, with no program of their own but to cut, cut, cut.

Then there is the effort to cut drastically federal spending on our critical domestic programs of education, of health, and of equal opportunity.

Those are the ones they're after. This is the danger signal that cannot be ignored.

Just last week the House of Representatives passed a Continuing Resolution on funding of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the home of the War on Poverty. That resolution arbitrarily specified an inadequate ceiling for War on Poverty funds. I don't think the Senate will accept that ceiling, but let me tell you what it would mean.

OPPORTUNITIES SCUTTLED

One hundred and fifty thousand children would have Head Start classroom doors slammed in their expectant faces. Two hundred and fifty thousand fewer needy youths would have employment and job training in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Sixty Job Corps centers would be closed, and 20,000 enrollees -- school drop-outs, kids that never had a break in their lives -- would be sent home to live on welfare. Half of the VISTA projects would be closed. Twelve thousand fewer potential productive citizens would reach college under Project Upward Bound.

There would be no federally supported programs for disadvantaged young people during the explosive summer months. The House action, if it became law, would scuttle the Youth Opportunity Program.

If proportional cuts were applied to the budget of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it would mean a reduction of 30 percent in the present education and health programs of the United States.

In Housing and Urban Development, it would mean a half-billion-dollar reduction for low income housing, sewer, and water projects, and many others.

Do you think this country is ready to go backwards on programs like these? I don't think the country wants to, but I think there's a powerful coalition in the Congress that is determined to stop progress in the name of what they call economy.

The War on Poverty has non-partisan support from 22 Republican mayors of major U.S. cities. Every church group in this country has supported it. Life Magazine editorialized in favor of full funding. Businessmen are buying ads to support it. The labor movement supports it. The Urban Coalition of business, labor and church leaders and public officials supports it. They spoke out strongly, in fact, for an even greater program.

FOREIGN POLICY

The danger signs are up on foreign policy as well as on the home front.

The achievements of our trade negotiators are under attack, risking a favorable balance of trade with the outside world, inviting retaliation by other nations against domestic jobs, industry, and agriculture.

There are new attacks on foreign aid. Yet this is the country that helped put Europe back on its feet with the Marshall Plan. This is the country that took the lead in the Alliance for Progress. This is the country of Food for Peace and the Peace Corps. This is the country whose own security depends upon the stability and the economic growth of independent non-Communist nations around the world. And who better knows it than the free labor movement of America?

I know what the AFL-CIO has done. I know of the effort and the resources that you've put into the struggle to build a better world. But in the Congress of the United States, that coalition is undermining your efforts. The necessary monies are being choked off. A bare-bones foreign assistance request -- and it is bare-bones -- is now in danger of being cut deeply or not passed at all. Our whole constructive post-war work of nation building is in jeopardy.

VIETNAM COMMITMENTS

Then there is another danger signal in the arguments we now hear for withdrawal from other international commitments, specifically in Vietnam.

I served in the Congress a long time, and I haven't changed my view on our international commitments. I was for our policy in Vietnam before Lyndon Johnson was President and before I was Vice President. In 1955 as a Senator from Minnesota, I said in the Senate that if South Vietnam falls victim to Communist aggression, it vitally affects the national security of the United States.

Let's take a look at the arguments that are increasingly being made as if the whole course of pre- and post-World War II experience could be overlooked.

OUR STAKE IN ASIA

Our commitment in Vietnam and Southeast Asia is the same kind of commitment that this nation undertook after World War II when it faced Soviet pressure in Europe. Of course, I understand they spell their names differently in Southeast Asia. They don't look like us. We don't have many relatives there, and they don't speak our language. But Asia represents two-thirds of the people of the world. And every struggle that this country has been engaged in since Pearl Harbor has started in Asia. We are a Pacific power by geography. We border on the Pacific Ocean. Hawaii is one of our states. Guam is one of our possessions. Australia has been one of our most loyal and faithful allies. To pretend that Asia is out of our sphere of interest is to defy reality.

Our commitment in Vietnam is to see that Communist aggression and subversion in Asia -- of the kind that we have plainly seen in Korea, in India, in Tibet, in Indonesia, in Burma, in Malaysia, in the Philippines, in Thailand, in Laos, and now in Vietnam -- does not succeed.

I don't think the objective of this commitment is difficult to understand. We're not there just because of South Vietnam, important as that country is. We're not there just because of our treaties, important as they are. We're there because of our national security and because we believe that if one country after another falls prey to an aggressor, it is a rising tide of danger to the whole free world. We're there to prevent World War III, to stop aggression before it becomes a pattern of international conduct.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The commitment we've made is to allow the nations of Asia to develop freely and independently, just as the nations of Europe have done, so that aggression may not find fertile ground in which to grow. Our commitment is to convince the leaders of militant Asian Communism in all of its varieties that time and history are not on their side, and that peaceful coexistence is a far more profitable path.

The importance of our commitment in Vietnam is certainly clear in the eyes of free Asians.

Thanat Khoman, the Foreign Minister of Thailand, said earlier this year: "Thanks to the wisdom and the courage of the President of the United States, we are now succeeding in putting out a small fire. It was a decision that will go down in history as the move that prevented the world from having to face another major conflict."

President Park of Korea said last year: "For the first time in our history, last year we decided to dispatch combat troops overseas, because in our belief any aggression against the Republic of Vietnam represented a direct and grave menace against the security and the peace of free Asia, and therefore directly jeopardized the very security and freedom of our own people."

The Republic of Korea and Thailand are standing with us, and with others, in Vietnam. The combined military contribution of Asian and South Pacific nations in Vietnam now far exceeds the contribution of our allies in the Korean War.

These nations understand our commitment.

And I think the American people understand it.

It is a commitment that is advancing the world toward peace and stability in the nuclear age. This democracy should surely debate the tactics and timing that we use to realize that commitment, and such debate can be healthy. But let us announce to the world as one people that we share a basic, unshakeable commitment to stability, to growth, to self-determination, without which there can be no peace.

PATIENCE AND STATESMANSHIP

Securing peace is a hard job, requiring infinite patience, perseverance, resolution, firmness -- the application of strength where it's needed, the generous use of compassion where it's required -- and statesmanship of the highest quality.

The task before your President now is to apply that amount of power which is necessary to prevent the success of aggression without triggering nuclear conflagration.

Anybody can get this nation into a nuclear war. It takes a statesman -- a man of firm purpose, wisdom, and judgment -- to guide this nation and its destiny through these troubled waters without such a conflagration.

So let us make it clear to the world that we have the patience, the courage and the will to see it through. I believe the American people will stand fast. I think they know the history of all human behavior -- the lesson that aggression unleashed is aggression unchecked.

ROADBLOCK TO PEACE

The roadblock to peace is not in Washington. The roadblock to peace is in Hanoi. We have tried again and again, even this month, to find some way to discuss, to talk, to negotiate without conditions. And time and again the door has been slammed in our faces -- not only ours, but the United Nations, the Geneva Conference, and Pope Paul VI. There will be no peace until the adversary comes to understand that he cannot gain his objective through the use of force.

What kind of world do you think we would have today if President Truman hadn't been willing to resist Communist aggression with American forces in Korea? And yet, only six months after doing so, he found in a public opinion poll that 66% of the Americans polled by Dr. George Gallup said we should withdraw at once.

What if the President had gauged his foreign policy on public opinion polls? We would be fortress America, trying alone to resist the ever-growing forces of tyranny and aggression.

I doubt that George Washington would have carried on our War for Independence if he'd relied on public opinion polls. And do you think there would be one nation today if Abraham Lincoln had not had the courage to be unpopular?

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

We're winning this struggle in Vietnam. The enemy cannot defeat us militarily. A government is being established in South Vietnam -- not a perfect model parliamentary government but five elections have been held since 1966. A constitution has been written, a president has been elected.

"But he didn't get a majority," some people say. Well, eleven American Presidents never got a majority of the votes. And we didn't elect our constituent assembly, they were appointed. One hundred were appointed, and fifty-five came to Philadelphia -- two weeks late. Thirty-nine stayed to write our Constitution. Thirty-eight signed it.

We gained our independence with foreign aid. At Yorktown, when Cornwallis was defeated, most of the troops were French. The French fleet bottled up the British fleet, and most of the casualties were French.

Let me say one other thing before I go.

My friends of the labor movement, over the years you've helped give the Democratic Party its vital cement. You above all have known that in unity there is strength and in division there is only defeat.

UNITY AND SOLIDARITY

The labor movement has won its great victories through solidarity and unity. Now you'd better talk a little to the Democrats.

You don't need to talk to the Republicans -- they don't want to listen to you. They never have. They don't want a War on Poverty. They don't want new laws and programs for education. Never in platform or in conscience have they been able to support Medicare. They opposed the birth of Social Security, and they don't like any of its children. They have consistently supported the rich and the privileged above the poor and the deprived.

When they lacked the votes in Congress to build their fortress against progress, they have always bid for the support of reactionary, backward-looking forces in America -- wherever they could find them.

You know what our opposition is. But you also know a little bit about Democrats. So I call on you today as leaders of the American labor movement to help the Democratic Party unite again.

I tell my fellow Democrats, be careful about putting poison in the pitcher because it's from that pitcher that you're going to have to drink.

JOIN THE FIGHT

I think it's time that you called the Democratic leaders in and gave them a little lesson in organization, solidarity, and unity. Tell them to pocket any selfish ideas they may have and join the great fight, because the chips are down and the stakes are high.

We're going to have a Presidential election in 1968, and one of the men in that election is going to be President Lyndon Johnson.

I submit to you that you've never had an administration that has accomplished more of the things you've fought for than the administrations of Kennedy and Johnson. You started it in 1961 and you're still with it.

President Johnson is a man who has always stood up for the working man, for the farmer, for the Mexican-American, for the Negro -- a man who, all of his life, has spoken out for those who had no voice. This man as President has done more for the cause of human rights, has done more for the cause of

education, has done more for the cause of the people's health, has done more to open opportunities for the deprived and the needy in this nation than any man since the time of Franklin Roosevelt.

President Johnson is the best friend that American labor has. He is the best friend that the vital and growing free enterprise system has. He is the best friend of the child reaching out for a chance in life, of the grandfather or grandmother asking for help and understanding.

Is there anyone in this room who doesn't know this?

I'm proud to say that he is my President and my friend; he is your President and your friend. And he needs your help.

Go home to your states and carry our message. Don't be filled with doubt or uncertainty. Be confident. Carry the message of social progress. Carry the message of international commitment. Carry the message of victory.

And I'm here to tell you, we're going to win.

COPE - AFL-CIO
THE DECISIVE DOZEN CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
LUNCHEON

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY -- INTRODUCTION

3 MR. BARKIN: ... are our leaders from the twelve largest States. We've called them to Washington for two days of planning and program. As far as we're concerned, when we leave here the 1968 COPE Campaign in the twelve largest States will have started.

They'd be delighted to hear from a friend, a prov-- (coughs) a proven friend. (LAUGHTER) Vice President Hubert Humphrey.

(APPLAUSE)

COPE - AFL-CIO
THE DECISIVE DOZEN CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
LUNCHEON

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much. Well, thank you, Al. I was sorry to hear you choke on that sentence there, but before I'm through here I hope to demonstrate to you that you were just clearing your throat. (LAUGHTER)

Ladies and gentlemen, I really regret that I interrupt your luncheon like this, but I'm not the master of my own schedule, and sometimes I'm quite sure I'm not the captain of my own destiny. Anyway, it's a special pleasure to be with you. Ordinarily, when I come to a gathering like this I'm given a free luncheon, and I feel some obligation to deliver a fairly good speech. Today I am not eating with you. (LAUGHTER) So what ever may come in terms of the speech, just remember it didn't cost you a thing--except your time.

I know that I'm talking to the leaders of twelve of the most important States of the Union, and more than that, States that can represent victory or defeat in the elections of 1968. But in saying that we do not underestimate the importance of every State. I believe that we must give very careful attention to every possible group of people in every State in the Nation.

Al, my first comment to you is an expression of thanks to you, sir, for your leadership of COPE, for your leadership of

Political Action, for the leadership of Mr. Meany and the AFL-CIO Executive Board given to us, for the leadership of every COPE Director in every State gives to us.

I know full well that I never would have had a chance in American public life without your help. This morning I met with my friends from Minnesota, with our State President, Dave Roe (?), with our Vice President, Neil Sherburn (?), with our COPE Director, Leonard LeChamps (?), and I can tell you without them and others there wouldn't have been a Hubert Humphrey as United States Senator from Minnesota, and there wouldn't be a Hubert Humphrey as Vice President of the United States. I'm grateful to them, and my hope and aspiration is that I'm worthy now, as I was in the past, of their trust, and that I may be worthy in the days to come of their trust and confidence. We've had a good working relationship, and that relationship at home is one that I want to convey to you as a standard for every State in the Union. We believe that together we can build.

Now I have to be kind of careful how I talk to you. I read the paper this morning. It said that I spoke sarcastically and with emotion. Well, I'm guilty of both on occasion. I want you to know that. (APPLAUSE) I didn't come here to deliver you a dull dissertation, and if my glands start to react, that's exactly what they're intended to do. That's what they were put there for. Now

[+Leonard LaShomb]

I intend to speak to you from the mind and from the heart and from the soul about our Country, and what's at stake in 1968.

We've put a lot of work into this Country. We've put a great deal of work into building a liberal movement, a progressive movement in America, and a progressive program. So I want to visit with you about the programs for social progress that organized labor and the Democratic Party have supported for years. And I wish to say to my friends of the Democratic Party that without organized labor's help you don't win. With it you have a chance, and better than a fair chance to win.

Now, what is at stake this coming year of 1968 is, as I see it, our record of unbroken prosperity running into over 80 months, and of declining unemployment. You remember when John Kennedy said, "Let's get this Country moving again." And it was on dead center, in fact, it was in retreat. And he started it. And Lyndon Johnson said, "Let us continue." And we've been moving it.

What's at stake is our commitment to offer every American the best in education, and we're doing it. Our determination to provide cleaner, safer cities for the 70% of the American population that live in those cities. This is a tremendous task. We're only beginning. We can't falter now. We cannot afford to turn back.

What's at stake is our assault on the roots of poverty in

America, both rural and urban. And we're beginning to make progress. We're beginning to show results. And we can't turn back.

Our ability to work for a more peaceful and prosperous world is at stake, too.

All of these things I want to talk to you about. All of it's on the line in 1968. So let's just take a quick look at what has happened these past few months. Well, we knew that our effective working majority in Congress had been cut in the 1966 elections. But I doubt that many of us realized until now how serious the implications of that cut would be. I know that my friend, Andy Bemiller (?) down here knows what it means because he's up there on Capitol Hill.

Today we see all of the Kennedy-Johnson programs for social and economic progress in America under attack by the same old crowd, the coalition of the doubters and the retreaters, the "pause generation," I call it, the coalition that we had temporarily outnumbered in the 89th Congress, only to see it regain its power in the elections of 1966, the coalition of retreat. Now that political coalition which is at work in Congress, it knows the American people want a War on Poverty. It knows that the American people want to do something about their cities, model cities. It knows that rent supplements make sense, and it knows that the American people want to do something about education to improve its quality

and its quantity, and therefore, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act they know the American people want. But the coalition of retreat also knows that by withholding or choking off or drastically cutting the appropriations it can leave these programs standing hollow and empty, shells, so to speak, of commitments with no resources. And that's what the fight is all about.

And there are growing indications that the coalition of retreat would impose a new isolation, or maybe the same old isolation, on America in a shrinking and hungry and troubled and dangerous world. And I'm talking to men and women in this room that have resisted the isolationist tendencies of some of our political leaders for many and many a year, in fact, for better than two generations. I don't know where America would have been had it not have been for the vigilant, courageous leadership of some of the labor leaders back in the 1930s who had the courage to stand up and be counted when the world was witnessing the unbelievable barbarism of Hitlerism and Naziism and militarism in the Far East. The labor movement understood it when some of our others did not.

The hard truth is, gentlemen and ladies, we cannot turn back, but somebody wants us to. We can either press on towards the American Dream of full and equal opportunity for every man, or we can slip, yes, slip back into an abyss of social tensions, irresponsibility, recession, and depression. There is no guarantee

that this can't happen except eternal political vigilance. And I'm talking to the guardians, right now, of this Country.

I think the warning flags are up, the storm signs are out. I'm going to talk to you about two or three of them, and I know that we're not always in full agreement. There's fiscal policy, high interest rates, inflation, and one of those measures before the Congress is the Administration's tax bill. I know that taxes are never popular unless they're reduced. This Administration has reduced Federal taxes twice in the last three years, and it should have. If the same tax rates prior to President Johnson's Administration were in effect now, however, your Federal Government would have an additional 24 to 25 billion dollars in revenue, and we'd have no financial problems, no fiscal crisis, no budget problems.

But those tax rates were reduced, and they were reduced for good purpose, in order to move the economy forward when it needed it, to provide maximum employment, to stimulate new investment when the economy was operating at less or far below capacity. And the labor movement was in the forefront of support for giving the American enterprise economy a chance to provide the jobs, to do something to build a more prosperous America. And it worked. It was called the new economics, but it worked.

Now I fully appreciate the desire of those who want tax reform before they have any additional taxes. I fought for tax

reform all of my days in the United States Senate, and I believe in it now just as I believed in it then. And I can tell you that the President of the United States and his Administration is committed to sending to this Congress, this 90th Congress, a tax reform program, committed to it even though we know of its difficulties. We're willing to make the fight, and with your help we'll make the kind of a fight that will clarify this issue once and for all. And we can take it to the American people if we can't win it in the Congress. And I think that's what you'd like to have done. (APPLAUSE)

some
 But we face ~~an~~ immediate and pressing needs and we face some hard choices. As I said, none of us likes taxes, but if this Administration tax bill fails, or some version of it fails, and Government is forced to step into the money markets and to borrow 25 to 30 billions of dollars, interest rates will go up, unless every advisor we have doesn't know a thing about what he's talking about. They're already on the rise. Government paper is on the rise. I heard the President only yesterday, as we met ^{with} the leadership of the Congress, discuss with us what's happened just since the tax bill went to the Congress. The additional cost on the taxpayer of interest on the public debt, the additional cost of refunding the public debt, and more importantly the additional cost of consumer credit, the additional cost of commercial credit, the additional

cost of credit that affects every businessman, every labor person, every working man and woman in this Country.

I think we're going to risk a new depression in housing unless we take some steps to put our financial house in order. You're going to see a new surge in imports because inflation increases the cost of domestic goods, a deterioration in our balance of payments, and a rise, they predict, of 4 to 5 percent in 1968 in the cost of living, and the danger of more in 1969.

Now those are the predictions, not of pessimists, not of prophets of doom and gloom, but those are the predictions of men that we have relied on, that we've trusted. Let me emphasize, the President's tax bill would mean no additional tax for a family of four with an income of five thousand dollars. That's a low income family, but there are hundreds and thousands of them. But inflation at the rates now predicted would cost that family an additional 147 dollars a year, an inflation tax on those that least can afford to pay it.

A family of four with an income of ten thousand would pay 111 dollars additional tax under the Administration's tax bill, or with the inflation tax, 285 dollars in inflated prices at a minimum. Of course inflation would mean that the cash incomes of some Americans would increase, but not the millions on fixed incomes, and we have millions on fixed incomes. Not those who get no wage raises,

and not the organized worker, my dear friends, whose wage increase always follows price increases. You're always the last car, you're the caboose on the train of inflation. Wage increases follow price increases and profit increases. Inflation has never been a help to a man of modest income, and surely it is disastrous to the person of low and fixed income.

Now I know there are those who would prefer other ways to meet this need, but I challenge outright the members of the coalition of retreat who simply oppose for opposition's sake, with no program of their own but to cut, cut, cut, and believe me, they know what they want to cut. Then there is the effort to drastically cut Federal spending on our spending on our critical domestic programs of education, of health, and of equal opportunity. Those are the ones they're after. They're not going to cut the Defense budget. If we never raise another nickel in this Government, the Congress will continue to appropriate the monies that are required for the Defense budget.

What's at stake, ladies and gentlemen, is education. What's at stake is health. What's at stake are the programs that we're trying to work up in the field of equal opportunity, the War on Poverty, that's what's at stake! And we have to have your help now as never before. This is the danger signal that cannot be ignored.

Just last week the House of Representatives passed a Continuing Resolution on funding of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the home of the War on Poverty. Let me show you what it means. That Resolution arbitrarily specified an inadequate low ceiling for the War on Poverty funds. We're not spending too much now, you know. The President's budget request of two billion was a minimum. I don't think the Senate will accept that ceiling, I'm happy to tell you, but let me tell you what it would mean, and what the House action did mean.

One hundred and fifty thousand children would have their Headstart classroom doors slammed in their expectant faces, closed out. Now don't tell me that a country with a gross national product of almost \$800 billion can't afford a Headstart program. You know we can. We cannot in good conscience, we cannot as moral citizens close the door on 150,000 children in the name of economy. (APPLAUSE)

Two hundred and fifty thousand fewer needy youths would have employment and job training in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Sixty Job Corps Centers would be closed, and 20,000 enrollees, school drop-outs, kids that never had a break in their life would be told to go home and to live on welfare. Half of the VISTA projects would have to be closed. Twelve thousand fewer potential productive citizens would reach college under project Upward Bound, which takes gifted young people from the ghettos, from rural

poverty areas, tests them and finds they have great ability, and sends them on for college preparatory courses. We have 38,000 of them right now, and in the name of economy on the part of the coalition of retreat we're going to cut that. There would be no Federally supported programs for disadvantaged young people during the explosive summer months.

I've been the Chairman, as you know, of the Youth Opportunity Program, and we have to really work hard, my friends, to find the means and the sums of funds or monies that can do some good in these summer months. The House action, if it became law, would scuttle the Youth Opportunity Program. No more, and would come next summer with trouble, trouble, trouble, and people say, "Why don't you do something about it?" Well, the doctor that depends on penicillin to cure infection cannot cure it if you take the penicillin away. And I'll tell you something else, as an old pharmacist. It doesn't do you any good to take 25,000 units when you need 500,000. Better you should get yourself a package of lifesavers, or some doublemint chewing gum. You have to administer what is required.

If proportional cuts were applied to the budget of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare it would mean a reduction of 30 percent in the present education and health and welfare programs of the United States. That's what we're talking about. That's what the President faces today.

In housing and urban development it would mean a half a billion dollar reduction for low income housing, sewer and water projects, and many others. Do you think this country is ready to go backwards on programs like these? I don't think the Country wants to, but I think there's a powerful coalition in this Congress that is determined to stop the progress of this Country in what they call the name of economy, a false economy if I ever heard of it.

The War on Poverty has non-partisan support, by the way, from 22 Republican mayors of major U.S. cities. Every church group in this Country has supported it. Why, Life Magazine editorialized in favor of full funding. Businessmen are buying ads to support it. The labor movement supports it. The urban coalition of business and labor and church leaders and public officials supports it. They spoke out strongly for it, in fact, for an even greater program.

And yet, an election of 1966 put the men in the Congress of the United States that want to stop it, that want to cut it, that want to maim it. I know of no way to correct that but to have another election. That's the purpose of elections. (APPLAUSE)
I want to go to bat.

Now, the danger signs are up on foreign policy as well. The achievements of our trade negotiations are under attack, risking a favorable balance of trade with the outside world, inviting

retaliation by other nations against domestic jobs, industry, and agriculture. We're not blind dogmatic Free Traders. We know that there are problems that industry and labor face, and this is an Administration that is fully cognizant of them. The President of the United States is not a theoretical intellectual, nor is the Vice President. We think we're reasonably well informed men that have been through the realities of life and the realities of politics. (APPLAUSE) And we're not about ready to see the great needs of our Country forgotten or unanswered, and we're not about ready to sacrifice the needs of our workers for jobs or the investment of our businessmen. But we do thing that we have a stake, a great stake in the expanded commerce of the world. And we're going to do our best to expand it.

There are new attacks on foreign aid--that's a favorite whipping boy these days. And yet this is the country that helped put Europe back on its feet with the Marshall Plan. This is the country that took the lead in the Alliance for Progress that is working. This is the country of Food for Peace and the Peace Corps. This is the country whose own security depends upon the stability and the economic growth of independent non-Communist nations around the world. And who better knows it than the free labor movement of America which has done as much or more than any group in this Nation to help develop free independent trade unions

that help strengthen free independent non-Communist nations. You're the ones that have been doing that job. We're partners in an effort to help build a more peaceful world.

The President spoke yesterday to one of your great organizations, the Retail Clerks in their International movement. I know what the AFL-CIO has done. I know of the fantastic amount of effort that you've put into it, and the resources that you've put into this struggle to build a better world. And yet the Congress of the United States, that coalition, is undermining your efforts because your efforts depend upon the partnership of your Government. Your efforts to build non-Communist free trade unions, your efforts to provide low income housing for needy people at home and abroad depend upon a partner in the Federal Government carrying its share of the load.

That Government today is not doing it because the monies are being choked off. This is the country whose own security requires that we do these things. This is the country where a bare-bones foreign assistance request--and it is bare-bones--is now in danger of being cut deeply or not passed at all. Where our whole constructive post-War work in nation building is in jeopardy. We can't even get a Conference Report on a program that's been cut a billion dollars already.

Do you think this is the way you're going to help Indonesia,

my dear friends, where the Communist movement has been smashed temporarily, at least, the country that is the fifth largest country in the world, that maybe needs a little help from this country? Do you know that we can't extend that help under the present authorizations?

And yet those who would deny us that help, that would deny your President the opportunity to give that help will be the first to condemn him if things go wrong in Indonesia, if things go wrong in Malaysia, if things go wrong in other countries in Asia and Africa.

Oh, you need to know what the fight's about. And there's another danger signal, and it is in the arguments that we now hear being put forth for withdrawal from other international commitments, and I refer specifically to Viet Nam. Now, my fellow Americans, I served in the Congress a long time, and I haven't changed my view one bit on our international commitments. I've had those that say, "Well, you can expect the Vice President to be for President Johnson's policy because he's Vice President." I'm happy to tell you that I was for the policy before Lyndon Johnson was President and before I was Vice President. My record is a printed record, it is a public record. And in 1955 Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator from Minnesota, said that if South Viet Nam falls victim to Communist aggression it vitally affects the national

security of the United States. It opens the flood-gate for Communist conquest. We must stand firm. I haven't changed one bit, not one bit. (APPLAUSE)

And, ladies and gentlemen, I knew what I was voting for when I voted for the SEATO Treaty. And I knew what I was voting for when I voted for the Resolution on the Gulf of Tonkin. I knew what I said then, and knew that I meant it. And if I must say that if the Congress or some other group doesn't feel that that's the right resolution, you can always have a repealer. But until then, when the AFL Executive Board gives its marching orders to its President, the President has an obligation to follow the resolutions of the AFL Executive Board. Isn't that right? The Congress of the United States gave its orders to the President of the United States in the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Until that Congress changes its mind the President of the United States is obligated to follow those directions of that Resolution. And as Commander in Chief, entrusted by the Constitution of the United States, he has the responsibility to provide for the security of this country, even if he disagrees with the Congress of the United States. That is the Law of the Land.

Let's take a look at the arguments that are increasingly being made, as if the whole course of pre- and post-World War II experience could be overlooked. I think what many of our fellow

Americans need is an elementary course in history. I don't say that history repeats itself. I just say it teaches us some lessons.

Our commitment in Viet Nam and Southeast Asia is the same kind of commitment that this nation undertook after World War II when it faced Soviet pressure in Europe. Of course, I understand they spell their names differently in Southeast Asia. They look differently. We don't have many relatives there. They don't speak our language. But they are people. And what is more, Asia represents two-thirds of the people of the world. And every struggle that this country's been engaged in since Pearl Harbor, including Pearl Harbor, has started in Asia. Don't pretend it's not there. Don't think that it can't cause us trouble. We've been a Pacific power by geography. We border on the Pacific Ocean. Hawaii is one of our States. Guam is one of our possessions. Australia has been one of our most loyal and faithful allies. We've been there. And for some to pretend that it's out of our sphere of interest is to just defy reality and the facts.

Our commitment in Viet Nam is one to see that the Communist aggression and subversion in Asia of the kind that we have plainly seen in Korea, in India, in Tibet, in Indonesia, in Burma, in Malaysia, in the Philippines, in Thailand, and in Laos, and now in Viet Nam does not succeed. That's what it's all about.

And when I read people saying, "Well, you're getting overly excited about this..." Excited! Ladies and gentlemen, there's been a constant militant aggressive struggle on in Asia. I listed them. Five to six hundred thousand dead in a blood bath in Indonesia. Sure it wasn't Americans, but they're people. A war that was on between Malaysia and Indonesia for years that took thousands of lives has now been settled because we took our stand, at least in part. The Communist conquest in Tibet, the Communist unprovoked aggression in Korea, Communist China's two unprovoked attacks on India in five years, seven years of Communist attack in Malaysia, the Communist forces trying to make a captive out of Burma. And yet I read occasionally that the President and the Vice President are over-excited, over-simplifying matters about Asia. I don't think that this is getting overly excited.

Let me tell you, when you see in the union movement one force after another destroy one union after another, it's time to get excited. And you do, thank goodness. I wish everybody had the common sense about foreign policy that the labor movement has about its economic policy and its collective bargaining policies. We need the same kind of solidarity and collective security that you men and women have shown in collective bargaining. (APPLAUSE)

And I don't think that the objective of our commitment

is difficult to understand. We're not there just because of South Viet Nam, important as that would be. We're not even there just because of our treaties, important as that may be. We're there because of our own national security. We just happen to believe that if one country after another falls prey to the aggressor, that it is a rising tide of danger to the whole free world. We think we learned that lesson, and we're a part of that free world. We're there to prevent World War III, to stop aggression before it becomes a pattern of international conduct, and a habit.

We think we ought to have learned something from the days of Hitler. We think we ought to have learned something from the time of the Japanese militarists, when the labor movement warned time after time that if this went unchecked the day of decision, the day of catastrophe would fall upon us, and it did. And it did.

That commitment that we've made is one to allow the nations of Asia to develop freely and independently, just as the nations of Europe have done, so that aggression may not find fertile ground in which to grow. Our commitment is to convince the leaders of militant Asian Communism with all of its varieties, and I mention this because our critics would have you believe that we are so ill informed that we think that it's a monolith. Now, I can teach history to some of our critics, to put it bluntly, and have. (APPLAUSE) This is my business, you know. There's a lot

of difference between a professor of international relations and a commentator. (LAUGHTER) I do get a little irked once in a while when I read some of these self-appointed week-end wonders.

This commitment is to convince the leaders of militant Asian Communism that time and history are not on their side, and that peaceful coexistence is a far more profitable path. The importance of our commitment in Viet Nam is certainly clear in the eyes of free Asians. Thanet Koman (?), the Foreign Minister of Thailand who is no lackey of the United States, a man in his own right, said this, "Thanks to the wisdom and the courage of the President of the United States, we are now succeeding in putting out a small fire. It was a decision that will go down in history as the move that prevented the world from having to face another major conflict."

President Park of Korea, who fought on the front lines as a brave soldier, said this, "For the first time in our history last year we decided to dispatch combat troops overseas, because in our belief any aggression against the Republic of Viet Nam represented a direct and grave menace against the security and the peace of free Asia, and therefore, directly jeopardized the very security and freedom of our own people."

That's the kind of talk and thinking that's in the NATO Alliance that the critics of our policy in Asia now openly support.

What is there that's so sacred about Europe, that doesn't apply with equal meaning to Asia? What is there about the defense of Berlin that is not applicable to the defense of other peoples when they are being menaced by Communist aggression? It is not to conclude that one group is better than the other, but we have said that an attack upon any one of our NATO partners is an attack upon all. We have said that we will defend the city of Berlin, even though it's a hundred miles within the Communist wasteland, we'll defend it with every man, woman, and child of this Republic. With all of our resources, we have said. And we've proved that we mean it. Why? Because we have said that if that commitment is not one that can be fulfilled, who will believe any of our commitments? If our word on Berlin isn't something that can be tested and proved worthy, who will ever believe us that we will keep any commitment? That's what it is about.

We have proven that we have the courage and we have the will to keep that word. And that's why the Republic of Korea and Thailand are standing with us, along with others in Viet Nam. And there is, by the way, the combined military contribution of Asian and South Pacific nations to Viet Nam now far exceeds the contribution of our allies in the Korean War. I wonder how many knew that. Many more troops there from other countries as people complain that we're doing it all than we had in Korea. We had to stand much more

alone in Korea even though it was under a United Nations banner than we do now in Viet Nam.

Yes, these members of free Asia understand our commitment. I've talked to them. Interestingly enough, some of our most avid critics have never been there. It helps a lot if you just never see the truth. It makes your arguments so much more easy to make. I have been there, and I'm going there again this week-end, and I can say that the leaders of free Asia that I've talked to understand why we're there. And they know what's going on. The people in Thailand are fighting for their lives right now, and they're not fighting against the Americans or the Laotians, or the Indians. They're fighting against Communist-trained grerillas, trained in Communist China, and North Vietnamese regulars. Souvana Phouma, the Prime Minister of Laos, was here this week-end, the neutralist, they called him, the man of peace. He knows what's going on, and he says for America to withdraw from Viet Nam, or even for America to cease its bombing, would be disastrous for a free Laos.

They all say it. Mr. Lee, the Prime Minister of Singapore, was here too. And do you know what he said when he came? He said, "I came here to find out if the American people had the will to stand up in Viet Nam. Whether you had the will and the stuff that would keep you there. Because I've been reading

that you didn't." He doesn't agree with every move that we make, but he made it quite clear that for us to retreat now, to give up, or for any of us to in any way modify our commitment or to renig on that commitment would be a catastrophe.

I don't think we're going to, despite the fuss and the fanfare. I don't think the American people are quitters.

(APPLAUSE) I think we understand our commitment. It's a commitment that is advancing the world towards a better day, towards peace and stability in the nuclear age. This democracy should surely debate the tactics and timing that we use to realize that commitment, and such debate can be healthy. But let us announce to the world as one people that we share a basic unshakeable commitment to stability, to growth, to self-determination without which there can be no peace.

Let us let the world know that we know the difference between peace wishers and peace makers. Between peace walkers and talkers, and peace makers. Making peace is a hard job, time consuming, requiring infinite patience, perseverance, resolution, firmness. The application of strength where it's needed, the generous use of compassion where it's required, statesmanship of the highest quality. The task before your President now is how to apply that amount of power which is necessary to prevent the success of aggression without triggering nuclear conflagration.

Anybody can get this Nation into a nuclear war. It takes a statesman and it takes a man of firm purpose, wisdom, and judgment to guide this Nation and its destiny through these troubled waters where the Communist aggressive forces are on the march, to know how to stop them, when and where, how much power to apply, and how to do it without escalating a struggle into a total world conflagration. This is what we pray about. This is what we work about. This is what consumes our time and energy.

And I can only say this to you, that there isn't any man that I know that is more deeply concerned about the cause of peace and the search for peace, the unrelenting search for peace, no man that has pursued it more diligently than President Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States. (APPLAUSE)

So I ask you to help us make it clear to the world that we have the patience, persevering patience and courage and the will to see it through. I believe the American people will stand fast. I think they know the history of all human behavior--you know it, and I know it--you don't discourage a bully or an aggressor by giving him what he wants. The aggressor has an insatiable appetite. Haven't we learned that? For what did men give their lives in World War II? For what the disaster of Pearl Harbor? The losses at Iwo Jima? The unbelievable slaughter of our men, if we haven't learned the lesson that aggression unleashed is aggression

unchecked? That the aggressor has no end to his appetite? That the law of the jungle is a dangerous law for free people. That we must somehow, somehow make the aggressor understand that he cannot settle his political disputes by the use of force. That he must come to the conference table. That he must engage in diplomacy. That he must live within the world of the family of nations, and live peacefully. We're prepared to to that.

My fellow Americans, the roadblock to peace that you want and I want is not in Washington. The roadblock to peace is in Hanoi. We have tried again and again, even within this month, to find some way, somehow, to discuss, to talk, to negotiate without conditions. And once again the door has been slammed in our faces. Not only ours, but the United Nations. The Geneva Conference. Pope Paul VI, even in public letter. And yet we have people in America that say that we must try for peace. Well I remember those immortal words of a great American statesman who said, "Peace! Peace! There is no peace!" And there is no peace until the adversary comes to understand that he cannot gain his objective through the use of force.

I want to remind you. I said, I was with a group of young people not long ago on a TV show. They were asking me some questions, and one of them said that his conscience was bothering him. And I said, "Well, I think you ought to examine it again."

Let me just put it this way to you. What kind of a world do you think this would be, my fellow Americans, if Harry Truman hadn't stood up to Joe Stalin immediately after World War II and told Mr. Stalin to get his Russian troops out of Iran, and gave him a time limit. And said, "If you don't, I'll send the American power, the American military to push you out." It wasn't easy for him. The President of the United States didn't want to do that, but he did it.

What kind of a world do you think it would have been if Mr. Truman hadn't had the courage almost single handedly to call the Russian bluff, Yes, the Russian power play, on Turkey and Greece, with the Truman doctrine? That wasn't popular. We think it is now, but it was bitterly debated.

What kind of a world do you think it would have been if Mr. Truman hadn't used his judgment and his will for the Berlin Airlift in 1948 when the Soviets said, "We will take Berlin." What kind of a Europe do you think there would have been today if Harry Truman hadn't had the courage to give the world leadership and to stand firm?

What kind of an Asia do you think there would have been today if Harry Truman hadn't been willing to resist Communist aggression with American forces in Korea? And yet, only six months after doing so he found a public opinion poll that said 66% of

the Americans in that public opinion poll of Dr. George Gallup, January 20, 1951, 66% said we should get our troops out, withdraw at once. What if the President had gauged his foreign policy on public opinion polls? What kind of an America do you think there would have been if John Kennedy hadn't stood up to Kruschev on the Cuban missile crisis, where this nation was within hours on the verge of nuclear conflagration? I just leave it to you.

You wouldn't have the world that you have today or the America that you have today. We would be fortress America, holed up, trying to resist the ever growing forces of tyranny and aggression. No, great men had to make great decisions, tough decisions. And it's been true all of our history. I doubt that George Washington would have been able to survive in our War for Independence if he'd relied on public opinion polls. He couldn't even get the Continental Congress to send him food when he was in the snow praying in Valley Forge. He had God and a few Continentals on his side.

And of all the men in our history that have suffered, Abraham Lincoln. And you think there would have been one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all, if Abraham Lincoln had not had the courage to be even unpopular, and to take his stand, and even to defend Ulysses S. Grant when others said he should be sacked?

And Woodrow Wilson, who understood the importance of America's position in the world? And Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who warned the world that we must quarantine the aggressors and was the victim of unbelievable assault in the press and in the Congress? The Draft Law that passed only a few months before Pearl Harbor by one vote, a columnist only three months before Pearl Harbor that said we should shrink our Army. Another eminent commentator who said after Hitler rolled over the Lowlands, "We should make our peace with Hitler." These are the bright minds that spoke to us. These are the oracles of truth that told us what to do. Thank that God that we had Presidents. Presidents who understood/what a President is supposed to be to the best of his ability is right as God gives him to see the right, and not to govern the policy of this Nation on the basis of the whims of public opinion that can be cleverly manipulated. (APPLAUSE)

Ladies and gentlemen, now we're winning this struggle. The enemy cannot defeat us militarily. A government is being established in Viet Nam, not a perfect model parliamentary government, indeed not. Of the 70 new nations in this world today, less than a fourth of them have parliamentary governments. Five elections have been held in Viet Nam since 1966. A constitution has been written. A constituent assembly elected. A President has been elected, and they said, "But he didn't get a majority."

Eleven American Presidents never got a majority. The Constiuent Assembly elected--we didn't elect ours, they were appointed. One hundred were appointed. Fifty-five came to Philadelphia, two weeks late. Thirty-nine stayed. Thirty-eight signed. (LAUGHTER) The Capital of the United States was moved eleven times from 1776 to 1790.

We gained our independence with foreign aid. And I want to tell you that at Yorktown when Cornwallis was defeated, most of the troops were French. The French fleet bottled up the British fleet, and most of the casualties were French. If you doubt it, go see the Yorktown Memorial.

Do you think Louis VI did it because he loved us? He did it because he thought it was in the interest of France, his France. He was opposed to England. We're not in Viet Nam only because we think we like the Vietnamese. We're there because we think it's in our national interest, and in the interest of our commitment to the Charter of the United Nations. And what is that commitment? Some people seem to forget it. To resist aggression, it says, collectively or individually, to promote self-determination, and to defeat social misery.

That's our commitment. We signed a solemn treaty, and we're doing it. I'm proud that we're doing it. Sure it's tough. Sure it's difficult. But I ask you, what kind of an America do you

think it would be if we walked out? What kind of an America do you think we would be if we signed a dishonorable peace, a peace of appeasement? Could you really look at your children? Could you really look yourself in the face in your mirror and be proud that you're an American if this, the mightiest nation on the face of the earth, with goodness in its heart--and it has it, with generosity unequalled in the history of the world, with help to others that noone ever dreamed possible, what kind of an America do you think history would record us if we were the ones that gave up, if we were the ones that were unwilling to help the weak and the poor, if we were the ones with our power and our wealth that said we couldn't take it?

I think we can, and I'll tell you something. The sooner that Hanoi finds out that the overwhelming majority of the American people think that we can take it and that we'll stand firm, that we'll never retreat, we'll never quit until we have accomplished our task, the sooner they find that out the better, because that will promote the day of peace. The doubt and the uncertainty prolongs the war. The unity of the American people will help bring about a conclusion of this struggle, a conclusion that we want honorably with no territory, no sphere of interest, no domain, no conquest on our part.

What do we ask for? Cease the aggression. Permit a

nation to live in peace. Go back to your own homes. We want to work together to rebuild North and South to help a better world. I think that's an honorable purpose, and my friends of the labor movement, I ask you to help make it come true.

(APPLAUSE)

I have to run along. I have a few other things that I want to say, and I'll just summarize it. I want to say to my friends from the press, you're looking at a couple of pages there, and I noticed in the paper somebody said this morning that I digress from my text. Is this news? (LAUGHTER) (APPLAUSE) The text is only a kicker just to sort of remind you that you ought to be here. (LAUGHTER) Frankly, I do that because I believe in cooperating with people in their respective jurisdictions, you know. Makes it easier for all of us.

But I want to say this: I know Will Rogers once said that he belonged to no organized Party. He was a Democrat. It's a good joke but it's bad politics. My friends of the labor movement, over the years you've helped give the Democratic Party its vital cement to make it an organized Party. You above all have known that in unity there is strength and in division there is only defeat. You can't win collective bargaining agreements by having the locals whacking away at the leadership at the bargaining table. Do you think Mr. Reuther would have been able to sign a good agreement with the

Ford Motor Company if every one of those who doesn't seem to like Mr. Reuther a little had been standing off in the sidelines whacking away at him, cutting away at the leadership? Do you think there would ever have been an agreement? You know better than that. The labor movement has won its great victories through solidarity. You've won your great victories through unity. You won your great victories even when you had some doubts about those who were in the front lines. You stood by them.

You said, "A decision was made." You don't cross the picket lines. You don't try to make it difficult for your leaders to achieve what you told them you wanted to achieve.

I'll put it to the Democratic Party. You can help a lot. You'd better talk a little bit to the Democrats. You don't need to talk too much to the Republicans--they don't want to listen to you. They never have. I think you know that. They don't want a War on Poverty. They don't want new laws and programs for education. Never in platform or in conscience have they been able to support Medicare. They opposed the birth of Social Security and they don't like any of its children. They have consistently supported the rich and the privileged above the poor and the deprived. When they lacked the votes in Congress to build their fortress against progress they always bid for the support of reactionary, backward-looking forces in America wherever they could find them. When

they say they'd rather be right they mean far Right, believe me. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE) You know what that opposition is. I don't need to spell it out for you, but you also know a little bit about Democrats. So I call on you today as leaders of the American Labor Movement to help the Democratic Party once again unite. And I'll put it to you very frankly, and I have across this country--I tell my fellow Democrats, be careful about putting poison in the pitcher because it's from that pitcher that you're going to be drinking the water.

There's another way of putting it: Don't put poison in the soup that you're going to have to eat. It makes a headline, but it can also spell defeat. I think it's time that you called the Democratic leaders in and gave them a little lesson in organization, a little lesson in solidarity, a little lesson in unity. Tell them to pocket their little petty selfish ideas that they may have and to join the great fight, because the chips are down, the stakes are high.

We're going to have a Presidential election in 1968, and one of the men in that election on one of the tickets is going to be the President of the United States just as surely as I'm standing before you, President Lyndon Johnson. (APPLAUSE) And I submit to you that you've never had an administration that has accomplished more of the things that you've fought for than the Administrations of Kennedy and Johnson. You started it in

1961 and you're still with it. We're on the move. President Johnson is the man who stood up for the working man, for the farmer, the Mexican-American, and for the Negro, the man who all of his life has spoken out for those who had no voice.

Some people dislike him because they say he stands up too much for these people. I like him because he does stand up for them. I became his partner because I knew the kind of a man he was, and some of you in this room know I talked to you privately about it. I worked with him in the Senate. We didn't always agree on every issue as Senators, but this man who has been President has done more for the cause of human rights, has done more for the cause of education, has done more for the cause of the people's health, has done more to open the opportunities for the deprived and the needy in this nation than any man since the time of Franklin Roosevelt. I think he stands right with him.

(APPLAUSE)

I think he is the best friend that American Labor has. I know he's the best friend that a vital and growing free enterprise has. He is the best friend of a child reaching out for a chance in life, of a grandfather or grandmother asking for help and understanding. Is there anyone in this room who doesn't know this? Of course you know it. And I'm proud to say that he's my President. He's my friend. He's your President and he's your friend. And he needs your help.

And I want you to go home to your States and bestir yourself. Register those voters. Carry our message. Don't be filled with doubt or uncertainty. Be confident. Carry the message of social progress. Carry the message of international commitment. Carry the message of victory, because as a man thinketh, so is he.

And I'm here to tell you, I know we're going to win. I can hardly wait for the time that they declare the campaigns on, because I have a lot of scores I intend to settle with the Republican opposition.

Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)



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