

381 WBZ—LINO

My dear friends, the opposition has yet to discuss their programs and policies for peace in this world, for strengthening America's security, for making this country more secure.

They have failed to discuss a single major issue, but they reach deeper and deeper into the barrel of smear and innuendo and half-truths, and they continue to do it now, and they will do it in the days ahead because when you are losing and you have nothing else to talk about, the politics of desperation takes over. And I am afraid that the opponents are becoming desperate.

Therefore, I warn this audience that we can expect one so-called smear bombshell after another.

American people don't like it. The American people won't tolerate it. The American people will rebuke it. And they will rebuke those who dispense it.

I appeal to my fellow Democrats and to those independents and Republicans that stand with us to discuss the issues in this campaign and not the personalities.

Let me make it crystal clear. I happen to know the standard bearer of the Republican Party. I know him as a fellow Senator. I know him as a human being. I have never contested his patriotism because he is a patriot. I have never contested his personal integrity because I believe he is a man of integrity. I have never said a word about his personal life because I think it is a good one.

I feel that he would make a good neighbor, but I don't think he would make a good President, and that is why I am here today. [Applause.]

I haven't said a word about this fellow on the ticket with him. I feel he speaks well enough for himself. Not only that, I like the State of New York. And I want all New Yorkers to know that we respect you, that we ask for your help and that we don't intend to make any unkind remarks about any of your fellow citizens.

I make no unkind remark about the candidate of the Republican Party for the Senate. I make no unkind remark about the candidate of the Republican Party for Vice President. I only say this, that you have a choice in this election, and when you have a choice and it is a good one, I think you have got the good sense to make the right choice, and I think you are going to elect President Lyndon Johnson for another 4 years in the White House and Robert Kennedy for 6 years in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And I think you are going to elect these two Congressmen, these candidates for Congress, from the 36th and the 37th Districts.

Now, let me talk to you a little bit about what I consider to be the one dominating issue above all others in this campaign.

This issue is which candidate for President of the United States is better prepared to assume the fearful responsibility for the destiny of America in the days ahead, both at home and abroad. That is the issue that you must contemplate, and it is on that issue that you must make your decision.

The choice as I see it is between the radicalism of Mr. Goldwater and the responsibility of President Lyndon Johnson.

The leader of the Goldwater party through public statement, through written word, and basic philosophy, has left responsible Americans with only one course of action, and that course of action is an overwhelming majority vote on November 3 for President Lyndon B. Johnson. [Applause.]

By every standard of American life, the standard bearer of the Republican Party, Mr. Goldwater, is a radical, and he preaches the doctrine of radicalism. He seeks to repeal the social and the economic achievements of the past generation. He repudiates the standards of bipartisan foreign policy. He distorts the past. He misrepresents the present. And he misunderstands the future.

He accepts the support of irresponsible extremist groups, and he alienates loyal and responsible members of the Republican Party.

It is not surprising that the harshest words of criticism of Senator Goldwater have come from Republicans themselves. Former Vice President Richard Nixon, for example, said, "It would be a tragedy for the Republican Party if every Goldwater view as previously stated were not challenged, not repudiated."

382 WBZ—LINO

I must say that that is a harsh statement, but it was made by Mr. Nixon who today is running around our country telling you that you ought to elect Mr. Goldwater.

Now, that isn't what he really means. Deep down in his heart he knows you are not going to do that. Deep down in his heart, what he is doing is going around hoping he can pick up the pieces of the Republican Party after this election. [Applause.]

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller—I think you have heard of him—Governor Rockefeller describes Mr. Goldwater as the candidate of “an extremity outside the main currents of American political life.”

Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania termed Goldwater's view, and I recite it, “a weird parody of Republicanism, the echo of fear and reaction, the echo from the never-never land that puts our Nation backward to a lesser place in the world of freemen. The fast draw and the quick solution.”

These are the words of a distinguished Republican Governor about the Republican standard bearer for the Presidency.

And it was Senator Goldwater himself who termed the Eisenhower administration a “dime store New Deal,” and it was Senator Goldwater himself who announced “one Eisenhower in a generation is enough.”

End of quote.

My, how these men love each other. [Laughter.]

It was Senator Goldwater who said, “Nixon would be difficult to sell to anybody.”

It was Senator Goldwater who repudiated the 1960 Republican platform on 25 specific issues, voting against those 25 platform commitments 25 times. No, no, 25 times.

In his heart, deep down in his heart, Senator Goldwater knows that he is neither a Republican nor a conservative. He knows that he is a radical. [Applause.]

On the three great issues of conscience in this past decade to come before the U.S. Senate, the censure of Senator McCarthy, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and the civil rights bill, the Senator from Arizona voted “no” on each occasion.

He has voted “no” on education, on public works, on aid to the elderly, on scholarships for the students, on higher education, medical education, agriculture, REA, minimum wages.

You name the bill and you will be right 99 times out of 100 if you say “I think Senator Goldwater voted ‘no’.” [Applause.]

This gentleman preaches the doctrine of selfish irresponsibility, a doctrine uninformed by history, uncontrolled by reason, and untempered by charity.

It is the doctrine of selfish irresponsibility which appeals so directly to the very extremist groups that Governor Rockefeller, Richard Nixon, Governor Scranton, and others warned us about.

The Goldwater convention in San Francisco refused flatly to repudiate these extremist groups. And by its refusal to condemn the lunatic fringe of American politics, the Goldwater party has permitted into its ranks those individuals and organizations whose stock in trade in politics is the politics of hate, the politics of division, the politics of despair, and the politics of catastrophe.

Let me quote to you from the minority report of the Republican 1964 Convention, the report on extremism, and listen to the words of fellow Republicans, and you will now understand why so many great Republican newspapers, why so many honorable, true Republicans have refused to support Mr. Goldwater and are joining in the support of President Johnson.

I quote the exact words of a document which the Goldwater party would like you to forget. I quote the words of the most responsible members of the Republican Party in convention assembled.

The report accused, for example, and cited the John Birch Society and other groups whose tactics are wholly alien to the American democratic tradition. The report accused them of using “secrecy, vigilante tactics, violence, smears, character assassination, of dealing in unfounded rumors, gross exaggerations, and falsehoods to trigger public hysteria.”

End of quote.

383 WBZ—LINO

I ask you to read your morning press about the very film that was to have been played on the networks last night. Read the description of its intent. Read the description of the man who prepared that film and said that it was to be used. For what purpose? To trigger public hysteria, to play upon the passions of the people, to arouse their fears.

Ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, if that is the price of political victory, it is too high, and I don't think the American people are willing to pay that price in order to see somebody elected to high public office. [Applause.]

And what does the Senator from Arizona say of the John Birch Society? Listen to these words. After his own party—at least a substantial portion of his party—condemned it, he says of the Birch Society: "I am impressed by the type of people in it. They are the kind we need in politics."

End of quote.

What kind of politics, my fellow Americans? The politics of Lincoln? The politics of Wilson? The politics of Herbert Hoover? The politics of Roosevelt? The politics of Eisenhower?

I think not.

We do not need the extremist radicals of the left or the right to guide American politics. The American people are interested in following and walking down the broad road of progressive democracy. They don't want to be dragged into the gutters of the Communist left or of the Goldwater-Birchite right, and they are not going to be. [Applause.]

I am happy to say that the overwhelming majority of Americans—we are almost 200 million now, many races, groups, nationalities, and creeds—but whether we are Democrats or Republicans, whether we are minorities or majorities, we are loyal to the fundamental values of American society. The overwhelming majority are committed to those priceless ideals that we hold in common, faith in our future, mutual trust, respect for human dignity, and a great devotion to the spirit of individual and political liberty.

The overwhelming majority of Americans repudiate, and have in the past and will in the future, repudiate the politics of radicalism whether of the right or of the left, and I think American people remember and agree with the words of President Johnson who said, following the tragic days of Dallas, Tex., when our beloved President was taken from us at the zenith of his life—remember these words, my fellow Americans. Let them be seared into your souls. Remember them as you would a creed of faith.

President Johnson said:

Let us put an end to the teaching and the preaching of hate and evil and of violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of the law and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream.

My fellow Americans, those words were uttered as a warning to the people of this Republic. Great nations have perished because they listened to those who spread throughout the land bitterness and hatred and division. America will never be great nor can it preserve its greatness if it listens to the false prophets.

This is one country, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all, and that ought to not only be our pledge of allegiance. It ought to be our way of life. And we ought to make it so in this campaign and this election. [Applause.]

I believe I now understand better than ever before why our President has such great support: because he is the healer. He doesn't open wounds. He seeks to heal wounds. He doesn't divide us on the basis of race or ethnic group. He seeks to unite us.

Our President doesn't demean and criticize ethnic minorities. He praises them and welcomes them as a part of the great symphony of American life.

Oh, my friends, how fortunate it is that our gates have been opened so that America could be blessed by the cultures of many lands and by people from many areas of the world.

384 WBZ—LINO

We the American people are of many faiths and many cultures but we are one people in spirit, one people in dedication to our country, and to the high and noble purpose for which it stands, and I was nothing short of shocked in this campaign when I heard the spokesman of the opposition condemn the immigrant, chastise and criticize the minority.

Let me make it clear in this beautiful city of Rochester that the immigrant has made America, that the minority adds up to the majority, and that President Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are grateful that America is a nation of many peoples, many creeds, many faiths, and many points of view. Thank God that we have the richness of that diversity. [Applause.]

I think the American people will make their decision on November 3, not out of hysteria but out of reason. The American people know that performance is the test of a man, and the American people know that the challenges of the 1960's call for responsible, moderate, intelligent, progressive, and enlightened leadership. And in President Johnson, the American people know we have a man who has been and can and will continue to provide this leadership.

He has been tested as few in our history, by public service under four Presidents, by leadership in the Congress of the United States, as Vice President of the United States, and then under the most unbelievable and tragic of circumstances, to rise to the high office of President and to fulfill that office with dignity, with responsibility, and with capacity and competence that has earned for him the respect of the overwhelming majority of the people of America, yea, of the world. [Applause.]

So I come to this great audience in this beautiful and fine city of Rochester. I appeal to you as others have to think of your country and not just your party, to think of your children, and not just your past, to think of how we can make America a better land in which to live, to think of how we can make this world a safer place in which to live.

Last night our President outlined for you and for the world his program of peace. I am proud to support a man who has the courage to work for peace. I am proud to stand alongside of a President who knows that blessed are the peacemakers, who understands that the strength and the richness of America is not for conquest or luxury but understands that this strength is to be used with reason and restraint for but one purpose, to save mankind from the unbelievable catastrophe of nuclear war and destruction.

We have a man in the White House who understands it. I suggest that we make sure we don't turn that office over to one who is impetuous, irresponsible, rash, who engages in ultimatums, and in kinds of nuclear war games. That is too dangerous a decision for anyone to make.

So I ask you to join with me in helping elect the man that was selected in 1960 as our Vice President, who has proven himself capable of undertaking the high duties and the burdens of the Presidency.

I believe that America will be in safe hands. I believe the world will be a happier place in which to live if the American people in this election by overwhelming majority will rebuke the agents of bitterness and dissension and distrust and if the American people will reaffirm once again the goals of the New Frontier, once again the goals of social and economic progress, and commit this country to honorable peace, to strength for victory over war itself, victory over disease, victory over pestilence, victory over ignorance, victory over prejudice.

That is the kind of an America that is worthy of our heritage.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Boston, Mass.
October 22, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Thank you very much for inviting me to come tonight. I am deeply honored that your distinguished association decided to present me its Paul Revere Award.

385 WBZ—LINO

We have come to recognize the development of a great partnership between business and government in America. This partnership has grown upon a mutual recognition that if America is to be strong—if it is to be prosperous—if it is to be free—then American business and American government must work together.

Before this campaign, there were those who contended that American business leaders were forever dedicated to whichever candidate gained control of the Republican Party. I never believed this. I knew too many of you—I had worked too often with you in the interest of the country. I was convinced that the intelligence and objectivity required in business would rule in evaluating the respective candidates and proposals. And it has.

Senator Goldwater's nomination produced consternation not only in political circles in the United States and among the top financiers and industrialists of America, but also in the political and financial circles of Europe, Asia and Latin America.

The election of Senator Goldwater to the Presidency would destroy the confidence of the international banking community. It would threaten our alliances; it would result in a raid on our gold reserves and it could shatter the great credit structure of Europe and America which underpins the unprecedented prosperity that we now have and the economic base for our military power.

The prospect of Senator Goldwater at the helm of the U.S. Government is enough to give nightmares to every major banker, industrialist and investor in the free world. And that is precisely why there has been such a powerful consensus developed among genuine conservatives of our country that Senator Goldwater must be defeated—not only in the interest of our national security, but in the interest of continuing prosperity and an expanding economy.

I submit that our opposition has not presented a thoughtfully conceived plan for promoting the American economy. I submit they have failed to recognize the impressive progress that has been made in building an environment of cooperation and confidence between business and government.

The administration of President Johnson has faith in our free enterprise system and it has demonstrated that faith in policies and programs to encourage business enterprise.

The White House has become the conference house for business and labor, for employer and worker. American management is respected. American labor leadership is respected. And this administration places its trust in the workings of fair competition as the principal guardian of the marketplace. The Kennedy-Johnson administration has exercised prudent and responsible fiscal and monetary policies. The stock market knows this. The financial community knows this. The industrial community knows this.

Look at the record of the last 4 years.

For 44 straight months, business has been expanding steadily—employment has been rising steadily—and incomes have been growing steadily.

This is unprecedented. In 100 years, only two periods of peacetime business expansion have lasted more than 3 years. The average business expansion period usually lasts about 2 years, but consider this—today we are in the fourth year of expansion.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration will be the first peacetime administration in the history of the United States without a recession or a depression. Remember that in the 1950's there were three recessions—in 1953-54, in 1957-58, and in 1960.

But it is not simply an unparalleled 4 years of prosperity which is impressive. It is also the size of our economic gains. During the last 4 years, the rise in real output of goods and services—striking out all price changes—is more than the entire rise in real output during the preceding 8 years.

And if you look at the average yearly growth rate, you find that it rose to 4.1 percent during the Kennedy-Johnson years—up from the 2.7-percent growth rate of the previous 8 years.

These percentages reflect bigger profits for business, more jobs for working people, and better living for all Americans. During the last 4 years, the average income per capita for every man, woman, and child in the United States went up by \$320. For a family of four that means a gain of \$1,200 in added purchasing power.

386 WBZ—LINO

These gains in the economic welfare of individuals have come side by side with history's greatest gains in the profits of business. Recognizing that profits are the engine of progress, this administration has contributed to the spectacular increase in corporate profits after taxes—\$13 billion, or 67 percent, in just 3½ years.

This is not "paper prosperity." This is not a phony, feverish prosperity based on rising prices and inflation. No indeed. Our economic growth has been solid and steady.

The average level of wholesale prices is no higher today than it was when President Kennedy took office almost 4 years ago. And the average level of consumer prices has gone up only 1 percent a year—a better record of price stability than any other industrial nation in the world.

These achievements—prosperity and price stability—are certainly not just the result of Government action. For these achievements we are much indebted to the initiative, the enterprise, and the genius of American industry, and to the skill and energy of American workers.

Business and labor have contributed to the health of the current expansion by restraint and moderation in wage and price policies. Business has been careful to cut costs and to avoid excesses in inventories and in plant and equipment, and yet remain responsive to opportunities for sound and profitable investment.

The policies of the Federal Government have also played a vitally important role—and we must not underestimate or downgrade this important role.

For the first time in history, Federal fiscal policy has combined rigorous economy and efficiency in government, with due attention to the impact of the budget and taxation upon the private economy. Monetary policy has also contributed to a deliberate, steady, and controlled expansion.

There has been no repetition of the sudden shifts to tight money that cut off previous expansions. Nor will there be, so long as business expansion remains healthy, well-balanced, and noninflationary.

A major contribution has come from the tax policies of the past 4 years. These have played a key part in providing the climate and the expansionary fuel for a sustained prosperity.

Another factor is the renewed confidence of business in government. Business likes a businesslike administration of Government programs and funds. And that's precisely what we have had.

People may have their little jokes about turning out lights in the White House. But this is a symbol of the new spirit of cost-consciousness in the Federal Government.

The Federal budget for fiscal year 1965 calls for a decrease in expenditures—only the second budget in 9 years to do so.

Budget expenditures this year are smaller in relation to the gross national product than at any time since 1951.

Instead of increasing Government civilian employment, this budget calls for a reduction—the first budget to do so in the last 8 years.

Civilian employment in the executive branch in September 1964 was down 21,000 from the beginning of the Johnson administration and at the lowest level in nearly 2½ years.

During the first 2 months of this fiscal year, budget expenditures are \$675 million below the same period last year.

* We do not want a government which pinches pennies when human needs are concerned. But we do need a government which recognizes that saved pennies mount into saved dollars, and a President who demands a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

The chief role of government is to support—not supplant—the private enterprise system.

When a lack of private credit stifles business growth, government must stimulate a flow of credit.

When tax incentives are needed to encourage private investment the Government must consider such action.

When business firms seek to compete successfully in the markets of the world, government must try to remove international trade barriers.

When massive investment beyond the means of private business is required for pioneering efforts in space, communications, atomic energy, or aviation, government has a crucial role as an investment partner.

387 WBZ—LINO

We need a government that is not afraid of mere bigness in business for its own sake, but understands that expanding markets and growing economic opportunities provide business with the means to stimulate competition and to avoid restraints on trade.

In this role of creative and constructive partnership, government must always recognize the legitimacy of profits for businessmen. Profits are rewards for successful risk-taking, ingenuity, and hard work. Not only are such profits fair, their reinvestment in an expanding economy benefits everyone.

And, as you know, New England has shared in our prosperity. Enough? Of course not. New England has some special problems that have received special attention and will require more action in the future.

Efforts to help the textile industry have occupied a great deal of time and energy. We are now at work to help the wool textiles industry to good health and have been talking to other wool-textile producing countries to stabilize imports at reasonable levels.

We are also looking forward to improved conditions in your fishing industry through the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act enacted by this Congress.

And our space program will continue to draw on your area's immense concentration of scientific and technical know-how through the space center to be built here.

And as we look ahead hopefully to the possibility of some easing of the arms race, you can be sure that this administration will act effectively to ease the adjustments for defense-dependent industries, for both labor and capital. We shall do our utmost to preserve the general prosperity that will permit the labor and capital released from military uses to be used in constructive civilian purposes. And we shall devise additional means to keep the human costs of the change-over as low as possible.

But we shall always spend what is necessary for national security—for the defense of freedom. Without peace and security there is no freedom; there is no prosperity; there is no free enterprise.

And, of course, here we touch the very heart and core of this presidential campaign: the question of who will bear the burden of the security of our families, our communities, and our Nation. Who will be the man to whom we entrust the fateful decisions of peace and war, the control of the dreaded nuclear weapon? Who will be the man in whose hands for the next 4 years we shall place our lives, our fortunes, and our honor? This is the deadly serious question about which there can be no games and no frivolity. And as I see before me men entrusted with the decisionmaking for great enterprises, I know that I am addressing men who understand the meaning of trust and responsibility.

We have a man who has assumed the heavy burdens of the Presidency, who bears our trust, who has spent a lifetime training himself for the great decisionmaking of the Presidency. That man is President Lyndon Johnson. And I ask you to rise above party, and partisanship. I ask your leadership and your support for the sound and prudent and restrained leadership of a great President of all of our people.

Boston, Mass.

Associated Industries of Massachusetts Meeting at Statler-Hilton Hotel.

October 22, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SENATOR HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mrs. Edward Kennedy, my dear friend Joan. If I ever had any meanness in me, you have sure taken it out of me right now, I will tell you that. That is the sweetest, nicest, kindest, most generous introduction I have ever had by the loveliest lady that I can imagine. [Applause.]

I want you to know, Joan, that I told my Muriel that I was going to be here tonight and that you were going to introduce me, and she said: "Well, I trust Joan, but I don't trust you." [Laughter.] And she is so wise. [Laughter.]

388 WBZ—LINO

But it is such a wonderful, wonderful privilege to be here in your company, and as you know, a little later we are going over to see Teddy. It will be somewhat later tonight, I might add.

Mr. Speaker and President Yeager and the officers of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, my friend from the Congress, Congressman Boland, and Governor Peabody, this distinguished Governor of your great Commonwealth, and, Mrs. Bellotti, I understand that the Lieutenant Governor will be here. He may have come in while I wasn't looking. And my dear friends of Massachusetts and of this great New England area.

I really am apologetic and somewhat in a whirl. We arrived late in Boston tonight because, as you know, the very great and beloved man of our country, whose stature grew every hour of his life, and whose place of honor in America grew with every year of his life, the former President, a great American, Herbert Hoover, passed away, and today there were memorial services for him in New York City.

I joined with my colleagues of the Congress and with the President of the United States and the standard bearer of the Republican Party, Mr. Goldwater, in paying our respects to this good man, to this man that gave so many years of faithful service to this Republic.

Following that memorial service, this well-deserved tribute by thousands, yea, many thousands of people, to a great American and a great humanitarian, some of us sat down to talk a little bit about the affairs of the Nation, and I should tell Mr. Yeager we even talked a little bit about the affairs of the Democratic Party and the prospects for this election.

I noticed on your program that you said tonight's banquet will feature the Honorable Hubert Humphrey expressing the Democratic viewpoint of America's needs, and I understand that you had my eloquent friend, the distinguished minority leader, Senator Dirksen from Illinois here earlier. [Applause.]

Well, I want you to know I feel just the same way about him. I think he is a wonderful man. [Applause.]

He has just one minor limitation. [Laughter.] Namely, his political preference, other than that he is great. [Laughter and applause.]

And I gather that you don't think that is a limitation. [Laughter.] But I can assure you that those of us that serve in the Senate with him have grown to love him, to respect him and to honor him for his great ability as a Senator and as a political leader.

But I want to tell you that there are no better or greater political leaders, no finer artisans or skilled craftsmen in the legislative arts than a gentleman from this State who honors us tonight by his presence, who holds the second highest office in the land; namely, the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you get all these votes, but I am sure you have all the respect. And I also know that America is a better country to live in because of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the service he has given to this Republic. [Applause.]

Massachusetts has given so much to America. From its very earliest days, this great city of Boston was indeed the scene of the inspiration of independence, and this city has given to America and this State has given to America some of its truly great leaders, its greatest conservative leaders, and I think its greatest progressive leaders. It has given to America a John Adams, yes, a Samuel Adams, and it has given to America in our time one of the most gifted, one of the most courageous, one of the most creative and one of the most ingenious minds and personalities of this century, the late and beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy. [Applause.]

But it has given more than persons. It has given commerce and industry, and it has given great ideas, the ideas of the very foundation of our Republic. Some of the great literature of America comes from the poets and the authors of Massachusetts. Some of the great inventions of this Nation came from the sons and daughters of this great State."

389 WBZ—LINO

Tonight I speak on behalf of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and I am very much like the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, so that I do not travel under any false colors. Sam Rayburn used to say I am a Democrat without prefix or suffix and without apology. And that is exactly the way I feel. [Applause.]

I also feel with even greater pride the privilege of my citizenship in this great land of ours, and I hope that through whatever deeds or words that may be mine, I can be worthy of the greatest honor that can be bestowed upon any human being by a political society; namely, to be a citizen of the United States of America, a greater honor than to be king or emperor, a greater honor than to be the richest man on the face of the earth, because the man that is a citizen of this Republic, like in earlier days when there were citizens of Rome, has the power and the prestige and the honor of the American Republic at his side.

What greater authority, what greater claim to honor, what greater prestige could you ask for?

Tonight we come to recognize a great partnership, a partnership that often has been forgotten but always exists, a partnership that has even been ignored by some or denied, but nevertheless is a reality.

I talk of the great partnership between business and Government in the United States, and this partnership has grown up or grown upon a mutual recognition that if America is to be strong, and strong it must be, if it is to be prosperous, and prosperous it must be to assume the burdens of world leadership, and if it is to be free, and without freedom the rest would not be worth while, then American business and American Government must work together and respect one another. And I am happy to say that American business and Government are working together, and that partnership can even be closer if those in Government and in business will forget the yesterdays, prejudices, doubts, or suspicions and seek to learn to know one another in truth rather than in fancy.

The White House, which is in a very real sense the focal point of the attention of the world, has become the conference house for business and labor, for employer and worker and financier. American management is highly regarded in that house as it is on Capitol Hill, and American labor leadership is respected, and this administration from President Kennedy to President Johnson has placed its trust in the workings of fair competition as the principal guardian of the marketplace.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration has exercised, even to the most severe of critics, prudent and responsible fiscal and monetary policies. Those that are interested in these policies know this to be a fact. The stock market knows it, the financial community knows this.

Now, before this campaign started, there were those that contended that American business leaders were just automatically or forever dedicated to whichever candidate gained control or gained the nomination of the Republican Party. I never believed this. I have worked with many business people and I know many of you.

I was and I am convinced that the intelligence and the objectivity required in the management of a business or even in the creation of a business would rule against evaluating the respective candidates and proposals strictly on a partisan basis, and I am happy to say that that observation has proven to be true, because if there is one salient fact of the year 1964, campaign year—I say this in the presence of those who will obviously not agree with me—that fact is that more leaders of industry and finance and business are today supporting the presidential candidacy of Lyndon Johnson than ever before in my memory for any Democratic nominee for the office of President. [Applause.]

Just today I saw the standard bearer of the opposition. I want to be very frank with you. I consider him to be a man of good character, patriotism, and complete sincerity, and it bothers me sometimes about the sincerity of his commitments because I worry about those commitments.

I do not come here with the purpose of attempting to change your mind. I come here with the objective of stating my case.

It is my view, and apparently the view of many, as I read the press, New York Herald Tribune, Life magazine, Curtis Publishing Co., Saturday Evening Post, the newspapers in Philadelphia, and, I gather,

390 WBZ—LINO

in Boston, and in many other areas, that Mr. Goldwater's nomination produced some concern, not only in the political circles of the United States but among the top financiers and industrialists in America. It also did produce concern in the financial circles of Europe and of Asia and of Latin America.

This is not a political statement. It is factual; that can be completely documented by the careful review of any financial journal in the land or abroad.

From what we see in the foreign press, the election of Mr. Goldwater to the Presidency could well weaken the confidence of the international banking community in American monetary and trade policies.

The prospect of Mr. Goldwater at the helm of the U.S. Government has been expressed as a matter of concern to many bankers, industrialists, and investors in the free world, and I think that is precisely why many of the captains of industry in this Nation, men like Mr. Ford, just to mention one, and others, leading industrialists and bankers, who are genuine conservatives have expressed their support for the Democratic incumbent.

I say this in all sincerity to you because I am convinced that not only is the issue one of international foreign policy that we face today, but it is also one of monetary and fiscal policy, because America has become the world's banker. America has become the largest creditor nation on the face of the earth, and therefore, the management of monetary and fiscal policy is of the utmost importance, not only to the economic prosperity of the United States but of the entire financial stability of the whole free world.

Therefore, prudent men, not partisans, men of business, men of finance, men who view things in terms of the value of currency, men who view things in terms of the flow of commerce, are carefully watching the development of this election.

Now, I respectfully submit that our opposition has not presented a thoughtfully conceived plan or outline for promoting the American economy, and that economy is a very sensitive one. I submit that they have failed to recognize the impressive progress that has been made in building an environment of cooperation and confidence between business and Government, and this Senator does not underestimate that word "confidence." It is an intangible, but it is a very vital factor.

The administration of our late President and now of President Johnson has faith in our free enterprise system, and my dear friends and fellow Americans, I believe it has demonstrated that faith in policies and programs to encourage business enterprise.

I ask you to view with me for a moment the record of the last 4 years. For 44 straight months business has been expanding steadily in this country. Employment has been rising steadily. And incomes have been growing steadily.

I repeat the word "steadily," not fitfully, but steadily.

This is unprecedented in the language of any economist or any economic historian. In 100 years only two periods of peacetime business expansion have ever lasted more than 3 years. Today we are in the fourth year of steady, continuous economic expansion.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration will be the first peacetime administration in the history of this Republic without a recession or a depression. In the 1950's there were three recessions, 1953 to 1954, 1957 to 1958, and in 1960.

But it is not simply an unparalleled 4 years of prosperity which is impressive. It is also the size of the economic gains. During the last 4 years the rise in real output of goods and services, screening out now all price changes, is more than the entire rise in real output during the preceding 8 years. And if you look at the average yearly growth rate and you check this with your Federal Reserve bulletins, you find that it rose 4.1 percent during the Kennedy-Johnson years, up from 2.7 percent growth rate of the previous 8 years, a fact that cannot be disputed.

Now, these percentages reflect bigger profits for business as well, of course, as big risks, more jobs for working people and above all better living for all Americans.

391 WBZ—LINO

During the last 4 years the average per capita income, that is, the income for every man, woman, and child, in the United States went up \$320 in real income. For a family of 4 this means a gain of \$1,200 in added real purchasing power.

Now, these gains in economic welfare of individuals, which are significant and represent purchasing power for shoe manufacturers, for textile manufacturers, for jewelry manufacturers, this real purchasing power which is the heart and the core of the bloodstream of business, stands alongside of the greatest gains in profits of business in the history of this country. I speak now of net profits, because those are the profits that really count.

Recognizing that profits are the engine of progress, this administration has contributed to the spectacular increase in corporate profits after taxes, an increase net of \$13 billion or 67 percent in just 3½ years.

This is money left over after taxes, after expenses, for business to invest or to divide up in dividends.

Now, this is not paper prosperity nor is it an illusionary prosperity because you can't have 44 months of illusion. You have to have some substance. This is not a phony feverish prosperity based on rising prices and inflation. No indeed. I repeat, our economic growth has been solid and steady. The average level of wholesale prices is no higher today than it was when President Kennedy took office almost 4 years ago, and the average level of consumer prices has gone up only 1 percent a year, a better record of price stability than any other industrial country in the world, bar none.

Now, these achievements—(applause).

Yes, that is a mighty good opportunity to applaud what happened in America's economy. [Applause.]

I see my good friend Tip O'Neill there.

These achievements, prosperity and price stability, are certainly not just the result of Government action. We are deeply indebted, in fact, to this partnership that I spoke of, to the initiative, the enterprise and the genius of American industry, and the skill and the energy of American workers, and I might add the selectivity of American consumers.

Business and labor have contributed to the health of the current expansion by some restraint and moderation in wage and price policies, and business has been very careful to cut costs and to avoid excesses in inventories and in plant and equipment, and yet to remain responsive to the opportunities for sound and profitable investment.

Now, the policies of the Federal Government need to be understood as to their importance because they played a very vital role, including the policies of the Federal Reserve System.

For the first time in our history Federal fiscal policy has combined rigorous economy and efficiency in Government with due attention to the impact of the budget and taxation upon the private economy. Monetary policy, credit policy, has also contributed to a deliberate steady and controlled expansion. There has been no repetition of the sudden shift from easy money to tight money, tight money that cut off previous expansions, nor will there be so long as business expansion remains healthy, well balanced, and noninflationary.

A major contribution has come from the tax policies of the past 4 years. The investment tax credit should not be forgotten. This investment tax credit passed in the 87th Congress, initiated by the late President Kennedy and his fiscal advisers, has provided one of the better ways of modernizing plants so that American industry can be in a better position to compete. And the recent tax bill surely had its impact.

These have played a key part in providing the climate and the expansionary fuel for a sustained prosperity.

Another factor is the renewed confidence of business and government to which I referred. Business, I think, like a businesslike administration of Government and of the programs and of the funds and resources of Government, and that is precisely what we have had.

Now, people have their little jokes about turning off those lights in the White House, but I might say that this is in fact a symbol of a cost-conscious spirit in the Federal Government. The Federal budget—(groans and applause)—well, you have to expect me to do that much for my President, wouldn't you? [Applause.]

392 WBZ—LINO

Apparently your folks weren't like mine. As long as I can remember my mother, she was saying please turn off the lights. [Applause.]

But may I say that while we may have turned off a light or two at midnight in the White House, we have turned on a lot of lights across America that have made it mighty good. [Applause.]

And I am looking at some of the folks that have been in that light. You look mighty good. [Applause.]

The Federal budget for fiscal 1965, that budget calls for a decrease in expenditures. It is the second budget in 9 years to ever do so. The budget expenditures this year are smaller in relation to the gross national product than any time since 1951.

Instead of increasing Government civilian employment, this budget calls for a further reduction. This is the first budget to do so in the last 8 years. Civilian employment in the executive branch in September 1964—and I have always heard my business friends talk about the number of civil servants we have—was down 21,000 from the beginning of the Johnson administration, and it is the lowest level in the past 2½ years. During the first 2 months of fiscal year—this fiscal year—the budget expenditures are down \$675 million below the same period of last year. I believe that this indicates proper fiscal management. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, we do not want a Government which pinches pennies when human needs are concerned, but we do need a Government which recognizes that saved pennies mount into saved dollars, and we need a President who demands a dollar of value for a dollar spent.

The chief role of Government as I see it is to support and to supplement—and not to supplant—the private enterprise system. In other words, to encourage and not to harass.

When there is a lack of private credit, then Government may or could step in and stimulate a flow of credit. When tax incentives are needed to encourage private investment, and we thought they were—and I can say in the presence of my esteemed colleagues of the Congress, we passed the largest tax cut in the history of this Republic—it was endorsed, I gather, by this association, by the Chamber of Commerce, by the AFL-CIO, by the National Association of Manufacturers, by practically every responsible economist and businessman in America, and it was passed with the help of two political parties, and it has had a tremendous impact upon this economy.

I can't help but say, because it is a fact, that the gentleman who stands as our opposition in this national election did not see fit to vote for it when the opportunity was there. Now he has a 5-year tax plan that would cut more in one year than the plan that we have had adopted, but I learn that if you are in Congress, the time to register your opinion is when the roll is called and not when you leave. [Applause.]

When business firms seek to compete successfully in the markets of the world, Government must try to remove international trade barriers. When massive investment beyond the means of private business is required for pioneering in efforts such as space, communications, atomic energy, or aviation, Government has a crucial role as an investment partner.

In other words, we need a Government that is not afraid of mere bigness in business for its own sake, but understands that expanding markets and growing economic opportunities provide business with the means to stimulate competition and to avoid restraints on trade, and in this role of creative and constructive partnership, government must always recognize, and this Government does, the legitimacy of healthy profits, because profits are the reward for successful risk-taking, for ingenuity and hard work.

Not only are such profits fair, but their reinvestment in an expanding economy benefits everyone, and this administration recognizes that principle. [Applause.]

Now, as you know, New England has shared in our general prosperity. You might ask the question, has it shared enough? And I think the answer would be, of course not. New England, like my part of the country, has some special problems that have received special attention and will require more special attention in the future. Efforts to help the textile industry have occupied a great deal of time

393 WBZ—LINO

and energy and have had top priority. The Senator from this State, the junior Senator and your senior Senator, Ted Kennedy and Senator Saltonstall, have worked tirelessly to be of help to this textile industry as have your Congressmen.

Right now we are working to help the wool textiles, the wool textile industry, to good health, to good health and have been talking to other wool textile producing countries in an effort to stabilize imports at reasonable levels.

This Government is committed to helping the textile industry, whether it is cotton or synthetic or wool, to be a profitable and an expanding industry at home and abroad.

Now, we are looking forward to other things. We are looking forward to improved conditions in your fishing industry through the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act encouraged and enacted by this Congress, and we are fully aware of the shoe industry. I remember speaking to the shoe industry in Chicago, and here again your Government must be careful to watch the market and to see to it that the domestic producer is not the victim of unfair foreign competition, and this Government is committed to that endeavor.

And let me mention our space program. This will continue to draw on your areas immense concentration of scientific and technical know-how because here in the Boston area, right here in this great marvelous area of technical, scientific, and academic progress, the largest electronic center in the world is to be constructed, and this, of course, means unbelievable investment and expansion of the economy of Massachusetts and of all of New England.

And as we look ahead hopefully to some easing of the arms race, I think you can be sure that this administration will act effectively to ease the adjustment for defense dependent industries, for both capital and labor, and we ought to be prepared for this because just as surely as we are in this room, weapons systems become outdated, and the change in weapons technology causes many shifts in industry, and because Government demands so much of industry in the defense area, we need to do some advance planning lest capital and workers alike are left idle due to a change of policy on the part of Government. [Applause.]

We shall do our very best, therefore, to preserve this general prosperity that will permit the labor and the capital that is released from these industries to be used constructively in civilian purposes, and we shall devise additional means to keep the human costs of the change-over as low as possible.

But I want to be frank with you. We shall spend whatever is necessary for national security. We will not skimp nor shall we in any way unnecessarily reduce the costs of national security, because there is no market, there is no free enterprise, there is no peace, there is no freedom if you in any way fail to maintain the defense structure and the security structure of this Republic and our allies. [Applause.]

Now let me finally call to your attention what I consider to be the most urgent matter before us. I said a moment ago without peace and security there is no freedom and there is no prosperity and there is no free enterprise, and here we touch on the heart and core of this presidential campaign. And that question is, Who will bear the burden of the security of our families, of our communities, and our Nation? Who will be the man to whom we can entrust the fateful decisions of peace and war, the control of the dreaded nuclear weapon, and who will be the man in whose hands for the next 4 years we shall place our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

And may I add that the decisions of the next 4 years could well determine the decisions of the next generation.

Now, this is a deadly serious question, and it is the question, I think, that has caused the greatest shift in political support in recent history. This is one about which there can be no games, no frivolity, no gimmicks, no slogans, no simple answers and no instant victories. And as I see it, and the menace I see before me, you people who are entrusted with decisionmaking every day in great enterprises, I know that I am addressing people who understand the meaning of decision-making, the meaning of trust, and the meaning of responsibility.

394 WBZ—LINO

I believe that we have a man who has assumed the heavy burdens of the Presidency, who bears our trust, who has spent a lifetime training himself for the great decisionmaking of the Presidency. I believe that we have the right man. I believe that he has demonstrated the qualities of prudence and judgment, the qualities of fairness and reason, the qualities of responsibility and restraint which power requires, and which the use of power necessitates. And I am very happy to stand here tonight and say with complete confidence that the American people will see that that man is elected for 4 years as President of the United States, President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

And I ask my friends of this distinguished audience that has been so gracious as to give me this platform and this forum, I ask you to do what millions are doing. I ask you to analyze platform and program. I ask you to analyze statements and commitments. I ask you to analyze the record, not of two perfect men but of two contestants, because the choice that we have is not between perfection and imperfection. The choice is between two men with two philosophies of government, with two different sets of views in terms of our national security and our quest for a just and an enduring peace, and I believe that if you will make an objective, thoughtful analysis, that you will rise above party and partisanship as millions have, and I ask your leadership and I ask your support for what I consider to be the most fateful decision of our time, a decision as to who will be the President of the United States at a period of time when the Communist world is in confusion, at a period of time when the proliferation of nuclear weapons is not only a possibility but a reality, at a period of time when America's commerce is being challenged in every land and on every sea.

I ask you to thoughtfully weigh in your mind the qualifications of the two contestants, the platforms of the two parties, the statements of the two exponents, and I think if you do, you will in the main come to the conclusion that you now have leadership that can be trusted, and that you now have a President that will know how to exercise the use of power with restraint and will be able to guide the destiny of the Nation prudently and cautiously toward the great and noble objective that was outlined for us by our late beloved President, the pursuit of peace.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

TEXT OF BOSTON ARENA RALLY SPEECH, OCTOBER 22, 1964

We meet here in the shadow of titanic events.

Last week, within 24 hours, Nikita Khrushchev tumbled from power and the Chinese Communists set off their first atomic blast.

We cannot be sure what policies the new men in the Kremlin will pursue—or whether other men with other policies will fight their way to the top.

We cannot be sure how the Chinese will behave as the newest and the least responsible nation in the nuclear club.

Last week we were indeed fortunate to have a wise, stable, experienced and careful Government to respond to these dramatic changes. We were indeed fortunate to have had John Fitzgerald Kennedy as President of the United States for 1,000 days.

It was his dedication and his vigor that got America moving—moving forward to the unparalleled military and economic strength we need in these turbulent times.

He lived gallantly for his country—and died nobly in its service.

We were indeed fortunate he chose Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President.

In that time of national grief and tragedy, President Johnson stood before us. With the three simple words, "Let us continue," he summoned all that was best in America for the unfinished task ahead.

He did more than speak for us and to us. He acted for us.

With determination and firmness of purpose, he sustained the achievements of President Kennedy. He retained the confidence of our friends and the respect of our enemies. And he continued to move America forward—both at home and abroad.

395 WBZ—LINO

If there is one issue dominating all others in this campaign it is this: Which candidate for President of the United States is better prepared to assume the fearful responsibility for the destiny of America both at home and abroad?

The choice is a simple one: between the radicalism of Senator Goldwater and the responsibility of President Lyndon Johnson.

The leader of the Goldwater party—through public statement, written word, and basic philosophy—has left responsible Americans with only one course of action: an overwhelming vote of confidence for President Johnson on November 3.

By every standard of American life, Senator Goldwater is a radical—and he preaches and practices the doctrine of radicalism.

He seeks to destroy the social and economic achievements of the past generation.

He repudiates the bipartisanship in the conduct of our foreign affairs—a tradition established by Senator Arthur Vandenberg and President Franklin D. Roosevelt and upheld faithfully by leaders of both political parties.

He distorts the past, misrepresents the present, and misunderstands the future.

He accepts the support of irresponsible extremist groups and alienates loyal and responsible members of the Republican Party.

He preaches the doctrine of selfish irresponsibility—a doctrine uninformed by history, uncontrolled by reason, and untempered by charity.

It is not surprising that the harshest denunciations of Senator Goldwater have come from members of the Republican Party.

Former Vice President Nixon said: “* * * It would be a tragedy for the Republican Party if every Goldwater view as previously stated were not challenged, not repudiated.”

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller described Goldwater as the candidate of “an extremism outside the main currents of American political life.”

Gov. William Scranton termed Goldwater’s view “a weird parody of Republicanism * * * the echo of fear and reaction, the echo from the never-never land that puts our Nation backward to a lesser place in the world of freemen * * * the fast draw * * * the quick solution.”

It was Senator Goldwater who repudiated the 1960 Republican platform by casting his vote in the Senate against 25 of its key provisions.

In his heart, Senator Goldwater is neither a loyal Republican nor a true Conservative. He is a radical in the true and basic meaning of that word.

On three great issues of conscience to come before the U.S. Senate in the past decade—the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy, the nuclear test ban treaty, and the civil rights bill—Senator Goldwater voted “No” on each occasion.

The overwhelming majority of Americans repudiate the politics of radicalism—whether of the right or of the left. They agree with President Johnson, who said:

Let us put an end to the teaching and the preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation’s bloodstream.

I believe profoundly that America will repudiate Goldwater radicalism at the polls on November 3.

The American people know that performance—not promises—is the true test of a man.

The American people know the challenges of the 1960’s call for responsible, moderate, progressive, and enlightened leadership.

In Lyndon Johnson we have a man who can provide this kind of leadership. He has been tested as few men in our history: by public service under four Presidents, by leadership in the Congress of the United States, by sudden elevation under tragic and dreadful circumstances to the White House.

396 WBZ—LINO

To every post he has held, President Johnson has dedicated all his great talents and all his abundant energy. He has given every waking hour—and including many when most of us would have been asleep—to the job in hand, whether as a young Congressman from Texas or as President of the United States.

In Lyndon Johnson we have a man who possesses the qualities to create unity from diversity and consensus from conflict—who pursues his duties as Commander in Chief with responsibility and restraint.

In Lyndon Johnson we have the one man we can trust with our nuclear arsenal. This is one area of Presidential responsibility where there can be no mistakes, no rash decisions, no second thoughts, no impetuous actions, no shooting from the hip.

This is the question each American must ask before voting on November 3: Whose finger do I want on the nuclear trigger?

I am confident you will join the overwhelming majority of Americans in casting your vote for President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Boston, Mass.
Boston Arena
October 22, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very, very much, Mr. Speaker. My goodness, when the Speaker speaks, he certainly causes a commotion. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, and my fellow Democrats, and particularly my good friends, the young Democrats. [Applause.] You couldn't make me happier if we had Christmas every day the way you cheer. [Applause.]

Governor Peabody, Mayor Collins, and our next Governor of the State of Massachusetts, Governor Bellotti [applause]—and of course, the one and only—one of the most distinguished, one of the most powerful men in terms of government responsibility of the United States, my dear friend, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, John McCormack [applause]—Speaker John, I almost forget that you ever have to run for reelection, but now I remember it, and let's make sure that he gets the biggest vote that any man ever got in this State. [Applause.]

And my dear friends, may I just take a moment of your time to tell you of another friend. Tonight on this platform is a gracious and beautiful and lovely lady that is my very close friend. [Applause.] Muriel Humphrey and Hubert Humphrey are very, very honored and very proud to have as two of their very finest and dearest friends in Washington, Senator Ted and Joan Kennedy. [Applause.]

And I know that Ted would love to be here. Regrettably and, of course, most unfortunately, he cannot be with us here tonight, but thank goodness that he will be with us soon, and in the meantime, let me tell you this. How lucky can a man be to have such a lovely woman carry on his campaign for him? [Applause.]

Joan, I will have to tell you the time I got the biggest vote in my life was when my wife Muriel was doing most of the campaigning for me. So it helps to have the girls out front. [Applause.]

But in all seriousness, we want this great Commonwealth of Massachusetts to elect a Democratic Governor to succeed a very fine and a very able Democratic Governor. [Applause.] And we want this great Commonwealth of Massachusetts to see to it that they return to the U.S. Senate a very distinguished citizen, a fighter for this State, one of the most able and one of the most brilliant Members of the U.S. Senate, Senator Edward "Ted" Kennedy. [Applause.]

And now, before I should forget it, let me tell you we want to make sure that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts gives to the Democratic ticket, gives to the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, the greatest majority ever [applause] in our history. [Applause.]

All those in favor of electing as President of the United States Lyndon Johnson say aye. [Chorus of "ayes."]

I wouldn't want any Goldwaterite to have a chance to say no because it would look too small. [Laughter and applause.]

397 WBZ—LINO

Well, my dear friends, politics is not just enthusiasm, and it isn't just the good humor and the good fun that so many of us have. I must add, however, that I am proud to notice the spirit of optimism, of confidence, and of happiness that I find on the countenances, on the faces of the people across America that have already assured us, and pledged us, that they are going to support the Democratic ticket. What a wonderful thing this is. [Applause.]

And I am particularly pleased, particularly pleased, that we are privileged, President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey, to have the affection and the loyal enthusiastic support of the young people of America. [Applause.] The young people who know that they need a President that will believe in the future and will work for it.

Tonight we meet in the shadow of titanic events. Last week, within 24 hours, a world changed. Within 24 hours Nikita Khrushchev tumbled from power and the Chinese Communists set off their first atomic blast.

This, or these events, have world-shaking consequences. We cannot at all be sure what policies the new men in the Kremlin will pursue or whether other men with other policies will, in short order, fight their way to the top. And we cannot at all be sure how the Chinese will behave as the newest and the latest nation in the nuclear club.

In fact, my friends, we live at a time when the danger of nuclear proliferation, of the spread of nuclear weapons, to more and more nations is a possibility and easily could be a fact.

These days are indeed perilous ones.

But last week we were fortunate indeed to have a wise, a stable, and an experienced and careful government to respond to these dramatic changes. We were indeed, my dear friends, very fortunate to have had John Fitzgerald Kennedy as President of the United States. [Applause and cheers.]

I know how you feel. Thank you. Yes, to have had him for 1,000 days of the most gifted, the most dramatic, and the most inspiring leadership of this Republic. [Applause.]

As I listen to your applause, I knew how you felt because believe me, I feel the same way. We didn't only lose a great President. We lost a dear friend, every one of us. [Applause.]

But it was his dedication and his vitality and his vigor that got this great America of ours moving forward to unparalleled, unequalled prosperity, and unequalled military and economic strength that we need so much in these turbulent days.

Oh, he prepared well for the future. He lived gallantly for this country. And he died nobly in its service.

We are indeed fortunate, too, that he had the wisdom to select Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President. [Applause.]

In that time of national grief and tragedy President Johnson stood before us, and with those very simple, yet profound words, "Let us continue," he summoned all that was best in America for the unfinished task ahead. He did more than speak for us and to us. He in fact acted for us with determination and firmness of purpose. He sustained the achievements and the promises of President Kennedy. He retained the confidence and the friendship and the respect of our allies, and indeed, the respect of our enemies, and he continued to move America forward both at home and abroad. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, there is one central issue in this campaign and only one. Which candidate for President of the United States is better prepared to assume the heavy burdens and responsibility for the destiny of America both at home and abroad? And I say to you the choice is a simple one between the irresponsibility and the radicalism of Senator Goldwater [applause and boos]—and the sanity and the responsibility of President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause and cheers.]

Yes, my friends, by every standard of American life the pretender to the Presidency on the Republican ticket is a radical, and he preaches and practices the doctrine of radicalism. He seeks to destroy the social and the economic achievements of the past generation. He repudiates the bipartisanship of our foreign policy. He distorts the past. He misrepresents the present. And he misunderstands the future. [Applause.]

He accepts the support, he accepts the support—and gives it respectability—of the irresponsible extremist radical groups and even alienates loyal and responsible members of his own party. [Applause]

398 WBZ—LINO

He preaches the doctrine of irresponsibility, a doctrine uninformed by history, uncontrolled by reason, and untempered by charity.

Is it any wonder that millions of people who call themselves Republicans are going to vote for President Lyndon Johnson? [Applause and cheers.]

Yes, my friends, America doesn't like radicalism, and America doesn't want the radicalism of the left, and it doesn't want the radicalism of the right. America wants the democracy of Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

The American people know that the 1960's call for responsible, moderate, progressive, and enlightened leadership, and they know that in President Johnson, through 30 years of faithful public service, under four Presidents, as Congressman, as Senator, as Vice President, that they have in Lyndon Johnson a man in whom we can place our trust and one in whom we can place our confidence and win the election.

Thank you very much.
[Applause.]

Boston, Mass.
October 22, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, thank you, thank you.

You know, I always heard that ward 14 was a special type of ward. I always heard that it was the best Democratic ward on the eastern seacoast, and now I know it is true. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, a while ago you said—a while ago you indicated that I had been a rather busy man today, and that is true. But I want to tell you that the last message that President Lyndon Johnson gave to me was—he said, "You get up there to that G. & G. rally out at the 14th ward in Boston, Mass." And I want you to know that when the President asks Hubert Humphrey to do something, Hubert Humphrey does it. [Applause.]

And he asked me to do some other things. He said to me, "Do you know that the folks up there in Boston, that they have even gotten to a point where they are willing to even have somebody even run against the Speaker?" I said tonight I didn't even know the Speaker ever had to be elected. I thought he served for life. [Applause.]

Ah, this Speaker of yours, this John McCormack. Let me tell you something. You people in this congressional district are the luckiest people in the world because you have one of the finest men that ever served in public office to represent you. [Applause.]

I am so happy to be here with my friends, Governor Peabody, "Chub" Peabody to you, and I am very happy to be here tonight with a young friend of mine who is going to be the next Governor of the State of Massachusetts, Frank Bellotti. [Applause.]

And I am very, very pleased to be able to ask this wonderful audience tonight to do for a distinguished young American what you did for his great and distinguished brother. I ask you to elect with an overwhelming majority Ted Kennedy to the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And by the way, don't forget Julie Ansel either. And don't forget the rest of the Democratic ticket either. They are all, all right.

Now, how many folks out here think that we ought to elect for 4 years Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States? [Applause.]

You know, my dear friends, I have been getting around the country a lot, and when I am around the country, I run into some folks that say they are Republicans, and they say to me, "You know, things have changed. There was a time that GOP stood for Grand Old Party. Now it stands for Goldwater's Our Problem." [Applause and laughter.]

Let me ask you something. Can you imagine the American people electing a man to the high office of the Presidency whose calendar has no months, whose watch has no hands, and whose glasses have no lenses? [Applause and laughter.]

399 WBZ—LINO

I don't think so. But my good friends, I didn't come here merely to joke with you. I know that the G. & G. rally out here in ward 14, that this rally has always been one that has been visited by the top leaders of our national Democratic ticket. I know that Franklin Roosevelt loved to come here. [Applause.] I know that that one and only, that fighter, that man from Independence, Harry Truman, loved to come here. [Applause.]

And I know that that good man that did so much for our party during those difficult years, Adlai Stevenson, loved to come here. [Applause.]

And I know that John Kennedy got a big inspiration out of coming here. [Applause.]

And let me tell you, my dear friends, your presence here tonight makes Hubert Humphrey and Lyndon Johnson feel mighty good, too. [Applause.]

Well, just a little word or two about the serious aspects of this campaign. We have a big decision to make, and it is a decision that affects the lives of everyone in this ward, everyone in this city, everyone in this State and Nation. We have a decision as to whether or not we want to have an administration that worships a past that never existed or whether or not we want an administration in Washington that wants to look to the future and make it worthy of the American people. And I think I know what your decision will be. But I want to be sure of it.

Some time ago President Johnson was asked this question: "Mr. President, Franklin Roosevelt had his New Deal; Harry Truman called his administration the Fair Deal. John Kennedy called his administration the New Frontier. President Johnson, what will you term or call your administration?" And this big man from Texas who has taken on these burdens of the Presidency under the most difficult of circumstances following a tragic death of a great and beloved President, this man looked at that reporter and said, "Well, I guess what I want is a better deal for all humanity and all Americans." [Applause.]

And my dear friends, that is what we want. We want a better deal. We want a better deal for our young; better schools, better opportunities in education, a better chance for a good job and a better future.

We want a better deal for our sick and our needy. And let me say in the presence of the great Speaker of the House, of your Governor and of your Governor nominee and your State officers, let me say that we do not consider as Democrats that compassion for the needy is weakness nor do we believe that concern for the afflicted and the sick is socialism. We believe that all of this is good, solid, decent Americanism. [Applause.]

And my friends, we don't believe as our opponents do in this election that the word "minority" is ugly. We don't believe that America is governed and ruled, as the spokesman of the opposition says, by just minorities. We believe that America is the richer and the better because there are many people here of different races, creeds, and nationalities. [Applause.]

We love this America. We love this America. We love this America that is a symphony of many people, many creeds, many races, and many ethnic groups. And I hope that the people in this great congressional district will remember that because our opposition, my friends—don't worry about that. They will come out of it all right up there. [Laughter.] You know, we love to see our young friends work their way up in the world. [Laughter.] And particularly may I say when they are for Bellotti for Governor and President Johnson for President. [Laughter and applause.]

But let me say to these good young friends that this election is for them and not for their grandparents. This election is for the future of our country. It is, as I said, for a better deal for the young. It is for some dignity and respect for the elderly. It is for some care for the afflicted and the needy. And it is for the worker who needs a friendly government. And it is for the businessman so he can expand his enterprise. And above all, this election is for, may I say, the peace of this world because without it there is nothing else.

I am happy to come to this audience and say that we have a President in the White House who understands that the power and the wealth of America is not for conquest or luxury but rather that it is for social justice and for peace, for all of humanity. [Applause.]

400 WBZ—LINO

I call upon this wonderful audience tonight to take their citizenship responsibilities seriously. In many parts of the world there is a better record of democracy in terms of voting. I can call to your attention the following: About a year and a half ago an election in Italy, 93 percent of the eligible voters in Italy went to the ballot box to vote.

In Great Britain, in recent days, 85 percent. Even in India, far, far away, over 75 percent. In that little democracy in the Middle East that has withstood the attack of the aggressor, the oppression of those who would grind it into the dust, in that little democracy that today is a symbol of freedom and progress and democracy, in the last election in the State of Israel, 97 percent of the people voted. [Applause.]

I wonder, then, why, my friends, it is in America in this the greatest of all countries that in the last election even when we had a brilliant man like John Kennedy as our standard bearer—[applause]—even then only 63 percent of the eligible voters of America took time out to love their country.

I have found in my public life that the people that gripe the most are the ones that do the least. I have found out that those who complain the loudest are those who vote least often.

I call upon everyone in this audience who loves this Nation, who believes the forces of hate and the forces of bitterness, and the forces of division which are represented, may I say regrettably, in this campaign by our opposition, that those forces are defeated and that they are defeated with an overwhelming vote of the American people. [Applause.]

So, the hour is late. The evening is cool. The blood is warm. And the votes that you have are good. Put those votes to work. See to it that the Democratic ticket wins. See to it that your next President of the United States is the man who serves you now, President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Detroit, Mich.
October 24, 1964

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON TRADE POLICY

In the field of trade policy, the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party is offering the voters a choice and not an echo—a choice between either continuing a bipartisan trade expansion policy pursued for 30 years with great benefit to American business and agriculture or the destruction of the advances we have made in the last three decades.

Ever since the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the U.S. Government has worked for the expansion of international trade. The act has been extended 11 times under Republican and Democratic administrations alike. Most recently, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was endorsed by an overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans in the Senate—but not by Senator Goldwater.

Last month, Senator Goldwater sought to explain away this vote, and claimed that he has never been a protectionist at heart.¹ He will,

¹ Business Week, Sept. 26, 1964, p. 180.

however, need a whole packet of alibis to explain away the fact that, in 14 key votes on trade expansion during his 12 years in the Senate, he voted on the protectionist side 13 times.² Senator Goldwater's

² Trade Talk, Committee for a National Trade Policy, July 23, 1964, p. 5.

record speaks louder than his current alibi. And, the platform adopted by his faction in San Francisco speaks the same language of protectionism.

There is no trace in this platform of any appreciation or understanding of the benefits of trade expansion to our economy. Since 1934, our foreign trade has multiplied more than 10 times—from \$3.8 billion in 1934 to a current annual rate of \$42.5 billion. Our exports are running at an annual rate of \$24.5 billion. This represents a favorable balance of our country of \$6.5 billion annually compared

401 WBZ—LINO

to our imports. Foreign trade provides jobs for more than 4 million American workers, and our trade surpluses have made a massive contribution toward easing the balance of payments problem which the Democratic administration inherited in 1961.

No group in our economy has a greater stake in international trade than our farmers. In the 12 months ending with June, we exported over \$6.1 billion in agricultural products—equivalent to the crops from 1 out of 4 acres of our harvested land.

Throughout the world, people are buying and using American products. Their quality, their variety, and their competitive price give tangible testimony to the high performance of our free enterprise system.

In the past few years, there have been great changes in the patterns of international trade. There are new problems to be met and new opportunities to be seized.

First, there has been the emergence and development of trading blocs which transcend national boundaries. As other nations have come to realize what great advantages our huge internal market has given us, they have sought to profit from our huge internal market. Thus, there have come into being the European Common Market, the European Free Trade Association, the Central American Common Market, and the Latin American Free Trade Association. Each grouping is in the process of eliminating tariffs and other barriers to trade among its members.

Secondly, the developing countries are demanding—with increasing urgency—the opportunity to play a greater role in international trade. They made this crystal clear at the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development in Geneva this spring. They want—and this is much to their credit—to earn through their exports more of the resources they need for development. They want to be less dependent on external aid.

The growth of trading blocs and the drive of the developing countries for trading opportunities confront us with immediate problems. But they offer long-term opportunities as well. As the members of these new trading blocs achieve accelerated economic growth, they will want to buy more of the things we have to sell.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was carefully tailored to meet these immediate problems and to take full advantage of these long-term opportunities. The negotiations made possible by this act, the sixth round of international negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—widely known as the Kennedy round—opened in Geneva this spring.

These are the most important and comprehensive trade negotiations in which the United States has ever engaged. They will be lengthy and complex—and, at times, difficult and delicate.

Up until the Republican convention, the countries participating in the Geneva talks—which include all the major trading nations of the free world—could sit down with us at the bargaining table with full confidence in the seriousness of American purpose. They could take it for granted that our delegation was acting on the basis of policies firmly established for 30 years and strongly supported by the responsible leadership of both our major political parties.

For the time being, they can no longer operate on this assumption, in light of the fact that the Republican Party and its candidates have said, in effect: "Include us out!"

That is one of the many reasons why it is vitally important that the American people give a decisive endorsement to the Johnson administration this November—one so decisive that it reaffirms the administration's mandate to speak for the United States at Geneva and elsewhere in the councils of the nations.

Our negotiators will need that kind of mandate, for they have an important job to do.

They must seek, by negotiating substantial tariff cuts across the board, to reduce the discrimination against us in a world increasingly grouping into great trading blocs.

They must seek to halt and turn back the rising tide of agricultural protectionism, so that we can maintain and expand our farm exports—and retain access, for example, to the European Common Market, where we sell \$1.2 billion of agricultural products a year.

402 WBZ--LINO

They must seek the reduction or removal of the nontariff barriers which hamper our exports—barriers such as quotas, State trading practices, discriminatory taxes.

They must seek means of meeting the urgent demands of the developing countries for a greater role in international trade.

These are give-and-take negotiations—and to secure benefits for ourselves we must offer benefits to others. They will be conducted on the basis of reciprocity.

The benefits of trade expansion are shared by all Americans, but its cost should not be imposed unfairly on a few. That is why, while pressing ahead on the broad front of trade expansion, this administration has taken specific remedial action for the relief of pressing import problems with regard to textiles, apparel, and meat.

Trade expansion has dollar-and-cent advantages to the United States. But it also has a significant role to play in promoting international cooperation and peace. Trade among the developed nations weaves a seamless web across national frontiers. When nations are busily and profitably trading with one another, they have a powerful incentive to live at peace. For the developing nations, increased trade opportunities can do much to allay the economic discontents from which graver dissensions arise.

Therefore, in a very real sense, every American engaged in international trade is a merchant of peace.

President Kennedy saw clearly the great economic and political importance of increased international trade for the United States and the free world—and that is why he took the leadership in the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. President Johnson and his administration carry on this firm dedication to trade expansion, and are pressing vigorously forward with the international negotiations made possible by the act.

As President Johnson has said, these are not the kind of negotiations in which some nations need lose because other gain. The increased exchanges among the free nations which can result from these negotiations will be to the advantage of all. As President Kennedy liked to say, "A rising tide lifts all the boats."

Hamtramck, Detroit, Mich.
October 24, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Ah, that man down there has the kind of Democratic enthusiasm I like.

Congressman Nedzi, this great Congressman from this powerful Democratic ward, this is just like the Rock of Gibraltar of the Democratic Party to be around here. I surely want to thank Lou for his introduction.

I want to thank, too, our good friend, Gov. T. John Lesenski, who is our wonderful, wonderful friend. T. John is the Governor, in fact, of this State. We sort of have one working part time but John is on the job all the time. When you have Lesenski on the job, when you have T. John Lesenski on the job, you have a big man at work. [Applause.]

I want to say he's going to be succeeded by a great citizen of this State, a fine young man, a gifted public servant. You all know who I'm talking about, your own Bob Deren. [Applause.]

Well, today, we are here with your Congressman. He has been kind to invite us and your good mayor of this fine community of Hamtramck, a wonderful community. I want to thank the mayor; Mayor Grzecki and Lou Nedzi have given me a wonderful welcome.

I notice that the minute Lou and the mayor got in the car, Neil Staebler looked like he'd been elected Governor right there.

All I can say is that if the good mayor will turn out those Democratic voters, if Mayor Grzecki will do what he has done, if Lou Nedzi will do what he's done, you will not only elect Phil Hart, you will have a good Democrat in the statehouse and every one of you will be happier people with Neil Staebler at the helm of state government in Michigan. [Applause.]

403 WBZ—LINO

Phil Hart is a great man. Hart is a great man.

I want to thank the band of Hamtramck for being here with us. I also want to thank that band of the Dodge local for being here with us.

Might I add also that I was told and I'm so pleased to know that some of the sisters are here from St. Ladislau Parish. Where are my friends—because some of them are from Minnesota. [Applause.]

I hope you have noticed how this Humphrey of Polish extraction pronounces all of these words. [Applause.]

Now, I have just received a passport to Hamtramck. According to the instructions on the back of this, Mr. Mayor, it permits me to park my car, get into any kind of trouble that it may or can take care of. So, you're lucky, I'm not staying long.

Well, I want to talk to you very briefly today about the importance of this election. I would sure like to take a lot of time just to visit with you—but about these candidates. I want to start out by saying whenever you are in doubt as to how you want to vote in any of these elections, just vote Democratic. [Applause.]

That will be the best bet for your future that you will ever make and in this campaign, there can be no doubt as to how we ought to vote. I think I know how the people of this great industrial district feel. I think I understand your feeling about this great National and State election.

These are the people that I see before me that loved Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson and John Kennedy. [Applause.]

These distinguished men that I speak of built a record of social and economic progress that has led every one of us. There isn't a worker in this audience that isn't better off because Roosevelt was President, Truman was President, and John Kennedy was President, and Lyndon Johnson is President. [Applause.]

Not a businessman on Main Street, not a businessman in this great community isn't better off because you had Democrats running this Government over the majority of the years since the 1930's. Prosperity has blessed this land under Democratic administration. You have had 44 consecutive months of it. There are more jobs today than there have been at any time in our history and the business community is making better profits than at any time in our history.

Is it any wonder that our business friends today are voting for President Lyndon Johnson? They know that that is a good vote and a good investment. They don't have any intention of voting for that fellow in Arizona that would take them back—back. [Applause.]

Well, now, my friends, there are two great issues in this campaign. Those two issues are, first, do we want to or do we not want to continue the progress that America has made since those dark days of the depression? I think we know the answer. I think the people in this audience want to go on and build a better America. I think they do not want to turn back to the old days when government had no concern for the people, when people were left to their own, when there was no chance for an unemployed worker, when there was no food for a hungry person, when there were inadequate schools for our children.

But if they do, they have got a candidate. If they want to have a candidate that says "No—no," to the future, "No—no—no" to the present, they have got one.

One think I will say for Mr. Goldwater. He is an honest man. He tells you that he thinks the 20th century should never have happened. He tells you that he is opposed to aid to education; he is opposed to the minimum wage law; he is opposed to housing for the low-income groups; he is opposed to social security for the disabled; he is opposed to old-age assistance for the elderly. He voted against medicare for our elderly people.

Oh, yes, he said he had his own medicare program, his own medicare program. He said, "I have a son-in-law that is a doctor intern." What kind of talk is that?

Ladies and gentlemen, the Democratic Party stands committed to its platform, stands committed to its record. If you want better schools for your children, mother and father, you vote for the Democratic candidates in Michigan and at the national level. If you want a college

404 WBZ—LINO

education for your son and daughter, vote for a President that will help you get it. If you want better working conditions, Mr. Worker, vote for a President that respects your union and not one that will destroy it. [Applause.]

And if you want to have some sense of dignity in old age, if you want to see a program that will help our elderly have better places in which to live and hospital and nursing home care, prepaid social security insurance so that you can be treated as a dignified human being, the thing to do is vote for Lyndon Johnson as President.

Lou Nedzi and Phil Hart are committed to these programs, and let me tell you that Neil Staebler and Bob Derengoski, and the people on the Democratic ticket are committed to work with President Johnson and Vice President Hubert Humphrey to help make these programs possible.

So, the issue is clear. The issue is clear. If you want to go back to the old days, when government cared not for you, you vote for the man that represents the past—and I will spell his name for you if you have forgotten it—if you want to vote for the past, if you want to vote for reaction, if you want to vote for the 19th century, you can vote for the candidate of the Republican opposition. [Boos.]

I gather you don't want to do that. Do you want to have a candidate and a President that represents the future? Do you want one that will build on the gains of yesterday? If you do, will you vote for President Johnson? [Applause.]

My dear friends, the other issue that is before us is the question of our strength and our security. Because all of this means nothing unless we can save this world from destruction. And make no mistake about it, my fellow citizens, mankind has within his hands today the power to destroy all that he has created, indeed all that God Almighty has created, the nuclear bomb, the powerful forces of destructive power.

And if we ever needed a President that was calm and strong, that was reasonable and patient, it is now.

We have built a great bipartisan policy that is neither Republican nor Democrat over some 20 years. We have built a great military power that is neither Republican nor Democrat, but American, over these 25 years. We don't want to sacrifice it. We need that strength.

This strength was built up in the last 4 years. The late and beloved President, John Kennedy, said to the American people, "Let us begin." Let us begin to build up our economy; let us begin to build up our schools; let us begin to build up our military strength; let us begin to build the blocks that lead to peace.

Oh, my fellow Americans, we have lived in some great and wonderful days. We have lived in a time when we had a great, courageous, intelligent President that dared to challenge the forces of tyranny. We lived in a time when that great and courageous President literally pierced the Iron Curtain and extended the hand of friendship to millions of people who today live under tyrannical regimes. That's the kind of administration you have.

That young man selected as his Vice President Lyndon Johnson. He was trusted, all right. On that terrible day in Dallas, when John Kennedy was taken from us by the cruel assassin's bullet, a tall, strong man rose up in our midst, prepared for public service. Under four Presidents, he served—Congressman, Senator, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate, and Vice President. Never has a man come to the White House more fully prepared to lead this country, and I am here to tell you that he leads us well.

He leads us into greater prosperity. He leads us into greater social justice, and he leads us in the paths of peace.

I stand before this audience and say that the really strong men of the world are those who seek an honorable peace, who seek to keep this Nation and the world from destroying itself. The weaklings are those who brandish the saber. The strong man does not need to tell you of his strength. He has it.

May I just say, my friends, don't ever turn away from men of wisdom. Don't turn your back upon those who would lead us forward. Don't turn away from those who believe that peace is possible.

I end my message on a very somber and sober note. I think there have been great peacemakers in our time. There was Dag Ham-

405 WBZ—LINO

marshjold of the United Nations, who gave his life for peace in Africa. There was Eleanor Roosevelt, who gave her whole life for dignity and peace—a great lady of the world. No finer—no finer woman. [Applause.]

And then, my dear friends, as I said very private in our car as we drove here today to Senator Philip Hart and to Congressman Neil Staebler, I said that in our time, I think the greatest man of them all for the cause of peace was that blessed man, that blessed parish peasant priest, who became the head of his church, the great and beloved Pope John, the XXIII. [Applause.]

What a great man. This man in his great encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, spoke to us of the paths of peace. And he was followed in that work by our late and beloved President. President John Kennedy picked up that message, and he was willing to give his life to the cause of peace, to the cause of building the blocks of peace, the Peace Corps, the United Nations, food for peace, the nuclear test ban treaty, the great programs of military power that gives us the opportunity to negotiate for strength.

I am proud to stand on this platform and say that I am here to represent the accomplishments of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. I am proud of those two Presidents. I am proud of their record. And so are you. I know it. [Applause.]

Well, dear friends, let us not lose what we have. Let us take no chances. I ask you to join with me in repudiating these forces of backwardness and reaction represented by the temporary spokesman of a faction of a faction of reaction in the Republican Party. [Applause.]

I ask you to join with me in supporting the candidates of the future, the candidates of the party of hope, the Democratic Party. I know you are going to do it. [Applause.]

Before I leave you today, may I say that I was privileged to have with me today a young lady that works in our office. I thought you might like to see her, because I know that in this community, there are many people of Polish extraction. I am not unaware of that, and no finer citizens in the world do we have.

My voice gets a little rough when I talk about those Republicans, but don't worry, it will last.

I have with me a young lady today who I asked to come up here. I thought she ought to see some of her good friends. She is a direct descendant of one of the great heroes of our country and of Poland, General Pulaski. Her name is Eileen Pulaski, and I am proud to say that she works for Senator Hubert Humphrey and helps us in this campaign. And she's pretty, too. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, enough of this sociability. I want to tell everybody in this audience to get out and go to work. There is only one way to defeat the opposition and that is to be a worker in the vineyards of democracy. I ask every mother and father in this audience to be a voter. I ask every boy and girl in this audience to make sure that mother and father is a voter. I ask every young man and every young woman here—as a guardian of democracy in your home—you see that every person in your household, every person in your block that is 21 years of age and over and registered to vote—see to it that they are there to vote.

If you do, America will be a more beautiful country. America will be a more democratic country, and the Democratic Party will have a smashing victory.

Thank you.

Detroit, Mich.
Taylortown Shopping Center
October 24, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. I gather that there is a real spirit here from the Henry Ford Community College; is that right? [Applause.]

I thank the young folks here of the band of Taylortown Center. We thank you very, very much. I understand that you won your homecoming game; is that right? [Applause.]

406 WBZ—LINO

Well, now, you know, I'm in very bad shape today because the University of Michigan is playing the University of Minnesota, and the half-time score was 10 to 0 for Michigan. [Applause.]

I thought you'd also like to know that Michigan State is winning over Northwestern. The half-time score was 17 to nothing.

But, then, I think you would like to know that the full-time score on November 3 is going to be an overwhelming Democratic victory. [Applause.]

And that doesn't mean just a victory for our President. It means a victory for your Congressman here, your candidate for Congress, Bill Ford, who is going to win. [Applause.]

And I might add, since I'm close to it, it means a victory for John Dingle over in the Sixth District, too. [Applause.]

Mr. Canfield, I'm so very pleased to be here in your district and I'm delighted that I have the opportunity to complete your day of campaigning here in Michigan right here in Taylortown. It's a wonderful day that we have had. I have been traveling today with our good friend, your U.S. Senator—whom you are going to reelect—Philip Hart. [Applause.]

I have also had the good fortune once again to be on the campaign trail with the gentleman that I know is going to be the next Governor of the State of Michigan, and that's your own Neil Staebler. [Applause.]

And just as you are going to elect a Governor, may I suggest you elect a Democratic Lieutenant Governor, Bob Derengowski, who is on our ballot, too.

Just go right down the line and elect that Democratic ticket.

I want to pay tribute to the sisters from St. Pascal's parish, who I notice are here. [Applause.]

I want to let our young people know how much we appreciate their attendance and their presence in these meetings. I noticed—I heard a voice out there, way back—far, far back—that indicated that this poor soul is still carrying one of those banners of the candidate of the past, the candidate of never-never land. I want all my young friends here to be charitable to these people. Just be charitable to them because they only come here for one purpose. They come here only to repent for their political iniquities. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, may I just suggest that when they suggest that "We want Barry," we never know whether it's straw-Barry or rasp-Barry. And these poor souls don't know that Barry-picking time is over by November 3. [Applause.]

It's a great day, isn't it? Don't you like this day? [Applause.]

How many people here feel like Democrats? Say "aye." [Applause.] How many people feel sick and tired? Say "Goldwater." [Goldwater.]

Well, I just thought I would test you out. The reason I did that is every time we hear the candidate of the opposition, he says, "We're sick and tired." [Applause.]

Now, just a few moments of serious visiting with you. We are in one of the newer communities of this great growing State of Michigan. These communities have many, many opportunities ahead, and indeed, many challenges. And I can think of no area of America that needs closer cooperation with government and the people than those communities that are what we might say growing, that are on the upward surge—new homes, new businesses, new schools. I think the choice that we have before us these next few days is one of whether or not we want to have an America that moves ahead, that meets the challenges of tomorrow, or whether we wish to have an America and a Government in this country that looks backward and fails to appreciate the opportunities of today and tomorrow.

We have some very serious decisions to make. Every election campaign is filled with a certain amount of tumult, and every election is filled with a certain amount of "pointing with pride" and "viewing with alarm." But I do think that after we settle down and quit chanting the nonsense and start to think about the real problems and the real challenges, then we understand how terribly important it is that we make a sensible decision on November 3. [Applause.]

407 WBZ—LINO

The two great issues before us, or questions, are first, do we want to continue the progress that we have made over these 30 years, or do we want to turn back the clock and revert back to a day when government showed little or no interest in the people and there was no real partnership in the people, with the people, when there was no real effort made to coordinate the great institutions of our Government for public betterment?

I believe that the issue is, Do we want to build the social and economic progress that this country has demonstrated since the days of the great depression? That social and economic progress has been supported, not just by the Democratic Party, but it has been supported by the wise and the sensible leadership of the Republican Party.

We now have, however, a candidate on the Republican ticket who repudiates that progress, who would turn it back, who says that he does not feel that the Government of your Nation—you see, that what's wrong with their party right there. [Applause.]

You know, every time that party boos like that, we gain another thousand votes. [Applause.]

The American people don't like people with bad manners or booing. They like nice people, happy people.

Well, now that we have gotten rid of the boosers, we'll go down now for the cheerers. [Applause.]

The American people want to see this country grow and expand. The American people want to see their Government fulfill its legitimate role in that process of growth and expansion.

The American people believed, from the time of Abraham Lincoln—yes, from the time of the inception of this Republic—that there is a responsibility of the Federal Government and the State government to education, that there is a responsibility to help make our economy a stronger and a better economy.

I can say to this audience, without any fear of successful contradiction, that in the last 4 years, this economy has grown more rapidly and there are more jobs and greater prosperity and greater profits and better wages than any time in the history of the American Republic, and we ought to keep those gains, not lose them. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, as important as the issues are of economic growth, as important as the issues are of social security and education, all of these matters take secondary importance to the matter of our security, to the matter of peace in this world.

And as we view the world situation today, we can't help but be concerned about the days ahead. And I believe that it's fair to say that the strength of America is not the result of either a Democrat or a Republican, but rather the result of a collective effort between Democrats and Republicans.

We have built a great bipartisan foreign policy. We have had men of both political parties that have helped build the strength of this Nation militarily. We have had men of both political parties that have supported the United Nations, and today is United Nations Day, and the United Nations is an instrument of strength and of peace for the people that want a peaceful world. [Applause.]

It was this great bipartisanship that had the support of the late Senator Arthur Vandenburg, of this State, of President Harry Truman, of President Dwight Eisenhower, of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. [Applause.]

And now has the support of President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

We want to make sure that this great citadel of bipartisanship in support of American security and American foreign policy is not lost. And yet, the candidate on the opposition ticket—who does not really represent the majority of his party—that candidate today repudiates the United Nations, repudiates bipartisanship, repudiates every bit of the structure of national bipartisanship that has built our foreign policy.

So, the question before Americans on November 3 is do you want to build on the solid foundation of 30 years of social and economic progress? If you do, you will vote for Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

408 WBZ—LINO

The second question is do you want to continue and to build upon that solid rock of bipartisanship in foreign policy and national security? If you do, you will vote for Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

And if you want to see that Michigan works with the Nation, if you want to make sure that Michigan makes its contribution to this great effort of a better America and a more peaceful world, you will reelect Philip Hart to the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And you will send Bill Ford to the Congress of the United States. You will send John Dingell to the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

And you will see to it that you make as Governor of this State one who can work with a Democratic administration, one who will work with President Johnson and a Democratic Congress, Neil Staebler. [Applause.]

Detroit, Mich.
Green 8 Shopping Center
October 24, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Governor Swainson. My good friends from the State of Michigan, our fellow Democrats, fellow citizens, I hope you will forgive us for pushing this program along, but you have been waiting for some time and we have a very tight schedule today, a number of meetings in this great metropolitan area of this marvelous State, this beautiful, enterprising State of Michigan, and then down to Lacrosse, Wis. Then, tonight I go to visit my hometown of Minneapolis, Minn., where we have our traditional Democratic Bean Feed, which means that we elect a Democratic President every time we have one of those Democratic Bean Feeds. [Applause.]

I come here today with good heart and good cheer and good enthusiasm. I come today to say to you that the people of Michigan have a glorious opportunity awaiting them on November 3, an opportunity to return to the U.S. Senate one of its most talented and gifted sons, a man that has earned the respect and the admiration, not only of his Democratic colleagues in the Senate, but of those in the opposition of the Republican ranks. I haven't the slightest doubt but what the people of this great State are going to return to the U.S. Senate their U.S. Senator, Philip Hart, for another term. [Applause.]

And, Phil, I'm looking forward to the opportunity of sitting up there in that Presiding Officer's chair and saying, "The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan." Stand up there, Phil. [Applause.]

Then, on November 3, you have yet another great opportunity. You have the opportunity to see to it that here in the State of Michigan you have in the Governor's office one that will work with and cooperate with the national Democratic administration. You have a friend here, a friend of this State, highly regarded and respected, in Michigan, in Washington, throughout the Nation. He has done as much or more for the building of this party in Michigan than any man that I know and I haven't the slightest doubt but what when the votes are counted on that election day of November 3 that the next Governor of the State of Michigan will be Neil Staebler. [Applause.]

And might I add that with all of these fine men, we need Democratic Congressmen. We need them in every district that we can get from this great State. We need from Billy Farnum in the 19th. We need Frank Sierawski in the 18th, and we need that fine lady that has done so much for your State and your area and for our country, Martha Griffiths from the 17th. [Applause.]

And I'm sure you know that we want to see this Democratic ticket backed right down the line. We are now at a point in the campaign where the American people must make two decisions on two fundamental issues. Both of those decisions will decide who will be the next President of the United States.

Let me say the first decision is whether or not we are going to continue to build on the platform of progress that we have developed these last 30 years of economic and social progress for every American, for progress for our workers, progress for our farmers, progress for our businessmen, progress for our needy and our elderly, progress for our youth through education.

499 WBZ—LINO

For 30 years, the American people have hammered out a program of social and economic progress that, in the main outline, has been accepted by both political parties. But now, there rises a man who is but a temporary spokesman of a small fraction of a faction of reaction in the Republican Party, a man who repudiates that great 30 years of progress, who would veto it and who has said so quite candidly.

Let me make it quite clear. Mr. Goldwater does not deceive you. I admire him for his candor. I have said a number of times that I know this man and know him well. I am not here to cast any aspersions upon him as an individual and as a person.

As a matter of fact, I will be very frank with you. I think he would make a fine neighbor, but I think he would make a poor President. [Applause.]

Mr. Goldwater tells us frankly that he wants to get the Government out of the programs of social welfare, of agriculture, of labor standards, of urban renewal, of housing, of education. He means it, and if that's what you want, you should vote for him.

But if you want to continue down the lines of social and economic progress started with Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, carried on by Truman, forwarded under Eisenhower, and then advanced further under John Kennedy, and now under the leadership of President Johnson—if you want to keep that, vote for President Johnson. [Applause.]

Then, might I add this, the second issue. The second issue is whether or not the American people wish to repudiate the standards and the basis of our bipartisan foreign policy which is designed for our security and for the peace of the world. We have patiently constructed this policy over many years, and right here in this State, a great statesman of the opposition party, of the legitimate opposition party, Arthur Vandenberg, helped build that foreign policy.

He worked with Harry Truman and Harry Truman worked with him, just exactly as Lyndon Johnson worked with Dwight Eisenhower and Dwight Eisenhower worked with him, and just exactly, may I add, as men like Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts have worked with John Kennedy, and others, like Senator Aiken of Vermont, have worked with President Johnson.

We have built together, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. We have created a great bulwark of freedom, a great foreign policy, a program of national security and national strength. We have constructed alliances.

Today, we celebrate United Nations' day. We have strengthened the United Nations. We support the United Nations. This is a part of the general security structure of this land. Yet, my fellow Americans, there stands before us, seeking the high office of President, someone who repudiates it all, someone who says "no more bipartisanship," someone who says "no United Nations," someone who says we ought to get out of the United Nations.

That man is the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party. Now, if you want to destroy our alliances, if you want to repudiate our foreign policy, if you want to put America alone in the world against all others, if you want to weaken the United Nations, if you want to see it scrapped, you can do it and you can make that decision. Because I will say that Senator Goldwater has given us a choice.

He is frank and he is honest. He has said this is your choice. If you want that, vote for Senator Goldwater.

But, if you want to strengthen the U.N., if you want to work for peace, if you want to see the Peace Corps advance, the food-for-peace program made even more effective, if you want to see some curbing of the arms race, if you want to continue the nuclear test ban treaty, if you want to build our alliances and our strength, if you want to sustain the policy of this country for peace and progress, I say weigh this carefully and I say to this audience—young and old alike—you'd better vote for the Democratic nominee. You had better vote for President Johnson—and I might add, for Hubert Humphrey, too.

Now, I leave you with this word. November 3 is election day, but more importantly, it is citizenship day. It's a day—may I have the attention of our young friends for a moment? Every boy and girl in this audience, this day is your day and maybe, in many ways, it ought

410 WBZ—LINO

to be dedicated to the children of America, because on that day we are going to determine whether you have a future or not. We are going to determine the issues of peace and war, of progress and reaction. And I ask every boy and girl in this audience to be a committee of one, a sentinel, a guardian of democracy.

In fact, I commission you from this platform in your home to see to it that your mother and your father and your brother or your sister, age 21 or over, any relative or friend that you have, any member of your family, you young people here prove to the world and to America that you love your country even as much or more than your adult seniors. Prove it by seeing to it that mother and dad vote; prove it by seeing to it that America turns out an overwhelming vote on election day. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, we must go on to the next meeting. I leave you and thank you so much for coming to us. Help us November 3. Help Lyndon Johnson, Neil Staebler; help Philip Hart, and the Democratic ticket.

Detroit, Mich.
October 24, 1964
T.V. Taping—WXYZ

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

At this time, I think I ought to just say to you that I am delighted. The ANNOUNCER. The participants are Senator Hart, Congressman Staebler, Bob Perrin, and our boy, Humphrey.

Mr. PERRIN. Gentlemen, here are some of the questions that have come into rather sharp focus in the closing days of the campaign.

Senator Humphrey, we would like to start with you.

The dramatic world events of the past few weeks in Moscow, China, and elsewhere have caused the American people new concern over the basic issue of war and peace. Why do you feel you and President Johnson are better equipped to meet these challenges than Senator Goldwater and his running mate?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would say that we surely live in very perilous days and with the changes that have taken place in the political structures in the Soviet Union, changes that yet may have further developments, and with Communist China detonating a nuclear device, all of this throws the world situation into somewhat of a turmoil and, at least, some unpredictability.

I believe that President Johnson is much better equipped to meet these situations, primarily because he follows and adheres to an established bipartisan foreign policy that has been credited out of the minds of not just Democrats but Democrats and Republicans.

As a matter of fact, now that I mention it, it was right here in this State that one of the great men of our time came and contributed so much of this bipartisan foreign policy, the late Arthur Vandenberg. When we faced the Communist menace in Greece and Turkey, in the period of President Truman's Presidency, it was President Truman and Arthur Vandenberg who joined hands to meet this situation.

From that day to this very hour, through the administrations of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and President Johnson, we have had a bipartisan support that is a basic understanding of the two great political parties as to the nature of our foreign policy, how it would develop, how it would be applied, and also as to our total national security policy.

President Johnson is a part of that great program. He supported President Eisenhower in foreign policy, as Hubert Humphrey did, and as Philip A. Hart did, and we put our country above any party consideration. There ought not to be real party positions on matters of international security.

So I say that President Johnson is equipped by knowledge, by background and experience, and by temperament—his rationale attitude, his willingness to pause and wait, and see what to do with these developments. He has the confidence and the trust of our allies. This is very, very important. He is not impetuous or irresponsible. The whole theme of President Johnson's life, as Senator, Vice President, and President, has been one of responsibility, of trying to act, not as an opposition or not merely as an advocate, but as a responsible public servant.

411 WBZ—LINO

In this day and age, where you have these fantastic developments in unpredictable matters, I think you need a man that is wise and prudent, that is not only bright but also has some wisdom with it, and that has a sense of calm and a sense of perception of what is going on.

I regret to say that the opposition, Mr. Goldwater, has not demonstrated he had those qualities. It's not just Hubert Humphrey who says this.

Gentlemen, there is a New York Herald Tribune editorial—a Republican newspaper—that I think was most demonstrative of what I am saying. It said that in sum—looking at the total picture—Senator Goldwater lacks an understanding of the world in which we live, has given the image of being impetuous and irresponsible and tries to find simple answers to very complicated problems. I am only paraphrasing the editorial.

I think, if the American people would take a look at the editorial in *Life*, the editorial in *Saturday Evening Post*, the New York Herald Tribune, the editorials that have come from the Knight papers, from the Scripps-Howard papers, and others, you will begin to see that these traditional Republican-oriented newspapers and their editorial policies have come to President Johnson primarily because he is a more responsible voice, a more responsible and prudent and cautious man in areas of foreign policy.

In reference to your question, sir, that's why I believe we need President Johnson as President of the United States.

Mr. PERRIN. Congressman Staebler, here is one for you.

Michigan's prosperity is up, unemployment is down. Why should we change Governors?

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER. The present Governor has played down the influence of national programs on Michigan's prosperity. Eighty-five percent of the cars we make, Senator, in Michigan, are sold in other States. But that is only part of what he has been boasting about. He has boasted that he has changed Michigan from a bankrupt State to a solvent State, ignoring the fact that it was a set of nuisance taxes passed in the previous administration that accomplished that.

Now he has been exhibiting magnificent showmanship in Michigan, but not much leadership. Two of the serious failures of leadership, for instance, occurred in the field of fiscal reform and in the field of help for our senior citizens in their property taxes, but these are only part of his failures.

The greatest failures have been the failure to pay attention to Michigan needs. Michigan needs more school aid. State school aid. We need more attention to the dropout problem. Our juvenile delinquency has gotten out of hand. And our mental health program has practically stalled.

We need community mental health programs, and we are not getting them at anything like the rate we ought to have. So, what I am suggesting is a program of action.

First of all, school aid. The Governor has put a lot of money into a building program that ought to go into the operation of our schools. That will help the schools. It can give us a chance to attack the dropout problem, to keep property taxes from rising. We can roll back the property taxes for our senior citizens.

We need, in addition to that, to speed up our mental health program. We need to pass an equitable labor legislation. Our farmers have been totally neglected. They have several important things they want done in the State—a unified dairy inspection and meat inspection.

We need an office of small business to help our small businessmen in the department of economic development.

What we need in Michigan is not the showmanship, not this era of boasting of great accomplishments. We need action and we are not getting it. That's why we need a new Governor.

Senator HUMPHREY. Neil, if it's agreeable, can I just comment in here for a minute? Because you have said what you need is action and not showmanship.

You have also indicated the delevance or the relationship between what is happening here in Michigan and at the national level. I think those are very pertinent observations. The fact is that you may recall back in 1960, our country was in its third recession of that

412 WBZ—LINO

8-year period. That recession was taking a big toll in unemployment, in revenues, in loss of income, in jobs. Industrial capacity was down; unused capacity—about 10 or 15 percent of our total capacity being unused.

Then President Kennedy came in and said, in those dramatic words in that inaugural address: "Let us begin. Let us get this country moving."

And in many areas, in investment tax credit, tax reforms, manpower retraining, programs of encouragement of industry, accelerated depreciations schedules, minimum wage improvement, unemployment compensation, accelerated public works, area development, we got this country moving.

Do you realize that since—we have increased the gross national product by over \$125 billion in the past—

Congressman STAEBLER. That's 25 percent.

Senator HUMPHREY. An increase of about 25 percent.

Congressman STAEBLER. In less than 4 years.

Senator HUMPHREY. That's correct, and I saw that figure yesterday, which was almost startling, that since President Johnson came in as President, following the tragic death of President Kennedy, the stock market values, the values on the New York Stock Exchange have gone up \$100 billion.

Congressman STAEBLER. That's confidence.

Senator HUMPHREY. That's confidence, and this stock market has had, you might say, a wringing-out period and has come back to a constructive valuation.

Now, this 44 consecutive months of economic growth at the national level is unprecedented. There has never been anything like this in the history of our country, never before. We have had almost 4 years of no recession, no retreat.

This is unprecedented in the history of economic growth and expansion. So your jobs are up. Your income is up. For a family of four, it's up a little over \$1,000. Your profits are up. Your wages are up. That means a higher purchasing power.

I might add, Neil and Phil, that when that happens, it helps Minnesota; it helps Michigan, your great State. It helps—

Congressman STAEBLER. It helps revenues, too, because Michigan is a hard-goods State. When times are bad, we fall further. When times are good, we rise higher. That's what is happening now.

Senator HUMPHREY. I remember your unemployment situation in Detroit in 1960, early 1960, and 1961, in the automobile industry. Today, more power to you, you're building great cars; the employment is booming. All we need is a little more bargaining space.

Mr. PERRIN. The Democrats have emphasized the record of the 88th Congress, how good it was—

Senator HART. It was.

Mr. PERRIN. Yet Congress was unable to pass a medicare program of hospital insurance for elderly Americans. Was all of this talk just an election year gambit to win the senior citizen vote?

Senator HART. Of course not. We came closer to winning medicare this time than we ever have before. For the first time in history, we got it through the House—one House. I am glad to say it was the Senate. We are going to win this one, because, needless to say, the concept is right. For older people, with their increasing health needs at the end of life, it's important to their children, who, unhappily sometimes, have to elect between sending their children to college and taking care of mother and father, and it's vitally important to the dignity of the older person.

We are going to win. This isn't an election year gambit. This was what John Kennedy committed us to and what Lyndon Johnson has said we are going to do, and we are going to do it.

Congressman STAEBLER. And, Senator, since you pointed out that it was the House of Representatives who failed to put it through—

Senator HART. Neil Staebler voted for it.

Congressman STAEBLER. I think what would help most would be the election of some more Democratic Congressman from Michigan. There are some in this very locality that would vote for it.

Senator HART. Right in Michigan.

413 WBZ—LINO

Senator HUMPHREY. Could I just say the election, yes, of Democratic Congressmen, and the reelection of Philip Hart, and other Democrats in other States would be very helpful. People are committed to this program of social security improvement and expansion and medicare. But I believe we ought to just set the record straight.

Mr. Goldwater not only voted against hospital and nursing home care, the modified beginning program under social security, he also voted against the Kerr-Mills bill, the Kerr-Mills bill, which was a program that was supported overwhelmingly in the Congress of the United States. In fact, over 75 percent of all the Congressmen, better than that, voted for it en masse. But not Senator Goldwater. He voted against the Kerr-Mills.

That's where you have the program of just taking care of the indigent and the needy. He voted against a program of improvement of old-age assistance, under which people who would earn up to \$50 a month would be able to earn that \$50 a month, and still have their old-age assistance benefit.

He voted against including the disabled persons under social security—those totally disabled. That program was sponsored by the late Senator Walter George, of Georgia, and it was a conservative program. Robert Taft supported that program and supported it vigorously.

He voted against housing for the elderly, which is one of the finest programs we have.

Now, notice what we have been doing. What is happening in America in all too many cities is in old people with incomes of \$1,000, \$1,200, \$1,400 a year. They are being shunted off in the attics of third- and fourth-story buildings in old parts of the cities, just as we once used to put the mentally retarded, and hid them away, before we became humane and decent and started taking care of these loved ones, these real little, blessed loved ones, and those who were the victims of terrible tragedy.

We used to put them away, just shut them away. Now, we have them out where we can do something for them, passing aid for the mentally retarded, doing something in the way of scientific, loving care for these people.

We are trying to do that now for the elderly. The elderly have a higher rate of sickness, the poorest housing, poorest conditions, the least chance for work.

The Senator from Arizona, I regret to say, because it makes my heart heavy to say it, this Senator has voted against every single one of these programs and not given one bit of help to our local communities or volunteer his assistance to try to do something about it.

Mr. PERRIN. Senator Humphrey, let us assume you and President Johnson are going to be successful on November 3—

Senator HART. Let's say we'll miss it enormously if the majority don't win, but we will be delighted to keep him in the Senate.

Mr. PERRIN. Assuming you are both going to be successful, what difference does it make to you who is Governor of Michigan?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, well, it makes a great deal of difference as to not only who is Governor of Michigan—may I say, even though that is where we are talking right now—but it makes a great deal of difference who is Governor in any of these States. Because the lesson that we need to learn in American government is that our government is not in Washington. That is part of our Government. Our Government is in Washington; it's in your State capital; it's at your county courthouse, at the village hall, in the city council. Government in America is a partnership.

It's a coordinated system of government. Most of the government activities, gentlemen, are at the local level. It's the local level of government who tells you what your speed rate will be on your highways, takes care of your highways, takes care of your social and economic problems.

The Federal Government can help. The Federal Government supplements. The Federal Government is a partner, but the Federal Government doesn't provide for your highway speeds, your police patrols, and so on.

414 WBZ—LINO

You need, at your State capital, a Governor that is in harmony with, in sympathy with, in coordination with, the policies of the National Government. Why? So as to get the most out of the taxpayer's dollar, to see to it that these programs that are available are actually initiated and that they are carried out vigorously and effectively. That's why I think Neil Staebler, who has helped design many of these programs, who has been a faithful supporter of the progressive social and economic policies of President Kennedy and President Johnson, if he can be elected Governor in your State, you are going to get more out of every tax dollar that is spent, you are going to get more out of every program that is available, and you are going to have real cooperation for business, for labor, for your educators, for your students, with the Federal Government. That is a good investment.

Congressman STAEBLER. Senator, let me just illustrate what you have just said.

The present Governor in one single program, aid to dependent children of the unemployed, lost the State of Michigan \$20 million by his obstinate refusal to cooperate with the Federal Government. A year later, he did, but in the interval, we lost \$20 million.

Senator HUMPHREY. There would not have been any interval if Neil Staebler had been Governor.

Congressman STAEBLER. Correct.

Mr. PERRIN. Congressman Staebler, you have been accused of running against Senator Goldwater rather than George Romney. How do you answer that?

Congressman STAEBLER. Well, the Governor is very unhappy when I mention the fact, because in some parts of the State, particularly the east side, he tries to disavow Mr. Goldwater, but on the west side of the State, he is running with him. The billboards there carry him half Goldwater, half Romney. The center spread of the Michigan Farmer, in the last issue, two pages—one page Goldwater, one page Romney. He is part of the team and he is not running away from that team.

But there is a more important reason and that is he thinks like Mr. Goldwater on most questions. Now, he has dwelled on a couple of points where he differs, and I give him credit for that. But on most things, he has that same superficial attitude toward government that—shove it back to the localities whether they can afford to pay for a service or not, don't let the Federal Government in, we are suspicious of the Federal Government.

To illustrate—the war on poverty. At the very same time that the President was talking about the war on poverty, the Governor was in Chicago saying he had already won the war on poverty. He doesn't even understand it, or didn't at that time. I have noticed since the campaign has heated up, he has paid a great deal more attention to it. In fact, he is coming closer and closer to our position on it.

Mr. PERRIN. Well, speaking of poverty, gentlemen, you all three have the distinction of having voted in the Congress for the war on poverty bill.

Senator Humphrey, in fact, is one of the architects of that program. You all three voted for it, yet Senator Goldwater calls it a hoax. Is it?

Senator Hart?

Senator HART. My dear colleague from Arizona claims that everything is a hoax that he doesn't agree with, and he disagrees with about everything we have done.

Look, we have never lost a war in this Nation and we are not going to lose this one. The worst thing we could do, the most costly thing we could do about poverty is to do nothing. There are a lot of by-passed people in this affluent society of ours and we are going to zero in on them with just the straight way that we would zero in on an enemy. Poverty, harsh poverty, in the midst of plenty, destroys the plentiful.

You're right. We are going to win this one and this is no hoax. This is exactly what they said about the Peace Corps, and history is in on that one. That is a success. And Barry was against that.

Congressman STAEBLER. Senator Hart hasn't said so, but his opponent calls the war on poverty a hoax, a cheap political trick.

Senator HART. That's exactly the label he put on the Peace Corps, and history is against him on that one. That one is a success.

415 WBZ—LINO

Senator HUMPHREY. I think the war on poverty isn't just to wage war on the economics, that is, on low income. It is a war on illiteracy, a war on inadequate education. It's a mobilization of community resources.

What the Economic Opportunity Act did, and what the war on poverty means, is the regrouping, the remobilization of the resources of America—Federal, State, and local, and voluntarily at the community level, with some Federal and State participation. As you said, to zero in on these particular problems, which can gnaw away at you and consume you.

There are little pockets of malignancy, economic and social malignancy. We have to eradicate them. We have to cure them.

We are now setting up a command staff, as you know. The whole economic and social structure of our government, the programs and policies, are under careful review for the new budget that will be presented by the President in the 89th Congress.

One of the points I want to make clear to you, under that reexamination, is that in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, is a review of our whole social structure in an effort to improve it, to make it more meaningful. One of the areas of review is to try to find a way that we can incorporate in social security a formula that will provide for cost of living increases, so that you arrive at a base point and then you automatically—if the cost of living goes up—there are automatic increases in the social security payments.

Now, we have got to do this without jeopardizing the solvency of the fund, but we have the best economists in America right now on a task force working on that. This, plus review of our vocational aid, review of our whole social and welfare programs, with the war on poverty program, I think, will represent a singular advance in America, and it will again be fruitful because you get more out of each dollar you spend.

This is one thing I like about President Johnson, gentlemen. This man watches that budget like a hawk. He insists that there be economy in Government without sacrificing human needs.

We have reduced Federal employment. We have kept within a budget figure that was agreed upon. In fact, we have reduced the budget figure this over even what President Johnson presented to the Congress.

Congressman STAEBLER. When he first presented the war on poverty to Congress, he pointed out that he was paying for it out of savings, real savings, in the defense program.

Senator HUMPHREY. That's right, and in the cut down on civilian employment. We actually have about 25,000 fewer civilian employees now than we had a year ago, and we have been able to make some real savings through careful management in the Defense Department without sacrificing in any way the strength of our defense structure.

Congressman STAEBLER. Could I add one more thing? I'm glad you emphasized the State and local aspects, because the State can do other things besides just implement the Federal program. We can attack this, too, at its very root. The root of the problem is the school dropout program.

Senator HART. We would like to have a Governor who voted to go to war on poverty, as you did.

Mr. PERRIN. Let's have a quick answer here, next.

Senator Humphrey, we were talking about the Peace Corps, and the labels put on it. I understand Senator Goldwater has called the Peace Corps a "haven of beatniks." Could you comment on that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; he called it that and he voted against it. I must say I hope he will retract that statement, you know.

Senator HART. If he retracts that, look at all the others he will have to.

Senator HUMPHREY. I know. There are so many programs. You said a moment ago here, Phil, that history is already recording that the Peace Corps is a success and it is. Every country in the world that is not in the Communist orbit wants some of our Peace Corps volunteers. These people are young—some of them are. They are young

416 WBZ—LINO

in spirit, but they have many older workers. It's one of the finest examples of American compassion to help people help themselves that we have ever had.

I don't know of any responsible American today, gentlemen, that says the Peace Corps is a failure. I think that most of us know that it is a great success and it is an insult to call it a "haven for beatniks." That—well, all I can say is I wish he'd retract it.

Senator HART. Well he's got so much else to back off on.

Mr. PERRIN. Senator Humphrey, as our guest in Michigan today, I would like to ask the final question of you.

Your party's campaign literature states "Vote Democratic on November 3—the stakes are too high to stay home." Why should people vote Democratic? Why is that statement emphasized so much?

Senator HUMPHREY. It's my view that 30 years of economic and social progress is on the line in this election. The great programs that we have worked so hard to build, that we have talked about on this program—they are either going to be reaffirmed or they are going to be vetoed. Vetoing them means voting for Mr. Goldwater. To reaffirm them and say this is a plateau on which we will rebuild for a better America is to vote for President Johnson.

Then, our bipartisan foreign policy, gentlemen, is on the line in this election. Senator Goldwater has repudiated that bipartisan foreign policy on every tenet and every principle of it.

I think peace is on the line, because Senator Goldwater seems to think that force is the way you settle the problems of the world. We happen to feel that strength is important to the accomplishment of peace, but strength to be used to win the war, to win it strictly over war itself. We want a victory. We want a victory of winning the war against war. We want a victory of winning a victory for mankind, and we want a real victory of winning a victory for peace.

And this requires patience, perseverance. It requires reason. It requires the kind of dedication to the cause of a just and early peace that I believe we have seen in President Kennedy and we now see in President Johnson. These are the stakes in the election.

Senator HART. And we want a man as Vice President, because Dallas is fresh enough in our minds to recognize the quality of Hubert Humphrey.

Senator HUMPHREY. We need to take this seriously, because November 3 is not just election day. November 3 is citizenship day. On that day, the citizen is sovereign. He will determine whether we go forward or backward. I think we are going forward with President Johnson, Neil Staebler here, Philip Hart.

Mr. PERRIN. Gentlemen, it has been a most informative visit. Thank you very much.

La Crosse, Wis.
Mary E. Sawyer Auditorium
October 24, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Governor Reynolds. Thank you for your gracious and warm welcome once again to this beautiful State of Wisconsin. I am so very honored to be greeted at the airport and here by my friend and colleague, your former Governor, and now your U.S. Senator, Gaylord Nelson. [Applause.]

I know that our other colleague in the Senate, who stands for election in this year 1964 would like very much to be with us, but he's busy campaigning elsewhere, and I surely hope that the people of this Third District, this community of La Crosse County, are going to give William Proxmire their strong support for reelection in this coming election. [Applause.]

Might I add that we are very pleased to know that in this, the Third Congressional District of Wisconsin, we have on the Democratic ticket a candidate for Congress that is respected throughout all of this fine community, that is known not only as a great Democrat but as a fine, outstanding citizen. I am very proud to be able to say a word of support for and a word of friendship for a wonderful man that I believe can serve this district with honor and integrity and ability. I refer to my friend and yours, Harold Ristow. [Applause.]

417 WBZ—LINO

And may I add that we also have with us candidates for the State assembly. We also have with us today your La Crosse County candidates that I have had the privilege of meeting on the Democratic ticket.

And we have on this platform one of my longtime friends in Wisconsin that was most helpful to me in a little political exercise that I once indulged in in this State about 4 years ago. I want to say that Charles Dahl would make a fine State senator. [Applause.]

But I do think that your interest is not only on your legislative and local races, even though they are very important, because government in this country is not in Washington—it is in Washington and Madison, and in the La Crosse County Courthouse, and at the city council and at the assembly, all up and down the many levels of government.

I am particularly pleased to note when I come back to Wisconsin the renewed support for a courageous and for a hard-working government, and I want to say that nothing would be more gratifying to the President of the United States or to his associate in this campaign, Hubert Humphrey, than the election of John Reynolds as Governor and Pat Lucey as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Wisconsin. [Applause.]

Well, it's good to be back with friends and it's mighty good to see this fine group of young musicians before me. I want to thank them so much for entertaining this audience while we were on our way here from the airport.

While I mention our young friends and young people, might I say that the enthusiasm which young people show in this campaign for their respective candidates is one of the most gratifying aspects of the whole experience. I have traveled from one end of America to the other, from the west to the east coast, from the North to the South, throughout this great Middle West, and I find high school students, grade school students, college students, all deeply interested in the outcome of this election.

The yare eager; they are enthusiastic, and they are hard working. And might I add a suggestion at this point? That in the next few days, our young friends can do something for their country that is even more important than any enthusiastic shouting or any enthusiastic handicapping that they may indulge in. And we all do it. Campaigning is filled with enthusiasm. It is filled with all of the partisanship that you would expect. This is healthy. This is normal. This is the way it ought to be.

But I say to the young people that are here today, and there are some of you, which gratifies me and pleases me much, make yourself a sentinel or guardian of democracy in your home between now and November 3. You would be surprised, my dear friends, how many of our adults, that are all too willing to be critical of their government, are also all too willing on election day not to pay any attention to their citizenship responsibilities.

The privilege of voting in America is a privilege second to none. And this right to vote and this privilege to vote that is ours is meaningless unless it is exercised. And I hope that our young friends here, the sons and daughters of the parents of this community, will make it their business to see to it that their mothers, their fathers, their brothers or sisters of age 21 or over, that these fine adult citizens of your family and of your neighborhood, that they are voters on November 3.

I think you have a right this time to ask your elders to do this for you. Because the decisions that will be made between now and the next 4 years are decisions that are going to affect the lives of every young boy and girl, every young man and woman in this audience, and it's really going to make the difference between peace and war.

They can make the difference between education and noneducation; they can be the difference between economic progress and economic stagnation.

And I do feel that regardless of how you may feel about the candidate—and we have people here of both political parties—may I say that you have an obligation, even more than anyone else, to see to it that the candidate of your choice has a spokesman in your house, and you be that spokesman and you speak up for whom you believe in and

418 WBZ—LINO

you ask your parents to weigh carefully the arguments, the platforms, and the qualifications of the men and the woman that seek public office in this State and in this Nation.

If my young friends will do this, you will be doing something for your country that is the highest form of good citizenship and all of us will applaud you.

I think it would be a good idea now if the adults gave these young people some encouragement. [Applause.]

You just want to do a good job, now, and we are going to talk a little good, solid politics, and we are going to talk about our Government. We are going to talk about our country, because when you get right down to it, between now and November 3, our country is making the greatest decision of this decade, the decision as to what philosophy will govern us, will motivate us, the decision as to which of these two men that are seeking the Office of President will be elected.

And I think that it is important that everybody think clearly and think—may I say—deeply about this decision.

Senator Goldwater wants—no, we don't boo. We do not boo our opposition. We cheer. We may feel sorry for the opposition but we don't boo.

Senator Goldwater once said, speaking at Monterey, Calif., in the month of May 1964, the following words—and I say about the Senator that he is a man of sincerity. You may not agree with him—and I don't on many things—but I have never doubted his sincerity.

He said, "By our votes, you can judge us, not by our talk." I think that is a very fair standard, and we owe Senator Goldwater a great deal for having stated that standard of political measurement. And I want to see how he votes and let's judge the candidates by how they vote and let's judge by performance and not by promises.

Let's just take a look, for example, at where we were 4 years ago. A brave and courageous man, intelligent and gifted young man, stood on the steps of the Nation's Capitol in Washington, being inaugurated as President of the United States.

He took that oath of office. He pledged himself to the fulfillment of constitutional responsibilities, and he said to us, "Let us begin." He said to us, "Let us get this country moving again."

Here was a man that welcomed the responsibility of the most awesome burden of public life, the Presidency of the United States. Here was a man that saw an America that was in its third recession in 8 years, and it was. Here was a man that said, "Let's get this country moving again." And he called in everybody, regardless of party, to join hands together to see if we couldn't, somehow or other, energize our economy. Because our unemployment was up to 7 and 8 percent of the total work force. Our plant capacity of industry was unused, as much as 15 percent.

America was not fulfilling its full capacity for jobs and for production, and what happened? The President of the United States didn't merely say, "Let us begin." He gave us a program and he laid down one bill after another before the 87th Congress and then again before the 88th Congress.

And as a result of those measures, I think it can be said without contradiction that America moved further ahead in the past 44 months in terms of economic progress than at any other time in its history.

As a matter of fact, my friends and neighbors of Wisconsin, never in the history of this country have there been 44 months of continuous upswing in the economy. Never has there been a period of 4 years in which there was not at least some recession or some drop in production or gross national product—never, never, except now.

And under the Kennedy-Johnson program, it's a fact—not a political statement, but a fact—that for 44 consecutive months our country has moved forward economically. [Applause.]

More jobs—the highest employment in the Nation's history. More profits—the highest profits for business in the Nation's history. In fact, an increase in net profits for American business in 3½ years of \$13 billion. The highest dividends—the stock market in the last 11 months has increased in value by \$100 billion. The gross national product—which is the sum total of our production in services and goods—has increased \$125 billion.

419 WBZ—LINO

And when you hear the opposition complain of costs and of expenditures, I want to remind them that America today is the most prosperous Nation on the face of the earth, that America today has an increase of \$125 billion in production, \$100 billion in value on the market, and billions and billions of other dollars.

This is a fantastic growth rate—double what it was in the preceding 8 years.

We kept our promises. John Kennedy said to you and to me we must move again, we must begin, we must get this country moving. We must attack unemployment. We must get our factories back into production.

I left Detroit today and I noticed on the billboard that Detroit has produced this year over 6 million automobiles. It will produce as many as 7.5 to 8 million by January or by December 31, 1964. Unprecedented—the first time in the history of this country that the automobile industry has had 3 consecutive years of increased production. [Applause.]

And how did it happen? First of all, they encouraged enterprise. The White House today is open not only to the farmer but to business, not only to business but to the farmer and the worker, to the student and the teacher. The White House has become the people's house. The White House is conference house for every element of American life.

The President of the United States seeks to unite us. He seeks to encourage us, to inspire us to do better.

Investment tax credit—\$11.5 billion tax cut.

Area redevelopment, public works, expansion and increase of the minimum wage, the doubling of the activities of the Small Business Administration—my fellow Americans, is it any wonder that some of the leading bankers, industrialists, and businessmen of America that traditionally voted Republican have now declared their support for the Democratic administration and for the reelection of President Johnson? [Applause.]

Now, let us move to an area that is very critical for this part of our America. We, in Minnesota, and you, in Wisconsin, are deeply concerned about the prosperity and the progress of our agriculture. And agriculture has had a difficult time keeping pace with the rest of the economy, not only now but throughout our history.

Agriculture, in a real sense, has subsidized America. The American farmer has produced more food at lower prices than any other agricultural producer in the world. He has been generous to a fault with everyone else. And one of the reasons that America is as prosperous and as great and as strong as it is, is because of the family-farm system in this Nation and the sacrifice of the family farm and farmer and his family for the American economy. [Applause.]

Senator Goldwater, as I said, speaks clearly and especially candidly. He said—and I think we should respect his statement—“I favor placing agriculture back under the law of supply and demand with provisions for farmers hit by acts of God” (Los Angeles Times, Sept. 21, 1960).

He also said in his book “The Conscience of a Conservative”: “There must be prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program.” And I will say for Mr. Goldwater, he meant every word of it because his votes prove it.

He has voted against the dairy industry at every opportunity. He has yet to cast one vote for a dairy program in the U.S. Senate. On every occasion, he has voted “no.” And any dairy farmer that needed any cooperation from his Government never received it from a vote of the Senator from Arizona.

He voted against the emergency feed grains program on two occasions. He voted against America's conservation programs on two votes in 1962 and 1963. He voted against the wheat program, the cotton program, the corn set-aside program, the price-support program for basic crops, and he voted against the food-for-peace program, the food-for-peace program that has done more to relieve human suffering than any act of our Government, that has been designed to use the bounty of our fields to feed the hungry, to develop markets, to provide economic standards to people that desperately needed it.

420 WBZ—LINO

So, Mr. Goldwater has kept faith with his statement. He said that the farmers should be left to the free market. He said let him be back under the law of supply and demand—a noble thought if everybody else was there. But do you think anybody else is?

The utility that feeds a city is entitled by law, under Federal and State law, to a reasonable return on its investment. And the Federal Power Commission or your State utility commission sees to it that that is the case.

The telephone company, the finest in the world, none better than our telephone system, but it is entitled by law to protection of reasonable rates so that it can be a solvent, self-sustained enterprise.

The airline industry has had subsidies for years, the merchant marine, and there isn't an industry in America of any consequence that doesn't have some tariff protection.

So, Mr. Goldwater says:

Let the farmer be ruled by the rule of the jungle. Let him be thrown to the wolves. Let him be thrown out into the open market of law, the law of supply and demand.

But he says for the rest of us, "Oh, no."

Well, now, I'm of the opinion that if Mr. Farmer is going to have to stand alone, then we ought to have equal standards for everybody. But the truth is that Mr. Farmer shouldn't stand alone. He is a part of this community. He is a part of our country and a vital part. And what we have tried to do since 1933 is to find ways and means to help that farmer improve his marketing, ways and means to help that farmer to improve his price, ways and means to help him to better living.

There is nothing wrong with this, my friends, any civilized country on the face of the earth has that obligation. And everyone knows it. Yet, the Senator from Arizona, who openly professes that he knows nothing about farming and then proceeds to say let the farmer be the victim of the law of supply and demand, which would do what to him—let every farmer in Wisconsin understand that it would mean that farming economy, according to your own State university, your own land-grant college—would be cut in half. Every farmer in this State would be the victim of a depression.

And we long ago learned, any of us that have a little gray in our hair, we long ago learned that depressions are farm fed and farm led, and we don't intend to have Mr. Goldwater be President to start another depression in rural America. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, there is yet another issue which is key, very central to this State, and this part of America. The goal of America is the "land of opportunity" and it should be. The goal of this administration is to expand those frontiers of opportunity, opportunity for everybody, equal opportunity to the best of our ability to make it equal, opportunity regardless of race, color, and creed. This is the commitment of the American public, but opportunity is meaningless unless it is opportunity fortified by education. Education is the wisest investment of the people in a community.

Education is the power of the 20th century, and education is a minimum, absolute necessity for every young man and young woman for the future. There isn't a chance for a young man or a young woman to make anything out of his or her life without the benefit of a high school education or a technical school education or a college education, or at least, some college education.

And these young people are growing in numbers. By the year 1970, a majority of our population will be under 25. We are going to have to double our college classroom space in the next 35 years. We are going to have a tremendous job of providing over 100,000 new classrooms for our elementary schools in the next 5 years.

Mr. Goldwater should know this. He is a parent, as I am. He has lived in local government, as I have. Yet, what is Mr. Goldwater's view on education? I quote it to you as he said it in Jacksonville, Fla., and I wouldn't want to do him a disservice, so I read it exactly as he said it:

The Government has no right to educate children. The parents, you and I, have that responsibility, and the child has no right to an education. In most cases, the children get along very well without it.

That was July 8, 1962.

421 WBZ—LINO

Ladies and gentlemen, a man that feels that a child has no right to an education in America has no qualifications for being President of the United States. [Applause.]

What's the history of education in our country? As early as the Continental Congress, 1785, before our present Constitution, the Continental Congress set aside land in every township in the Northwest Territory for public education.

During the Civil War, when our Nation was being torn apart, even then, Congress took time to enact the Land-Grant College Act, after which college act, Congress gave us the University of Wisconsin and we in Minnesota, the University of Minnesota.

Then, there was the GI bill of rights after World War II that helped over 10 million veterans, gave technical or vocational higher education.

What's Mr. Goldwater's record on education? He has been true to his statement. I respect him for being consistent, but I deplore his consistency because it would be catastrophic for America if it became public policy.

He voted against any aid for the construction of medical schools, dental schools, professional schools. He voted against any aid for school construction or teachers' salaries or the operation of schools. He voted against increasing the school lunch program, even though the population of our schools since 1950 has increased over 40 percent. He voted against providing loans and scholarships to help thousands of needy students who ought to be attending college. He voted against the extension and the expansion of vocational education, even though we know that school dropouts are one of the major problems confronting our Nation and we know that every boy and girl, every young man and woman, must have some kind of technical or vocational training.

He voted against the Public Library Services Act that would bring library services to those smaller communities and help bring good books to 61 million Americans.

He voted against the National Defense Education Act. He voted against aid to higher education. And right here in this community of La Crosse, your own State college will receive aid to higher education under a bill enacted by the Congress of the United States.

But Mr. Goldwater's vote would have provided no college dormitory, would have provided no help to your higher educational facilities. So, Mr. Goldwater meant what he said when he said no child has a right to an education.

Senator Goldwater, I disagree with you. The citizenship of the United States places an obligation upon this Government to see to it that we do have education. Education above everything else is a community responsibility. Education is a Government responsibility in a democracy and any presidential candidate that doesn't understand that is unfit to be even a candidate, much less a President of the United States. [Applause.]

I think it would be better if you said, "We want an education."

Now, we just improved on one of the themes. There is much to talk about. But time does not permit it.

I want to talk to you in this audience about the role of this Government in the field of social welfare. Again, Mr. Goldwater is very frank. I repeat, I respect him for his frankness but I disagree with him.

He has said that the Federal Government should withdraw from programs of social welfare, of public housing, of education, of agriculture, of assistance to the elderly. And if he were elected President, that is exactly what would happen. This is exactly why many people in the United States of America are deeply concerned over the Senator's views on social security and other aids to our unemployed, our needy, and our elderly.

His voting record on the problems of senior citizens, however, is crystal clear. In session after session during the time of his incumbency as a Senator, he has voted against every constructive, common-sense proposal to help our older citizens enjoy a more meaningful, healthful, and worthwhile life.

He voted against Federal aid to housing for the elderly on four occasions. Yet, my fellow Americans and my good neighbors, in every major city of America, the problem of housing of our elderly

422 WBZ—LINO

is disgraceful. And, thank goodness, that some of these cities are beginning to respond through private enterprise, through cooperation between private enterprise and municipal government and Federal Government, and you see in city after city now these new apartment areas that are called senior citizens housing projects.

How did they come about? By action on the part of your Congress and your Government. And may I say, this is not only action on the part of Democrats. I do not stand here to claim all of this for one party. In fact, the late Robert Taft, U.S. Senator from Ohio, was one of the staunchest advocates of the Federal housing program. And the former Senator from Indiana, Mr. Capewell, Republican, was one of the first to support housing for the elderly.

It hasn't been just Republican or Democrat. It hasn't been a contest between Republicans and Democrats. It has been and is in this election a contest between most Republicans and most Democrats, and Mr. Goldwater. [Applause.]

Mr. Goldwater not only voted against housing for the elderly, he voted against creating disability protection and insurance under social security for our totally disabled.

He voted against increased Federal funds for aid to dependent children and for those who were on old-age assistance. He voted to deny a man or woman on old-age assistance the right to earn \$50 a month without having deductions made from your old-age assistance checks.

I want to say, my dear friends, that is pinching a penny pretty tightly. When you can deny a person who would like to add a little income to an already very small pension, when you would deny them the right to add \$50 a month, I say that you're denying freedom to that man and that woman and you're hurting them in every possible way.

And yet, the Republican nominee did just that. He voted against medical care for the elderly, not merely under social security, which is a highly controversial issue, but in the Senate of the United States, over 90 percent of the Senators—9 out of 10—voted for the Kerr-Mills bill, which would have provided aid for those that were needy, those that couldn't possibly pay their own hospital bill. Nine out of ten Senators, 90 out of 100, voted for it, but the Senator from Arizona voted no.

He said, "You can pay your own bills even if you have no money." How that goes, I don't know. [Applause.]

He voted against increased research for heart disease, cancer, for the diseases of the elderly. He voted against the restoration of funds for research on housing for the aged. He voted against legislation for new hospital construction, for more medical schools, more doctors and more nurses.

He just voted against anything that was brought up. That seems to be the record—anything that related to the care of the elderly people. [Applause.]

I ask my friends who are here today to examine this record. It's not good enough, however, to recite merely the yesterdays. We need to ask what of the future.

I predict that if you give us the chance, if you give President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey a Democratic Congress, if you give us an opportunity to lay down a program for you, the 89th Congress can be—convening this coming January—will be remembered as the Congress to establish a commonsense, sound, long-overdue plan for prepaid hospital and nursing home insurance under social security for every man and woman aged 75 and over. [Applause.]

The Goldwaterites have said that most of the aged are better off financially than the younger people. They can easily pay their medical bills. Well, let's try a little experiment.

Think of three people who know who are over 65. The odds are that two of those three will soon have an annual medical bill of approximately \$1,000 or \$1,200. Can they afford it after age 65? The income is the lowest, the jobs opportunities the least, the duration of illness the longest, the cost of hospitalization the highest. And surely, in America that is primarily young, and this America will have over 75 percent of its people, by the year 1970, under 55 years of age—that American that is young and vital ought to be able to

423 WBZ—LINO

provide decency and dignity for the American senior citizen, and if you let President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey be your leaders in the year 1965, and for the next 4 years, we will give you just that kind of a program.

My friends, I leave you. I must go to my home city of Minneapolis. It has been a joy to be here with you. I'm sure that you know, as I know, that the election campaign is soon drawing to a conclusion. For this, we may all be grateful. I ask you, however, to do once again some thinking about the problems of peace and war, the future of our country. I ask you to help us build on the platform of progress that we have made these past 30 years. I ask you to help us keep the peace, keep America strong, and keep working for a more humane society, both at home and abroad. Thank you.

Minneapolis, Minn.
DFL Bean Feed
October 24, 1964

SPEECH PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

I return to Minnesota—to this great Democratic-Farmer-Labor bean feed—with a message of joy and good news.

The Democratic Party is headed for an overwhelming victory on November 3. And the Democratic Farmer-Labor candidates in Minnesota are on the same victory trail.

But this historic victory still depends on you. Every registered voter has the solemn duty to make that trip to the voting booth on Tuesday, November 3.

There is no greater privilege available to a free people. There is no duty more sacred than the full exercise of this privilege.

In the opening speech of my campaign for the Vice-Presidency, I said the Democratic Party brought to the American people a record of accomplishment unparalleled in modern times.

As assistant Senate majority leader, I was privileged to work with President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson in building this record.

Democrats should be proud of this record. Americans should be proud of this record. And we are.

We know that performance—not promises—is the test of a political party. And we have kept our promises.

We are proud of the \$11.5 billion tax cut—it provides 80 million taxpayers with a 20-percent decrease in their taxes.

We are proud of the nuclear test ban treaty—it cleans the atmosphere of radioactive fallout and takes us a step closer toward peace.

We are proud of the Civil Rights Act—it proclaims that there is no room for second-class citizenship in America.

We are proud of the Economic Opportunity Act—it signifies our determination to banish poverty from our land.

We are proud of the college aid bill—it provides urgently needed assistance for the construction of new college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

We are proud of the Vocational Education Act—it increases by millions the number of students and teachers in vocational schools.

We are proud of the Library Services Act—it insures library facilities for 61.5 million people who do not have local libraries.

We are proud of the Hospital Construction Act—it provides funds for construction and modernization of hospitals and health centers in urban areas.

We are proud of the mental health bill—it establishes local mental health centers for research, training, and treatment.

We are proud of the Mass Transportation Act—it provides grants and loans for local transit facilities.

We are proud of our record in agriculture—the feed grain program works—farm income is up—surpluses are being reduced—we are exporting more food overseas—REA has been strengthened—reclamation and irrigation projects are going forward.

We are proud of our record in conservation—the wilderness bill—the land and water conservation fund—new national parks and seashores were established by the 88th Congress.

424 WBZ—LINO

During the past 4 years, President Kennedy and President Johnson dedicated every effort toward building a better America and providing for a more peaceful world.

We believe the record of the Democratic Party under the Kennedy-Johnson administration demonstrates its fidelity to the ideals of the past, its responsibility to the challenges of the present, and its commitment to the opportunities of the future.

We are the party of hope. We are the people of faith. And we do not run from problems—we regard them as opportunities.

During the next 4 years we will face staggering challenges and unparalleled opportunities.

We have the opportunity to banish hunger throughout the world.

We have the opportunity to make America the land of first-class citizenship for all our people.

We have the opportunity to make machines the servants—not the masters—of men.

We have the opportunity to create new jobs and achieve full economic development in a nation growing at the rate of 3 million persons a year.

We have the opportunity to make our cities decent places in which to live.

We have the opportunity to destroy poverty in America forever.

We have the opportunity to provide security and dignity to our elderly. And this is not merely an opportunity; it is a moral obligation.

We have the opportunity to improve and expand our educational system to train and prepare our youth for life in the age of science, automation, and technology.

These are the opportunities and the goals of President Johnson's Great Society.

These are the goals of the Democratic Party—a better America—where there is opportunity for the young, security for the elderly, compassion for the afflicted, and peace for all mankind.

And what does our opposition offer? Rather than accept the challenges of the future, they are making plans to destroy the accomplishments of the past. The leader of the Goldwater party has proposed the following:

The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs * * * from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal * * * I do suggest that we establish by law, a rigid timetable for a staged withdrawal.

This is not the voice of a loyal Republican or true conservative. In his heart, Senator Goldwater is a radical in the true and basic meaning of the term.

A true conservative wants to conserve the best of the past—Senator Goldwater wants to pull everything out by its roots.

Senator Goldwater seeks to weaken social security—if not destroy it entirely—by making it voluntary.

He seeks "prompt and final termination" of farm price support programs.

He seeks to sell TVA "even if they could only get a dollar for it."

On three great issues of conscience to come before the U.S. Senate in the past decade—the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy, the nuclear test ban treaty, and the civil rights bill—Senator Goldwater voted no on each occasion.

Senator Goldwater and his followers say we are losing our freedom. I suggest the 20th century American has more true freedom than any individual ever had in any society in history.

Choice is the foundation of freedom and never in our history has the individual American had the range of choices and the capacity to choose that he has today.

We must, however, be ever vigilant to insure that the torch of freedom is not extinguished—that the frontiers of freedom are persistently and patiently extended.

425 WBZ—LINO

We know that a man cannot be fully free if he is ill-housed, ill-fed, or ill-clothed.

We know that a man cannot be fully free if he works 10 or 12 hours a day for starvation wages.

We know that a man cannot be fully free if he faces his later years in poverty and insecurity.

We know that a child cannot be fully free if he grows up in an urban or rural slum, or receives an inadequate education in overcrowded or ill-equipped schools.

We know that true freedom is achieved only in a society where each and every person has an opportunity to develop his native capacities to the fullest.

It is to insure this kind of freedom that modern, positive, enlightened government has acted at every level—local, State, and National.

It is not a question of the Federal Government against the States, or counties against municipalities, but one free people joined in common cause to give new and richer meaning to that glorious word—"America."

But these visions of a Great Society—these commitments to build a better America—are for naught unless we preserve the peace.

No problem has demanded more time and attention of President Kennedy, President Johnson, and the Congress of the United States than taking constructive initiative in the cause of world peace.

In the past 4 years we began anew to formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms.

We began anew to focus the machinery of our Government on the question of peace and arms control—by establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

We began anew by establishing the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, foreign aid, the trade expansion program, the hot line to Moscow, and matching funds to support the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

We began these initiatives with full knowledge that world peace will never be achieved by any single act—any single agreement. But—to quote President Kennedy—we understood that "peace is a process—a way of solving problems."

The history of our era has taught us that peace is best preserved through strength—strength used with restraint, with wisdom, and with a clear sense of perspective.

In 1961 President Kennedy and the Democratic Congress acted decisively to insure that our strength would be preeminent—that our balanced military power could deter or defeat any foe in any foreseeable situation.

Our enemies know this—and so do our allies.

But President Johnson also knows that it is easier to destroy than to build. He knows that it is easier to make war than to think, persuade, construct, and act responsibly in this nuclear era.

President Johnson knows—and we know—that responsible action is the only sure path to peace. And he knows that mankind yearns for a world where peace is more than just an interval between wars. For he knows that the next war will be the last war.

President Johnson has pledged himself to work for the growth of freedom and the survival of mankind. Listen to his words:

* * * As long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace. That peace is much more than the absence of war * * * If the strong and the wealthy ignore the needs of the poor, frustrations will lead to force. Peace, therefore, is a world where no nation fears another, and no nation can force another to follow its command.

President Johnson will honor that pledge.

Our opponents ask, "Why not victory?" We reply, "Why not victory, indeed?"—victory over war itself, victory for peace, victory for mankind.

This is our cause. This is our commitment.

We ask your help.

426 WBZ—LINO

Minneapolis, Minn.
Bean Feed at Hippodrome,
October 24, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Governor. You taught me the lessons of frugality. When I see that this program is on television, I just hate to see us waste any time at all, you know.

What a wonderful, wonderful audience. What a wonderful crowd we have here tonight. I know that if our President could see this great meeting in the Hippodrome in Saint Paul, he would feel as I do, that happy days are here again. [Applause.]

Governor Rolvaag, Senator McCarthy, Secretary Freeman, our Minister and Ambassador, Eugenia Anderson, and my distinguished colleagues in Congress, whom I will introduce a little later on in this program, and my good friends, fellow citizens and fellow DFL-ers, I hope you know how I feel tonight. How wonderful it was to step off that airplane out here at Wold-Chamberlain Airport and once again to breathe this invigorating, good, fresh, crisp air of the State of Minnesota. Believe me, it made me feel good and it makes me want to campaign 24 hours a day from now on. [Applause.]

First of all, may I say that my Muriel is very sorry that she cannot be here tonight, but we were invited to come to the 49th State of Alaska, and they had a choice up there, and I hate to tell you what they decided. The national chairman said, "You can have either Muriel or Hubert." And they said, "Stop. We'll take Muriel." And she, tonight, is in Anchorage, Alaska, addressing there a dinner of the Democratic Party.

She has 24 meetings between now and the 29th day of October, when she will join with me on the west coast. She goes from Alaska to Hawaii—poor girl. I don't believe she has a single meeting over there. But, anyway, she told me she had.

With her tonight on this tour is on our own national committeewoman, Gerri Joseph. I thought you would like to know that Minnesota is well represented.

Today, we have been in Detroit and La Crosse, had four meetings in Detroit, a couple of airport speeches, a nice meeting at La Crosse, Wis., and now here today. And next week, more of the same.

But let me tell you quite frankly I feel good physically. I feel even better politically, and I just have a suspicion that things are going to come out all right. [Applause.]

I bring you a message of joy and good news. You may remember that commentator some years back that said, "Yes, there is good news tonight." The good news? The Democratic Party is headed for an overwhelmingly victory on November 3 and the Democratic Farm Labor Party in Minnesota is headed for the same thing. [Applause.]

I think that the best party organization in any of the 50 States, and everybody knows it, from President Johnson down to any precinct worker in any of the 50 States of this Union, I am proud of its leadership, proud of its program in Minnesota. [Applause.]

But as our Governor has said, and rightly so, this victory will depend on each and every one of us, every registered voter, and we have many more than in other days all over this land. Every registered voter has a solemn duty and the high privilege to be at that election box, in that election booth, on November 3. There isn't any greater privilege available to a free people and there is no duty more important for the future of this land than to make sure that on November 3, the party of hope and the party of progress—the Democratic Party—has the greatest victory in all of its history. [Applause.]

Tonight, in my opening speech for the Vice Presidency right here in the Twin Cities, I said that the Democratic Party brought to the American people a record, a record of accomplishment unequaled in modern times. And I repeat that truism, because the 87th and 88th Congress, under the Kennedy-Johnson administration, will go down in the history of this land as the two most productive Congresses in modern days.

427 WBZ—LINO

As the assistant majority leader in the Senate, I was privileged to work along with our late and beloved President Kennedy, and with President Lyndon Johnson, with my esteemed colleague in the Senate, Senator McCarthy, and with all of these four DFL Congressmen to help build that record that we talk of tonight. And the Democrats should be proud—yes, proud—of that record, and Americans, I'm sure, are pleased, very pleased, with that record. And we ought to be, because performance is the test of political leadership.

And I say on this platform tonight that we have met that test and we have met it with honor and met it well. [Applause.]

Let me cite the record just sketchily. We are proud as Americans of the \$11.5 billion tax cut, the greatest in the Nation's history, that provides to 80 million taxpayers a 20 percent decrease in the taxes and a substantial increase in their spendable income.

We are proud and justly so of the nuclear test ban treaty because it cleanses the atmosphere of radioactive fallout and it was a major step toward world peace. And we are proud, gratefully and humbly proud, of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that proclaimed the end, for once and for all, of second-class citizenship [applause] the end of second-class citizenship in this land and it fulfills 100 years later the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation, and we are proud—justly so, may I add, of the Equal Opportunity Act, the antipoverty program, because it signifies the determination of the American people to banish poverty for once and for all from this blessed land of ours. [Applause.]

And permit me also to cite the college aid bill. It provides urgently needed assistance for the construction of new college classrooms, libraries and laboratories for our ever-increasing college population. [Applause.]

And we are also proud of the Vocational Education Act that brought us the most important Vocational Education Act in the history of this country because it will prepare and provide for an increased number of students and teachers in our vocational schools to give our young people an opportunity for skilled and gainful employment. [Applause.]

We cite for your attention the Library Services Act, another major advance in the field of education. It insures library services to 61 million American who today have no libraries. It provides the extension of cultural life to every area of America.

And we can be proud, too, of manpower training, reemployment, because in the Manpower Act, we permitted those who were the victims of unemployment and automation to once again be trained for new jobs and new opportunities.

We are proud, Congressman Blatnik, and Senator McCarthy, of the Area Redevelopment Act to which both of you gave so much of your attention in designing, and may I say, in providing jobs and investment and industrial expansion in areas of chronic economic distress.

We did not forget those who were in need. We kept our word. [Applause.]

We are proud of the expanded Hospital Construction and Nursing Home Act because it provides for expanded programs of better hospital care, of construction and modernization of hospitals and health centers in urban and rural areas.

And above all, we are proud of a Congress and an administration that took note of those afflicted by mental retardation and those in need of better care for mental health.

We are providing for the first time at a national level a broad program of care and treatment for those blessed souls that are the victims of mental retardation and mental disorder. What a great, compassionate act this is. [Applause.]

Nor have we forgotten our cities with housing and mass transportation, providing grants and loans to rebuild cities, providing grants and loans to modernize transit facilities.

And, Secretary Freeman, we owe you a debt of gratitude for your leadership, courageous and determined, in the field of agriculture. [Applause.]

It is a record that was accomplished with hard work and with wisdom and patience. The feed grain program that pours millions of dollars of new income into this great breadbasket of America—it's a program that works for the farmer, for the consumer, for the taxpayer.

428 WBZ—LINO

Farm income is up, Mr. Citizen, and surpluses are reduced. We are exporting more food and improving our commercial markets. Rural electrification has been strengthened. Reclamation and irrigation projects are going forward.

Farm credit has been modernized and increased. The school lunch program and the school milk program expanded to meet the needs of increased school population. And the food stamp program, which was once a pilot project, is now a national program. [Applause.]

Yes, my fellow Minnesotans and my good friends, this is a record of work, of leadership, and it's not all. Because we are proud of our record in conservation: the wilderness bill, the land and water conservation fund, new national parks, and the preservation of seashores—all for a growing America—were established under the leadership of the late President Kennedy and President Johnson and a Democratic Congress. [Applause.]

And then may I add, we have had the greatest burst of prosperity and economic growth in the Nation's history—44 consecutive months of uninterrupted economic progress—the longest in the history of this Nation—44 months of ever-increasing jobs, profits, business, dividends, wages, consumer income, per capita income—no other administration in the history of this Nation has ever had such a great record of economic progress.

I come home as a public servant to report to you and I am proud to say we have been faithful to our trust. This is our record of promises kept and performance achieved.

President Kennedy and President Johnson have dedicated every human effort toward building a better America, a more just America, an America of greater opportunity and of providing a more peaceful world.

The record of the Democratic Party, under the Kennedy-Johnson administration, demonstrates fidelity to the ideals of the past, responsibility to the challenges of the present, and commitment to the opportunities of the future.

We are a party of hope. We are the party that cares. We are the party with a heart. And we are the people of faith. And we do not run from problems or apologize for them. We regard every problem as an opportunity and every day as a challenge. [Applause.]

And during these next 4 years, we will face staggering challenges and unequalled opportunities. Let me just list a few of them for you:

We have the opportunity to banish hunger from the face of this earth. We have the opportunity to make America the land of first-class citizenship for all its people. We have the opportunity to make these fabulous machines of automation our servants and not our masters. We have the opportunity to create jobs and achieve full economic development in a nation growing at the rate of 3 million persons a year.

And we, here in Minnesota, my fellow citizens, have the opportunity for economic growth and expansion if we will but work together and cooperate together. And permit me to say once again that I sincerely believe that the adoption of the so-called taconite amendment is in the interest of this State, in the interest of its economic development. [Applause.]

We have the opportunity of seeing the necessity of making our cities livable and decent places in which to live, and we do have the opportunity to destroy poverty in America forever.

We also have the glorious opportunity to provide security and dignity to our elderly, and this is not merely an opportunity, my friends. It's a moral obligation and it's an obligation that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and a Democratic Congress will keep and fulfill. [Applause.]

We have the opportunity to improve and expand our educational system to train and prepare our youth for the life of science and automation and technology. And, indeed, to prepare our youth for these programs of social justice and social advance which should be the guideline of a free people.

These are the opportunities and the goals of President Johnson's "Great Society." These are the goals of the Democratic Party—a better America, where there is opportunity for the young, security for the elderly, compassion for the afflicted, and peace for all mankind. [Applause.]

429 WBZ—LINO

And now, what does nor opposition offer? Rather than accept the challenges of the future, they are making plans to even destroy the accomplishments of the past. The leader of—or should I put it this way—the temporary leader of a fraction of the faction of reaction—yes, this temporary leader of the Goldwater party has proposed the following as his creed:

The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs, from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal.

This is a man who wants to run the Government by dissolving it. [Applause.]

But, my fellow Americans, this is not the voice of a loyal Republican or a true conservative. The late Senator Robert Taft was known as Mr. Republican when I went to Congress. He rejected the Goldwater interpretation of government. Senator Taft supported and sponsored public housing in the National Housing Act. He supported Federal aid to education. He supported urban renewal. He supported social security and its expansion. He supported farm cooperatives. He voted for and supported REA. He supported foreign aid.

But Senator Goldwater rejects all of this. He repudiates his party. He is neither a Republican nor a Democrat. GOP used to stand for "Grand Old Party." Now, it means to millions of Republicans "Goldwater, Our Problem."

Yes, I repeat, the Senator from Arizona surely is not a Democrat. He surely is not a Republican. Then what is he? He is a radical, if you please. [Applause.]

A true conservative wants to conserve the best of the past. But Senator Goldwater wants to pull it up by its roots. Senator Goldwater doesn't seek to strengthen social security. He seeks to destroy it, or weaken it.

He seeks prompt and final termination of farm price support programs. He seeks to sell the TVA "even if they could only get a dollar for it." [Applause.]

But more importantly, on the three great moral issues or the three great issues of conscience to come before the Senate in this past decade, the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy, the nuclear test ban treaty, and the civil rights bill, Senator Goldwater has had no conscience on these matters. He has voted no on each occasion. [Applause.]

The Senator says we are losing our freedom. He says the Federal Government in Washington is a greater enemy to freedom than Moscow. What shameful disrespect of our Government. What shameful disrespect of our Constitution.

Let me say that freedom of choice is the foundation of freedom. And never in the history of an individual American has the range of choices and the capacity to choose been greater than it is today.

The modern American has freedom to move and travel freely, to worship in a church or synagogue of his choice, to speak and write as he chooses, to meet and assemble and change jobs or residence. He can vote for the party or the candidate of his choice. He is a free man, protected by the law of our land.

We know that we must be ever vigilant for this freedom and that the frontiers of freedom should be persistently and patiently extended. But we also know that a man is not fully free if he is ill-housed, unemployed, ill-clad, and ill-fed. He is not fully free if he works at less than decent wages—starvation wages.

A man is not fully free if he faces the later years of his life in poverty and insecurity, and a child is not fully free if he grows up in an urban or a rural slum, and he is not free if he receives an inadequate education in an overcrowded or ill-equipped school.

But the expansion of freedom has been our business and we have tended to that business. Over the past 30 years, freedom in America has been advanced through social security, through better education, through collective bargaining, through economic expansion and through our war on diseases and poverty.

Freedom becomes real and meaningful when the right to vote is protected and used and when the Constitution applies equally and impartially to all citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed. And this freedom we have protected. [Applause.]

430 WBZ—LINO

We are one free people, joined in a common cause to give rich, new, and richer meaning to that glorious word on the lips of every child, "America." But these visions of the Great Society, these commitments that I speak of to build a better America, are meaningless—they are for naught—unless we preserve the peace.

The late and beloved President Kennedy reminded us that peace is a process, a way of solving problems. He and the other great peacemakers of history have told us again and again that peace is not achieved by the wishing. Peace is the product of sacrifice, dedication, and strength.

Peace, like a beautiful cathedral, is constructed block by block and stone by stone. It's a noble work of today, and of the tomorrows, and it demands our finest efforts and our constant devotion.

And for the past 25 years, bipartisanship in foreign policy has been the solid rock in our pursuit of peace. For the first time since World War II, my fellow Americans, our bipartisan foreign policy of national security is challenged, and it is threatened by a presidential candidate. This challenge threatens the processes of peace, endangers the peace. And this challenge to the peace must be rebuked by the American people on November 3. [Applause.]

No problem has demanded more time and attention of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Johnson in building the steps in the cause of peace. In the past 4 years, we began anew to formulate serious and precise proposals, not only to win the arms race, but more importantly, to win the peace race. We offered serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms and established the Arms Control Agency. We established the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, revised our foreign aid, the Trade Expansion Act. We initiated the hot line between Washington and Moscow. We strengthened and have supported on this, the anniversary of the United Nations—we have lent our support, and unstintingly, to that great organization for world peace in its peacekeeping operations. [Applause.]

We began all of these initiatives with full knowledge that world peace will never be achieved quickly or by a single act. As President Kennedy said, "Let us begin." And President Johnson said, "Let us continue." [Applause.]

And continue we shall. But history teaches us that peace is best preserved through strength—strength with restraint—strength used with wisdom and with a clear sense of perspective.

And I stand before this great audience to tell you tonight that never has America been stronger. We have built such a massive force of strength that it is the wonder of the world. Our balanced military power could deter or defeat any foe in any conceivable situation. Our enemies know this, and so do our allies, even if the Senator from Arizona does not. [Applause.]

But President Johnson knows, and I know, and you know, that it is easier to destroy than it is to build. It is easier to talk about using force and issue ultimatums than it is to think and to persuade and to construct and to act responsibly in this most dangerous of all ages, the nuclear age.

President Johnson knows, and we know, that responsible action is the only sure path to peace, and he knows that mankind yearns for a world with peace. And he knows that peace is more than just an interval between wars. For he knows, and you know, that the next war will be a catastrophe for all of mankind—indeed, it may be the end of God's creation.

President Johnson has pledged himself to work for the growth of freedom, peace, and the survival of mankind. Listen to his words—this is our pledge to you:

As long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace. We know that peace is more than the absence of war. If the strong and the wealthy ignore the needs of the poor, frustrations will lead to force. Peace, therefore, is a world where no nation fears another, and no nation can force another to follow its command.

President Johnson will honor that pledge, and I, as his associate, will honor it with him.

431 WBZ—LINO

Our opponents ask us and ask you, "Why not victory?" We reply, "Why not victory, indeed?" Yes, real victory, victory over war itself. That's the victory we seek. Victory for peace for all mankind, and victory for humanity. This is our cause. [Applause.]

This is our cause and our commitment. And with your help and with divine providence—the guidance of divine providence—I say to you that we, the American people, shall succeed. This we ask you to do with us—help us. Help us win this struggle for humanity.

The decision day is November 3. I ask you what will be your decision? Will you help us? [Applause.]

Now, may I take this moment to show you others that will help us. We have on this platform tonight not only my esteemed colleague in the Senate, but we have Members of the House of Representatives who are with us: John Karth, from the Fourth District; John Blatnik, from the Eighth District; Don Fraser, from the Fifth District; and we have on this platform tonight our candidate for Congress from the First District, George Daly; Charles Simpson from the Second District; Richard Parish, from the Third District; Ben Richterman, from the Seventh District.

These, my fellow Americans, are all soldiers in the struggle for the promotion of social and economic justice and the cause of a just and enduring peace.

I am honored to be with you and I say to you that on November 3, there will be good news in America: Lyndon Johnson will be reelected as President of the United States. [Applause.]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, WASHINGTON, D.C.,
OCTOBER 25, 1964 (FOR RELEASE OCTOBER 26, 1964)

THE DIMENSIONS OF FREEDOM, 1964

On this day of contemplation and prayer, it seems appropriate to reflect on perhaps the most precious gift with which our Creator has endowed us—the gift of free will—the gift of liberty.

As Thomas Jefferson said, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." In 1964 the American people must decide how best to retain that God-given liberty—and how best to extend it in a meaningful fashion in a society far more complex than any dreamed of by Jefferson.

We have been told by Senator Goldwater that President Johnson and the Democratic Party neither understand the meaning of freedom nor value it. We are allegedly letting it slip from our grasp through inaction and lethargy. We have been told by Senator Goldwater that he has a special love and understanding of freedom—that he alone can keep the torch of liberty ablaze.

We reject—as the great majority of Americans will reject—the foolish and arrogant notion that any man or group has a special role as keeper of the torch of liberty. Indeed, the great genius of the American people has not been the discovery of freedom, but in broadening its blessings to our people, regardless of race, religion, or color, and in broadening freedom into the realm of social and economic opportunity.

We are not losing our freedoms.—On the contrary, the 20th-century American has more true freedom than any individual in any society in history: freedom to get a better education, freedom to find a better job, freedom of knowledge about the world, freedom to enjoy cultural pursuits, freedom of mobility—physical, social, cultural; and freedom from the prison of dogma and prejudice.

Choice in the foundation of freedom, and never in our history has the individual American had the range of choices and the capacity to choose that he has today.

But we cannot afford to become lax or smug. We must be ever vigilant to insure that the flame of freedom is not extinguished, that the frontiers of freedom are persistently, patiently extended.

What strange methods of maintaining our freedom Senator Goldwater and his followers urge upon us. These oversimplified approaches are neither grounded in reason nor founded on experience. They are in contradiction to the whole American heritage—all that

432 WBZ—LINO

we have learned, all that we have become, all that we hope to be. They demand the closest kind of scrutiny.

Freedom is not preserved by gagging those persons whose views differ from our own.—A society which cannot tolerate the dissenter, the questioner, the challenger, is neither free nor strong. As Judge Learned Hand said, "That community is already in the process of dissolution where orthodoxy chokes dissent." This Nation is strong enough, the fabric of our society is tough enough, "to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it."

Freedom is not preserved by turning our backs on tomorrow.—It is fashionable today in American politics to look back with a touch of nostalgia to the good old days when the simple life still prevailed in this land. We hear a great deal about the need to recapture the simple and direct approach of our ancestors to solving our contemporary crises and challenges.

In this stampede to the past it is generally forgotten that every generation has had its share of complex problems and crises. Read any period of our history and the lesson is always the same: Democracy in America is a difficult business. In fact, man's eternal struggle to govern himself is the most demanding of all human endeavors. This is just as true today as it was in the golden days of some unidentified past.

Every generation has heard its false prophets pleading for a return to the glories of yesterday, only thereby to sacrifice their right to participate in the building of today and tomorrow.

The world turns—and, like it or not, we turn with it. Man's eternal quest—the search for justice and peace—can only be fulfilled by the patient, unremitting application of free and creative minds to solving the problems which divide men and nations.

Freedom is not preserved by dismantling the Government, as Senator Goldwater has proposed.—But we have not lost our freedoms to a rapacious Central Government. In fact, many of our contemporary freedoms were made possible only by the mutual collaboration of people and government united in the common sense cause of securing the national interest and promoting the general welfare.

Franklin D. Roosevelt believed that "the only sure bulwark of continuing liberty is a government strong enough to protect the interests of the people." Senator Goldwater's philosophy of government is directly at odds with this concept. He has written:

The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs * * * from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal * * * I do suggest that we establish by law, a rigid timetable for a staged withdrawal.

Senator Goldwater fears that such laws threaten us with an irretrievable loss of our liberty. Yet our American experience—our tradition, our history—is clear on this point: progressive and constructive laws do not restrict men but liberate them:

Our banking laws have given the people faith in the safety of their savings.

Our laws on proper labeling of foods and drugs have given people greater safety and confidence.

Our legislation establishing minimum wages, decent treatment of workers, and collective bargaining have given people opportunity and security and these people have responded with a faith in our Government and free economy to a degree unknown in any other nation.

Our laws providing for education for the young and our programs helping to construct educational facilities and provide scholarships and loans have given us the priceless gift of expanding educational opportunity and a scientific and technical competence that is the marvel of the world.

The list is endless. The efforts of responsible government have always been toward the liberation of human potentiality.

Liberty is, after all, a "beloved discipline." In Daniel Webster's words, "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraints."

In 1964, as in all the years before, it is wise restraints that make men free.

433 WBZ—LINO

To Lyndon B. Johnson and his supporters freedom means what it did to Franklin Roosevelt a generation ago: the freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear.

The Democratic Party of 1964 reaffirms these "essential human freedoms." John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson sought to implement these freedoms which lie at the heart of our democracy. When we passed a civil rights bill, an economic opportunity act, a college aid bill, and tax reduction legislation, we were preserving the ancient freedoms in the light of modern conditions. We were, in the words of the Founding Fathers, "securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

In 1964, on this Sunday morning, we commend this wisdom and this faith in democracy to our countrymen.

Chicago, Ill.
October 26, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Just 8 days remain before Americans decide whether Lyndon B. Johnson or Barry Goldwater will determine the destiny of this great land for the next 4 years.

Let me ask you *the* basic question: Are you going to vote for Lyndon Johnson?

From my travels in every section of America, I find the same answer—the people want Lyndon Johnson to lead America in these perilous times.

And the people are absolutely correct.

These times demand a leader who is responsible and constructive. These times demand a leader who creates unity from division and consensus from conflict. These times demand a leader who pursues his duties as commander in chief with responsibility and restraint.

And America has that leader in Lyndon Johnson.

America cannot risk the leadership of a man who scorns the path of moderation and restraint—a man who sows the seeds of disunity and discord even within his own party—a man who misunderstands totally the nature of today's world.

By every standard of American life, Senator Goldwater is a radical—he preaches and practices the doctrine of radicalism.

He seeks to destroy the social and economic achievements of the past generation—and that is radicalism.

He seeks to—

Destroy social security by making it voluntary.

Destroy programs to help rebuild our cities.

Destroy the TVA.

Destroy programs to assist our schools.

Destroy job security for union members.

Destroy programs to help the unemployed.

Senator Goldwater, in short, is the candidate of destruction.

He distorts the past, misrepresents the presents, and misunderstands the future.

As the Republican Governor of Pennsylvania put it: Goldwater has—

too often casually prescribed nuclear war as a solution to a troubled world.

Governor Scranton continued:

Goldwaterism has come to stand nuclear irresponsibility * * * Goldwaterism has come to stand for being afraid to forthrightly condemn rightwing extremism * * *. In short, Goldwaterism has come to stand for a whole crazy quilt collection of absurd and dangerous positions * * *.

This condemnation by Governor Scranton has been confirmed a thousandfold in recent weeks.

Look at the type of campaign the Goldwaterites have waged.

434 WBZ—LINO

The American people have a wide range of tolerance for campaign extravagance. But they also have a deep sense of dignity—a deep sense of fairplay—a deep sense of right and wrong.

And on November 3 the American people are going to vindicate the restraint Lyndon Johnson has displayed during this campaign. They will vindicate his refusal to reply to the vile charges leveled against him. They will vindicate his wisdom and courage in fulfilling the office of President of the United States—and the magnificent way he carried forward the torch of liberty and freedom born so nobly by our beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Almost exactly 4 years ago this gallant warrior in the cause of freedom spoke in Chicago about America's efforts to restore liberty to the peoples of Eastern Europe.

John F. Kennedy said:

Our task is to pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny—a policy that looks toward evolution, not revolution—a policy that depends on peace, not war * * *. We must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.

This policy, stated by John F. Kennedy in 1960, continues to be the policy of this government.

Let me make it clear: only a political charlatan can talk of instant victory over communism—or instant “liberation” of the captive peoples held in Communist subjection.

We cannot imitate those of an earlier era who talked grandly of “liberation”—but when the Hungarian people rose in heroic revolt, stood mute on the sidelines.

No, the possibility of instant victory vanished with the coming of the era of instant annihilation. We must pursue the more challenging course, the only sane course, of devising a policy that will achieve freedom without obliteration—not only for the peoples of Eastern Europe, but for all peoples wherever tyranny and dictatorship rule.

We are convinced that time is on the side of freedom. We are completely confident that these peoples will be restored to the family of free nations.

The United States has initiated a new and constructive policy toward the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe. We have recognized the deepening divisions of the Communist camp. We have encouraged these divisions. And we have made use of these divisions for helping these brave people regain their freedom and independence.

We seek peace and freedom not only for the peoples of Eastern Europe but for mankind everywhere.

This is our cause. This is our sacred duty.

In the great tradition of Pope John XXIII and John F. Kennedy, President Johnson has asked that we look beyond the cold war which has “consumed our energies” and “often limited our horizons.”

While remaining strong, he understands we must strive to overcome—the obstacles to man's efforts to build a great world society—a place where every man can find a life free from hunger and disease—a life offering the chance to seek spiritual fulfillment unhampered by the degradation of bodily misery.

President Johnson knows it is easier to destroy than build. He knows it is easier to make war than to think, persuade, reconstruct, and act responsibly.

President Johnson knows—and we know—that responsible action is the only road to peace. He knows that Americans—and most people on this planet—yearn to build a world where peace is more than an interval between wars.

To those who ask “Why not victory?” we reply: Why not victory indeed—victory over war itself, victory for peace, victory for mankind?

This is our cause.

This is our commitment.

435 WBZ—LINO

Chicago, Ill.
State and Madison
October 26, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mayor Daley. May I say once again what I said on the occasion of my visit here about a month ago, that there is no city in America that has a finer, a more progressive, a more honorable, a more able, a more effective mayor than Chicago in its Mayor Daley? [Applause.]

And what a wonderful day we are having today. I have good news for you, my friends. It looks like a Democratic victory on November 3. [Applause.]

And that victory is not just for President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey, but that victory is for the entire Democratic ticket in this State, headed by your splendid Governor, your good friend, and I know he will be reelected, Otto Kerner, of the State of Illinois. [Applause.]

Well, I must say that the people of Chicago surely look good. Wonderful city, this beautiful, magnificent Chicago, the city of effort, the city of vitality, the city that is going places and the city that is the pride of the Democratic Party—Chicago, Ill. [Applause.]

You know, dear friends, it's such a joy to be on this platform with my beloved colleague in the U.S. Senate, a man that served this city with courage, a man that's served his country with unbelievable courage, a man that stands in the U.S. Senate as the symbol—not only as the symbol but the living embodiment of intelligence, integrity, courage, and ability—one of the finest men that ever came to public office, and indeed, one that honors your State and this Nation, my friend and your Senator, Paul Douglas. [Applause.]

And I am very honored and pleased to have on this platform today, and I hope you will permit me just to single out—because this fine young Congressman was kind enough to me to be willing to stand up in the Democratic convention and second my nomination—I want to publicly thank Congressman Rostenkowski for what he has done for me. [Applause.]

And lest we forget, and I am a team player, I am a Democrat without prefix or suffix and without apology, and I am here to say that you can't go wrong by electing this ticket, headed by Otto Kerner, your Governor, Sam Shapiro, your Lieutenant Governor, Paul Powell for secretary of State, my friend Mike Howlett, your auditor of public accounts, and your attorney general, Bill Clark—William Clark. [Applause.]

And don't forget, dear friends, there are members of this party on the county ticket, too. And Cook County needs Democrats, because Cook County and Chicago are going places and the place that they are going is ahead. They are moving forward in this great city for more jobs, for better prosperity, for better schools, for better communities. That's the kind of a city that we love. And that's the kind that makes America the America that we are proud of. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, let me take a few moments of your time for serious discussion of the politics of our day, because in 8 days, the American people are going to make a fateful—indeed, the most important decision of this decade. We are going to determine the destiny of this great land, not just for 4 years, because the decisions that are made in this next 4 years are going to determine the destiny of America for a decade or a generation. There is no turning back once that decision is made.

Once you have selected your President, you cannot repeal it. He is there for 4 years, and indeed, those 4 years can be years of peace or of war, years of prosperity or depression, years of going forward or going backward. It's in your hands on Tuesday, November 3—no one else's.

It's on that day that the American people will determine the kind of an America that they want and the kind of a world that they are going to have.

So let me ask you this question and let me get your response. Are you going to vote for Lyndon Johnson on November 3? [Applause.]

436 WBZ—LINO

Well, I'm glad to get your point of view, because I thought you would like to know that in my travels in over 40 States in this land, that is exactly the way the majority of the people felt. They are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

And why are they going to vote for our President? They are going to vote for him because they know that we need a leader who is responsible and who is constructive. These times demand a leader who can unite us and not divide us, who can heal our wounds and not open them, who can build consensus and not conflict. These days—perilous days—demand a leader who pursues his duties as the Commander in Chief of the greatest power on the face of this earth with responsibility and restraint.

Yes, the American people are going to vote for that kind of a man and they are going to vote for President Lyndon Johnson, not only because he is that kind of a man, but because they are fearful of the man that is his opponent and his irresponsibility. [Applause.]

That is it, this State and this Nation—does it want a man in the White House who scorns the path of moderation and restraint? They don't want a man who sows the seeds of disunity and discord, even within his own party. He can't get along even with his own, much less others. They do not want a man who misunderstands the nature of our world, the world in which we live. By every standard of American life, every standard that we know, the history of our country, the temperament of the people of today and the needs of tomorrow, by every standard of American life, the Senator from Arizona is neither a Republican nor a Democrat. He is a radical, a radical. [Applause.]

And he preaches and practices the doctrine of radicalism. He would repeal and destroy the social and economic achievements of the past generation—yes, the past 30 years. And anyone that would pull up by the roots that which we have planted and nourished these 30 years, anyone who would destroy what we have achieved through painful effort, and may I say with proud achievement, over the past 30 years, can only be classified as a radical. He neither agrees with his own party nor ours. I have said from many a platform and I repeat it here that I hope that the good Democrat mayor of Chicago will forgive me, but I have voted from more Republican measures than the Senator from Arizona.

I am a better Republican than he is and I am a Democrat. [Applause.] I don't know whether that is a compliment but I do know that that is a fact.

Ah, my friends, why do I make this serious charge? I charge this man nothing in his private matters. I know the Senator from Arizona. I do not dispute his loyalty or his patriotism. I do not make snide innuendoes about his private matters or his private life. I think he is a good family man. I am sure he is. But let me say, even though I think he would make a good neighbor, I think he would make a bad President. We don't want him. [Applause.]

Yes, this man seeks to destroy or seriously weaken our social security system and he can deny it all he wants to, but he voted against including disability under social security. Not a cripple in this audience, not a single disabled person in this State, would be receiving 1 nickel of social security benefits had Senator Goldwater's vote been the majority. Thank goodness, he has neither a majority in his own party nor in ours. He stands out there in his loneliness. He stands out there in the icy cold of his own argument, forlorn and lost, and no friend, no friend in need, and he will have fewer of them on November 3. [Applause.]

And, Mr. Mayor, this Senator that is on the opposition ticket—not the Republican ticket—the Goldwater ticket. It's a special breed unto itself. This man that is on that ticket has never voted once to help your city or any other city. He would destroy the programs of urban renewal. He votes no.

He would destroy the programs of housing. He votes no. He would destroy urban development. He votes no, unless it's for Arizona.

Oh, well, that's different. [Applause.] One billion dollars for central Arizona, not a nickel for Chicago or downstate Illinois, not 1 penny.

437 WBZ—LINO

He would destroy—I'm not giving him that. It's just because I'm revealing his record, that's all.

He would destroy the programs to assist our schools. He would destroy job security for union members. And any union member that votes for Senator Goldwater ought to know what he is doing. And if he is elected, he will deserve what he gets. [Applause.]

He would destroy the programs to help our unemployed. He would destroy the programs to aid our elderly. He has voted against every single program for the elderly, for the housing for the elderly, for medical care for the elderly, for hospital care under social security for the elderly. Anything that has to do with old people, for their dignity, for their care, the Senator from Arizona says, "No, no, no."

QUESTION FROM AUDIENCE. How about freedom?

Senator HUMPHREY. And he says no to that, too. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, I was afraid he wasn't going to come in with that line. You know, we had that fellow hired out there and I thought he was shirking his duties. Give him an extra dollar. [Applause.]

Now, friends, there is a man on the opposition ticket that has, he says, support for the business community. Oh, he says he is a great friend of free enterprise. And my dear friends, when the biggest measure before the Congress was there, the test measure as to what you would do for free enterprise, the tax cut bill that was the biggest tax cut in the Nation's history—\$11.5 billion—may I say when that tax cut bill was there, the Senator from Arizona voted no. He voted no for the businessmen of America. He voted no for the consumers of America. [Boos.]

Sometimes it takes an awful lot of screaming and gnashing of teeth to bring people within the confines of the party of progress. Give him a chance. He will come in. This poor fellow is just in agony as he confesses his political sins. [Applause.]

Blessed be those who return to the fold. [Applause.]

Now, friends, look here. I noticed in one of your papers in this city—I read them all so I enjoy more than others—I notice that this morning's paper carried a little story that says as follows: "The \$11.5 billion income tax cut will bring \$610 million to the Chicago area residents when it becomes fully effective next year," the Treasury reported; \$610 million of economic aid, \$610 million of spendable capital coming to the people of Chicago under a tax cut, initiated by President Kennedy, passed by a Democratic Congress, signed by President Johnson. And the Senator from Arizona said "No, no." [Applause.]

Well, my friends, that is an expensive candidate. That is an expensive candidate. This we can't afford.

Now, let me cite just another two or three items and then we will proceed to have our luncheon in the spirit of happy democracy. I think that I ought to quote now just a little bit from some of our Republicans because, you know, really, the best arguments today are not between the Democrats and the Goldwaterites. They are between the Republicans and Goldwaterites.

The Republican Governor of Pennsylvania—and he is the Republican spokesman of the Middle Atlantic States—here's what he said. I wouldn't have said it quite this way, because I think he is pretty harsh, but maybe he knows the Senator from Arizona better than I do. He says:

Goldwater has too often casually prescribed nuclear war as a solution to a troubled world.

Then he went on and said—this is Governor Scranton—Governor Scranton, Republican:

Goldwaterism has come to stand for nuclear irresponsibility. Goldwaterism has come to stand for being afraid to forthrightly condemn right-wing extremism. Goldwaterism has come to stand for a whole crazy-quilt collection of absurd and dangerous positions.

Those are the words of condemnation of a spokesman of the Republican Party.

May I say that when these Republicans begin to tell the truth on each other, it's so interesting. [Applause.]

438 WBZ—LINO

Now, my friends, on November 3, the people of America are going to vindicate the restraint and the sense of decency and responsibility that President Johnson has displayed during this campaign. I think that people are getting a little tired of the vicious assaults upon the intelligence of the American people by the opposition. I think the American people will vindicate President Johnson's refusal to reply to the wild charges leveled against him. They will vindicate his wisdom and courage in fulfilling the office of the President of the United States. And may I say this just shows the mayor is bipartisan.

And I think the people will vindicate the magnificent way that our President has carried forth the torch of liberty and the torch of responsibility and freedom borne so nobly for 1,000 days by our late and beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. [Applause.]

Today, I was presented a little placard, a streamer here that had badges from seven ethnic groups. The charming young ladies are on this platform—Polish, Puerto Rican, Filipino, Chinese, Italian, Mexican. This is a part of America. This is the beauty of our land.

These ethnic groups are the ones that the Senator from Arizona and his partner calls the minorities that would rule us. These are the ones that they speak of with disparaging remarks.

Let me say to this wonderful audience that President Lyndon Johnson and Senator Hubert Humphrey, and the Democratic Party, we love the fact that America is made up of many peoples, many races, many creeds, many ethnic groups, many religions, to make America a great country.

Yes, America is like a mighty symphony, beautiful symphony. Each part of it has something to do and to play in the life of this Nation. We are proud that America is, in fact, a nation of many, many nations. We are proud that America is these United States of many peoples, and the Democratic Party is committed to the protection of people without regard to race or color or creed or national origin.

We think of our people as Americans, citizens of this Republic. [Applause.]

Almost 4 years ago this day, Mr. Mayor, a gallant warrior in the cause of freedom spoke here in Chicago about America's efforts to restore liberty to the peoples of Eastern Europe—the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the East Germans, and all the others, just to mention a few. John F. Kennedy, loved in this city, loved in this America—John Kennedy said then, and it remains our commitment now in the days to come:

Our task is to pursue a policy of patiently encouraging freedom, and carefully pressuring tyranny, a policy that looks toward evolution, not revolution, a policy that depends on peace, not war. We must never at any summit in any treaty declarations, in our words or even in our minds, recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe."

Ladies and gentlemen, that was the commitment of a President now taken from us. And may I say from this platform, as the spokesman of this administration, it is the commitment of President Lyndon Johnson and a commitment of the Johnson-Humphrey administration in the next 4 years. [Applause.]

Let me make it clear, only a political charlatan can talk of instant victory over communism or instant liberation of the captive peoples. We cannot imitate those of an earlier era who talked glibly of liberation, but when the Hungarian people rose in heroic revolt, they stood mute on the sidelines. No, the possibility of instant victory vanished with the coming of the era of the nuclear weapon, which is the era of instant annihilation.

We must pursue the more difficult and more challenging course, the only sane course, of divesting a policy that will achieve freedom without obliteration—not only for the peoples that are represented in part here and for all of Eastern Europe, but for all peoples everywhere where tyranny and dictatorship rule. We are convinced that time is on the side of freedom and we are confident that these peoples that I speak of today, living under regimes of dictatorship, will be restored to the family of free peoples and free nations if we pursue the policy of constantly pressuring those who subject them to dictatorship. [Applause.]

439 WBZ—LINO

Now, friends, we seek peace and freedom, not only for the peoples of Eastern Europe but for mankind everywhere. This is our cause. This is our duty. And in the great tradition of that blessed man of the church, Pope John XXIII, and in the tradition of our fallen President John Kennedy, President Johnson has asked that we look beyond this cold war, which has consumed our energies and often limited our horizons.

He asked us to look to a life offering the chance for spiritual fulfillment, unhampered by the degradation of bodily misery.

President Johnson knows it is easier to destroy than to build. He knows it is easier to make war than to think or to persuade or reconstruct and act responsibly. He knows there are no instant answers to these great problems.

My dear friends, it is dangerous enough to have the Communist Chinese with an atomic bomb. It would be unbelievably dangerous to have the Chinese Communists with an atomic bomb and Senator Goldwater with his finger on the nuclear trigger. This we can't take. [Applause.]

So I leave you with this. To those who ask this question, "Why not victory?" We reply—and we reply, I think, in words of sanity and responsibility: "Why not victory, indeed?" Why not victory, my fellow Americans, over war itself? Why not victory over poverty? Why not victory over ignorance? Why not victory over prejudice? Why not victory, my friends, for peace? And why not victory for America for all of mankind?

This is our cause. This is our pledge, and we ask you on this day—we ask you that on this day, from now until November 3, every thoughtful, decent person make up their minds to back the candidate of responsibility, the candidate of social progress, the candidate of peace.

And that candidate is President Lyndon Johnson, the next President of the United States. [Applause.]

Chicago, Ill.
Luncheon
October 26, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

* * * I say you have something to work for, you have something to fight for. I have a list here of all these fine Congressmen here in this great Chicago area. Everyone that is an incumbent deserves to be reelected and everyone who isn't ought to have been elected before, so let's get on the job and get them in. I see that Syd Yates has given up diplomacy and decided to come back in with the folks. Glad to have you back, Syd. [Applause.]

If you think that United Nations was something, you just wait until you get through with this campaign. I don't need to give you any lecture on the virtues of the Democratic Party. We are here for, one, the final quarter, so to speak, in this historic battle between the forces of backwardness and the forces of progress.

I do think there are at least two major propositions that are on the line and we ought to know what we are fighting for as well as fighting against. I think we do know what we are working against and fighting against.

The best campaign that the Democratic Party has going for it are the statements of Senator Goldwater. We can't beat that. They are great. This is a man that not only doesn't understand the present and has no idea about the future, but he is even mixed up on the past. [Applause.]

Somebody said not long ago, "You shouldn't expect too much from a candidate that has a calendar with no months, that has a watch with no hands, and glasses with no lenses." [Applause.]

But I suppose that is sort of the snide remark that a man ought not to say too often, but it's true, too true to be even funny. We have been building in this country since the days of the New Deal a social and economic order that is based upon opportunity for anyone that wants to do a good job for himself and his country and a social order that came of both human dignity and social justice. That is what the fight is all about. We have been trying to translate into political action truly some of the great philosophical truths.

440 WBZ—LINO

And one of those reasons that I have been willing to be a fighting Democrat at times, even to the dismay of some of my friends, is because I believe in what our party stands for.

I believe that Franklin Roosevelt was right. I think he was a great President. I not only believe in the New Deal, I know that it was life itself for the Nation, for my family and for anybody else that wants to be honest about their predicament.

I believed in the man. I believed in his program. I believed in the cause of our party. And I have no apologies for the work that was accomplished and the work that was undertaken and even at times in those days of the 1930's and the early 1940's. And let me tell you that that man was followed by another great man and history will record as surely as my name is Hubert Humphrey and you are here, that one of the most forceful, one of the most courageous, one of the most patriotic, one of the great Presidents of our country, was that man from Independence, Mo., Harry Truman. [Applause.]

And when I hear the opposition talk about our Nation and our security program and I hear them talk about communism and all that sort of thing, I want them to remember and I want us to remind them, even after the election, because these people ought to learn the truth, even if they are slow learners and they will have to take a couple of weeks after the election—I want them to remember that the reason there is a free world today, the reason that the Communist power didn't run all over Western Europe, was because there was a brave, basically honest, intelligent conscientious man in the White House who, in that period from 1945 to 1952, during his period of administration of this Government, mobilized the forces of the free world, backed up by American power and American wealth and American strength to stop the tide of communism. That was Harry Truman.

I also want us to remember that during the 8 years of Eisenhower, the Democratic Party wasn't like our Republican neighbors. We were not opposition for the sake of opposition. We didn't sit around with programs of character assassination and attack, for the sake of attacking. We recognized that we had a bipartisan foreign policy. We recognized that this Nation had responsibilities at home and abroad. And wherever we could, we supported the programs and the policies of the administration, even as headed by a Republican President.

In fact, may I say, we improved many of those programs?

And Lyndon Johnson, as a majority leader, taught the United States Senator that the first duty of a man in public office is to love his country and to be a patriot and to be responsible. And that is the way we acted. [Applause.]

We had three recessions in 8 Republican years. I don't want us to forget that, either. It isn't any miracle to me why many of the businessmen are for us. American business is intelligent. American business is forward-looking. And a large number of great captains of America industry are for President Johnson, not because of a party label, not even because they may have left their own party. They are for President Johnson because the Kennedy-Johnson program has been the best economic medicine that America has ever seen. [Applause.]

And let me also say that even during those 8 years that we were out of power, a man from this State who was your former Governor, who was our nomination on two occasions, did honor this Nation and did honor to this party by speaking sense, speaking in terms of intellectual and personal integrity, speaking in terms of noble ideals, and he kept the Democratic Party a party of hope, party of ideals, and a party of progress. That is Adlai Stevenson. [Applause.]

I am proud that I have had a chance to live through this period and be in Congress—much of it—and how happy I am and how proud. And yet how sorrowful I am to have had the privilege of standing alongside of and working with, as one of his legislative lieutenants, the late and beloved President who, for 1,000 dramatic days, took this country to new heights, new heights of idealism and exploration and economic progress. That was our President, and we don't intend to let him down. [Applause.]

441 WBZ—LINO

If for no other reason you want to fight in this campaign, if for no other reason you redouble your efforts, remember this, that the attack that's being leveled upon President Johnson today is not just an attack upon President Johnson. It's an attack upon the program and the policies which were conceived and inaugurated and initiated by the late President Kennedy and President Johnson.

And I say to Mr. Goldwater and his crowd, if they want to fight it out on the basis of their backwardness and their reaction, and on the basis of our great leaders and our inspiration and our forward-looking program of the New Frontier, we welcome the fight and we will give them the licking of their lives. [Applause.]

So, let's resolve right here, we don't intend to let—as I said—this temporary spokesman of a fraction of a faction of reaction—and that is what he is—we don't intend to let that little clique that captured a political party, we don't intend to let them repeal what we are for and we don't intend to let them repudiate the very basic tenets of our foreign policy.

We don't intend to let them demean America by talking about how bad we are, how weak we are, and how we have sold out to this and sold out to that. In all my life, I have never heard a campaign of such vilification, a campaign that is so derogatory of everything that America stands for.

Let me tell you something, my dear friends. American young people are no worse today than they ever were. In fact, they are better, they are smarter, they are more decent. [Applause.]

And American workers work hard and they produce more goods and they produce better goods than ever before in the history of this country. And we don't need to be lectured by Mr. Goldwater about it, either. [Applause.]

And may I say to the Senator from Arizona, we don't need any radicals. We don't need any radicals from the left. We repudiated them a long time ago and they never captured our party. And we don't need any Commies and we don't need any Ku Klux Klans. We don't need any Birchites. We don't need these people. [Applause.]

I tell you all this because this is what we are fighting about. If you want this country to be turned over to the voices of hate, if you want to continue in America to let these voices of hate and bitterness and dissension have a respectable platform, you just lose this election, that's all.

I will tell you the tragedy of this campaign. It isn't the candidate himself. I am not going to attack Mr. Goldwater personally. I will say I disagree wholeheartedly with his political philosophy. I disagree with his utterances. I disagree with his political program—if I can find it.

But I will say this. What I do feel badly about is that, by his nomination, forces have at long last in America, forces that we never permitted to ever have a frontline position in this country before, are today out in front.

When the Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan can sit on the same platform with a candidate for President, something is wrong in this country. [Applause.]

When a candidate for President can say that the John Birch members are the kind of people that ought to be in American politics, something is wrong. We don't need that. [Applause.]

I thought we had gotten to a point where we had repudiated bigotry and prejudice. We, for once and for all, repudiated religious bigotry that denied a man the high office of the Presidency. We did that in 1960. Now, let's make sure that we repudiate every other form of bigotry. We don't need any candidate or any forces in American life gaining any sense of respectability that will deny our people, that will promote violence or hate, dissension or distrust. What have we heard as we have listened?

We have heard a constant barrage of verbiage that tells us that the Federal Government is a greater enemy to our freedom than Moscow, that tells us that there is an animosity between Federal and State government, that divides us on the basis of region, a candidate that whistles Dixie in the South and plays Yankee Doodle in the North.

I told those good southerners when I saw a sign that said Barry Goldwater, I said, "What he will do for Dixie will make Sherman look like a public benefactor." [Applause.]

442 WBZ—LINO

Now, my friends, if you need any more of a fighter, I guess you have got to get another fellow. [Applause.]

I have spoken sharply. I have spoken possibly too sharply for some, but this has been a tough battle. And we need to win this fight—not just for the Democratic Party. That would be enough for me, but we need to win it for our country. And we need to win it, more importantly, for the forces of decency in this country.

The Democratic Party has no monopoly upon wisdom or virtue. We have never claimed it. But I do know this, that there are millions of people who are not Democrats, that are thoroughly frightened and disgusted with the campaign of the opposition.

These people, my dear fellow Americans, are rising above party to vote for their country. They are rising above partisanship to be patriots. If they are willing to do that, and I saw an ad here in one of your papers, "Republicans for Johnson," my fellow Democrats, if people are willing to break with their party to help us, then you had better break every record you have ever had for hard work. Every voter that you leave at home is one of ours.

There is only one way to win. My dad told me early in life "most people are half as smart as they think they are, son, and you may be one of them." He said, "I have a simple solution for you. You just work harder than anybody else and you will make it as far as most people." [Applause.]

I have a formula for you. I am a bit of a pharmacist at heart, and the prescription I have for you is this: Believe in your candidate. Believe in your party. Understand the nature of the opposition. Make up your mind that what you plan on doing, anybody could have done. Therefore, you'd better plan on doing twice as much as you ever planned on doing." And anybody that isn't so tired on election night that he is ready to drop and look like a Goldwaterite when he is happy—anyone that isn't that tired on election night, that fellow or that lady that isn't that tired is one that didn't do their duty.

I hope to have a message come from Chicago that there has been mass prostration in the city. [Applause.]

And if I read that the emergency wards of your hospitals are filled with loyal Democrats who have fallen from fatigue and exhaustion, then I will know what Cook County is going to do. I will make sure that Cook County not only does well for President Lyndon Johnson—you see, if you do well for him, you get me, anyhow, whether you like it or not. [Applause.]

When we used to run that family drug store, we used to have two for one sales—buy one, get two. That's what we have here. You just go ahead and elect Johnson and I come along as a sort of bonus, or whatever you want to call it.

But we are not here just to elect Johnson. I would be derelict in my duty as a party leader and a spokesman if I didn't say that we are going to need Governors; we are going to need Congressmen; we are going to need legislators. We are going to need county organizations. Hubert Humphrey is an organization man. Don't you ever forget it. [Applause.]

I'll make a bet with you right now. I will bet my organization in Minnesota, and it's a good one, and we didn't build it by hope and by whistling—we built it by working. Mr. Mayor, I'll bet you the best dinner in Chicago or Minneapolis that after you have tallied that vote in your State and we have tallied in my State, I'll bet you that we have as good a percentage—not as America, because we don't have the population—but we'll have as good a percentage as you have in Illinois.

Now, I know that I'm talking to a real competitor. And I feel that if I just give him that extra little nudge, that's all it will take. [Applause.]

It's sure great fun to be a Democrat. I feel sorry for those other folks, I really do, but I want to tell you something. It's not fun to lose. I have tried it. It doesn't build your character one bit more than winning. There isn't a thing wrong with our character that victory won't help. And there isn't a thing wrong with this country that a Democratic victory won't help, and the center of the Democratic victory is right here in Cook County.

I thank you. Go to work now, and get that vote out. [Applause.]

443 WBZ—LINO

PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. I hope you will forgive me for having overindulged in a rather enthusiastic Democratic reception in Chicago.

But it is an experience that every good citizen ought to have and one that every Democrat longs for.

You are here for the purpose of a press conference and I am very happy to be with you.

So why don't we go without any further preliminaries?

QUESTION. How many States are you prepared to claim for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket next week?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Scherer, I would hope that we can claim enough for an electoral college victory. I think that we will have a very substantial majority of the States.

A guessing game on numbers is always a hazardous business. But I would expect that President Johnson would gain a very large plurality or majority victory and that we ought to carry better than two-thirds of the States.

QUESTION. It is a rather conservative estimate, isn't it?

Senator HUMPHREY. I thought with what my opposition has been saying, I should be rather conservative.

QUESTION. It was said at the beginning of this campaign, Senator, this was going to be one of the dirtiest in years. Do you think it is?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, this is the first national campaign that I have been in with the exception of some primaries. Those were friendly and hard hitting and clean cut.

The concern I have had over the campaign is that the opposition has yet to discuss a single program for America, with the exception of one. I want to be frank about it.

Mr. Goldwater, a month after—well, I should say several months after we voted on the tax bill which provided tax relief for everybody in Wisconsin, provides hundreds of millions of dollars of tax relief for the people of the metropolitan area of Milwaukee—several months after that, while he was flying over the desert, he decided he should be for a tax cut program. He was safe, because he wouldn't have any opportunity to do anything about it.

There has been no discussion on the part of the opposition of the issues. And when a political candidate refuses to discuss the issues, he generally indulges in the politics of desperation, and the politics of desperation generally gets down into some of the dirt.

We are not going to demean our country with that sort of talk. We think this is a very good country.

President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey have a great deal of faith in the American people. We believe that our prosperity is good for the people.

We believe that this country is a better country today than it was 25 years ago and 50 years ago.

We believe that our young people are healthier and better educated.

We believe that our workers are more skilled and better producers. And we believe that our businessmen are more socially conscious and better managers.

In other words, we think this is a great place in which to live.

I am sorry that Mr. Goldwater doesn't like it.

We do.

QUESTION. Senator, how do you feel Wisconsin is going?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, Wisconsin is showing all the signs of going strongly Democratic for President Johnson and for Governor Reynolds and for William Proxmire, for your State ticket.

I don't want to encourage any wagers, but in case you are doing any of it, that is a mighty good suggestion.

QUESTION. Senator, you said recently, we can expect another smear bombshell from the Republicans. Do you have anything specific in mind?

Senator HUMPHREY. No; I think we have been going through more of the same. I thought yesterday was a mighty good example of differences between the parties.

President Johnson spoke of education. He spoke of the need for expanding our educational facilities, of the need for providing greater opportunity for education to every young American that wishes to be educated.

444 WBZ—LINO

In the meantime, the opposition kept chanting those tired, worn-out old phrases of socialism and communism and moral degradation.

That is just about as old as the dinosaurs, and just about as lively, I might add.

QUESTION. Senator, the opposition has talked about the Walter Jenkins case. In light of this case, do you think possibly there should be tighter security measures and tighter security checks for Government employees?

Senator HUMPHREY. That matter, I think, is pretty well recognized as one of the—as a personal tragedy. It really and truly is.

I think any man of good heart and sympathy and Christian compassion understands that.

I personally feel that the matter has brought enough grief and anguish and pain to those involved so that the less said about it, the better for the family and the loved ones.

Insofar as the security is concerned of our country, I am the author of an act which established a National Commission on Security. That Commission was headed by the former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Wright, of Los Angeles, Calif.

A great deal was done under the work of that Commission. It was a civilian commission to examine our security laws and provisions and procedures and a number of improvements were made.

It is my view that we ought to always, constantly reexamine our security system. And when we find that there may be some difficulty, we ought to improve it.

But let me be very candid about it. Even the most strict police state has security problems.

Mr. Jenkins' case is not a security problem. It is a problem of health and of tragedy and of personal life.

J. Edgar Hoover made it quite clear that there were no security leaks involved. And I might add that I would take Mr. Hoover's word before I would take the word of a partisan that is desperately trying to be elected or one of his associates who is desperately trying to pick up the pieces of a debacle, like Mr. Nixon.

QUESTION. What is your reaction to the fact that some of the Republicans in the final days of the campaign seem to be centered around the fact that you are only one heartbeat away from the Presidency, if the Democrats win the election?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I am slightly flattered. We really are talking about whether it should be Mr. Johnson or Senator Goldwater for President.

But we are flattered that the Goldwater party has seen fit to center their attacks on me. I am serving a useful function for President Johnson. If they are tired of working on President Johnson, then they can work on me.

I don't believe anybody that knows Senator Humphrey believes these things and I think it doesn't bother me, but it ought to bother them.

One thing a man learns from life is how to live with himself. If he hasn't learned to live with his own conscience, how can he live with other people?

The only thing I can say to these people who indulge in these indiscretions, these innuendoes, these lies, all I can say is I hope they can sleep at night.

If they do, they are unusual people. They are doing very well.

I sleep very well. I love my country. I have no animosity toward my people. I think they are wrong politically. I think America is a great place to live. I don't think it is evil, I don't think it is corrupt. I don't think it is debauched. I think this is the finest place in the world.

If the opposition thinks otherwise, that is their privilege, or their unfortunate predicament.

QUESTION. Senator, Milwaukee is having difficulty now trying to keep its National League team here. What do you think?

Senator HUMPHREY. Now, you know that Minneapolis has an American League team and I never indulge in these jurisdictional disputes.

445 WBZ—LINO

Have you any ideas of how we can get a new pitcher?

QUESTION. No, I don't.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is really what we need.

QUESTION. What about the antitrust aspects of major league baseball? Any feelings on that, Senator?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am really not an expert on the legal aspects of baseball. I am very good on being a fan. I am one of the most enthusiastic fans, but when it comes to the laws about baseball, I am not half as good as I am at suggesting how to run the team. I am sort of a Monday morning—not quarterback, but what do you call it in baseball.

I am always good at knowing who they should have had pitching for the Minnesota Twins.

If you have one from the Braves, we would like to have him.

QUESTION. Thank you, Senator.

Racine, Wis.
October 26, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very, very much, my good personal friend, and your very distinguished, competent, and respected State senator, Lynn Stalbaum, who will be, without a shadow of a doubt, if you will get out and work, the next Congressman from this district. [Applause.]

I think Wisconsin's First Congressional District deserves to have a good, hardworking, competent, responsible, progressive Congressman, and Lynn Stalbaum is just the man for the job. [Applause.]

What a joy it is to be received. What fun it is to see many of my old friends, many new friends, to be here with me in the company of one of my colleagues of the Senate, a gentleman that I have been able to call friend for many years, your former Governor, Gov. Gaylord Nelson, new U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson, and also to be here on this platform with your county candidates, your candidate here for attorney general, Bronson La Follette, and also to say a word for the candidate for Lieutenant Governor, who I am sure with your help can be that Democratic candidate that is successful on November 3. That is my friend Pat Lucey for Congressman from the Fifth District.

Speaking about friends, let me tell you that when I got on this platform, the gentleman walked across the stage and said, "I have been looking for you, where have you been?"

I saw my old friend, George Molinaro, your assemblyman, I knew that I was home.

George, there isn't any doubt that you will be reelected. I don't even recall that you have an opponent. If you have, he ought to quit now and save money and time, because George is going to be elected. [Applause.]

I know that a good deal of effort has gone into this meeting. This is a difficult hour to hold a meeting of this size. Let me thank all those in this great community of Racine, Wis., that have gone to work to bring out this fine audience of fellow citizens, of representatives of your business community, your labor community, your agricultural community, and all these fine young people.

I am delighted. I am going to have a word with these young people in just a moment.

But I noticed on the platform here a gentleman who helped me so much some years ago, has been indeed my good friend, very active here in the UAW. I refer to Sam Risser, and Sam, I want to thank you. [Applause.]

Then I want to point to a man on this platform who literally gave up his time, his energy, and his life to me and his beloved wife, who is no longer with us, worked her heart out for Hubert Humphrey.

I am so grateful to Harvey Kitzman for all the help he gave me. [Applause.]

Harvey, look up there and you see, "UAW Welcomes Humphrey." Well, Humphrey thanks UAW and you.

May I thank also the distinguished gentleman who opened this program for us, Ken Greenquist, for his friendship and his support. [Applause.]

446 WBZ—LINO

On the way here from Milwaukee, we were driving—we were within the speed limits; that is the disadvantage of having the Governor with you. And he is a law-abiding citizen.

We were talking about Racine, talking about your neighboring community, Kenosha. We were talking about this whole area and somebody said to me, "You know, Humphrey, you had better remember, a lot of Scandinavians up around there."

And somebody else said, "You had better remember, there are a lot of folks there of Italian descent."

I said, "I know, and I am a sponsor of two bills in Congress to show that I am impartial, one for Columbus Day and one for Leif Erickson Day." [Applause.]

Like that old fellow said from down in Kentucky, when he was faced with a highly controversial issue, he said, "Half of my friends are for Leif Erickson, half of them are for Christopher Columbus, and I always stand with my friends."

So I think we are in good shape around here. And I do want to thank you.

Now, let me say a word about this man that is running for Governor. I am here to speak, of course, for our national ticket. But I am here to speak for our national ticket and I am here to speak for a man that follows a great Governor and has demonstrated, in his own right, that he, too, is a great Governor.

He is a fine son of a great father that was known and respected in this State.

This Governor of yours, Gov. John Reynolds, has earned for himself through courage, through leadership, through the willingness to stand and take a position even through at times, it was difficult—he has earned the respect of thoughtful people and of people who appreciate political integrity.

Governor Reynolds' bold program of granting property tax relief to the aged based on their ability to pay, is a new stroke of fiscal policy in America and it has been a policy that has attracted attention throughout the Nation.

He is the kind of Governor that leads rather than follows. [Applause.]

And speaking of leading, may I say that his courage in leading Wisconsin to new accomplishments in the care of mentally retarded is something that should be respected and honored by everybody, regardless of party.

I say it has marked him as a national leader in this field. And his farsightedness in fighting for the young people of this State in higher education, for better education—[Applause.]

This program of his has enabled Wisconsin to guarantee all of its children a good education regardless of where you may come from or regardless of economic status or of your wealth.

And his awareness of the needs of the workingman, his program for unemployment compensation improvement and workmen's compensation—I say that this marks this man as progressive, as a liberal, and as a forward-looking leader for Wisconsin. [Applause.]

And let me tell you now that President Lyndon Johnson, who will be the next President of the United States—[applause]—that President Lyndon Johnson wants to have as Governor in this State to work with him on education, on programs of mental retardation, on tax policy, on improvement of the social and economic conditions of this great State and Nation—President Johnson has asked me to tell you that he would like to see the people of Wisconsin reelect Gov. John Reynolds. [Applause.]

I gather you feel the same way. I will tell President Johnson. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, let me speak to you about this national campaign. First, let me say a word to our young friends here.

I hope you appreciate how much I appreciate your attendance. One of the most gratifying developments of this campaign is the friendship and the enthusiasm of our young students. I am ever indebted to you.

There are times when we become a bit weary, there are times when you can become discouraged. There are times when the campaign gets a little ugly.

447 WBZ—LINO

But then, all at once, you see young people—young people who are not afraid, young people who believe in their country, young people who seize the future and don't run away from it, young people who know that their government is a partner with them in their future.

And I asked every one of my young friends not merely to be a participant in a political rally, not merely to be here to cheer and shout and give us encouragement as you do so well, but I ask you to become sentinels and guardians of this democracy.

I ask you to take up the mantle of stewardship of this democracy.

I ask you to go home to your respective households, to write to your parents if you are away from them, and ask them to join with you in taking care of America.

Ask them, if you please, to give you a vote of confidence. Because what we are talking about and what we ought to be talking about is not the America of yesterday, wonderful as it is—and not even the America of today, good as it is.

What we need to be thinking about and talking about is the America of tomorrow and how much better we are going to make it if we work together. [Applause.]

I am sure I speak for the parents in this audience when I address these remarks to our sons and daughters.

I have three sons and I have a daughter, and I am proud to say, I have two lovely granddaughters, with whom I spent yesterday afternoon.

I am interested in them. And I want to see our America a place in which there is opportunity for them.

I don't want it easy for them or for me. But I want it so that if a person is trained and educated and if the opportunity is here for education and training, that with conscientious effort, there will be an opportunity for everybody, regardless of their race, their color or their religion or their national origin.

I want an America in which everybody can contribute to the maximum of their ability to make it even a better America. [Applause.]

You know, I must tell you that on our plane, we have a wonderful group of people. I just looked over here at the side for a moment and I saw a friend of mine here that reminded me that Wisconsin was the most up and coming State in the Union. That is what he told me because he is from Wisconsin.

I had to say that it is about even with mine.

I think you will forgive me, but it really is and this State knows what social program means. This is a State of great social reform, of great economic reform. And in this State, there has been what we call pioneering.

Now, for 30 years at your Federal Government level, we have been attempting to build a better America economically and socially. This Federal Government has been working with State government, it has been working with local government.

The Federal Government, from the day of Franklin Roosevelt up to this date, has been one that has been a Government with a heart, with a sense of duty, with a conscience.

Somebody said that the Democratic Party is the party that cares. And I think that is the apt description of it. We do care. [Applause.]

We care, we care about our elderly. We want to make sure that they have an opportunity to live in dignity and security. We care about our unfortunate, the afflicted, the sick, those that are in trouble. And we do not believe that to be concerned about the unfortunate or the sick or the needy is socialism. We believe that it is decent, wholesome Americanism, and we are going to continue to care. [Applause.]

And, my friends, we do not believe nor has the Democratic administration ever believed that it is the duty of Government to take care of everyone. What we do believe is that it is the duty of Government to help people help themselves.

We believe that it is the duty of Government to help a farmer with his farm programs and with his farm problems. We believe that Government can be of help—not to take over the farmer's job but to help the farmer do a better job.

448 WBZ—LINO

And we don't believe that the way you help that farmer do a better job is to leave him alone and just walk away and leave him the victim of the marketplace.

We believe that the American businessman is the most efficient manager in the world. And we believe that the duty of Government is not to mind that business, but we believe the American Government can be of help to the business management in seeing to it that his business is profitable and that it is modern and that it is efficient and that it serves the American people better than any other business in the world. [Applause.]

We do not believe that the Federal Government should take over all of the responsibilities of education. To the contrary, education is essentially a local responsibility. But we believe that every American citizen is entitled to a good education.

And therefore, we believe that the Federal Government can be of some help to local governments, to colleges, to public and private schools alike, that we can be of help in seeing to it that America's youth gets the best education in the world. [Applause.]

We do not believe that the Federal Government or any government, should tell management or labor what their wages should be. But we do believe that the Federal Government should protect the right of a worker to organize and to bargain collectively and preserve his rights. [Applause.]

And ladies and gentlemen, this is what we have been doing for 30 years. We have been building a better America and a more economically prosperous America, a more socially just America. And all of that now is up for a vote.

The question in this election on November 3 is do you want to veto what you have accomplished? Do you want to repudiate it? Or do you want to go ahead and build on it? If you do, vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

No, my friends, there are really two great issues. The first issue is whether or not we will destroy all of the social and economic gains of the past 30 years. The Senator from Arizona has been quite clear in his pronouncements. I want to say for the Senator that I think that he is a man of conviction. And his convictions are manifestly clear. And one of them is that the Federal Government should get out of these programs of housing, of agriculture, of education, of health, of social welfare, and he has said so. He said there should be a timetable of withdrawal.

And ladies and gentlemen, if you think that the Federal Government, your Government, a Government that ought to be your servant, a Government that ought to stand and help you when help is needed, a Government that ought to be your partner—if you think that Government ought to be removed from these many activities that I have spoken of—agriculture, helping labor, business, education, social security—if you think those programs are unwise, if you think we ought not to have them, there is a way to get rid of them. And you can do it in this election. You can vote for the prophet of reaction and despair.

Or if you think we ought to keep them, you can vote for the Kennedy-Johnson program and Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Now, the second great issue is even more meaningful than the first. Because every mother and father in this audience knows that it means nothing as to our prosperity or our schools or our social programs of human betterment if mankind in his madness destroys himself.

We have within our powers, my fellow Americans, within our hands, I should say, the means of destruction of God's creation.

We have entered a new era of human history. On the day that that first nuclear device was exploded on the sands of the deserts of New Mexico, from that day on, war took on a new face. From that day on, the power struggle was different. And from that day on, mankind has built up powerful forces that can be used either for good or for evil, either for peace or for war. And the President of the United States is in command today of the greatest nuclear arsenal that the world has ever owned.

We have within our hands today, ladies and gentlemen, enough power to obliterate all of God's creation. We must make sure, therefore, that this power that is ours and this wealth that I have spoken of that is ours—we must make sure that it is used responsibly. We must make sure that it is used with restraint.

449 WBZ--LINO

What is the purpose of our wealth? What is the purpose of these social advances? Is it just a luxury? I think not.

We have gained this great prosperity and it is tremendous. And every mother and father, every worker, every son and daughter in this audience knows that today America is enjoying unprecedented prosperity—44 months of continued expansion of our economy.

And we can build it even better. We can eliminate the pockets of poverty.

But the purpose of all this is not just for more money in the bank. The purpose of all this is for the good life, the life of education, of culture, the life of happiness for our people.

But all of that, my dear friends, can be lost if we should become involved accidentally or by miscalculation or by preconceived decision in a nuclear holocaust.

I don't know how a speaker can properly explain to an audience the unbelievable devastation that is possible if we should, by some unfortunate development, become involved in a nuclear war.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, your America has power, unbelievable power. Believe not the false prophets. This country is more powerful than any nation on the face of the earth. This country has more power than any combination of nations on the face of the earth. This country has so much power that it is both the envy and the marvel of the world.

And a country that has that must have at its helm a President who understands responsibility, who understands that this Nation's problems will not be solved, nor will the world's problems be solved by force.

They will be solved, my friends, and ladies and gentlemen, they will be solved by reason. They will be solved by the use of strength for peaceful purposes. They will be solved by compassion. They will be solved by understanding.

The purpose of our nuclear power is not to make war. The purpose is to prevent war. The purpose is to deter the aggressor so that over the period of time, by patience and perseverance, by precept and example, by pressure upon tyranny, we can drive back these forces of aggression, and that we can change people who are momentarily trapped under vicious Communist regimes.

I do not want a man in the White House who thinks in terms of war. I do not want one in there who is irresponsible and impetuous. And I must say with all seriousness that the man who is the opponent of President Johnson in this election has spoken too often in impetuous words, intemperate words, to leave any doubt as to his feelings and as to his philosophy.

Let me quote to you just briefly, so that the record may be clear, not from my words but from his, what he believes. And then possibly you will see why I am so concerned.

First of all, here is a man who has said that he considers—he says:

I am convinced that we will either be in a war or we will be subjugated without war, and I mean real nuclear war. I don't see how it can be avoided perhaps 10 years from now.

This was stated in 1961, May 8. Mr. Goldwater said he felt that war was inevitable. He said we would either be in a nuclear war or we would be subjugated without one.

Well, let me say on this platform in Racine, Wis., that I speak for a man who doesn't believe war is inevitable. I speak for a President who has been going around America telling the American people that the noblest cause of God's children is to work for peace and peace is a necessity. [Applause.]

There are not the only words of the Senator from Arizona. There are other words he has uttered that are even more frightening. He says:

Now, I will have to admit that I possibly do shoot from the hip. I have been exposed to problems and I don't have to stop and think in detail about them.

Ladies and gentlemen, any man that says in this day and age that he doesn't have to stop and think about the problems that beset this world is a man who, by his own words from his own lips, has disqualified himself for the office of Presidency of the United States. [Applause.]

450 WBZ—LINO

Let me quote from this man who today is running around America saying we ought to elect Mr. Goldwater. I quote from a man who was the former Vice President of the United States. And I quote from Mr. Nixon, and here is what he said: I think that it is well for you to hear what other people have said, not only what a candidate on the Democratic ticket has said. Then maybe you will understand why millions of Republicans and thousands here in the State of Wisconsin have no stomach for Mr. Goldwater. [Applause.]

You will understand why they are concerned. Because these people have put their country above their party, their patriotism above their partisanship. But here is a man who only a few months ago had these words to say about Mr. Goldwater. And I quote Mr. Nixon:

It would be a tragedy for the Republican Party if every Goldwater view as previously stated went unchallenged and unrepudiated.

Here is what Gov. Nelson Rockefeller had to say, speaking of Mr. Goldwater as the candidate of an extremism outside the main currents of American political life. And here is what the Republican Governor of Pennsylvania had to say, Mr. Scranton, about Mr. Goldwater's views:

A weird parody of American Republicanism an echo of fear and reaction, the echo from never-never land that puts our Nation backward to a lesser place in a nation of free men; the fast draw and the quick slugs.

Ladies and gentlemen, the man that seeks this high office of the Presidency on the Republican ticket is a man who has frightened his own partisans. He is one who has driven them from his own party. He is the leader of a faction that booed, that booed, if you please, the Governor of New York, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Governor of Michigan. Every reasonable, modern Republican was hooted out of the hall.

This is the man, if you please, who said of the John Birch Society that they are intelligent people who are doing an effective job of calling attention to the dangers of communism. "I don't consider the John Birch Society as to be extremists," he said, "I think we need them in American politics."

A society that said that Dwight Eisenhower was a congressional agent of the Communist conspiracy. And this man says he is a Republican. Any man that can sleep in the same bed with the John Birch Society that has said the unbelievable things about Dwight Eisenhower and the Chief Justice of the United States, any man that can do that is no Republican, he is no Democrat, he is a radical, and he ought to be repudiated. [Applause.]

This age in which we have lived and in which we will continue to live is the most perilous and dangerous age of recorded history. Only a few weeks or days ago, the Chinese Communists exploded a nuclear device. The possibility of nuclear weapons spread to foreign countries is here, mother and father. And every new country that gets a nuclear weapon puts the life of your family and this Nation in jeopardy.

This Nation sought to stop nuclear tests. And we were able to arrive at some agreement to stop nuclear tests. But only 100 nations signed that treaty.

President Eisenhower asked us to stand for it. President Kennedy led us to that treaty. Republican Senator Dirksen of the State of Illinois, just to your south, led the Republican ranks in the Senate for that treaty. It wasn't a partisan issue. It was an issue of humanity. It was an issue of morals. It was an issue of decency.

And four-fifths of the Republicans of the Senate voted or it. And better than four-fifths of the Democrats voted for it.

But the Senator from Arizona, standing as he generally does, far out to the right, voted "no," voted "no."

Ladies and gentlemen, any man that can't understand that this world has changed, any man that can't understand that the awesome power of the nuclear weapon is something that ought to be treated differently than a conventional weapon, any man that can't understand the nature of the world in which we live—that man must not be our President.

451 WBZ—LINO

We need somebody at the helm of this country that understands that America is the last best hope on earth, that our responsibilities are tremendous.

We have been selected as if by divine providence to give this world leadership, decent leadership—not leadership for war. Not leadership by ultimatum; not leadership by fear; not leadership through threats; not leadership through cynicism and bitterness and hate. But leadership through love, through compassion, through justice, through reason, using the strength that we have, not to terrify people but to use that strength as a shield to protect ourselves and from whence we can work with our hands and our hearts and our minds to build a better world.

This world is in trouble and it has been in trouble. And it needs somebody in America as its President who understands that God Almighty gave us brainpower to use and a heart to use and a conscience to use.

And I submit to you that the overriding issue in this campaign is whether or not America is going to elect a man of peace and reason, or whether you are going to elect a man who rattles the saber, who issues the ultimatums, who acts and talks impetuously, who represents irresponsibility.

And if you want that kind of a reckless America, you have a choice. But I don't think you do. I think you want an America that is strong and is tolerant; that is strong and yet is compassionate; that is strong and yet seeks the peace.

Because it is still true, my fellow Americans, that blessed are the peacemakers. It is still true that the strongest person in the world is the one that pursues the just and noble cause of peace, pursues it honorably without appeasement, pursues it with a vigor and with a dedication, and doesn't give up.

And I submit to you that we started on this road to peace. We started on it under John Kennedy. We started under, may I say, the late beloved Pope John. And we continued it under Lyndon Johnson.

And if you give us your help, if you give us your votes, if you take this election seriously, we will pursue this cause with a fervor and a dedication that will make you proud of America. [Applause.]

Green Bay, Wis.
Monday, October 26

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Governor. Thank you, Father Cornell, for your gracious introduction.

May I say my special thanks to the students of the College of Saint Norbert. [Applause.]

Some of you that are here may recall I had the privilege of visiting with you some 4 years ago and I cannot recall any more happy occasion in my private or public life, and I am deeply grateful for the wonderful reception that was then accorded me, for your fair and kind and generous treatment, and for the inspiration that you gave to me then as a candidate in a primary election.

Now, I come to you tonight as a candidate on the Democratic ticket for the high office of Vice President. I am privileged to be on this ticket with one who was selected by you 4 years ago by our great and beloved President as the then nominee for Vice President. I must say that to serve in this campaign and indeed to look forward to serving in the next administration with President Lyndon Johnson is to me a tremendous privilege, a high honor, and a very, very serious responsibility. [Applause.]

You know, when I hear my young friends that walk in the paths of political transgression say—[applause]—when I hear that—this is all in good fun—may I say that when I hear that familiar chant that I have heard from so few voices, but rather loud ones, I always have to remind them that by November, Barry-picking season is over. [Applause.]

452 WBZ—LINO

Now, permit me just to acknowledge here on this platform the candidates for the U.S. Congress from the Eighth and the Sixth Districts. From the Eighth District, we have Cletus Johnson, and from the Sixth, we have John Race.

We also have here for the State senate candidates Jack O'Malley from the Second and from the 30th, Ralph Heller.

Now, these are fine, good Democrats. And might I add that as good Democrats, they are a part of the Democratic team. That Democratic team wants to work together. It recognizes that our Government and its partnership with the people is not merely a government in Washington, but is also a government in the State Capitol of Madison. It is also a government in the county seat. It is also a government at every level.

And one of the things that it is well for us to learn as we go through this campaign is a fundamental lesson in American government, that these many institutions of government are not enemies. They have no built-in animosity. They should be working partners in the common endeavor of improving the life of the American Nation. And that's the way we feel about them.

Now, our opposition, regrettably, on occasion has a different interpretation. But I must say that were they to enroll in a course in American government at Saint Norbert's they would undoubtedly fail. Those of us that believe in government as a working partnership and that all government is not at one level but is spread throughout the Nation—Federal, State, and local—those are the students that will get a passing grade and some of you will get "A" if you vote Democratic on November 3. [Applause.]

You know, Father Cornell, I believe that your specialty is in the field of history. If I recall correctly—is that right, Father? If it is, may I say to this student body something that I believe you ought to take very seriously.

It's entirely fitting and power that as you round out your education, you study history and study it well, indeed. You even ought to study ancient history, but don't vote it—don't vote it. [Applause.]

I want you to study contemporary history as well, the making of history. And there is a man on this platform that has been making history for your State, and he is your Governor—Governor Reynolds. [Applause.]

Governor Reynolds has been making history in Wisconsin and it's a pattern that is being followed in other States because of his initiative. Governor Reynolds' bold new program of granting property tax relief to the aged, based on their ability to pay is an act that told the Nation what kind of a compassionate and what kind of a forward-seeing government you have in Wisconsin.

And his courage in leading Wisconsin in one of the finest programs in the care of the mentally retarded has marked him as a leader in this field. If there was ever a compassionate act on the part of a Governor, it is in this area.

His farsightedness in working for higher education has enabled Wisconsin to guarantee to all of its young people a college education, regardless of the wealth of their families. This is truly a progressive, sane, forward-looking, hard-working, sensible Governor. And he commands the respect of thoughtful people in this State and around the country.

And I would urge everyone in this great hall tonight, whether you are of voting age or not, if you are not of voting age, I urge you to ask your parents to help you by having your parents vote for this Governor that has worked to help you. And if you're of voting age, I ask you to take on this additional duty and responsibility of carrying the message to your community that Wisconsin has a hard-working, able, fighting Governor for the people of this State. And he will make a great partner with Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

We continue to have trouble with those dear friends, don't we? You know, on every good program there's a little static. [Applause.]

I know that Governor Reynolds is a native son of Green Bay, and I know how proud you are of him. And I want you to know that on our plane—we have a plane that we have tabbed "The Happy Warrior" because we believe politics ought to be an exercise not only in hard work but a sense of joy and happiness.

453 WBZ—LINO

We have aboard that plane another native son of this community. He doesn't have an Irish name, but he does have one that starts with Hjalmar, and his name is Hjalmar Norrell. We call him "Yummy." He is with us. I wanted to pay my respect to him in this community because he has been—well, he was with Harry Truman when Truman won, and he was with John Kennedy when Kennedy won, and he is with Hubert Humphrey, when Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey will win. [Applause.]

I want for just a very few moments now, before our questioning period starts with this illustrious panel of students, I want to just outline what I think are the two basic issues in this campaign. This campaign should be more than just a chanting and shouting contest. Both sides have done a good deal of it. We are arriving now at the point where, within the next 7 days—7 days tomorrow—we will make the fateful decision as to the future of this country.

This election is a national election and we elect the President as well as the Congress. And when you elect a President for 4 years, you can't turn back. You have made the decision. And the decision of the next 4 years will affect the lives of the people in this hall and the people that are listening to us or viewing us, not just for 4 years but for many more years to come.

America has no choice but to be the leader of the free world. And our prosperity, our strength, economic, our strength, political, our strength, moral and spiritual, will decide the future courses of this world. This is the last best hope on earth, this great republic of ours, as Lincoln termed it, and we have no easy choices to make. We have to make up our mind that our power and our wealth is not merely for ourselves. And we have to make up our minds that to sustain this power and this wealth is not merely an exercise of selfishness.

We do this for noble purposes. We do it to provide, yes, a higher standard of living for the American people, to really enrich the lives of our people.

But we also pay for this power, and we pay for it through hard-earned taxes and hard-earned currency. We have to make up our mind that this power and this wealth is for the principal purpose of sustaining peace for the purpose of seeing if by constant perseverance, patience, and pressure upon the forces of tyranny, we cannot make this a better world, to roll back these aggressive forces of communism, to roll back these aggressive forces of ignorance and illiteracy and fear and prejudice.

Our problems in this world are not merely communism. Communism is indeed a powerful, sinister, evil force that would like nothing better than to dominate this earth. And we don't intend to let that happen.

But there are other forces at work. There are the forces of ignorance; there are the forces of bigotry and prejudice; there are the forces of disease and pestilence, and we need to wage war on those forces as well.

Our opposition says to us that they want victory—victory now. They want instant victory. The only thing that is instant, my dear fellow Americans, is annihilation. That, we can provide if we are rash, irresponsible, impetuous, and by miscalculation or by some unbelievable premeditated mistake. We want to make sure, therefore, that the gains that we have made these past 30 years are sustained, and not only sustained, but that they are platforms from whence we can build to higher ground.

The America that we seek—the better America—is like the building of a mighty cathedral. It isn't done in a day. The cathedrals of Europe took centuries, many of them, to build. And each generation gave something to those great cathedrals. And in those cathedrals, there is more than stone and there is more than just brick and mortar. There is the life of the people, the spirit of each generation.

America has been building, building, building a better America every generation. This is a better America and a generation ago, and a generation ago, it was better than before, materially, educationally, spiritually, economically—we are a better and a stronger people.

454 WBZ—LINO

But we can go further. There are still pockets of poverty. There are still young people that ought to go to college that do not go. There are yet people in America that have not really fulfilled their capacity to do a good job. The process of emancipation is continuous. The process of freedom is continuing. And we must be in the vanguard of that fight for the expansion of these frontiers of freedom.

Now, we build also for peace. Anybody can destroy. It takes no statesmanship, my dear friends, to destroy the world. A madman can do that. It takes no reason. It takes no power of mind or spirit to be destructive. But it does take a statesman and it does take will, it does take reason, it does require patience and perseverance, and it does require mind and spirit to construct, to build a better world.

And we are building in the paths of peace. We are building this mighty cathedral of a better world. We are doing it through many programs. We did it after World War II with the Marshall plan, with aid to Greece and Turkey. We have been doing it more recently under the leadership of President Kennedy with the Alliance for Progress, with the Peace Corps, with the food for peace program, with the Arms Control Agency, with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, with revised foreign aid, building up our military strength as a deterrent to aggression.

We have been building, my fellow Americans, block by block, stone by stone, this mighty edifice, this mighty cathedral of peace.

I remind you of what John Kennedy said, my dear friends, in the most memorable speech of his career on June 10, 1963, American University commencement address, when he pierced through the Iron Curtain, when he broke through to the peoples of Eastern Europe, when he finally put the Communists in moral and spiritual retreat, indeed, in military retreat. He said then that "Peace is a process." He reminded us that it took courage, that it took stamina, that it took sacrifice that we could not be unselfishly. We had shrdlu shrdlu shrd.

The biggest coward in the world can be a bully but only the strong are the peacemakers. And I submit that in this election, what we are trying to do is to continue just what President Johnson said after our beloved President was taken from us.

John Kennedy said "Let us begin." And we did begin, and you know it. We began to build a better America and a better world, and John Kennedy was taken from us 1,000 days after those immortal words. And then a man rose up in our midst, his Vice President, and held high that torch that John Kennedy had carried so briefly, and he said three words, "Let us continue."

And we have been continuing. And what we are asking you to help us do now—and I worked alongside of these men, may I say—I sat there with them as they designed this program. I think I even had a little hand in it as one of the legislative lieutenants.

We are asking you now, my fellow Americans, to let us continue to move this country forward not only economically, not only in material things, but we are asking you to help us move this country forward to its real mission, which is a mission of trying to have a better world, a world in which there is some hope, a world in which there is some life, a world in which peace can march forward rather than to be destroyed.

I happen to think that the candidate that I represent, the President of the United States, is a man dedicated to peace. He is dedicated to peace with justice and peace with strength. He is dedicated, as he said, to a better America.

And I come here to ask your help to make this possible. Join me, will you, in electing President Lyndon Johnson to make this a better America? [Applause.]

MR. DUDEK. Senator Humphrey, I am Lee Dudek, chairman of the speech department in Saint Norbert College. With me are four students of the college, all of them social science majors, all of them are members of the Young Democrats Club. On my left is Judy De Crave. Next to me is Jerry Fox. On my right is Michael Roe, of Green Bay, and on my extreme right—nothing significant in that—Roger Burbach of Watertown, Wis.

MISS DE CRAVE. Senator Humphrey, do you feel that there is a basic inconsistency between Americanism and extremism?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. Judy asks if I think there is a basic inconsistency between Americanism and extremism.

455 WBZ—LINO

If you mean extremism, yes; radicalism, that would destroy what I consider to be the values, the institutions of this country, I do. It is my sincere view, Judy, that the American society has had a continuity of purpose and a continuity of philosophy and that an extremist is one who would pull up these institutions by the roots, that would destroy—and I believe we have those extremists, regrettably, that would appeal to the prejudices, as they see them, of our people; extremists that would divide us ethnically, religiously, on the basis of section and race. That kind of extremism really has no place in the American society. The American people are not haters. When I hear people preach the doctrine of hate—to hate a particular man or woman because of color, to hate somebody because of religion or to dislike or hate someone because of the section of the country in which they live, I say that is extremism.

What this country needs is leadership that unites us, not divides us. What we need are the voices of commonsense and reason, not of extremism and radicalism.

I might add that I consider Mr. Goldwater not to be a real Republican or a Democrat. I say this because of those in his own party that have literally exposed him by their own words—not what Senator Humphrey has said. But I call to your attention what Governor Scranton has said, what Governor Rockefeller has said, what Governor Romney has said, what Richard Nixon has said. And Richard Nixon said that the Republican Party must repudiate the standards of Mr. Goldwater.

Of course, he is around now trying to pick up what he thinks will be the pieces of the national calamity of his party. [Applause.]

I consider that when a candidate for office on the Republican ticket can vote 25 times on 25 issues—25 times “no” against his own party—and he did—Mr. Goldwater did that—on 25 specific commitments of the 1960 Republican platform, Mr. Goldwater voted “no.” On those same 25 issues, Mr. Kuchel, of California, Republican, voted “yes”; Mr. Dirksen, of Illinois, voted 18 times “yes”; Mr. Saltonstall, Republican, of Massachusetts, voted 20 times “yes”; and Mr. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, voted 17 times “yes.” I say that if the four leading Republicans of the Senate can vote from two-thirds to three-fourths, from 17 to 25 votes “yes” on 25 Republican platform commitments, and Mr. Goldwater votes 25 times “no,” Mr. Goldwater is not a Republican, he is a radical, and that is an extremist. [Applause.]

Mr. Fox. Senator Humphrey, do you consider your association with the Americans for Democratic Action a political asset or a liability?

Senator HUMPHREY. I gather you must have heard the chanting of the rightwing up here.

I am very pleased that the young friends of ours in the gallery—by the way, many of them are very happy looking and smiling young people. May I say that if that is the case, they know that deep down in their hearts, they are for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Well, now, I think maybe I'll try to answer your question. Your question was with reference to the ADA. It is an organization known as the Americans for Democratic Action. ADA was established for one purpose only, and everybody knows that that purpose—maybe a man who is a member of it would know what it was established for a little better than somebody that can't spell it. [Applause.]

It was established as a militant, anti-Communist organization for the primary purpose—you know, that is why they lose all those votes. [Applause.] If we can just keep them acting with such bad manners, they are going to lose almost every vote. [Applause.]

The American people are really rather fairminded and they are rather well mannered and they are rather happy people. Sometimes they find it a little bit difficult to understand those that go around as if they have the political colic.

Now, may I just say—repeat my statement on ADA. It was established as a militant, non-Communist, anti-Communist organization. In my State of Minnesota, where it was very active and I was a leader in it, it was the purpose of rooting out of our party—which had been captured in 1946 by the then Progressive Wallacites—not your Progressive Party, but the one that was in the national election of 1948—a Communist-front organization, regrettably, or one that was infiltrated by Communists—our political party was infiltrated by this group.

456 WBZ—LINO

Therefore, the ADA came to the State of Minnesota with Hubert Humphrey, with Arthur Naftalin, the mayor of Minneapolis, with Eugene McCarthy, U.S. Senator from Minnesota, with Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, our respected Ambassador, and with many of the leading figures in the State, respected by Republicans and Democrats alike. May I say it came there with the purpose of cleaning up the political party, of cleaning out communism, Marxism, and leftism in the liberal movement of America.

It was supported by the most militant, anti-Communist leaders, men who know that the American labor movement must be rid of the Communist influence. And the ADA ought to get a merit badge for service beyond the call of duty for American Government and anti-communism, rather than the jeers and sneers of people who know little or nothing about it.

But might I add that when an organization can call the former President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, a conscious agent of the Communist Party and can make the same comment about the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and the same organization can make derogatory comments about ADA, I happen to think that that kind of talk proves its own irresponsibility. Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, a great general, called a conscious agent of the Communist Party. How unbelievably bad can you get? How unbelievably irresponsible can you get?

And the same people that make that charge against a former President make it against others, including a little organization like ADA. I sometimes wonder, because the same people who say "Get the U.S. out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the U.S." and claim to be 110 percent superpatriots are chanting the same thing that Nikita Khrushchev and Joseph Stalin chanted. It's a peculiar thing how the extreme right and the extreme left always get into bed at the same place at the same time. The only difference is they are fighting over the sheets, that's all.

Might I also add so I can be perfectly clear, we want neither. We want neither. The Senator that is speaking to you now is the author of the Communist Control Act. The Senator that is speaking to you now is never, in his own State, attacked for any of this nonsense that you hear frequently from some of these propagandists of the extreme right.

Let me say that the extreme right of extremism and the extreme left of communism, both of them are like plagues, and we ought to have nothing to do with them. And this speaker for the Democratic Party repudiates both. We don't like the Ku Klux Klan; we don't like the Gerald L. K. Smiths; we don't like the John Birch Society. [Applause.]

And we don't like the Communist Party and we don't want anything to do with any of them, period. [Applause.]

Mr. ROE. I have a question on the foreign policy. In view of the recent detonation of a bomb by the Chinese, would not formal diplomatic negotiations with them be a more practical policy than our informal diplomatic negotiations with their American Ambassador at Warsaw?

Senator HUMPHREY. Sir, I am opposed and have been opposed ever since I served in the Senate, when the issue of recognition of Communist China has been in the public environment, for public discussion—I have been opposed to admission of Communist China into the United Nations and the recognition of Communist China. I will say that the reason I am opposed to it is, first of all, I think this would encourage the Communist Chinese in southeast Asia. It would give them prestige and acceptance which I don't think they ought to have. Secondly, I believe the Communist Chinese are irresponsible aggressors. They are aggressors and they violate the treaty that they have signed. I am not for their recognition.

Now we come to the matter of the atomic detonation. First of all, let me make it clear that this was not a weapon. This was a device, and a weapon is the difference between a Model T and a Cadillac—or a Lincoln—I don't want to choose up sides here—or a Chrysler New Yorker or an Imperial. It's a great difference. And there will be some time before the Communist Chinese will be able to produce what is known as a usable nuclear weapon with systems of delivery that are accurate and reliable.

457 WBZ—LINO

But I do think it's entirely possible that we can, under the terms of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, continue to negotiate, through friends, through our allies, and ourselves directly, to see whether or not the Chinese Communists will come under that treaty. I want to be frank with you. I don't think they will. I don't think you can depend upon the Chinese Communists to sign a test ban treaty. They have shown no indication of so doing.

If the matter of Chinese atomic weaponry becomes a serious matter with us, we have an escape clause in the treaty, as you know. In the meantime, I can assure you that no nation on earth has the nuclear power that this Nation has. In fact, the question of nuclear power is not related to not having enough. It's what do you do with the amount you have and how do you treat it responsibly.

Mr. BURBACH. Senator, the opposition has charged that social legislation has endangered our American system of government and will inevitably lead to socialism. Do you think this is a substantial charge in any way?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, my good friend, I keep hearing this old slogan of socialism. I guess that's why Henry Ford is supporting Lyndon Johnson.

My goodness, you know, isn't it something? It's an insult to the American intelligence. Here we have an economy of \$625 billion. The stock market has increased in value since Lyndon Johnson alone became President over \$100 billion. We have \$125 billion greater gross national product today for the American private economy than we had 3½ years ago. We have 73 million people working. We have \$13 billion increased net profits over what they were 3 years ago for corporate business. We have more independent business enterprises today than at any time in the last 25 years. We have a country where profits and dividends are at an all-time high, where the corporate and business structure of this Nation is the strongest it has ever been, where investment is at an all-time high.

Yet, the opposition hollers socialism. Let me just say that if this is socialism, then I have never read a book on private enterprise and capitalism. I might add they'd better quit talking about this being socialism or they are going to convince people in other places that socialism is pretty good.

They preach about this being creeping socialism. This is leaping capitalism, and, boy, do I like it. [Applause.]

Mr. DUDEK. Thank you, Senator Humphrey. As much as we would like to keep you here, we know Madison is waiting for you and rather than deprive them of the honor, we will declare this closed.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I thank this audience for your participation. We could stand here tonight and have many, many questions and I think we could have some good answers. But I just want to leave you with this thought. This is your decision week. From here on out, it isn't in the hands of candidates. It's in the hands of the people.

I want to thank St. Norbert's, this great college, for sponsoring this program, and I want to thank the panelists here tonight for their questions.

And I hope that those who have come here with their minds already made up will give that mind a little exercise. You'll be surprised how it refreshes the human spirit. [Applause.]

Madison, Wis.
October 26, 1964

SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

THE TRUTH AND CONSEQUENCES OF SENATOR GOLDWATER'S FOREIGN POLICY

In the past few weeks the American people have heard much about peace, and the dangers of our turbulent world.

But words are no substitute for the lightning flash of events—the sudden illumination of reality.

Last week, events beyond our control changed our world. They brought an abrupt end to the age of Khrushchev in the Soviet Union. They brought the first burst of primitive nuclear power to Communist China. And they brought a peaceful change of government to our close ally, Great Britain.

458 WBZ—LINO

Once again history has swept its fierce beacon across our horizon. Once again events have reminded us of the interdependence of men and nations, of the limits of even our great power, of the dangers of nuclear arms, and the inevitability of change.

These events must remind us of something else; that all we are, and all we seek, as a nation and as individuals, is utterly dependent upon the prevention of nuclear war.

That is the supreme issue of this campaign—the supreme issue of our generation and the precondition for future generations. Without peace, there can be no freedom. Without peace, the survival of our planet is in doubt.

And that is why Senator Goldwater must be judged above all on his fitness to conduct our Nation's foreign affairs.

This campaign has been in one sense a valuable educational exercise. It has been a nationwide educational eye opener to the utter folly of Goldwaterism—of jingoism, sloganism, and mudslinging as a substitute for policies.

It is a shame that valuable time had to be spent on exposing the notions of a fringe group—the Goldwater faction. But it has become essential that their recklessness be thoroughly exposed—and then decisively rejected. We all know that we have infinitely more important things to discuss and to do at this crucial moment in the 20th century.

But every now and then great nations produce within themselves the poison of frustration and impatience—and they produce men who preach this poison. We saw such men in the Know-Nothing Party that arose before the Civil War—men who blamed all our problems on the flow of Catholic immigrants to our shores. We saw such men in the witch-hunting days of McCarthyism—men who traced all our troubles to a Communist conspiracy within our homes, our schools, and our Government. Each time this has occurred, we had to purge our national conscience of these absurdities by exposure and rejection.

This is our obligation once again today: to hear out and to reject those who have fled the intricate tasks of world leadership—who have lost the courage to be patient. These prophets of defeat who tell us that Americans are "sick and tired" of our complex world only reveal their own sickness and tiredness, and hold out false promises of quick, easy solutions that will make our problems disappear.

Do not misunderstand me: Senator Goldwater is a loyal, patriotic man.

But Senator Goldwater is dead wrong—tragically, dangerously wrong. The "solutions" he offers are no solutions at all. They are instead a sure path to widening conflict—and ultimately to a terrible holocaust.

What are the principles of the Goldwater foreign policy? And where would these principles lead us?

The Senator's first principle is that every one of the world's problems stems from a single source: communism. He tells us in his speeches that "communism * * * is the *only* real threat to the peace of the world today."

Has the Senator never read history? Has he never heard of nationalism—of clashing national ambitions? Has he never heard of territorial conflicts, of economic struggles, of tribal and religious strife? Has he never seen the facts and figures of poverty, illiteracy, and disease—of the chasm between the very rich and the very poor—that breed unrest and despair in two-thirds of our world?

Obviously, communism is an evil and a danger. We recognize the danger. We have met it and repulsed it time and again. We will continue to do so.

Yet many of the problems that face us would be with us today even if Marx and Lenin had never been born—and would still be with us tomorrow even if communism were to vanish from the face of the earth.

These problems are as old as mankind—but intensified today by a revolution in science and technology, by a spiraling armaments race, and by the demands of millions of men and women for a better life.

459 WBZ—LINO

Yet Senator Goldwater would have us think only of one great threat to peace—and ignore the many others. He would have us reject all nations who see the world as something other than a vast stadium for the cold war. He would stop our aid programs—except as a payoff for obedient American satellites. He would divide the world neatly into those who are “with us”—and the rest, who must be counted “against us.”

And furthermore, he fails to understand even the threat of communism itself. He fails to see that our national interest requires different approaches to different Communist states. For communism is no longer a monolith. It is fragmented through the impact of the free world. And it is increasingly shaped by the national soil where it takes root.

The second fundamental of the Goldwater foreign policy flows directly from the first. This is the principle of “total victory.” He thinks he has found the one enemy—now why not slay it and live happily ever after? “Why not victory?” he asks.

How does he propose to achieve “total victory?” In “The Conscience of a Conservative,” he says he would “withdraw recognition from all Communist governments including that of the Soviet Union”—and apparently expect them either to plead for mercy or collapse. He would “encourage the captive peoples to revolt against their Communist rulers”—and does he mean that we be ready to move in to support them with nuclear weapons? We would issue ultimatums to the Kremlin—and “be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes.”

In so doing, he tells us frankly, his goal would be to invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat.”

Clearly, Senator Goldwater understands neither men nor nations. He fails to see the simplest of truths: that most other nations are composed of men and women who, if pressed to the ultimate choice, will choose—like Americans—to fight rather than surrender.

He fails to understand that in our age of quick and total destruction, there is simply no such thing as quick and total victory. Those who seek total victory must contemplate total self-destruction.

Yet the Senator remains quite willing to risk all-out nuclear war in the pursuit of “total victory.” As he told an interviewer in May 1961, “Someday, I am convinced, there will either be a war or we’ll be subjugated without war * * * real nuclear war * * *. I don’t see how it can be avoided—perhaps 5 or 10 years from now.” And as he told the correspondent for the German magazine *Der Spiegel* earlier this year, he would willingly go to the brink of war—“just as your country (Germany) has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully.”

What kind of statement is that? What kind of man could make such a statement? You don’t have to major in history to know that any man who offers the disastrous examples of Imperial and Nazi Germany for us to follow is a man who has no understanding of past history or current reality.

Clearly, the Senator is advocating nothing less than a continuing juvenile game of nuclear “chicken.” What he fails to understand is that such games must eventually result in the annihilation of both players.

The third principle of the Goldwater foreign policy is his stubborn assumption that America is omnipotent.

The Senator says that we are the strongest power on earth—and he is right. The Senator demands that we use our military might to get our way on all things—and he is wrong.

Our power is not absolute—it is relative. And the effective use of relative power requires responsibility, restraint, and a careful sense of priorities. The last thing we can afford is to lose our heads and use our missiles at the slightest excuse.

He wants us to fly with both barrels every time he thinks he sees someone “pull Uncle Sam’s whiskers.” He wants us to solve every problem with force. He fails to realize that there are hundreds of world problems for which force simply offers no solution.

460 WBZ—LINO

Some months ago the Senator announced that "the United States no longer has a place in the United Nations."

Today he is not so sure he is for the UN if it does our biddings; otherwise he will take his marbles and go home.

The UN has rendered an indispensable service in helping to damp down brush-fire conflicts which might well have escalated into full-scale wars between the nuclear powers. It is also a unique forum where men and nations can reason together and try to find common grounds of mutual interest. That continuing search for common interests is what foreign policy is all about. And that search is mankind's only ultimate alternative to nuclear suicide.

Nowhere in the world are there easy solutions. Five American Presidents since 1944 have understood this truth. But not Senator Goldwater.

American military power is a firm fact of life. But American omnipotence—America's ability to force an American solution on all the world's problems—is sheer illusion, a dangerous and crippling illusion for any who aspire to the Presidency.

A final principle of the Goldwater foreign policy is the total rejection of arms control—the quest for safeguarded disarmament. In "Why Not Victory?" the Senator wrote: "The United States should announce in no uncertain terms that we are against disarmament * * *"

Here the Senator has voted his conviction. Recall, for instance, his vote against the nuclear test ban treaty—a treaty which had the support of President Eisenhower and 25 of 33 Republicans in the Senate. And recall, as well, the moving words of Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican Senate leader: "I want to take a first step, Mr. President," he said. "I am not a young man—one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, he knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

Senator Goldwater knew what happened at Hiroshima. But he said "No" to the test ban. He refused to take a first step toward stopping the spiralling horror of the nuclear age.

The implications of the Senator's position are obvious: he would cease all efforts to control the armaments race; he would lead us to unbridled nuclear testing, to the further poisoning of the atmosphere, to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And, if the record of such races throughout history can be our teacher, the outcome would be nuclear cataclysm.

The logical consequences of Goldwaterism are only too clear:

If we were to do as he bids us, we would find ourselves eventually at war all over the globe—war fought with nuclear weapons in Eastern Europe, escalated war in southeast Asia, war against Cuba, war in Berlin.

We would find ourselves alone, in grim isolation, for our NATO allies and our other allies would have fled from us in horror at policies of rampant belligerence that they would regard as madness.

We would have repudiated the Test Ban Treaty with the stroke of one man's pen—and would have resumed the intensive poisoning of our atmosphere.

We would have lost all contact, influence, and respect in the less developed continents by stopping our programs of assistance.

We would have removed all possibility of negotiation to avert disaster—by pulling out of the United Nations and by cutting our diplomatic channels to our adversaries.

We would find ourselves, in short, a garrison state in a nightmare world—isolated from everything except a nuclear reign of terror.

Clearly, my friends, the Goldwater alternative is no alternative at all. It is simply a flight from reality on the part of men who have given in to total frustration and despair.

Our power is massive and will remain so. What Senator Goldwater does not realize is that power alone will not keep the peace. He does not understand that his mere repetition of the word peace will not bring peace. He does not understand that the building of peace is a process, a process which we must continue by both word and deed, day after day, month after month, year after year.

461 WBZ—LINO

This administration has taken steps toward peace. We have given our unswerving support to efforts to strengthen the U.N. We have expanded the food for peace program. But Senator Goldwater said "No." We have begun an historic new partnership with our Latin American friends in the Alliance for Progress. But Senator Goldwater said "No." We have initiated the Peace Corps, and made fitting use of the idealism and dedication of Americans like yourselves. But Senator Goldwater said "No."

We have established a "hot line" between Moscow and Washington to help prevent the accidents which may lead to nuclear war. But Senator Goldwater said "No." We have created an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to help reach sensible agreements to slow down the arms race. But Senator Goldwater said "No." We have achieved the test ban treaty to stop atmospheric poisoning. But Senator Goldwater said "No."

To all our constructive efforts to build the peace, Senator Goldwater has said "No." He has not only said no, and voted no, but he has offered *not one* constructive suggestion, *not one* bill, *not one* project, which would promote the process of peace.

Senator Goldwater failed to meet the test on the three great moral issues to come before the Senate during his 12 years in that body—(1) the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy, (2) the civil rights bill, and (3) the test ban treaty.

Senator Goldwater refused to repudiate McCarthyism, unlike many of his fellow Republican Senators. He refused to vote for a bill to provide equal rights for all our citizens, regardless of color, unlike a heavy majority of his Republican colleagues in the House and Senate. He refused to join the administration, Senator Dirksen and the great majority of his fellow Republicans in taking a first step to peace, a first step toward taming the atom, by voting for the test ban treaty.

In his callousness to the great moral issues of our times—issues that have presented themselves to the Senate for his vote, Senator Goldwater has demonstrated to all that he has repudiated not only the best traditions of our country, but also the best traditions of his own party.

In contrast to Senator Goldwater, we are led today by a man who has displayed this "higher order of responsibility." He understands yearning of all mankind for peace. He understands that we must remain strong to preserve the peace. And he understands that strength employed without responsibility is the short-cut to mutual annihilation.

Our President is a man of prudence and compassion, a man fully conscious of his responsibility to use our awesome power with reason and restraint. Under his leadership, America will never risk the extinction of the torch of world leadership by the bitter whirlwind of nuclear holocaust.

To those who ask "Why not victory"—we reply: "Why not victory indeed—victory over war itself, victory for peace, victory for mankind."

Madison, Wis.
Address
October 26, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, my friends. You surely cause a great commotion around here whenever you introduce anybody. [Applause.]

I want to say that I am perfectly delighted to hear so much cheering in this Stock Pavilion, because the last time there was any noise out of a Cow Palace, it was mostly booing. [Applause.]

I want my friends here who are carrying those badges of their political iniquity—those Goldwater signs—[applause]—I want them to know that my name is not Nelson, my name is not William, my name is not Rockefeller, my name is not Scranton, I am not Romney. I am Horatio, so don't blame me. [Applause.]

And as you have heard, there are some people that worry about the backlash, there are some that talk about the frontlash. But I'm the candidate of the midlash. [Applause.]

462 WBZ—LINO

It's good to be in Wisconsin once again. It's good to hear your band play the "Minnesota Rouser" under such peaceful conditions, and it's very good to be here in the presence of one of the best Congressmen that ever went to the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

And it's good to be on this platform with the lady, and the lovely wife of one of the best and one of the hardest working and one of the most effective U.S. Senators, Bill Proxmire, who could not be here tonight. [Applause.]

And may I say, I am simply delighted to be here with two of my closest friends, socially, politically, and every other way, who are the men for the State senate from this area, Fred Risser and Tom Carlson. [Applause.]

By the way, you know this is a wonderful place in which to hold a pleasant little social gathering like this. As I recall, the last time you had a good political meeting in the Stock Pavilion—the Democratic Cow Palace—the last time you had one here, it was Harry Truman who spoke here and he went on to become President of the United States. [Applause.]

By the way, that was the last time Wisconsin voted Democratic for a presidential election, so get with it this time, Wisconsin. [Applause.]

And I believe maybe in light of the more recent attacks that have been made by a desperate opposition, I believe I should let you in on a little political secret. The candidate for President on the Democratic ticket is not Hubert Horatio Humphrey, but it is Lyndon Baines Johnson. [Applause.]

And as an old radio announcer used to say, "There's good news to—SEPT 3—JDT—44-201—FOL—3656*—"

And as an old radio announcer used to say, "There's good news tonight"—the Democratic candidates, from the White House to the statehouse, Lyndon Johnson and John Reynolds, will be elected on November 3. [Applause.]

And I also want to add that no Governor in this United States deserves reelection more than the Governor of this State of Wisconsin, Governor John Reynolds. [Applause.]

Governor Reynolds, who has set a national pattern for providing tax relief for those persons of older age who have property by a progressive tax schedule that relieves them of some of the burden of taxation. Governor John Reynolds of Wisconsin, who has led the fight for higher education in this great State of Wisconsin so that any student, any young man or woman, that wanted—that wants an education, may have one regardless of the economic status of his family. [Applause.]

And, Governor, you ought to be justly proud of your record of bringing new industry to this State, of working in behalf of the labor organization and working man, the improvement of workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation. Listen, if I were a voter in the State of Wisconsin, I could recite this record and I would see to it that anyone that believed in Wisconsin as a great wise State mobilized their friends and neighbors to see to it that on November 3, John Reynolds is reelected Governor of the State of Wisconsin. [Applause.]

It take it for granted that you're going to have the good sense to reelect Bill Proxmire and Bob Kastenmeier, so I'm not going to say much more about it. [Applause.]

That trumpet is just calling back into the fold those that have strayed away momentarily. [Applause.]

And, my dear friends, every time you see someone carrying one of those Goldwater signs, they have a smile, and they have a smile on their faces and their eyes are bright and shiny, you know that deep down in their heart, they want to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

May I just pause for a moment to say that the President of the United States was very honored, as was his running mate, Hubert Humphrey, by the great tribute that was paid to us by the editorial in the Capital Times by Bill Evyjue, supporting the Johnson-Humphrey ticket. [Applause.]

And I want to say this. There is no more objective analyst and critic of those of us that are in public life and if we can meet, even partially, the high standards that are set by this distinguished journalist and citizen of this State, then I feel highly honored. [Applause.]

463 WBZ—LINO

I didn't come here tonight only to talk in terms of political clichés or even political puns. I want to talk to you seriously. I talked to a very enlightened college audience and to students and faculty and citizens of one of the finest communities in America. It has been said, and maybe with some justification, that there has been all too little discussion of the basic fundamental issues that face the American people in this campaign. [Applause.]

I want to take time tonight—by the way, all of those that are coming back to the fold have heard the trumpet. [Applause.]

There are a couple more that we were looking for.

I want to take time tonight to discuss seriously with this fine audience the questions of foreign policy and national security and of what I believe are the challenges to peace in our time. The American people have heard a great deal about peace. Everybody does a little talking about it and we have heard a great deal about the dangers of a turbulent world.

On this platform tonight, sits Robert Kastenmeier, one of the most able Members of Congress in the field of foreign nations, of disarmament, of national security—but I must say that I believe that he would agree with me that words about peace, about the perilous times in which we live, are no substitute for the lightning flash of events that brings the sudden illumination of reality.

Last week, events beyond our control changed this world. It brought an abrupt end to the age of Khrushchev in the Soviet Union. They brought the first atomic burst of an atomic explosion, of nuclear power, to Communist China, and they brought a peaceful change in the government of our close ally, Great Britain.

Once again, history has swept its fierce beacon across our horizon. And once again, event have reminded us of the interdependence—I repeat—the interdependence of men and nations, and of the limits of our own great power and of the dangers of nuclear arms and the proliferation of those arms.

And once again, we are reminded of, despite our best efforts, the inevitability of change.

Now, these are matters that students of government and thoughtful citizens give careful analysis and consideration to. I think these events must remind us of something else, that all we are and all we seek as a nation and as individuals is dependent upon the prevention of nuclear war. This is the supreme issue, not only in this campaign but before the American Nation and before humanity.

And it is the supreme issue of our generation. And it is the precondition of any future generations, because without peace, there can be no freedom. And without peace, the survival of our planet, in light of our unbelievable power of destruction, is in doubt.

So, where is there a better place to discuss these matters? Now, I confess limitation. I can only give you my views. And I do not say that I have any omnipotent knowledge, because I surely have none. I can only speak from my limited experience. But I speak to you with all sincerity.

I say that because of this overwhelming issue of the survival of the planet and a peaceable world. That's why whoever is the President of the United States for the next 4 years, when fateful decisions will be taken, must be judged above all on his fitness to conduct the Nation's foreign affairs and to maintain the security of this Nation. That is the issue and you know it.

And we ought to quit talking about the trivial and get down to the fundamentals.

Now, this campaign has been a valuable educational exercise and every campaign ought to be. A man in public life ought to be an educator first of all. It has been a nationwide educational eye-opener to the utter folly of Goldwaterism, of jingoism, of sloganism—I repeat, of jingoism, of sloganism, and of mudslinging as a substitute for the discussion of programs and policies. [Applause.]

Every now and then great nations produce within themselves the poison of frustration and impatience. Those who are students of history know this. And they produce men who preach this poison.

Now, we saw such men in earlier American history in the Know Nothing Party that arose before the Civil War, men who blamed all

464 WBZ—LINO

of our problems on the flood of immigrants of the Catholic religion. We saw such men in the witch-hunting days of McCarthyism, men who traced all of our troubles to alleged Communist conspiracy within our homes, our schools, and our Government. And each time that this has happened, each time, my fellow Americans, we have to purge our national conscience of these absurdities by exposure and by rejection.

I say this is our obligation once again today, to hear out—and we should hear even those with whom we openly disagree and reject those who have fled from the intricate task and the demanding discipline of world leadership—those who have lost the courage to be patient, because mark my words, the hope of the Communist dictatorship and of the Communist movement is that those who love freedom or profess a love for it will tire of the task of sustaining freedom.

They hope that we will become the victims of our own frustration. Now, these prophets of defeat, who tell us that Americans are “sick and tired” of our complex world, I say, only reveal their own sickness and their own tiredness. And knowingly or unknowingly, they are playing into the hands of the enemy, giving aid and comfort to those who would destroy us.

They hold out false promises of quick and easy solutions that they know are no solutions at all. And they say that these quick and easy solutions will make our problems disappear, like a patent medicine of the old medicine show of generations ago.

Now, don't misunderstand me. I'm not talking about a private individual or a private life. I want my position manifestly clear. I'm a Member of the Senate. I respect my colleagues. I happen to think that the Senator from Arizona is a loyal, patriotic man. I think he believes in what he says. [Applause.]

I do not make any aspersion upon him as an individual or as a spirit. I simply say that Senator Goldwater, while a loyal, patriotic man, is dead wrong, tragically and desperately wrong. [Applause.]

The solutions that he offers are no solutions at all. They are instead a sure path to a widening conflict and ultimately, if followed, or if we walk that path, to a terrible holocaust.

Now, what are the principles of the Goldwater foreign policy? He has stated them and I respect him for his willingness to state them and state them clearly.

And where would these principles lead us? The Senator's first principle is that every one of the world's problems stems from a single source. And I repeat exactly what he says.

That source—communism. He tells us in his speeches that “Communism is the only real threat to the peace of the world today.” [Applause.]

May I say that the beloved peasant priest, Pope John XXIII, had a different view. In his encyclical, *Mater et Magistra*—and may I suggest to every student of this day and age that you read two encyclicals, *Pacem in Terris*, *Mater et Magistra*—very good social doctrine, very important political theory.

But the beloved Pope said, “Given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among the people persists.” [Applause.]

Of course, communism is an evil. Of course, it is a threat. But the point is it is not the only one.

I wonder if the Senator has read his history? And as I have said [applause] as I have said to every student body that I have been privileged to visit with, I recommend that you read history. I recommend that you read it well, that you learn its lessons. I recommend that you read and learn and study ancient history. But I don't recommend that you vote for it. [Applause.]

I wonder if the Senator has ever heard of such forces as nationalism, or the clashing of national ambitions. Has he ever heard of territorial conflict, of economic struggles, of tribal and religious strife? Has he never seen the facts and figures of poverty referred to by the Holy Father, of illiteracy and disease and of the chasm between the rich and the very poor that breed unrest and despair in two-thirds of the world? This is what the encyclical, *Mater et Magistra*, was all about.

465 WBZ—LINO

Obviously, communism is an evil and a danger. We recognize it and we have met it. And we have repulsed it time and again. And we will continue to do so.

Yet, many of the problems that face us would be with us if Marx and Lenin had never been born and would be with us tomorrow, even if communism were to be banished from the face of the earth.

These problems are as old as mankind. But they are intensified today by a revolution in science and technology, by a spiraling arms race, and by the demands of millions and millions of people for a better life.

These facts cannot be ignored. Yet, the Senator from Arizona would have us think only of one great threat to peace and ignore the many others. He would have us reject all nations who see the world as something other than a vast stadium for the cold war. He would stop our aid programs, and he says so, except as a payoff for obedient American satellites.

And those, my friends, are hardly worth the money. [Applause.]

He would divide this world neatly into those who are with us and the rest who would be counted against us.

Furthermore, he fails to understand even the threat of communism itself, which is generally the case of those who talk the most about it. [Applause.]

He fails to see that our national interest, the interest of our country, requires different approaches to different Communist states.

For communism, Senator, whether you know it or not, is no longer a monolith. There are troubles in the Communist world, Senator. It is fragmented and it is fragmented through the impact of the strength and the examples of the free world. And it is increasingly shaped by the national heritage and soil, but it takes work.

Now, the second fundamental of the Goldwater foreign policy flows from the first. This is the principle, as he says, of total victory. How neat these packages comes. [Applause.]

One enemy, easy to identify, and one cause, total victory. He thinks he has found the one enemy and he says now that I have found it, why not slay it and live happily ever after? [Applause.]

He repeats, "Why not victory?" But how does he propose to achieve the total victory? In the "Conscience of a Conservative," his book, he says he would withdraw recognition from all Communist governments, including that of the Soviet Union. And, of course, apparently he expects all of them either to plead for mercy or chance. [Applause.]

He goes a step further. He says, "Encourage the captive people to revolt against their Communist rulers."

But then, what does he say? After they revolt—nothing. Does he mean to say that you, that the American people, must be ready to move in at once to support them with nuclear weapons? I think we have a right to ask.

There was a campaign not long ago in which we encouraged people to the doctrine of liberation, and the Hungarian people rose up and fought for their freedom. And what did that administration do?

CROWD. Nothing.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think we should have learned a lesson. I think we should have learned a lesson.

VOICE. What about Cuba?

Senator HUMPHREY. I'm glad they mentioned it, because Mr. Castro came into power under the previous administration. [Applause.]

And I might add he was invited to Washington—not by a Democrat. [Applause.]

And I might add with equal sincerity, I think that the President of the United States was doing what he thought was right and I must say that it's the same blindness of some today that existed then, that permitted conditions to persist in Cuba that made possible a Castro and his wicked regime. [Applause.]

Now that we have helped our friends with their history lessons—[applause].

What is it, then, the formula and the program that is advanced? Mr. Goldwater has frankly stated that we should issue ultimatums to the Kremlin. And he says—and one must admire him for his audacity—he says, "Be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes."

466 WBZ—LINO

Now, in so doing, he says to us very frankly that his goal would be "to invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat."

Now, clearly, my dear friends, university students, which indicates that you are students, Senator Goldwater understands neither men nor nations. He fails to understand the simplest of truths, that most other nations are composed of men and women who, if pressed to the ultimate choice, will choose, like Americans, to fight rather than surrender. And the task of statesmanship, my fellow Americans, in this, the 2d half of the 20th century, the nuclear and the space age, is not to find out how you can get into a war but rather to find out how to prevent one and preserve your freedom. [Applause.]

The Senator fails to understand that in our age of quick and total destruction, there is simply no such thing as quick and total victory. And those who seek total victory must contemplate, if they are honest with themselves, total self-destruction. Yet, the Senator remains quite willing to risk all-out nuclear war in the pursuit of total victory.

As he told an interviewer in May of 1961, and I quote:

So today, I am convinced there will either be a war or we will be subjugated without a war, real nuclear war. I don't see how it can be avoided, perhaps 5 or 10 years from now.

Now, that was 1961, and if it were 5 years from then, that would make it 1966. I don't want a man in the White House in 1966 that thinks war is inevitable. [Applause.]

He recently told the correspondent for an outstanding publication in Germany, the German magazine, *Der Spiegel*, that he "would willingly go to the brink of war, just as your country has used the brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully." [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I wish it were a joke. But it is not. Let me say that the German Government of today, of Adenauer and Erhard, repudiates that kind of thinking. They are building a democracy and they are building a mighty, peaceful nation.

But I remind you that an American said that we should be willing to go to the brink of war "just as your country has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully."

What kind of a statement is this? What kind of a man would make such a statement? You don't have to be a major in history to know that any man who offers the disastrous examples of imperial and Nazi Germany for us to follow on brinkmanship is a man who has no understanding of past history or current reality. [Applause.]

Now, the third principle of Goldwater's foreign policy is his stubborn assumption that America is omnipotent. The Senator says in one breath that we are the strongest power on earth, and in that he is right. Later on he says that we are growing weaker. But I assume he really means that we are stronger.

He is a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and he should know.

The Senator demands that we use our military might to get our way on all things. And I say he's wrong. Our power, great as it is, is not absolute, it's relative. And the effective use of relative power requires responsibility, restraint, and a careful sense of priorities. And the last thing that this Nation can afford is to lose our heads and to use our missiles at the slightest excuse.

He wants us to let fly with both barrels. Every time he thinks that one is—as he says—pulling Uncle Sam's whiskers, he wants us to solve every problem by the threat of force or the use of force. He fails to realize that there are hundreds of world problems for which force offers no solution.

Some months ago, the Senator announced that the United States no longer has any place in the United Nations. That is a happy thought, isn't it? And this is United Nations Week. Yet, I must say, today, he is not so sure.

He now says he is for the U.N. if it does our bidding; otherwise, he indicates that we'll pick up our U.N. marbles and go home. [Applause.]

467 WBZ—LINO

I think I should remind this delightful audience that there are others in the world that think the United States ought to get out of the U.N. In fact, the International Communist Party line is get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States. I don't want to have guilt by association, but there is a strange relationship. [Applause.]

I say that the United Nations has rendered an indispensable service in the keeping of the peace, helping to damp down brushfire conflicts might well be escalated into full-scale wars between major powers. It also has been a unique forum where men and nations can talk together and reason together and try to find some common ground of mutual interest.

That continuing search of mutual interest or common interest is what foreign policy is all about. And that search is mankind's only ultimate alternative to nuclear suicide.

Nowhere in this world are there any easy solutions. President Eisenhower knew that. President Truman knew that. President Kennedy learned that, and President Johnson knows that. Five American Presidents since 1944 have understood this truth. But not the man who now seeks to be President on the opposition ticket; not Senator Goldwater.

American military power is a firm fact of our life and this administration of the late and beloved President Kennedy and President Johnson, backed by two parties—not a partisan matter—has built that military power until today, our power is the greatest that it has ever been and greater than any nation on the face of the earth.

But America's omnipotence, America's ability to enforce an American solution to all the world's problems is a sheer illusion. And the man who seeks to be President should not deceive the American people by peddling that illusion. And it's a dangerous and crippling illusion for anyone who aspired to the Presidency.

A final principle of the Goldwater foreign policy is the total rejection of arms control—questions the safeguarding of disarmament. And why not victory? In his publication, the Senator wrote, "The United States should announce in no uncertain terms that we are against disarmament."

May I say that the day we announce that, we will have lost every friend we have in the world, because the people of the world will leave us. [Applause.]

But again, I am happy to say that a great general, who became a President, was the leader in disarmament, General Eisenhower, followed by a great President, John Kennedy. Not unilateral disarmament, not the misrepresentations that are peddled by an opposition that is indulging in the politics of desperation and intellectual bankruptcy, but mutual disarmament, safeguarded disarmament that we, the American people, through our Government have proposed.

I want to say that Senator Goldwater, again, is a man of his convictions, and I repeat that for this, you can admire him, even if it terrifies you. He voted his convictions in his vote against the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, a treaty which had the support of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and 25 of the 33 Republicans in the Senate, and of the overwhelming majority—better than four-fifths—of the Democrats.

I recall the moving words of Senator Dirksen, who surely is no left-wing leader, no Socialist, no unilateral disarmament man—a midwestern conservative, responsible Republican. [Applause.]

And may I say, I have had the privilege of working with the Senator and I find that he is man of responsibility. He said, on the occasion of just a moment before the vote on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:

Mr. President, I want to take this first step. I am not a young man. One of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone "He knew what happened at Hiroshima but he did not take a first step" (Republican leader of the Senate, Everett Dirksen).

Senator Goldwater, I believe, also knew what happened at Hiroshima. But he said no, in no uncertain words to the test ban. He refused to take the first step for stopping the spiraling horror of the nuclear age and of keeping the atmosphere clean from the poison of nuclear fallout.

468 WBZ—LINO

Now, the impressions of the Senator's position are obvious. He would cease all efforts to control the armaments race. He would lead us to unbridled nuclear testing, to the further poisoning of the atmosphere, to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And if the record of such races through history can be our teacher, the outcome would be a nuclear cataclysm.

The logical consequences of Goldwaterism are only too clear. If we are to do as he bids us, we would find ourselves eventually at war all over the globe—war fought with nuclear weapons in Eastern Europe, escalated war in southeast Asia, war against Cuba, and war in Berlin. [Applause.]

We would find ourselves alone, in grim isolation, for our NATO allies and our other allies would have fled from us in horror at policies of rampant belligerence that they would regard as madness.

We would have repudiated the test ban treaty with the stroke of one man's pen—and would have resumed the intensive poisoning of our atmosphere.

We would have lost all contact, influence, and respect in the less-developed continents by stopping our programs of assistance.

We would have removed all possibility of negotiation to avert disaster—by pulling out of the United Nations and by cutting our diplomatic channels to our adversaries.

We would find ourselves, in short, a garrison state in a nightmare world—isolated from everything except a nuclear reign of terror.

Clearly, my friends, the Goldwater alternative is no alternative at all. It is simply a flight from reality on the part of men who have given in to total frustration and despair.

Yes, those are the choices that are the alternatives. And those that are honest with this record know that to be the case unless the Senator from Arizona never meant a word of what he said. But if he means that we should withdraw from the U.N., as he says, if he means that we should cut off our foreign aid, as he says, if he means by the vote no Peace Corps, as his vote indicates, if he means no negotiations but merely ultimatums, then I warn this audience and this generation that if this man should be elected President of the United States, there is no alternative.

The only prospect is one of disaster and one of cataclysmic tragedy for the American people and for the world.

Our power is massive and will remain so. But power alone, my fellow Americans, will never keep the peace. It never has and I see no prospect for the future.

The Senator does not understand that his mere repetition of the word "peace" will not bring peace. The building of peace is like the building of a magnificent cathedral. It takes time. It must be built block by block, generation by generation, a process we must continue by both word and deed, day after day, month after month, and year after year.

President Kennedy reminded us that peace is a process and every peacemaker in the history of the world has reminded us of that fact from the days of Biblical Scripture to this very hour.

And President Kennedy and President Johnson, like President Eisenhower and President Truman, before them, took steps toward peace. We have given our unswerving support to efforts to strengthen the U.N., bipartisan efforts with the exception of this one faction, this one fraction of a faction of reaction which presently controls the Republican Party. [Applause.]

Yes, we have been building peace by strengthening the U.N. to which Mr. Goldwater says no. We have expanded the food-for-peace program to feed the hungry, to use food as economic assistance, to work with our churches and our voluntary organizations in a mission of mercy, to which Mr. Goldwater votes no.

We have begun a historic new partnership with the Latin American countries in the Alliance for Progress. And again, Mr. Goldwater votes no.

We initiated the Peace Corps and made fitting use of the idealism and the dedication of Americans, like you in this audience and many more like you throughout America.

469 WBZ—LINO

Mr. Goldwater called the Peace Corps a haven for beatniks and voted no. This is not building peace. This is insulting intelligence. [Applause.]

We have established communication, a hot-line between Moscow and Washington to help prevent the actions which may lead from a breakdown in communication to nuclear war. But again, the Senator from Arizona said no.

We have created an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency out of the recommendations of two Presidents, Republican and Democrat, to help reach sensible agreements to slow down the arms race. But again, Senator Goldwater said no.

We have achieved the test ban treaty to stop atmospheric poisoning. But Senator Goldwater said no to every one of the constructive efforts, step by step, stone by stone, block by block, that we have attempted to build this pathway for peace. The Senator from Arizona has said no.

He has not only said no, he has voted no. And he has offered not one single constructive suggestion—not one bill, not one project which would promote this process of peace. That is his record. [Applause.]

I fully realize that there will be those that will not like this stern appraisal. But it's an appraisal based on the record. And Mr. Goldwater was right. He said the American people should have a choice. They have one—between progress and disaster. [Applause.]

The American people have another choice, because in the White House today is a President who has displayed what's required in the Presidency. The higher order of responsibility, he understands the yearning of mankind for peace and he also understands that the search for peace is man's noblest pursuit.

He also understands that we must be strong to preserve this peace. And he understands that strength employed without responsibility, without restraint, and without reason is a shortcut to mutual obliteration.

I stand on this platform tonight and take your time to talk of these serious matters in extended form, to be sure, because this is a matter of life and death. This is not an ordinary election. There are forces at work in this election that need to be repudiated. There are forces, if you please, of bitterness and of distrust and of doubt and confusion.

We have witnessed the reactivation of a Ku Klux Klan. We have witnessed the rise of a John Birch Society that can call the former President Dwight Eisenhower a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

We have witnessed Gerald L. K. Smith once again blessing a presidential candidate. We have witnessed the Minutemen, who practice open guerrilla warfare. We have witnessed once again the know-nothing parade upon a respectable platform.

And I say to my fellow Americans, these people must be rebuked, they must be repudiated, they must be defeated in such a fashion that never again will they be a threat to the ideals of this Republic. [Applause.]

May I leave you with this thought, and not a chant. To the thinking people and to those who love this country for what it is, and for the pursuit throughout its history of the highest ideals of human compassion, representative government and peace, to those who ask this question, "Why not victory?" I ask you to reply, "Why not victory indeed—victory over war itself, victory for peace, and victory for mankind?"

That decision is in your hands and you will help make that decision on November 3. And I think you can help in that decision by electing as President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson.

Article

News release from the Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

October 27, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, PRESIDENT'S CLUB, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator Goldwater has been desperately searching for an issue—and he hasn't found one.

470 WBZ—LINO

Goldwater and his political adventurers have shot up "bombshell" after "bombshell" during this campaign and every one has been a dud.

The Goldwater crew thought they found a sure-fire votegetter when they raised that old cry from a discredited past—that the Johnson administration is soft on communism.

This proved to be such a dud that its godfather, Dick Nixon, ran away from it.

Yes, this ludicrous Halloween mask didn't scare anyone. So what did the Goldwaterites do? They trotted out another old hob-goblin and accused the Johnson administration of *promoting socialism*.

This tommyrot—to borrow a term from General Eisenhower—is a further insult to the intelligence of the American voters. Every American knows that the Johnson administration is so "Socialistic" it won the enthusiastic support of Henry Ford and a host of other leaders of American industry—not to mention many of the most influential Republican newspapers in this country.

Every responsible businessman and banker knows the Kennedy-Johnson administration has helped lead the American economy through the longest period of prosperity and sustained growth in our history—44 months in a row. Businessmen know that President Johnson practices a sound fiscal policy—a tight budget policy and has encouraged American business.

But I must say, the Goldwater propagandists do not stop trying. After all these earlier "bloopers" they have resorted to the tactics of political desperation—the sure sign of defeat. They turn to personal villification of their opponent. There is nothing new about personal abuse toward the President of the United States. It has been an unfortunate part of American campaigning throughout our history. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, Hoover, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Truman, and John F. Kennedy—all were the subjects of abuse and unfair attacks.

But Senator Goldwater goes beyond tasteless personal attacks on our President. He indicts an entire nation. He heaps scorn on the American people. He has launched a systematic campaign to degrade almost every aspect of American life. The Goldwaterites spread doubt among the American people. They scold our youth, vilify our cities, and show a cynical disregard of our elderly. To the Goldwaterites America is sick and tired. What an insult to this great country.

Senator Goldwater knows he cannot wage a successful campaign by defending his stubborn opposition to specific programs of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. He knows he cannot win by continuing to attack laws that were enacted by a bipartisan majority in Congress.

Instead, he and his fanatical followers feel they must propagandize with cynically contrived television commercials that our whole society is *delinquent, immoral, corrupt, and rotten*.

I do not know whether Senator Goldwater believes all this hogwash, but I do know that he and his advisers have coldly calculated that their only chance to win this election is to play on what he believes are the passions and the prejudices of the American people. But he misjudges the American people. He doesn't know them, but they are getting to know him.

The American people know such tactics are unworthy of any political candidate—much less a man who is running for the highest office in the land. Such tactics reveal that Mr. Goldwater has lost faith in the American people.

I have news for the Goldwater party. The American society has never been stronger—in both a material and a spiritual and a moral sense—than it is today. This country is not beset with moral decay. The American people are strong and vital.

While the Goldwaterites are wallowing in self-righteous breast-beating about the flaws in our society, the American people are building a better America—a better America with more opportunity for our young, with compassion for our afflicted, and security and dignity for our elderly. Yes; a better America that is dedicated to the cause of peace and freedom.

471 WBZ—LINO

The American people are going to give their answer to the candidate from Arizona just 7 days from today. They are going to tell Senator Goldwater that even though he lacks faith in this country—they have faith in our country—they have faith in themselves.

In his desperate search to find an issue Senator Goldwater fails to recognize what the American people have long realized. The issue in this campaign is Senator Goldwater himself.

The American voters realized long ago that the overriding issue in this election is which man is best equipped by training, by experience, by intellect, and by temperament to lead this Nation through the perils of the nuclear age.

I am confident the American people will choose a man of patience, a man who has met the test of leadership—a man of wisdom and courage and restraint.

I am confident the American people will give an overwhelming vote of confidence to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

New York, N.Y.
President's Room, Waldorf Astoria Hotel
October 27, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much.

Well, thank you very much, Harry, for the sudden promotion. Sort of something like Barry's instant solutions. And I am very grateful to you.

Arthur Krim, may I once again thank you for your graciousness, and for your leadership in these wonderful programs, your support of President Johnson, and for myself. I am simply delighted to see all the good members of the President's Club here. And I am pleased to see my old friend Mr. Farrell, a friend of my father's, and my friend here, and see Harry and Frank and Al and all of you. And then my friend, Senator Ribicoff. He said he is up here to protect his interests. Listen, I heard you were going to be here, and I came up here to protect my interests.

You don't realize that some of those days when I would sneak away from the Senate I was coming up here, sort of working the vineyards of New York and trying to just move in on you just a little bit.

But I am very, very proud of the friendship that I am privileged to have and to share, and that is with the Senator from Connecticut, Senator Abraham Ribicoff, who is a wonderful Senator, and a good friend of ours.

Well, I looked around this room. I remember the times that I had been here before. I am a man that has been to the well many times, you know. Each time my cup runneth over. If ever there was, as I said—Marvin will remember this, Marvin Rosenberg—one time a few years back we had a little gathering, it wasn't quite as large as this, and surely didn't do quite as well. But it was sort of an emergency treatment for a sick and dying patient. And we were up raising a little money in the campaign in 1960. And I looked around the room and I said what in the world am I going to say to these folks, I have talked to many so many times, there is really nothing new to say. And then it just dawned on me why I believe in a full employment economy, and a prosperous economy. I said this is the only way you can afford me. And I might add that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and the Democratic Party are committed to this program of ever-expanding prosperity in the hopes that you will be able to continue to afford us. And you have been mighty generous, very, very generous.

I wish that I could come for other purposes than just asking for your help. But if there is any endeavor in human life that requires the cooperation of others to make it a success, it is the endeavor of politics. There isn't a single man in public life that ever got there alone. It is impossible. You need friends, you need loyal friends, you need giving friends, you need generous friends. I used to say on some of my good friends back in Minnesota, when they would hear these things about you, I said, "Look, if you are going to give me a political blood test every time you see me, I am going to die from political anemia. Just believe in us or don't believe in us, and help us or don't help us."

472 WBZ—LINO

And you have been the people of faith. You have helped generously. It is a fact that without the President's Club, and without the generosity of the club here in New York, that President Johnson's program of reelection, and his program for America, and his efforts to meet this onslaught, the likes of which I don't believe we have experienced for many a generation—that these efforts would be futile, they could not possibly be undertaken.

But you have made it possible, and you have made it possible for us, not only to fight back, but more importantly, to state the case for a better America, and for the things in which we believe.

I want to just say two or three things to you that may indicate why we think this is a serious business.

By the way, there have been a couple of discoveries in this campaign. The first one is my middle name. I think that Mr. Goldwater has been very helpful. Some people address me as Hubert, the newer friends call me Horatio. But I was asked about that on a program, and I told them that my father would have been most happy if he could have known that that name would become so popularized, because, really, it was given to me in the hope that an uncle would leave us a little in his will. [Laughter.]

The fact of the matter is the old rascal never left a cent. He went out and voted the Republican ticket, and denied his relationship.

The other discovery, I think, is the fact that the candidate of the opposition is not within the traditional pattern of a Republican opposition. We have always had tough opposition. There are men and women in this luncheon today that can recall campaigns that were hard fought, always filled with some distasteful aspects. But this candidate of the Republican Party is neither a Republican nor a Democrat. At best, he represents, as I have put it somewhat facetiously, but I put it now in all seriousness, a fraction of a faction of reaction in his party. He captured his party. And actually we are doing a service for two parties, and for the Nation, by his defeat. Because if the Republican Party is to be maintained under the leadership of its present sponsors, or under the sponsorship of its present leaders, then for the first time in America public life, in political life, the most ugly and distasteful forces and attitudes gain a respectable platform. And that is what I think is very, very important for us to understand.

I don't like to indulge in personalities in politics. I am very frank with you. I have never run on the sainthood ticket, I have never qualified. But I must say that the campaign of vilification that has been carried on against President Johnson in this campaign has known no equal in our time. And it isn't just a campaign of vilification against the President. It really is a campaign of vilification against the American institutions. No one has been spared—even yesterday he came out against daddy, according to what I saw in the paper.

It says, "Barry opposes daddy." By that I gather that he meant that the Government was being a little too kind to the citizens of this country.

But we are faced today with several challenges. And I have said from every platform that I believe that Mr. Goldwater is very serious about what he is talking about. Many people try to laugh him off. And I don't think you should. Because it isn't just the man that is talking. He represents a set of forces in this country, or attitudes, and they have gathered around him, and they have gathered around him on public platforms, and on his airplane, and they have gathered around him in every one of his councils.

You can examine into that yourself without Hubert Humphrey giving you detailed information. But when I noticed the Washington Star carrying an article that the grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan was on the platform in Columbia, S.C., when a candidate for the office of President speaks, I think it is about time that we were concerned. And when I hear a candidate for the office of President saying that he thinks that the members of the John Birch Society are the very kind of people that ought to be involved in American politics, and that he is impressed with them, a society that has branded the former President Eisenhower as a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy, I think we ought to be concerned. And that is why we are here.

473 WBZ—LINO

Let's face it. We are here for two reasons. We are here because we want to see the continuation of the Kennedy-Johnson program, and we want to see President Johnson reelected in his own right. Because we believe in his sense of compassion, we believe in his sense of progress. But we are also here, if you just think it through, because you can literally be terrified at the prospect of what can happen in this country if you lose this election. And we ought not to take this in just, you know, sort of as they say, take it in stride. This isn't one of those ordinary elections. This is a very different one. And that is why I am throwing myself into it with everything I have. I don't labor under the idea that this election couldn't be won with a little less effort on the part of the candidate. I have never been quite sure just how much good a candidate really does out on the hustings. But I suppose you do some. You have to feel that you do. I have been told by many—"what are you out there wearing yourself out for? Why don't you take it a little easier? You are going to win this election." Many an election has been lost with that attitude.

But, more importantly, I want to feel in my own soul and heart that I gave everything that I have to see to it that this country wasn't poisoned with what I consider to be an ugly and unwholesome political attitude and doctrine.

I want to be able to look myself in the mirror on the morning of November 4, regardless of the results of that election, and say, "I did my part." And I think that if we all do that, there won't be any doubt how it will come out.

But let me say this. It isn't important just to win it. You are in the process of stamping out in this country, at least for the foreseeable future, forces of hate and bitterness and violence and distrust and suspicion and cynicism and negativism that are the very forces that have destroyed many a good country. And the time to stamp that out is before it gains too much momentum. We have let it gain too much already. It has been working around the perimeter of America for a long time. It has been influencing people in Congress, Governors and legislators and mayors. It has been influencing public opinion and public journals. And the time has come to call a halt. And I think that Barry Goldwater has performed a great national service, and I would like to honor him for it. He has said we are going to make a choice. He has said very frankly that it is about time the American people had a real choice, and he is giving us one. And if a man wants to have a fight on that basis, if he wants to fight it out on the basis of clear-cut cleavage of attitude and philosophy, I am for taking him on, and for giving them a whipping that they won't forget for another generation or so.

Then I think there is yet another point that needs to be clearly understood.

I know it is important that we are prosperous, I know that it is important that we have social security. We have worked for these things together for a long time. But all of this will go by the boards, every bit of it, if our country falls into untrustworthy hands, or falls into the hands of those who preach a doctrine of division, disunity, and prejudice and bigotry and hate.

And, remember, that every public figure takes with him people that help him. You need to look at his helpers, as well as the man. That is why I can be proud in this room today. I am proud of our helpers. I know the people in this room have fought the good fight, against religious intolerance, against racial intolerance, against every form of bigotry. I know that the people in this room have fought for better education for our young, better health for our people, better care for our elderly, better opportunity for our business community, fairer standards for our laboring people. That is why I like the company that I keep.

And you have to know a man, not only by what he is, but with whom does he associate? Who are the people that help him?

But all of these great social gains that we are so proud of will be lost if we cannot perform the real task of statesmanship. And that is the preservation of our national security and world peace. That is the issue.

474 WBZ—LINO

Last night I spoke in Madison, Wis. I gave the speech I wanted to give all during this campaign. We had a packed house. Huge crowd. Of students and faculty and townspeople. And I spoke on the truth and the consequences of Barry Goldwater's foreign policy. And, believe me, it is a frightening exposition.

A man who openly advocated withdrawal from the United Nations. A man that says you should never negotiate. A man who serves ultimatums, who believes that foreign policy is advanced only by ultimatums. A man who says that war is inevitable. A man who says we will either be in war or we will be subjugated without war in 5 to 10 years. A man who says that we should not attempt to have cultural exchanges and build bridges between people. A man who says we should serve notice on the leaders of communism that they either accept total defeat, or else.

That kind of loose talk frightens our friends, aids and gives comfort to our enemies, and will leave America standing alone, alone in the cold wintry indifference of other people in an ugly nakedness. We will just be there alone. We will be the garrison state. And everything that we ever believed in will be on the line.

I truly believe that this man that is our opponent in this election has no comprehension whatsoever of the nature of the world in which we live, of the forces that are at work. I quote that last night a passage from the late beloved Pope John the XXIII, who in his greatest encyclical, *Mater et Magistra*, traced for us some of the causes of war, as he did in *Pacem in Terris*, two of the greatest documents of our time. And when you read what that great man said, and then read what our opponent says, I think you know what the issues are. When you read what President Kennedy said, that peace is a process, and you read what President Johnson has said, that our goal is to build and not destroy, that we shall go the extra mile, we shall go any place, anywhere in the cause of peace, just peace—not appeasement, a peace with honor and a peace with freedom. That is what is on the line. And I know that every thoughtful person in this room realizes it. But you have to realize it right down into the very depths of your heart, it has to be seared right into us. Because if we think for a minute that you can win this effort by just hoping you are going to win, or even public opinion policy—those policies disturb me a little bit, I want to be frank with you, because every Goldwater voter is going to vote once and more times if they can. I give them credit for voting once. They will be there, if the weather is bad, they will be there. And instructions are out in my State to every Republican leader that is a Goldwater leader, I should say, out there to see to it that every Democratic vote is contested—if there is any doubt whatsoever—to make it difficult for our people.

Mind you, they put out a memorandum in my State—to make it difficult for our people to vote.

They are going to try everything. And that is why Hubert Humphrey comes here to you today and says, "Look, give of yourselves." Anybody can do what is possible. We have got to do what is impossible. And we have got to let the world know. We have to let the world know that in this election that the American people are ratifying and reaffirming the policies that this Nation has been pursuing. We have to let the world know that America refuses to be intimidated by the forces of hate, violence, and reaction. And you are the people that are doing the job. You are providing us, as they said in those war years, pass the ammunition.

You are passing it. You are making it possible for us to do it.

Well, I wanted to be a little more of light heart today. I am going to make a little tour out on the west coast. I must say that I feel very confident, I feel we are going to do all right. But I don't want to do all right. It is sort of like I tell my kids. They come home with those report cards. And they come by and they say—"Well, Dad, I passed." I say anybody can pass. Go back and do better.

We don't want to just pass. We don't want an election that we squeak through. We want an election like we had, Jim, in 1936, where when the votes are in [applause] when the votes are in, we have made it manifestly clear to friend and foe alike the direction of America for the next generation. And you are in the process of giving us the fuel to do that job.

475 WBZ—LINO

I will go back and tell President Johnson that you have taken care of it, and he doesn't need to worry, he can sleep well. Everything is fine.

Thank you very much.

New York City
Street Rally
October 27, 1964

REMARKS OF HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. But they have been looking for an issue, and they are in the process of doing this, they set up what they call one bombshell after another, and they kept ending up with a dud, and the American people know. What is more, my good friends, in all seriousness, the American people are weary of innuendo and half truths, weary of personal vilification and attack.

I have said a number of times about Mr. Goldwater that I consider him to be a loyal patriotic American. I have never made a personal comment about him in terms of his fine family or himself and I don't think one needs to. It isn't his private life. It is his public utterances that disturb me. I happen to think that Mr. Goldwater would make a wonderful neighbor, but a very poor President.

And in this campaign we are not selecting neighbors. We are selecting an occupant for 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and that place needs someone of reason, someone of judgment, someone that has a record of performance, someone that is responsible, someone that understands the world in which we live, and the challenges of that world.

Now, our opposition has indulged in the same kind of old politics of desperation that every great President has faced. You go back over the life of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, or Jack Kennedy. And you will find that they were all the victims of great personal abuse. But there is something different in this campaign. It isn't just the candidate that is being abused, and it isn't just the President that is being vilified. It is the entire Nation. As a matter of fact, the opposition launches its attack upon the people of this country. They say we are sick and we are tired, and they talk about it so much that even an amateur psychologist could make this examination and analysis. People that talk about others being sick and tired are generally the sick ones themselves, and they are very tired, and they need a rest, a long rest.

The people of America have been scolded. The elderly have been treated with cynicism. The American community has been told that it is demoralized and rotten. The American people, however, I think, have a better idea about themselves. This country is strong economically, it is strong politically, it is strong in its terms of the spiritual quality of our life. This country of ours is the wonder of the world, and it seems to me that we ought to have a President in the White House, and we have one now, that seeks to tell of the wonders of America, of its glories, that tells of some of its good things, rather than one who downgrades us and degrades us, rather than someone who scolds us, and indulges in breastbeating with self-righteousness.

My, it must be wonderful to be so pure. It must be wonderful to be able to—it must be wonderful to feel that you are so right, so far right, I might add.

But, frankly, there is an issue in this campaign. And the issue, if Mr. Goldwater will look for it, he can find it. The issue in this campaign is the policy, the pronouncements and the utterances of Mr. Goldwater himself. He ought to just play back his own tapes, and read his own stuff. And that is the issue. The issue of a man whose statements on foreign policy frighten the daylights out of our friends, and give aid and comfort to our enemies. Statements on foreign policy that carry the air of belligerence, statements that say that we ought to get out of the United Nations, statements that say that war is inevitable, statements that tell us that we ought to break our alliances. Statements that tell us that we ought to indulge in brinkmanship. Statements that tell us that nuclear weapons are really conventional.

476 WBZ—LINO

Ladies and gentlemen, the issue in this campaign is the public posture, the public attitude, the public statements, and the public records of the candidate of the Republican Party, or should I say a segment of the Republican Party.

This is the issue. And, my good friends, on that issue we are going to win this election, because the American people want a responsible Government, they want a President that can lead this Nation forward, not backward. And the American people want a President that knows of the present and things of the future. They want a President that believes in education, and doesn't say that it would be better if some children—some children would be better if they didn't have it. They want a President that respects the many ethnic and religious groups of our country, and recognizes that in this great land of ours, we are a great national symphony of many peoples, many voices, many cultures, many ethnic groups, many attitudes, but blending together in these United States of America. That is the kind of a President that we want, and we have got one.

Now, I want you to know that I have been highly honored in this campaign. I never knew that anybody took quite so much interest in who was going to be Vice President. But for all of you that may be concerned, the candidate for President is Lyndon Johnson, and when you elect him, like it or not, you get me, too.

So I suppose the opposition has a point. They say "you ought to take a look at that Humphrey." Well, look me over, folks. I feel fine. And may I say that I am happy to stand here on this table in rather improvised, I might add, and just about as wobbly as the opposition's platform—I am happy to stand here on this table and say that I believe in an America that provides opportunity to all of its people, I believe in an America that is a government of laws and not of men. I believe in an America in which every boy and girl has an opportunity for an education, regardless of their economic status. I believe in an America where there is only one kind of citizenship, first-class citizenship for everyone. I believe in an America where we encourage enterprise, private enterprise, to expand and to grow, where we encourage investment, where we encourage a worker to do a better job. I believe in an America, if you please, that has respect for human dignity and for human rights. I believe in an America that understands that the wealth of this country and its power is not just for ourselves. We are a blessed people, we have been given an opportunity for world leadership, and leadership is not just the privilege of having it your way. Leadership means that you must occasionally sacrifice, it means that you must act responsibly, it means you must take into consideration the needs of others.

We are the richest Nation on the face of this earth, and the strongest, and we will continue to be that way, if we are worthy of it. I think we are worthy of it.

This wealth of ours is to buttress our noble efforts for peace and security. I know our opposition doesn't like to hear us talk about this, but the task of statesmanship is not to rattle the saber, it is not to demonstrate that you are belligerent and bellicose. The task of statesmanship is to work patiently, persistently, sacrificially, for a just and enduring peace, because everything that this great city means, these buildings, these schools, these cultural institutions, we, the people, everything, is lost if we lose the peace. And I say in the words of John Kennedy, that the pursuit of peace is man's noblest work, that peace is a process, we build it stone by stone, and block by block, like you build a mighty and a beautiful cathedral. And we are going to build it decade after decade and generation after generation, and we are not going to lose faith. But I do not want a man in the White House who has never contributed to the building of that peace. I do not want a man in the White House who voted no on the Peace Corps, who voted no on the Arms Control Agency, who tells us to get out of the United Nations, who voted no on the Alliance for Progress. Who says we ought not to negotiate. Who says we ought to lob a missile in the men's room of the Kremlin. I don't want that kind of man. I want a man in the White House that resolutely and carefully searches for peace, and know that the peacemaker is truly the courageous man, knows that the quest for peace is the task of strong people.

477 WBZ—LINO

Finally, let me say this. All of this will mean nothing unless we vote. I have got some suggestions for you, in case you haven't gotten the idea how to vote. But that is up to you, basically. You are in charge next Tuesday, 7 days from today. You will make the decision. Popular sovereignty. On that day you will select the leadership of this country, and this is a high privilege and a heavy responsibility because the decisions that are made in the next 4 years will be decisions that will affect the lives of people for generations yet to come. We cannot make a mistake. You cannot repeal an election. When you elect a President, he is elected for 4 years. You cannot back away from it.

I urge upon you, your citizenship responsibilities. Not merely your privileges. I urge that there be a turnout, the likes of which you have never known in New York. I urge this because we are not in an ordinary election. We are faced today with forces of hate and bitterness and dissension. There are forces at work in America today that must be defeated—the Ku Kluxers, the Gerald L. K. Smith, and the others.

I say to you that this election is the most important one that you will participate in for many a year. And join me, will you—join us, with your hands and with your votes, to elect as the next President of the United States, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Thank you.

New York, N.Y.

Television Interview With Walter Cronkite
October 27, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

MR. CRONKITE. Senator Humphrey, do you believe the polls? Are you winning?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. Well, Walter, the polls are indications, they are indicators. They give us some trends. And I suppose that when the polls read well, you like to believe them. But I remember what President Truman told me. He said he never paid too much attention to them, he just went out and worked and worked and worked. And that is what we are doing. But the polls look very good.

MR. CRONKITE. Do you have any personal assessment as to what States among these key States you are going to carry as opposed to Senator Goldwater?

For instance, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana.

SENATOR HUMPHREY. Well, I do feel that it looks very good for President Johnson in New York, the whole New England area is strong Democratic area this year, and not just Democratic—there are a large number of Republicans in this area in particular that are moving over to support President Johnson. I believe that we are going to do well in Michigan and Illinois, California. The key States, Pennsylvania, very good. Ohio is always somewhat of an enigma to me politically. Even though it looks very good in Ohio. And I believe that this time President Johnson has a tremendous following in that area. We feel that the key States should fall in line in terms of a Democratic victory. And there are, as you know, approximately—well, if you carried 11 or 12 of the large populated States, you have a sufficient number for the electoral vote. But that wouldn't quite be satisfying. We would like to have a large popular vote, a large majority, and, of course, to carry as many States as possible.

MR. CRONKITE. What about the South?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. I have a feeling that the South is coming around to the banner of President Johnson and the Democratic Party. It has been a battleground. But, the President is the first Southern President, well, since Woodrow Wilson, and you might even say the real—in terms of being really a southerner, for a hundred years. And I cannot believe that the southerners are going to turn their back upon President Johnson. I think that he understands their needs, he understands their problems. He understands the attitudes of the people there, and some of their sufferings, and some of their hopes and aspirations. And I think this message is getting through. I am interested as to how the President approaches the people of the South. His speech at Columbia, S.C., was a very, very fine address. He has a way of communication.

478 WBZ—LINO

And I believe that that message and his personality and his understanding will bring the victory.

Now, I don't mean in every State. I want to be frank with you. I think we have some problem areas. Mississippi, Alabama. But even there, I think it is going to be surprising, the large vote that President Johnson will get in Mississippi, and in Louisiana.

Mr. CRONKITE. How about Florida?

Senator HUMPHREY. I personally feel, from what I have heard, and my own observation, but primarily from those who live there, they are in a much better position to give you a really objective observation—that President Johnson is going to carry Florida. It is a close State, but I think we will carry it. His recent visit to Florida was very heartening.

I had one of the best meetings I have ever had at St. Petersburg, Fla., and another one at Tampa—very, very good. But most of the Democratic officeholders in Florida are out helping the President, working for the Democratic ticket. There will be a large vote in Dade County, Miami, for President Johnson, and the Democratic ticket. I think this, plus what we will get elsewhere, will bring the State into the Democratic column.

Mr. CRONKITE. Senator Humphrey, in view of the defection of some southern leaders, some of your fellow Senators, do you feel that there will be a revision of party loyalties and party lines in the South, particularly in the Senate?

There has been talk in the past of throwing out the seniority system in some of these States that don't deliver presidential votes for the party. Do you think anything like that is likely to occur after this year?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I wouldn't think that we would want to throw out the seniority system because a State didn't deliver its vote for the national ticket. I think that would be most unfair. But if a Senator or a Congressman bolts his party, and does as Senator Strom Thurmond did, and says, "Look, I am going over to help the opposition," and openly goes over to help the opposition, and denounces or renounces his Democratic Party affiliations, he obviously shouldn't have any seniority under the Democratic party majority in the Congress.

Mr. CRONKITE. Anything short of outright renunciation should not be penalized?

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't think that it should call for the loss of their seniority status. However, I would like to encourage my colleagues in the Senate to stand up for their President, and most of them are, may I say. Some of them are not as active as others. But there have been very few. Actually, I know of only one U.S. Senator on the Democratic side that actually bolted the party, and has refused to take a stand for President Johnson. Some of them haven't been very active. But Senator Richard Russell, for example, of Georgia, has announced that he would support the President. Senator Herman Talmadge of Georgia, Senator Eastland, and Senator Stennis—these are men that have difficulties in their respective States, but they have announced for the President.

I wish that some of them were a little more active. But that is their decision.

Mr. CRONKITE. Is it going to make it more difficult for them to go along with the President's various programs, not just civil rights but the President's various programs if their States this time turn Republican for the first time in some cases in their history?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I think it will for some. But let me say that while in a way one doesn't like to see, as a Democrat I speak now—I do not like to see the weakening of the Democratic Party in these areas. The development of a good two-party contest in every State is a healthy development.

Of course I would like to see that development with a Democratic majority.

But there is a realignment taking place, not by fiat or by edict, but just by evolution. And more and more you are seeing younger progressive forward-looking political leaders coming into the Democratic Party, and the more conservative are moving over to the Republican Party.

479 WBZ—LINO

You take Governor Sanders of Georgia, a very fine forward-looking Governor. We wouldn't agree on every issue, but he is a man of the future.

Governor Don Russell, of South Carolina—splendid, progressive-minded, that is, a forward-looking, modern up-to-date political leader.

Now, again, I want to say that we in the Democratic Party always leave some room for individual decision. We don't have a disciplined party organization, and we don't want it. We don't ask for unanimity. We ask for unity, based upon respect for the other fellow's ideas.

But these are the leaders of the future. These are the men that I think are building the Democratic Party. I think a man like Senator Talmadge of Georgia is another one of the forward-looking leaders. And others have given a great deal. I don't think we ought to forget that some of our colleagues from the South have made great contributions to the United States, and in a campaign we are prone to do that. You take a man like Senator Lister Hill of Alabama. The whole hospital construction program of this country, and much of the medical research undertaken by the National Institutes of Health are due—these achievements are due to his leadership, Senator Sparkman of Alabama, the housing programs that we have throughout America, the small business activities of our Government—much of this is due to his leadership. Senator Russell has been a guardian, so to speak, of our National Defense Establishment, he has been a great friend of American agriculture. I can't bring myself, Walter, around to just criticizing people because they don't always agree with Hubert Humphrey on this issue or that issue. We have our differences, and you have to judge these men in terms—and I hope to be judged the same way, I might add—in terms of the total spectrum of political life, rather than riffling in on one issue and saying you, Hu, you weren't on that one, therefore out. I don't believe that that is the way to operate.

MR. CROOKITE. Senator, there has been a great deal of discussion about the dirtiness of this campaign. Do you feel that it has been a dirty campaign?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. Well, I think it has been a campaign that has not really done what it should have in terms of lifting the levels of public discussion. There has been a great deal of appeal to prejudice and passion and emotion on the part of our opposition.

I really believe this. I think there are forces at work in this Nation of ours today that are not good, not in the public interest. We had a period of time in America when there was an infiltration of Communist leftwing politics into many of the social and economic and political structures of America, back in the 1930's and the early 1940's. But they were repudiated, they were thrown out of the trade union movement, they were thrown out and kicked out of the political parties, they were decisively defeated. Their defeat in 1948, the period from 1946 to 1948, when the Progressive Party was launched. I don't want to be misunderstood. There were many people in that party that were fine, decent, wholesome, loyal, idealistic Americans. But there was an effort made to penetrate the party with Communist influence. It was defeated. It was denounced and renounced, and some of us were in the vanguard of that denunciation, and renunciation of their efforts.

Now, we see the extreme rightwing radicalism in American politics, and in these past 15 to 20 years, there has been a growth of this rightwing radicalism, these forces of bitterness and hatred and discontent and disunity and cynicism and negativism they have been working on the fringes of American public life. We have seen them in the John Birch Society. We have seen them under the mantle of the Ku Klux Klan. We have seen them under the leadership of a man like Gerald L. K. Smith, and there is a movement—I have forgotten now just the name of it—but where they train people actually for guerrilla warfare. These are the forces that are sinister and evil, I think.

I mean they are wrong, they appeal to the meanness that some of us—that all of us may have a little of. And I don't want to see them gain a respectable platform. And I regret to say that I am afraid that is what is happening in this campaign. Some of them are being able

480 WBZ—LINO

to gain a platform to enunciate their ideas, to articulate again in the open their programs and policies. I think this is very bad. That is the ugliness of this campaign.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, now, if there is a trend, a growing trend in that direction in this country, as you have just said, it must indicate some underlying dissatisfaction with what we have in this country. Therefore, doesn't this raise a genuine issue for this campaign?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I want to say that this is not unusual. Every nation has had within it people who are the victims of frustration and impatience. And we have been mobilized as a nation now since 1940. We had World War II, the postwar period, the constant Communist pressure upon us, the evolution and revolution throughout the world, whole new areas of the world in convulsion and erupting and nationalism, the continent of Africa and Asia in turmoil, Latin America. And we have people that just weary of this. They actually—the pressure upon them is more than their systems can seem to take. And they want—they become impatient, they want answers. And some of the answers that they seek are literally to issue orders—do it this way or else, as they see our massive military power, they begin to think that that power is omnipotent—even though there are many problems in the world today that do not lend themselves to the use of force, the solution, to the use of force. You don't conquer hunger by the use of force. You don't conquer illiteracy by the use of force, you don't conquer even the emotions of nationalism by the use of force. You cannot even stamp out communism by the use of force. As a matter of fact, the use of force itself may, if it is large enough, could bring a nuclear war, might well leave a world in which the forces of communism and fascism were really dominant forces in the world in the sense that people would be so beaten down and so destroyed that there would be little freedom left.

I would say this: We have gone through this before. We had the Know-Nothing Party in the United States prior to the Civil War. The Know-Nothing Party blamed everything onto the Catholic immigrants, all the problems, you know. We have had these little fringe parties before, and these fringe elements. But we have always been able to repudiate them, we have always been able to cleanse ourselves, purge ourselves of them. And I hope that in this election we will be able to purge ourselves of this, too, purge ourselves of any form of active political or any form of political action based upon racism—and there are appeals to racism in this election, we know that. There are appeals based upon sensationalism. There are appeals based upon painting our Federal Government as a conscious enemy of the people. We have one organization in this country that even charged the former President, General Eisenhower, of being a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy. That was the John Birch Society.

Now, my good friends, anybody that makes a statement like that, of course, is irrational. This is incredible, because General Eisenhower, whatever you may think of some of his politics, was one of the greatest men of our time, a great general, a great patriot, and a loyal American.

These forces need to be repatriated, and they will be.

Mr. CRONKITE. Senator, do you feel that an overwhelming majority for President Johnson and yourself will represent a repudiation of Senator Goldwater, the man, or will it be interpreted as a repudiation of these fringe elements that you are talking about?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Senator Goldwater, the man, is not the issue at all in this campaign. I know the Senator. I wouldn't indulge in any personality discussions at all, except to say that I have always found him a sociable man. I consider him a thoroughly loyal and patriotic American. It isn't Senator Goldwater the man. It is Senator Goldwater's public utterances; it is his public posture. And it regrettably is the forces that have surrounded him. Every man is more than just—when he is in public life, he is more than just a man. He becomes a leader of a group, he becomes a leader of a philosophy or of a program or a policy of a set of attitudes. And Senator Goldwater the man must disassociate in a very real sense from the Goldwaterism, and you take the foreign policy of Goldwaterism, which is expressed doubt about the United Nations. In fact, get out of the United Nations, and maybe we ought to stay—said that we ought not to negoti-

481 WBZ—LINO

ate, we ought not to build bridges of cultural exchange with the Eastern European countries, the expression that possibly war is inevitable, either we will have a war or we will be subjugated by war in the next 5 or 10 years. This is Goldwaterism. The feeling that you can't—that you ought to have no arms control, that we ought not to discuss any disarmament, even though we can have safeguarded disarmament. The Goldwaterism of voting "No" on the Peace Corps and calling it a haven for beatniks. Voting "No" on the arms control agency. Of opposed to the extension of the food-for-peace program. Of voting "No" on the Alliance for Progress.

Now, I consider all of those items that I have listed as steps in the stairway to peace, or to put it another way, they are like stones in building the cathedral of peace.

And, to me, to build a secure world, and a world in which peace is more than the absence of war, in which peace becomes something of a positive force for human betterment, or an environment conducive to human betterment, this takes time, it takes patience, it takes understanding. It is like building a beautiful cathedral. The cathedrals in Europe, they were not built in one generation. Some of them took a hundred, two hundred years, and each generation contributed something to the magnificence and the beauty and the spiritual quality of these magnificent cathedrals.

Well, peace is a cathedral. It is really man's—man's political cathedral. He seeks to add something to it, and sometimes you may put a stone in place in the structure that is out of place, you have to redo it, you have to redesign it. We are not always right. We make mistakes. But I think that we need an attitude that peace is possible. I think the world will be very disappointed in America if in our present situation of wealth and power and of prestige, we fail to lead and to lead kindly, and yet to lead with strength, and to have compassion, and to have understanding.

Mr. CRONKITE. Senator, in view of the, seemingly the overriding discussion of personalities in this election, do you feel that the vote will contain any sort of a mandate to—whichever side wins—to pursue a given course? It seems to me that the situation is so confused, that perhaps you won't have a mandate, no matter how large the vote.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think there will be a mandate. It is my hope that, first of all, that there will be a repudiation and a rejection of some of the more ugly and unsavory elements in American life. I can only speak for myself. But I can think of nothing that is more injurious to the future of this country than to have doubt and suspicion of one another. You can't build a free society on that. You must have some faith, you must have some trust. The whole—the central theme of freedom is human dignity, and respect for human dignity. And when there are voices that are heard loudly and sometimes very racially and brashly that scream out against different ethnic groups, or that condemn a man because of his color, or cast suspicion upon him because of his race, or because of his religion, or because of where he lives—I say that this is bad, and we need to repudiate it. It is evil, and there is such a thing as evil. And we ought to repudiate it. And I think that in this election, we can do that. I regret to say that in the process of doing that, we may very well appear to be repudiating a man.

I have no personal animosity toward the Senator from Arizona. I want that quite clear. I have said quite frankly that I think he would make a good neighbor.

But I don't think he would make a good President. And there is a great deal of difference between a man's social—his friendly associations as a social being, and the standards that he has for political leadership.

Now, the other mandate will be for President Johnson, and Hubert Humphrey, and what we stand for, to move ahead. And that means, I think, in the field of education—we have got to do much more. We have to do much more in terms of a government and a people, all areas of government working to build better cities, to make these cities livable. These cities are becoming congested, not only in terms of traffic, but of air pollution and all sorts of problems. We have to do a better job of building our cities. We have to think in terms of how we can apply this wonder of science and technology called automation, not merely to the production of better and more goods, but how do we improve life with it—how do we use leisure time?

482 WBZ—LINO

There are many things that I think that we get a mandate to do, plus, as I said, the search for peace.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, taking the other side of that coin, if there is a sizable vote for the Republican Party in this election, if it is a close result, wouldn't you consider that a mandate to go slow in the things that they call big government?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, if there is—and there will be, mind you, of course, in any election, a rather sizable vote for which every party may lose, because there are a number of straight party adherents. I appreciate that. I am a man in politics, and understand that. But I think it is very, very important that if we speak of a mandate, that we talk about a rather handsome, a rather big majority vote, running into several millions.

But to answer your question specifically, I think what it would really pose is a challenge to us, if we believe what we are doing is right, to get out and work a little harder.

Now, no one believes in big government for the sake of big government. I hope no one does. But this is a bigger country. In fact, the Federal Government today, in relationship to the growth of population, has grown smaller, rather than larger, than it was, let's say, 20 years ago, or 15 years ago. State and local government have had to expand their revenues, their taxes, the largest increase in employment in government officials is local and State government.

Yet our opposition tells us that the Federal Government is drying up local and State government, that it is taking over from local and State government.

Well, now, I consider myself to be somewhat of a student of government. It was my work as a teacher. The fact of the matter is that local and State government today have grown by leaps and bounds. And why? Not because some mayor wanted it or some Governor. Because most of the legislatures are rather conservative. And most of the cities are generally governed by rather middle-of-the-road people. Why? Because you have more people. You need more water service, more sewage service, more police service, more fire service, more health service. It just grows.

Every man's business is a little bit bigger today, too. He hires more people. That doesn't mean he is a bad manager. When you look at the business expenses of a large corporation today you see that it is much larger than it was 25 years ago. You don't fire the manager because of that. You look and see how much business he is doing, how many customers is he serving, and then you look at the balance sheet. Is he making a profit or is he losing? Is it well managed or is it poorly managed? I think that the judgment on government as to what it ought to do in its size is related to the needs that it fulfills and, to the services that it is required to perform. And today, our Government, much of our Government, most of it is in the field of defense and national security and research.

We have a whole new area of government today. In the last 6 years, that is larger than the total budget of Franklin Delano Roosevelt at the highest peak of his prewar administration.

In other words, when you used to hear about the terrible expenditures of the New Deal, we are spending more on the space program right now, one program, than we spent on all of the New Deal at any one year.

Now, that has just been added, that has been added since 1958. So you take that kind of a program, and you can plainly see that Government activities do change, and they do expand.

Mr. CRONKITE. There have been many Democratic voices raised in protest to bringing morality into the campaign, as not a fit subject for the campaign. And yet it would seem that there is some legitimate concern on the part of the American people regarding a certain moral decay. Don't you feel that this is something the people should be entitled to discuss in this campaign?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think that every issue is entitled to full discussion. And surely morality is one of them.

I want to say that one of the reasons that I attend church, Walter, is because I am not a perfect man. I need counsel, spiritual guidance, I need to be lifted, I need to have a chance for prayer and meditation. Everybody does. And this is a very private matter, as well as a public matter.

483 W B Z—LINO

And there are problems of morality. You have people. When you have people, you have problems of morality, and immorality, of mediocrity, and less than mediocrity, and sometimes a genius. These are all subjects of discussion. And we ought to have a high level of performance in our Government. But morality is a very broad subject. I think a man must be honest. I think he should have respect for a fellow human being. That is morality. I think that he should conduct himself in a way that proves that he believes in the high standards of what we call ethical or moral conduct. Personal moral conduct. But there are some other kinds of morality, too. Is it moral to walk by a man who is sick and leave him? Is it moral for a government of the people to be unconcerned about the afflicted or the blind or the unemployed or the needy?

My morality, my sense of morality is both personal and public. And I may at times fail in both. But that sense of morality includes more than just whether or not I go to a cocktail party, or whether or not I may use profanity, or whether or not I may have done something that is personally evil or sinful. It also includes how I feel about my fellow human beings. Do I think that the elderly ought to be shunted away in attics, in the richest country in the world? Am I concerned about little children that may never have a break, that may be the victims of a broken family, or a father that is unemployed? It is not their fault. Should they be helped? Should the child of an unemployed father or mother receive help? Or should we say that that is socialism, and just push them aside? Should we be concerned about our cities? We ought to build cities that are beautiful—not jungles of asphalt and concrete. We ought to have schools, better schools for the poor even than the rich, to be frank about it, because they have less chance, or as good schools—let me put it that way. We ought to want to see that young people have guidance in their schools. Some of them are emotionally disturbed. They ought to have psychological guidance, courage. Do we do that?

I consider it immoral—my religion tells me, my personal feeling tells me that it is wrong, it is evil, to let a man be sick that can be healed. It tells me that it is wrong to leave somebody hungry when you have a surplus of food.

And yet I hear people talking about morality who vote against food for peace, who vote against helping use American food and fiber to feed hungry children. I have as much obligation to a child that was put on this earth as a creature of God, surely, as I have to myself.

Mr. CRONKITE. Senator, I don't think that is what the opposition is talking about.

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I am afraid that is not what they are talking about.

May I say that ought to be talked about. Both sides of this must be talked about. I am saying that the American people need to understand that compassion and charity and kindness and love for one another are also items of morality. That is what we are taught. And it isn't just morality, the immorality of an individual that is the only problem. No one can deny that. And that ought to be openly and frankly faced, wherever there is a mistake. Sometimes it is a personal tragedy, as we have witnessed, and then you have to ask yourself How much politics should one play with personal tragedy?

I think one ought to ask himself that. What right do I have to really bring anguish and pain into the life of a family?

I think you have to ask yourself that. And then see if you can sleep well at night.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, I think that the Republican position on that, regardless of some perhaps misuse of the issue, was on the basis of security problem in the White House.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. Now, that was answered, wasn't it, by J. Edgar Hoover. I think Mr. Hoover is possibly a better judge, a better objective nonpartisan judge, as to whether or not there was any security problem, than a partisan on the platform, whoever that partisan may be. And Mr. Hoover said there was no security problem after an intensive, exhaustive survey. So that matter, I think, has been fairly well, at least reasonably well handled.

Mr. CRONKITE. Does it reflect, though, a weakness in procedure up to the time that J. Edgar Hoover went through a rather late examination of the issue?

484 WBZ—LINO

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, we have been trying to improve our security procedure for some time. I had the privilege in 1956—1955 or 1956—of introducing a resolution in the Congress to establish a Commission on Security. I was joined in this by Senator Stennis, of Mississippi. It was passed in both Houses. President Eisenhower appointed the Commission. It was headed by the president—then president—of the American Bar Association, Mr. Wright, of Los Angeles, Calif. And that Commission examined the entire security structure of our Government, and made many recommendations for its improvement. I thought there was a need for improvement. That is why I offered it. I thought that the whole security structure had become a patchwork, that it ought to be reviewed, not by people that had a partisan or political interest, but by competent lawyers, by people who were in the best sense of the word objective. That Commission was established. I did not serve on it. I was asked to serve, to be frank about it, because I was the author of the act, I felt it was not right for me to, that I would be looked upon as possibly an apologist for one side or another, or an advocate. So I did not serve. And the Commission, I think, made a good report.

Now, we maybe ought to again, in light of these developments, take a look at our security mechanism procedures. I might add that every country has had a problem. The Swedes have had a very serious problem. The Russians have problems in the police state of the Soviet Union. The Federal Republic of Germany has had several serious problems. The British, the French, the Italians. It is very difficult to have a foolproof security system or procedures of security, because you are dealing with human beings. And you never can tell when one goes off base, or when something goes wrong. So you cannot develop even in the most cruel police state an absolute security system. Every day you are reading of somebody, if not every day, every month, I should say, of someone that defects behind the Iron Curtain. This is happening in China, it has happened in Czechoslovakia, it has happened in the Soviet Union, it has happened in a free country like Great Britain several times, as you know, and it happened only this last summer in Sweden, it has happened in Italy, it has happened two or three times in Germany.

What we need to do is to recognize this, and then try to improve it, try to improve it without becoming a police state.

Mr. CRONKITE. What can a Federal Government do to try to lift the moral tone that the Republicans charge is being lowered because of an example in high places of graft and corruption? I am not pointing a finger directly in this case at some of the cases that they bring up, but through our recent history, and of several administrations, there have been a case or a couple of cases of some kind. And I think the Republican attitude is that there is this trickle down that finally ends up with the juvenile violence in the streets.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. Well, now, Walter, I don't think there has been a finer man in government than General Eisenhower. I didn't agree with all of his policies, but, goodness me, he surely is a good man. He has given his life to his country. And yet in the Eisenhower administration there were a number of instances where people violated their public trust, very seriously. I don't even want to repeat their names. And I haven't spent my time doing it. Not once in this campaign. I have felt that General Eisenhower took remedial action—President Eisenhower—and I didn't accuse and I wouldn't accuse the President, the former President, of doing any wrong.

Now, President Johnson has been the victim of vilification. So was every other worthwhile man. Washington—what they said about him—Jefferson, Lincoln, Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, Dwight Eisenhower, Herbert Hoover.

You name any man that has been in public life, and he has had somebody that failed his trust that was near him, someone that somehow or another got out of line. It is just one of those tragedies.

Now, I don't think that America is immoral, and I—it is one thing to level a political charge upon a political candidate. But what I really protest of the opposition is that they attack the whole of the

485 WBZ—LINO

country. They say that anybody that is unemployed is just sort of a loafer, and they have said it right here in New York City. They say that our children are acting as if somehow or another they were delinquents, all of them.

Sure, we have delinquency. But we have more children than we ever had before. And I might add we have more reporters. And one of the things that I have found out, when I was mayor of Minneapolis was that I initiated that working with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a new police reporting system, so we kept better records. And the crime rate in my city jumped 200 percent. Now, the crime rate wasn't up. The reporting was up. They just didn't used to put it on the tab before.

Now, there is a good deal of that. Now, I am not trying to play down what are real factors of social breakdown. We have gone through a world war. We have had a country that has been at least in many cold war police actions. There is a question of whether we have—How do we learn to live with prosperity? Our youngsters today live in automobiles, they have more freedom. As a matter of fact, I marvel at the self-discipline and the moral code of our youngsters. They are not under the watchful eye of Walter Cronkite or Hubert Humphrey all the time, as parents. They are out on their own. They are in the countryside, they are in the car, they are away from home. They do mighty well. As a matter of fact, they are a whole lot better than many of them in our day and age. We just didn't get caught, to put it quite frankly.

I think that there are more good things going on in communities, more people are helping one another. We are building more churches. Not that that within itself is a sign of morality, but at least it indicates a sense of spiritual need. I resent the attacks that are being made upon America. I know that we ought to lift, and the President of the United States is a man of good conduct, he is a human being. He is what he is. But he is a man of religious faith, he is a good family man, he is a good man in every sense of the word. And to try to paint out a President, or paint him as some sort of, well, irresponsible, immoral individual, I cannot take. I don't like it. And I don't like it even more when it appears that our whole country is rotten, as they say, that the American people are sick and tired of this, and sick and tired of that, the opposition says. The American people aren't sick. They are very healthy. And they are not tired. They are very vital. And they are doing things. They are building schools, and they are building better communities.

Walter, I travel. I get in these motorcades, and I come into these cities, and I see these lovely homes, these fine yards or lawns, and I see mother there, a young mother, four or five little children, she is a good mother. She is taking care of those children. The man, her husband, is working, he is bringing home the paycheck. He is a good father.

Now, I don't think I have any right to stand up and scold them about their moral conduct. And I don't think that I have any right to scold all of my contemporaries in public life. I know the Members of the Senate. And I don't want to brag on them, but by and large I think they are just about a good a group of men and women as you will find any place in America. Not a saint in the crowd, even though some may occasionally want to feel that they are. But they are pretty good. They are pretty nice people.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, the people will decide on next Tuesday.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, they will. We will await the decision.

Mr. CRONKITE. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, sir.

Charleston, W. Va.
Civic Center
October 27, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, thank you very much.
Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much.

486 WBZ—LINO

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you, first of all, for a very enthusiastic welcome. I was trying to say to my good, prudent, enlightened friend, Hewlett Smith, that sometimes we almost forget how much that television time costs. But we surely want to thank you for a warm welcome.

And I am simply delighted to be here back in Charleston, W. Va., a wonderful city, more beautiful than when I saw it the last time, more prosperous than when I was here 4 years ago.

And I might add, I am sure that it will be as good or more Democratic than it was 4 years ago.

It is so good to see my colleague in the Senate, Jennings Randolph, who is a remarkably able, gifted, hardworking U.S. Senator. And I want to say, Jennings, that your colleague and my friend, Senator Robert Byrd, called me while I was in my home State in Minnesota, to let me know that he could not be with us here tonight. But I come here to his State of West Virginia, knowing that he is a candidate for reelection, and I say to you that you have a good Senator, and he is one that deserves your support, and I urge upon you that you send Robert Byrd back to the U.S. Senate.

And, Governor Barron, it is good to see you, and Mrs. Barron, to meet again in the presence of good friends, happy neighbors. And above all, it is good to see my colleagues from Congress. They have been introduced from this platform, and each and every one of them has been a faithful public servant for the common good of this great State, this wonderful area, so beautiful and so much moving forward to a better aim here in West Virginia. I want to say that I am particularly proud to be back in this countryside, because I sense a spirit here that tells good tidings. There is good news tonight, real good news. And that good news tonight is news that even the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party knows—namely, that President Lyndon Johnson will be reelected to the office of President.

And there is some other good news. It is the good news that here in the State of West Virginia, this honorable State, where mountaineers will always be free, and where a people of this great State appreciate the importance of cooperation with Government. That good news is that one of the finest men that this State has ever produced, one of the finest individuals personally, and one of the most talented men in public service will be elected just as surely as we are gathered in this hall tonight, will be elected the next Governor of this State, Hewlett Smith.

I have known Hewlett Smith and his lovely wife, family, for some time. And let me say right now that this man has been a public servant or has been working for the people of this State, both in private and public life all of his life. Every young businessman in the State of West Virginia knows of Hewlett Smith, and everyone knows that this man is their leader, every workingman in this State knows of Hewlett Smith, and every workingman in this State knows that Hewlett Smith, Democrat, Hewlett Smith, progressive, forward-looking, will be a friend of American business, of West Virginia business, and American labor, and West Virginia labor.

Yes, I have been in his home. And nothing could be more pleasing to President Johnson, nothing could be more gratifying to his friend, Hubert Humphrey, than that the people of West Virginia would take this man to their hearts, and that they would give him a vote of confidence, so that West Virginia may have progressive, enlightened, forward-looking leadership for the next 4 years. And I am sure you are going to do just that.

I see some signs around here that tell me of times that I traveled from county to county, and I want you to know how happy those signs make me feel. I want you to know that Muriel Humphrey, my Muriel, Mrs. Humphrey, and Hubert Humphrey—in fact, Hubert Horatio Humphrey—that Muriel and Hubert will never, never forget the wonderful, wonderful friendships that we have in this beautiful State, and of the days and the weeks that we spent here. And may I say that while some people may look back upon that experience, if they are close friends of mine, saying, "Oh, it was too bad for Hubert," let me tell you it might have been too bad for Hubert, but it was good for America, because we got a great President.

487 WBZ—LINO

I think it is fair to say that John Fitzgerald Kennedy went on to be President of the United States because of your votes in West Virginia. And you made the right decision.

I was privileged for those months and weeks afterwards to work with him, for 1,000 days, of some of the most dramatic, some of the most moving and gifted leadership that this country has ever experienced. So I thank you, I thank the people of West Virginia for what you did for America by seeing to it that John Kennedy became President of the United States.

My friends, when we were here in 1960, we were talking to you about your problems. Now, I can come back and talk to you, not about your problems alone, but about your progress, and how much better that is.

Four years ago the Kennedy-Johnson administration started. Four years, almost 4 years ago, about 3 years ago and 9 months ago, President Kennedy said to you, "Let us begin." And the beginning started right here, in West Virginia because it was in West Virginia that the very first touch of John Kennedy was to be felt. It was right here where the very first programs were launched. And for 4 years the Kennedy-Johnson administration has been giving good, good reliable leadership and constructive programs to your great State.

Unemployment is down from what it was. While it is still too high, the direction is right. The trend is down.

Income, personal income in this State is up \$100 million, Governor, and Senator, and Hewlett, up \$100 million, in less than 4 years. And the trend is up.

The most important thing of all is the morale, the spirit of the people of West Virginia is up. And morale is nothing more or less than the expression of self-confidence, and of optimism on the part of the people.

Oh, you have done well. But you haven't even started. Because we are going to do much better. And with the election of Lyndon Johnson as President for 4 more years, West Virginia will move ahead at an ever-increasing pace of progress.

But let me be very frank with you—if you are going to do that, you are going to have to have a cooperative team. We cannot move West Virginia forward with just Washington. You are going to need an administration here in your State that is a part of a great cooperative endeavor. You are going to need not only Lyndon Johnson in the White House, but you are going to need Hewlett Smith in the state-house.

Lyndon Johnson, President Lyndon Johnson told me to tell you that he is going to need Hewlett Smith as Governor of this great State, and I am going to be able to tell him when I return, am I not, that you are going to see to it that Hewlett Smith is Governor of this State.

Now, let me talk to you about the leader of the Goldwater party. I didn't say the Republican Party, because they scrapped that out at San Francisco at the Cow Palace.

Now, you know, GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party. Now it means Goldwater, our problem.

I speak of our Republican friends with respect. I don't want to saddle them with Mr. Goldwater. I prefer to speak of the Goldwater party.

And I ask you what has he been doing for West Virginia, and what has his associates been doing for West Virginia? And make no mistake about it. The candidate on the Republican ticket in this State is sleeping in the same bed as Mr. Goldwater.

What has the Senator from Arizona ever done for you? He has been in the Senate with Jennings Randolph, Hubert Humphrey, and Bob Byrd. He has been in the Congress. He hasn't sponsored a single piece of legislation to create one single job, not one, or to bring one new industry to West Virginia. But he hasn't been idle, I want you to know that. I think we ought to be fair about it. As a matter of fact, he has been mighty busy.

There are two kinds of busyness. You can either be a constructor or a wrecker. You have to be busy either way. You have to be busy to build a building, you have to be busy to destroy one. And I want to say that the Senator from Arizona has been a mighty busy fellow. He has fought against every single constructive program. He has been on the job. Every single constructive proposal of the Kennedy-Johnson administration to extend opportunity to the American people.

488 WBZ—LINO

He has opposed the area redevelopment legislation. He opposed the vocational educational legislation. He opposed the tax cut of 1964. That meant millions of dollars to the people of the State.

He opposed manpower training and redevelopment. He opposed the antipoverty bill. He opposed the Economic Opportunity Act. He opposed the standby public works bill, that has been used in this State, sponsored by your Senator, to bring you thousands of jobs and to help many communities. He opposed conservation measures. He opposed medical care for the elderly—medical care even as a grant under the Kerr-Mills bill, and medical care—hospital care under social security. He opposed increasing the minimum wage. He opposed the food stamp plan.

Listen, he has opposed everything. He even came out against daddy in New York last night.

Imagine the gall of this Senator to come to Charleston recently and announce his opposition to every one of these progressive programs that has meant something to this State. And he did. He stood right here, I believe, in this same auditorium, and he told the people of this State that he opposed all these measures, as if you were supposed to enjoy it. He suggested that by telling you this, he demonstrated the depth of his courage and his convictions. I say he demonstrated the depth of his callousness and his indifference.

Let me ask this question: Is it courage to refuse to help an unemployed father? Is it courage to deny a worker that has been displaced by automation a chance for a job by retraining and vocational education? Does it take courage to deny a State the chance to build needed public improvements and to put the unemployed back to work? Is it courage to vote against aid to education, so that our young people can go to college? Is it courage to oppose a much needed tax cut for people that are trying to make a better life?

I ask you, is it courage to vote against hospital insurance for the elderly?

I think not. This is not courage. This is the doctrine of selfish irresponsibility, a doctrine of uninformed by history, a doctrine that is uncontrolled by reason, and a doctrine that is untempered by charity. This is not courage.

My fellow Americans, that is plain obstruction, plain reaction, just plain against the American people.

But I notice tonight in your wonderful newspaper that there is a story that says, "Barry sees L.B.J. heading Nation to socialistic ruin." What a lot of tommyrot and bunk that is.

Henry Ford endorses Mr. Johnson. When the Saturday Evening Post endorses President Johnson. When Life and Time magazines and the New York Herald Tribune, and the New York Times, and your own paper, when the leading industrialists and bankers of America, and the trade unions of America endorse President Johnson. And Barry Goldwater calls it socialism.

I want to say, my friends, that any man that doesn't know any better than that is not qualified to be President of the United States.

The truth is that Senator Goldwater is neither a Republican nor a Democrat. The truth is he is not a conservative. The truth is he is a radical. He is a radical in the true sense of the word.

Why do I say that? Because he seeks to destroy social and economic achievements that we fought for for 30 years. He repudiates a bipartisan foreign policy that has been built up carefully over a generation. He distorts the past. He misrepresents the present. And he misunderstands the future. And, ladies and gentlemen, that is the definition of a radical, and America doesn't like radicals of the left or the right, and America is not going to vote for Barry Goldwater for President of the United States.

This man accepts the support of irresponsible and radical extremist groups, and he drives away from himself loyal members of his own party. And, as I said, the overwhelming majority of our people will repudiate this kind of action.

President Johnson knows that the American people need opportunities, that they want to build a better life, and he knows that the American people have the energy, the initiative, and the resourcefulness and the hope it takes to build that life.

489 WBZ—LINO

Our President doesn't cast doubt and suspicion. Our President doesn't indulge in smear and innuendo. Our President seeks to inspire, to educate, to lead, to unite us. And that is the kind of a man we ought to have as President of the United States.

Finally, may I say that President Lyndon Johnson knows another thing that needs to be known by every citizen, by every public official—a world of opportunity, a world of better living, and a better America requires a world at peace. And I ask you to remember this—that the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, knows that it takes courage to be a peacemaker.

I ask you to remember that only the strong can be the peacemakers. I ask you to remember that only the just are the peacemakers. And those who rattle the saber, those who talk about belligerence, and those who talk as if somehow or other they deserve notice of the world—they are not the strong, they are the weak. They are the very ones who have neither the strength of themselves or of others to perform the duties of public service.

Peace, therefore, is a world where no nation fears another, and no nation can afford another to follow on its command as our President said—"Peace is where we build a better world." And President Johnson is a man of peace, and he is a man who pursues his duties as Commander in Chief of the most powerful nation in the world, with restraint, and with reason, and with responsibility.

Let me say to every mother and father in this room tonight, that every other issue fades into insignificance, save this issue of our national security and peace.

There will be no better America if it is destroyed by war. There will be no jobs, there will be no education if we become involved in nuclear war. And what America needs in the next 4 years, because faithful decisions will be made in those 4 years, is a President who can work with the rest of the nations of the world in the pursuit of peace.

We need a man who understands the world, who realizes that our power is not for conquest, but that our power is for peace, who realizes that our wealth is not for luxury, but rather is for the strength to give us to pursue the peace. We need a President, if you please, who understands the terrible burdens of the office of the Presidency, who senses that there is a new day and a different day on that very day that the first nuclear weapon was perfected. And we need a President who can use this power with restraint and with reason, so that no nation may fear America in terms of any impulsive act, but that all nations may respect America for the ideals and for the purposes that she stands.

I submit to this wonderful audience here tonight that you folks in West Virginia, as people in Minnesota, as I saw them in Wisconsin last night, have an overriding responsibility on November 3 to select the man that you can trust. Once you have elected a President, you cannot repeal it. Once that you put him in office for 4 years, there is no turning back. Once you have given him your vote, you cannot take it back. And, therefore, the decision that you make on November 3 will be the decision of your life, the decision of the life of your children. It will be the decision to determine your future. It will be the decision to determine what kind of a world we are going to live in. Because if this is to be a better world, we will make it that way. And if this is to be a world that will be lost and destroyed by accident or miscalculation or premeditation, it will be because we failed in our leadership. And my fellow Americans, I have yet to hear one word from the Senator from Arizona that indicates that he has the vision to lead this Nation. And the Scriptures tell us that a nation without vision shall perish.

I have yet to hear one utterance from the Senator from Arizona that indicates that he understands the problems of humanity at home and abroad.

This man would seek to repeal 30 years of progress. This man would indeed substitute force for negotiation and diplomacy. And that kind of a man is too dangerous for these days. A man that can repudiate the Peace Corps, a man that can repudiate food for peace for the hungry, a man that can vote against the Arms Control Agency, a man that can vote against the nuclear test ban treaty, a man that

490 WBZ—LINO

can vote against the Alliance for Progress, a man who can say we ought not to negotiate, that man has proven himself by his vote and his words to be unworthy of the Presidency of the United States.

So I come back to West Virginia, this time in what I hope and honestly think will be a mission of success and of victory.

You, my dear friends, have received much, and now it is time to repay. We Americans have received much. No people so blessed, no people so privileged, no people anywhere so free, no nation ever so strong. And because these are our blessings, we have the responsibility to see that at home in America there is opportunity for everyone, regardless of race, color or creed, or economic station, or section of the country. We have the moral obligation to see to it that the young of this land have an opportunity and an opportunity that is assured them through the best education that we can possibly provide. We have the moral responsibility to see to it that our elderly, who have given a full lifetime of service, may live out their remaining years in dignity and in security, and not in humiliation and in poverty.

And, my friends, I want to repeat from this platform what I have said across America—that to me concern about the weak, or to be compassionate for the needy, is not weakness. To be concerned about the afflicted and those who are the unfortunate is not socialism. I say to this good audience of good Americans compassion and concern for the needy is the highest form of Americanism, and we know it.

Beware of these false prophets. Beware of these folks that have no concern for you. Because if they have no concern for you, for then whom shall they have concern? Beware of the man who tries to make this Government look as your enemy. Beware of those who have no understanding of the economic and social needs of a rapidly changing America. If you want this great State of West Virginia to realize its potential, if you want this State to have industry and jobs and universities and opportunity for the young, and recreation, and culture, if you want these things, my friends, work with those who believe in those things. Work with those who believe in those things.

You have on this platform tonight those men and those women, and you have in the White House tonight a President who follows in the footsteps of the man that selected him as Vice President. I remind this audience that the Kennedy-Johnson administration is now up for its test vote. The question before America is, do you approve of what we have accomplished thus far? If you do, then you vote for President Johnson.

If you wish to see your America go even further forward in the paths of economic and social progress—if you do, you vote for President Johnson and Hewlett Smith.

Now, let me ask to stand here alongside of me tonight those good people, public servants, that believe in progress, that believe in the future of America, that have faith in the people of America, and those men and women around this platform—and I ask my friend and your friend, the next Governor of the State of West Virginia, to stand by my side, and I ask Senator Jennings Randolph to stand by my side, and I ask Governor Barron to stand by my side.

Ladies and gentleman, this is your team.

Article

News release from the Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

October 27, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY,
CINCINNATI, OHIO

One issue dominates all others in this campaign: which candidate for President of the United States is better prepared to assume the awesome responsibility of leading the land we love, for the next 4 years?

This election comes at a time, and in a world, where there is nothing certain but the fact of change itself. Only a few days ago, the world was witness to a vivid demonstration of this fact of 20th century life. Within 24 hours, the world was shaken by three events which point up, as no words can, the character of the world we live in, the

491 WBZ—LINO

times we live through. In one short, breathtaking day, Nikita Khrushchev tumbled from power in the Soviet Union—the Red Chinese detonated an atomic blast—and in Great Britain, the reins of government changed hands.

That historic day clarified and illuminated the basic issue in this campaign, made it stark and simple: At a time in history when no man can know what the morrow will bring, which candidate is better qualified to work for the preservation of our ideals?

On November 3, you will have to make that decision. It may well be the most important decision of your life, and the most important decision for the lives of your children.

How should the American people go about making this fateful choice?

Reason, experience, and plain commonsense—all tell us that for guidance in choosing the President of the United States, we must look to performance—not promises.

Performance is the true test of a man. Performance separates great leaders from second-raters.

On the basis of performance—not promises—Lyndon Johnson towers head and shoulders above his opponent. He is the one person qualified to bear the fearful burden of the Presidency for the next 4 years.

Think back to those dreadful days last November. Our great President was struck down. History stood still. The Nation and the world teetered on the brink of despair and collapse. One slip, one misstep, one rash judgment, one impetuous remark by the President of the United States could have produced international chaos. It was absolutely imperative that our own citizens as well as our allies and our enemies, see that we were still a united people—still determined to seek peace, and still determined to maintain the capacity to preserve that peace.

And Lyndon Johnson stepped forward. He grieved with us. He wept with us. But he calmed us—he strengthened us—and with his guidance, we walked out of that valley of despair.

Never has a human being carried such responsibility on his shoulders. And never has a human being responded with such courage and determination, with such wisdom and leadership. Never has the Presidency known a finer hour.

Lyndon Johnson's vision of a Great Society is one which is shared by most Americans—for it is a vision which arises from the very promise of American life.

But there are some who do not believe in the promise of American life. Senator Goldwater is one of them. Senator Goldwater flatly rejects all that we have learned, all that we have become, all that we hope to be. He thus shows himself as the radical he is—preaching and practicing the doctrine of radicalism.

He seeks to destroy the social and economic achievements of the past generation.

He repudiates the tradition of bipartisanship in the conduct of our foreign affairs—a tradition established and upheld faithfully by leaders of both political parties.

He distorts the past, misrepresents the present, and misunderstands the future.

And finally—and perhaps most corrosively of all—he accepts the support of irresponsible extremist groups and alienates loyal and responsible members of the Republican Party.

By its refusal to condemn the lunatic fringe of American politics, the Goldwater party has welcomed to its ranks those whose stock in trade is the politics of hate.

For a generation these extremists and radicals have been pushing their filth and their accusations in the back alleys of American politics. Now they have come off in the street corners and are peddling their hideous wares in the front parlors of what was once a proud and honored establishment.

They have captured the Grand Old Party and transformed it into Goldwater's Own Party.

The first public act of the Goldwater party was to display its pedigree—and its devastating potential for evil—in San Francisco.

492 WBZ—LINO

The Goldwater party deliberately refused to repudiate support from the John Birch Society, an organization which called President Eisenhower "a dedicated conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy."

What does Senator Goldwater think of the John Birch Society? Listen to his own words:

I don't consider the John Birch Society as a group to be extremists.

* * * I am impressed by the type of people in it. They are the kind we need in politics.

Well, Lydon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and the Democratic Party are *not* impressed.

And neither are the great majority of responsible Republicans. So it is not surprising that the harshest denunciations of Senator Goldwater have come from the leaders of the Republican Party itself.

Former Vice President Nixon said:

* * * it would be a tragedy for the Republican Party if every Goldwater view as previously stated were not challenged, not repudiated.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller described Goldwater as the candidate of "an extremism outside the main currents of American political life."

Gov. William Scranton termed Goldwater's views—

a weird parody of Republicanism * * * the echo of fear and reaction * * * the fast draw and the quick solution.

My friends, the message which Lyndon Johnson and I have sought to bring to the American people is this:

The era of the fast draw and the quick solution in foreign affairs is over. It died at Hiroshima, when the first atomic bomb was detonated in 1945.

The era of "a long twilight struggle * * *" is here.

The awesome, the momentous, question facing every American on November 3 is this:

Do you want a President who will devote his enormous energies toward leading us through that twilight struggle to the dawn of a brighter day for freemen everywhere?

Or do you want a candidate who casually accepts the possibility that that twilight will suddenly be lit up by a blinding flash of nuclear holocaust?

Listen to Barry Goldwater:

Someday, I am convinced, there will be either a war or we'll be subjugated without war * * * real nuclear war * * *

I don't see how it can be avoided.

"Perhaps," he said, "in 1966."

What is the American voter to think of a man who frankly admits that he does * * * and I quote—"shoot from the hip?" Of a man who concedes that, in the conduct of foreign affairs, he will take Nazi Germany as his model?

Just before the nomination Barry Goldwater was asked by a German newspaperman whether he would take America to the brink of war. He responded:

Yes. Just as your country—that is, Germany—has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully.

Twice in this century irresponsible leaders of imperial and Nazi Germany have taken the world over the brink. Indeed, the history of imperial and Nazi Germany in this century is a case study in the tragic consequences of shooting from the hip, of impulsive action without restraint or responsibility.

But Nazi Germany and her allies met defeat in the last world war that will ever be "won." On that August morning in 1945, the face of the war changed suddenly—and permanently. Since that moment, the initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become unthinkable.

Yet those are precisely the terms in which Barry Goldwater thinks.

493 WBZ—LINO

In no area is the difference between President Johnson and Senator Goldwater greater than on the question of responsibility in the field of international affairs. In no area are Senator Goldwater's views more dangerous to the safety and welfare of all Americans—to the safety and welfare of all mankind.

An overriding conclusion has emerged from the campaign: the American people do not want Barry Goldwater's finger on the nuclear trigger. And the American people are absolutely correct.

The American people know that President Johnson will continue to provide this Nation with responsible, moderate, progressive and enlightened leadership.

The American people know that Lyndon Johnson is the one man superbly qualified to lead America and the world away from the last great war toward the first great society.

Cincinnati, Ohio
October 27, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. Secretary, when you introduce a man, he is really introduced.

It is plain to see that you have an electrifying effect upon these fellow Ohioans of yours. But I must say that it also amazes me how the former mayor of Cleveland gets such a great response in Cincinnati. I know he deserves it, but I was mayor of Minneapolis, and I hate to tell you what used to happen to me in St. Paul.

Father McCarthy, and Governor Welsh, and Chairman Beckford, and Chairman Coleman, my good friends of Hamilton County, Ohio, and if there are a few of you who crossed over the river here from Kentucky [applause] I just can't tell you how happy I am that it is my privilege to visit this beautiful and wonderful city of Cincinnati, that now appears as if its program of higher education is taking effect and will vote Democratic on November 3.

I had hoped that I might see, this evening, two very good friends of mine, but I understand that they are exceedingly busy, and they ought to be out on the hustings, bringing the message of progressive and constructive democracy to some that may have strayed from the fold.

And I want to once again ask the people of Ohio to give their support to a U.S. Senator that has never any moment in his public career forgotten his allegiance to and his dedication to the well-being and the welfare and the progress of the State of Ohio. And I refer to my colleague in the Senate, and your U.S. Senator, Steve Young. [Applause.]

Perhaps if I would make my speech as short and meaningful as Steve's letters, I would be a howling success. And I guess I should learn, but I am too old now. I just cannot change.

But this is a fine and good man. He exercises independent judgment, but also a loyalty to the program of our President and the program of the Democratic Party. He always keeps in mind, and uppermost in his mind, the needs of his State and of his great America, and the obligations of our America in the role of world leadership.

And I come before the people of Ohio—if I may be permitted to, and you have generously given me that privilege—to ask you to send to the U.S. Senate, not someone that flirts with Goldwaterism, but someone that embraces the New Frontier and the new horizons, and the better America of the late President Kennedy and now our President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

I also say in the same spirit, and with the same depth of sincerity and personal affection that we need, as Congressmen at large from this, the Buckeye State, this wonderful State of Ohio, Bob Sweeney, and please give him your help. See to it that he can join President Johnson in the opening of the 89th Congress, so that he, too, can work for you and work for this State and this Nation. I ask your support for Bob Sweeney.

And I do the same thing for two distinguished Democrats, great citizens, who are candidates for the House of Representatives, the people's body in our Government, and I know that you have already heard from them, and I know that you know of them and are working for

494 WBZ—LINO

them day in and day out. But we need them. And we need them badly to help us, to help you, because, after all, they are going to be your servants.

I speak of Jack Gilligan—I believe Jack is in the First District—and of Harry Stans in the Second District.

I suppose I should have been more formal and said John J. Gilligan and Robert E. Sweeney and Harry H. Stans, but that is one thing about we Democrats, we are kind of friendly folks, and kind of friendly, even in a hurry, you know.

Well, I have a little message for you—several, in fact. I don't know how we are going to do it tonight. I hope you are not in a hurry. All I have to do is get to Lexington, Ky., sometime between now and tomorrow noon. I haven't too much to do. So, just lean back and enjoy this evening.

First of all, I am very pleased to learn that President Johnson and I are running far ahead in Ohio already, having received at least three votes—two from Ohio's best-known and highly respected voters, Senator Frank Lausche, and his very charming and wonderful lady, Jane Lausche, tell us that they already voted for us by absentee ballot. So we are two ahead right now.

Well, we got a few more I hear down the table. And by the way, as I was walking down the hall, just coming to this wonderful roof garden room, a young man looked at me, and I looked at him, and after all, I am running for office, and I said, "How do you do," and he said, "How do you do, Senator." He said, "I am from New Orleans, and I have cast my absentee ballot for President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey."

So things look good in Louisiana, too.

Oh, I will tell you. It is going to be a whole lot better than some of you ever dreamed, and it is going to be so much better than the opposition ever dared to think that I am really worried what is going to happen on November 4.

By the way, I know this is a fund-raising dinner. That is a very noble exercise, may I say, of political activity, because I can't think of any political party that needs more funds in order to carry on the activities that we are carrying on than the Democratic Party.

But I want you to know that the Humphrey household is also sort of bipartisan in the sense that we do receive mail from the opposition. This morning, just to make my day a little more dreary—I wake up feeling bright and sunshiny, it has been a lovely day, and a marvelous day yesterday, a wonderful day from Chicago to Milwaukee to Racine to Green Bay to Madison, Wis., and back to Washington. This morning the postman, who, by the way, is not only an excellent letter carrier, not only a fine upstanding citizen, a fine family man, with high qualities of character, but also good political perception—he votes Democratic—this gentlemen stopped by the door and he said: "Oh, Senator, I hope you will forgive me, it is all in the line of duty. And you know we must be nonpartisan."

And he handed me the mail. And here I want to show you exhibit A. I want you to know that my friend Senator Goldwater thinks enough of me to ask me to contribute. [Laughter.]

It says here, "Citizens for Goldwater-Miller, Post Office Box 1964. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, 3260 Copeland Terrace, Chevy Chase 15, Md."

Now, I ought to look into it. But I want to tell you something. Hal- lowe'en is so close, I am afraid that there may be a trick in here. [Laughter.]

Now, that I have mentioned it, I think I will look into it. And it indicates to me that—oh, yes, I have a prepaid, postage-will-be-paid envelope, which indicates that I could send them a little something. And I plan on doing it. I plan on sending them a few of President Johnson's speeches, a couple of mine, and a bumper sticker. [Applause.]

I wouldn't want my friend Barry to think I had forgotten him. All these Senators have a cozy little club. We get to know each other pretty well. And I want to say one thing about this man—he would make a fine neighbor, but a very, very bad President.

495 WBZ—LINO

I am simply delighted that our good friend Secretary Celebrezze—I want to just call him affectionately Tony Celebrezze, because we think so much of him—I am happy that he, took the time here this evening to be with you, and I am highly honored by his introduction. He is one of the outstanding public servants of our country, and truly a remarkable man, and I am so grateful that he is a Democrat, because I am afraid I would like him even if he wasn't.

Well, I had a speech I was supposed to deliver, and I suppose now I will have to run along and see what I can do about it.

I want to talk to this audience very seriously tonight about this campaign, because it is not just joy and happiness that comes with contact with our people. Let me be very frank with you. I do enjoy campaigning. I am having a marvelous time. Once in a while I find a citizen or two that is somewhat in doubt and confused, carrying insignia that indicates that they are lost in the fog of confusion and political uncertainty. But we speak to them, we extend the hand of fellowship, and you would be surprised how often they lay down their arms and confess their political sins.

I can always tell the Democrats. They look happy. I can always tell a Republican that has put his country above his party—they, too, look happy.

And I can always tell a man that is really in doubt, because when he carries that Goldwater banner and he has a smile on his face and a sort of a gleam in his eye, he knows that deep down in his heart he is going to vote for Johnson. But he also knows why he is going to vote for the President. He knows this because he is a serious citizen. And I think Americans are very serious about their politics, and they are very much concerned this year of 1964. And they have a right to be, because we love our country, we know that our country has tremendous responsibilities.

We also know that there are fantastic changes taking place in our own country, everyone knows that, and all around the world.

In fact, the one fact of our life is change. And within 24 hours we witnessed or at least we heard the reports of a detonation of a nuclear device, explosion in Communist China, and another political explosion in the Soviet Union, and also a change in government through the process of free elections in Great Britain.

That day, I think, that very brief period, clarified and illuminated the basic issue of this campaign and made it stark and simple—at a time in history when no man can know what the morrow will bring, we have to ask ourselves, don't we, which of these two men that stand for the office of Presidency in this election have the capacity for that office, which of them is better qualified for the responsibility of the Presidency, because that is what the issue is.

There isn't any office in the world with the power of the Presidency of the United States. And no nation has the burden of responsibility for freedom and for decency and for what we believe to be human dignity, such as the office of the President of the United States.

And it is on November 3 that you and your neighbors and my neighbors will make that decision. The President isn't going to make the decision as to the future of America on November 3. We the people are. The Constitution says, "We the people of these United States of America do establish and ordain"—we the people, popular sovereignty.

And on November 3, the most powerful person in the world speaks, and speaks quietly. And that person is the American citizen. And he is going to determine, by the sum total of his votes, what your life is going to be and what the life of your children is going to be. Because make no mistake about it, my fellow Americans—in the next 4 years, decisions are going to be made that will affect the lives of generations yet unborn.

Because in the next 4 years there will be fantastic advances in science and technology; in the next 4 years we will find our way to the moon; in the next 4 years we will explore outer space. In the next 4 years there will be changes all over this world. And once you have elected a President, you cannot repeal it. You cannot say "Wait a minute, I made a mistake, I want to take my vote back."

496 WBZ—LINO

Once you have elected a President, he is there. And, therefore, that decision is the most important decision that you will make for many a year. That is why I go around this country saying that what we need in the White House, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, is a man of responsibility, a man of competence, a man of experience, and one who can base his claim to that office, not upon a promise, not upon a word, not upon a speech, but upon performance.

And I will tell you who the man is. Lyndon B. Johnson. [Applause.]

Performance separates the first-raters from the second-raters. Performance determines the quality of the man. We all remember, don't we, the sadness, almost with continuing grief, what happened in November of 1963, almost a year ago. A President, a wonderful man, brilliant, intelligent, wise, inspirational, courageous, was struck down. And the whole Nation, for a moment, was in confusion and doubt. There was real uncertainty as to whether or not our constitutional system could survive. And the world wondered, too. Not only on this side of the Iron Curtain, but on the other side.

I think the greatest testimonial to America, to America's policies, to America's promise, was the fact that behind the Iron Curtain millions of people wept, just as they wept here. That shook up the Kremlin, and shook up the Communist world more than anything, because they found out, those men in the Kremlin, they found out these men of international communism, that their propaganda hasn't worked, that their lies had not been believed, the people loved America, they loved our President.

We wondered what was going to happen. And then a man came forward. He was the man selected by John Kennedy. He was our Vice President. And under our system, he became the President of the United States. And that man took hold of this Government—5 days after that tragic moment of assassination, this man stood before the Congress assembled and reminded us that we could not hesitate, that there were unfinished tasks, that the fallen leader wanted the torch to be carried, the torch of freedom.

The torch of freedom—and just as John Kennedy had said to you and to me on January 20, 1961, "Let us begin," President Lyndon Johnson said to the world, "Let us continue."

And we did continue. And we have been moving ahead.

I think that President Johnson assumed burdens that were almost unbelievable in their immensity. And he stood up like a man, like a giant. And he has commanded the respect and the attention of friend and foe alike. It was only a few weeks ago that people who today were criticizing him were praising him, before they became too partisan. Is it any wonder that some of the leading publishers of America, some of the leading businessmen of America, traditionally Republican, have come out to support our President?

And one of the reasons that they left the man who temporarily leads the opposition is because they cannot place their faith in him, they cannot find him reliable, they find him irresponsible, they find him not truly either a conservative or a Republican. They find him, if you please, to be a radical and a radical in every sense of the word.

Why do I make this charge—can you say it is not a charge that should be made without evidence? I make the charge that Senator Goldwater is a radical because he repudiates his own party and drives those away from him that do not agree with him.

I make this charge because he seeks to destroy the social and economic bipartisanship in your foreign policy—the tradition that was established and upheld faithfully by leaders of both political parties. He distorts the past. He misrepresents the present. And regrettably, he misunderstands the future.

Finally, he accepts the support of irresponsible extremist radical groups that are the very antithesis in their words and philosophy of everything that this country stands for. [Applause.]

By his refusal to condemn and disassociate himself of these lunatic fringe groups of American politics, the Goldwater party—I say Goldwater party because I have too much respect for my fellow Republicans—[applause]—has welcomed into its ranks those whose stock in trade in politics is division and doubt and confusion and suspicion.

497 WBZ—LINO

For a generation these extremists and these radicals have been pushing their filth and their accusations in the back alleys and the sewers of American politics. Now, they have come out in the open, they have come off of the streets and out of the alleys, and they are peddling their hideous wares in the front parlor of what was once a proud and honored establishment of the Republican Party and the American political scene. Yes, they have captured the Grand Old Party.

This man who leads that party today has repudiated the very founder of it, the great emancipator. Ohio, they say, for many years has been so strong a Republican State. It has given many great Republicans to this Republic. But let me say—and I wish now that I could speak to every citizen in this State—that the man who presently heads what is known as the Republican Party is the temporary spokesman of a fraction of a faction of reaction of that party. He does not represent that party. [Applause.] And this gentleman has repudiated the very founder of it, the great emancipator.

GOP stood for Grand Old Party—as I have said to many an audience; now it stands for our Republican friends as “Goldwater, our problem.”

Let me review with you just a minute some of the developments, because we occasionally forget them in the hurly-burly of the campaign.

At the San Francisco Convention the Goldwater Party deliberately refused to repudiate support from the John Birch Society. I suppose that was their privilege. But this is an organization, my fellow Americans—not fellow Democrats now—my fellow Americans, that branded and called the former President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, General of the Armies, patriot, and as loyal as any man could be, branded him, and I quote, “A dedicated conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.”

These are the words of an organization that the Senator from Arizona spoke of in these terms. “I don’t consider the John Birch Society as a group of extremists,” said Senator Goldwater, “I am impressed by the type of people in it. They are the kind of people we need in politics.” Ladies and gentlemen, that is why this campaign is different than any that you have ever been in before. When a man standing for the high office of Presidency can say that these are the kind of people we need in politics, people that brand a former President of the United States as a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy, when he says that we need them in politics in America, I say he has disqualified himself to be President of the United States.

Let me say that Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are not impressed with these people. We don’t want any radicals from the right and we don’t want any radicals from the left. We don’t need any Communists, and we don’t want them, and we repudiate them, and we don’t need any Birchites, or any Ku Kluxers, or any of the rest of them. We repudiate them. [Applause.]

Lest you think that my words are just too partisan, let’s listen to what some Republicans have had to say.

Now, one of these that I am about to quote is around doing a little speaking now for the Senator from Arizona, but I don’t think that is really what he is doing. He is going to be here I understand tomorrow. He is going around as a sort of what you call the cleanup crew. Oh, yes, pick up the pieces. And I can’t think of anyone that is better at it, because he has had so much experience. [Applause.]

I want to make it clear, just as he says about me, that he is a fine, loyal, patriotic American. But—and he takes off and starts on Hubert Humphrey.

Well, I think he is such a high taker-offer of the Senator from Arizona, that I think I will just leave him stand with his own words.

The former Vice President, Mr. Nixon—you have heard of him—he said—and I quote him now—these are his exact words, and somebody might want to ask him about it, “It would be a tragedy for the Republican Party if ever Goldwater’s view as previously stated were not challenged and not repudiated.”

Thank you, Mr. Nixon. [Applause.]

I can well understand why he feels this way, because Mr. Nixon’s views on many of the great issues of the day, when he was Vice President and candidate for President, are diametrically opposite to those

498 WBZ—LINO

of Mr. Goldwater. Mr. Nixon is a Republican. And he is a leader in his party. The man he speaks for is not really a Republican, and I don't think he will be a leader long.

Now, the next man I would like to quote from is Governor of a great State, the Empire State, New York, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. He described Mr. Goldwater as the candidate of "an extremism outside of the main currents of American political life."

Thank you very much, Mr. Rockefeller. I thoroughly agree—a bipartisan support for that statement.

Then let me quote from the Governor of Pennsylvania, Gov. William Scranton. And he, too, is getting around a little bit—not much, just enough to be known. Gov. William Scranton termed Goldwater's views, and I quote him word for word as "A watered parody of Republicanism, the echo of fear and reaction, the fast draw and the quick solution."

Now, I want to say that these Republicans who know this gentleman better than anyone state the case against him better than any Democrat could possibly state it. [Applause.]

But let me say that the era of the fast draw, to which Mr. Scranton referred, and the quick solution in foreign affairs is over, and it has been over for a generation. It died at Hiroshima, when the first atomic bomb was detonated in 1945.

The era of the long twilight struggle that John Kennedy referred to, the long twilight struggle of building slowly, patiently, solidly, for peace and security, is here. The question facing every American voter on November 3 is simply this: Do you want a President who will develop his enormous energies toward leading us through that twilight struggle to the dawn of a brighter day, for freemen everywhere, or do you want a candidate who casually accepts the possibility that the twilight will suddenly be illuminated by the blinding flash of a nuclear holocaust?

I think that is the question. And I ask you to listen for just a moment to the words of the spokesman of the opposition.

Listen to what Mr. Goldwater says. These are his exact words:

Some day I am convinced there will either be a war or we will be subjugated without a war. Real nuclear war. I don't see how it can be avoided.

Now, what is the American voter to think of a man who says that war is inevitable, who frankly admits, and he does, and I quote him, that he shoots from the hip, end of quote, or then concedes in the conduct of foreign affairs, that he cites Nazi Germany as his model for the conduct of foreign policy.

Now, that is a rather serious charge. Can it be documented? And the answer is unqualifiedly "Yes."

Just before his nomination Barry Goldwater was asked by a German newspaperman, who by the way is in this country now, and has been covering this campaign, whether he would take America to the brink of war. And the answer to this newspaperman, who was the correspondent for the newspaper publication in Germany known as Der Spiegel, an outstanding publication, Mr. Goldwater responded, "Would you take America to the brink of war?"

He said:

Yes, just as your country, that is Germany, has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully.

My fellow Americans, twice in this century responsible leaders of Imperial and Nazi Germany have taken the world over the brink, not to the brink. Indeed, the history of Imperial and Nazi Germany in this century is a case study in the tragic consequences of shooting from the hip of impulsive action without restraint or responsibility. And this is why today that the lovers of freedom, and men dedicated to democracy in Germany, like Chancellor Adenauer, who is no longer the Chancellor, but the former Chancellor, and Chancellor Erhard, are men who are dedicated to NATO, dedicated to friendship with the United States, dedicated to our policy of security, and our foreign policy. They don't want brinkmanship. They want responsibility.

499 WBZ—LINO

But Nazi Germany met defeat in the last war. But ladies and gentlemen, that will be the last war that was ever won by anybody. On that August morning in 1945 the face of war changed. Suddenly and permanently. And every mother and father in Ohio, in America, needs to remember it.

Since that moment, the initiation of a full scale war, as an instrument of national policy, has become unthinkable, and the task of statesmanship from this day forward is not to use war or force as an instrument of policy, but the task of statesmanship is to pursue a policy of peaceful pursuit of the objectives of a nation. And the objectives of free men.

In no area is the difference between President Johnson and Senator Goldwater greater than on the question of responsibility in international affairs. And ladies and gentlemen, the future of this country will not be determined in the Middlewest, nor even in the Northwest, or the Southeast. America's future may well be determined in southeast Asia, or Berlin, or it may be determined in the Middle East, or Africa and Europe and Asia.

And that is why we need a man in the White House who understands that power, that this unbelievable power that we have is not for conquest, but that it is as a deterrent to war itself, that it is like a mighty shield that gives us protection while we use our minds and our hearts and our hands, while we use our intelligence, while we use every instrument of peaceful pursuit and negotiation, to find answers to problems in this world, and to push back the forces of tyranny patiently, persistently, by example, by pressure, and indeed by deed itself.

The overriding conclusion emerging from this campaign, which needs to be driven home, not as a partisan message, but as a message of life and death, of survival, that message is the American people must have someone in charge of this country who is responsible, who understands the use of power with restraint and reason.

In recent days, the Chinese detonated an atomic device. That within itself is enough to frighten humanity.

The possibility of the proliferation of nuclear weapons—but my fellow Americans, to have the Chinese detonate an atomic explosion and to turn over the nuclear power of this country to the Senator from Arizona's compounding danger beyond anything, that we ought to take into consideration. [Applause.]

I summarize my case for you tonight by saying this: The American people do not want Barry Goldwater's finger on the nuclear trigger. And the American people are right, very, very right. The American people know that President Lyndon Johnson will continue to provide this Nation with responsible, moderate, sensible, progressive, and enlightened leadership.

And the American people know that President Johnson is superbly qualified to lead America and the world from the last great war toward the first Great Society.

My fellow Americans, we have many victories to win, and this Nation is dedicated to the winning of those victories.

We want a victory over man's ancient enemies of hunger, of disease, of ignorance, and poverty, because these, too, are the cause of man's downfall and of his trouble. We want victory over prejudice and bigotry, and we are winning that victory. And we want victory over war itself, because without victory over war, there isn't any victory, there isn't any victory for anybody, for anything.

So, on November 3, we make the choice of the kind of an America that we want—one that is dedicated to the future, to hope, to progress, and peace, or one, if you please, that has given up the hope of the future, that has cast it aside, and we will become a garrison state, living by itself, eroding and corroding in its own troubles.

We can make that decision.

But you know what? The American people are a wise people. And they are a good people, and they are a peaceful people.

And the American people are going to continue to support the policies of reason and moderation, policies of peace and progress. And those policies today, in this election, are represented in the living spirit of and in the program of President Lyndon Johnson, and he will be victorious.

Thank you. [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