

44-201

## 90 HHF

QUESTION. Senator, do you see a possible Cabinet position for Governor Connally?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I haven't had any such discussions with him. To be Governor of the Lone Star State is a great responsibility and a high honor. I think he's competent to be most anything in this country.

QUESTION. Have you talked with the President as to that possibility?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I haven't. The President and Senator Humphrey have our visit before I take these trips, and he trusts me and I have full faith in him, and if I stumble along the way, I think he will help me, as he has in the past. He's picked me up several times and put me back on my feet.

QUESTION. Senator, any report on the health of Governor Faubus?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I understand that he might be ill and that he had canceled his meetings this evening. He was not present today in Little Rock. He had invited me to the Democratic Convention. I was very grateful for the invitation. I am very appreciative of the Governor's support of President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey.

I hope that all Governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, will do the same.

QUESTION. Thank you, Senator.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

---

Houston, Tex.  
Businessmen's Dinner  
September 18, 1964

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

We live in the most exciting era of all recorded history. In America we have the unique opportunity to banish from these shores mankind's traditional antagonists: hunger, ignorance, disease, prejudice, and poverty. We possess the power to accomplish in the next 40 years more for the betterment of mankind than the entire world achieved in the last two centuries.

This is no idle dream. We are already an affluent society. We can become a Great Society. But to make this vision of the Great Society a reality, we must have sound, practical, common sense in political and economic policy—we must have a cooperative and creative partnership between government and business.

We must have political leaders who understand the workings of our free economy. This year Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party come before you with a record of faith in American private enterprise, a demonstrated knowledge of its dynamics and needs, and a mature understanding of the role of government participating constructively in a free, private economy.

Our opponents have tried to convince the country—in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary—that there is something seriously wrong with our economy. They do not deny that times are good. They merely tell us that we should not feel good about it. We are supposedly enjoying—to use the words of Senator Goldwater—"an artificial prosperity."

But there is nothing artificial about—

Forty-three consecutive months of economic expansion—in comparison to 3 recessions in the previous 8 years;

A gross national product of \$625 billion—up 23 percent from January 1961;

A peacetime record increase of \$15 billion in consumer spending in the first half of 1964;

A 13 percent rise in business investment in plant and equipment for 1964;

A \$3.5 billion rise in after-tax corporate profits in the first half of 1964;

A decrease in the unemployment rate of 6.7 percent in January 1961 to 5.1 percent in August 1964;

## 91 HHF

And a wholesale price index in July below its level a year ago, and below the level in February when the tax cut became law.

These statistics dramatize the story of a vigorous and expanding American economy made possible through the enlightened cooperation between business and government. The only artificial aspect of this prosperity is the artificial eye glasses through which Senator Goldwater views these happy and hard facts of a burgeoning, prosperous America.

This remarkable record of economic growth was made possible by two principal factors: (1) The coordinated, sophisticated and flexible use of all policy instruments available to the Federal Government to eliminate recession and promote economic growth; and (2) the courage, wisdom, and skill of American private enterprise in taking full advantage of this favorable business climate.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration has used with great precision the tools of fiscal and monetary policy along with a carefully regulated level of Federal expenditures. This successful record stands in stark contrast to the recent economic pronouncements by the Republican candidate for President.

Senator Goldwater is seemingly a man of many contradictions.

He talks of reducing government expenditures while simultaneously proposing the largest peacetime spending program in our Nation's history.

He votes against a tax reduction measure in January and by September has proposed one of his own. He calls the tax cut of 1964 impulsive—altogether Congress deliberated over the matter for more than a year. He calls it "politically motivated gimmickry"—although President Kennedy introduced the legislation 22 months before an election.

Senator Goldwater's proposal to cut taxes by an automatic 5 percent each year for 5 years is an irresponsible adventure in economic clairvoyance—a proposal to freeze tax policy for 5 years to come, without regard to changing business conditions, to military and civilian needs, or to the total shape of the domestic and international challenges which may confront us in the future.

His total package of spending proposals and tax reductions would produce a deficit for fiscal year 1966 of \$16 to \$17 billion. This massive deficit—exploding in an economy already approaching full employment—would set off an orgy of inflation. It would reverse 3 years of progress in our balance of payments and accelerate the flow of gold overseas.

The Goldwater economic program is, in short, the height of economic irresponsibility.

But the record of the past 4 years demonstrates the benefits which a responsible working partnership of business and government confers upon all of the people. This is not a matter of textbook theory. It is a matter of experience.

Government must constantly recognize that the remarkable American system of free enterprise has been built upon a sharing of incentives, responsibilities and rewards by businessmen, workers, and consumers.

The chief role of government in this system is to support—not to supplant—the system.

When a lack of private credit stifles business growth, government action should be taken to stimulate credit.

When tax incentives are needed to encourage private investment or the modernization of plant and equipment, the Government has a responsibility to act.

When business firms seek to expand by competing successfully in the markets of the world, government can remove international trade barriers and bring its vast knowledge about foreign markets to the aid of the businessman.

When patent rights are used to foster monopoly instead of rewarding inventiveness and promoting technical competition, government must seek ways to make technical knowledge work for everyone.

## 92 HHF

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.

When the power of large corporations is used to restrain the competition of dynamic medium and small-sized firms, government must act—not to oppose monopoly nor to punish bigness for its own sake, but to encourage free, productive competition.

In this role of creative and constructive partnership, government must always recognize the legitimacy of reasonable 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.

In carrying out a successful partnership, government must make plans, just as any sensible businessman plans for the future. Government can learn much from those businessmen who, as someone phrased it so well, "have tested the future and found that it works."

Managerial decisions depend upon reliable forecasting of business trends plus shrewd judgment plus long-range goals. No one—not even that great free enterpriser from Arizona—can run a department store in Phoenix unless he plans. That is, if he wants to stay in business.

American society should not be a planned society, but it ought to be a continuously *planning* society. No one blueprint will fit it, for no mortal is wise enough to plan everything. No magic formula will ever solve all of the economic and social problems of men.

Government planning is pragmatic and open-ended. It is an attempt to reach widely accepted goals by reasonable and fair methods. It is an effort to encourage partners—such as American business—to share in stating the goals and in working out the methods. Government planning is undertaken with a willingness to adapt, to reshape both plans and methods to meet changing needs.

Any public official is not only arbitrary but dangerous when he tries to force the people and their needs to fit his preconceived plan, whether he claims divine inspiration or not. The most famous robber in ancient Greece either stretched or shortened his victims as needed to fit his bed. The American people are too dynamic to be planned—or mutilated—into fitting anyone's bed, even Senator Goldwater's.

When government makes plans which may have a significant impact upon the ability of business to survive or grow, it has a special responsibility to consult and to inform, and to recognize the tremendous investments which businessmen have made in plant and personnel.

Many businessmen have devoted their careers and their capital to such programs as space exploration and military preparedness. Government, as a working partner, must inform such businesses of impending changes in procurement requirements and accept the responsibility for assisting these businesses to develop alternative production plans. It is always essential to remember that people—employers and employees alike—are directly affected by such decisions.

The cooperative partnership of which I speak tonight recognizes the astounding ability of the American businessman to invent, to organize, to produce, to distribute, and to put people to work. Without stimulating this creativity, progress toward the Great Society will be slowed immeasurably.

The great promise of American life was well stated by Thomas Wolfe when he wrote: "To every man his chance; to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity; to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this is the promise of America."

To turn this promise into full reality will take planning and innovation by both government and business, in mutual recognition that they are partners—and not rivals—in the work of the Great Society.

## 93 HHF

Houston, Tex.  
Rice Hotel  
September 18, 1964

### TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Governor Connally, and thank you, my good friend Marlin Sandlin. And my thanks to these brave and courageous sponsors. Thank you very much. [Laughter and applause.]

I knew that the spirit of the pioneer, the courage and the bravery of a Sam Houston was in each and every one of you and when I read the local press, I knew that I had been tested.

Of course, I meant not the press but the ad. Truly, I am very honored to be here tonight, and you Texans surely do it in a big way.

You have Mrs. Humphrey and myself feel as welcome as a member of the family, and then you went ahead and made these arrangements which I know have the fine subtle, efficient hands of my friend, Marlin Sandlin, and of the Governor.

You see, the President of the United States said some kind words about his associates, and I am proud to say his friend, so that the portals of this great city and of this great State were opened, not only opened but opened with fellowship and with the warmth of your Texas hospitality that touches my heart.

I want to thank every one of you. [Applause.]

I sense tonight that the eyes of Texas are upon me and I sense that even upon me from faraway places like Washington, D.C. [Laughter.]

I sense even that some of my Republican friends from Minnesota are observing me and I am delighted for that.

I know that I am in the presence of the leaders of Democrats in this State. I know that I am in the presence of men who make this economy what it is, a free economy and a dynamic economy, and I know that I am in the presence of people who have seen to it that Texas has the kind of executive leadership and executive direction that makes it the great State that it is, and that leadership and direction is in the hands of your Governor, whom you admire and justly so. [Applause.]

Governor, I must say that it is a wonderful thing when you are in public life to have so many friends as you have. It's been my privilege in the State of Minnesota to have a number of friends. Some are for me and some tolerate me. [Laughter.]

Some feel that you have to have a little, you know, extravagance and luxury in life and they take me on for that, but we have had a good, warm, wonderful working relationship in every segment of our society in the North Star State and now that I come to the Lone Star State, I begin to feel as I said in the press conference, if you will just give me a little chance, I am going to feel like a Texan. [Applause.]

After listening to our President, I am sure you must realize that I am somewhat overwhelmed and can't help but feel both proud and humble. The President of the United States has placed a great deal of faith in me. In fact, he has placed a great deal of faith in you.

He is the leader of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. He has responsibilities that are beyond our understanding or comprehension, because it is one thing to write of responsibility and it is one thing to speak of it; it is another thing to face it and to be called upon to perform the task of leadership responsibility.

I believe that I have been taught almost like a student by the President, this concept of responsibility. We all have our ways of doing things. We all have our little idiosyncracies. My father taught me that. He once told me, he said, everybody is off beat a little and I guess we make some adjustments for that, but the President of the United States, as a Senator and as a majority leader, as my colleague in the Senate for many years, and as the leader of the majority in the Senate, I was privileged to be one of his deputies, and he taught me that the first duty of a man in public life is to act responsibly, to think first of his country and then of his party, to think in terms of his convictions and his commitments of ideals, and then of his party or partisan adjustment or cooperation.

I think those lessons were well learned, and I believe that I am right in saying that our President learned some of his lessons from a great statesman of this State, the late Sam Rayburn, the beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

## 94 HHF

And I have looked over this what I call countryside philosophy of this good man, this able man, that for so many years presided over the House of Representatives, the people's body of our Government, and one thing that Sam Rayburn said, a simple statement of just three words, has been brought home to me and to every Member of Congress time after time, and I think that this simple statement which I shall soon say to you, is so needed at a time whenever decisions that you make may be the final decision that every word that you utter may have consequences beyond anything that you dreamed, and that every deed that you perform may have an impact, not only at home but throughout the world. Because America today is such a center of power. It is so important that whatever we say or whatever we do not say only affects our lives but the lives of everyone of us throughout the world.

What were those words? He said, "Just a minute." He temporarily slowed one down in the heat of battle and emotion to ask us to take a look at the problem. Just a minute—not shooting from the hip or the lip but rather to reflect, to mediate, to think about the consequence of our words or our acts; to be sure, many of us didn't do that.

We all occasionally violate the standard that we proclaim but I believe that those words of Sam Rayburn, words of caution and prudence, not words of indecision, not of philosophy or of avoidance, but rather words of prudent decision and a philosophy of decisiveness and action after careful evaluation that brings mature judgment.

These are some of the things that I have learned and I know of no better way to learn them than just living because there isn't any way that you can learn them out of a book any more than the man in this room can operate this business by following charts or by taking the leading business publication.

To be sure, it is helpful. Sometimes it is interesting. Other times, it is confusing. But the only way that a man ever learns is by doing. There is no substitute for experience and there is no way to gain experience except to join in the fight and in the battle. That is true of business or of any other thing.

Our President has been busily engaged in the experience of Government all throughout this land. There are his associates and his students and his mentors, and I can think of no greater compliment that can befall any man in this America than to be selected by the President of the United States as his associate.

I am grateful; in fact, I am overwhelmed. [Applause.]

My one desire is to be worthy of that trust. My one ambition is to be a good partner for our President, and I pledge to this audience, I pledge to these people, the friends of our President in his State, that my every word, my every action, my every purpose, shall be to help the President of the United States do his job. [Applause.]

Now, let me talk to you just a little bit about our Government and a little bit about our country because I didn't come here to berate the Government or to berate our system. I happen to believe in our form of government. I believe that it is the best system that has ever been devised by man in the past or the present.

I believe in our system and when I say our system, I mean our governmental, our economic system, which is one that places great reliance upon individual initiative, is one that places great respect for human dignity. In fact, the difference between the Communists and the freeman is the concept of human dignity. [Applause.]

There is no room in this country for mutual antagonisms. As I have said from every platform in these 2 or 3 days that I have been on this tour, which I have said a thousand times before, a man that is worthy of public respect and of public responsibility in this America of the second half of the 20th century must be a man that seeks to unite this country and not divide it, must be a man that seeks to call out the best from people and not their worst. [Applause.]

And I have little time for people that try to drive us into opposing camps of the Federal Government against the State government, of the city against the farm, of the worker against the employer, of the big against the little, and of the rich against the poor. That kind of doctrine will breed disaster, will lend itself to putting us on the skids of a slippery slide to chaos.

## 95 HHF

And I, for one, don't intend to indulge in it. If the price of political victory is to pit race against race, community against community, region against region, capital against labor, Federal Government against local government—if that is the price of victory—then the price is too high. [Applause.]

Now, I speak of this system but it is a system that is based upon representative government. It is also a system that is based upon a free economy. Every ideal has its imperfections. I suppose our Government is not always fully representative, but it comes as close to it as any representative government that has been known, and I suppose with our free economy—that our free economy is not totally free in the most theoretical, idealistic sense, but it is free enough to give mankind the option of choice and it is free enough to unleash the dynamics of a free price system that permits growth—in fact, encourages it. [Applause.]

It goes, I think, almost without saying that we need people in government today who understand the working of the government, who understand the working of a free economy. The businessman can no longer ignore government as if it were an evil.

He must participate in it and he must do all that he can to make sure that those who are in charge of that government are at least thoughtful, considerate, and friendly partners in the development of the great American system.

I think, if I may say so, that something has happened in America recently. I believe that the American business community, just as the American community of organized labor, has found in the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, a man who understands the dynamics of this society, one who does not harass but encourages, one that is not suspicious of your every move but places faith in your integrity and your purposes, and I think that because of this philosophy of the President, it will permeate the Government.

May I say that there is no more powerful office in the world than the Presidency, that the President is not only the Chief Executive; he is not only the Chief Administrative Officer and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He is, in a sense, the philosopher of our society. He is, in a sense, the educator of our society and he establishes the standards of public and private conduct of our society.

So it is important what his attitude may be on American business—yes, and the American economic structure; capital and labor, business and management, for the first time in my memory, feels a sense of neighborliness and being at home in the White House of the President of the United States.

We do have opponents in our election. I don't think we have enemies. I have been in a lot of political contests and I generally end up sort of liking the people I ran against, particularly if I win over them. It's easy to be magnanimous under those conditions but our opponents in this election are trying to convince you—and I think they are trying to convince the country—despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, that there is something seriously wrong with the American economy.

Now, they don't deny that times are good. At least, they are good for most people. They primarily tell us that we should not feel good about it.

Whether you gentlemen know it or not, you are supposedly enjoying—to use the words of someone that would like to be President—you are enjoying an artificial prosperity.

Well, that may be the case but I want to tell you it sure looks mighty good to me, and I'd like to just tell you a little bit about what is the evidence about this artificial prosperity:

Forty-three consecutive months of economic expansion. A gross national product of \$625 billion, that is up 23 percent since January of 1961. A peacetime record increase of \$15 billion in consumer spending in the first half of 1964. A \$3.5 billion rise in after-tax corporate profits in the first half of 1964. A decrease in the unemployment rate of 6.7 percent in January 1961 to 5.1 percent in August 1964. Over 72 million Americans gainfully employed at better wages than ever before in the history of our land. A wholesale price index in July below its level a year ago, and below the level in February when the tax cut became law.

## 96 HHF

Now, while it seems to me that these statistics—I bore you with them, possibly, but that is the evidence—that these statistics dramatize the story of a vigorous and expanding American economy that has been made possible through enlightened cooperation and understanding between business and government.

The only artificial aspect—and now permit me just a little partisanship because I am running for somewhat of a partisan office, you know [Applause]—the only artificial aspect of this prosperity is the artificial eyeglasses through which Mr. Goldwater views these happy and hard facts of a burgeoning, prosperous America. [Applause.]

Now, the remarkable record of this economic growth, I think, has been made possible by two factors: One, the coordinated, sophisticated and flexible use of all policy instruments available to the Federal Government to eliminate recession and promote economic growth. We ought to know about them, and you ought to know about them. You have got a stake here in what your Government does.

Secondly, there is the courage and I think the wisdom and skill of the American private enterprise system in taking full advantage of this favorable business climate, and might I add since one does come under occasional review and analysis as he stands for public office that this Senator was one of those that was the advocate of the investment tax credit to encourage any investment.

This Senator went to the Treasury Department to advocate accelerated depletion for many of our industries and a modernization of our depreciation schedules so that we could amortize new investments and be competitive at home and abroad, and this Senator 1 year before the tax bill law was a staunch advocate of a sizable tax reduction for both individual and corporate income—and I am happy to say that.

Now, this successful record stands in stark contrast to some of the recent economic pronouncements of the Republican pretender for the office of President.

I want to say a word about that. I know there are many people in this room tonight that have for years voted the Republican ticket. A good healthy two-party system is what this country needs, I have said somewhat facetiously at times, but I suppose even a fellow means it once in a while.

I like it when my party wins but we need a good two-party system and today literally thousands of people who have been the backbone of the traditional Republican party have joined to support Lyndon B. Johnson because they know they can trust him, because they know that he has the skill and the experience and the prudence and the judgment that this Nation needs in its decisions both at home and abroad. [Applause.]

Now, all of us are occasionally guilty of some contradictions but I don't believe you should make a specialty of it. [Laughter.]

Then Senator from Arizona seemingly is a man of contradictions. He talks of reducing Government expenditures—that is not unusual, may I say, for many of us that seek public office—while simultaneously proposing the largest peacetime spending program in our Nation's history. He votes against a tax reduction measure in January when we had the roll call in the Senate but by September, when he is cruising in a jet, he has proposed one of his own.

Now, I don't want to say you can't do many great things in a jet, but this is one thing you can't do—you can't vote on taxes in a jet. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Goldwater calls the tax cut advocated by our President and the late President Kennedy a tax cut of 1964. He said it was impulsive, although I confess and state for the record that Congress deliberated over this matter for more than 1 year. I was with Wilbur Mills this afternoon at Little Rock. He is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. They had held hearings on the tax bill for 1 year. I wouldn't actually call that impulsive.

Senator Goldwater's proposal to cut taxes by an automatic 5 percent each year for 5 years—to be most charitable, unusual, and to be more factual—is irresponsible. [Applause.]

I'd say this is a sort of adventure into economic clairvoyance, a proposal to freeze tax policy for 5 years to come without any regard to changing business conditions, to military or civilian needs or to the total shape of the domestic and international challenges which may confront us in the future.

## 97 HHF

His total package of spending proposals listed by him and tax reductions would produce a deficit, at minimum, for fiscal year 1966-67 of \$16 to \$17 billion; and this massive deficit, may I say, that even frightens some liberal Democrats. [Laughter and applause.]

I think that massive deficit would literally set off an orgy of inflation. I know that it would reverse 3 years of progress in our balance of payments and accelerate the flow of our gold overseas, and any man that seeks the high office of President or Vice President better understand the importance of the balance of payments, the importance of stability of the dollar, the importance of our gold reserves and the importance of a prudent fiscal policy; those are the requirements you ought to have.

I have also believed that government must constantly recognize that this remarkable American system of free enterprise has been built on the sharing of incentives, the sharing of responsibilities and of rewards by businessmen, workers and consumers.

Now, the chief role of government is not to supplant. It is not to take over. The chief role of government is to supplement and to support the system, not to take it over and hold it and control it, and this Senator, throughout all his public life has tried to get people in and out of the government to understand the differences of supplanting something and supplementing something.

Now, when there is a lack of private credit that may stifle business growth, Government action could be taken to stimulate credit. At all times Government action by word and deed and policy and statement must be one of encouragement. I know that business people are fed up with the little harassments, the little picking that all too often take place.

And one thing that I have heard the President say time after time is this, that we put our faith and trust in this system, and we don't intend to run this system out of any bureau or department of government. We intend to have you run it, and if you run it, well, you can be in charge. If you don't, then you can expect your Government to do something about it. [Applause.]

When tax incentives are needed to encourage private enterprise, investments, or modernization of plants and equipment, I think the Government has a responsibility to act. When business firms seek to expand by competing successfully in the markets of the world—and there are many business men in this room tonight who understand the importance of international trade and international complexity—when those firms seek to expand by competing in these markets, government can and should remove international trade barriers and bring its vast knowledge about foreign markets to the aid of the American businessman who seeks to enter those markets.

When patent rights are used to foster monopoly instead of rewarding inventiveness and promoting competition, government must seek ways to make technical knowledge work for everyone.

When massive investment beyond the means of private enterprise and businesses requires pioneering efforts, such as in aviation, such as in space or communications or atomic energy, government has a crucial role as an investment partner, but here again, the Government's role should not be to own and to operate but as in the instance of the communications satellite to encourage, to share, to charter and to rely upon the great genius of American enterprise system to manage and to perform.

I think that system work is better. [Applause.]

Now, let me say a word about one subject that is dear to all of our hearts, and that is the matter of profits. I like them. I believe in them. I never claimed to be very much of a businessman but may I just say that the Humphrey family established a business in South Dakota in the year 1903. Sixty-one years later it still is running, and may I say that it is still solvent and making money, and anybody that can do that is doing very well; and it is still a family corporation, a going family corporation for 61 years, and it ought at least to get one star in his lapel today. [Applause.]

## 98 HHF

So, I believe that I understand the importance of profits. Profits are the rewards for successful risk taking, ingenuity, and hard work; not only are such profits fair but they are needed and they are reinvestments in an expanding economy and benefits everyone.

In carrying out this successful partnership, Government does have some role in making some plans, just as any sensible businessman plans for the future. Government can learn much from those businessmen who, as someone phrased it so well, that they have tested the future and found that it works. That is a very reassuring statement that some people might take a good look at it. [Laughter.]

American society should not be a planned society. No one blueprint will fit it, for no mortal in any view is wise enough to plan everything.

Mr. Khrushchev is finding that out, even. No magic formula will ever solve all our economic and social problems; and when I hear people come forth with a very simple answer on a moment's notice to the most complex problems of our age, I get a little worried.

And when I hear people come forth with a kind of childlike simplicity for man-sized problems, I get a little worried. That is one of the reasons that I am in Houston, because I want to make sure that the greatest country on the face of the earth has a giant of a man in charge and not someone that thinks that the problems of the second half of the 20th century can be resolved and solved in a simple direct manner without the kind of careful analysis and prudent judgment that these problems require. [Applause.]

Any public official is not only arbitrary but dangerous when he tries to force the people and their needs to fit his preconceived plan whether he claims divine inspiration or not. Now, the most famous robber in ancient Greece either stretched or shortened his victims as needed to fit his bed.

The American people are too dynamic to be planned or to be mutilated to fitting anyone's bed, even Senator Goldwater's. [Applause.]

But I must say that when Government makes plans which have a significant impact upon the ability of businesses to survive or to grow, then that government has a special responsibility to consult ahead of time, to inform, and to recognize the tremendous investments which the businessman may have made in plant and personnel.

Many businessmen have devoted their careers to such programs as space exploration and military preparedness, and government, as a working partner, must inform such businesses in advance of impending changes in procurement requirements and accept the responsibility for assisting those businesses develop alternative production plans.

I think it is always essential to remember that people, employers and employees alike, are directly affected by such decisions.

Now, I conclude with this note, my friends: The cooperative partnership of which I have spoken tonight recognizes first of all the outstanding and the astounding ability of the American business community to invent, to originate, to produce, to distribute and to put people to work; and I, for one, having visited the Soviet Union, having visited some of these socialist countries, have never for 1 minute come back believing that they were going to overtake us.

I suppose that there is a way that you can frighten people, but it seems to me that it is better to educate than it is to frighten. I have found out in my travels and tours, in my studies of countries behind the Iron Curtain and on this side, that there isn't even a point of comparison between the efficiency of the American productivity system and the distributive system, as compared to the unbelievable inefficiency and bureaucracy of the system behind the Iron Curtain; and the American businessman ought to proclaim this.

We ought to quit going around pretending somehow or other that this massive system of totalitarian power, which is essentially military, essentially police state, can compete with this unbelievable system that is ours.

My fellow Americans, you are living in the country for the first time in history that can have both \_\_\_\_\_ than we need and more guns than we know what to do with and still support more. [Applause.]

## 99 HHF

I, for one, am not going to go around this Nation telling our children that somehow or another we have failed. We have not failed. To be sure, we can do better. To be sure, we can do much better, and our President has asked us to do so.

We do have pockets of poverty, and none of us are content with it; and we are determined to do something about it. As a matter of fact, I believe that one of the fine signs of character, one of the great spiritual commitments of the President of the United States, is to be found in the fact that even though he presides today as the President over the richest economy on the face of the earth that he could see that some were not enjoying the blessings of this prosperity.

He read the Biblical admonition, "Remember the least of these." [Applause.]

He remembered that you "judge not by the ninety and nine that were in the fold" but the one that may be out, and the greatness of America is not the conscience of a conservative; but the greatness of America is our conscience of social justice. We are a just people. [Applause.]

I think it is about time that this concept of justice, of compassion, concept of social justice, no longer be permitted to be just the words or just the concept belonging to a few.

There is no more human and humanitarian and progressive force in American life than the American business community. You talk about being liberal. You talk about being progressive. Why, there aren't any people in the world that have the spirit of adventure, the spirit of progress, the willingness to try something new, the willingness to meet unbelievable challenges.

There is no one in the world that can equal you and why don't you admit it and why don't you believe it? [Applause.]

I think together we are beginning to do so. I leave you then with this plea:

America needs you, not just in the marketplace, because there you will meet, if only from duty or habit, but America needs you for even greater things, to set standards of social conduct, to interest yourself in the affairs of state, to encourage people to do better, to be relentless in the pursuit of opening the pathways of opportunity for generations yet unborn.

This country hasn't finished its appointed task and duty. We are only beginning. We are the newest of the free nations in a very real sense because our freedom is ever expanding. We are a people that are just now beginning to see the new horizons. We are beginning to understand this earth and this planet upon which we live and we are beginning to make it a better place in which to live.

And now we are reaching out to the stars, to chart new courses and to find new worlds and I am convinced that if I could live another 50 years that the history books of this country will write or will say that in this, the 20th century, the second half of the 20th century, after nations had spilled their blood in the first half, twice in two terrible wars, that the American people—because of their sense of idealism, because of their sense of compassion, because they were willing to share with the unfortunate, because they were willing to sacrifice for peace, because they were willing to unleash every inventiveness and creativity of the people—that the American people have built on this earth not only the Great Society but the Just Society and they have pioneered into the new world that God himself has given us the opportunity to know.

Thank you very much.

### Article

News release from the Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

September 19, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, NATIONAL PLOWING CONTEST, BUFFALO, N. DAK.

Let me congratulate you on the miracle of American agriculture. The entire Nation should know—and this great occasion is a good place to tell it—that rather than being a problem, agriculture actually is America's No. 1 success story.

## 100 HHF BAT—LINO—1

Since before the dawn of history, food has been a matter of life-and-death importance in man's daily struggle to survive.

You have conquered that challenge. You have created a revolution of abundance within the past generation.

The American farmer is the world's most efficient producer. The output of the average agricultural worker in the last decade has increased almost three times as much as the industrial worker's.

Farmers represent less than 8 percent of the population, yet they produce enough food and fiber to feed the Nation better and cheaper than any place in the world. These same farmers produce enough so that we can provide over three quarters of a billion dollars in food each year to our own needs, distribute \$2 billion of food around the world under our food-for-peace program, sell nearly \$4½ billion worth for dollars abroad to increase our Nation's export earning—and still have adequate reserves for the Nation's safety and potential to produce even more. This is an amazing record.

The world has never seen anything like this. It truly is an American miracle. We should be proud of that achievement—and I am proud of you who have made it possible.

Unfortunately, we have come to take this American miracle of agriculture for granted. The American people must come to understand the great contribution that American agriculture has made to this Nation, and to the rest of the world as well.

We need to know how we can improve the economic position of a numerically and proportionally shrinking group in our population.

We need to remember who takes the risks of drought and flood, hail and early frost, insects and markets, and all the uncertainties of the marketplace. You know and I know, and if Senator Goldwater doesn't know, I'm sure he will before this day is over.

Consider what this miracle of agricultural abundance means to the Nation—other than just farmers.

For consumers—and that is all of us—it is consumer insurance of market basket bargains. For workers—millions of them—it is job insurance. For the Nation as a whole it is balance-of-payment insurance. And perhaps most significant of all, it is our insurance of peace, plenty, and freedom.

And let us remember that peace and freedom is everybody's concern, not just the farmer's. Food is power in today's world. Food is a vital force for peace and freedom, giving us needed diplomatic strength in the world as well as enabling us to exemplify the true humanitarian spirit of the American people.

Food for peace may yet prove the real path to peace.

We have scored our greatest victory over communism in the world by the evidence of the success of our free enterprise system of American family farmers.

With the miracle of agricultural abundance meaning so much to this Nation, the Nation's conscience requires greater economic justice for the farm people.

Unfortunately, the blessings that this miracle of abundance have brought to our Nation are not fully shared by all our farm people.

Despite the increased efficiency of the American farmer, he does not fully share in benefits of this great productivity. Even with farm income increased during the past 4 years, the farmer's average income is only 63 percent of that of the nonfarm worker.

That's hardly the way to reward the most efficient segment of our economy.

We need to do better—a whole lot better. And we're going to.

We have heard and we will hear more about freedom in this campaign. All of us are for freedom—real freedom. And that must include freedom from poverty, the greatest force for regimentation of them all.

Opportunity—equal opportunity—is the promise of America. It must be the promise to rural America.

But let's remember that social and economic justice for farm people—as necessary as it is to the Nation's conscience—is only one part of the argument for greater concern about agriculture.

## BAT—LINO—2

What we do—or fail to do—about protecting and improving farm income is not for farmers alone. It is necessary to protect our national interest.

It is necessary to assure continued consumer insurance market baskets bargains resulting from abundance. It is necessary to assure continued job insurance for millions of workers. It is necessary to assure continued balance-of-payment earnings through continually expanding farm exports. It is necessary to maintain our Nation's power for peace and freedom.

And, most of all, it is necessary to protect our great agricultural producing plant and to conserve the God-given resource of the soil.

With the uncertainties of climate and disease, the Nation can only be assured of always having enough food and fiber if farmers are willing to produce more than enough. Yet that more than enough needed for the Nation's security is what brings down the farmer's prices in the marketplace.

If there is a cost involved in maintaining our power of abundance, it truly is a national cost, not a cost that should be absorbed by farmers alone.

None of us knows all the answers to the complex problems of American agriculture and what we can do to make better use of our tremendous productive potential, while providing greater equality of opportunity for our farm families.

Changing technology, changing American commitments in the world, changing requirements of international trade, changing marketing structure, changing eating habits of American people—all of these have a direct bearing upon American agriculture and American agricultural policy.

We need to know what is good in our programs and what needs change.

I see no reason to seek changes in the present and effective tobacco, peanut, and rice programs—unless the producers themselves find improvements they desire. The same thing is true for the wool program.

Our sugar program is designed to benefit the Nation's beet and cane farmers, assure American consumers adequate supplies at reasonable prices, and provide many foreign countries with a market for their sugar. This program apparently is working well. Any adjustments in it should be designed merely to meet current conditions without changing its basic objectives.

However, we still need improvements in our wheat program, our feed grains programs, our dairy program, and our cotton program. Working and planning together we can get needed improvements, but they will not be brought about if the Chief Executive of this Nation is a man who is unsympathetic to the needs of American agriculture.

You know where President Johnson stands. He is a rancher and a cattleman. He is your friend.

You had better know where Senator Goldwater stands. He has said he doesn't know anything about farming and I believe him. He also has said he wants to get rid of our price support programs—and a good many of you. I believe he means that, too.

The wheat program, the cotton program, and the wool program all expire next year. Any new legislation must go to the White House for approval or veto.

You had better make sure you have a friend in the White House. You had better make sure that Lyndon Johnson remains as President of the United States.

We need to restudy our wheat and feed grains programs. Compulsory production restrictions to gain price objectives do not seem to be a satisfactory answer for wheat and feed grains. Voluntary production adjustments programs properly administered are better, but will not alone achieve our income objectives. Cropland retirement to expand conservation acreage should be further explored. However, we must be concerned with the future of rural communities.

There are various ways of supplementing farm income without distorting market prices and normal channels of trade—at a time when international trade in farm commodities is becoming of increasing significance. Actually, vigorous efforts to expand outlets for farm products both at home and abroad, seem to offer the brightest hope of

## BAT—LINO—3

all. This particularly is true of cattle, where the ranchers themselves have asked for nothing more than the opportunity to further develop and preserve an expanding free market.

Our farm cooperatives and indeed other segments of our free enterprise system, can and probably should perform many of the marketing functions now being performed by Federal agencies. The Government's role should be to supplement, not supplant, private enterprise—including cooperatives.

What we may need is a combination of several alternatives—depending upon which best fits a specific commodity. At least the door never should be shut in the search for new ways to achieve our national objectives.

For milk and other dairy products we need to find better ways of meeting the real needs of our low income groups and fulfilling our humanitarian objectives abroad.

We certainly must expand and provide adequate funds for our farm credit programs, the great rural electrification program, the soil conservation programs, the special milk program, the school lunch program, and the food stamp program. All of these have made and continue to make great contribution to rural America and the rest of the Nation.

A rapidly changing agriculture in a changing world requires continuing review and reappraisal of farm programs and policies. This is why I have proposed the creation of a bipartisan blue ribbon commission on agricultural policy.

There is one approach, however, that I flatly reject—the Goldwater alternative of wiping out all of our farm programs and deliberately seeking to force farmers off the land.

Senator Goldwater has laid bare his innermost convictions about many matters of public concern in his book called "Conscience of a Conservative". Here is what he says about farm programs, and I quote, "There can be no equivocation here—prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program."

This is the death sentence to agriculture. I regret it. It would impoverish farm people—wipe out billions in rural land values—ruin business on rural America's main streets—and solve absolutely nothing.

But it shouldn't surprise farm people that the temporary spokesman for the Republican Party shows little concern for their well-being. For 10 years he has been voting against the farmer in the Congress.

Look at his record.

Senator Goldwater voted against the feed grain programs in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Senator Goldwater voted against the Agricultural Act of 1962, which authorized programs for wheat and feed grains and expanded authority for food for peace and the Farmers Home Administration.

Senator Goldwater has voted consistently against efforts to support and strengthen REA loan funds.

Senator Goldwater voted against the bill to authorize funds for public works, TVA, and power marketing agencies of the Department of Interior in 1959.

Senator Goldwater voted against the Niagara River project to produce low cost power with preference for cooperative and other consumer electric systems in 1956.

With a record like that, is Senator Goldwater the man you want to trust with the destiny of American agriculture?

I don't think so.

Let me assure you of one thing: a Johnson-Humphrey administration never will abandon American agriculture. It never will reject constructive change as long as the change can be for better.

Our criteria for judging proposed changes in American farm policy will include these nine points.

1. Will it assure an abundant supply to meet the needs of consumers at reasonable prices?
2. Will it add to the strength of the Nation in its quest for world peace, increasing prosperity, and national security?
3. Will it help the individual farmer to preserve his economic independence?

## BAT—LINO—4

4. Will it permit our system of free markets to operate efficiently, fairly, and without needless handicaps?

5. Will it facilitate the expansion of our foreign trade and maintenance of a fair share of world markets for American farm products?

6. Will it encourage the full utilization of land, water, and human resources that are not needed for the agricultural production for alternative purposes more beneficial to the public interest?

7. Will it encourage conservation of our soil and water resources for future generations?

8. Will it assure us of a desirable level of reserves for our national security?

9. Will its cost to the taxpayers be commensurate with its benefits to the consumers, the national economy, and the Nation's strength in world affairs?

With these tests as our guide, I am confident that we can and will build a better future for rural America—and for all America.

---

Buffalo, N. Dak.  
National Plowing Contest  
September 19, 1964

### TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you.

And thank you very much, Senator Burdick. My sincere thanks to Senator Burdick for his gracious, kind and generous introduction and my warm regards—and I say warm—to Homer Ludwig, chairman of this great event, and our thanks to the Fraases for permitting us to come to this magnificent American family farm, and have the opportunity to see modern American agriculture in action.

I want to say that I salute this family. [Applause.]

I gather that there may be a little politics talked around here today, and I gather that you folks are going to be very considerate and tolerant to all of us who express our point of view.

How wonderful it is that we have this privilege to talk to the American people, to visit with one another, and I come here for that express purpose, but first, may I say, that I come to the State of North Dakota that is privileged to have as its chief executive and as its Governor one of the outstanding public servants of the 50 States of this Union.

And I salute Governor and Mrs. Bill Guy— [Applause.]

And I have had the privilege of serving in the Congress with the distinguished Senator that just introduced me, a fine son of a great father, both of whom have represented this State with honor and with distinction and with progressive government. [Applause.]

Might I just say this word in case some of you in North Dakota may have forgotten? There are a few men up here that would like very much to see you later on; for example, Rolland Redlin out in the west district tells me that he is ready to go to Washington as your Congressman. [Applause.]

And George Sinner, from the east district—a fine State senator, too—tells me that he's just anxious to go to Washington. [Applause.]

And lest I forget, just across the river on the other side of Fargo, there's a fine, fellow citizen from Minnesota that has been studying the road maps, has been looking at the airplane schedules, and he tells me that he and his wife and 11 children are all ready to go to Washington as the Congressman from Minnesota's 7th District, Ben Wichterman. [Applause.]

And I wouldn't want to forget my colleague in the U.S. Senate, one of the finest men that ever came to Washington, the Honorable Eugene McCarthy of the State of Minnesota. [Applause.]

Now, I come here today, not to talk about our troubles as much as I seek to talk about the achievements of the American people and particularly of American agriculture. I come here today to congratulate you, the tillers of the soil, the family farmers of America and their families, for the miracle of American agriculture.

## BAT—LINO—5

The entire Nation owes you a debt of gratitude, and I say, as one member of this Government, that never have so few done so much for so many, and been given so little credit for what they have done. [Applause.]

Farmers represent less than 8 percent of our population but yet, they produce enough food and fiber to feed and overfeed us. They produce enough food and fiber for the great humanitarian programs of our country. They produce enough food and fiber for the greatest humanitarian effort that's ever been undertaken overseas in the food-for-peace program, and they produce enough food and fiber for our commercial exports and our strategic reserves.

No group of producers in all of the world has as fine a record of production efficiency and capability of producing for the great multitudes of people as the American family farmer and, indeed, his family that tills the soil. [Applause.]

Now, let me just say we ought to consider for a moment this miracle of agricultural abundance for what it means to our Nation, other than just farmers.

Let me talk to the consumers because we are all consumers and that's all of us.

The abundance of our farms is consumer insurance of market-basket bargains. No place in the world does the consumer get as much food for as little cost as in the United States of America, and that is due primarily to our farm producers and our great system of distribution. [Applause.]

For the workers in our factories and our shops, this farm abundance means job insurance; for the Nation as a whole, it is balance-of-payment insurance, and perhaps the most significant fact of all is that this food and fiber abundance is the insurance of peace and of plenty and of freedom.

Farmers are in the front line of the fight for a just and an enduring peace, and for the advance of freedom throughout this world.

Let us remember that peace and freedom are everybody's business, not just the farmers. Food is power in the world today. Food is a vital force for peace and security. Food for peace may yet prove to be the real path to peace.

We have scored our greatest victory in the cold war. We have scored our greatest victory over communism by the evidence of the success of our free enterprise system of American farmer families, and this should be heralded throughout this land. [Applause.]

But this miracle of agricultural abundance, meaning so much to this Nation, I think that the Nation's conscience—yes, the Nation's conscience requires greater economic justice for our farmers.

Opportunity, equal opportunity, is the promise of America. That's what this country stands for and it must be the promise to rural America, but let's remember that social, economic justice for farm people, as necessary as it may be for the Nation's conscience, is only a part of the argument for our concern about agriculture.

What we do or what we fail to do, my fellow Americans, about protecting and improving farm income is not for farmers alone. It is necessary to protect our national interests, just as necessary as the defense weapons that we produce for the security of this Nation.

It is necessary to assure continued consumer insurance of market-basket bargains resulting from this abundance, and it is necessary to assure continued job insurance for every worker, and that means millions of workers.

And it is necessary to assure our balance of payments and expanding world markets, and this abundance is necessary to maintain our Nation's power for peace and freedom in the world.

And may I add also that protecting this farmer's income is necessary also in order to protect our great agricultural producing plant and to conserve the God-given resource of the soil which the farmer protects and conserves, not only for himself, but for generations yet to come, and for, indeed, the security and the safety and the strength of America.

And let every American citizen know that that job of conservation needs to be rewarded by the American people to those who are the stewards and the custodians of the land. That's what our agricultural program is about. [Applause.]

## BAT—LINO—6

With the uncertainties of weather—we even have it in the plowing-contest day—and the possibilities of plant diseases, the Nation cannot always be assured of having enough food and fiber unless farmers are willing to produce more than enough, and when you produce more than enough, in order to protect those of us that don't produce food, that's when you have trouble in the marketplace, and that's when farmers' prices drop. So, if there is a cost involved in maintaining our power of abundance, if there is a cost in producing just more than enough so that we can be sure of the adequacy of our supplies, I say that it is not a cost that ought to be leveled upon the back of the farmer, or upon the Department of Agriculture, as such.

It is a national cost and a cost that should be absorbed gratefully and thankfully by the entire American citizenry. [Applause.]

If there is one fact of our time that's evident, it is the fact of change. Everything changes, more rapidly than we even dreamed, and change has been the fact of farming. The impact of science and technology has been unbelievable.

There are changing markets, changing eating habits. All of these have a direct bearing upon American agriculture, and our policy toward it.

Therefore, we constantly need to reexamine what we are doing. We need to know what is good in our programs and we need to know what needs to be changed.

I see no reason, for example, nor to seek changes in the present effective programs of tobacco, peanuts, and rice. These are programs far away from North Dakota, but they are a part of American agriculture.

I see no need for change unless the producers themselves find and agree upon improvements, and the same thing, it seems to me, is relatively true of our wool program. It works well.

Our sugar program is designed to benefit the Nation's beet and sugarcane farmers, as well as to protect the consumer. And it assures the consumer of adequate supply at reasonable prices, and it may provide many foreign countries with a market for their sugar.

This program is apparently working well, and any adjustments in it should be designed merely to meet current conditions without changing its basic objectives.

However, we still need improvements in our wheat program, our feed grains program, our dairy programs, and our cotton programs, and working and climbing together, people and their government, we can get these needed improvements, but you can't get them by saying no. You can't get them by closing your eyes.

You can't get them by pretending that no problem exists. You get them only by thoughtful analysis and by a willingness to do something to meet a problem and do it in cooperation with the people that need the help. [Applause.]

I speak today for a man that is a farmer. I think you know where President Johnson stands. He is a rancher; he is a cattleman. He has worked for and supported programs to aid American agriculture since he was a boy. He helped organize the first REA cooperative in his district. He is a friend, and he is a proved friend that has an understanding and sympathetic heart for America's agriculture. [Applause.]

I think we need to know where these men stand and you'd better know where Senator Goldwater stands. He has said, and I quote him, he doesn't know anything about farming—and I believe him. [Applause.]

He has said—he has said, and it was in your morning newspaper, that he wants to get rid of price support programs—and I believe he means that, too. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, compulsory reduction restrictions to gain price objectives do not seem to be the satisfactory answer for our wheat and feed grains. Voluntary production programs, properly administered, are better and would—but I remind you—would not alone achieve our income objectives.

Cropland retirement to expand conservation acreage should be further explored. However, we must be concerned, not so much about retirement, as we are use of that land. Farmers like to use the God-given heritage of their land and not leave it to stand idle with no income or no proper use for humanity. [Applause.]

## BAT—LINO—7

And we must be concerned about our rural communities. There are various ways of supplementing farm income without distorting market prices in the normal channels of trade. This has the advantage, also, of improving our world trade position.

Actually, vigorous efforts to expand outlets for farm products, both at home and abroad, offer one of the brightest hopes of all. This has proven to be particularly true of cattle, where the ranchers themselves, much to their credit, have asked for nothing more than the opportunity to further develop and to preserve an expanding free market for their produce. And they have our commitment, from a rancher who is in the White House who understands cattle because he raises them. He has our commitment that they will receive the helping hand of an understanding and friendly government. [Applause.]

Now a word about our great farm cooperatives because they have meant so much to America, and indeed, the other segments of our free enterprise system. All of these can, and probably should, perform many of the marketing functions now being performed by Federal agencies.

The Government's role should be to supplement and not to supplant. And may I say that the Government of the United States has now as its policy the encouragement of the private sector of our economy and the encouragement of our farm producers cooperatives, so that farmers may better protect themselves in the marketplace through their own efforts with a sympathetic, understanding government policy.

So, when we add it up, what we need is a combination of several alternatives, depending upon which fits a specific commodity the best. For our milk and dairy products, we need to find more and better ways of meeting the real needs of our low income groups, fulfilling our humanitarian objectives abroad. We certainly must expand and provide adequate funds for our farm credit programs, and we could use a little help from the Congress on that.

We certainly need to expand the great rural electrification program, and yet the man that will speak to you this afternoon has advocated that we liquidate the Rural Electrification Administration. No greater blow could come to American agriculture than that. [Applause.]

We need to expand our soil conservation programs with the growing population demanding more of our soil. We need to expand our school lunch program and our food stamp program.

All of these have made, and continue to make, a great contribution to rural America.

Now, a rapidly changing agriculture requires constant reexamination. For this reason, I have proposed the establishment of a National Agriculture Food Policy Commission to examine into every possible alternative.

Now, let me talk for just a moment about the record of our respective parties.

I speak today for the Democratic Party. I do not claim that it is without blemish nor do I claim that its every program and policy has been totally effective, but we have the choice of alternatives.

I claim that its heart is right; I claim that its programs have been designed for the purpose of aiding farm income and of seeing to it that this great agriculture plant of America remains solvent, remains modern, and remains as a great force of security for the American people.

Senator Goldwater has laid bare his innermost convictions about many matters of public concern. For this, we should be grateful. He has done this in his book called "The Conscience of a Conservative." And here is what he says; I quote him verbatim about farm programs.

"There can be no equivocation here—prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program."

Now, my friends—that's a Republican committeeman up there—I think that's one of Barry's boys.

(Referring to plane flying overhead.) [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. We need one of those fellows to come down to earth. [Applause.]

## BAT—LINO—8

We need to understand just what this statement means, that I have read, "Prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program."

This morning I read in the paper that it wasn't going to be so prompt, slow death not immediate. But may I say, whether you die slowly or die quickly, when you're dead, you're dead. [Applause.]

(Plane again flying overhead.)

Senator HUMPHREY. That's always the danger if you nominate a pilot. [Applause.]

This statement of the Senator from Arizona that I have read is a death sentence to agriculture, and I regret it. It would impoverish farm people, wipe out billions in rural assets. It would ruin business and ruin America's main street. And very frankly, it would do exactly as was done once before. It would trigger a major recession and depression in America, which this country cannot possibly endure. [Applause.]

(Plane again flying overhead.)

Senator HUMPHREY. Ladies and gentlemen, it's hard to compete against one of those whirlybirds.

I speak now of the record of the Republican candidate—or should I say of the candidate of a section of the Republican party? [Applause.]

Because, only a few weeks ago, both Republican parties met at Hershey, Pa.—the Eisenhower party and the Goldwater party. Out of there came a little more sense to the Republican program, but only for a short time.

Let's look at this record of Senator Goldwater. He voted against the feed grains programs in 1961 and 1962 and 1963. These programs, my friends, meant millions and millions of dollars in your income for the farm people in this area.

Senator Goldwater voted against the Agriculture Acts of 1962, which authorized programs for wheat and feed grains, and expanded authority for food-for-peace and the Farmers' Home Administration.

Senator Goldwater has voted consistently against efforts to support and strengthen REA loan funds. On 35 key votes in 10 years, the Senator voted wrong 33 times, according to the National Rural Electrical Cooperatives Association. Two times he voted right, and those two times were for projects in Arizona. For this, we can be grateful.

Senator Goldwater voted against the bill to authorize funds for Public Works, that helped North Dakota and every other State, Area Redevelopment, TVA. He says he wants to sell it for \$1.

He voted against power marketing agencies that affect this great area of the Missouri River, and he voted against, if you please, even the Niagara power project, from whence his own running mate comes, a project to produce low-cost power with reference for cooperative and other consumer electric systems.

Now, with a record like that, I ask you is the Senator from Arizona the man you want to trust with the destiny of American agriculture? I don't think so. [Applause.]

Let me assure you one thing, a Johnson-Humphrey administration never will abandon American agriculture. It never will reject constructive change, as long as that change is for the better. A Johnson-Humphrey administration will be dedicated to the improvement of our programs, not to their death—to the improvement of the programs. [Applause.]

And we shall judge all those changes on American agricultural policy on the following points:

Will that change provide a fair return to the farmer consistent with the goal of full parity of income for our farm people?

Will it assure an abundant supply to meet the needs of consumers at reasonable prices?

Will it add to the strength of our Nation in the quest for world peace, increasing prosperity and national security?

Will it help the individual farmer to preserve his economic independence and to develop his talents to their fullest potential?

Will any change permit our system of free markets to operate more efficiently, fairly, and without needless handicaps?

Will it facilitate the expansion of foreign trade and the maintenance of a fair share of world markets for American farm products?

## BAT—LINO—9

Will it encourage the full utilization—and I underscore the word—utilization of land, of water, and of human resources that are not now needed for agricultural production, for alternative purposes more beneficial to the public interest?

Will it conserve or encourage conservation of our soil and water resources for future generations?

Will it assure us of a desirable level of food and fiber reserves for national security?

Finally, will its cost to the taxpayers be commensurate with its benefits to the consumers, the national economy, and the Nation's strength in world affairs?

These are the 10 guidelines that will direct our thinking, and I can say to you that, in cooperation with the leaders of American agriculture and with our farm families, sitting down together with your representatives in the Congress, that if we but look ahead to the day when our population is bigger, the requirements of our people larger, that we can find not only better answers that we have now, but we can find that happy day when the American farm family will enjoy every benefit of life that he sees in the city, and even more, and that the concept of parity of income will no longer be a stump speech but will be a bank account for the American farmer and a part of the great American economy. [Applause.]

Now, let me leave you with this thought. I addressed you today primarily as farm people but I know more than that that you are citizens in the fullest sense of the word, and America today needs as never before men and women who understand our responsibilities in the world in which we live.

If there is to be peace, it will be because we have that great power of mind and spirit and economy and body that brings that peace.

If there is to be a better world, it will be because out of the midst of the American people comes the leadership that provides for a better world.

We are in a mighty contest today, ladies and gentlemen. It's a contest against powerful forces, and in that contest, we need an America that is united. We need an America that offers opportunity, that sets a wonderful example for the whole world.

And I want to make this pledge to every person here, regardless of one's political point of view, that my every word, my every deed, as a private citizen and as a public official—and I know that I now speak for the President of the United States in this—that every word, and every deed, will be to unite our Nation, to make us more of a brotherhood, to bring us closer together for common purposes and common goals.

I must say "Shame upon those that pit one group against another, race against race, city against farm, city government against State government, rich against poor." This is no way to build these United States of America. [Applause.]

May I thank you for being so patient and so understanding in this rather inclement weather and may I also thank you for, by your wishes and your thoughts, seeing to it that the air was at least cleansed of the slight interruption.

All I want you to do is to reward us on November 3 by voting for Lyndon B. Johnson for President and Hubert H. Humphrey for Vice-President.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

---

Chicago, Ill.  
City Hall Rally  
September 19, 1964

### SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you very much.

They always told me that if you really want to see some place to come to Mayor Daley's Chicago. [Applause.]

And I want to tell that fellow that has a big horn, the first time that fellow from Arizona comes in here, give it to him.

## BAT—LINO—10

My good friends, this is a very exciting afternoon for Mrs. Humphrey and myself. These last few days we have traveled through many parts of our country—yesterday in Arkansas, last night in Houston, this morning in North Dakota and now in the great State of Illinois, with this fine, good Governor you are going to reelect, Governor Kerner.

And speaking of elections, I know that you are going to see to it that everyone of these Democratic Congressmen and every one of these good members of the State Legislature, all of these local officials, all the councilmen—elect them all. Elect the whole Democratic slate.

Well, now, my friends, I know what a momentous moment this is for any candidate for public office. I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, that the late and beloved John Kennedy stood right here at this same spot and addressed an overwhelming, strong people and told you about his plans for America.

I was one of John Kennedy's lieutenants in the Congress of the United States, just as I am now Lyndon Johnson's lieutenant in the Congress of the United States.

And I come here for two purposes: first of all, I come here to help carry out the unfinished task of the man that we loved, the man was taken from us, the man that you people here in Chicago did more to elect than any people in America. I come here to help elect Lyndon Johnson.

I know that the mayor of that city loved him as a brother and may I say that I have the privilege of sitting by his side and working by his side during those 1,000 days of his Presidency but I think that the greatest thing John Kennedy ever did for America was the fact that he had the foresight to select as his running mate in Los Angeles, in 1960, a man of experience, a man of good character, a man of integrity, a man with vision, a giant of a man, a man who today is our President, Lyndon B. Johnson. [Applause.]

Yes, it's been my privilege to know these men as friends, to know them as public officials and the highest honor that could ever be paid to me has already been granted. It was the honor, if you please, of being selected by our President, Lyndon Johnson, as his running mate in this election, and I can pledge you one thing, one thing that I pledge you, is that my every action, my every words, my every thought will be to help our President within this election and then to carry on this Government. [Applause.]

Now, friends, I think I will let you in on a secret. You know with old officials, GOP used to stand for "Grand Old Party" but they have changed it. Now it stands for "Goldwater's Our Problem."

And that is why, whenever you take a look at anything that is happening in America, you always find the Goldwater crowd on the far right.

After yesterday, you always find them out there in pasture by themselves. I have got a program for you. I want to tell you something, my friends. Most Americans, most Americans, yes, Republicans and Democrats alike, thought it was a good idea that we, the people and the businessmen of America, have a good tax cut, \$11.5 billion tax cut, but not Barry Goldwater.

CHORUS. Barry Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. And most Americans, most Americans, my friends, believed that when it comes to the period of your life which is called the "senior citizenship" period, when you reach that twilight of your life, you are entitled to social security and good social security.

Most Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, agree upon that, but not—

CHORUS. Senator Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. And, my friends, most Americans believe that we should have for every American the fullest protection of the law, for every person, regardless of race, color, or creed. Yes, most Americans and most Senators and most Congressmen voted for a civil rights act to make America a better country.

CHORUS. But not Senator Goldwater.

## BAT—LINO—11

Senator HUMPHREY. And, now, my friends, I am going to let you in on a nice secret. Just listen to this secret. Most Americans, most Democrats with an overwhelming majority, and hundreds of thousands of Republicans, and millions of independents, yes, most Americans on November 3, 1964, are going to vote for President Lyndon B. Johnson, but "not Senator Goldwater."

Thank you and goodbye.

Terre Haute, Ind.  
Airport  
September 23, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. What a fine Democrat. He knows where he is going and he goes forward.

(Riding a donkey.)

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Mayor and Senator Hartke and Senator Birch Bayh, and our next Governor here in the State of Indiana, Roger Branigin, and I think you folks ought to get used to calling him Governor, Roger, where are you, stand up so they can take a good look at you.

Here is your next Governor right here, and your next Congressman, where is Karl O'Lessker? Karl, come on, stand right up here. Take a good look at this fellow, he is going down to Washington. You won't see him for a while.

Where is Elden Tipton? Right here, here is the Seventh District, is that right? Did you get that hat from the President? That is right.

My dear friends, we are so grateful for your warm reception here and this very wonderful outpouring of fine people to greet us as we come into Terre Haute, Ind. We have been over in your neighborhood, neighboring communities in Evansville, where Senator Hartke once presided as the burgermeister over there, the chief citizen, the mayor of this city. But on the way over here I was told by Birch Bayh that there was no finer city in the United States than Terre Haute, that is what he told me. He has been bragging about it all the way.

I have been told about your own Indiana State College, which is one of the fine educational institutions of this State, about the Wabash Valley Development Association, and the development of this great river valley.

I have been told of many of the accomplishments of this wonderful community. In a very short time we are going to have a chance to be together downtown, where is it, in the city square, down at the courthouse, and we hope that all of you will get into your cars, don't drive any faster than the law permits, but be a Democrat and drive forward, don't go backward.

We want to drive forward. We want you to drive safely. We want you to know where your goal is and that is down at the courthouse. We are going to go down there and before I go I want to bring each and every one of you the greetings of our great President.

I talked to our President last night. I told him of my tour here in Indiana, and he said to me to be his aid in bringing to each and every one of you his warmest greeting and his best wishes.

He thanks you first of all for having two such splendid U.S. Senators in the Senate of the United States, both of whom have helped him so much. [Applause.]

He asked me to ask you to keep a Democrat in the statehouse so that we can have cooperation between Washington and the State capitol of Indiana, and then he told me, he said, "Hubert, there is one thing I want you to emphasize at every speech, that what our country needs today is more understanding amongst one another."

One of the great attributes and characteristics of President Johnson is that he is a man that preaches and teaches and practices brotherhood and fellowship; that believes in national unity not as a slogan but as a reality for our great country, and I ask you to believe it with him. The voices that try to divide us, the voices that could set city against country, farmer against worker, Federal Government against State government, black against white, the different religious groups against one another, those voices wherever you find them in any part of Amer-

## BAT—LINO—12

ican life, those are the voices that play into the hands of the enemy, and weaken this great structure of this great social system of the United States of America.

We are the most blessed people in the world. Name me a country, my fellow Americans where you have so much. Name me a place where there are so many healthy and happy people. Tell me of any place where you have so much opportunity. There just isn't any, there just isn't any and I don't know of any place that is better to live in unless it would be Minnesota than in Indiana, and I sure want to tell you [applause] I want to tell you that it is simply wonderful to be with you and to be in this great Midwestern State, the part of America that I think I know the best and love so much.

But having said that, remember this. We are one country, there is no north, there is no south, there is no east, there is no west, there is what the Constitution says: "We, the people of the United States of America." That is our country. That is what we are for, and if we work together like that we can do anything we want to do and we can have what we want, and we can be what we want, and I think I know what we want to be, a proud, a happy, and a just people.

Thank you very much. See you downtown.

Terre Haute, Ind.  
Vigo County Courthouse  
September 23, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. All I can say is I sure get good introductions in Indiana, and I want to thank you, Senator Hartke, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your generous, kind, enthusiastic, and even more than generous introduction. I am delighted to be on the platform with you, delighted to be in the Senate with you, and honored to be here in your great State with both you and Birch Bayh, two of the finest men that ever came to the Senate of the United States and do honor to this great Hoosier State. [Applause.]

But you know they both have wonderful wives. There is Martha, there is Marvela, both of them dear friends of the Humphreys, and it has been said so many times, you know, about these wives really sort of fix it up for us. As a matter of fact, they say that behind every successful man, stands a surprised mother-in-law, and I would say in this instance that not only a surprised mother-in-law but a very gifted and charming wife.

First of all, Mayor Tucker, my thanks to you for your reception, for in fact giving me the keys to your city, and the keys to your city are here in the people, in the fellowship, in the warmth of the reception of your people, and I want to thank the county committee here of Vigo County or Vigo County, however you wish to pronounce it, for the wonderful arrangements that have been made. I wish all of this county ticket of the Democratic slate the greatest success in the coming election, and I surely want to pay my respects to a man who deserves by record and by performance, by character and by intellect the privilege and the right to be the leader and the Governor of this State, your own Roger Branigin and he can do the job for you. [Applause.]

I have many things in my heart tonight. I know you must go to your homes and I shan't keep you too long.

I am reminded of my helpmate who, by the way, is on her own campaign tour out in Kansas today. She is quite a campaigner, too. She always tells me, "Daddy, don't forget your speeches don't have to be eternal to be immortal," and I am going to try to remember that now. It is going to be here. I generally say it and forget it but I do it just for her.

But I noticed as I was looking around here a few souls, a little unhappy. It touches my heart because I believe that everyone should be happy. I noticed occasionally as I came in a little sign here and there. [Laughter.]

## BAT—LINO—13

And I tell you, friends, it is a wonderful thing that we have these outdoor rallies, because it sort of gives those who have transgressed and have walked in the paths of political sin [laughter] it gives them an opportunity for nonsense, you know, just give up the past and join the future. [Applause.]

And I want to make a proposition to them. We are perfectly willing to give any one of these people that support that man from Arizona for every three signs and two Goldwater buttons they put in they get a Johnson-Humphrey bumper sticker, is that fair? [Laughter.]

By the way, they have got to bring some green stamps, too, otherwise we don't really let them have it. [Laughter.]

I am delighted to see the number of young people here. I mean it is truly great to have you here. Every place I travel we have hundreds and hundreds of young people, teenagers, college students, high school students, right up front working hard for the Democratic ticket, and they ought to be.

Take, for example, here I noticed the great ovation that this fine young Senator from your State, from your hometown here of Terre Haute, Birch Bayh, received from all of you. Well, Birch is the chairman of the Young Citizens for Johnson and Humphrey, and I tell you he is a young man not only in age but in heart, and he leads young people and he leads them for a political party and a candidate for President that is young of heart and young of spirit, and has the determination, and the getup and the go to do something for the young people.

We thank the young people of America. [Applause.]

I gather many of you here are from Indiana State College. [Applause.]

Well, I can plainly see they are reading the right books and studying the right lesson in Indiana State College. [Applause.]

Now, my young students, it is perfectly proper, may I say now, I am a former college professor and I want you to know it is proper for you to study ancient history but don't vote it. [Laughter and applause.]

Respect it, oh, yes, have respect for it. You can even believe it but don't practice it. Join the future, get with it, as they say.

Well, I look up ahead of me and I see city hall. I notice behind me the courthouse. I see on this platform representatives of the statehouse and one who can be the chief executive. There are Members here of the Congress and some that ought to be, like Karl O'Lessker, and like Elden Tipton. These men ought to be. [Applause.]

Maybe we should pause for just a moment to have a little lesson in government, and by the way, if you listen you will do well over there in Indiana State University, Indiana State College.

Now, let me tell you why. There are some voices in this land who would like to have you believe that the enemy in America is your government. That is not the case, and anyone that applauds it does a great disservice to this Republic. The enemy in this land is our indifference to our needs, to our hopes, to our problems, and to our dreams. Our government is the government that was created by our Founding Fathers, developed out of experience, and out of the refiner's fire of trial and error. It is a government from the White House to Capitol Hill, from the statehouse to the legislature, from the courthouse to the commissioners, from the city hall to the mayor and council, the townships, yes, to the hundreds of independent jurisdictions of government. It is one government, one people, we, the people of the United States of America. Not we some of the people, but we the people. Not we the city people, not we the rural people, but we the people, and I have listened to the voices on radio and television of late as I have heard the Pretender to the Presidency, the Republican pretender, go into the Southland and try to preach a doctrine that the Federal Government is the enemy and the State government is the friend.

The fact of the matter is the only way we have built America is by teamwork, by cooperation, by practicing the philosophy, if you please, from the days of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton and Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy up to Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

## BAT—LINO—14

It is written that a nation without vision shall perish and beware of false prophets and more than that beware of those who haven't learned their civics lessons, their basic lessons of American government. They are ill equipped to lead the Republic.

What America needs is not division. What America needs is not the voice of disunity. What America needs today more than it has ever needed in all of its history because of the challenge it faces from without, the powerful challenge of communism and Marxism, the powerful challenge of totalitarianism, what America needs today more than ever before is an understanding of its own strength, an understanding of its own tradition, an appreciation of its own Constitution, of its own system and above all of the dedication and faith of its own people. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk to you just a little bit about some of your folks, as they say, some of the people who have grazed this community and still are with us, some departed. Theodore Dreiser, a famous novelist, I believe he was born here and is buried here. He helped to open the eyes of his countrymen years ago. He helped to open our eyes then to the ruthless and sometimes the hopeless ways in which men trampled and which men struggled for survival in power in an earlier day in America.

Unlike his brother Paul, who wrote that famous Indiana song, "On the Banks of the Wabash," they had or saw around him a world where the weak were at the mercy of the strong, where injustice went unpunished, where the law was the instrument of the privileged, and with all of the force and moral courage and persuasion at his command and at the command of his pen, this great author, this great man of letters, condemned that society of selfishness, of naked power, and of inequality of opportunity.

Those days, thank God, I say in all reverence, we hope are gone, and gone forever, and they are gone thanks to many Americans to men of letters like Dreiser, to clergymen who insisted upon social justice, who preached to us the doctrines of social justice, like the late and beloved Pope John XXIII who reminded us of our responsibilities for justice on this earth.

Those days are gone because of responsible businessmen who are concerned with public welfare as well as private business, and to political leaders who knew and viewed government as having a moral responsibility towards its citizens, and they are gone, too, because of ordinary citizens who have tried to live fairly and justly with one another. It is because of all of this, my friends, and more, because of this fantastic political and social system that we have created with our hands, our minds and our hearts, which is without a doubt one of the great dramatic episodes of all human history that we live in a country today unparalleled in opportunity for everyone, and let me tell you as one who has traveled to the many corners of this world, there is nothing like what we have here, and any time you feel discouraged or disgusted all you need to do for a brief moment is to think of other parts of the world. What a blessed land indeed we have. What a blessed people we are, divinely blessed, as well as blessed, may I say, by an intelligent electorate, an intelligent citizenry.

Now, the policies of the New Deal, the policies of the Fair Deal, and John F. Kennedy's New Frontier, and Lyndon Johnson's Great Society are directed precisely toward the objectives of extending freedom and opportunity to all persons in America.

The watchword of this age in America is opportunity. Open the gates of opportunity, blaze the pathways of opportunity, opportunity not only for the young but opportunity, if you please, for the afflicted, opportunity for the elderly.

As I have said from many a platform, both as a man in public life and as a teacher, the duty of this Government above all is to provide in the dawn of life for those that are young like the students who are here from this great College of Indiana or St. Mary's of the Woods College, or other colleges, the duty is above all for our society to provide opportunity for an education for our young; to provide care and compassion for our afflicted and to see to it that those who are in the twilight of life, our senior citizens, the elderly, can live in dignity and not in shame.

## BAT—LINO—15

Surely a great country like this can do no less. [Applause.]

Honor thy father and thy mother is not only a spiritual commandment, it is a political mandate, and any government worthy of the respect of a free people is one that will blaze the paths of opportunities for those who are in the dawn of life, that will see to it that those who are in the shadows of life, in sickness, and affliction can be cared for, and that those who are in the twilight of life may live in dignity and in peace.

Unfortunately, however, the leader of the Goldwater faction of a great party fails to understand that the exercise of freedom by any person is directly related to the opportunities which are available for a full and productive life.

I ask you, my fellow Americans, when women and children labored 12, 16 hours a day for a dollar and a half how much freedom did they enjoy? When most Americans know that a high school education was beyond their reach, how much freedom did they really enjoy? When Americans stood in breadlines while a government stood by helpless or refused to move and they lived in literally hobo jungles, how much freedom and individualism did they enjoy?

When employees and employers settled their labor disputes with clubs and bombs, how much freedom did they enjoy?

When our people were constantly exposed to sickness and disease, how much freedom did they enjoy?

I think the answers to these questions are self-evident. The essential role, therefore, of a government of the people, and the essential role which government performed in eliminating these so-called freedoms cannot be denied not even by the Senator from Arizona. [Applause.]

And may I add the Government did eliminate those alleged freedoms.

So let us never forget in the words of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, that the responsibility of government is to serve the people. That is its first duty. And let it never be forgotten as a lesson of American life. [Applause.]

And it is that duty and that responsibility which moved Woodrow Wilson with his new freedom, which moved Franklin Delano Roosevelt with his New Deal, which inspired Harry S. Truman with his Fair Deal, and John F. Kennedy with his New Frontier, and today inspires Lyndon B. Johnson with his dream of the Great Society for all Americans. [Applause.]

Yes, as the sun sets in the west on this beautiful evening, let us remember that freedom must mean opportunity for the unlucky as well as the fortunate, for the poor as well as the rich, for the average man as well as those endowed with genius.

Now, the view of freedom championed by the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party is the freedom to remain uneducated or ignorant, if you please; the freedom to be sick, the freedom to stay unemployed, the freedom to be hungry. Some philosophy, some freedom but not worthy of this country, I will tell you. [Applause.]

This is not the philosophy of President Lyndon B. Johnson, and it is not the philosophy of the Democratic Party.

In the words of our President, "We will not turn our back on those who through no fault of their own can no longer sustain themselves. This Nation will never again fall into indifference towards the distressed and the despairing."

Yes, my friends, we know that compassion is not weakness, and we know that concern for the unfortunate is not socialism. It is good wholesome Americanism. [Applause.]

My friends, we don't intend, if we can help it, to let these great standards of human decency and of opportunity and freedom be destroyed. We don't intend to let anyone weaken social security by word or deed, and if you mean that, that means we don't intend to let Mr. Goldwater be President in 1964. [Applause.]

We don't intend, we do not intend to have anyone at the helm of this Nation who could not see the necessity for aid to education, who could not see the necessity for better medical care for our people, the young as well as the elderly, and we do not intend, if you please, to have anyone guide America in the days ahead who believes that some-

## BAT—LINO—16

how freedom means only freedom of an individual to do as he pleases without regard to the rights of others. Freedom carries with it the responsibility of social responsible. It carries with it the responsibility to community as well as to self.

I believe, my friends, that an overwhelming majority of Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, independents, people of all walks of life agree that freedom is meaningless without opportunity, and that freedom for all means opportunity for all, and that opportunity for all means genuine freedom for the American people.

I call, therefore, upon this audience to carry the message, to carry the message, if you please, of the Great Society, to carry the message of the program of President John F. Kennedy in his 1,000 days at the helm of this Government, and of Lyndon B. Johnson in these miraculous 10 months of his leadership, I ask you to carry that message into your home. I ask you to study it as a student and not as a partisan. I ask you to think of the choices in this election. I ask you whether or not you want a President who is willing to wage war on poverty or whether you want one who stands up and wages war on progress.

I ask you that. [Applause.]

I ask you, I ask you do you want a President who has his foot on the throttle of American strength and American power steering this course and steering this great vehicle of American democracy on the straight and narrow road of progress or do you want someone who has failed to identify the difference between the gas feed and the brake and slams his foot on the floor, hits the brakes, stops the country, and then what happens. I ask you. [Applause.]

The choice is yours, the choice is yours, and I think you are going to make that choice.

Most Americans, Republicans and Democrats and independents on November 3 are going to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson and not Senator Goldwater.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Fort Wayne, Ind.  
September 23, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY,  
DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. It is thrilling to be back in this Hoosier country which stands—in the words of one *non*-Hoosier historian—"more than any other environment for the neighborliness of democracy."

This crossroads of America was practicing a good-neighbor policy in the original sense long before Franklin D. Roosevelt enunciated the doctrine. Here in your city lies buried one of the most beloved good neighbors in American folklore, Johnny Appleseed, who wanted all America to be productive and heavy laden with a rich harvest.

How unlike the leaders of the Goldwater faction who rely on the seeds of discontent. But those who have sown the wind will reap the whirlwind. And in November they will be flattened by a hurricane of Democratic votes.

Studying a map the other day, I noticed a town not far from Fort Wayne called by the unlikely but delightful name of Prairie Switch. To those traditional Republicans of Indiana, I urge you to be guided by another Indianian, Walter G. Gresham<sup>1</sup> who, after serving with

<sup>1</sup> Gresham—Postmaster General, later Secretary of the Treasury under Arthur.

distinction in two Cabinet posts under a Republican President, and himself a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, did a Prairie Switch and turned to Grover Cleveland and became his Secretary of State. How many more charges, retractions, explanations, clarifications, and obfuscation will it take for all Indiana Republicans who yearn for clarity and sanity in government to do a Prairie Switch?

In the past 4 years, the Democratic Party has sought to restore *responsibility* and *opportunity* as the operating principles of the Federal Government.

In his historic inaugural address, our martyred and beloved President Kennedy proclaimed, " \* \* \* I do not shrink from responsibility—I welcome it \* \* \*"

## BAT—LINO—17

And Lyndon B. Johnson, in that hour of grief and horror after the death of President Kennedy, said to the Nation:

This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us.

*Responsibility* has been the hallmark of the Kennedy-Johnson administration and *responsibility* is the quality which most distinguishes President Johnson from the leader of the Goldwater faction.

Responsibility in the conduct of government is demonstrated in many ways.

Responsibility is taking an economy which has suffered three recessions in 8 Republican years and transforming it into an economy which produces 43 consecutive months of recordbreaking growth.

Responsibility is reducing the unemployment rate from almost 7 percent in January 1961 to less than 5 percent in July 1964, and reducing it in Indiana from 6.7 to 4.2 percent.

Responsibility is guaranteeing to workers a just and equitable minimum wage. And the Democratic administration and Congress has enacted a minimum wage of \$1.25 and broadened coverage, too.

Responsibility is enacting a tax reduction to provide individuals and corporations additional funds to spend or to invest for the future.

Responsibility is recognizing that 35 million Americans still do not participate fully in the prosperity of this land. And President Johnson has declared war on poverty.

Responsibility is guaranteeing to every American, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, the basic rights of citizenship. And the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been passed.

Responsibility is attempting to provide the American farmer with a more equitable share in our national prosperity. Farm income has increased by over \$1 billion each year; surpluses have declined; exports have risen. But responsibility is also recognizing that much more remains to be done—and the Johnson administration intends to do it.

Responsibility is insuring that America will be first in military strength and first in the pursuit of peace. And today we possess more powerful military forces than any nation in history, and the nuclear test ban treaty proves that no nation will surpass our determination for a peaceful, safe world for our children.

In area after area—in program after program—the Kennedy-Johnson administration and the Democratic Party have demonstrated what *responsibility* in government really means: namely, serving the people of America so that every citizen may enjoy equality of opportunity—so that every citizen may participate fully in the pursuit of happiness.

And what of the words and deeds of the leader of the Goldwaterites? What of his sense of responsibility? What has been his answer to the awesome problems which test our people and our system of government?

On the \$11.5 billion tax cut, Senator Goldwater said "No."

On the Vocational Education Act, the National Defense Education Act, the Medical Education Act, and the College Aid Act, Senator Goldwater said "No."

On the test ban treaty, Senator Goldwater said "No."

On the Trade Expansion Act, Senator Goldwater said "No."

On the civil rights bill, Senator Goldwater said "No."

On hospital insurance under social security, Senator Goldwater said "No."

In short, the leader of the Goldwater faction said "No" to almost every constructive piece of legislation to come before the Congress in the past 4 years. This record of retreat, reaction, and regression stands as the very repudiation of responsibility. Our opposition has shown that it did not understand the meaning of responsibility in the past, and has promised only more irresponsibility in the future.

## BAT—LINO—18

Irresponsibility is the deliberate and calculated advocacy of extremism—however it may be defined or explained or redefined or reexplained. *Irresponsibility* is a seemingly endless stream of confusing and contradictory public statements which leave Republicans and Democrats equally befuddled. *Irresponsibility* is surely the use of empty slogans, meaningless generalities, and impetuous schemes to resolve the awesome problems and crises of our age.

*Responsibility* is the factor which most distinguishes President Johnson from his opponent, and a commitment to *opportunity* for every American is the factor which sets the Democratic Party apart most distinctly from the Goldwaterites.

Woodrow Wilson's *New Freedom*, Franklin D. Roosevelt's *New Deal*, Harry S. Truman's *Fair Deal*, John F. Kennedy's *New Frontier*, and Lyndon B. Johnson's *Great Society* were similar in one fundamental respect: each Democratic administration sought to expand the opportunities available to each American for a full, productive, healthy, and stimulating life. The leader of the Goldwater faction places great stress upon the concept of freedom. But our opponent always fails to mention that the exercise of freedom is related directly to the existence of opportunities.

When women and children labored 18 hours a day for a dollar and a half, how much freedom did they enjoy?

When most Americans knew that a high school education lay beyond their reach, how much freedom did they enjoy?

When Americans stood in breadlines for food and lived in hobo jungles, how much freedom did they enjoy?

When employees and employers settled labor disputes with clubs and bombs, how much freedom did they enjoy?

When our people were constantly exposed to the ravages of sickness and disease, how much freedom did they enjoy?

Freedom, rightly understood, must mean opportunity for the unlucky—as well as the fortunate; opportunity for the poor—as well as the wealthy—opportunity for the average man—as well as the genius.

The philosophy of freedom espoused by the leader of the Goldwaterites is the basis for a whole new set of freedoms: the freedom to remain ignorant, the freedom to be sick, the freedom to remain unemployed, the freedom to be hungry.

Some philosophy. Some freedom.

Let us understand one thing: this is not the philosophy of the Democratic Party. This is not what the Democratic Party means by freedom.

We believe the Government has the responsibility to serve the people. We believe that government has an obligation to help the people help themselves, or—to use the words of our Constitution—to provide for the general welfare. We do not apologize for enacting those programs which provide our children with a better education, or retrain a worker cast off by automation, or assist a local community to stimulate its economy, or permit the training of more doctors and nurses.

We still subscribe to the philosophy of Franklin D. Roosevelt which he set forth with such clarity in accepting the presidential nomination for the second time:

Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weights the sins of the coldblooded and the sins of the warmhearted in a different scale. Better the occasional faults of a government living in the spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party are not indifferent to America. We believe this country is moving again. And we believe that with your continued assistance and support, America will continue moving forward in the 1960's.

I have come to Fort Wayne to ask your help.

---

# BAT—LINO—19

Fort Wayne, Ind.  
Municipal Coliseum  
September 23, 1964

## REMARKS OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, the Demosthenes of Indiana, Senator Vance Hartke.

Every time he introduces me he gets better. [Laughter.]

I don't know whether I am good for him or maybe it is just because I begin to like him more and more as he tells all those nice things about me.

Truly, it is a wonderful privilege to be in the great Hoosier State and to be here as the friend and the colleague of two of the most able, gifted, talented, fine, and dedicated U.S. Senators that ever came to the Senate of the United States, your great senior Senator, Senator Vance Hartke, and your junior Senator, Birch Bayh. [Applause.]

Now, all you need to do for this district is to make sure you send a Democratic Congressman down to help us and I know you are about ready to do it because Indiana's Fourth District deserves good, progressive, thoughtful, considerate, cooperative representation, and Max Hobbs seems to be the man you want. [Applause.]

This business of government, friends, is teamwork. It requires more than just men and women in Washington. It requires people at the State level and at the local level, that are pulling together as a team, and I want to say that when I looked over this program tonight and saw once again the photo, as I have seen the man in the flesh today, the photograph of Roger D. Branigin, the Democratic candidate for Governor, all I can say is Lyndon B. Johnson wants a Democratic Governor in Indiana. So, let's get busy and elect him. [Applause.]

More importantly I think you want to continue Democratic administration in this, the great Hoosier State.

Well, we had quite a time today. It has been a wonderful, wonderful day. But I never realized that my friend Ray Scherer was so popular as to see this great testimonial outpouring for him tonight. [Applause.]

I hope that the authorities at the NBC will get a panorama picture of this tonight and I would expect to see Ray Scherer double his income within the next year or two. [Applause and laughter.]

Of course, I have had to really dig for this one because every time any of these fellow Democrats of mine get up, are able to get up, here at the platform they steal all my lines. I will tell you there is one thing about Democrats, they are highly competitive, and the man that gets here first gets the best, you know. [Laughter.]

Truly, I want to say that it is a real privilege to work with fine people in any endeavor in any walk of life. We are very proud of our friends of the press, of the radio, and of television. Once in a while we have a disagreement with them, occasionally; we occasionally have disagreement with a publisher but not as often as we used to, as you have noticed this year. [Applause.]

But I believe I am right, and I believe that Jim Fleming, this distinguished senior statesman of your community, would agree with me that one of the most trusted and one of the most, well, one of the employees that has been with him the longest, is none other than Ray's father, Arnold Scherer, and I had the privilege of meeting Mr. and Mrs. Scherer tonight. I know they have stood here but now if you can't take time out to say "hello" to friends and be a human being out on a political circuit you ought to quit, and I just wanted to let them know how proud we are of them, how proud we are of their son, and I want you to know how very proud I am tonight of all of Ft. Wayne, Ind., for the wonderful, wonderful warm welcome you have given to me. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Well, this is sort of like old home week in Evansville, which is Hartke's hometown and he really had them out. I don't know whether or not he has more relatives than I have or not but they seem to be more there. [Laughter.] We had a wonderful time.

## BAT—LINO—20

The first time I met Vance Hartke was when he was mayor of Evansville and he did a remarkable job as the chief executive of that city. Secondly, we went to Terre Haute, and that is the hometown of that fine young Senator, Birch Bayh, and again we had a thrilling, an exciting and, may I say, a very, very large meeting, wonderful.

Now, in the hometown of another Hoosier, I am happy.

May I say to you that Indiana is a very key State in this election. Yes, we are going to give Indiana a lot of attention. But really, I think you have the people here in your Governor, in your Governor-nominee, in your Senators, some of your great Congressmen, Democrats, that is, and in these men that are aspiring to Congress, I think you have the power here, you have the talent here, to make sure that Indiana sets the pace, Indiana sets the standard for all of America, and that when that night of election comes on November 3, one of the first States to be heard from in the Midwest will be this crucial, this important State of Indiana, and the announcers will say "Indiana goes for Lyndon Johnson." [Applause.]

And, Ray, as much as we would like to have you have an exclusive of that for NBC, do you mind if we cut in ABC and CBS, too, because we want everybody to listen to that, everybody, everybody, yes, indeed. [Applause.]

We surely owe a debt to your chairman here, Mr. Byron Hayes, and I want to say that I have a suggestion for his fine community. As I came down these streets tonight, and I was told that the reception was very good, and I knew it was but I like to hear it, I saw some wonderful people. We went by some beautiful homes, and this is a fine, clean, modern American city. But every city, every year, has what they call the paintup and cleanup campaign. Now, ordinarily they have it in the spring. But sometimes I think it is even worthwhile considering it in the fall, particularly when I noticed that there were a few Goldwater signs around. [Laughter.]

Now, my fellow citizens you know that the Scouts, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and others hold these paper drives in which they gather up old and unneeded and sometimes used and sometimes unusual articles that can be shipped someplace and reward these fine young people for their efforts. I want to say that prior to November 3 or if you have to wait, you can do it right after November 3, turn in, ask your neighbors to turn in, the copy, the buttons, the placards, and the posters that they have because truly all it is doing is cluttering up the landscape. It isn't going to convince anybody, those Goldwater posters. [Applause.]

We have a regular standing proposition for you. We give you for every three Goldwater buttons you turn in you get one LBJ button and a friendly Democratic handshake. [Applause.]

I sense in Indiana a new spirit. I sense here not only the spirit of Democratic victory, because as you listen to me tonight I hope you will sense it isn't just a Democratic victory we want. Because this State like my State of Minnesota is pretty well divided politically on a party basis, but we have some very definite attitudes about the kind of government we want, and the kind of people that we want in government.

I heard your distinguished Senator, Senator Hartke, tell us tonight of how things were in 1958. He came to the Senate in that great class of Senators of 1958. My own esteemed and much admired colleague, Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota, came with that same group. There has never been a finer group of U.S. Senators come to the Senate than in that year. And I think I know why. [Applause.]

I think I know why. Because the American people saw the necessity of taking out an insurance policy, so to speak, on the future of this Nation. They wanted to make sure that in the Congress, at least, that there was a working Democratic majority, so that some of the policies that were being advocated would not have the opportunity to take hold and retard the progress of this Nation.

But more significantly in 1958 America was in some economic trouble. We were slowing down our pace, and frankly when you slow down in the world you just start running backwards. We have to be so geared up, so equipped physically, mentally, spiritually, emotionally, so that we can be in high gear, full steam ahead, all the time.

I know that you feel that way because I see this kind of attitude every place that I have traveled in this State today.

## BAT—LINO—21

You know your community impressed me as one of warmth and neighborliness. In fact, Hoosier country, which stands in the words of one non-Hoosier historian, more than any other environment for the neighborliness of our democracy. You have a great heritage here. This is, as you put it, the crossroads of America, and this crossroads of America was practicing a good-neighbor policy in the original sense of that phrase long before Franklin D. Roosevelt enunciated the doctrine for our international relations.

Here in your city lies buried one of the most beloved good neighbors in American folk lore, Johnny Appleseed who wanted all of America to be productive, and heavy laden with a rich harvest.

Ah, Johnny Appleseed must have been a real card-carrying Democrat if he felt that way. How unlike the leaders of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party. How unlike these leaders who rely on the seeds of discontent. But let me warn them those who have sown the seeds of discontent will reap the harvest of defeat, and in November they will be literally flattened by an avalanche of Democratic votes. [Applause.]

## BAT—LINO—22

I was studying a map of your State the other day. You know, you have to sort of get prepared for these wonderful excursions into these rich and thriving parts of America, and I noticed a town not far from Fort Wayne that was called by the unlikely but delightful name of Prairie Switch. Now, to those traditional Republicans of Indiana, I urge you to be guided by another Indianian, a Republican, of some years ago by the name of Walter Gresham. Walter Gresham may not be familiar to you as a name but he served in the Cabinet of President Arthur and he served as the Postmaster General, and after serving with distinction in two Cabinet posts under a Republican President, Chester Arthur, and himself later on a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, Mr. Gresham, Indiana Republican, prominent in his day, leader in this Hoosier State of Republicanism, he did a Prairie Switch, and he turned to that great Democrat of that that time, Grover Cleveland and became his Secretary of State. That is a good example for many good Republicans now. [Applause.]

Frankly, in all seriousness, President Johnson and Senator Humphrey extend to the thousands and thousands of normal traditional Republicans the hand of welcome. We believe in the two-party system, two-party structure, and we believe in two responsible parties. It is healthy for America. And we believe that there are literally millions of people of Republican persuasion of this country that don't like what happened out at the Cow Palace in San Francisco, they don't like what is happening today on the political hustings as the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party makes charge after charge.

These are the Republicans, if you please, that I speak of, who are putting their country above their party and they are needed in this election as never before. They are needed to redeem their own party and they are needed to back the President of the United States in his effort to gain a great victory for American democracy. [Applause.]

You know, I am sure many of you remember Wendell Willkie, a great Indianan. Well, there are thousands of Willkie Republicans voting for Lyndon B. Johnson, thousands of them, and may I say that there was a time, and it will be again, when people who adhere to this banner of the party of Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, who has been betrayed by one who could not see the necessity of making the Emancipation Proclamation, which was a promise, making it a reality, this last summer when we voted in the Congress of the United States on equal rights for every American. [Applause.]

Yes, there are many who are proud to remember that their party, the GOP, stands for the Grand Old Party, but you know what has happened to it now. The same old initials but it has different meaning, GOP to millions of people stands for "Goldwater, Our Problem." [Applause.]

Yes, how many more charges, countercharges, recharges, retractions, explanations, and clarifications will it take for these good Indiana Republicans who yearn for clarity and sanity in government to do a good old Indiana Prairie Switch. This time you can switch and you can fight, too, and you can fight for Lyndon Johnson and a victory. [Applause.]

All through this State today I have been trying to speak or should I say preach one doctrine, responsibility in government. If there is any one thing that Lyndon Johnson, as majority leader of the U.S. Senate, taught us, it was responsibility.

During those years when President Eisenhower was the leader, and the President of the United States, the Democratic majority in the Congress acted as a responsible majority, and the man who is now President of the United States acted responsibly in his position of responsibility.

In the past 4 years the Democratic Party has sought to restore responsibility and opportunity as the two key operating principles of our government, responsibility on the part of the officers of government and opportunity as the promise, the pledge, and the performance of American government in this great America of ours.

In his historic inaugural address our martyred and beloved President, John Kennedy, proclaimed, and let these words sink deep into

## BAT—LINO—23

our hearts because every one of us who have been entrusted with any degree of responsibility must never forget them, John Kennedy said, standing there on the steps of the Capitol as he took his oath of office and delivered us that great challenge to the future, his inaugural address, "I do not shrink from responsibility, I welcome it."

Those are the words of a courageous man. Those words marked him from that moment as a leader, as one who sought to come to grips with the difficult problems that beset our Nation then, just as we have those problems now. And Lyndon B. Johnson in that hour of anguish, of grief and pain that we all suffered, when our President Kennedy had been assassinated, when he was the victim of the assassin's bullet, Lyndon Johnson, speaking to the Congress of the United States and to the entire Nation and the world said, "This is our challenge. Not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us."

Those are the words of a man who, thank God, who was able to give America leadership when the torch of freedom fell from the hands of a President that had been taken by the assassin's bullet, and that torch of freedom and responsibility fell into strong and trustworthy hands. Possibly the greatest, the greatest act of John Kennedy's life was the fact that he had the foresight to choose as his Vice President someone who was so skilled in government someone who was so strong, and someone who was so prudent, and someone who was so knowledgeable and so trustworthy as Lyndon Johnson so he could carry on. [Applause.]

I think there is just one word, this one concept of responsibility that distinguishes this administration and this President more than any other from the Republican pretender to the Presidency. Responsibility in the conduct of government is demonstrated in many ways every day. Responsibility is taking an economy which, as Senator Hartke pointed out to you tonight, had suffered three recessions in 8 years, and transforming it into an economy, by fellow Americans, that has had 43 continuous months of growth, of expanding opportunity and expanding prosperity for 190 million American people. That is responsibility. [Applause.]

Responsibility is cutting the unemployment rolls, seeing to it that this economy was growing at such a rate that not only could we absorb many of the unemployed of the past but that we could absorb into our factories and shops and mines the new population, a growing population.

My dear friends, this Nation has before it the unbelievable task of being able to absorb and to provide jobs for 300,000 new workers every month for the foreseeable future. You can't turn this kind of a country over to someone who has his glasses without lenses, and his vision through a rear view mirror. [Applause.]

Responsibility, responsibility in government, is working out through careful legislation process, through planning, through study in the executive branch of the Government over months and months, hundreds of days of hearings and testimony, a tax bill, a tax reduction, a tax reduction to provide individuals and corporations in America with approximately \$11½ billion of free cash to be used for the consumer, to be used for investments, to be used as we want it. What does this mean to Indiana this year? \$275 million of money, of money available to the people of this State for your use, for your investment, for your purchases. This is why jobs are coming. This is why you have unprecedented prosperity in America.

My friends, you don't figure out a tax program in the cabin of a jetplane flying over the deserts of Arizona. You figure out a tax program in the air-conditioned Chambers of the U.S. Congress. [Applause.]

## BAT—LINO—24

Possibly the distinguished Senator from Arizona has forgotten that Congress legislates taxation, and that this isn't something that is created by the publicity artists of a political apparatus at high altitude. Taxation is down-to-earth stuff.

Now, responsibility in government is recognizing, my fellow Americans, that even if this great, rich, and powerful country, richer than it has ever been, more productive than it has ever been, with higher profits than we have ever had, with better wages than we have ever had, with greater production than we have ever known, with more dividends than we have ever known, that even with all of that because of the pace of technology, because of the change in industry, because of the uprooting of many communities, we have within our country approximately 35 million Americans who do not fully participate in the prosperity of this land, and this is what President Johnson meant when he said, "We must declare an all-out war on poverty" not only because it was morally right that we should do something about the condition of the poor in this period of our rich and affluent life, not only because it was helpful to the poor, but because by doing something to eliminate poverty, you do a great deal to expand prosperity for all Americans, for years and years to come. [Applause.]

Yes, and responsibility takes a toll. You pay a price for it. Our President is paying a price right now in certain parts of America because this President and the one before him, John Kennedy, kept faith with America, and kept their promises and their pledges, because this President knew that the denial of equal rights was not only a violation of the Constitution but it was also morally wrong, and that that civil wrongs had to be changed into civil rights. Yes, President Johnson, a southerner, had the courage, if you please, to lead all of America into a new day where in America there is only one kind of citizenship, where you are a citizen of the United States of America with all the privileges and all the duties and with all of the opportunities regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. That is a great leader. [Applause.]

And, Mr. Farmer, because America still is blessed with a productive land, a rich land, and the most efficient, the most capable the most able farm producers, agricultural producers, that the world has ever known, responsibility in government is attempting to help provide for that American farmer a more equitable share in our national prosperity and I am happy to say that while we haven't been able to do all that we should or all we want to, agricultural income is up at the annual rate of \$1 billion per year net. Surpluses have been reduced. The cost of storage to the taxpayer, the cost of the program, has been reduced, and in this blessed State of Indiana farm income per farm for the average farmer in your state in 1960 was \$9,400. In 1963 at the end of 1964, it was \$11,600. Responsibility has helped the American farmer. [Applause.]

Mr. Farmer, and, yes, Mr. Citizen, wherever you live, how many people know in this State that 13 cents out of every dollar of produce produced on the farm is for export, farm markets abroad.

Responsibility is insuring that this great and mighty Nation will never be defenseless, that its military strength will be second to none and that it is today. We have fulfilled the requirements of providing for the common defense which is one of the mandates of the Constitution. So, that today America stands as the mightiest military power that the world has ever known, stronger than any of them and stronger than any combination of nations so that we can do what President Kennedy said, "We shall never be afraid to negotiate but we shall never negotiate from fear, we shall negotiate from strength." [Applause.]

Just as we are first in strength, we are also, thank goodness, first in the relentless pursuit of a just peace. And responsibility, my fellow Americans, young and old alike, is providing a program of social security for our elderly, for our disabled, for our needy children, for our unemployed, and responsibility means that we keep that program solvent, that we maintain it as a pledge not only to present Americans but to generations yet unborn, and we have fulfilled that requirement of responsibility, my fellow Democrats. [Applause.]

## BAT—LINO—25

So, I say to you tonight, I am like that great late Speaker of the House of Representatives when asked about his politics said, "I am a Democrat without any prefix or suffix and without apology." [Applause.]

In area after area, in program after program, the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and the Democratic Party has demonstrated what responsibility in government means, namely, serving the people of America so that every citizen may enjoy one privilege above all others, equality of opportunity and so that every citizen may participate fully to the utmost capacity of his being in the promise of our forefathers the pursuit of happiness. These are the responsibilities that we have fulfilled. And what are the words of the leader of the Goldwaterites. What of his sense of responsibility? What has been his answer for some of the awesome problems which have tested our people in the past, and which now test our people in our very system of government now and in the future?

Well, let's take a look. Out of the 11—let's take a look at the \$11½ billion tax cut. Where was the Senator from Arizona when the issue was before the Congress, not when it was up in the clouds, but when it was on the floor of the Senate? He voted "no."

On vocational education which means \$5 million, Superintendent Wilson, \$5 million to the State of Indiana, every year as compared to \$2,600,000 3 years ago? Where was Mr. Goldwater? Well, you know, he was hiding out, voting "No."

And then the National Defense Education Act to strengthen our security for education backed by every responsible educator in America. Where was the Senator from Arizona? He was under the no-no tree, in the shadow of his indifference. [Applause.]

Now, may I say to my good friends of the healing arts, as a pharmacist, as a professional man, where was the Senator from Arizona when the great societies of medicine, the great schools of medicine, the deans of the medical institutions came before the Congress and asked the Congress of the United States to help build medical schools for a growing population so that we could have more doctors and the best doctors in the world, more nurses, more medical technicians, more pharmacists. We passed a bill for aid to medical facilities at the request of the finest medical authorities of America so we could have medicine that was practiced where the physician could have choice of patient and where the patient could have choice of physician. Where we could really maintain the high standards of medical care under a system of freedom and where was this man from Arizona? of the medical institutions came before the Congress and asked the Voting "No" against every one of the doctors of our land. [Applause.]

I mention this because I heard there might be a couple that were going to vote for him. [Laughter.]

And where was this man from Arizona? Where was this man when we witnessed the need for more college space, more classrooms, better facilities? Because, my fellow Americans, in the next 25 years America must double its entire higher educational establishment. We must build more college space, more classrooms, more college facilities, more higher education facilities in the next 25 years than we have built in the last 300. These are not the words of Senator Humphrey. These are the words of the American Council on Education. Every educator knows it and the leading educators of America—the presidents of our great universities, private and land-grant, private and public—have come before the Congress and asked for aid to higher education, and your two Senators here were instrumental in those programs. Where was the Senator from Arizona? Well, I guess he just thought school was out. He voted "no." [Applause.]

On the nuclear test-ban treaty negotiated after months and months, yea, years, of effort—a nuclear test ban treaty to prevent this atmosphere that we live in from being saturated with the poison of radioactive debris, to protect the lives of our loved ones and children yet unborn, to keep the milk that we drink from being polluted and adulterated from strontium 90, to take the preventive and precautionary steps that God's people ought to take because we have a responsibility not only to our generation but to others yet to come, where was the Senator from Arizona when an overwhelming majority of the U.S. Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for it. He said "no." [Applause.]

And the record is the same, my friends, on the Trade Expansion Act which means millions of dollars to the people of this great city and

## BAT—LINO—26

State, Indiana—one of the great industrial States—the chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the AFL-CIO, the American Bankers Association, the Congress of the United States, Republicans and Democrats alike voted for the Trade Expansion Act. But not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

You know it must be very comforting to think you can be so right when you stand alone so often. [Applause.]

And my friends, we are concerned about our elderly, we are concerned about their need and we are concerned about their health and the Congress of the United States, U.S. Senate in which the Senator from Arizona serves, only recently by a rather substantial majority, passed a bill that would provide under prepaid insurance, not as a gift, not as charity, not as welfare, but as something you owned and paid for—hospital and nursing home care under social security. It is right, it is proper, it is not any of this nonsense that they call socialism. It is insurance. It won't hurt anybody. It will help a lot of people and above all it will help people who are in the twilight of life, when their period of sickness is the longest, when their stay in the hospital is the longest, when their income is the lowest, and when their earning power is the least, it will provide some reasonable period of care in a hospital of their choice, in their town, in a nursing home approved by their State, and their local government so that they can live a better life. And where was the Senator from Arizona? He was voting, "no." [Applause.]

Well, I will tell you, it is quite a record: vote "no" against the children, vote "no" against the college students, vote "no" against the farmers. Vote "no" on the REA, vote "no" against the chamber of commerce, the AFL, the NAM, the bankers, vote "no" against industry and trade. Vote "no" against grandfather and grandmother, and even "no," may I say against keeping the atmosphere clean. How wrong can you get? [Applause.]

And then an effort was made only recently to do something about these pockets of poverty. Not the greatest effort, but a beginning. Something about our youngsters. By the way, 40 percent of the teenage youngsters in Harlem are unemployed. No jobs, no hope, no education, school dropouts, walking the streets, as Dr. Conant said, the great educator, this is social dynamite. These are some of the youngsters who get in trouble.

Yes, they get into riots, into violence which we cannot condone. The law must be enforced. The first duty of any government is to maintain public order. No one can condone rioting or violence or pillage or looting. But my fellow Americans, my fellow Americans, examine into your hearts, take a moment for silent meditation, can you really be content, can you say that nothing ought to be done, can you say that nothing can be done, about the 40 percent of the colored boys, the Negro boys that are teenagers in Harlem who have no job, school dropouts, who stand on the street corners, should we do nothing about that? Should we only lecture them about law observance or should we see to it that the law is just.

Not only shall the law be enforced but the law shall also provide opportunity, it shall provide a hope, a promise for a better day and a better life and that is what we have tried to do in this poverty program. [Applause.]

Senator Goldwater, what is your program for these that have been cast aside except your weekly lectures? What is your program for the youth of America that wants to do something. Well, we offered a program, Job Corps training, youth training, youth conservation camps, putting these young men, if they want to, out working in the great outdoors, giving them guidance, giving them vocational training, providing them with education, seeing to it that their bodies are healthy, that their minds are alert, and that they can have the strength that come from communing with nature. This is the program for our youth that Lyndon B. Johnson and the Congress of the United States have legislated, and where was the Senator from Arizona? At his country club, not helping his young people. Voting "no." [Applause.]

So, I say, then, that we have witnessed irresponsibility rather than responsibility, irresponsibility in the seemingly endless stream of confusing and contradictory statements which means Democrats and Republicans alike, bewitched, bothered, bewildered, and befuddled.

## BAT—LINO—27

Irresponsibility is surely the use of empty slogans and meaningless generalities and impetuous schemes to resolve the awesome problems and crises of our age. But responsibility, this is the factor which most distinguishes the man that I am privileged to work with, the man that I am privileged to speak for tonight, President Johnson, this distinguishes him from his opponent, and a commitment to opportunity for every American is the factor which sets the Democratic Party apart most distinctly from the Goldwaterites.

Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom, Roosevelt's New Deal, President Truman's Fair Deal, John Kennedy's New Frontier, and Lyndon Johnson's Great Society are similar in one fundamental respect. Each Democratic administration sought to expand opportunities available to each American for a full productive, healthy, and stimulating life. Each of these great Presidents talked to us about the joy of living in freedom, and they gave to us more than words, programs, policies, and leadership. The leader of the Goldwater faction places great stress upon his concept of freedom but our opponent always fails to mention that the exercise of freedom by anyone is related to the existence of responsibility and opportunity.

Freedom rightly understood must mean opportunities for the unlucky as well as the fortunate, opportunity for the poor as well as the wealthy, and opportunity for the average man as well as the genius.

We in the party, and I think most Americans, believe that government does have a responsibility to serve the people. Government ought to care about the people. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people ought to be a government with a heart that cares and cares and cares about the people of this land. We believe the Government has an obligation to help the people help themselves or to use the words of our Constitution, "to promote the general welfare," and we do not nor shall we now or in the future apologize for enacting those programs which provide our children with a better education or retrain the worker that may be cast off by automation or assist a local community to stimulate its economy or permit the training of more doctors or nurses. We think this is good, not bad. We think this is progress, not retreat. We still subscribe to the philosophy of Franklin Roosevelt which he set forth so clearly in accepting the presidential nomination for the second time. And as we go to our homes tonight may we ponder what he said—the great President of the depression period, Franklin Roosevelt—some of you remember his advice, how it lifted us, reassured us, and what it meant to young and old alike.

Roosevelt said, "Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes. But the immortal Dante tells that divine justice weighs the sins of the coldblooded and the sins of the warmhearted in a different scale. Better the occasional faults of a government living in the spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference." [Applause.]

What is then the choice? It is the choice, if you please, of a government that may make an occasional fault or err occasionally, but it does it not as a mistake of the heart. It does it because it has a warm heart that may occasionally err.

And Goldwaterism, how should we define it? I would say frozen in the ice of its own indifference. Division, doubt, confusion, this is no program for America, for the land of the free and the home of the brave.

America deserves better than such faltering, retreating leadership. Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party are not indifferent to America. We believe this country is moving again, and we believe that with your continued assistance and support America will continue moving forward in the sixties.

We are not merely concerned about today. We are dedicated to the future, because an administration worthy of our respect must not only be capable of meeting the immediate problem but it must be able to have the vision to look to the tomorrows. It must, in fact be willing, to say yes to tomorrow. It must be willing to mobilize the resources of America, to make sure that the tomorrows are brighter days in our future history than the yesterdays. We believe in an America that is vital with a forward thrust, and we see our America as an exciting drama of human experience creating a fabulous system of justice and opportunity. We don't see our America as weak, as confused, and as immoral and as bad and as indifferent.

## BAT—LINO—41

ful now that every one of you who are here from the Sixth District will keep in mind that this is one of the few districts in this area—I think it is about the only one—that has a Republican serving for them in Congress and you think that—you can remedy that unfortunate set of circumstances by electing Emil Levin for Congress from the Sixth District. Emil, my best to you. Take a good look at him; that name is not hard to remember. When you remember Kennedy, remember Levin, and you have them together. Give Lyndon Johnson some help in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

My greetings to your State senators. I always like to think of the good work these men are doing, Tom Mackell and Tom Duffy. Here we are, both of these men are here. They are the people who are serving so well. My best to you.

This is—you know Bobby, if we could translate or transfer all that energy that I see over there into votes this fellow that is running against you will wish he had never filed, and Goldwater won't have a chance. [Cries of "We want Johnson."] Boys, you have got the right idea.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to give you a chance to join in on this happy occasion because what we are here to talk about, for the few moments that are ours, is to talk about keeping this country on the forward path of progress on which it was set back in January 1961. On that day of January 20, 1961, a brave and courageous young President said to an America that was in trouble, an America that was asleep, an America that was in retreat, he said to America, let's get this country moving again, and he said to us, let us begin, begin the many programs, the progress, the many programs of forward movement that today characterize our great country, and we started. We made a good start, and in 1,000 days a great record was established by a great President and Congress with a Democratic majority. And 10 months since the loss of our beloved President, President Lyndon Johnson has given to America 10 months of the most dynamic leadership that this country has ever had and we are ever indebted to him. [Applause.] We don't intend to let this progress be halted. We don't intend to let America be put in retreat.

I said to a group of students last night at Fort Wayne, Ind., college students, that it is a wonderful thing to study ancient history but don't live it, vote for the future, not for the past.

I was told just a little while ago, that the Republican candidate for President was initiating a whole new series of television programs, and I think you ought to tune in. They start at 7 o'clock and end at 6:30. This is the only way that I know of explaining to you in concise terms what would happen to America. Somebody said to me what do you think life would be like under Goldwater, and the friend said, "Brief." [Applause and laughter.]

As I came down the street today somebody handed me a little note and he said, "You know, we got our man nominated," and then I said to him, "Well, now, what do you expect to do if you get him elected?" He said, "We will jump off that bridge when we crossed it."

Surely this is not what Americans want to do. What we want to do is to do more of what we have been doing, and what have we been doing? We have been, for example, making possible for the residents of this great country, better living, better jobs, better income, better wages, better profits, better dividends, just a better time for the American people, and as I said, as I said from many a platform when it came to the tax cut in Congress, a tax cut that added billions of dollars of new purchasing power to the American economy, most Republicans and most Democrats, yes, most Americans, wanted it and voted for it, but not Senator Goldwater. [Applause]

When it came to a housing program—a housing program that would help build apartments, that would help build homes—most Democrats, most Republicans in Congress voted for it, but not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.] And when it came to aid to higher education, to help our colleges, to help our schools so that we can have educational opportunity for the young Americans, most Democrats, most Republicans in the Congress voted for it but not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.] And, my dear friends, when it came to medicare, hospital and nursing home care for our senior citizens who needed, as all Americans need some attention from their Government, most Democrats and a few Republicans voted for it in the Senate, but not Senator Goldwater.

## BAT—LINO—42

I say that a man that has a record of no, no, no, a thousand times no, that is the kind of a fellow that has got to go, and we don't intend to elect him to the office of Presidency. What we intend to do is to see to it that the man who is presently our President is given another 4 years to lead this country forward as he has in the past.

One other thing to you. I was talking to your State senators and your Congressmen here; I was talking to your president of the council of this borough, and I know that there are many difficulties here, many problems; for example, mass transit. This great city because of the Democratic Congress, this great city, because of a Democratic President, has a mass transit program—they are just going to pick up a Republican, he has some trouble. Don't pay any attention to those little interruptions. I understand that according to your people here that once in a while you have a little trouble with jet noise out at the airport. Well, I would like to tell you something. It is the intention of the man that you elect to the Senate, Robert Kennedy, and it is the intention of the President of the United States, and of the Democratic administration, to try to do something about this. But the answer is, "We don't know, but we are going to look for it and we are going to do something about it and we are going to ask your help to get the job done." [Applause.]

Well now, if you will just do as much work between now and November 3 as you are doing here today, I haven't any doubt what's going to happen because I will tell you what I think is going to happen. On election day, most Americans on election day, most Americans, Democrats, Republicans, and independents on November 3 are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and are going to vote for Bobby Kennedy and not Senator Goldwater.

Thank you, very much.

---

Brooklyn, N.Y.  
In front of the Borough Hall of Brooklyn  
September 24, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, very much—thank you, very much, Mayor Wagner.

My fellow Americans, these wonderfully good people from Brooklyn—Brooklyn that cast more votes in 1960 for John F. Kennedy than 31 other States. What a borough. Weren't you proud of that Bob Kennedy and that fighting speech he gave us here today? [Applause.]

My good friends, don't you be at all upset about the noise that you heard down there to your far right. [Applause.] It is very, very, difficult—very difficult to drag somebody into the 20th century when they have been hanging back in the 19th century for so long. And my dear friends, there is not a thing wrong with these dear friends over here, they are just trying to repent for their political sins, that is all. [Applause.]

You had a great speech from a great U.S. Senator, and you have had an opportunity here to hear from a fine public official, your great mayor. I am very honored, to be on this platform with the leader here of King's County, with your county leader, Stanley Steingut, and I want to thank you and this organization for sending to the Congress of the United States such a distinguished congressional delegation as we have here on this platform today in Manny Celler, a great Congressman; in Edna Kelly, and Abe Multer and in Hugh Carey. These are fine Members of the Congress, and these are Members of the Congress that helped ease the load for John Kennedy as he advanced the New Frontier. [Applause.] And, these are the Members of Congress that when Lyndon Johnson needed help to advance the program of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, every one of them were there to help him. [Applause.] And now all you have to do, what you have to do now, is to make sure that in the U.S. Senate you have a man that is going to be with him to help our President, because the next President of the United States is not going to be that noise from your right. It is going to be Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Isn't that right? [Applause.] You don't want Barry Goldwater, do you? [Cries of "No."] I don't hear you. [Cries of "No."] Did

## BAT—LINO—43

you hear that, Barry? It's great. You've got the right idea around here. These fellows, the only record they have got is scratched, can't you hear it? [Applause.]

Now, my friends, I want to just say a few more words to you because you are going to make the decision that is so important in a very few weeks, just a few weeks. In a few weeks on November 3, the people of this county, the people of this great city, of this State, and this nation are going to decide whether America is going to say "Yes" to the future or whether it's going to worship the past, and if they are going to say "Yes" to the future, it means they elect a Democratic team of Johnson, Humphrey, and Kennedy, and a Democratic Congress. [Applause.] Let me tell you, you have had this team to work for you for a long time. It was the team, it was the team until that fatal day, that tragic day, in that history of Kennedy and Johnson and the man who is speaking to you now was one of the lieutenants of that team. It was then the team of Kennedy, Johnson, and in part, Humphrey, and now it is going to be the team for 1965 of Johnson, of Humphrey, and Kennedy, and we are going to make it work.

Yes, you know what you want to do. You want to make this country a better country. You want what President Johnson said, a better deal for America, better education for your young, better health care for our elderly, better jobs for our workers. Better cities for our people, a better America. The promise of the Democratic party is equality of opportunity, full opportunity for the American people, a better America for America of tomorrow and a peaceful world for all of humanity. [Applause.]

Say, you know, I want to tell you, I would not be a bit surprised that when Senator Goldwater sees the pictures of the tremendous crowds of today in New York that he may want to return all his buttons and all those placards. [Applause.] But I think we ought to be nice to him. If he does we'll buy them back at the original price, believe me. We will give him green stamps.

Now, friends, our task is very simple, and yet it is very important. I am delighted to see so many young people here. I like to see young people. [Applause.] I like to see young people who are democratic. There is nothing worse—you know, somebody once said, it is bad enough to be an old fogey, but it is worse to be a young fogey. So our job, our job is to go to work. There is only one thing that this opposition is going to understand. They are going to have to understand that you cannot preach division, you cannot preach disunity, you cannot arouse bitterness, you cannot fan hatred, you cannot do these things, my friends and expect to lead America. What America needs is a President that unites the people, and America needs a President who will work for the people. America needs a President like Lyndon Johnson who will work for them. [Applause.]

New York, N.Y.  
New York Liberal Party  
September 24, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

While I come from the wild West, having crossed the Continental Divide in Hackensack—we of the Minnesota Democratic Farm Labor Party and you of the Liberal Party have a common bond.

Twenty years ago you in New York affirmed one of the basic principles of a democratic political movement. In 1944 the Liberal Party was founded because you would not tolerate Communist extremism in the liberal movement. When you condemned extremism you set an example which the Republicans in San Francisco 20 years later regretably ignored.

In 1964 everybody condemns communism. But when you founded the Liberal Party in 1944, and we in Minnesota began our successful campaign to destroy Communist influence in our State in 1946, many Americans looked hopefully toward the Soviet Union, feeling that perhaps communism would change its character as a result of our common struggle against Nazi Germany.

It was we liberals who stood firmly against this tide of sentimental nostalgia, who were denounced to the skies as "red baiters," but who established the point once and for all that totalitarianism—extremism—of any stripe is alien to the traditions of American democracy.

## BAT—LINO—44

At a time when political hucksters and medicine men are smearing liberalism, we can stand up proudly—on our record—and tell them that we will not even listen to their charges until they purge their ranks of rightwing extremists.

*With these hands* we have destroyed Communist influence in American politics, *with these hands* we have laid the foundations of a good society, dedicated to freedom, justice, and equality; *with these hands* we shall continue under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson to the joyous task of building a Great Society worthy of our dreams.

We have come a long way together—and you who know my strengths and my frailties must realize how deeply I am moved by your action. I accept the nomination of the Liberal Party for the office of the Vice President of the United States.

Emerson once said that a speaker should try to call attention to his facts, not to himself. I have tried to do just that during this campaign. Sometimes audiences want to hear stories or be entertained. Sometimes they just want to hear about the temporary Republican spokesman and encourage me with shouts of "But not Senator Goldwater!" I enjoy this.

And it is tempting to analyze the statements, retractions, explanations, and expurgations of Senator Goldwater. It is always a thrill to hit a moving target.

Consider what he said the other day in trying to compare himself with liberals. He said:

A lot of my enemies call me simple. The big trouble with the so-called liberal today is that he doesn't understand simplicity \* \* \*. I refuse to go around this country discussing complicated, twisted issues.

Is life really as simple as the Senator thinks? Are matters of life and death simple? Are the problems so simple and the answers so easy that they need not be discussed? Can a serious candidate for President actually be so fearful of the complexities of life that he blocks them from his mind—and then has the gall to ask the people to follow him?

America's history is the dramatic story of a people fighting for independence, creating a government, settling a continent, engaging in a civil war, reuniting a nation, and emerging as a world power. Who truly believes that these were simple and easy tasks?

The story of America from Bunker Hill to Vietnam is one of struggle, sacrifice, heroism, and courage—but never simple, never easy.

The reality of America has always been complex. When my father was a young man, living on the frontier in South Dakota, he saw small-scale things in the middle of open spaces. Towns were small. Buildings were small. Factories were small. Roads were little more than a dent made by wagon wheels on the raw surface of the earth.

In its best aspects, that was an America that fostered virtues we justly admire—self-reliance, independence, thrift, neighborliness.

But life was not simple. There was a dark and often brutalizing underside to this seemingly idyllic world. There was too often disease, illiteracy, poverty, and loneliness—even along the main traveled roads.

But independence and self-reliance alone were not adequate to deal with a complex and impersonal world.

Few workers could see beyond their immediate jobs when they exhausted themselves from dawn until dusk.

No single farmer could affect the price of grain on the world market.

Few talented youngsters could expect to carve out a successful career when they had to begin work after the eighth grade.

And in a day when most people were poor, it was almost impossible to hedge against family catastrophes or to save for a restful retirement.

People increasingly saw the need to mobilize the powers of the National Government on behalf of individual opportunity. In an unbroken line, the New Freedom, the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the New Frontier initiated programs which demonstrated that Government is the servant of man, not his adversary.

Today we confront a far more complex world, one whose beckoning opportunities excite us, but whose acute needs torment us with their immediacy and their obstinacy.

## BAT—LINO—45

This complex world is the work of man himself, with his science and his technology, and man himself has given it the name of the metropolis. You know that metropolis well—and that is why I speak of it tonight.

The metropolis is centered in New York City, and it stretches northward continuously into New England and southward along the Middle Atlantic coast. Other parts of the metropolis exist in the South and in the Southwest, in the region of the Great Lakes, and along the Pacific coast.

Today more than two-thirds of all Americans live in the extended metropolis. By 1980, 8 of every 10 Americans will live there. In fact, at that time, when the population is expected to reach 260 million, some 80 million persons will be concentrated in a single urban strip extending from New England to Washington, D.C.

The figures I have just cited say two things: First, the modern American is the metropolitan man, blessed and cursed by complex conditions of life wholly unknown to the pioneering architects of the American Republic.

Second, these questions must be answered: How do we adapt those political and social arrangements which served rural man to the urgent needs of metropolitan man? How do we enlarge our vision to take in the whole Nation and invent new ways of meeting the rightful demands of both the metropolis and the rest of the country?

The answers to these insistent questions will decide whether we can deal successfully with the problems of race relations, employment opportunities, air and water pollution, policing and crime detection, and the nerveracking and costly congestion of traffic.

These problems would be enough. But how we adapt our political arrangements will determine whether we can cope with specific difficulties of the metropolis—the crowded schools and hospitals, the degrading shums, the absence of open spaces for recreation, even the ordinary logistics of everyday living—how to get back and forth to work.

Those problems alone would be enough.

But even as we try to adapt our private and governmental organizations to serving metropolitan man, we confront antiquated local tax structures, wasteful and overlapping agencies of local and State governments, rivalries and jealousies between suburbs and central cities, and too often the tradition of inertia.

These problems are urgent and these complexities are critical because most of us today live in the metropolis.

Throughout human history, the stages of culture have been marked by the names of great cities like Jerusalem, Athens, Rome, Paris, London, and New York. The things created by men working together in cities outlast the living generation. Cities carry forward, to be modified by time and by new man, the spirit of an age.

When men in cities have built meanly, without common purpose or a sense of the ideal, the probability is that they have lived meanly also—that they have neglected the influences which make a civilization out of a collection of individuals. Leisure in such a city turns negative and sour, and men lose their self-identity as they endure anxiety, loneliness, and boredom.

But when men build cities in a spirit of community and with an eye for a nobility of line, they are reaching beyond the purely material satisfactions of life which so quickly grow stale.

The Liberal Party's work shows that you have a vision of such a city, of a metropolis that enriches the lives of its citizens, of an urban civilization that can become truly urbane.

President Kennedy had such an urban civilization in mind when he spoke of the New Frontier. President Johnson has this in mind when he speaks of the Great Society. And I have it in mind tonight.

During his all too brief 1,000 days as President, John F. Kennedy was forced to concentrate most of his strength upon the international crisis he inherited. But it is part of his supreme triumph that his success in averting foreign danger has won for us a margin of time in which we can shape the future of our metropolis.

That is what President Johnson has been doing. He remains fully alert to every shift in the balance of world power. He is poised to deal prudently but resolutely with any danger or opportunity that presents itself on a day-by-day basis. But all the while he has been using the

## BAT—LINO—46

margin of time President Kennedy won for all of us, to revive and renovate and strengthen the internal conditions of American life.

In everything he has done in his public career, President Johnson has lived by a principle of responsible power. This principle was once defined by President Theodore Roosevelt, that dynamic responsible Republican whose heritage has been so savagely repudiated.

"A man," Theodore Roosevelt said, "is worthless unless he devotes himself to an ideal, and he is worthless also unless he strives to realize that ideal by practical methods. A man must promise both to himself and to others only what he can perform; and what really can be performed he must at all hazards make good."

President Johnson needs the support of a united America. And I submit to you that he has fully earned your active support.

Our record is a good one. We have preserved and expanded those freedoms that constitute our priceless inheritance. And we have extended these rights to those members of the community who have been ignored and excluded.

We have faced up to the fearful perils of the nuclear age, rejecting both those who counsel appeasement and those who shout for reckless action.

We have lifted the economy of our own Nation. And we have seen our faith in the American enterprise system vindicated.

We promised we would view success at any task we undertook as being no more than a downpayment on new commitments toward even greater advances.

To guarantee that future, we must mobilize behind President Johnson in this campaign. He must win from the American people an overwhelming mandate to get on with the job.

Every citizen must know that the second half of this century will be an urban area. We must plan for a renaissance of cities.

It must be obvious even to those who take the simple view that we need a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. The cities of the future will not neatly conform to present city lines. Regional planning is essential.

Those cities of the future must offer education of the highest quality. Life in interdependent proximity calls for knowledge, wisdom, and tolerance.

Those cities of the future must provide access to an abundant cultural life.

Those cities of the future must allow a variety of paths of human development to use the increasing leisure which will be ours.

Those cities of the future must remove not only the ugliness of the slums, but the ugliness of intolerance—create not only the beauty of design, but the beauty of spirit.

Those cities of the future must provide an environment for the enrichment of life. This mammoth task challenges whatever creativity and courage we can muster. We must begin now—and we must use every resource at our command.

In these, and in countless other ways, the city of the future calls for the closest cooperation between all the vital elements in the American political process—private individuals, private groups, corporations, mayors, county commissioners, and Governors; teachers, scientists, engineers, architects, leaders of the arts, and on up to the resources of the Federal Government.

We cannot do this by avoiding our problems, by ignoring our challenges—or by saying no to progress.

Liberals say yes to life. President Johnson says yes to life. I say yes to life. And authentic Republicans say yes to life.

The difference between the petulant "no" of the Goldwaterites and our massive "yes" is the choice the American people must make in November.

It is the same difference Moses put to his people when he said to them:

I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day: I have set before you life and death, blessing and curse. Choose life.

Not long ago as I was coming along the street, your wonderful street, here in Evansville I noticed a sign that indicated that possibly

## BAT—LINO—47

it was the headquarters, it was a vacant building, somewhat symbolic, may I say of what is going on, I noticed a sign out there and it said, "Ha, ha, ha, ha, Goldwater." I wouldn't say that because I don't think it is any laughing matter. If they do, well, let's enjoy it.

Truly, this is an amazing city. I could spend my time allowed us here today of just talking about your fine city and your many accomplishments. I notice that one of the industries in this city makes Metrecal. I couldn't help but reflect on that a moment, because it appears to me that the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party has been drinking that stuff, that is why its program is so thin. [Laughter.]

May I say as a registered pharmacist and a practicing druggist it's a fine product for Democrats or Republicans. [Laughter.]

Today I want to speak very seriously with you. It is always a question in a campaign as to how one should best conduct himself. This campaign can be all entertainment because there are many things that one could talk about that would be entertaining. We could quote and unquote and requote the opposition because they have indulged in all of that, but I think that we maybe ought to settle down to some serious business because we are here in the home of a great college, your own Evansville College, or in the vicinity or the county or an area once visited by Abraham Lincoln. We are here in the great homeland of America.

As I recall, when I came to prepare for this meeting I remembered that almost 4 years ago, in fact it was October 4, 1960, a brave and determined young Senator from Massachusetts came to Evansville as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency of the United States, and he came here to Evansville, then in economic trouble, then, you might say, in some serious difficulty. He came here to ask you to help get America moving again, and moving forward in the 1960's.

This man came to express his belief as I do today that America cannot afford to stand still. He said then, and I say now, that America had a choice between vigor and progress under a Democratic administration or stagnation and status quo under the Republicans.

America made that choice in 1960. America elected John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, and I can tell you the statistics will tell you, your businessmen will tell you, your labor people will tell you, that we have been moving ahead, moving forward in these last 4 years.

For 1,000 days our beloved John F. Kennedy kept his promises to America. I served every day with him, as one of his lieutenants and when he was taken from us, his Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson, stepped in to give America the most productive 10 months in her history. I say that the Kennedy-Johnson administration has kept faith with America and kept its promises. [Applause.]

Now 5 days ago another Senator came to Evansville. He, too, came as a candidate for President, but he came not to seek your help in moving America forward. Oh, no. He came to nag, to criticize, to impugn, to accuse, and to say no, no, no to the challenges of the 1960's, my fellow Americans, what a contrast with the vision and the courage and the faith of John Kennedy, what a contrast for all Americans who believe this generation bears a sacred obligation to make Democracy prevail in these difficult and dangerous times.

Unlike the leader of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party, I come to Evansville today to reaffirm the conviction that we need not fear the future. We need not retreat to the past. We need only to seek the helping hands of the American people in our quest for a better America, and in our pledge to keep America moving forward. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, this forward motion is not accidental or inevitable. These are challenging times. These are times that are hedged by trials and tribulations, and difficulties. None of us can escape these trials, none of us can avoid the difficulty in this struggle for a better life for ourselves and our children.

These are not times where there are simple answers. These are not days in which childlike answers satisfy manlike problems despite what the spokesmen of certain factions of a Republican Party may say.

## BAT—LINO—48

In 1960 John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson promised that life in these years of trial and testing would not be easy. President Kennedy spoke of our people bearing, and I quote him, "The burden of a long struggle year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, and patience in tribulation."

This is, if you please, and I hope Reverend King will permit me, these are in a sense the words of our prayer today. There are no easy days, and a great people should not expect it. But there is the strength among the people of this land to do whatever we will, and what we must and what we must "will" is to do that which is just, to do that which is right, and to do it bravely and to do it in confidence which I am sure is what we want to do. [Applause.]

---

Chicago, Ill.  
Polish-American Congress, Hotel Sherman,  
September 19, 1964.

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

No nation has a unique claim to America—but no people from other lands can claim to have made a greater contribution to our society than those who came here from Poland.

America has always been a land of opportunity, and none have understood this better than those who came to these shores from Poland. And it was a great Polish patriot over 150 years ago who eloquently stated that opportunity in America means opportunity for all. A statesman of compassion, a soldier of courage, he had received from our Government a large land grant in gratitude for his valor in fighting for American freedom. When he returned to his native land—again to fight for its freedom—he left his testament with Thomas Jefferson. Let me read its inspiring words:

I, being just on my departure from the United States, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, husbands, and wives, in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and of their country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful; and I make the said Thomas Jefferson the executor of this.

This paper bears the signature of "Thaddeus Bonaventura Kosciusko."

General Kosciusko was the brilliant leader who walked 160 years ahead of us—50 years ahead of Abraham Lincoln—in the cause of extending freedom and opportunity to all Americans. You Americans whose forebearers came from Poland—you have an unusual number of heroes in your ranks, but none greater than Kosciusko. And his heroism in battle, against big armies or bigoted minds, is both an inspiration and a challenge to those of us who follow him.

I share your pride in him. I have a warm feeling that today when we are challenged to make opportunity available to all American Americans by protecting the human rights of all Americans, Kosciusko would be proud that we have succeeded in passing a law that guarantees equal freedom and equal opportunity to all.

One month ago the newest of our nuclear submarines was commissioned—the *Casimir Pulaski*. So honor the name of the young Polish nobleman who gave his life to help our Nation win its independence. But although this ship will carry inside her more destructive power than all of the explosives used in World War II, her purpose is still the defense of liberty and the cause of peace across the globe. We must always remember that America is a land of peace as well as a land of opportunity. Peace is our preeminent purpose in the world today.

## BAT—LINO—49

Nineteen sixty-four marks the beginning of the thousand year anniversary of the existence of Poland as an independent state and a Christian nation. Despite today's conditions of temporary subjugation, the fires of liberty have not been dimmed in Polish hearts. And Poland shall be free again!

We trust the Polish people. We understand well their bravery. As President Johnson has said, "we know the unswerving dedication of the Polish people to the goals of liberty, equality, and independence. That is why our policy is designed to help the Polish people so that they may increasingly help themselves."

Americans are offered a choice this year on how best to serve the cause of Poland—and the cause not only of Poland, but of all Eastern Europe.

We can continue to be friends of the people of Poland through bridges of trade, ideas, visitors, and humanitarian aid. Or we can consider them sworn enemies of ours because they are under Communist domination—and coldly reject the claims of nourishment and brotherhood.

We can accept the commitment of the Polish people to their long Christian heritage. Or we can reject the people of Poland as a godless people because the Marxists in control have betrayed the religious traditions of a thousand years.

Almost exactly 4 years ago that Gallant Warrior in the cause of freedom, John F. Kennedy, spoke to this congress here in Chicago. He 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. Poland's claim to independence and liberty is not based on sentiment or politics. It is deeply rooted in history, in culture, and in law—and no matter what pressures the Soviets may exert, we do not intend to see that claim abandoned.

\* \* \* We must strive to restore the traditional identification which Poland and Eastern Europe have had with the European community instead of the Soviet Empire. For Poland back through the centuries has belonged to the European tradition of freedom and national independence. It has been a part of European culture, of European economy and European history. And even the Soviet Union cannot rewrite that history.

This policy stated by John F. Kennedy in 1960 continues to be the policy of this Government and the policy to which I am personally committed.

Let me make it clear right now that only a political charlatan can talk of instant victory over communism, or instant "liberation" of the captive peoples held in Communist subjugation.

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. So 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 Polish people, but for all peoples wherever tyranny and dictatorship rule. We are convinced—unlike narrow-visioned defeatists—that time is on the side of freedom. That is, if we put time to good use. We are completely confident that Poland and its people will be restored to the family of free nations. And we intend to use time as a tool, not a couch. We intend to build bridges to the Polish people—bridges which may now be obstructed at the other end but which will be there to be opened wide when the day of freedom dawns. We have already begun. The United States has initiated a new and constructive policy toward the Polish peoples and the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe. We have recognized the deepening divisions of the Communist camp. We have encouraged those divisions, and we have made use of these divisions for helping these people to regain their freedom and independence.

## BAT—LINO—50

We have strengthened the economic and culture ties between Poland and the United States. We have expanded trade. We have assisted the Polish people to build their economy. We have encouraged exchanges of students and scholars. Through the efforts of Congressman Clement Zablocki of Milwaukee, and myself, the U.S. Government has provided more than \$10 million for the construction of a 300-bed children's hospital and research center in Krakow. We have sold American agricultural products for Polish currency which, in turn, we have been able to spend in promoting valuable projects of friendship. We have encouraged the Poles to assert their independence and to pursue a course of action based on Poland's national needs and interests. For example, in the agricultural sector they have repudiated the disaster of collectivization. Today in Poland 85 percent of the land is privately owned.

There is much more to be done. We must continue to open doors and windows in the iron curtain. The Polish people must never have reason to believe that we have forsaken them.

Yet there are some within our Nation who would close these doors and windows—who denounce our efforts to build bridges to the people of Poland. Such men seek instant answers to long-range problems. We are dealing "with the enemy," they bellow. We are following a "no win" program.

But when Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski deals with Gomulka, is he engaging in a "no win" policy? When Pope Paul concludes a diplomatic agreement with the Hungarian Communist regime—as occurred this very week—is he capitulating to the atheists?

To ask these questions is to indicate the absurdity of the issue. Pope Paul and the primate of Poland have as their first charge the spiritual welfare of their people. When they negotiate with the enemy it is from an impregnable bastion of principle which has stood for almost 2,000 years.

It is Gomulka who runs the risks in dealing with the church; 2,000 years of Christianity and the Catholic church will survive two decades of communism and dictatorship!

It is the Communists, not we, whose power is being eaten away by the corrosive impact of freedom—by the knowledge among their people that the United States looks upon the people of Eastern Europe as friends who have temporarily been denied the right to assert their friendship and their common dedication to liberty.

The Goldwater extremists may cry that in sending food to hungry people behind the Iron Curtain we are aiding communism. But the people who receive this food know its American origin and do not thank their Communist bosses for the nourishment it brings.

Some thinking people can denounce our aid and trade in nonstrategic goods. But you know, and I know—all the rest of the American people know—that such aid and trade is instead an assertion of human solidarity against the forces of inhumanity. The Polish people know this too. And so do men and women of the other nations of Eastern Europe.

Having provided the lifegiving substance of hope, the Democratic Party under President Johnson will not now turn its back. As President Johnson has said: "The objective of the United States is—and will continue to be—to see freedom returned to Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe. We know the years of darkness have not extinguished the light of freedom in Poland. And the masters of darkness know that."

The Soviet leaders in the Kremlin do indeed know that. The nations of Eastern Europe are no longer the satellites they were. In being forced to lengthen their leash, Mr. Khrushchev has been forced to admit that "they are getting too big to spank." Soon they will be too strong to chain.

The process may not be swift, but we shall prevail. In spirit Poland never left the West. In full political freedom it shall return.

The same Goldwater faction that distrusts people abroad, distrusts people here at home. And, characteristically, it distrusts the same people.

I was shocked to hear that Senator Goldwater's running mate—whose ancestral boat presumably came in only a few lengths behind

## 51—BAT—L

the *Mayflower*—has recently condemned the Johnson administration's proposal to revise the immigration laws. He says that he opposes "opening the floodgates" but what an incredible distortion. What is really at issue is not the floodgates at all. What is at issue is "fair gates"—gates which are fair, which do not open only at the knock of an Anglo-Saxon hand.

The Johnson proposal, which is similar to the proposal made earlier by John F. Kennedy and myself, is designed to end the stigma which was imposed by the Republican administration and platform in 1924—that insulting statutory endorsement of the principle that Poles, Italians, and other Eastern European and non-European peoples somehow belong to inferior breeds.

The immigration bill, which President Kennedy sent to Congress shortly before his tragic death, opens no floodgates. But it would correct this burning inequity and a disgraceful discrimination against peoples. It will end the quota system which sought to maintain a mythical racial and ethnic purity by apportioning immigration visas among the nations of the world in proportion to the ethnic composition of our population in 1920.

In its 1960 platform, the Republican party pledged to do something about it, too. But the Goldwater platform of 1964 purged this concession to decency, and now the temporary Republican leadership has added the insult of disdain to the injury of neglect.

On Wednesday of this week, Senator Goldwater's handpicked chairman, Mr. Dean Burch, welcomed Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina to the Goldwater party with the statement: "The Democratic party has forsaken the people to become a party of minority groups."

Now what would your grandfather have said of all of this? You will recall, I am sure, that your grandfather belongs to that courageous group of men and women in Eastern Europe who dared to pull up their roots and move their families in search of justice and liberty in another land. They fled from tyranny to be welcomed to our shores in one of the great tides of immigration that invigorated our country in the middle of the 19th century and the early 20th century—like my own grandfather and those of so many millions of Americans.

But I tell you this in astonishment and wonder: Your grandfather could not come to America under our present immigration laws. Your grandfather could not come to America under the legislation Barry Goldwater supports. Your grandfather would have found our gates barred to him and his family—barred by Barry Goldwater and those who share his views on immigration.

And what would your grandfather have done? He would have had to remain in a Communist state in Eastern Europe, hoping and yearning for the light and air of liberty, his eyes turned toward America in quest of friendship and reassurance. Yet what would he have found if America were ruled by Barry Goldwater? I tell you what he would have found—and Senator Goldwater has made clear what he would have found: A closing of the windows we have opened to bring light and air to the people of Eastern Europe—an end to our programs of educational and cultural exchange, our food-for-peace programs, our information program. And your grandfather would have to suffer in darkness because of the policies of Barry Goldwater.

President Johnson has stated the truly American position on the question of immigration:

In establishing preferences, a nation built by immigrants of all lands can ask those who seek admission: "What can you do for our country?" But we should not be asking, "In what country were you born?"

America is a great land. Yet we are on the threshold of the possibility of more progress by the end of this century than ever before achieved in a century.

The comforts of many will be extended to all.

Our people, who are living longer, will also live in dignity and health.

Our cities that have grown big will come also to know beauty.

A Great Society is possible for America in which every man will have the opportunity to provide a decent life for himself and his family—regardless of race, creed, or nationality.

## 52—BAT—L

We need leadership, however, with vision to match our potentialities. We need a President who heals divisions between people at home and abroad who will help put salt in peoples' bread, not pour it into their wounds.

By the grace of God, we have such leadership in America. Let us continue, with Lyndon B. Johnson.

Chicago, Ill.  
Polish-American Congress  
September 19, 1964

### TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Rozmarek. I understand from our friends of the photographic profession that they ought to have a little time.

I'd just sort of like to feel that I was tall enough in the saddle to stand on the floor but maybe not. [Indicating platform.]

Mr. Rozmarek, Governor Kerner, and Mayor Daley, and all of you that are the officers of this fine organization, and the many organizations that are gathered here for this Congress, I am singularly honored to have been invited and be permitted to participate in your proceedings.

It is a fact that in 1955, I did have the privilege of meeting many of you, and some time later out here at Humboldt Park, I remember again meeting many of you.

I recall the wonderful opportunity that I had of becoming acquainted, not only with Charles Rozmarek, but also with his very lovely wife. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I know you have had a very full program. You have had the best that you can get when you had John Gronouski address you. [Applause.]

This distinguished citizen, great public servant, violated every rule that I ever hoped he would abide by. I told him I never like to speak after he does, because he is so good that anything that happened afterward seems like it shouldn't have happened at all.

John, I am going to be very tolerant this time, and next time, you let me on first, and then you get up and brag on how good I am.

I also understand that you have had a rather unique experience here last evening. I gather that the President of the United States decided that he just had to visit with you. I don't blame him at all—and he picked up that telephone and called you long distance.

This is indeed a singular honor for all of you and all of us for you know that the President found it an honor for he, himself, to be able to visit with you—not in person, that is, by physical presence—at least, to visit with you by long-distance telephone.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I came prepared to give you some remarks. One of the disadvantages of being a candidate for the office of Vice President that they always tell you that you have got to have it written out. I don't know why.

It would really be more important after you were elected, it seems to me, but maybe you have to be more careful on the way getting there.

No nation, it's fair to say, has a unique claim to America, but I would say that no people have a greater claim and can claim greater contributions to our America than those who came here from Poland. [Applause.]

America has always been a land of opportunity. That is what this country truly stands for, opportunity for people. And it was a great Polish patriot, according to my investigation into history, who, over 150 years ago, eloquently stated that opportunity in America means for all.

He was a statesman of great compassion. He was a soldier of course and he had received from our Government here in the United States a large land grant—a land grant in appreciation for or gratitude for his valor in fighting for American freedom.

And when he returned to his native land, as the books tell us, again to fight for the freedom of that fine Poland, he left this testament with

## 53—BAT—L

Thomas Jefferson. Let me read it for you, lest you may not have remembered these most inspiring words:

I, being just on my departure from the United States, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes and giving them liberty in my name. In giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, husbands, and wives; in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and of their country, of the good order of society; and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful; and I make the said Thomas Jefferson the executor of this. [Applause.]

This document I quoted from is on file with Jefferson's papers, on file in the Library of Congress. I had hoped to even bring it with me, and that paper bears the signature of Thaddens Bonaventura Kosciusko, one of the great Polish liberators.

General Kosciusko was the brilliant leader who walked 160 years ahead of modern America—50 years ahead of Abraham Lincoln—in the cause of extending freedom and opportunity for all Americans. You Americans whose forebears came from Poland.— [Applause.]

You Americans whose forebears came from Poland, you have heroes in your ranks, but none greater than this great statesman and soldier. And his heroism in battle, against big armies or against bigoted and tyrannical minds, is both an inspiration and a challenge to those of us who follow him.

I share your pride in him. I have a warm feeling that today, we are challenged to make opportunity available to all Americans by protecting these great human rights. Kosciusko would be proud that we have succeeded in making some forward steps in the law of this land on behalf of equal human rights. [Applause.]

Now, 1 month ago, the newest of our nuclear submarines was commissioned. It is the Casimir Pulaski, so we honor the name of the young Polish nobleman who gave his life to help our Nation—to help our Nation win its independence, but although this ship will carry inside her more destructive power than all of the explosives used in World War II, her purpose is still the defense of liberty, and the cause of peace across the globe.

We Americans in this second half of the 20th century know that we build our power for peace, and there is no peace without strength and without the power that this mighty Nation possesses.

May I just suggest that we must always remember that America is the land of peace as well as the land of opportunity, as well as the land of freedom and peace, our preeminent cause.

The year 1964 marks the beginning of the thousand-year anniversary of the existence of Poland as an independent state and a Christian nation. Despite today's conditions of temporary subjugation, the fires of liberty have not dimmed in Polish hearts, and every person in this room, indeed every person that has ever read a page of history, knows that Poland shall be free again.

We trust the Polish people. We understand well their bravery, and as President Johnson has said, and I quote him:

We know the unswerving dedication of the Polish people to the goals of liberty, equality, and independence. That is why our policy is extended to help the Polish people, so that they may increasingly help themselves.

This is why some of the things that were mentioned here today by Mr. Rozmarek, why some of these things are being done, because we are going to help the Polish people. [Applause.]

My friends, Americans are offered a choice this year on how best to serve the cause of Poland—and not only the cause of Poland, but the cause of all subjugated peoples of all Eastern Europe. Here are our choices:

We can continue to be friends of the people of Poland through the tireless, slow, but good work of building bridges of trade and ideas and visitors and humanitarian aid, or we can consider the people of

## 54—BAT—L

Poland sworn enemies of ours because they are under Communist domination and coldly reject the claims of nourishment and brotherhood.

We can accept the commitment of the Polish people to their long Christian heritage or we can reject the people of Poland as a godless people because the Communists are in control and have betrayed the religious traditions of a thousand years.

Almost exactly 4 years ago, that gallant warrior in the cause of freedom everywhere, John F. Kennedy, spoke to this Congress here in Chicago, and here is what he said, and if it has been repeated to you before, then let me repeat it again because it is the stated policy of this Government, a comment of 190 million Americans. Here's what he 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. Poland's claim to independence and liberty is not based on sentiment or politics. It is deeply rooted in history, in culture, and in law—and no matter what pressures the Soviet may exert, we do not intend to see that claim abandoned. [Applause.]

Then this gallant warrior for freedom said:

We must strive to restore the traditional identification which Poland and Eastern Europe have had with the European community instead of the Soviet empire, for Poland back through the centuries has belonged to the European tradition of freedom and national independence. It has been a part of European culture, of European economy and European history.

I come here today as a U.S. Senator and as the nominee of my party for the second highest office in this land to say that this policy stated by John F. Kennedy in 1960 continues to be the policy of this government and the policy to which I am personally committed. [Applause.]

Let me state a personal point of view. Let me make it clear right now that only a political charlatan can talk of instant victory over communism, or instant "liberation" of the captive peoples held in Communist subjugation.

We cannot imitate those of an earlier era who talked grandly and glibly of "liberation"—but, when the Hungarian rose in heroic revolt, stood mute on the sidelines.

No, the possibility of instant victory, my fellow Americans, vanished with the coming of the era of instant annihilation through nuclear weapons. So we must pursue the more challenging and the more trying course, the only sane course, of devising a policy that will achieve freedom without obliteration, not only for the Polish people but for all peoples wherever tyranny and dictatorship rule.

We are convinced—unlike some narrow-visioned defeatists—that time is on the side of freedom; that it, if we put time to good use.

We are completely confident that Poland and its people will be restored to the family of free nations, and we intend to use time as a tool for that purpose, not as a couch upon which to relax.

We intend to build bridges to the Polish people—bridges which may now be obstructed at the other end but which will be there to be opened wide when the day of freedom dawns. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, we have already begun to do this. The United States has initiated a new and constructive policy toward the Polish people and the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe. We have recognized the deepening divisions of the Communist camp—what divisions, what those men are saying about each other.

We have encouraged and have been encouraged by those divisions and we have made use of these divisions for helping these people to regain their freedom and independence.

## 55—BAT—L

We have strengthened the economic, cultural ties between Poland and the United States. Yes, we have expanded trade and some of us have been severely chastised because we stood up for it and have been accused of being soft on communism.

Let me say what we are soft about. We seem to like people who love their God and love liberty. [Applause.]

This Government has no intention, at least, if some of us have something to say about it, of leaving the peoples behind the Iron Curtain lost and left unto themselves. We will extend the hands of human fellowship and of friendship to those peoples wherever there is the opportunity and we will do our best to make those opportunities possible. [Applause.]

Now, we have encouraged exchanges of students and scholars. Through the efforts of a Congressman in my neighboring State of Wisconsin, Congressman Zablocki, and myself, the U.S. Government has provided more than \$10 million for the construction of a 300 bed children's hospital and research center in Krakow.

Let me just say a word about that. I am coauthor of this program and proud of it. Oh, I have got nasty letters, and some people saying, "Why are you wanting to build a hospital in a Communist country?"

I want the people of Poland to have some sort of tangible evidence that the people of the United States still love children, that we are willing to fight disease. [Applause.]

I want the people of Poland and people everywhere to know that even though there may be a regime that puts upon the backs of people for the moment a government unwanted, a system unwanted, that we, the people of the United States, have faith in freedom and liberty, and we have faith in democracy, and we are going to have faith in the people that believe in those things, and I think our policy is paying off.

The Polish Government itself, the present Government, has had to repudiate collectivization of its farms.

I just left North Dakota this morning where I visited a family farm. Thousands of people were present and I said from that platform that one of the great achievements of America is the American agricultural abundance, and we have been able to do it through private enterprises.

We have been able to do it through the American family farm and the greatest single failure in the economic structure of the Communist socialism setup is their collective state farm. They are no good. [Applause.]

And when you find a people that loves the land, it is one of their connections with divine providence: to love the land is a very real way of expressing one's spiritual commitments.

I know there is much more to be done. We have only begun. I want to remember—you want to remember what John Kennedy said on January 20, 1961. He said, "Let us begin." And, my fellow Americans, the great achievements of history are not accomplished overnight. The history tells us the story of generations, of centuries, yea—in this instant we are celebrating the thousandth anniversary of the nation of Poland.

It takes a long time to get things done. [Applause.]

But what is important is to begin, and to begin with purpose, and we must continue to open those doors and windows behind the Iron Curtain and in the Iron Curtain and the Polish people must never, for a single moment, have reason to believe that we have forsaken them. [Applause.]

Now, there are those that would like to close those windows and some people accuse us of being very impractical. Such men seek instant answers to long-range problems. They shout at us we are dealing with the enemy, or they shout again that we are following a no-win program, but my fellow Americans, when Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski deals with Gomulka, is he engaging in a no-win policy?

When Pope Paul concludes a diplomatic agreement with the Hungarian Communist regime, as occurred this past week, is he capitulating to the atheists?

## 56—BAT—L

To ask these questions is to indicate the absurdity of the issue. Pope Paul, the Primate of Poland, have as their first charge the spiritual welfare of their people and when they sit down and even negotiate with the enemy about it, it is from an impregnable bastion of conviction which has stood for almost 2,000 years. [Applause.]

And let me say it is Gomulka who runs the risk when he deals with such a great force for good. [Applause.]

Two thousand years of Christianity and the Catholic Church will survive two decades of communism and dictatorship any day.

So, I say it is the Communists, not we, whose power is being eaten away by the corrosive impact and erosive impact of freedom. The Communist power weakens by the knowledge among their people that the United States looks upon the people of Eastern Europe, not as enemies but as friends, who have temporarily been denied the right to assert their liberty and their freedom and their common dedication to the liberty of mankind.

Now, the extremists may cry that extending food to hungry people behind the Iron Curtain will aid the Communists, and I have heard this from the opposition in this campaign, but the people who receive this food know it's American in origin.

They don't thank their Communist bosses. They thank Almighty God and the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Having provided this life-giving substance of hope, the Democratic Party under President Johnson will not turn its back, and as President Johnson has said, and he follows within the policy guidelines of our late President Kennedy, the objective of the United States is and will continue to be to seek freedom's return to policy. [Applause.]

We know the years of darkness have not extinguished the light of freedom in Poland and the masters of darkness know it, too. Soviet leaders in the Kremlin do, indeed, know just this. The nations of Eastern Europe, no longer willing satellites as they were, compelled Mr. Khrushchev to lengthen their leashes; as he has been forced to admit. "They are getting too big to spank."

Soon, they will be too strong to chain and that will be the day.

Now, the process may not be swift, and I know there are many that are impatient, but in these grave matters of world affairs in the nuclear age, impatience can be side by side with annihilation.

What we need is persevering patience; what we need is to be strong and resolute without being arrogant and belligerent; what we need is to be firm without being bellicose, and patience with purpose, persevering patience.

The program of purpose—this is the formula for freedom in our time. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I know that you have been kept here a long time. I'll just say a few words about one development in recent weeks that has been disturbing to me.

I was shocked, yes, shocked to hear Senator Goldwater's running mate—whose ancestral boat presumably came in only a few lengths behind the Mayflower—recently condemn the Johnson administration's proposal to revise the immigration laws. I know a little something about this because I have been at this work 16 years in the U.S. Senate.

He says that he opposes opening the floodgates—but what an incredible distortion—what is really at issue is not the floodgates at all. What is at issue is "fair gates"—just being fair. [Applause.]

Gates which are fair and which do not open only at the knock of the Anglo-Saxon hand. The Johnson proposal, which is similar to the proposal made earlier by John F. Kennedy and myself when we served in the Senate and I was Senator Kennedy's cosponsor on this same legislation, we worked at it for years.

It is designed to end the stigma which was imposed back in 1924 in the Republican administration of that time, that insulting statutory endorsement of the principle that Poles and Italians and eastern Europeans and non-Europeans somehow belong to inferior breeds and that is what the act literally said.

The immigration bill, which President Kennedy sent to Congress shortly before his tragic death, opens no floodgates. But it would correct this burning inequity and a disgraceful discrimination against peoples. It would end the quota system which sought to maintain a mythical racial and ethnic purity.

## 57—BAT—L

In its 1960 platform, the Republican Party pledged to do something about this because there are many Republicans in the Senate and in the House that agree with us, but the Senator Goldwater platform of 1964 purged this concession to decency and now the temporary Republican leadership has added insult of disdain to the injury of neglect.

On Wednesday of this week, Senator Goldwater's handpicked chairman, Mr. Dean Burch, welcomes Mr. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina to the Goldwater party with this statement :

The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become a party of minority groups.

What would your grandfather have said of all of this? Most of us are the children of immigrants, and am I in the minority group, if you please? You well recall, I am sure, that your grandfather or great-grandfather belonged to this courageous group of people, men and women, in Eastern Europe who dared to pull up their roots and move their families—often with no worldly goods at all—in search of justice and liberty in another land.

They fled from tyranny, and they were welcomed to these shores, and in one of the great tides of immigration, invigorated our country in the middle of the 19th century and early 20th century, like my old grandfather and my old mother, and those many other millions of Americans.

And I resent a tax upon immigrants. [Applause.]

But I will tell you this in astonishment and wonder. Your grandfather could not come to America under our present immigration laws. Your grandfather could not come to America under the legislation that Barry Goldwater supports. Your grandfather would have found our gates barred to him and his family and barred by those who share the views of Mr. Goldwater on this subject of immigration.

And what would your grandfather have done? He would have had to remain in the Communist state in Eastern Europe, hoping and yearning for the light and air of liberty, his eyes turned toward America in quest of friendship and reassurance. Yet, what would he have found if America had been ruled by the philosophy and by the attitude expressed by the Senator from Arizona in his recent comments?

I'll tell you what he would have found. Senator Goldwater has made it clear what he would have found—a closing of the windows that we have opened to bring life and air to the people of Eastern Europe, and an end to our programs of educational and cultural exchange, an end to our food-for-peace program, which is literally the difference between life and death to hundreds and thousands of people in Eastern Europe, an end to our information program so that some people in Eastern Europe can know what America is, as it is—and not as the Communists' propagandists tell them that it is.

And your grandfather would have had to suffer in darkness because of these antiquated, because of these evil policies, and that is what they are.

Now, President Johnson has stated the truly American position on this question of immigration and the President before him stated it eloquently. Here's what President Johnson has said :

In establishing preferences, a nation built by immigrants of all lands can ask those who seek admission, "what can you do for our country?" But we should not be asking, "in what country were you born?" [Applause.]

Oh, my dear friends, let us be proud of this great symphony of people that are yours. No nation on the face of the earth has the vitality, has the creativeness, has the strength of this mighty nation, and many nations have more lands, many nations have more resources. Why is it, then, that we are so blessed?

I think it is because we have had faith in people. We have placed our faith in God. We placed our faith in people and we have placed our trust in a government "of the people, by the people and for the people." [Applause.]

## 58—BAT—L

We are proud of this greatness and these many blessings, but we can do even better things.

I think we are on the threshold of more progress by the end of this century than ever has been achieved in any century.

The comforts of many will be extended to all. Our people, who are living longer, will also be able to live in dignity and health. Our cities that have grown big and vigorously will come to know beauty.

A great society, a just society, is possible for America, in which every man will have the opportunity to provide a decent life for himself and his family, regardless of his race or his creed or his nationality.

We need leadership. We need leadership with vision to match our potentialities. We need a President who heals the divisions between peoples, who seeks not to divide but to unite, who seeks to make this an America of one people, a people of the United States of America, one people with our different culture, our different origin, but with a common purpose. [Applause.]

Yes, we need a President who heals the divisions between people at home and abroad, and who will help put salt in people's bread, and not pour it onto their wounds.

By the grace of God, we have such leadership in America, and may I say, as I said just awhile ago out here on the streets of this city, by the good judgment of our late and beloved President, who made such a wonderful President, by the judgment of John Kennedy who selected his Vice President in Los Angeles in 1961, we have today leadership in American with vision, and I suggest that we continue with Lyndon B. Johnson.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

---

Chicago, Ill.  
CBS Studio  
September 19, 1964

### VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF THE "AT RANDOM" PROGRAM

#### Participants:

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota and candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket.

Clayton Kirkpatrick, assistant managing editor, Chicago Tribune.  
Melvin "Pete" Akers, editor, Chicago Sun Times.

John Madigan, narrator.

Mr. MADIGAN. The election campaign is heating up and "At Random" intends to be in the thick of it. They have extended invitations to both the vice-presidential candidates to be with us. One of them is with us now and the other we hope to have before election time.

U.S. Senator Hubert Humphrey from Minnesota, candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket.

With the Senator, Clayton Kirkpatrick, assistant managing editor of the Chicago Tribune, and Melvin "Pete" Akers, editor of the Chicago Sun Times.

Senator, the brunt of Mr. Goldwater's and Mr. Miller's attacks on you in the campaign or remarks concerning you in the campaign so far are on your alleged socialistic views. They equate the Ku Klux Klan on the right with the ADA on the left and say they have repudiated the Ku Klux Klan and why don't you do the same for the ADA.

How do you answer this charge—and it is continuing day after day.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, the charge is made, but of course that doesn't make it very creditable or true. I think there is a great deal of difference. The members of the ADA wear civilian clothes; they do not belong to a conspiracy; they don't cloak themselves either in secrecy or in sheets. They are "Ku Kluxers."

Furthermore, the Americans for Democratic Action represents an independent organization, open meetings, membership is open, its officers are well known, and it expresses its point of view on many political subjects, some of which I agree with, some of which I don't agree

## 59—BAT—L

with. It is a militant, anti-Communist, non-Communist organization. It fully respects the institutions of free enterprise and representative government.

There is a great deal of difference, my friend, between a society that literally seeks to violate the Constitution of the United States and one that seeks to express its views as an independent political organization.

So I would have to say that to compare these two organizations would be like like comparing an underground movement with a social club in your neighborhood.

QUESTION. Well, mind you, I quoted. I said—

Senator HUMPHREY. I understand that you did, sir—yes; I really do.

QUESTION. Senator, you are still a member of the ADA; isn't that correct?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; I haven't paid any dues to the organization—I don't quite know when you get to be a member and when you cease to be one.

QUESTION. In some of the earlier stories about your identification with it, you were identified as a vice chairman, and I understand—at least the stories identify you now as a former vice chairman. When did you give up the office?

Senator HUMPHREY. When I received the nomination as the Vice-Presidential nominee of our party, because I felt that it would not be proper for me to be an officer of any organization that had political views at a time that I had accepted the nomination of my party.

I am like Sam Rayburn, Mr. Kirkpatrick. I'm a Democrat, without prefix or suffix or without apology. I like my party. I support it. I find that sometimes other organizations can be helpful. I belong to several of them. But I never joined an organization that wasn't good for my country, and that didn't support the Constitution and all of the ideals of this Republic.

QUESTION. But you think that under present circumstances there might be a conflict between this office that you held and—

Senator HUMPHREY. Only because some people might feel that way, sir? And I feel that since the ADA may hold some views that are contrary to the Democratic platform, that I ought not be associated with it as a working officer or member.

And by the way, I have held a lot of views differently myself than the organization that we are speaking of.

QUESTION. Almost everybody changes his mind, I guess, once in a while.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I didn't change my mind. I just held different views.

QUESTION. Well, I don't contest that. But the Congressional Quarterly for September 11, 1964, analyzing the ADA's viewpoints—and the bills expressing those viewpoints which came before the Senate—says that you voted 100 percent ADA.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, what I did was vote 100 percent for the bills, and ADA happened to agree with them. And I think they were very smart in doing that. I want to compliment them.

The bills that I supported were administration bills. I am the majority whip of the U.S. Senate. And the fact of the matter is that this organization showed better judgment than the Republican Party.

The Republicans should have supported those bills. It would have been easier to pass them.

QUESTION. As a practical matter of politics, do you think there is much mileage in this for Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Miller to keep repeating this day after day?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think there is some for myself, because I think it is getting rather boring. And if they want to continue to work on that old wheel, why it's perfectly all right with me.

You know, I have gone through this in Minnesota for a long time. And the people in Minnesota are pretty responsible people; they take their politics seriously. And all of the charges that have been hurled thus far have been heard in Minnesota so often that we have filed them with the Minnesota Historical Society—they are not considered to be contemporary matters.

## 60—BAT—L

QUESTION. I presume that President Johnson and you were both aware that this would occur long before your selection as the vice-presidential nominee. Were you? Did you discuss it privately ahead of time?

Senator HUMPHREY. We had not really discussed it. But President Johnson is a very wise man. I suppose he was fully aware of this. And if I never do anything worse in my life than to have served in that organization, I think that I will survive.

QUESTION. Senator, that brings up another question that I have been wondering about, and that is when did you find out you were going to be Vice President, that is, the vice-presidential nominee?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Kirkpatrick, for sure I found out about 6:20 on Wednesday night.

QUESTION. Wednesday night.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

QUESTION. Well, we were rather apprehensive about that, too, because we went out on a limb with an early story and forecast very strongly that you would be the nominee. It looked awfully good on Saturday, Sunday, Monday. And yet the message never came. And I got the impression that even you were apprehensive about it.

Why was Senator Dodd brought down to the White House on that afternoon?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, let me just say first of all that I really wasn't very apprehensive. And I say this because I had confided with some of my close friends and with my wife that this was not an office that I was going to seek with such fervor that not to have attained it would have been any emotional shock or any heartbreak. I had made up my mind after 1960 that I could serve with, I hope, some competence and of some use in the U.S. Senate and I was going to be a good Senator. And I put myself to that task, as I had always. But I redoubled my efforts. I served as one of the lieutenants, legislative lieutenants, for President Kennedy, as the majority whip of the Senate.

So I was very content with that particular assignment.

Now, Senator Dodd—I knew what he was going down to Washington for. In fact, I was told by one of the White House aids that he would be going, and that this ought not to be of any great concern to me; I could draw whatever conclusions I wanted.

Also, Senator Dodd is a good friend of mine. I was so glad to have his company. He told me I was a bit boring, that I went to sleep on the way down. And when he was in the White House, I was sitting out in the car and I went to sleep again. I was a bit tired. And when the President finally came out to ask me to come in the White House, he had to pat me on the arm and say "Wake up, Hubert, I want you to come on in." I was somewhat relaxed about it.

QUESTION. Yesterday, when your opponent Mr. Miller was in town, he made a statement here that he guaranteed that there would be no John Birchers in the Cabinet, Republican Cabinet, when Mr. Goldwater was elected.

Do you expect that Mr. Goldwater shares that view?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I would hope that he did. I don't think John Birchers belong in the Cabinet. I don't even think they belong in the woodwork. And I would hope—and I think Mr. Goldwater would share that view.

I have never accused Mr. Goldwater of being directly associated with that organization. I don't consider him a man of bitterness or of hatred and of cynicism about our country. I consider some of his views to be wrong, and I surely don't want him to be President of the United States. But I know Mr. Goldwater, I know Senator Goldwater and his wife, they are two very fine people. In fact, I have had a kind of a friendly relationship socially with Senator Goldwater. I find him a rather interesting, charming man. I just wish that his politics was as good as his sense of charm and humor.

QUESTION. You have just come back from Texas, I think. You were there in the last few days. What sort of reception did you get there, and how does the State look to you from the standpoint of the November results?

## 61—BAT—L

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I thought Texas looked very good. Every indication that we have, it looks good for the President. Senator John—or Gov. John Connally is exceedingly popular in Texas. He is a very close friend of the President. The President has a great following in Texas. And I believe that with the enthusiastic leadership of the Governor, plus the basic respect and affection that the people of Texas have for the President, plus the fact that they really have political unity for the first time in the Democratic Party for many years in Texas—they have sort of patched up all the troubles and have been binding up the wounds—so that it looks very good.

I had a wonderful reception, Mr. Akers. I must say that I cannot think of any time in my public life that I have had a warmer and more friendly and more enthusiastic reception.

QUESTION. Except in Chicago today?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Chicago was every bit as good as Texas. It is really fine here. The mayor, of course, of Chicago extended me the hand of his fellowship and friendship. And the people here think a great deal of their mayor, and rightly so. And even coming over here to the television station we had large crowds of people as we walked out of the hotel. It is a very rewarding and pleasing thing.

QUESTION. That brings up the obvious point of the so-called backlash—those that have accused the Polish people, second and third generation, that they will be part of the backlash.

You have talked to the Poles here in Chicago today. Would you comment on that?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have not found that to be the case. I think there are people, of course, that disagree on the whole subject matter of legislation relating to civil rights. This is a position that people can take. Men of good will and men of good conscience can disagree as to how we ought to deal with these problems. And when you disagree, you sometimes vote differently than the other fellow.

But I haven't found that any one ethnic group or any one nationality group has any stronger points, or stronger views or prejudices, if you wish to call it that, than the other.

I expect that people of Polish extraction in our industrial areas in particular, such as Gary, Ind.; Milwaukee, Wis.; and Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland and some of the other great industrial centers—I expect them to vote Democratic. And every indication that we have shows that they are strongly in support of the Democratic ticket. And my reception today at the conference, the Polish conference, was, I thought, very fine.

QUESTION. If I may, gentlemen, and Senator, we will stop for one moment for a brief message, and then we will be right back.

QUESTION. Yes, Pete, do you want to bring up that point you mentioned during the break?

QUESTION. Why—you have long been opposed to or rather sought a reduction in the depletion allowance in oil. I was wondering whether you ran into this question in Texas, and also whether the fact that your position and that of President Johnson on this particular subject, which has differed over the years, is going to be of any significance.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; I surely ran into it at the press conferences. I held press conferences, because I thought it was the only fair way to enter the State, rather than just going into prepared meetings where you can come in and go out without having to face the inquiring press. And I can assure you that the men of the news media in Texas are every bit as good as they are any place else. And they asked me some questions. And I told them the truth—because it is a matter of public record.

I have voted for reduction in the depletion allowance, on a graduated basis—never for its elimination, because I thought that would be wrong. I voted for a reduction from 27½ percent after a firm had over \$5 million of gross income down to 22½ percent.

I did tell them that as a Senator from Minnesota, where the depletion allowance on iron ore is only 15 percent—and we have some of the largest iron ore deposits in the world—that it looked a little difficult for me—it would not have looked quite right for me to be voting for 27½ percent for oil in other parts of America as a natural resource and 15 percent in my own, representing my own State in the iron ore business in Minnesota.

## 62—BAT—L

I also mentioned, which I do again, that while some of our Republican friends would like to make some political hay with this, that the chief sponsor of the amendment on depletion allowances in recent years has been Senator Williams of Delaware, who is a strong supporter of Senator Goldwater, and obviously will have a great deal of influence with the Senator if he becomes the President of the United States.

So I thought that we might sort of even it off on that basis.

And then they asked me what would be my position in the future. Well, I said "I am not running for Senator." And I want to say this to you. My position will be what the position is of the administration.

When President Johnson is reelected and when the 89th Congress convenes in January 1965, if the President presents a program on taxation relating to natural resources, including an item on depletion allowance, Hubert Humphrey, as the Vice President of the United States, if asked, will support the position of the President. That is what a Vice President is supposed to do.

I did not become—I did not accept this nomination to betray him. I accepted it to help him. And I will express my point of view within the closed meetings of the administration advisers, as I have in recent years on matters. But once that decision is made, I walk down the line and support the administration's program.

QUESTION. Senator, I would like to ask you a question about our relationships with Cuba.

Congressman Miller was in here earlier this week, and he repeated statements that he had made in a campaign speech that there was a secret agreement between the late President Kennedy and Russia that there would be no invasion of Cuba and no other American countries would be permitted to invade Cuba, and so on.

The State Department denied that there was any such agreement or any such pact.

Since then, of course, documents have been produced to show that the Russians, at least, believed that they had such a pact. And they also quoted from letters which President Kennedy had sent.

I wonder—do you believe that there was such an agreement, and do you believe that there is still such an agreement?

Senator HUMPHREY. I do not. And I am in a better position to know than Mr. Miller, because it has been my privilege to have top security clearance as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which he does not belong to and which clearance he could not have.

QUESTION. Well, now, may I go one step further, then. Do you think that Khrushchev believes that there is such an agreement?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Khrushchev may say so for his own point of view—

QUESTION. He said so on October 28, 1962.

Senator HUMPHREY. He may very well have said so, because Mr. Khrushchev was confronted by the power of the United States and by the will of President Kennedy, and Mr. Khrushchev had to back down, he had to withdraw his missiles. I can well imagine that he might want to make some face-saving statement.

But the facts of the matter are there is no such agreement, and Mr. Miller, as a Member of the Congress ought to know that. And Members of Congress ought not to spread false rumor.

QUESTION. You think, then, that the document that was printed by the Soviet news in London quoting from a dispatch that President Kennedy sent to Khrushchev is a fraud and a fake?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I do. And may I add, sir, that any communications that Mr. Kennedy had, as President, with Mr. Khrushchev, relating to any American action on Cuba was based upon the right of our inspection or of the United Nations inspection of the installations in Cuba.

QUESTION. That is implied in the Kennedy letter.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. But that inspection was never granted. And therefore it was made crystal clear by the President of the United States, the late John Kennedy, that because that inspection was not provided, and because the Soviet Union was not able to obtain it, that the American Government reserved all rights, whatever was necessary, to protect our interests vis-a-vis Cuba, including,

## 63—BAT—L

if need be, attack or invasion if that was necessary for our security.

QUESTION. Have you ever had any indications from Khrushchev or from Castro that they believe that this agreement is no longer binding?

Senator HUMPHREY. There never was any such agreement, sir, because—

QUESTION. They believed it.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, may I say that if I have got to believe Mr. Miller quoting Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Castro, I would say that is the kind of evidence that would not stand very much credibility in any court of law, or even in the court of American public opinion.

I don't believe—

QUESTION. In other words, you renounce any such agreement and deny that there ever was one—

Senator HUMPHREY. I deny that any such agreement exists, because the facts that would have even brought about such an agreement do not exist—mainly, the inspection right of the United Nations, or any missile, or any of the missile sites in Cuba. When Mr. Castro rejected that, any possibility of any understanding relating to our relationships with the Soviet Union on Cuba, that was out. Because we based our whole program upon the right of U.N. inspection in Cuba.

QUESTION. You made the point that you thought it might be a fake. Clay, it was your paper that broke the story this morning. Maybe other papers have across the country at the same time.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It was picked up by the wire services.

QUESTION. The Tribune gave a tremendous play this morning. The veracity of the document, I presume, was traced by the Tribune as far as its source in London.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We know that it was published by the Soviet News which is—and was a publication of the Soviet Embassy in London.

QUESTION. We are not able to trace its source in Moscow to it, whether it could have been sent for any devious purpose and was not legit.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No. And I don't think there is any question about that, because this story was fully reported at the time, in 1962. And parts of Mr. Kennedy's message to Khrushchev were published at that time.

Senator HUMPHREY. Parts.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Parts—that is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. Kirkpatrick.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. And since then parts of them have been published in Look magazine by Mr. Hillsman.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is right—but not all, Mr. Kirkpatrick. And what is more, you know as well as I know, since we are engaged in this little argument, that Mr. Kennedy's policy with Mr. Khrushchev was predicated primarily, not only upon the missile withdrawal, where we were going to take their word for it, but upon U.N. inspection of Cuba, to make sure that there were no missiles left. That was refused. Therefore we have continued our U-2 flights. And we have said that we would protect those U-2 flights, and that we will protect any American interest that is involved, which surely indicates that any commitment to Mr. Khrushchev or to Mr. Castro that we would take no military action against them if we found it necessary for our self-defense or our interest, that no such agreement ever exists or has any validity.

QUESTION. Have—

Senator HUMPHREY. And I think is about time that we understood it.

QUESTION. We haven't taken any action against them, have we?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, I think we have taken a good deal of action against Cuba, a great deal of it—including having the Organization of American States impose economic sanctions, including having every country in Latin America, save Mexico, break diplomatic relations with Cuba, including imposing upon—

QUESTION. Did we do that, or was that something that the Organization of American States did?

## 64—BAT—L

Senator HUMPHREY. We took the initiative, sir. It was our initiative. And one of the things, sir, that disturbs me a great deal is when a Member of Congress, who could know better if he wanted to—because the Government of the United States, in this year of 1964, has made available to Senator Goldwater the same kind of accommodation toward information that General Eisenhower made available to John Kennedy and Richard Nixon in 1960. And what has Mr. Goldwater said, and his running mate? That they did not want to take a look at the information that the Government had. No—they have refused to look, they have refused to consult with the Central Intelligence Agency, headed by John McCone, a well-known and respected Republican: they have refused to take the State Department briefings and the Defense Department briefings so that they could be more accurate in their statements.

And I, for one, think that it is reckless policy for a man seeking the highest and the second-highest office of this land to go around mouthing half-truths or go around making statements that are not predicated upon known facts in the security files of this Government—and I am not about ready to do so.

QUESTION. Do you think our current policy as far as Cuba is concerned is bringing about Castro's downfall? Do you think we will ultimately have that Communist government out of there?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it is the best policy that we can follow. It is the kind of policy that requires a great deal of patient, persevering pressure upon a dictatorship, but it is a policy that is a peaceful one, one that does not lead to the loss of life. And Mr. Castro's influence in Latin America has practically dwindled to nothing. And I might add that Mr. Castro did not become dictator of Cuba while Lyndon Johnson or John Kennedy were President, since we are getting into this matter. And he was a known Communist, and a very well-known Communist long before John F. Kennedy became President of the United States. And this late superpatriotism about our attitude toward Cuba might well have been taken at a time when Mr. Castro did not have all the military assistance that he received from the Soviet Union.

QUESTION. Speaking of the campaign generally, Senator, what do you think is going to be the pivot on which the election will go? Is there a central issue here—is it Vietnam, is it Cuba, is it the so-called racial tensions? What do you consider the central issue, if there is one?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think there is a central issue—and I don't believe it is much of some of the things that we have talked about. People are concerned about social security and Mr. Goldwater's attitude about it; they are concerned about his attitudes in some parts of America when he says he is going to sell TVA and then he says "I didn't mean it" and then a week ago he says "Yes, I did." They are concerned about Mr. Goldwater's attitude up in my part of the country on agricultural policy.

But those, while they are important, are not nearly as important as the concern of the people of America over Mr. Goldwater's apparent lack of understanding of the kind of world in which we live and the responsibilities of this Nation to that world.

Mr. Goldwater seems to feel that the solution to the problems of communism are to be found in nuclear power, and the rather reckless use of that power, or at least the threat of the use of that power.

Now, I know that he says he didn't mean it all. But when a man says that he wants to give field commanders the control over the use of the nuclear weapon, and then tries to tell you and me that a nuclear weapon is a conventional weapon, he either is deceiving himself or knowingly deceiving the public, because there are no conventional nuclear weapons. The weapon that Mr. Goldwater talks about—as a Senator he knows this—I serve on committees where the knowledge of this is well known—these weapons are 10, 15 and 20 kiloton weapons, these little playthings that he wants to turn over to field commanders. And they are filled with radioactivity. They are the kind of weapons that destroyed Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

Now, you just don't turn those things over to some divisional commander or corps commander in the field. The law of this land says that those weapons will be controlled by the President of the United States.

## 65—BAT—L

The American people have a choice to make. Do you want a President that wants to exercise that control; or do you want a President that says "Well, let's decentralize everything. Let's give it to a commander out in the field in NATO, or in the south flank or NATO, or in SEATO or in someplace else." I think the American people know what that decision is. They are not going to give that kind of command.

QUESTION. Just a week ago tonight on "At Random" in your seat sat Mr. Shadegg, who you know is the 1952-58 campaign manager for Senator Goldwater and now his western campaign manager for President. And where Pete is sitting sat John Roche, the present head of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Senator HUMPHREY. That must have been an interesting evening.

QUESTION. Mr. Roche took Mr. Shadegg to task on that and Mr. Shadegg said that what you are saying and what Mr. Roche says is not true—that all that Mr. Goldwater had ever said was that "the NATO commander," he did not speak of a proliferation of weapons handed out to commanders all over, and that the Democrats are misusing this issue.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I don't even believe the NATO commander should have it, sir, because the NATO commander is not an American at all times. And I happen to believe that the atomic weapon which was developed by this country, and which the McMahon Act says shall be under the control of the President of the United States, that that weapon should remain under the control of a civilian President.

I do not believe in giving the control of the use of that weapon at the discretion of a field commander or a NATO commander who is a general. I do not believe in placing that kind of power in the hands of someone that ought to be subservient to a civilian power.

QUESTION. How much do we know about the Russian control of nuclear weapons? Do they have a similar restriction, or would they have vested that authority in field commanders?

Senator HUMPHREY. I really could not say. But that would not in any way of course condition my thinking. I do not at any time feel that we ought to gage our actions in terms of the exercise of political control on the basis of what the Russians do.

QUESTION. Not political control—military control.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, even military control. The Constitution of the United States, Mr. Kirkpatrick, makes it quite clear that the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief, and since the nuclear age has come to us, the whole matter of war, the whole structure of military organization has changed.

QUESTION. There would be no constitutional bar to this proposal of Mr. Goldwater's.

Senator HUMPHREY. No, there would be no constitutional bar to it. It is a matter of judgment.

QUESTION. Well, let's go to South Vietnam. What do you think of the course of events there? Do you see a solution?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, of course, the course of events, Mr. Aker, is not as good as we would like. But I have come to the conclusion a long time ago that the world in which we live is going to be an untidy one and a difficult one for some time to come. As a matter of fact, it always has been. It has never been as peaceful as some people have felt it was. People who think the past was peaceful are the people who did not live in the past.

Vietnam—we are pursuing there the policy that was laid down by Dwight Eisenhower in 1954. We have a bipartisan policy relating to Vietnam. Now, I hope that that policy will be successful. But it would be wrong to tell the American people that the possibility of quick success is here. To the contrary. I think we will have to remain as an ally to the Government of South Vietnam for a long time, and we will have to be willing to provide both economic and military assistance.

QUESTION. Don't you think that policy was considerably altered in 1961?

## 66—BAT—L

Now, Mr. Truman started sending huge sums of money in there to help the French. Then in 1954 the French were defeated and left. Mr. Eisenhower sent money in, economic aid—

Senator HUMPHREY. Right.

QUESTION (continuing). And the military assistance group, which at no time consisted of more than 600 or 800 men.

Senator HUMPHREY. Correct.

QUESTION. Then in 1961, following the loss of Laos, or the virtual loss of Laos, we started sending in large numbers of men, until today we have about 20,000. We have taken many of them out of the merely training of the Vietnam Army, they are now going into battle with them as advisers. And we are spending huge sums of money.

Now, the policy—as you correctly say, it started with Mr. Eisenhower, but it was greatly stepped up at least after Mr. Kennedy became President, wasn't it?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, it was stepped up, sir—not because Mr. Kennedy wanted it, but primarily because in the period up to 1961 tremendous advance had been made in South Vietnam economically and politically. And it is well known that the Vietcong and North Vietnam had practiced guerrilla tactics and subversion and infiltration. The example of a viable and healthy South Vietnam economically, with an almost economically prostrate North Vietnam, despite the fact that South Vietnam had absorbed over three-quarters of a million people that were refugees from the north—this example was literally something more than the North Vietnamese Communist regime could take. So they stepped up their infiltration, they stepped up their terror attacks, they stepped up their subversion and open aggression. And at that point the South Vietnamese Government, that had had a working partnership and relationship with the United States, asked for additional assistance. And we sent in advisers and training officers in this kind of guerrilla warfare to train the Vietnamese Army—and we did it, not because we sought to expand the struggle, but because we had a commitment to a loyal friend and ally in South Vietnam.

And by the way, all of the countries of the world that were involved in this matter up to 1954 had a commitment to respect the neutrality of South Vietnam and North Vietnam. That commitment was violated by North Vietnam and the Vietcong.

QUESTION. I would like to ask you one more question in connection with Asia.

Do you still oppose the recognition of Red China?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, I surely do. I think it would be a mistake. Red China has shown no indication whatsoever of any responsible action as a mature political power. It is an aggressive force, and what is more I think that our recognition of Red China might very well cause the complete erosion of resistance in southeast Asia to the Communist aggression.

QUESTION. That is one point on which it shows quite a difference of opinion between you and some heavy thinkers in the ADA.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. John Foster Dulles once recommended recognition of Red China. I think people—many people make a case for it, and there is a theoretical case to be made for it. But if I may be permitted to say from a pragmatic point of view, knowing that there are large numbers of Chinese in Indonesia, for example, and all through the Malaysian and Vietnamese areas—that if you recognized Red China now, it would be more or less saying to them that the ball game is over, I mean so far as the United States is concerned. And I am not about ready to do that.

QUESTION. Senator, in the short time we have left—I know you have a very busy schedule—last week John Roche, sitting on this program, referred to Mr. Miller as “Killer Miller” and Mr. Shadegg took hot exception to it and said it was an example of the abuse and vituperative remarks coming from the Democrats. Do you consider this—is it going to be a dirty campaign?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, not so far as I am concerned. I think Mr. Miller is a respectable American citizen with a very lovely wife and family. He was selected by Mr. Goldwater for some purposes, according to Mr. Goldwater, that I did not think were too worthy. He said he was selected to drive Lyndon Johnson nuts, as

## 67—BAT—L

I recall what he said at the convention. I don't think that is really what he was selected for—I hope not.

QUESTION. But for the Democrats' part, Mr. Shadegg has inferred that you Democrats may make it a little dirty.

Senator HUMPHREY. We haven't—and I have been in politics a long time. There is a great deal of difference of opinion that we can discuss honorably. I would prefer to discuss the issues. I don't think any of the candidates can run on the sainthood ticket. And I don't suppose any of us are without some error of political judgment. So why don't we just start out on that basis and admit that we have made some mistakes, and now let us talk about where we stand, where we want to go, and what we would like to see happen in our country. And I am prepared to conduct that kind of campaign.

QUESTION. Well, part of your great charm and acceptance in Washington, as you know, during the years that I was there was your ability to debate on the floor and your ability on television and under circumstances such as this. There are those who think that perhaps you will be toned down a little in this campaign, from the good two-fisted fighter that you were.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, you know, there are rules to every contest. You can fight a good, hard, clean-cut battle without fighting dirty. It is my view that the fellow that mixes it up, dirty like, loses the fight.

Furthermore, I just don't want to win that way. I have got a lot of friends up in my home State, and I have friends around the country. Some of them don't like my point of view on some things. But they at least feel that I am a decent individual. And if the price of political victory is to come in and pit race against race or group against group and to utter half-truths knowingly—now, sometimes we make a mistake, and if we do, we ought to confess it, we may be short of information, we may actually make a bad judgment. But to knowingly engage in falsehood or half-truths or innuendo, or to attack personally I think is a price that is too much to pay for this victory.

QUESTION. Senator, thank you very much for taking the time to come on at random.

We of the panel will continue right after this brief message.

Chicago, Ill.  
Crystal Ballroom, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel  
September 20, 1964

### TRANSCRIPT OF BREAKFAST SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. You do have the most enthusiastic Democrats and the most enthusiastic supporters of any human being I ever met in my life. [Applause.]

I don't intend to make any big display here this morning but just a few moments ago the Chicago Journeymen Plumbers, in the person of Steven Bailey, saw fit to give to me a paid-up membership card, and Mrs. Humphrey has already told me that there are a few things around home that need fixing. [Laughter.]

But I thought I'd let you know that the purpose of this gadget is to put the screws on the Republicans. [Laughter.]

And I might add, if you use it right, you can shut off Goldwater. [Laughter and applause.]

Nobody has more fun than Democrats, I'll tell you.

And unaccustomed as I am to speaking in the morning—really, I'm a night man myself—I'm not very good at these early morning affairs, but I sure must say that I've had one of the most exciting and delightful 20 or so hours in this great metropolitan center of the United States, this wonderful Chicago, that I've ever experienced or enjoyed in my life.

## 68—BAT—L

When I got off the airplane here yesterday afternoon, I was absolutely, positively reassured that this would be a rather slow-paced, quiet, friendly, restful afternoon, and I can say that my feet haven't really touched ground since I came here.

The mayor picked me up by one arm, and one or two of his aids by another. Otto Kerner was on one side, the mayor on the other, and we just flew through one meeting after another.

Colonel Jack, I thought you'd arranged things better than that.

I'm very grateful to all of you, and I want to thank you for your graciousness, for your kindness to Mrs. Humphrey, and for letting me come on over there and just walk around with those lovely ladies. I was watching Mrs. Humphrey all the time. [Laughter.]

I'm standing a lot higher at home right now than I usually do. And I appreciate that Bill Lee is here to make sure that this membership card that I have is absolutely legal. I don't want any jurisdictional disputes. [Laughter.]

And I'm delighted to see my old friend, Sam Shapiro, here and this gives us a chance to be together again and I know there are many here that I ought to acknowledge—Tom Keene, and the new secretary of state, Mr. Powell. I always feel that if you're going to have a secretary of state, you ought to make sure he's a Democrat. We have even a couple of Republicans in Washington, but it's much better if you have Democrats. [Applause.]

Now, I don't intend to make this, at this early morning hour, a real partisan meeting. I think the best thing for me to do is just really state what is the honest truth and conviction is that all good men and women vote Democratic on November 3. There's no partisanship in that at all. It's a matter just of public interest and public concern.

Just a few very serious words with you. I know that we win elections because we go out and work to win these elections. Sometimes it takes more than work. You know, in this great city, you have the best—the best organized and I must say the best motivated, most idealistic, and the most practical organization that we have in the United States. [Applause.]

I've been with your mayor, who is your leader, and is one of the most effective citizens of our country, and I find him to be as much of a spiritual guide for the things in which I believe as I do a down-to-earth political organization man.

And when you can put together both ideals and practicality, you have a winning combination, and I think that's fine. [Applause.]

This is a very important election. It's important enough so some of our brethren who for many years have supported the Republican Party and have done so out of conviction have now decided that they would leave—no, they didn't leave—they have now decided that they would join us while somebody else has pirated the Republican ship, and they would come and help us.

It is a fact wherever I've been, without exception, that anywhere from a dozen to a hundred or more people will come to me during the day and say, "Senator, I've been a Republican for 25 years, or I've been a lifelong Republican, but I'm going to vote for you and I'm going to vote for the President of the United States, and I'm going to do it because I think it's necessary, that our country needs you, needs the President, and our country can't stand what the opposition states it's for."

This is the situation that's happening, and why is it happening? Because in most of our political existence or political life, we have had a real degree of political responsibility. We have agreed upon objectives as political parties, and sometimes disagreed upon means, but in this election there is a disagreement even over objectives and, in this election, the American people know that everything that we've worked for and fought for—not just for the last 10 years or the last 4 years, but for many, many generations—could be jeopardized.

People now know that we have within our hands the power of the greatest advance of human history or the power to destroy everything that we ever dreamed, and they are not about ready to turn the decisionmaking on that power over to someone that may be irresponsible, or impetuous, or unreliable, and the American people are right. We simply can't have that happen in our country.

## 69—BAT—L

May I add also that there are forces at work in America. They have always been here, but they have never before had a respectable platform. There are forces at work in America today that would like to gain ascendancy. They would like to be out in front and see someone that they support win. Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I made up my mind early in this campaign that I was not going to indulge in any personal vilification because it isn't necessary and, what's more, it's wrong.

I do not say that the spokesman for the Republican Party in this campaign is one that hates, because he doesn't. I don't say that he's one that invites bitterness, but I do say that there are those who have attached themselves to his cause and that if that victory should come, that they would move to the front ranks, the front ranks of public policy, of public power, in the United States, and I don't intend to let them. [Applause.]

We have made a lot of progress in our country—real progress, not just progress in terms of social security—which is important; not only progress in terms of wages and hours, trade union organizations, which is important; not only progress in profits, in industry and commerce, which is important; but we have made some other progress that is important.

In 1960, we abolished for once and for all the myth that because of a man's religion that he could not hold the highest office of this land. That's done—through. [Applause.]

We now have but one standard in our party and, I trust, in our country. We want the best man that's available. We want the best man that's available for our country. His particular church or his particular ethnic group, that's his personal matter, his personal business, so we abolished—at least, we made the first step in the abolition of what I call religious intolerance and bigotry.

And this past year, by act of Congress, we stated for once and for all that there's only one kind of citizenship in the United States. We made it crystal clear by public law, by commitment of an overwhelming majority of the Congress, with the support of two Presidents and with the support of former Presidents, that there would never again be in America any second-class citizenship for anybody. [Applause.]

And I had thought that we have gotten rid of the old, dirty sheets that covered up some of these people—or, should I say, the white sheets that covered up some dirty souls? [Applause.]

But I see once again the Ku Klux; I see once again the hatemongers of the Burchites. Yes, I see even once again the extreme leftism of the Communists.

I see these forces once again plying their trade, and I want to tell you there is only one way to stop them. And that's to make sure that those that stand for fairplay, equality of opportunity, that those that have repudiated and renounced forms of bigotry and discrimination, segregation and intolerance, that those people work together and defeat this negativism as never before in the history of our country. [Applause.]

So what we really seek to do is what President Johnson asked us to do, build a great national unity; I like that line that the President used, Dick, in that acceptance speech when he said: "An all-American party for all Americans."

That's what we want, and that's what we have here, and that's what we ought to have. There is plenty of room for differences over economic issues. We can disagree on how we ought to govern this country, but Americans can never disagree over the fundamentals of human dignity. It cannot be disagreed with. [Applause.]

Now, we are on the road to progress, and everything that we have done thus far is but a prelude. It's just a preliminary to what we can do. Whole new worlds can be ours, and a better earth to make more inhabitable and more enjoyable.

I like what I see in Chicago, where people have demonstrated through their leadership, through their mayor and through their councilmen, and through their business organizations, through labor, and through community organizations—you have demonstrated here that you can make this a beautiful city. You have demonstrated that the beauty of the city is not only in the buildings and in the parks.

## 70—BAT—L

It's in the relationships of the people. What I see here this morning, and what I saw here yesterday at meetings, is the kind of beauty that the President spoke about when he talked about the Great Society.

I leave you with just this thought. We have some unfinished work. I sat at a breakfast table every Tuesday morning at 8:45 at the White House for 1,000 days, and I have been at that same table, with few exceptions, every Tuesday morning for the last 9½ months.

Now, it is no secret that some 4 years ago, I thought I was going to be at that breakfast table every morning, but I didn't make it. [Laughter and applause.]

I want to tell you it's not bad for a boy that was born in South Dakota to make it once a week. [Applause.]

And at that breakfast table, I would sit right across the table from the President of the United States—almost across, because immediately facing the President was the Vice President. I sat to the right of the Vice President, and I want you to understand what I said—not to the left, but to the right. [Laughter.]

Not to the far right, though, either.

And every Tuesday morning, when President Kennedy would come into that breakfast room, he'd have a little sheet of paper in front of him, and we'd start to work, right off the bat.

I want to say, that's one thing about Democrats. They go to a lot of meals, but they've never eaten one in peace in their life.

We'd start to work immediately and we would discuss the program for America. We'd discuss the program of the New Frontier. I think I am a witness to the making of history because I would see President Kennedy talk to, now, President Johnson—then the Vice President—and to the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to those of us that were there as lieutenants.

This was 1 hour every Tuesday, and sometimes on Thursday. Many times, we met during the week. And we hammered out the program of the 87th and the 88th Congresses. We worked out, under the leadership and the guidance of President Kennedy the program that we passed, and I want you to know that we have had the most amazing record of performance in the Congress on that program.

And I watched the then Vice President give his views. I sat in many a meeting where we disagreed momentarily, where we hammered out, where we would work it out, so that when I go before an audience today and talk about the Kennedy-Johnson program, I'm not talking about something just as a sort of fiction. I'm talking about a fact of history, and now when we sit across the table, the President sits across on one side and the President pro tem of the Senate, and I sit alongside of him.

And we have done the same thing to work out that program. It was John Kennedy that asked us, "Let us begin:" and I was with the President of the United States after the assassination of our beloved President Kennedy. I was there when that message was prepared for the joint session of the Congress. It was my privilege to help work on that message.

And I remember that day on November 27, Wednesday, when President Johnson stood before the Congress and, in fact, stood before the whole Nation, because the news media, the television, the radio, were all there.

He said to the American people, after reviewing this remarkable record of a thousand days, he said to the American people, "Let us continue."

And that's what we're doing. We're finishing that job, and once we've finished that first step, then we are going to move forward under the Johnson program, and it will be laid down to the Congress of the United States in January of 1965.

I want to have something to do with that program. [Applause.]

---

If ever you falter in this campaign, just remember this one challenge. Remember this, and this is one of the reasons I think we ought to conduct this campaign on the level of decency and dignity, the likes of which we have never, ever experienced before. Why?

## 71—BAT—L

Because this campaign, in a real sense, should be a living tribute and a living memorial to the life and the works and the unfinished task of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and we ought to remember that every time we falter, every time we weaken, every time we hear the opposition attack us unfairly.

All I ask you to remember is that we've got a job to do, and we're going to do it, and we're going to bring in the greatest victory that America has ever had, I think, since the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936, and you're going to help me and I'm going to help you, and we're going to do the job.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

---

The National Broadcasting Co. presents—

### MEET THE PRESS—AMERICA'S PRESS CONFERENCE OF THE AIR

Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak.

Guest: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (Minnesota), Democratic vice-presidential candidate.

Panel: May Craig, Portland (Maine) Press Herald; Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News; Alan Otten, Wall Street Journal; Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member.

Moderator: Ray Scherer, NBC News.

(Permission is hereby granted to news media and magazines to reproduce in whole or in part. Credit to NBC's Meet the Press will be appreciated.)

#### MEET THE PRESS

MR. SCHERER. This is Ray Scherer, inviting you to Meet the Press. Our guest today on Meet the Press is Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States. Now, we will have the first question from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the Meet the Press panel.

MR. SPIVAK. Senator Humphrey, recently you warned the American people that the Republicans—and these were your words “may appeal to passion and prejudices and to fear and bitterness in the campaign,” and you pledged that the Democrats' campaign would be conducted—and again these were your words “with honor and dignity.”

In view of that, why did the Democrats use the TV spot showing a little girl counting daisies and then being blown to bits by a nuclear blast, with the voice asking that you vote for President Johnson? Would you say that was an appeal to “passion” and “fear”?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. First, I said I felt that the Goldwater Republicans would make this appeal. I didn't say all Republicans, because a substantial number of them are supporting President Johnson.

I did not approve of the TV spot that you refer to, and when my point of view was asked, I suggested that it be removed from the air, even though I do feel that the issue of nuclear power and the control of nuclear power is possibly the central issue in this campaign, because I believe that what you need is a President who is experienced, who is reliable, who temperamentally is steady and calm and not at all impetuous. Nuclear power is too important and too devastating to be left in uncertain hands.

MR. SPIVAK. You do think then that that TV spot was a mistake, and you say it has been repealed, or it is not going to be used again?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. I said I did not personally think it was very good.

MR. SPIVAK. On the nuclear power issue, Senator Goldwater has said over and over again that he is not in favor of using nuclear bombs in southeast Asia. Why, in view of that, do the Democrats keep insinuating that he is?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. It is a little difficult for me to keep up with this shifting target of Mr. Goldwater. He did once say that he thought it would be well to use nuclear weapons to “defoliate,” I believe it was, the jungles in Vietnam. There isn't any doubt but that he said that. I think that was a very reckless statement, and I have said so. I haven't particularly stressed the point, but I think Mr. Goldwater now has retracted that. He has either said he didn't say it, or he said that he shouldn't have said it, but whatever he said has confused the issue.

## 72—BAT—L

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, hasn't he said that that was one of the things that might be done but that he didn't recommend it?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, I think that is about the way he explained it, but may I say to the world that is deeply concerned about any irresponsible action in the use of nuclear power, for a presidential candidate to make the suggestion that this is one of the ways that you might conduct your activities or military operations in Vietnam is indeed very dangerous and, I think, does our country a disservice.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, still on the question of nuclear power, whether or not to give NATO commanders the right of decision for the use of small nuclear weapons has become an issue in this campaign. There have been recent reports that General Lemnitzer, the head of NATO, has already been given a right to use small nuclear weapons in certain types of operation. Can you tell us whether or not that is true?

Senator HUMPHREY. It is my understanding that it is not true. And I think when we talk about small nuclear weapons, we should indicate to the American people what we are talking about. We are talking about little nuclear weapons that laid low Nagasaki and Hiroshima, 10 kiloton, 15 kiloton, 18, 20 kiloton weapons, larger than any weapon that was ever used in World War II with the exception of the atomic bombs on Japan. There aren't any small, little nuclear weapons. There are no little old conventional nuclear weapons. These are deadly, destructive, powerful weapons, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Let me ask you one other question on that: Suppose war did break out and suppose the enemy did use a small nuclear weapon. What would we do, would the commanders have to wait until they got in touch with the President of the United States before they could fire back? Would they have no right at all to use nuclear weapons in retaliation? Would they have to wait?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am not privy to all of the most intimate details of the relationships between the generals in the field and the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, but I do know that our military communications system is almost instantaneous. There wouldn't be any serious problem at all as to what we might do in terms of retaliation. If we are attacked by nuclear weapons, I am sure that the President of the United States, in combination and consultation with the top military officers of our Government, would make a quick decision and one that would be in the interests of our national security.

Mr. SPIVAK. May I ask your own judgment on this matter: Are we not to use the nuclear weapons until the enemy has used them first? Is this the policy of the administration?

Senator HUMPHREY. We do not believe in preventive war.

Mr. SPIVAK. And we would not use them until they had used them on us and mightn't that not be too late, Senator?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think these are matters a little too sensitive for candidates for public office to be talking about. This is a matter of the highest security of our land, and the Senator from Minnesota, not as a vice presidential candidate but as a responsible public official, is not going to be drawn into any "iffy" discussions or any theoretical discussions. These are matters which ought to be kept in the closest classification in terms of the security of our Nation. I don't think we ought to telescope or telephone our messages to the potential enemy.

Mr. LISAGOR. Senator Humphrey, I'd like to clear up a point you made in your exchange with Mr. Spivak just a moment ago. You spoke of military communications being virtually instantaneous today. In the Gulf of Tonkin just very recently we seem to be having trouble establishing what really happened there, and it led Senator Goldwater the other night in Charleston, W. Va., to say somewhat contemptuously that we were waiting for an air mail letter to tell us what went on.

Why is that a communication problem, and doesn't that bear upon the exchange you had with Mr. Spivak about the need of our commanders in the field to work and to react rather instantaneously?

Senator HUMPHREY. The problem in the Gulf of Tonkin incident that you are mentioning was not one of communications. The message did get back as to what action was taken by our destroyers, the two destroyers in that area. The problem was not of getting the message back, but of finding out what happened in the Gulf of Tonkin,

## 73—BAT—L

because the four vessels that appeared on the radar screen, after having been—after receiving a firing of notification, or of warning, kept coming on, and then there was open firing by our destroyers, and then the vessels seemed to disappear.

Insofar as to what we were doing and what was happening there, we have a pretty good idea, but how you evaluate it, that is another thing.

Mr. LISAGOR. But Senator, isn't it rather important to know what you are shooting at in this world of nuclear weapons?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, but we were not shooting nuclear weapons.

Mr. LISAGOR. Yes, but do we yet know what we were shooting at?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; it is the view of our Navy and the commander that was in charge of that particular detail or detachment that these were unfriendly vessels. We had had two such incidents before, that these vessels came on despite the warning shot, and they were moving in upon American ships, and the orders are to those destroyers to protect those ships.

Mr. Goldwater said that we apparently were waiting for an airmail letter. I consider that comment very childish, and I would hope that this incident itself might once again demonstrate how important it is to have thoughtful, prudent judgment before you take any type of massive retaliation or rather intensive retaliation over an incident like this.

Mr. LISAGOR. Senator, during his southern trip, which I covered the past week, Senator Goldwater seemed to be running against two main targets. One was the Supreme Court, and one was a man he kept calling Hubert Horatio.

I would like for you to tell us how much of an issue, if any, do you regard yourself in the South?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Lisagor, if I can serve as the lightning rod for President Lyndon Johnson in this campaign, I think I will have served a very great purpose. I think I ought to tell my good friend Senator Goldwater that I am not running for President. It is President Johnson that is his adversary in this campaign. But if he wishes to give me this friendly treatment out on the hustings, I am somewhat honored, and I am glad that he repeats my middle name, too, because it has seldom been used, and frankly it was my father's addition to the name, and I sort of like the fact that someone has thought of dad in these moments.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator Goldwater was the first to speak out at the Republican Convention about violence in the streets, the streets not being safe for people to walk upon. Now after the looting and the rioting, the President also called for law and order, but did not the Democrats condone the start of this sort of thing by allowing the demonstrations by the civil rights organizations?

Senator HUMPHREY. No; I do not believe that we have condoned it at all, and may I say that no one should condone lawlessness, violence, looting, vandalism, hoodlumism. We cannot do that. I have been the mayor of a rather large city. I have had to enforce the law. I operated and was in command of a police department, and I maintained law and order. That is the first duty of a public official that is entrusted with the responsibility of law and order, and of course law and order is essentially the responsibility of local government and of State government.

The President of the United States and the Senator from Minnesota both believe in law and order. We believe in strict law enforcement. We believe in law observance. The President has ordered the investigative services of this Government, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to be helpful, to try to find out if there is a pattern to these incidents of violence and disorder. And may I make the record crystal clear, the full power of this Government insofar as it has power—it doesn't have a Federal police system, and I don't want one, but insofar as we can do anything, that will be done. Then I think there are a few other things that need to be done, too, such as trying to find out what is it that causes this social dynamite that brings about these explosions in some of our cities.

## 74—BAT—L

Mrs. CRAIG. Yes, but Senator, you are speaking of now. I am speaking of the beginning, when the civil rights demonstrations broke laws, blocked streets, invaded business houses. I don't recollect that the administration then said anything against stopping the demonstrations, even when they blocked off, for instance, the Triboro Bridge.

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, Mrs. Craig, may I say that the first person, I think, to speak up on that is the man you are interviewing today, and I was joined in it by Senator Thomas Kuchel, of California. We both issued a statement, a joint statement in which we said that civil wrongs do not make for civil rights, and civil disobedience does not add to respect for law and order or equal protection of the laws.

Not for one single minute would I condone this kind of lawlessness, nor has the President, nor has any responsible public official. I might add that I would hope that Mr. Goldwater would help appeal to the basic sense of decency and fairplay of the American people and urge law observance and quit making these comments to the effect that the Civil Rights Act breeds hatred and bitterness and violence. This is just an invitation to trouble.

Mrs. CRAIG. But Senator, I was not aware that you rated the civil rights demonstrations as leading to what it has now come to in its exploitation by thugs and possibly for Communists.

Senator HUMPHREY. These demonstrations always lend themselves at times to people who are unsavory, people that have little or no regard for rights of other people, and there isn't any doubt at all but that in some of these demonstrations, gangsters, hoodlums, dope addicts, Communists, Klu Kluxers and their ilk, have been involved, and our task is to see to it that they don't take over.

May I add also that we ought to give a little word of praise to the hundreds of thousands of people who, though they may not have all of the privileges that some of us have, go quietly about their business, trying to be good American citizens. As far as Senator Humphrey is concerned, he is going to insist upon adequate protection for our people, that is, law enforcement. But I am also going to insist upon social justice.

Mrs. CRAIG. Have you asked the demonstrators not to demonstrate any more? I don't hear of demonstrations, now.

Senator HUMPHREY. I have constantly—or, let me put it this way: I have on many occasions said that demonstrators are not serving the cause of civil rights, they are not serving the cause of a better America, by demonstration with violence. The right to petition, peacefully, of course—that is free speech. But violence, looting, gangsterism, disorder in the streets, disregard for local ordinance or law, this we cannot condone, and this I deplore. And I have asked people wherever I have had a chance, "Please, please don't engage in it."

Mr. OTTEN. Senator Thurmond, of South Carolina, this week switched from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party. There are a number of other Democratic officeholders in the South who either have endorsed Mr. Goldwater or at least refused to support Mr. Johnson.

Do you think they should follow Senator Thurmond's example and switch to the Republican Party?

Senator HUMPHREY. We always believe in freedom of choice. Whatever people wish to do, that is their right and their privilege. I suppose some of them will. But I think that before this campaign is through most of our friends in the South will recall that the Democratic Party and the Democratic administrations have been good to the South. Likewise the South has been very good to the Democratic Party.

For example, Georgia and Arkansas have never voted any other way except Democratic. For this we are extremely grateful, and I might add from my point of view it shows very good judgment. I am of the opinion that when some of the southern local officeholders find out Mr. Goldwater is not merely trying to be President but he is trying to build, as Senator Thurmond said, a Goldwater Republican Party in the South, which if it takes hold and which if it starts to move, could throw out of office a substantial number of Democrats, that when that happens they may very well return to the home of their fathers, which is the Democratic Party. And may I say, they will be welcome.

## 75—BAT—L

MR. OTTEN. Assuming that the Democrats do keep control of Congress, would you favor some sort of disciplinary action such as taking away seniority or committee assignments against those southern Democrats who continue to refuse to support your ticket this fall?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. If a Senator such as Senator Thurmond announces that he is leaving the Democratic Party, that he has become, as he put it, a Goldwater Republican, then I must say that he will have to move his real estate in the Senate, and that desk will have to go from the Democratic side over to the Republican side. He has made that choice. I don't want to be unkind with him, but that is his choice.

If a Senator or a Congressman should just decide that they are going to ride this one out, we may be a little unhappy about it, but he still may be a Democrat and therefore may want to stay with the Democratic Party. I would hope that he would support Lyndon Johnson. I think that they should. But I wouldn't say that they ought to lose their seniority in the Democratic Party or their position on committees, as long as they remain as a Democrat. There will be some Democrats that will not support the Johnson-Humphrey ticket and still say they are Democrats. But if a man says, "Look, I am leaving you; I am joining the Goldwater Republican Party," then I think that he ought to have all the privileges that come with it; namely, of moving from the majority over to a diminishing minority.

MR. OTTEN. There seem to be a number of southern Democrats, though, who take an in-between course of not actually switching over from their party, but criticizing the administration and refusing to endorse the ticket. You would not take any sort of reprisal against those?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. No, I would not, but I would say this, I am of the opinion that before November 3 comes around, they will see the light, and they will be with us, most of them. I am quite confident that President Johnson will do exceedingly well in the Southern States.

MR. SCHERER. Senator, you have been out beating the bushes now for some 3 weeks. What feel do you get of this campaign? Is it focusing down to one central issue?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. Yes, I think so, Mr. Scherer. We like to feel, those of us who do campaigning, that there are many issues, and I suppose that there are regional issues, there are issues for special groups like social security, for example—many people are concerned about Mr. Goldwater's views about making social security voluntary, however he interprets that. And those that are in the TVA area are very concerned about his switching—first, he wanted to sell TVA, and then he didn't, and now he does want to sell it. But I think the central issue, the one that seems to bother people and that brings people to President Johnson, even though they may be Republicans or independents, is the issue of—let me put it this way: which of these two men, Senator Goldwater or President Lyndon Johnson, is best equipped by experience, by knowledge of Government, and of foreign affairs and by temperament to give this Nation leadership during the cold war. That decision, of course, must be made in light of the facts of nuclear energy and of nuclear power and of the kind of a world in which we live. So I think that is the issue. It is the issue of which of these two men can you trust with the responsibility of the guidance, of the leadership of this great Nation of our during this turbulent and troublesome period of world tension and cold war. And on that issue, I think many, many people that ordinarily were good, hard working Republicans have come over to President Johnson and are—I won't say they are leaving their party—they don't leave their party—but they have left for the moment the standard bearer of the Republican Party.

MR. SPIVAK. Senator, the Bobby Baker case in the opinion of many has become a disgrace on the Senate involving even the name of the President himself. Don't you think the American people are entitled to a real, fair, thorough investigation of the case by a Senate committee?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. Mr. Spivak, that case has been checked into by the Senate Committee on Rules. It has been reopened. I voted for that, to reopen that case, because of some allegations that were made recently. Furthermore it is being investigated by the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice. You ask me, does it deserve investigation? Of course it

## 76—BAT—L

does. And I also voted, may I say, as did the majority of the Senate and the majority of the Democrats, for that bipartisan committee to be established to keep a constant watchful eye upon the activities of the U.S. Senate and any of the employees of that body.

Mr. SPIVAK. But isn't it in the Senate Rules Committee now which is controlled by the Democrats overwhelmingly, and wouldn't it be a good idea to appoint a select committee, an impartial committee?

Senator HUMPHREY. I do not believe that one should judge or prejudge these men on the Rules Committee. I know them. My judgment would be after having served in the Senate with them for years, that they are honorable men, and there isn't a one of them that wants to cover up the thing. What they want to do is to do justice and to be fair, and sometimes it is rather difficult to please the desires of some people in a political year, if you try to be fair.

Mr. LISAGOR. Senator Humphrey, I think all three other candidates have issued a financial statement, and you have said that you are going to issue one, and it has been suggested that you are a little ashamed of how little you are worth, or how much you are worth, I forget which, but when do you plan to do this, and could you give us an idea of how much you may be worth?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think that ought to be released according to my lawyer, this weekend. I would say between now and Tuesday at the latest, and it would have been released last weekend except the accounting firm had some other work to do. I am going to do all right. There will be enough there to take care of mother. We had a little mortgage on a house out in Minnesota. This one's paid for. We have a few Government bonds. I made a couple of wise investments out home in Minnesota. I can say that I am not as well off as my brother, who is in private enterprise, but I am well enough off to get along, and I have no complaints.

Mr. LISAGOR. Can you give us a rough figure on this, Senator?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, I think you ought to wait for the bombshell. It will be very interesting.

Mr. LISAGOR. But you are not in the red, is that it?

Senator HUMPHREY. I surely am not. I am happy to say that I have proven myself to be a prudent man.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator, you have said on this program, last spring, that you are against taking children out of their neighborhood schools and taking them someplace else to achieve a racial balance.

The Washington Superintendent of Schools agrees with that and has so ruled, and I believe you said, did you not, that the civil rights bill said that it should not be used to do this?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is correct, Mrs. Craig.

Mrs. CRAIG. Now it is being done. It is being done in many places. You have even got a crisis in New York City about it. Can anything be done nationally and federally to prevent that?

Senator HUMPHREY. The Civil Rights Act made a specific provision that none of the pertinent portions or the sections of that act were to be used for the purpose of bussing children, as we put it. My position now is identical to what it was when we were on this program some months ago, I believe, in March. I do not believe that this is the way that you achieve the objectives of equal protection of the laws and full citizenship under the Constitution. I think the best thing to do is to build good neighborhoods. I don't want the Federal Government to be messing into this thing. I think this is a matter of local authority, and I think the problem ought to be handled locally.

Mr. OTTEN. Do you think it right for a high official of the Federal Government to have so much of his wealth in an industry regulated by another Federal agency, as broadcasting, where President Johnson has the bulk of his family wealth?

Senator HUMPHREY. I feel that the agency that regulates that is not one which is subject to executive persuasion. It is what we call a quasi-judicial agency. It is an agency established by the Congress, by the way, and not by the President of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. Senator, our time is up. Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for being with us.

# 77—BAT—L

Article  
Congressional Record  
September 22, 1964

## REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HUMPHREY AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT, U.S. SENATE

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
THE HUMPHREY AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in all the discussion about foreign assistance, there is one area that has been free of criticism and, in fact, has enjoyed the blessing of all Members of Congress. I refer to what AID is doing to encourage U.S. private enterprise to be more actively engaged in our foreign assistance efforts.

Here in the arena of private initiative, competition becomes a matter of ideas as well as commodities. We constantly are in search for new and better ways of doing things.

In this field the U.S. cooperatives, savings and loan associations, and credit unions have an enviable record. They are applying abroad the same know-how and skills that have made them so successful in our country.

I have received from Mr. David Bell, the Administrator of AID, the third annual report of our cooperative activities in AID, for the fiscal year 1964. I am delighted with our achievements.

These cooperative developments were carried out under section 601 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I proposed this section of the act to make certain that the people in charge of our foreign aid would be aware of the good that cooperatives, savings and loan associations, and credit unions can do among the underprivileged people in the emerging countries.

U.S. cooperatives are engaged in a wide range of activities. Our U.S. cooperative enterprises now are helping in 48 countries.

What was only an idea 3 years ago is a worldwide reality today. In the cooperative idea, we are exporting one of the finest products of a democratic society. And the cooperative program is not one of dollars, but of people.

During fiscal year 1964, AID obligated only \$13 million for technical assistance for cooperative development and \$52 million for loans for cooperative-type projects. Our success was due in large measure to the skill and dedication of 360 cooperative technicians and consultants, recruited from all parts of our Nation. They took their know-how, their experience, and their missionary zeal with them to foreign lands, and showed people how they can do great things just by working together. They were helped, of course, by the people in these countries.

Their effectiveness was multiplied many times by the people they had trained to carry on. More than 27,000 persons received training in cooperative subjects in AID-supported centers or schools in Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, the Central American countries, Uganda, Kenya, Thailand, Korea, and Vietnam.

In this connection, we should not overlook the dedication of the thousands of Americans abroad who are working with voluntary relief organizations. Thirty-one of the 242 voluntary relief agencies, missions, or foundations eligible to work with AID in oversea programs included the development of "cooperative credit unions and loans" among their objectives.

## 78—BAT—L

This report provides one part of an answer to our critics who declare that AID does not reach down to the vast masses of people. It also brings out the importance of having nongovernment organizations participate in our foreign assistance efforts. In its cooperative undertakings, AID has tried to do as much of the work as is feasible by contracts with nongovernment organizations. In the field of cooperative enterprise, these organizations were mostly federations representing many hundreds of local associations. They include:

National Farmers Union, National Grange, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Credit Union National Association, National League of Insured Savings Associations, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

I wish time would permit me to call the roll of new cooperative developments that have been carried out under the banner of AID during the past fiscal year. The outstanding developments, of course, have been in Latin America, under the Alliance for Progress. And they will continue to grow. Promising beginnings now are noticeable in Africa, and there is a growing interest in the Far East and Near East, south Asia regions.

There has been a substantial growth in the formation of credit unions, savings and loan associations, and housing cooperatives. Rural electric cooperatives were established in Colombia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua. In Latin America, 1,100 credit unions have been organized. The 300,000 depositors, mostly from lower-income families, have invested \$12 million in savings. The 77 savings and loan associations have financed nearly 22,000 new homes.

This is a report of what we are doing in the new and developing countries. I would be remiss, however, if I did not mention an event which took place in our capital city this week. There were 80 campesinos—young farm leaders—in our city. They were not tourists. They had just completed 6 months of living and working on our farms in the Middle West.

They learned for themselves how our institutions work. They learned that life is not all peaches and cream here. They shared the good things, and took part in the townhall meetings, and the cooperative sessions. They went to church and to school. They learned what Main Street is like. They saw what makes America tick. There was sweat and hard work, leisure and fun, and the kind of life that goes on in small towns and rural areas all over America.



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)