

1-7-4-4 H 10/15
REMARKS OF VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT
ROCKHURST COLLEGE, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1968

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much.

First of all, I want to express to this splendid student body and to the guests of this fine college -- I want to express the thanks for the poll I have just seen. I have seen Gallup polls. I have seen all other kinds. But I like that stand-up poll that we saw here just a while ago.

(Applause)

I do want to express also my personal appreciation to Father for the courtesy which has been extended to me to speak here at Rockhurst College.

And I am going to get right down to business.

When I came through, I saw one young man that had a one or two page folder with very large letters on it, and as I went by I quickly took a look at it, and it said "Nixon's Stand on the Issues". And I looked inside, and there was nothing.

(Laughter - Applause)

Well, almost -- almost nothing.

It said inside "I am saddle sore, riding both sides of the issues."

(Applause)

Now, this morning we have a very special kind of gathering.

I have a few words that I want to say to you, and then I want to turn myself over to the tender, objective mercy of this panel that is here to my left and to your right. And I know they have only my best interests at heart. But I haven't found out how they qualify my best interests. I surely will in just a little while.

It is always a special pleasure to come to a college campus. There have been times that I have wondered if the trips were really necessary, but I think they are.

This morning I want to welcome you to Humphrey's College of Political Participation, because that is what we are going to do here today.

Political life is a rather precarious life. Sometimes you are in and sometimes you are out. And I have to be frank with you. My contract is expiring this January.

(Laughter)

As I said to a few of my friends in the trade union movement the other day, I have no seniority clause. What's more, the management quit on me.

(Laughter - Applause)

So I am like one of those people that Mr. Nixon's economic advisor was talking about -- in order to keep price stability he said we maybe have to have a little higher rate of unemployment. And I thought I didn't want to be included in that group. So I am out shopping around this morning in the hopes that somehow or another I might be able to convince you -- not that I ought to go back to teaching at a university, because I really wasn't that good; I prefer staying somewhere near where I am -- just move across the street from the Executive Office Building into public housing, the White House.

(Applause)

Now, I wouldn't want anyone here to think that I had changed so much that I had lost my sense of compassion, because that is not the case. I want it quite clear that while I surely have no designs upon being unemployed in January, I do intend to make the most generous possible terms of unemployment compensation and social security benefits available to the Richard Milhouse Nixon of California and New York, and to George Corley Wallace of Montgomery, Alabama.

(Applause)

So today we are going to have what we call a dialogue.

But before that, I would like to just say what I think are some of the choices that you face and that I face in the two or three weeks, a little over three weeks that are ahead.

My -first observation is quite obvious in this hall.

This is a young country, very young, young in terms of history; but more important, in terms of spirit.

Half of our people today are under the age of 25. And the whole country is getting younger -- at least in age. And the question that is going to be before the house -- will we have a young spirit as a people, a spirit of hope, a spirit of faith, and a spirit of confidence which identify you, or will we have a spirit of despair, a spirit of fear, and a spirit of hopelessness which identify old age. That is really the question. Because someone once said you are as young as your hopes and as old as your fears; you are as young as your faith and as old as your doubts; you are as young as your confidence and as old as your despair.

And I believe that while we can talk about chronological age of our country being relatively young, we make a decision in every four years as to whether or not the spirit of this country is to be one of adventure, one of creativity, one of moving forward, all of which are symbolic and all of which are characteristic of youth itself; or whether it is to be a spirit of a country that is old before its time.

That is what we are really talking about.

And within a very short time, the young people that I am looking at here will in a very real sense be in charge. You will be making the decisions.

I thought I would like to come out and take a look at you, because you are going to be responsible for my medicare, and I want to know if you are for it, like I am, or against it, like Nixon. I just want to know.

(Applause)

Yes -- in very serious terms, you will be responsible for at least designing the plans for the education of my grandchildren. I want to know whether or not you are going to still believe that this country is rich enough, big enough, good enough, to provide excellence in education. I want to know whether or not you are going to believe that the federal government has the responsibility to be of help to students in colleges and universities, so that everyone who so desires and is capable can have the experience of education -- from pre-school up through college. Or whether you are going to identify yourself with a philosophy that says you can go it on your own.

I remember when the man who is my opposition in the Republican Party had a chance on higher education that would have affected this school. And there was a tie vote in the United States Senate. And the only time a Vice-President ever has a chance to exercise any authority is when he breaks a vote, a tie vote in the Senate. Up until then, all he has is responsibility and no authority. And when Mr. Nixon had his chance for authority, to cast a vote that would have decided aid to higher education, aid to this school, in its libraries, its laboratories, its dormitories, and to its administrative buildings, and to all of the facilities of this great college, and a thousand more like it, he voted no.

I just want to know whether or not you are going to double-deal my grandchildren that way. If you are, I am going to stick around and talk to you a little while, because I want every boy in America, black or white, rich or poor, to have a chance for an education.

(Applause)

And it is going to be up to you, quite candidly, what kind of a country this becomes -- whether it is a country that is torn with

division, in which we no longer trust each other, in which we live in a fear and animosity, rather than in trust and in friendship. And we are making that decision this year. And you are going to help make it.

I want to know whether or not I am talking to people that are going to help keep this country one of common trust, common faith, or whether it is going to be one of suspicion and doubt and fear and hatred and division. That is the central issue of our time.

Because America can do nothing divided. American can do nothing in anger. America can do nothing for itself or for anybody else in division and racism and bigotry and intolerance. And we are going to have to draw the line on it, this year of 1968, and send the message throughout the world, that we believe that we can be one people, and that we can trust one another, and that we can work together as one people.

We are going to decide that in a great national referendum/

(Applause)

I found a quotation from my notes, political philosophy, which I once had the privilege of teaching. And one of my favorite philosophers was that great theologian and philosopher, truly, of course, a saint, Saint Thomas Aquinas. And here is what he said.

"These three things are necessary for the salvation of a man. To know what he ought to believe; to know what he ought to desire, and to know what he ought to do". Not just what he ought to believe. Not just what he ought to desire. But what he ought to do.

And while those terms are written essentially for a spiritual message, it is still a fact that the difference between democracy and any other form of government or social organization, is the recognition of the human spirit.

If you let me divert for a moment to the teacher that I once was, I always believed that the only moral justification for democracy, since Winston Churchill described it so aptly as the worst possible form of government except all others that have ever been tried -- the only moral justification was that man was created in the image of his maker, and as such, being a child of God, he has -- there is no one that has the right, the moral right, to rule him without his consent. This is the whole moral premise for government by the consent of the governed, for majority rule and respect for minority rights.

Enough of the philosophical lesson. I am not getting paid for it. I am not on the faculty. But I thought I would just touch up the board here and the staff, in case things didn't work out -- I may want to come back.

(Applause)

Let me hurry along.

It will be the kind of country that you will help make, and we are going to decide whether or not we have peace in this world, and we are going to decide a lot about that this year, because the next President of the United States has the compelling responsibility to, first of all, to find a way that is within our interests and honor, to find a way to end that war in Vietnam and bring those troops and those resources back to this country for the work that is needed to do here at home. That is the first obligation.

(Applause)

Secondly, even more important, the next President of the United States must dare -- and I repeat -- dare to take risks for peace. He must pursue with indomitable courage and patient perseverance every course of action which can halt the arms race before the arms race halts humanity.

(Applause)

This year 1968 was the year that so many young people for the first time got into the political process.

(Shouts of "We want Gene")

I do, too.

(Applause)

Well, we agree on that. You see how quickly you can resolve these things.

(Laughter - Applause)

I want to ask my young friends of young America just a question or two.

You have aroused this nation to a need for peace, and you have helped reform, at least set in motion the reforms for a major political party. You have brought new people of all ages into the work of democracy.

Now, the question -- and it is a very serious question -- are you going to stay in that process, are you going to be part of the political action in the state, or are you going to opt out. And may I say that for those that opt out, they betray everything that they said they were for. Because we provide a way in this country -- (Applause) -- we provide a way in this land for change.

Three weeks from today this nation will decide its future, not by force of arms, or by a coup d'etat, but by the quiet, powerful force called the shuffle of ballots, entering the ballot box. And I ask every person of voting age, and those who are not, to encourage all who are, to play your part in it.

I entered politics some twenty years ago or more. And the people who came into politics with me were called "Humphrey's Diaper Brigade". That's right. We were a pretty young crowd. And we are still around -- a little the worse for wear, and maybe a little the better for some experiences.

Congressman Donald Frazier, Congressman John Blatnik, Senator Walter Mondale, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, the Mayor of Minneapolis, who was my secretary when I was Mayor -- he was 21 and I was 32. He today is the mayor of that great city -- Arthur Naftalin.

Senator Eugene McCarthy started the same time that I did in the same election. And may I say I have known Gene a lot longer than his more recent adherents. And I have been with him a lot longer. And we will be together a lot longer.

(Applause)

And you know, we began as young people, where you can make wonderful friendships.

We haven't always agreed. That upsets people sometimes. But after all, one of the aspects of democracy is the right to disagree. And good friends at times become the better, their lives become more enriched, their minds become more developed, out of honest dissent and disagreement than out of the plessantries of just yessing each other.

So we have grown together. But we have stayed within the system. And that is what America needs today -- young people who will start together, grow together, mature together, disagree together, work together, but will stay within the system.

Let me finally tell you then why I run for President. Because I believe that one man can make a difference in this country. I believe that one man, one woman, any one person can make the difference. I believe that what is wrong can be made right, and that people possess in this great land of ours the basic wisdom and the goodness to govern themselves without conflict.

I believe that we can create one nation. I think we can have it.

(Applause)

I really believe that we can heal --and there are wounds to heal -- we can heal the wounds of hatred and division among us. I believe that we can reaffirm the basic decency of spirit which lies within the American people -- at least if we call upon that spirit.

I believe that we can reassert this nation's moral leadership in a world that desperately seeks that leadership.

I believe that we can tell a generation that what we have here is essentially good and sound and that it is worth saving, and that the dreams of their parents are still worthy dreams.

I believe that there is work for all of us, and especially for you.

And I seek through the office of the Presidency of the United States to do my part.

My Presidency will be your Presidency: it will be an open Presidency, it will be an active Presidency.

I view the office of President as a forum for leadership and education, as a forum for inspiration and uplift. And I shall be a President calling forth participation by all Americans, and especially the young. And we can build into reality this free and open society that we talk about and that we want and must have, a society where all cannot only part dipate in the benefits, but equally and more important in the decisions that relate to those benefits.

And I believe that we can make the White House not a remote shrine known for its history and surrounded by a black picket fence, like a fortress, but a place where the doors are open to the people, and most of all the young people, where they can find a welcome.

And I will make my Presidency one, not where I always agree with everybody that comes through those gates, but one where I am willing to listen and to understand, and to search with those persons who come with different points of view, to search with them for what is right -- because who knows what is right? If you knew what is right, it would be so easy to do it. The great problem is to find out what is right.

Now I am ready to turn everything over to you at the right time. I still expect to be around here a little while, and I hope to be in charge for a little while. But I do make a bargain with you.

I first of all believe in you --I must. I have people like you in my family. And if you will believe in me, we will do things in this country that seemed impossible only a short time ago. We will wake this nation up. We will arouse it. We will give everyone a place and a chance. And that doesn't mean crowding anyone out of his place or his chance. And the historians will mark 1968 not as the year when America lost her faith, but the year that America found her conscience.

If you will put your trust in me, I pledge to you that 1968 will be a year when a new generation really did make a difference about the future of this country. I think you can make the difference. That is why I am here.

Now let me hear from you.

(Applause)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
ROCKHURST COLLEGE

- - -

Tuesday, October 15, 1968

MR. WIGGINS: Mr. Vice President, the first question will be presented to you by Mrs. John Cochran of Oberlin Park, Kansas, Mrs. America of 1968.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I sure appreciate that.

(Laughter)

The judges were right.

MRS. COCHRAN: Oh, thank you.

Mr. Vice President, as I traveled as Mrs. America and talked to the American home makers, I have found out that it is very important to them to be well informed on the activities of our government, but we continually find out that we are faced with falsehoods and untruths that come out of the government, and I want to know what your Administration can do to close up the credibility gap and give us truth in our government.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: (Mopping brow) I didn't do that because of the question.

(Laughter)

I am going to be as frank with you as a person can possibly be. There is no one that I know in a Republican Administration or a Democratic Administration that deliberately tries to deceive the public, but there are people who continuously have to answer questions day in and day out on what the facts are on that day as they see them, only to find out a month later the change, and then somebody that writes and analyzes says, you know what he said in October? On October, the 15th I heard Vice PRESIDENT Humphrey state the following. Then the world scene changes, the economic scene changes, the social scene changes.

Two months later somebody that has that great vision of the reverse, you know, what that mirror -- rearview mirror -- says he didn't tell us the truth.

Now, that is what is happening. For example, one can say here today that we can make some predictions about this economy. I have said that by 1972 we will have in this country or should have a trillion dollar economy, a trillion dollar economy. I have made that statement again and again. I can't be sure and I can imagine four years from now that if it is \$988 billion, some wiseacre will say he deceived you.

(Laughter)

He didn't tell you the truth.

Now, what happened was, for example, in the war situation somebody said it looks like this is going to happen. That was his judgment. Mr. Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense, I consider a fine man, an intellect, a genuine human, genuinely great man. He made many statements as Secretary of Defense that time proved wrong. But Robert McNamara is not a man given to falsehood. The regrettable thing was that he has to testify before the Congress about every other week and they ask him the questions and they don't want any of these generalities, the Congressmen and the Senators say, and I am sure that Tom Eagleton or Bill Robinson will say the same thing when they get elected Senator --

(Applause)

-- they will say, look, Mr. Secretary, we want specifics.

Take, for example, on the cost of living. I know that we have had members of the Council of Economic Advisers predict that as they see it now, the cost of living should not go up more than, let's say, 1.4 percent in the next year. So it goes up 1.8. They say, they lied to you, you see.

It isn't a credibility gap. It is that people in public life are not prophets. The good Lord knows they are not saints. They are very fallible. They are having to answer questions on the minute on current events and then they have people who stand in judgment with their pen and their mind, months later, sort of like those Monday morning quarterbacks. I have never seen a fellow that ever met me around the coffee bar on Monday that couldn't have won the game on Saturday. Every one of them. There are more good coaches unhired in this country.

(Applause)

MR. WIGGINS: Mr. Vice President, the next question will come from Dr. John Wells, a physician from Kansas City and a member of the Jackson County Human Relations Council.

(Applause)

DR. WELLS: Mr. Vice President, in view of the tendency in Congress to cut down on those programs which are helping our black community and our white community to maintain true self-help, equality and an integral part of this American system of government of ours, how do you plan in your next administration to alleviate this type of condition and this drain?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREYS: Doctor, you have permitted me to comment, if you will now permit me to comment on it, on a question that I am going to open up to this audience.

Last evening I sat with some friends, a little later than I should have, but the best meetings you have are after the big meetings, you know, when you work and everything like that Monday morning quarterbacking, you know. And I said, just what is the gossip that is going on in this country today? One man leveled with me and he said, I will tell you what it is, Mr. Vice President. It is this, that they feel that you are too interested in helping the black man and there are a lot of people that are in the blue collar white group who think that you are doing that at the expense of them. That is what I was told last night.

It is a fact that all of my life I have worked as you have in this vital field of human relations and civil rights. I haven't done it because I came from a community that had a predominance of black citizens. I have done it because I happen to believe that there are great resources in this country untapped, that I believe that everybody is entitled to a fair break. I believe that everyone is entitled to an equal opportunity. I believe that everyone is entitled to make the most of what God has given him in his talents. And I don't believe that any standards such as color or race or national origin or background should stand in your way.

I believe that the greatest days of America are yet to be lived. I believe that there are more hidden human resources untapped in this country than there are resources already developed.

I say that we wouldn't even be winning a single match of the Olympics were it not for the children of the poor. Some of the greatest artists today come from the ghettos. Some of our greatest dramatic artists, some of our greatest literary geniuses, some of our greatest doctors, some of our greatest architects were only 25 or 30 years away from abject poverty and the victims of gross bias and racial prejudice.

I happen to think in the ghettos and the hills and valleys, white and black, amongst the poor and the deprived of this nation is a treasure house of talent, tremendous resources to be developed.

Now, what is my view of it? I am not for taking another man's job. I am for adding another man on the job. I am not for dividing up a smaller pie. I am for baking a bigger one. I happen to believe that this economy is growing.

(Applause)

And just listen, this is a good time for a little leveling.

I had a fellow say tome the otherday, look, let me tell you what you havedone. You have gone aroundhere, Humphrey, and you have been chairman of a group that has beenforcing workers on to companies, black workers.

Yes, I have been workingwith the National Alliance of Businessmen and I have gone to hundreds of corporations in this country and I have asked them to help put a disadvantaged person, poorly equipped, with little or no skill, on the job. I didn't take somebody else's job. But somebody spread the ugly rumor in the factory, look, thatfellow Humphrey, he brought somebody on in here, yo know who it is, and that is going to crowd me, going to take my job.

Everybody is worried about his job. Now, what I want that white man to understand is that every time you bring a new man in behind him, he goes up the seniority ladder. Instead of being hurt, he is helped. And I want him to also understand that every man that is without a job is a drain on a man that hasa job. I want him to understand that every time --

(Applause)

I want him to understand that every time a man becomes a productive citizen he eases the load that you have to carry, and that is a fact.

(Applause)

This isthe issue that is being peddled in this campaign. This is Mr. Wallace's campaign of fear and suspicion and doubt.

Now, what about education? The fact of the matter is that there are some people that are saying, look, the reason I can't get my kid in school is that thereare fellows like this Humphrey that are going around with Project Upwardbound and they are around trying to get the young fellows and women from the ghettos that don't appreciate an education, thatarepoorly educated and, they are forcing them in on us.

I will tell you what I think. I think thatpeople that have been deprived for a century, been denied a chance like I have had, not only deserve equal opportunity, they deserve a little extra help.

(Applause & whistles)

I am going to call on the young people who havea conscience, the young men and women of idealism. I am going to call on you to be the counter force, so to speak, in this combat that is going on now between prejudice on the one hand and the desire of some of us to realize the American dream on the other. I have seen every public opini poll and every one that says that what I havejust said loses me votes. I know what they say. But I made up my mind in this campaign that I am not going to go around and measure every statement that I make by what the polls say. I think it is my job to help create a public opinion, notto follow it. I think it is my job to lead --

(Applause)

So Mr. Nixon says he is going to double the rate of convictions. Well thatis all right. But he didn't do it in his administration when they had something to say about it. They prosecuted 19 members of organized crime in the lastyear of the Republican Administration. We prosecuted 1,912 in organized crime.

(Applause)

Really and truly, I don't think that is what determines a great country. I think what determines a great country is not how many convictions you get but I think what determines a great country is what areyour convictions? What do you really believe in?

(Applause)

Now, Mr. Nixon's building program is going to be more jails and more penitentiaries, if that is his idea of the great America, so be it. What I want to help build is some new neighborhoods and some new schools and some new houses.

(Applause)

MR. WIGGINS: The next question will come from Mr. Allen Katz,

President of the Student Body of the University of Missouri.

(Applause)

Mr. KATZ: Mr. Vice President, in view of your recent statement on the Vietnam situation, the question that I have and I think that many people like myself are asking is why at the Chicago convention did you and your forces refuse to endorse the minority plank.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: We refused to endorse it because we thought that because it called for an unconditional cease fire, that it did not strengthen our bargaining people, our people at the conference table in Paris; that we thought it might indicate a position of some weakness; and that it might not contribute to the processes of peace.

Now, I think you know that you have heard me say before that I felt that much of the argument was much more ferocious in its temperament than it was meaningful in its actual words. The majority plank I thought made more sense, in all honesty, because what it called for was a cease fire. It did ask that we have a cease fire, but we take into consideration the safety of our troops, and that it look for and take into account some response from Hanoi.

Now, I think most Americans feel that that is a fair proposition I have expanded upon that. I have said that I believe that one segment of our majority plank that went unnoticed needs to be emphasized -- namely, that we must be willing to take risks for peace. We take risks on the battlefield every day. We have taken risks in our bombing, when we were close to the Soviet ships in the harbor of Haiphong -- very grave risks. And I ask that we be willing to take risks. And as President I will be willing to take risks.

But I am not going to be a foolish President. No President that has American manpower stationed south of the DMZ, the Demilitarized Zone, can afford to take any act that would leave them unprotected. And I don't think the minority plank did, either. I think the minority plank had reference to that. But that the President must first of all take into consideration what is the protection of his own troops. And then he must understand that the only reason that you stop the bombing is to encourage the processes of peace. So that means that he must take into account what would be the response of Hanoi.

Now, what did I say at Salt Lake City? I said I would stop the bombing as an acceptable risk for peace -- period. That is what I said.

(Applause)

I also said -- I also said -- but I said "Period", not comma or semi-colon. I also said that in making this decision, however, I would look to evidence by word or deed -- I didn't say -- I said I would look for it, for evidence, by word or deed, directly or indirectly, that the North Vietnamese should restore the demilitarized zone to its status of the demilitarized area.

Now -- why? Because that is the easiest thing for them to do, because it is an international zone. It means giving up nothing from their own territory.

I felt that that was an acceptable risk for peace, what I stated.

And let me make it very clear to you, that whoever is the next President of the United States is going to have to come to grips with this war one way or another if Mr. Johnson hasn't been able to find an answer to it between now and January 20, and I hope and pray he will. And I know that he is trying to. I know that as of this hour he is trying to.

I think that there are some who think -- I have a pretty good idea of what the Wallace-LeMay, the Bombsy Twins, are thinking about.

(Applause)

You know, when you have a candidate for Vice-President that says you ought to bomb North Vietnam back into the stone age, it is something to be worried about, believe me.

And then we come alone to the next one. Mr. Nixon has yet to tell you what he has in mind. But he did say this. He did say this, when he met with the Southern Governors and the southern leaders in Miami, when he made that marriage of convenience with Mr. Thurmond -- Strom, I mean -- when he made that marriage of convenience there, he did say that he would try everything, he would even put, as he said, the bomb on the fire. Now, what does he mean by that? I gather that there must be some feeling that when the Korean War was settled, it was settled because General Eisenhower -- and there hasn't been any General Nixon -- General Eisenhower -- General Eisenhower let the word out that if things didn't improve, that he was going to do something that was much greater in terms of military power than had ever been done before. That was 1952 -- when we had absolute, total nuclear superiority; when China had no bombs, when the Russians were just in the earliest stages of the hydrogen bomb, when they had no long-range missiles.

1968 finds the United States and the Soviet Union with weapons of super design, of incredible destructive power. We can obliterate 240 million people the first day at a minimum. And China stands there with intermediate range missiles.

Now, if Mr. Nixon thinks that he is President Eisenhower, he has another think coming. And it is a different world than 1952.

So we are not going to settle the war in Vietnam by bigger bombs. We are going to settle that war in Vietnam, and that is what I am going to do when I am your President, by the process of political negotiation for a political settlement, and we are going to get it done, and the next President will do it if this one doesn't

(Applause)

MR. WIGGINS: Mr. Vice-President, the next and the last member of the panel is the President of the Student Body of Rockhurst College, Mr. Larry Marnett.

(Applause)

MR. MARNETT: Mr. Vice-President, likewise, in view of some of the remarks you have made about your desire for peace in Vietnam, do you plan or foresee any revision of the present draft system if you are elected President in November?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I surely do. I think the present draft system is indefensible. I think it should be revised to the lottery system, the random selection system. I think a man ought to know when his number comes up at age 19, and if he is called, he is called, and if he isn't, he doesn't have to worry about it, he is through. And I think that is the kind of system we ought to have.

(Applause)

I want to tell you something else that we are going to do, because you asked a question -- by the way, we have had a very extensive study made of this. We are going to propose this. You may remember the late Robert Kennedy worked on this.

(Applause)

And I have already discussed the possibilities of legislation on this matter with his younger brother, who has -- who is working with me, as you know -- I am very proud to say -- and is one of my close personal friends. And when I am your President, one of the first things that we intend to do -- and I will have the help of some of our younger members of the Congress -- one will be Senator

Edward Kennedy, that will introduce legislation to revise this whole system.

(Applause)

Then I am going to tell you something else -- about all you young fellows. Listen to this.

General Hershby is a fine gentleman, but he is along in years. And I don't want to in any way deprecate his service, because he has been a tremendous patriot for this country.

(Shouts of "no")

Yes, he has.

(Applause)

But I'll tell you what we are going to do. We are going to find a Selective Service Director that is about 36 years old, that stands about 6 foot 4 and has got more medals than the all-time champ of the Olympics, and he is going to come to every college and university, and he is going to be a stand-up, he-man, that can dish it out, give it and take it, and he is going to be able to talk to people about what this is all about. That is what is needed.

I happen to think that what the young people of America want is not a patronizing attitude. I think you want somebody to come here, if you got an argument, say "Listen, I don't agree with you and here is why", and lay it on the line. You will have that kind of guy. You will love him -- fellows.

(Applause)

Now I want to thank you very much. You may have noticed that on this panel there were two presidents. You see how I get the idea? And you notice how happy they look? I told you once I believed in the politics of happiness. And one way that I can think of my being happy is for you to help me get elected President of the United States.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

KMBC Q and A SESSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1968

Kansas City, Missouri

ANNOUNCER: Metromedia television presents Opinion '68, Hubert H. Humphrey. Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Democratic candidate for President of the United States, will be interviewed by three representatives of the greater Kansas City community.

Mrs. Dorothy Johnson, 2632 West Pasco. Paul Haney, a senior student at the University of Kansas. And Chief Marion Beeler of the Raytown, Missouri, Police Department. Chief Beeler is President of the Missouri Peace Officers Association. And by Jack Cole, Metromedia News National Correspondent, Washington. And Claude Dorsey, News Director KMBC, TV 9.

Mr. DORSEY: Mr. Vice President, you have often mentioned that famous Missourian, former President Harry Truman, how he turned the corner and won in 1948. It is now getting late in the election year 1968. Has your campaign turned the corner at this point? Are you on your way to a victory in your opinion?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I surely think it has turned the corner and I think it has turned in the right direction. As I say to some of my business friends, the market trend looks good. It is up. And I really believe that there is, there has been a remarkable pickup both in the enthusiasm of the audiences that we, that I have visited or addressed, and in the enthusiasm of our campaign workers.

I feel a very definite forward movement. I hope that what we have going now is sufficiently well timed so that we come breaking through in those last couple of days or at least the last week of the campaign to a victory in November, and we expect to do so.

MR. COLE: If that is so, Mr. Vice President, what did it? Was it your Salt Lake speech?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think it was a number of things. We started out late. I was visiting the other evening with Mr. Kenny O'Donnell, who was very close, as you know, to John Kennedy, was his appointments secretary, Mr. Larry O'Brien, who is my campaign manager. And we were talking about, at this stage, at the time of the Democratic convention this year, John Kennedy had already had five to six weeks to plan his campaign. His convention was in 1960, was in late July. We really didn't have a chance to get our campaign underway until way after Labor Day. Actually, it opened on the ninth day of September.

We had a party that was very severely shattered and torn. We had many problems and we had the tragedy of Bob Kennedy's assassination, all of which has shaken the country.

It was difficult to put these pieces back together. But we have been able to do so, at least to a large degree. And we have begun to gain some momentum after putting together the many forces that make up what we call the Democratic Party and then getting our message projected to that broad spectrum of the American people of all political persuasions, and I have sensed since about the first day of October, and it took us about that long, I think maybe it would be fair to say that we started to turn the corner in the latter part of September, but I believe that in these first two weeks of October we have witnessed an appreciable improvement in our campaign, in the tempo of the campaign, in the enthusiasm of the audiences, the recognition of what we are trying to say, and particularly has there been a very substantial change in attitude on the part of our young people.

I think that was in part due to my Salt Lake City speech but also the fact that they are facing up to the alternatives.

MR. DORSEY: Here is one of those young people, Mr. Vice President, Paul Haney.

MR. HANEY: Mr. Vice President, of prime concern to the college students now is how and when you would end the Vietnam war and to what extent you would go militarily?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I made a statement at Salt Lake City which was a reasoned, balanced, carefully thought out statement. Paul, I made that -- that was my statement. It wasn't written by anybody else. In fact, I had quite an argument with some of my advisers about that statement. I said we are going to state what I believe, not what somebody else believes, in or out of the Administration.

What do I think is the policy that the next President of the United States should pursue? And I was assuming that it would be my privilege to be the next President. And the statement in Salt Lake City was the statement of a man concerned about the war, hopefully looking to its speedy conclusion in an honorable peace, or a peace that did not violate our national interest or the security of the people of South Vietnam. And I think what I had to say there was about as much as I would say now or could say.

We are at a very sensitive -- this is a very sensitive issue. We have negotiators in Paris, and I think that what everyone says, he ought to be extraordinarily careful and yet he ought to be very, very clear.

Now, every time I have commented on this, someone has tried to, because I might change a word here and there, place a different emphasis, and that is why I have adhered very closely to my Salt Lake City statement. And I said in that television address that I would stop the bombing of North Vietnam, and that I would regard this as an acceptable risk for peace.

Now, our party platform emphasized that we should take risks for peace, but I said that before taking this action, I would look very closely at the evidence, direct or indirect, by word or deed, as to the Communists' willingness to restore the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam.

Now, any man that is President of the United States would -- well, he would surely feel a moral obligation to protect the safety of his own troops, and what I was saying there in that statement was that I wanted to, before taking any decision, to make sure that the safety of our troops was one of the factors that was brought into the calculation. And I went on to say that I thought that one of the best ways to assure the safety of our troops was to make success -- to have success in the negotiations, to shorten the war, because ultimately that makes for the safety of our troops.

Then the other point that I emphasized was the de-Americanization of the struggle, that the next President of the United States, if there is no peace by January 20th, and I pray that there will be and I know that President Johnson is, well, is working for it day and night -- this is the main reason that he is not a candidate for reelection because he is concentrating his, I think, 95 per cent of his time on this matter -- that the next President should have a program in mind of a systematic reduction of American forces in South Vietnam, as the ARVN, that is, the Army of South Vietnam, improves its combat effectiveness and is able to take on more of the defense of its own country.

I believe that all of these things are possible. I particularly believe that we can find a way to systematically reduce our forces, and what I have said about the bombing stands. My statement in Salt Lake City is my statement and is my policy.

MR. COLE: Mr. Vice President, on that matter of your statement in Salt Lake City, now, this morning at Rockhurst College here in Kansas City, you said, what I said at Salt Lake, what I said now is, I would stop the bombing, I would take that risk,

period.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Right.

MR. COLE: Then I would look for evidence.

My question is, is Red activity or the cessation of Red activity in the DMZ a condition precedent to your stopping the bombing or would it be if you were the President or would you stop the bombing and then wait to see if the Reds pull out of the DMZ and then if they did not, if they demonstrated bad faith, resume the bombing.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The reason I said period, is because that is what it was in the message, and there are many times when you have the words "when" or "but" or this or that, that somebody starts interpreting.

Now, there is no use of us trying to play games with this and this is a very sensitive time in the negotiations. For example, the chief negotiator from Hanoi has returned to Hanoi, the chief negotiator at Paris. What this means, I don't know. But I am not about ready to have any misinterpretations or misrepresentations of what I have said.

Now, what I said is that North Vietnam, according to its own statements and those of others, said it will proceed to prompt and good faith negotiations if we stop the present limited bombing of the north. We must always think of the protection of our troops. As President I would stop the bombing of the north as an acceptable risk for peace because I believe it could lead to success in the negotiations and a shorter war, period.

This would be the best protection for our troops.

In weighing that risk, and before taking, and I said that today at --

MR. COLE: By taking action you mean the inaction of stopping the bombing.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, before taking action.

MR. COLE: So, you would not just stop the bombing.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I would place, I would place key importance on evidence, direct or indirect, by deed or word, of Communist willingness to restore the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam. If the Government of North Vietnam were to show bad faith I would reserve the right to resume the bombing. It speaks for itself and --

MR. COLE: Maybe I am stupid, Mr. Vice President, but it doesn't speak for itself to me. I still don't know whether you would stop the bombing whether the Reds did anything in the DMZ or not. Do they have to take some action before you would stop the bombing or would you stop the bombing and then wait to see what they did?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The theology of Vietnam will not be argued any more by myself. I said in this matter that the emphasis was upon stopping the bombing. I have said that any President that was worthy of the high office of President would be a prudent man. He would indeed first think of the security of his own troops, and the purpose of those troops.

Now, that is all that anyone can say. And for anyone else to spell it out any further than that is only to satisfy a questioner, and not to satisfy public interest.

MR. DORSEY: At that point, Mr. Vice-President, we will move to domestic affairs. Mrs. Dorothy Johnson.

MRS. JOHNSON: Knowing of your long history of concern for the poor, I wonder what your position is on a guaranteed annual income.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: My -- I am definitely concerned about the necessity of a form of improved income maintenance, but as a guaranteed annual income, I have not arrived at a determined position on that.

For example, there are many different ways that it has been talked about -- negative income tax. This is highly debatable.

Many people in industry, b - the way, are for a negative income tax. I note the former president of Ford Motor Company was for a -- was for a negative income tax. Some of the top industrialists are.

There are others that feel there ought to be a minimum income assured, a cash income to every American. That is likewise subject to great controversy.

What I do know is that there is a task force that is presently studying now the whole subject of forms of income maintenance. That task force will report to the next President of the United States. I will look forward to that report.

I have issued a paper myself on the improvement of what we call our income maintenance improvement -- how we can modernize the present system of welfare payments which are grossly distorted in this country. In some parts of the country they are very low; in other parts of the country they are higher and it promotes a migration of the poor seeking what they think might be better conditions only to find that the conditions that they thought were better turned out to be worse.

The important thing on our welfare system is to get at, to separate those that are willing to work, capable of work,

wanting to work, from those that are incapable of working and ought not to be working; in other words, to provide an adequate income maintenance for those that really need it and that are either by physical or mental handicaps incapable of self support or because of family reasons beannot engage in work for self support -- separate those out on the basis of compassion and decency, and then the others, engage in a very substantial program of training for skills, basic education first many times, then job training, all the counselling that sometimes comes when a person has never had a job and has no work experience. Job placement, the follow-through that comes after job placement.

Our emphasis ought to be upon productivity, upon the individual that has any capacity for work to be able to have a job, to be trained for the job, to be counselled in the job so that they gain the work habits that hold them to the job.

Now, such things as day care centers come into this. There are many mothers that would like to be working mothers, that ought to be working mothers, but they have no place to leave their children, and if they are working not ers today, they have to leave them in the street, which surely is not desirable.

So a program of day care centers is involved.

Surely a program of counselling, a very extensive program of basic education, a program of vocational training, and frankly an on-the-job training program such as we presently have through the National Alliance of Businessmen.

So we separate the welfare question into its two segments, and what we have done today is to leave it pretty much in one conglomerate and we pick at it.

I think that the next President and the next Congress must really get down to brass tacks about this and have a form of income maintenance for those that are really in need and cannot support themselves, and have a tremendous program, a much larger and a much more effective program than we presently have which we have started but which needs to be built upon for those that could be productive citizens.

MR. DORSEY: Another phase of domestic affairs, Mr. Vice-President -- Chief Marion Beeler.

CHIEF BEELER: Obviously, Mr. Vice-President -- law enforcement, is one of the key issues of this campaign, and I have two questions I would like to ask you:

You are quoted as saying that society must be willing to pay the bills for better police, courts, prisons and crime fighting in general. To what extent do you feel that the federal government should assist local law enforcement agencies financially, and do you feel that if federal funds are continually made available, that eventually a condition would exist that could lead to a police state and national police force.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, first of all I am opposed to a national police force and I do not believe that a federal grant in aid program to the states and localities would lead to that at all. As a matter of fact, the police force would still be under local control just as your schools are and just as your health officers are.

We have large sums of money that come in today to hospitals, federal funds. We have large sums of money today that come on into the public health services of your local cities, but they are still operated locally. We have large sums of money that come in to your schools, very large, into your universities, but they are still operated locally. And that is the way it ought to be.

The fact of the matter is that most municipalities today have only the property tax base and in order to provide for the many services that are required in a modern community, that property is being taxed to the hilt. As a matter of fact, sometimes these property taxes are confiscatory, particularly upon older people that have what we call not flexible incomes, but kinds of fixed incomes. So they have a little home that they own -- and each year the millage rate goes up: each year the tax rate goes up, but their income doesn't go up. And pretty soon they lose their home because of the heavy burden of local property taxes.

Now, I happen to believe that law and order is an issue of national significance, but I do not believe that it requires a national police force to grip it -- to come to grips with it. What I think it requires is a cooperative relationship where the federal government recognizes that it is of national concern, just as the education of our children is of national concern, the health of our people is of national concern. But education and health and police powers rests in the states under our constitutional system and under our constitutional traditions, and I think that is the way it ought to be.

So what I proposed was that much expanded program of federal aid to police departments, to schools of criminal law and criminology, to special police training institutes, to law enforcement officers that want to take advanced studies in law enforcement techniques.

I really believe also that we ought to have some kinds of protection, some kinds of insurance system for the families of those police officers that lose their lives in the line of duty. Sometimes the local police benefits are not adequate to provide for that family. After all, remember that a police officer is part of the security system of this country, but it is a security

system that is locally controlled, and yet it has a great relationship to the national security.

So the Humphrey program is not difficult to understand. It is, as I said under the Safe Streets Act -- which is the beginning -- it is the first time that we have really done anything about federal assistance to local law enforcement agencies. We put \$62 million under the Safe Streets Act for the whole United States, with a \$27 billion crime bill -- \$27 billion crime bill.

Now, I say that if law and order is the issue that people say it is -- and I think it is -- I think the rising rate of crime, particularly amongst juveniles, is sufficiently serious that we should do something about it.

So I said let's take that Safe Streets Act and let's make it -- let's improve it. Let's put in not \$62 million but ten times that much, and we could easily use it..

There isn't a city in the United States that could not use it.

Let's set up regional training institutes. Let's professionalize our police, not merely how to use a gun and a club, but, as you know, sir, what the law is, what the rights of a police officer is, what the rights of the citizens are, and let's also teach them in human relations, in community relations and all that it takes to be a police officer.

That police officer has to make more spot decisions than any other public servant. He is under constant harassment. He is under constant pressure. And he has to make decisions of life or death more times per day than almost any other person in our society. Yet we pay him on the average two-thirds of a living wage, and many of our police officers regrettably are not recruited on very high standards, and you know it and I know it. The Police Officers Association wants the standards to be improved about in order to improve the standards you have got to improve the pay.

Now, we find out that we had over 50,000 police jobs last year that went unfilled. There were authorizations but no one would take the job. It is pretty obvious why. Many of the places where these jobs were open the salaries were much less than a filling station attendant would receive, and yet that filling station attendant doesn't have to deal with matters of life and death every hour of the day.

I say that if you want law and order and you want a good police department, pay them. And if you pay them, you can expect professional performance. But if you pay them the rate of an unskilled laborer, you may get unskilled police performance.

So, I believe just like you need top grade men in your armed services for your officer corps and as you need them in any of the elite corps that you have, and we take great pride in the quality of our Marine Corps, for example, our paratroopers, the different brigades we have, the different units of our military, and they get highly professionalized training, we spend billions for it, but also for our national defense outside of our country, and we spend peanuts for security within our country. Now, all I am saying is let's do a better job and the Federal Government has a role to play.

MR. DORSEY: Would you, sir, propose Federal guidelines on the quality and standards of the local police work in order to qualify for this federal assistance?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think this could be easily worked out in our relationships with the governors and our state legislatures. The Congress frequently does say that if

you are going to hand out money or if you are going to give money, that there ought to be, for example, some improvement in standards. But you won't have any trouble with that.

I have met with all the mayors across the country some 50 times in the last four years. I have never met a mayor yet that didn't think it would be better if he could improve the standards in his police department but as he said to me, look, if I can only pay a police officer, \$4000, \$5000, \$6000 a year and if that is what I can pay him and he has got to support a family on it at this present cost of living, how do you expect me to ask for a man to have two years of college or even a high school diploma, particularly when he can go on out and pick up a job some place else if he is as able bodied as we ask him to be and if he is as basically intelligent as we ask him to be even though he doesn't have a great deal of education, so you give the localities and the states the funds and they will set up the standards but the Federal Government, I think, would ask for some guidelines along that line.

MR. COLE: Mr. Vice President, on the matter of the current campaign you have called for some time now and gone to great lengths to call for debates particularly with former Vice President Nixon.

Now, what distinction do you see this year from the situation in 1964 when President Johnson expressly declined to debate Barry Goldwater and you supported him in that decision?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: In 1964 that was the President's decision. I was the Majority Whip of the Senate. The President's -- in other words, I was his legislative leader. The President asked his leadership to support him in that request.

MR. COLE: Do you think he was wrong?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think that was his decision. I will let him judge it. But Mr. Nixon has written a book about debates. He had articles in the Saturday Evening Post about debates. Why, he said that candidates shouldn't even be asked whether they wanted to have debates. It shouldn't be a question of whether it was good for them or not. It shouldn't be a question of whether or not they were ahead or behind, that debates were absolutely essential in the modern world in which we have lived, that with the modern technology of the media, that debates should be a basic element in the whole political structure.

Now, let's assume that in 1964 I was wrong, then I want to say that in 1964 Mr. Nixon was right, and he ought to stick with being right. If I was wrong I confess my error.

I don't think I was wrong. What I did at the time was that the President who was the leader of our country said that he wanted his leaders at that particular time not to ask for suspension of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. That was Mr. Johnson's decision.

You have always asked me to be my own man, many of you have. I am my own man. I debated in 1964 around the country. In 1960 when I was running for the Senate, I had a series of debates in the state with my opponent. I was ahead of him. I won by 75,000 votes. I didn't let that bother me about debating.

In 1966 or 1968 at the Democratic Convention I went over to the California caucus where I didn't have a prayer. The caucus was not for me and I knew it before I went in, but there was Senator McCarthy and there was Senator McGovern and there was Vice President Humphrey. We each had equal time. We answered each -- we quizzed each other. We took questions from the floor. We debated and we came out of there the better for it, not the worse for it, and the caucus had a chance to hear us.

The question isn't whether I was wrong or President Johnson was right or wrong in 1964. That was Goldwater versus Johnson. There wasn't even a third party candidate. That was Mr. Johnson's decision. Let him explain that decision. I think he can.

I was his legislative leader along with Senator Mansfield and we followed, as you do in legislative matters, when the request is made from the top down, we are the leaders and we try to get our party to follow that leadership.

I am the party leader now and I am the candidate of the Democratic Party and I have asked my Democratic leaders in the Senate and the House to get a debate and to amend Section 315 to suspend it, and they did it in the House over Republican opposition, the first time the Republicans in years since the time of Speaker Cannon, have ever compelled the House to lock the doors and stay in session and has dozens of quorums, and I asked the Majority Leader of the United States Senate. Now, I am the leader of the Democratic Party and as leader of the Party in 1968, not as one of the deputy floor leaders in 1964 but now as leader of my Party, I said I want Section 315 to be suspended so we can have the debates of Mr. Wallace, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Humphrey. They tried to get it but Mr. Dirksen, the Republican leader, and his cohorts used the privileges of unlimited debate in the Senate to prevent any debate to the public. That is what it boils down to.

MRS. JOHNSON: You speak of peanut appropriations a while ago. Now, you take -- we have had a good housing act from this Administration and a lot of programs that helped minority groups and poor people and there is a wider spread of things to help grass roots people, but not the money that really carries it out. What do you think you can do with Congress to get more money?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, first of all, let me say that I know there has not been enough but there has been so much more than we have ever had before that it is well for me to state what the facts are.

For example, in 1960 -- 1963, the total amount of funds that were directed into what you might call any attack upon poverty or directed toward the needs of the poor was approximately \$9 billion, in the federal budget. This last year it was \$26.7 billion. Now, that is 300 per cent increase and that is what some of the members of Congress thought was too much.

I personally think that the money that we have been putting into education, into Project Head Start, into the Job Corps, into Vista, into many of these community action programs, is a wonderful investment. I can prove it. When ten million people have been able to lift themselves out of poverty in the last five years, ten million people that were not taxpayers have become taxpayers, ten million people that were welfare recipients have become self-sustaining citizens, I say that that is adequate proof that the programs that we have been working on plus the great advancement of private enterprise under our fiscal policies which has been tremendous, that between private enterprise and the government, ten million people that were burdens to themselves and to the state and the Federal Government only five years ago are today taxpayers, self-sustaining citizens and productive people.

Now, those investments that we have made that I think are a little, that are not enough, if improved and if increased, will produce more millions that come out of welfare and off the relief rolls and no longer are charges on the public.

The most expensive thing in America is unemployment and deprivation. The only society that can afford it is a very rich society like ours.

Now, what we have been having, what has been happening lately is a great upward movement of people and I think in the next few years

if we keep up, keep our economy expanding, if we keep working at some of these programs that have worked -- some haven't worked, now, we have to be honest about it; we have made mistakes and people always point to them. We have been experimenting. We have done more in the war against poverty in the last few years than the preceding hundred years.

ANNOUNCER: This has been a presentation of Metromedia on KMBC, Channel 9.

#

✓ Father Van Astoren

OPENING REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
ROCKHURST COLLEGE
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
OCTOBER 15, 1968

Bill Morris ^{It's}
Tom
Sen Eagleton
Bill Robinson
Kansas

My fellow students, welcome to Professor
Humphrey's College of Political Participation Knowledge.

↳ Political life is precarious these days.

I used to be a professor of Political Science before
I got into the job of real politics.

↳ In these uncertain days, I'll take every chance I
can get to renew my academic credentials.

↳ But I have news for you: I don't intend to be
unemployed next January.

But I intend to make the most generous possible terms
of unemployment compensation and Social Security available
to one Mr. Richard Milhous Nixon of California and New York,
and to one George Corley Wallace of Montgomery, Alabama.

↳ Today I want to hear from you.

But, first, I want to say a few words about the
choices we face three weeks from today and in the years
immediately ahead.

* * *

↳ This is a young country -- half of our people are
already under twenty-five.

↳ And it's getting younger.

Within a very short time, you will be in charge.

↳ You will be making the decisions.

↳ You will be educating my grandchildren. And
paying for my medicare. -

↳ It will be up to you what kind of country this
becomes -- and whether or not we have peace in this world

↳ When the historians write about 1968, I suspect
they will say it was the Year of the Young People.

↳ It was the year that so many young people --
many of them for the first time -- got out into the political
process.

↳ I don't know whether or not you know the effect you've
had this year.

↳ You have aroused a nation to the need for peace

↳ You have helped reform a major political party --
my own political party.

↳ By your example, you have brought new people
of all ages into the work of Democracy.

↳ Now the question: Are you going to stay in that
process?

↳ Are you going to be a part of the political action
to stay -- or are you going to opt out?

I say: Don't opt out. Stay with it. !

↳ Three weeks from today this nation will decide its future -- not by force or arms or by coup d'etat -- but by the quiet shuffle of ballots entering the ballot box.

↳ And I ask you to play your part in it.

* * *

↳ When I entered politics more than 20 years ago, I was a very young man.

↳ The people who came into politics with me were called "Humphrey's Diaper Brigade".

↳ We're all still around -- Congressman Don Fraser; *Blatnik*
Senator Walter Mondale; Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; Senator Gene McCarthy, *ambassador Anderson, Mayor Nagel* among others.

↳ We began as young people. We began together.

↳ We haven't always agreed.

↳ But we've stayed within the system and fought for the principles in which we believed.

That's what America needs today: Young people who will stay within the system and fight for the things in which they believe.

_____ * * *

↳ Let me tell you why I run for President:

Because I believe that one man can make a difference... that what is wrong can be made right... that people possess the basic wisdom and goodness to govern themselves without conflict.

But We face a new moment of crisis in our country.

In this moment, I believe we can heal the hatreds and divisions among us;

↳ can reaffirm the basic decency of spirit which lies within us as a people;

↳ can reassert this nation's moral leadership in a world that desperately seeks that leadership.

↳ can tell a new generation that what we have
is good... that it is worth saving;

↳ that the dream of their parents is still a worthy
dream.

↳ This is work for all of us -- and especially for you.

I seek to work through the Presidency of the
United States.

↳ My Presidency will be an open Presidency... an
active Presidency... a Presidency calling forth participation
by all Americans -- and especially the young.

↳ We can build into reality the free and open society
we all want here in America -- a society where all may participate not
only in the benefits but in the decisions of their country.

↳ We can make the White House not a remote shrine
surrounded by a black picket fence, but a place where the doors
are open to the people -- and most of all, young people.

↳ I'm not ready to turn everything over to you yet. I still expect to be around here and in charge for quite awhile.

↳ But I do make a bargain with you:

↳ I believe in you! If you will believe in me, we will do things in this country that seemed impossible only a short time ago.

↳ We will wake this nation up. We will give everyone a place.

↳ And the historians will mark 1968 not as the year when America lost her faith but when America found her conscience.

↳ If you will put your trust in me, I pledge to you that 1968 will be the year when a new generation really did make the difference about the future of this country.

Now let me hear from you.

#



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