HE – LINO – 280

I know full well that the people of Missouri are so proud of Senator Stuart Symington that they are going to elect him with an overwhelmingly majority. [Applause.]

Your good mayor was kind enough to greet me at the airport this morning, a number of your distinguished citizens. May I pay my respects to the Congressmen that are here that have spoken to you, your candidate for Governor, your candidate for Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Fagelson, may I say to them that Missouri has enjoyed Democratic leadership under John Dalton and I can't imagine once you become accustomed to such good living that you would want to turn the clock back and vote for a Republican, so I suggest that you vote for Governor Hearn. [Applause.]

You know that one of the facts of this campaign that is quite evident is the great enthusiasm of the people that are voting for President Lyndon Johnson, and those people are not just Democrats. I think that it is nothing short of amazing that people of all walks of life and of both of the great political parties have found that they must give their support to a trusted and a true and respected, and an experienced leader, the President of the United States.

When you can get a newspaper like the New York Herald Tribune that has never before endorsed a Democrat, and you can get the Saturday Evening Post that since 1797 has never endorsed a Democrat, and when you can get the New York Tribune, Life magazine, and the Saturday Evening Post saying that Lyndon B. Johnson is the man that you ought to have in the White House, I think the Goldwater buttons ought to be taken off, the signs ought to be thrown away. [Applause.]

Of course, that obvious fact is that these great publications are Republican and the fact of the matter is that the leader, the temporary spokesman, of the Goldwater faction of a fraction of the Republican Party is not, in the words of Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, he is not in the words of that Republican Governor, within the mainstream of Republican policy or thought, and we welcome those Republicans that come to us. [Applause.]

Now, let me in the moments that I have with you today talk to you not about the past, not even about our opposition. Let me talk to you about a record of accomplishment and achievement which is being heralded and written about, talked about all throughout this land.

The city of St. Louis on December 30, 1960, had 8.7 percent, almost 9 percent of its work force unemployed. That was the economic fact of this community.

Today the city of St. Louis is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, it has one of the lowest rates of unemployment of any city in the world right here in the city of St. Louis. [Applause.]

When John F. Kennedy became President of the United States, this city, like many others, like the great city to your north, Detroit, since you are one of the great automobile producing cities, there was Detroit, the great center of automobile production, that city with almost 10 percent of its workers unemployed, your city with almost 9 percent of its workers unemployed, and today these two cities find themselves teeming beehives of industrial activity and high employment.

This didn't happen by accident. This didn't happen as if it fell out of the clouds. This came about because an administration and a political party and industry and labor and others worked together to help build a more prosperous America.

John Kennedy said on that day of January 20, 1961, "Let's get this country moving again." He said, "Let us begin." He said, "I accept responsibility. I welcome it."

And then he asked us to look to the future, and immediately this man in 1,000 days of dramatic leadership, launched one program after another, and then when the mantle of leadership was taken from him by the assassin's bullet, it was picked up by the man that he had selected as his Vice President, and today in the White House, today in the Capital City of Washington you have a man that is recognized by friend and foe alike, by Republican and Democrat alike as one of the most able, one of the most gifted, one of the most experienced, one of the most talented political leaders that has ever occupied the Office of President. [Applause.]

The Kennedy-Johnson administration, it didn't, go back and say, "Let us study the ancient chapters of history." The Kennedy-Johnson administration didn't take you back, back, back and say, "Let's think about how things used to be."

The Kennedy-Johnson administration said, "Let's get to work, let's think about the things as they are. Let's deal with the world of reality, and let's look ahead."

And we came to grips with one problem after another; workers that had been displaced through automation, job training, older people who had no place to turn for employment were given vocational training. Public works in communities where there was need for jobs and for the improvement of civic improvement.

Area redevelopment for areas where there were unemployed and where industries were stagnant. In other words, this Government of ours set to work and started to stimulate this great economy in cooperation with the American people. Not Government alone, but Government and people. Investment tax credit to encourage every industry in Missouri, to expand its facilities and modernize.

A tax cut bill, a tax cut bill, that gave purchasing power back to the American people to the tune of $9 billion. And over $2 billion of tax relief to American corporate business and what has been the result? In less than 4 years we have added a hundred twenty-five billions of dollars to our gross national product, 72 million workers employed.

Business profits are up $10 billion over any Republican years. Unemployment is down, dividends are up. But the opposition leader says, "This is all artificial. It isn't real." This is the danger of having a candidate who wears glasses that don't have any lenses.

[Applause.]

And, my friends, it may seem artificial to the man from Arizona but General Motors doesn't think it is artificial, Henry Ford doesn't think it is artificial, the banks of America don't think it is artificial, the contrators don't think it is artificial.

America isn't stopping—America isn't going to play dead just because the candidate of the opposition says that things are bad.

He goes around and says, "Oh, I am sick and tired of what is happening." Well, may I say if you are sick, go to bed.

[Laughter.] [Applause.]

And may I respectfully say, if you are tired get out of the way and let somebody who wants to go to work go to work.

[Applause.]

America is not sick, and America is not tired. America is healthy, America is wide awake. America is active, America s moving forward, and America wants a President that looks forward. We don't want a leader that tries to guide this country by looking through a rearview mirror and putting the car in reverse, not one bit. We want to have a man in the White House and we want to have Members of Congress who have unbounded faith in this country, not only faith in its economy, and is it any wonder that the captains of industry are coming to the Democratic banner, and here the other day I heard somebody say, "Oh, all the Democrats have got for Lyndon is big business, big labor, and agriculture and the minority groups."

Not bad if we have got all of that.

[Laughter and applause.]

And my good friends we have built the kind of enduring economy which is going to offer more and more opportunity to more and more people.

Secondly, this administration has not only built a prosperous economy working with, encouraging business, hand in hand with business, believing in our enterprise system, but it has also built a better society for our people, a better society through recognizing the need of greater education, higher education acts passed in Congress, a food stamp plan that your Congressman right here on this platform sponsored in the House of Representatives; the expansion of our National Defense Education Act; student loans for deserving students; cleaning up of our cities through urban renewal, a host of programs designed for people.

And one of those programs, may I say, that was passed with the leadership of both parties, and I want to stop here to pay my respects to both of the political parties, to a man like Senator Dirksen of Illinois, Senator Kuchel of California, who stood side by side with us,

Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts, Senator Aiken of Vermont, all Republicans, all good men, standing side by side with President Johnson, with Senator Mansfield, with Senator Symington, with Senator Long and, may I add with Senator Humphrey and a few others. [Applause.]

We knew that the issue of human rights was not partisan. We knew that the issue of constitutional guarantees was not a prerogative of Democrats and Republicans. We knew that the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, made a commitment 100 years ago to this Nation and to this world, the promise of emancipation, and two great political parties, the party of Lincoln, and the party of Jefferson; yes, the party of Lincoln and the party of Kennedy and of Johnson, those two political parties stood together and with an overwhelming majority in both Houses of the Congress we said to the whole world there is but one kind of citizenship in America and that is first-class American citizenship. [Applause.]

But my dear friends, just as in the instance of the tax bill, the manpower training bill, the accelerated public works bill, the area redevelopment bill, the National Defense Education Act, you name it, every one of those measures designed to help the people of this country voted for by a majority of Republicans, voted for by a majority of Democrats, but not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

It is an amazing thing—it is an amazing thing how one person can feel he is so right and how everybody else is out of step. I happen to think that the collective and combined judgment of a majority of the Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate, the majority of the Republicans in the U.S. Senate and the House, I happen to think that combined judgment is maybe just a little bit better than the judgment of the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party. [Applause.]

And so today, my friends, today your America moves forward; today the people of this country are better off than they have been for years, they are happier, their youngsters are receiving a better education, they are living better, they are eating better, they are housed better, and everybody knows it except one man.

One man somewhow or another he can't seem to see it. He feels that things are bad. He feels that the prosperity is an illusion. He feels that the people somehow or another have lost their moral fiber and their will to live. I have never seen healthier looking people in my life than I see here this afternnoon. [Applause.]

And ladies and gentlemen, not only has this administration of this President sought to work for the prosperity and for the economic development of this country, not only has he sought to work for the betterment of our people, but he has sought to work for our security, our strength, and the peace of the world.

And when you get right down to it, my fellow Americans, everything else fades into insignificance. We have today one candidate that has instant answers for every problem, instant solutions. The trouble with instant solutions in international affairs is it results in instant annihilation and we are not going to have that.

You need a man as President of this country, someone that has worked such great creative programs as the Peace Corps. What did the man from Arizona call the Peace Corps, which has done this country more good abroad than anything that we have ever initiated, he called it a haven for beatniks. This was his description of it.

We have established a great food-for-peace program where from the farms of Missouri and Minnesota and elsewhere the abundance of our fields, the abundance of our great family farm establishments, has been used to feed the hungry, has been used to open up new markets, has been used to create commercial exports, has been used for economic development.

American food has saved lives: American food has demonstrated to the world that America's free enterprise system, America's free agriculture, America's family farm is the miracle of the world.

And the Communist system is the failure of the world and American agriculture has proved it. [Applause.]

The Peace Corps, "Mr. Arizona" says "No." Food for peace, "No." The Arms Control Agency, "No." The great research programs in international health, "No." Yet while all of these noes were being

given by one or two men, the vast majority of the American people, Republicans and Democrats alike, supported these efforts, and today, my friends, the admonition of John Kennedy is being kept.

He said, "We will build our strength, we will never be afraid to negotiate but we will never negotiate from fear." And we today conduct our diplomacy not by ultimatums but we conduct it, if you please, from a position of strength the likes of which this world has never known, and America today is stronger than ever before in its history and everybody knows it save one. [Applause.]

And surely the people of Missouri ought to know it. This State produces—is the third largest State in defense production.

America today has the power not only greater than it has ever had before but greater than all of its adversaries put together. And yet I hear from the opposition that we are weak. What nonsense is this? What colossal nonsense and deception is this?

The Senator from this State, Stuart Symington, former Secretary of the Air Force, can testify to you if you want it from anyone else but this Senator, that America today is the mightiest nation that God ever knew or that any people ever created. [Applause.]

But the opposition tells the Kremlin, tells you we are weak, we are losing our strength, we are losing our will. Ah, my friends, there was a time when there could be some reasonable slowdown in the arms race, when this great massive nuclear power might be brought under some control.

A President with 100 other nations negotiated a nuclear test ban treaty to slow down the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, to prevent our atmosphere from being polluted, to prevent the milk that children drink from being adulterated from strontium, to prevent the soil from being contaminated, to prevent yet unborn generations from being affected by radioactive debris and radioactive destruction.

The vast majority of the U.S. Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, men of wisdom, men of prudence, Conservatives, Liberals, Democrats, Republicans, they listened to the testimony, they examined into the issue with meticulous care, and they placed their faith after careful examination in a treaty that would halt or slow down this nuclear arms race, and would prevent this air of ours from being destroyed and being polluted by radioactive debris.

Everyone with few exceptions overwhelmingly, three-fourths of the Members of the Senate, voted for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, voted for the future, voted for peace, voted for reason, voted for some semblance of hope, but not the Senator from Arizona.

No, he voted "No," and this is why I now say to you, that it is an amazing thing, is it not, that everybody else can be so wrong. It is an amazing thing, is it not, that when we come to meetings like this the only evidence that anybody presents and the only charge is they put up signs "Pinko," "Socialism," all that unadulterated hogwash. [Applause.]

Let me say this—let me say this, to my fellow Americans. If the radicals of the Goldwater right want to advocate socialism that is their business. I am for America and its free enterprise system. [Applause.]

And if in their frustration they turn a little pink or a little red, I want to say that I am for the red, white, and blue of America. [Applause.]

And finally, may I say, there isn't a shadow of a doubt what is going to happen. In their hearts they known Lyndon Johnson is going to be President of the United States. [Laughter.]

So, my dear friends, I think the choice is quite obvious between a man who is responsible and one who is irresponsible; between a man who has strength and firmness as compared to one who is impetuous and rash.

I think the American people are going to make that choice and I think they see in President Lyndon Johnson a man of calm temperament, a man of reason, a man of strength, a man of tolerance, a man who seeks to unite America, not divide it, a man who seeks to heal our wounds, not to scarify them, a man, if you please, who seeks to build a peaceful world through negotiation, through understanding, through economic progress, and through social betterment, and not one who seeks to obliterate it by miscalculation.

I happen to believe that Lyndon B. Johnson has come to us at a crucial time in our history, when we have needed a man that is firm and resolute without being arrogant and belligerent, when we have needed a man who has preached national unity, when we needed a nation that could stand together and I ask the people of Missouri, I ask the people of St. Louis, I ask you to give this man your help.

You can trust Lyndon Johnson, and if you place your trust in him, I submit to you that the commitments of this administration will be kept, and America will not only be a better place in which to live now, but it will have a great and wonderful future.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Columbus, Ohio
City Hall
October 6, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Thank you—thank you very much. Thank you.

My very warm greetings to the gentleman that we hope that you will elect to the Congress of the United States, your own Bob Van Heyde. Bob, we want to wish you the best.

I simply can't tell you how delighted I am to be here in Columbus, Ohio, in a year when the University of Minnesota does not play Ohio State. [Applause.]

I just came out of Nebraska, and they really put it to me down there after that rugged day that Minnesota and Nebraska had where Minnesota came out on the short end. I told them that evened it up. That Minnesota, the man from Minnesota, had taken his licking 2 weeks ago and now it was time for the man from Arizona to take his licking.

Mr. Mayor, I am just delighted to be in this great all-American city of Columbus. It is a remarkable city. It is a growing city, it is a progressive city, and I have a feeling that in 1964 it is going to a Democratic city. [Applause.]

May I say that in all of my travels, and there have been many miles that we have traveled, that I haven't found more cordial, more kindly people and I want to make it clear from this platform that when I was mingling amongst some of the folks here I had the privilege of shaking hands with some of those who carry signs that are not on our side.

But I want them to know that they were gracious, they were kind, in fact, they had such a smile on their face that deep down in their heart I think they are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Well, I can see that Ohio loves its politics and I have a feeling that you fight hard here but you fight clean and that is a very wonderful, refreshing experience from all of our many competitive activities.

May I just for a moment tell you how much I hope and pray that the State of Ohio will see fit to send back to Washington to the U.S. Senate, a gentleman that has a record of constant service to the people. I have heard many charges that have been leveled at some of us, some of us are accused of this or accused of that, and we have people that make rather tough remarks about us. But the only charge that I have against your U.S. Senator Steve Young is that he is soft on people. He just loves people. [Applause.]

And I have known of no one that is more willing to stand up and be counted, more willing to show his colors, more willing to work for the people, and to work for them day in and day out than the U.S. Senator from the great State of Ohio, Stephen Young, and he deserves your support and reelection. [Applause.]

Plus the fact, may I add that you might just as well have a Democrat serving you in the U.S. Senate in this election because you are going to have a Democrat in the White House and he will know how to get in. [Applause.]

I see many friends here. I surely want to say to Bob Sweeney once again what a joy it is to be with him. I have been in Ohio several times and every time that I come here is this fine good-looking, smiling, optimistic, and very able man to meet me, and I hope that when you come to that ballot box on November 3, that you are not going to forget a man that is running at large in your State and you are going to send him down there to represent all of Ohio in the House of Representatives, and that is your own Bob Sweeney. [Applause.]

Now, there are many Members of Congress here, and I can't go down the whole list. The only thing I can tell you is as my father said to me one time when I was casting my first vote, I said, "Dad, I am a little worried about this person or that person. What do you think I ought to do?"

He said, "Son, there is a rule of thumb that a young man ought to follow. Whenever in doubt vote Democratic." [Applause.]

So, I hope that if any of you have any doubts at all, that you will vote Democratic and that you will give our President the support which he is going to need for his program.

Well, I can see that Franklin County is doing right well. I understand that you had a tremendously successful registration drive, and once you have gotten the people registered, then the next thing to do is to make sure that they are voters. And I have been noticing as I have come down your streets and see this warm reception, I have noticed that the people here take their politics seriously, and I will make a prediction, Mr. Mayor. I will predict that in the election of 1964 you will have a higher percentage of the people of this city going to the ballot box than ever before, and I will also predict that a majority of that high percentage will vote for Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

I see here on the platform my old friend Mike DiSalle and I see here Frank King of the AFL–CIO. I see others [applause] and I surely want you to know that it is sort of like old home week to come back to you.

Today I want to talk some good politics to you. I want to talk to you about the importance of our Government, the cooperation that is needed in government from the White House to the courthouse and from the courthouse to the White House, because government in the United States, dear friends, is not just in Washington, it is in your statehouse, it is in your courthouse, it is at your township, it is in your cities, it is in your villages and one of the things we need to keep in mind is the importance of all of these great areas of government working together, pulling together, not pulling apart, and one of the lessons that Lyndon Johnson teaches the American people is the lesson of a united America, a lesson of an America that is cooperative, a lesson of an America that is working together, and that doesn't only mean the governmental structure of working together.

It doesn't only mean Washington, statehouse, and courthouse pulling together, but it means capital and labor, it means people of every race and creed and color, it means people of every walk of life, it means farmer and city; it means all of us, acting as Americans, and recognizing that we have great responsibilities in this world, and great opportunities in our wonderful country.

And I want to talk to you a little bit about these opportunities, and those responsibilities.

I know that in a campaign the easiest way to get a cheer is just to attack the opposition. Tonight, as you have come here to listen to me, let me tell you a little bit about why I think that we owe the Democratic Party, the Johnson-Humphrey team and the Democratic Party, why we have a right to come to you to ask for your support.

You surely don't need to support us simply because of a party label, even though many people vote a straight party label.

I think more importantly that we ought to support or reject a candidate or candidates on the basis of their record, on the basis not only of their words, but on the basis of their deeds, on the basis of their performance.

Can I take you back just a little while? I am not going to take you back as far as the temporary spokesman of the opposition, he goes back too far. [Applause.]

By the way, may I say to these fine students of Ohio State and of Capital University, and of St. Mary's of the Springs, let me say, that it is wonderful—yes, of course, not merely but a good receptive, I can hear—it is a wonderful thing for all of you fine young people to study ancient history, and I want you to study your courses well. But don't you ever vote it. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, let me, therefore, talk to you of our record, because you have just now come to a point in the political year of 1964 where you can take inventory of that record. The 88th Congress, the 2d session, has completed its work. The 87th Congress was the first Congress of the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

On January 20, 1961, a brave, courageous, intelligent, gifted young man, stood before a multitude in Washington, D.C., on a cold day, and he said to the American people on that day, he said, "Let us begin. Let's get this great America of ours moving once again."

He then said to us in those words that we shall never forget but we can only paraphrase them, he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you but ask what you can do for your country."

He gave us this message of service, he gave us this message of doing our part as citizens, and then he looked at the whole of America through the television and the radio and the press as he glanced out over the multitude of people before him, and he said, "I welcome this responsibility."

He didn't shirk from it. He said, "Here are responsibilities to be performed and I welcome them."

And may I say that the first quality of a man that is worthy of public trust is whether or not he is a responsible man, whether he speaks responsibly, whether he acts responsibly, whether he thinks responsibly, and if there is any one word that is the hallmark of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, that will complete its work this coming January, if there is any one word that symbolizes this administration, that characterizes it, it is the word "responsibility."

We have been a responsible administration. [Applause.]

Our late and beloved Persident had only 1,000 days to give his service to his country in the Presidency. He had given a lifetime of service in Congress, in the Senate, in the war. He was a great man, and he left a message for us that will live forever, and that message was the message of hope. Here was a man that charted the course of the future. He wasn't willing to just praise the achievements of the day. He always looked ahead, and he was the man that looked ahead even in the moment of his nomination, because as he was nominated in Los Angeles, in 1960, this man looked ahead to the good of his country, and he selected as his running mate, and as his Vice President, one that he knew that if ever the hour came, if ever the time arrived, if ever tragedy should befall him that that man that he selected as Vice President could hold high the torch of American freedom, and could fulfill the responsibilities of the Chief Executive of this land, and I personally think that the greatest decision that John Kennedy ever made for America was the decision that he made to select and ask the convention to give to him Lyndon Johnson as the Vice President of the United States. [Applause.]

And how well history bears out that statement. That terrible ugly day of November 22 in Dallas when our President—young, gay, at the zenith of his administration, at the climax of his first term—was struck down by the assassin's bullet. Then the whole world faltered. Nations wept. But then out of all of this grief and pain stepped a strong man, and there was a continuity of government.

Many a person right in this audience wondered what would happen. Would America be able to carry on? We wondered what would happen in our country, in our programs, what would happen in the world, because every nation of the world at that moment recognized the tremendous role that the United States fulfills.

It is a matter now of historical record that even behind the Iron Curtain hundreds of thousands of people walked into American Embassies and signed their names in a book in memoriam expressing from their hearts their love of America. The totalitarian, the Communist, couldn't keep down that expression of love, and that expression of faith. And I ask Americans tonight to remember that this Nation has the faith of the world and it has in its hands the destiny of the world.

If there is a better world it is because we helped make it. If there is so be a world that is incinerated, a world that may be annihilated, it could be because of some rash decision here or there. Our tasks are monumental. Our responsibilities are unbelievable.

Now, what do we do about this? How do we fulfill these responsibilities? Well, one way is to make America strong not just by military power, even though we have today the mightiest military machine that the world has ever known, and right here in Columbus, you know of it with your defense plants, with your Army depots, with all of the many facets of your industry that contribute to our military power.

But no nation has been great only because of its military power. It takes more that that. We don't want America to be a Sparta. We want America to be an Athens, a strong nation, a rich nation, an enlightened nation. [Applause.]

So, we build the strength of our Nation. How do we build its strength? We built it as John Kennedy said, by beginning to do things for people. A government that is worthy of the respect of the people is a government that serves the people, and I think maybe we ought to get that simple lesson driven home once again because there are voices today that would make you believe that when government does something that it is wrong, that the government shouldn't do anything.

There are even voices today that say that the Federal Government is a greater threat to your freedom than communism. What nonsense, what unbelievable nonsense. [Applause.]

It was Abraham Lincoln—it was Abraham Lincoln, the authentic Republican, the real Republican who said "this is a Government of the people, and by the people, and for the people." It was Lincoln who said that it is the duty of government to do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves, or do so well for themselves. That was Lincoln. [Applause.]

And there have been hundreds of people in the great history of our Nation that have reminded us that in a democracy a government has as its duty first to serve the people, and to serve those people justly, to serve them fairly.

So, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson, President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, launched a tremendous program of trying to revitalize the whole American economy and that program included such things, for example, as training our workers who had been left aside by automation, retraining. Minimum wages for those that were not covered. It included area redevelopment for some of the distressed areas of our country. It included public works for areas that needed civic improvement and jobs, and it included tax cuts to stimulate the American economy.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration put faith in the American enterprise system, put faith in the free enterprise structure of this country, and by a great tax cut [applause] by a massive tax cut of $11½ billion injected back into that economy free capital to be used for the consumer, for the investor, for the producer, and, ladies and gentlemen, in 1960 the economy was stagnant.

In 1964 this economy is bubbling with power and vitality and today we have unprecedented prosperity. [Applause.]

I heard the other day that the opposition accused us of having business on our side, and labor on our side, farmers on our side, they said the minority groups were on our side. I said, "Well, that is good, that adds up to a victory." [Laughter and applause.]

Why do you think—pay no attention to that extreme right over there. [Applause.]

You know, friends, even on the best of programs there is occasionally a little static. You can tune it out. [Applause.]

Why do you think that many of the great industrialists of America are supporting the Johnson administration? They are supporting it because they know this administration has been good for business. Why do you think that great newspapers like you own press in the great State of Ohio [cries of "Not all"].

Not all—not all—but when I was in Cleveland I found those two great newspapers in Cleveland [applause] why do you think—for example—why do you think that a paper that never before has ever supported a Democratic candidate like the New York Herald Tribune, the Life magazine, the Saturday Evening Post, support Lyndon Johnson? [Applause.]

Let me tell you why they support him. They support this administration because this administration seeks to encourage the American economy, not to hold it back, but to offer the opportunity to move ahead. No harrassments, but the encouragement of enterprise.

Why do our workers that are represented here today by the president of the AFL–CIO, why have they joined in this great struggle for the reelection—or for the election of Lyndon Johnson? They have joined in it, my friends, because this economy and this Government has done well by the workingman.

The standard of living in this country is better today than it has ever been before. [Applause.]

Now, friends, my dear friends, I have mentioned to you certain programs we have sponsored and passed, and I am happy to say that most Members of Congress, even Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for these programs—the tax cut, public works, area redevelopment, minimum wage, manpower training, a host of activities, all backed and passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

But one man, one man stood aside, not Senator Goldwater, he voted "No." [Applause.]

And, my friends, now let's talk about one other area of our endeavors. The strength of this Nation is not in its factories, it is not in its banks, it is not in its checking accounts. Ultimately, the strength of this Nation is in its people, because it is from the people, the great human resource, that we truly gain our wealth and our strength, and it is the strength that we need for our responsibilities, and this administration has been conscious of the needs of the people.

If nothing else was done, my dear friends, in millions of families in this country there is affliction, affliction, sometimes it is mental problems, mental retardation, sometimes it is disease of the heart, or cancer, and in each and every one of these areas, this administration has seen fit to take action.

I will say that this administration will go down in the history books as, known as, the health administration. We have expanded our hospital program. We established a mental retardation program. We established a mental health program, we established—we have moved into one area after another for people, to help people. [Applause.]

And let me clear the record. Compassion, my fellow Americans, plain old-fashioned compassion, is not weakness, and concern for the afflicted and the needy is not socialism. It is good solid Americanism. [Applause.]

And your Government and this administration has not stopped with just the care for the needy. We have moved on to the frontiers of education, and the broadest program of aid to education that America has known since the time of the land-grant college has been enacted by this Government, and the 88th Congress under the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson—this is an investment in our future. [Applause.]

This is an investment in our future.

Every thoughtful person in this great community knows that in the next 30 to 35 years we will have to build more college classroom space than we have constructed in the last 300. Every person here knows if he will but think ahead that we must have trained minds, trained people—that education is becoming a national necessity, no longer a luxury, and we need to pour in the wealth of America to train our people, to train them for their tasks, to train them for the good life, to train them for the skills, to train them in science and technology, and this administration has had the foresight to lay the groundwork for a tremendous program of educational investment that will enrich and strengthen America. [Applause.]

And then may I say with considerable pride not as a Democrat but as an American, because both parties worked on this one, the American people through their two political parties in Congress decided to end for once and for all this shame of discrimination, the shame of the denial of equal rights and equal opportunity, and together as a great people and as one government we saw to it that we passed an act that guaranteed constitutional rights, civil rights, first-class citizenship to every American regardless of race, color, or creed. [Applause.]

And, ladies and gentlemen—and, ladies and gentlemen, America is the better for it. [Applause.]

This great America of ours that seeks to lead a world in peace and freedom must come to the world with clean hands and, ladies and gentlemen, we have tried. We are working at that, coming to the world not only with clean hands but coming to the world with a promise for the future and we are going to carry that promise for the future not only to our own people here at home but we are going to carry it to people everywhere, and I conclude my notes with you this evening and my message to you by saying this—I am fully aware of it, my friends—I conclude my message to you tonight by saying that with all of these things that we have sought to do, that the ultimate purpose is to make sure that we live, and that we live a good life, and that we live in freedom, and that we live in peace.

What good is it, what good, my friends, is it to build magnificent cities and great universities, what good is it to have extended the hand of compassion and of help if in some act of foolishness or some act of irresponsibility we trigger a nuclear holocaust?

The simple truth is that America today must have at its helm a President that is strong, that is understanding, a President that knows not only the country in which we live, but knows the world in which we live, and ladies and gentlemen, it is not weakness to seek a just and honorable peace. Only the giants of the earth have the courage to seek peace. [Applause.]

And our great country today is a giant on this earth. Only the brave and the strong can talk with humility and with kindness. It is the weak and it is those who are so uncertain of themselves that are the belligerent and the arrogant. [Applause.]

I am proud to be a U.S. Senator, proud to be a Member of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress at a time when our America saw fit to take the lead to keep our air clean from nuclear radioactive contamination. I am proud to have served in the Senate. [Applause.]

I am proud to have served in the U.S. Senate at a time when I could vote for a treaty that at least represented the hope of mankind for a better world, and ladies and gentlemen, I say to you that a man that seeks to be President of the United States, that could not find it within his conscience to vote for human rights, that could not find it within his conscience to vote to help future generations live at least a better life, to see that our air was free of pollution, to see that our food was not contaminated, to see that our soil was not adulterated, I say that a man that cannot see the opportunities for you through education, that cannot see the opportunities for people through equal rights, that cannot hope and pray and work for peace through treaties and negotiation, that that man does not deserve to be President of the United States. [Applause.]

I ask, and I ask of this audience tonight, I ask of this audience tonight what John Kennedy asked, what Lyndon Johnson has asked, I ask for your hands, I ask for your hearts, I ask for your help and, frankly, I come to you and ask you for your vote for Lyndon Johnson for President of the United States. [Applause.]

Toledo, Ohio
Airport Rally
October 6, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Boy, oh, boy—all right—all right——all right. Which one of these works?

Well, my dear friends, may I say first of all, that— is this the one, that works better—OK.

May I say first of all that I have made more speeches today than my good friend Tom Ashley and he can talk louder than I can.

I have been out trying to explain to the American people why they shouldn't elect that man from Arizona. [Applause.]

Yesterday, I was speaking to an audience of about 12,000 students out at the University of California at Berkeley, and I told them that I, as an old teacher, felt that it was a good idea to study ancient history but you ought not to vote it [Laughter and applause.] And so I would like to give you the same advice tonight. Don't you vote it at all.

HE – LINO – 290

Dear friends, let me tell you that of all the many nice things that have happened to me in this campaign, I don't think anything has been more exhilerating to me, more encouraging, and frankly more fun than the fact of your presence here tonight at this great community of Toledo, and I want to thank you all very, very much.

I should tell you that as I have traveled around this country, I found an awful lot of young people that are interested in our campaign, and believe me we need your help, and we need it badly and I know you are going to give it to us.

You know there was a time that GOP stood for Grand Old Party. Now, it is "Goldwater is our problem." [Applause.]

Let me tell you, I want to and I am very grateful that I have you here tonight and may I assure you of one thing, we are going to try to conduct this campaign in these remaining 4 weeks so that you will be proud of us so when we have won this victory you will know that it is not my victory or President Johnson's victory.

You will know that it is your victory. And I can promise you one thing, that you will never regret the efforts that you are putting in to help us, because there is one reason that I am in politics above all others, and that is to try to keep our country a young country, a vital country, a country that works for future, one that has really just constant new experiences.

I have said to many students that we are in the age of discovery, and we are. We have just begun to live and don't let anybody ever tell you about those so-called good old days.

I lived through a lot of the good old days. They weren't half as good as the one I am experiencing today, I can tell you now.

I will tell you one other thing, that when I was a college student, there were never as many young people interested in the political life of our Nation as there are today, and I think that the finest group of young people that we have ever had in our lives exists right now, and very frankly, if they would just quit looking at the calendar I could be as young as you are because that is the way I feel. [Applause.]

Now listen, we have got to go over to Toledo University, we are going to have a little meeting over there, and I plan to be telling you a little something about these other folk, you know, that are attempting to get into office.

I don't know whether you have seen it or not but the Republicans have got a crowd going around that they call the truth squad. Now, that is a play on words, of course, you know that. And for that crew to be in charge of truth is like putting a fox in charge of the chicken coop.

So, we are going to tonight not only talk about the opposition, because I don't believe we need to do too much of that, what I want to talk about, what I want to talk about is what we have been doing, what our country has been doing, what President Kennedy tried to have us do and started us to do, and what President Johnson is continuing to do, and then what President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and you are going to do in the years ahead, that is what we are going to talk about.

All right—OK. I know you have been here a long time and I am glad you are all steamed up now and all warmed up, just keep on a full head of steam, folks, until November 3 and after that you can relax.

Goodnight.

Toledo, Ohio
For release October 6, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Have you ever noticed the air of catastrophe which hangs over the Goldwater campaign like the mist on a Minnesota lake on a chilly fall morning? They have every reason to expect catastrophe from the American people on November 3, but must they impose their personal doom and gloom on all the rest of us?

The other night in Cincinnati, for example, the Senator cranked up his crossbow and let fly with a borrowed bolt. This administration, he said expectantly, is "soft on communism." His audience, wel-

coming an old familiar cliche—and perhaps preferring it to Goldwater's home-grown variety—whooped and hollered.

The next day, talking to the newspapermen, the Senator announced that Richard Nixon had suggested this line of attack. Can anyone imagine a better qualified authority on how to win an election?

Now Mr. Nixon say he didn't suggest this approach to the leader of Goldwaterites. Perhaps an exchange of airmail letters will help clarify the situation.

Then, the leader of the Goldwater faction continued, and I quote, "We're going to see what the reaction is before we push it." This is worth repeating. "We're going to see what the reaction is before we push it," before we push the "soft on communism" line, that is. Have you ever heard anything quite so cynical, so outrageous? The Goldwaterites have repudiated eastern capitalists, but somehow they must have picked up a Madison Avenue man. So, in the language of the advertising business, they are going to run this flag up the mast and see who salutes.

But the worst part of the whole affair is the attitude that it reveals toward the American voter. The Goldwaterites are not concerned with the truth of the statement, but with its appeal. If the reaction to the "soft on communism" toothpaste is bad, they will pull it off the market and try another package.

Senator Goldwater thinks he has found a real issue in my middle name. But I have been handling that old chestnut since I was 5 years old. In the spirit of charity, however, I must warn him: The hidden middle-name vote—all those youngsters blessed by loving parents with a middle name they choose to convert to an initial—may rise against him. He should beware of midlash.

In an effort to clear up some of the chaos and confusion surrounding the public statements of Senator Goldwater, I asked him 10 days ago to explain the meaning of some of his ominous statements.

I asked him for example, to clarify his remark to a German correspondent that he—Goldwater—would employ brinkmanship, and I quote exactly, "just as your country"—that is, Imperial and Nazi Germany—"has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so, very, very successfully."

I asked him if he thought Imperial and Nazi Germany provide us with a good model for the conduct of American foreign policy, Imperial and Nazi Germany which twice in this century took the world over the brink.

I asked him if he did not think that Imperial and Nazi Germany provided perfect examples of "shooting from the hip," deeply tragic examples of recklessness and irresponsibility.

The closest he came to a reply was to compare President Johnson with Hitler and Mussolini.

Tonight I would like to ask him to clarify another of his remarks. On August 25, Senator Goldwater told the Veterans of Foreign Wars that tactical nuclear weapons were just oversized hand grenades and should be considered "conventional."

Let me quote him exactly:

> These small conventional nuclear weapons are no more powerful than the firepower you have faced on the battlefield. They simply come in a smaller package.

How, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee who has received full briefing on tactical nuclear weapons, can the Senator possibly talk about these fearful instruments of destruction as "conventional"?

The facts are these:

Just one average-size tactical nuclear bomb in Europe has greater explosive power than all the bombs the U.S. Army Air Force dropped on Germany during the month of our heaviest air assault in World War II. And 12 average-sized tactical nuclear bombs would approximate all the explosive power of all the conventional bombs the United States dropped on Germany and Japan during World War II. Fifteen such tactical nuclear bombs would exceed all the bombs, conventional and atomic, we used in World War II.

HE – LINO – 292

On March 18, 1945, the U.S. Army Air Force conducted one of the largest daylight air attacks of World War II: 1,250 of our heavy bombers dropped over 3,000 tons of bombs on Berlin. These bombs contained about 1,600 tons of explosives.

Nearly every one of our tactical nuclear weapons has many times the explosive power of all the bombs dropped by all our heavy bombers on that memorable raid.

The nuclear firepower available to a single American infantry division today has over 100 times the destructive force of all our bombs dropped by all our heavy bombers in that Berlin raid and, indeed, exceeds the explosive power of all the conventional bombs the United States dropped on Japan during World War II.

I am here tonight to tell you that there is nothing conventional about any nuclear weapon, that the world entered a new era at Los Alamos in 1945, an area fraught with greater peril than any mankind has known before. We certainly cannot deal responsibly with the crisis of our time if we deny that they exist, if we argue that a tactical weapon is just a bazooka with a bigger bang.

A friend in San Francisco the other day told me that the Chinese symbol for crisis also means opportunity. In this sense, the awesome peril to our civilization created by nuclear weapons can be converted into opportunity for the establishment of lasting peace.

But this can only be done by responsible leaders, by men like John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, who know that we are walking down an uncharted road into the future; who recognize the appalling responsibility that rests upon the shoulders of the President of the United States—responsibility not only to the American people but to all mankind. For the first time in history it is possible for one man to destroy the past, the present, and the future—literally to bring time to an end.

I ask you to support Lyndon B. Johnson—a courageous, experienced, responsible President who has earned the right to your trust.

Toledo, Ohio
University of Toledo
October 6, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Thank you very much—thank you. Thank you—thank you.

Well, my dear friends, my goodness me, if the Senator from Arizona could hear what I have heard tonight he would fold up his tent and give up the campaign right now. [Applause.]

And my dear friends, down deep in his heart he may vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Congressman Ashley, president of this great university, Mr. Carlson, and many students who have come here not only from Toledo University but many universities throughout Ohio, I greet you.

What foolish columnist was it who said that the young people were going to back that man from Arizona? Never, never. [Applause.]

I have a feeling—I have a feeling that the young people of America are going to back Lyndon B. Johnson, Linda Johnson, and Luci. [Applause.]

I have a feeling that we are going to have quite a meeting tonight. It appears to me it may have some pep to it. [Applause.]

So, let me get on now, if I may have your attention. First, I want to extend my thanks to John Kelly, the county chairman, to Ned Skeldon, our campaign director, and I surely want to bring to this wonderful audience of the good people of Ohio, most of you, many of you from the Toledo area, but many from other parts, I want to bring to you the warm greetings, the good wishes of a gentleman that I have known in the U.S. Senate and a man who by his votes and by his actions lives up to his name. He votes young and his name is Steve Young and he ought to be reelected. [Applause.]

And while you are about it—while you are about electing a U.S. Senator to back the President may I suggest since you have a Congressman at Large contest in this State, that there is a fine young man by the name of Bob Sweeney that deserves the support of the people of this great State. [Applause.]

Congressman Ashley, if all of these people in this great auditorium and this fine university hall are your friends and your constituents, it seems to me that you have the election won, and I think it is a good idea to reelect Congressman Ashley. [Applause.]

Well, there ought to be something to a campaign except just the heat and the commotion so I think that for a moment or two we will settle down and see if we can't bring some light and some understanding to it.

This is my second visit to Toledo in the last few months. My first visit was to a Democratic dinner, at which I found great enthusiasm for the Democratic Party and for the programs of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and I am here tonight as a Democrat without prefix or suffix and without apology.

I am here tonight as a Democratic leader to support the programs of the late and beloved President Kennedy and our now President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Our opposition—our opposition says to us what does this Democratic Party stand for? This Democratic Party stands for the commitments and the promises and the inaugural message and the policies and the programs that were set down in this country from the date of January 20, 1961, to this very hour. [Applause.]

And may I add—and may I add, that we are not content—we are not content, to just base our cause upon the most amazing record of accomplishment that any two Congresses have had within a hundred years. We base our program and our plea to the American voter not content, to just base our cause upon the most amazing record of upon the pledges and the promises for the future, which is what the young people of America want from a political party. [Applause.]

The simple truth is that in this election we are faced with a real choice; a choice of a man who would like to direct the destinies of this country by looking through a rearview mirror or one who looks straight ahead down the road of progress. [Applause.]

And we are also given a choice—we are given a choice as to whether or not we want to vote for a man who is known by his deeds or whether we want to vote for a man who is known by his misdeeds, and I intend to talk about them tonight. [Applause.]

Now, a man in public or private life is known by his deeds as well as his words, and a man in public life is also known by his record, by the votes that he has cast or failed to cast, by the legislation that he has sponsored or worked for or worked against, and by the administrative decisions that he has taken.

In other words, by the public positions that he has held over the years and I would say to every conscientious voter in this land, that the best way to find out who you ought to support on November 3 is to examine the record not merely the speeches, but to examine the record, of the Senator from Arizona and to examine the record of the President of the United States and you will vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

I am sure that after having examined that record you will come to the same conclusion that some of the leading newspapers of America have arrived at, some of the leading Republicans of America have concluded, you will come to a decision that the man who today is our President is truly a gifted, talented, experienced, able, steady, stable political leader for a great country and we ought to keep him. [Applause.]

Never in the history of our Nation, indeed, my friends, in the history of the world, have so many people shared in such general and rising prosperity, and it was not always so.

Four years ago here in this great State of Ohio there was trouble in the economy. The men and women who are here from the ranks of labor know that 4 years ago in the State of Ohio there was a rising tide of unemployment, and that business was at a standstill.

But following those great decisions of, starting with January 1961, the American economy has been propelled forward until today no one can contest the fact that this great America of ours is enjoying the greatest prosperity and the highest rate of employment, the highest profits, the highest dividends, ever in the history of this Republic. [Applause.]

I respectfully submit that a wise and prudent people do not cast such a record aside.

Never in the history of our country, in fact, never in the history of the world, have we ever enjoyed such unbelievable opportunity as now this great people of ours experiences and enjoys.

Never in the history of our country has there been greater business confidence, more jobs and larger paychecks.

Never in the history of the world has the Nation been so strong militarily as this great country of ours.

And never has there been a greater concern on the part of the leaders of our Government on the part of our leaders in Government, for the plight of the poor, for the needs of the senior citizens, the elderly, and for the care and the concern of the handicapped.

This is a record of performance by an administration that gets things done. [Applause.]

But, you know the temporary spokesman of the fraction of a faction of the Republican Party [laughter] that spokesman says, this is all an illusion. It is all fake. It is all just make believe.

Well, my dear friends, don't be too harsh in your criticism because when you hear from a man who has no months on his calendar, no hands on his watch, and no lenses in his glasses you can't expect much. [Laughter.]

More seriously, this kind of talk, this utter political and economic nonsense, that America is somehow or another on the skids, and that the prosperity that we are enjoying is nothing but an illusion, this talk about fake prosperity is the talk of a man who has no program, who has no knowledge of the economy and has no understanding of what is happening in America. [Applause.]

And then we hear, we hear talk of the weakening of our defenses. May I add that nobody else in the world seems to think our defenses are weak. It is an amazing thing how one out of millions could have made the discovery all by himself that somehow or another that as a reserve general he has discovered that America's defenses are weak and weakening. Nonsense. [Applause.]

The truth is, my fellow Americans, the truth is that the United States of America, our country, is a great, powerful, rich country with responsible, resourceful, and experienced leadership, and I am of the opinion that the American people will not choose to replace this kind of strong and trusted leadership with a man who would radically change everything that we tried to build through these many years. [Applause.]

I cannot believe that the people of America will turn their backs on a wise and trusted President. I do not believe that they will choose a man who represents only uncertainty and impetuosity. The American people will not elect a man whose public record demonstrates a lack of concern for the American businessman, for the workingman, for the farmer, for the elderly, and for the young people of our country and indeed for the parents of America. [Applause.]

Now my fellow citizens, in this campaign we will bring and are bringing to the American people the record, the record, the accomplished record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. We offer a record of economic development and progress upon which we can stand, and a record, may I say, that has already received the overwhelming support of the captains of industry and finance in America because they know that record is true and good, and so do you. [Applause.]

We come to the American people with a record of strengthening our national security, a record of strength for one purpose, not the purpose of aggression, not the purpose of bluster and threat, but the purpose of building and pursuing the path of peace and that is what your President is doing. [Applause.]

I come to you tonight, I came to this audience tonight, to remind you once again that this expanding society of ours can be maintained and improved only under a President who is both a capable administrator and a great educator; under a President in whom the business community can find and have confidence, in which labor and farmers can have confidence and place their trust; under a President where the mothers and fathers of America can place their trust, and under a President who has the respect of the leaders throughout the world

and throughout the Nation. That is the way you build a better America for tomorrow. [Applause.]

And such a President, such a President, is in the White House today, and tonight, such a President is the man that succeeded our late and beloved President Kennedy and his name is Lyndon Johnson and he will be our President for 4 more years. [Applause.]

America and the world need a man in the Presidency who means what he says when he says it, and says what he means when he says it, and you have such a man. [Applause.]

In the coming weeks, in the coming weeks we shall make it crystal clear what responsible leadership has meant to our country, and how irresponsible leadership could wreck all that we have created. We are going to demonstrate and we are demonstrating beyond a shadow of a doubt that President Johnson's record and the record of the leadership of the Congress is one in which all Americans, Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike can and should take pride.

It is the kind of a record that a world power requires, that a great nation to remain great must continue, and the way you continue it is to elect for a full 4-year term the President of the United States and a Congress to back him. [Applause.]

Every one of us knows that the problems of America and of the world are still vast, but the difference between a forward-looking leader and one who has his vision in the past is that the difficulties turn into being challenges, and the problems turn into being opportunities.

Yes, our problems are vast, but they inspire us to greater things, and the opportunities in America are unlimited, and they are challenging and they are exciting and they are made for a country that is young at heart, vital in spirit, and that has confidence and faith in its destiny and future, and I think that kind of a country needs a big man in the Presidency and one that loves this country enough to lead it forward and not backward. [Applause.]

To put it another way, America needs as a President someone that units us, not divides us. America needs as its President someone that heals the wounds and not opens them. America needs as its President someone that thinks in terms of the total America, not just a section of it. America needs as a President a man who is optimistic, confident, prudent, but also who is strong and willful so that this great Nation can fulfill its destiny, and that man's name is Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States. [Applause.]

The fundamental objective of the Johnson administration, might I add, the Johnson-Humphrey administration, that the objective of that administration [applause] will be to harness together all the great intellectual and economic resources of our Nation, our objective will be to call forth from every walk of life men and women who can work together, and who are pledged to the greater good and the general welfare. We know where those people are, and we shall call upon them, and I say that despite the great accomplishments of today, that what we have done thus far will only be a beginning. It will be but a launching platform for America to achieve even greater goals.

With Senator Goldwater, the leader of the opposition, what does he have to offer? A cold and perilous alternative. He offers you by his own words a house divided against itself, a Nation ridden by bitterness, uncertainty, and controversy.

I don't believe that is what America wants. I believe that America wants a country that can literally reach up to the stars. I believe that this Nation believed with John Kennedy that there were new frontiers to be discovered and conquered, and I believe [applause] and I believe that the people of America agree with President Johnson when he said, when asked what was the objective of his administration, he said, "My purpose and my only purpose is to seek a better deal for America, a better deal for the world."

A better deal in education for the young, a better deal in welfare and care for our crippled and handicapped, a better deal for our elderly, and a better opportunity for our business and our labor, a better chance for everybody that is willing to take a chance and work to help build America—that is the promise of your President. [Applause.]

Let me now just address myself for a moment to the young in this audience in particular. A young man was President of our country for 1,000 dramatic days. This young man touched the hearts not only of the youth of America but all through the world. On that evil day of November 22, 1963, in Dallas, when the assassin's bullet took the life of that young President, every man, woman, and child in this country felt the pain.

It was like a personal loss, not only the loss of a life, but the loss of a promise, the loss of a hope. And fortunately, fortunately for America, this young man who was our President, made a very wise decision in Los Angeles in 1960—when he was nominated for President he didn't think only of himself or of his victory that was to be his. He thought of his country, and he reached out into the life of America, into the public life, and he found one man that he thought could best serve with him to safeguard this Republic.

Every man that is President knows that his life is literally in the hands of divine providence. It may be long or it may be short, and, therefore, when he takes on the duty of safeguarding this Republic and giving it leadership he must think of how he can always protect the interests of this great people of the United States.

John Kennedy's greatest decision was before he was elected, it was the decision to select as his Vice President a man of experience, of maturity, a man that is known for responsibility, a man who is a craftsman, a capable, skilled man in the art of government, a man who understood America and its dynamism, and President John Kennedy, then the nominee of our party, reached into the State of Texas, and asked Lyndon Johnson, then majority leader of the U.S. Senate, one of the most important jobs in this country—he asked him to give up that big job and to become his Vice President.

Lyndon Johnson put country above power, he put his country above his own personal position, because—make no mistake about it—to be the majority leader of the U.S. Senate is a powerful position, and Lyndon Johnson gave his word and his life to John Kennedy, and John Kennedy gave to America the assurance of the continuity of great leadership.

So, that when that evil day came, and when America stood in shame and anguish and pain and grief, as this young President was struck down, a tall, big man rose up, took the oath of office and from that day has continued to lead America in the spirit of John Kennedy, in the spirit of the American Republic, and in the spirit of progress for the American people. [Applause.]

Now, I give you but one—I ask you to do but one thing for us. I ask you to make this election a living tribute to a fallen President. I ask you to make this election a resounding mandate to the programs of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and I ask you to put the same confidence by your votes in Lyndon Johnson that John F. Kennedy put in Lyndon Johnson when he selected him Vice President, and I ask you to vote for Johnson for President.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Toledo, Ohio
Democratic Rally, University of Toledo Fieldhouse
October 6, 1964

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

A man is known by his deeds as well as by his words. A man in public life is known by his record—by the votes he has cast, by the legislation he has sponsored and worked for, by the administrative decisions he has taken, by the public positions he has held consistently over the years.

I believe that the American people, as they examine the public record of President Johnson and of the Kennedy-Johnson administration and of the Democratic Congresses of the past 4 years, will agree overwhelmingly that this administration and those Congresses have done magnificently well for our country.

Never in the history of our Nation, indeed, in the history of the world, have so many shared in such general and rising prosperity:

Never in the history of the world has there been created so much opportunity.

Never in the history of our country has there been greater business confidence, more jobs, larger paychecks.

Never in the history of the world has a nation been more militarily strong.

And never has there been a greater concern on the part of the leaders of a government for the problems of the poor, of the elderly, and of the handicapped.

Talk of fake prosperity is nonsense. Talk of weakening of defenses is nonsense. Talk of weakening moral fiber is nonsense.

The truth is that the United States is a great, powerful, and rich country with responsible, resourceful, and experienced leadership. That the American people would choose to replace this kind of strong and trusted leadership with a man who would radically change the existing system is inconceivable.

I cannot believe that the people of America will turn their backs on a wise and trusted President for a man who represents only uncertainty and impetuosity and whose public record demonstrates that he cannot be trusted—not by the businessman, not by the working man, not by the farmer, not by the elderly, not by the young people of our country, not by the parents of America.

In the next weeks of the campaign we shall remind the American people of the record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. We shall remind them that economic development and progress, that peace and national security, do not just happen. We shall remind them that this stable, expanding society can be maintained and improved only under a President who is both an administrator and an educator; under a President in whom the business community, labor, and the farmers can have confidence; under a President whom the mothers and fathers of America can *trust;* under a President who has the respect of leaders throughout this great pluralistic society.

Such a President is Lyndon B. Johnson, a man who means what he says, and says what he means.

Such a man is clearly *not* the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party.

In the coming weeks we shall make clear what responsible leadership has *meant* to our country, and how irresponsible leadership could wreck all that we have built. We shall demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that President Johnson's record and the record of the leadership of the Congress is one in which all Americans—Democrats and Republicans and Independents alike—can take pride. It is the kind of leadership that a world power requires, that a great nation, to remain great, must continue.

The problems of America are still vast. And the opportunities in America are challenging and exciting. With a unified Nation we can solve these problems and we can seize those opportunities. And that is the fundamental objective of President Johnson: to harness together all the great intellectual and economic resources of our Nation, to call forth from every walk of life men and women who can work *together* for the greater good and the common welfare.

What Senator Goldwater offers is a cold and perilous alternative—a house divided against itself; a Nation ridden by bitterness, uncertainty, and controversy.

I believe that in November the American people will turn away from such an alternative, and that they will ratify and endorse the strong, steady, reliable, and responsible leadership of a great President, Lyndon Johnson.

Washington, D.C.
United Press International Editors
For release October 7, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

The time has come to pause in this period of national referendum and to consider seriously the central questions of foreign policy at stake on November 3.

HE – LINO – 298

For nearly 20 years, the presidential candidates of both parties have agreed on our fundamental national goals in our relations with other nations. They have agreed on the need for a strong national defense to deter aggression, responsible management of our awesome nuclear arsenal, unswerving support for the United Nations, for Atlantic partnership, for aid to developing countries, for effective arms control agreements, and for sensible steps to reduce tensions with the Communist world.

Republicans played a leading part in building this bipartisan consensus—men like Henry L. Stimson, Wendell Willkie, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

So have five Presidents of both political parties.

The man we elect as President this November must understand the nature of this legacy and be committed to its continuation. In addition, he must clearly perceive the nature of the world in which he seeks to apply this bipartisan policy.

A man fit to conduct our foreign policy must understand that, although the United States is the world's most powerful nation, America is not all powerful, and that there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

A man fit to conduct our foreign policy must realize that, although we are well aware of the influence of world communism, we face many problems abroad which would be with us today even if Marx and Lenin had never been born, even if communism were to vanish from the face of the earth.

He must perceive that the character of the cold war has changed; that we are moving from a period of simple bipolar confrontation between two superpowers into a period of greater diversity.

There are a myriad of international problems to which the use of force provides no answer.

He must understand that the men and women of most other nations are like Americans—if pressed to the ultimate choice they will choose to fight rather than to surrender.

And the next President must realize that diplomacy by nuclear ultimatum is one sure path to war.

In the turbulent years since World War II, our Nation has been blessed with men of such understanding in positions of national leadership. These men have forged the principles of the bipartisan consensus. Their achievements are everywhere: in America's diversity, and in the disarray of communism.

What are the fundamentals of this bipartisan consensus? What are its most recent achievements, and what guidelines does it offer for the years that lie ahead?

A first principle is commitment to maintaining our Nation's defenses.

In the past 4 years, we have vastly increased the superiority of U.S. strategic power over that of the Soviet Union. And we have responded with power and precision to each Communist probe of our intentions—in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam, and in the Gulf of Tonkin.

We are today the strongest Nation in the history of the world. We will take all necessary steps to remain so.

Yet strength alone is never enough. Strength is a raw substance to be put to use—for evil purposes or for good, with recklessness or with restraint, toward deepening chaos and war or toward order and peace.

The vital key to our national security is responsibility in the use of strength: determination, wisdom, flexibility, restraint, and a clear sense of priorities. Our every action must meet the supreme test of responsibility.

A second principle is that of partnership with the developed nations of the Atlantic and Pacific communities.

The new Europe of today—and the new Japan—are living proof of the success of America's postwar foreign policy. But history does not stand still: success produces an entirely new spectrum of problems. The time is coming for new solutions of these problems; and our European friends can be assured that within the great bipartisan tradition, America is ready to share as a full partner in these efforts. Our commitment to NATO is unshakeable.

In our relations with the new Europe the problem of trade is fundamental. In the past 2 years, we have made a historic beginning in the Trade Expansion Act. If we can keep up our efforts to expand trade, negotiate, and break down the barriers, a new Atlantic economic unity is inevitable—a unity which will further strengthen our mutual security and enrich our lives.

At the same time, we must also develop new ways to pool our Atlantic resources—and those of Japan—in an intensive effort to assist the developing continents. For we have a vital common stake in the peaceful evolution of these societies

A third principle is that of communication with the Communist-ruled peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, of bridge-building in behalf of freedom.

In the past 4 years, the present administration has witnessed, and has treated with care and prudence, one of the greatest changes of modern history, a change that aids the cause of freedom, the fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet empire.

Everywhere the forces of national independence are slowly but relentlessly eroding the old Communist unity. Everywhere the people of Communist states have a new sense of hope and possibility.

Under the past three Presidents, we have sought to encourage this thrust toward national diversity. We have opened windows of light, air, and hope to these people through cultural programs, educational exchanges, travel, and trade. In Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself, we must and will do more to encourage this evolution toward increasing national freedom.

At the same time, we must understand that the new fragmentation of the Communist world presents us with dangers as well as opportunities. Especially in Asia, the Sino-Soviet rift removes the restraints on Peiping and increases the possibility of recklessness.

A fourth principle of bipartisanship relates to the priority placed on preserving unity and promiting social and economic progress in our own hemisphere.

In the past 4 years we have created the Alliance for Progress, a historic new partnership aimed at achieving economic and social justice for all people within a framework of free democratic government. Through the Organization of American States we have isolated Castro's Cuba and drastically curtailed his influence in the hemisphere.

A fifth principle of bipartisanship relates to the three-fifths of mankind who live in Asia, and Africa: our commitment to assist them in the difficult and complex tasks of nation building.

Of all the revolutions of our time, none has altered the shape of the map more fundamentally than the march toward full nationhood in Asia and Africa. The thrust toward expanding economic opportunities, social justice, and individual dignity in those vast continents inspires our hopes and commands our sympathies.

Through deft American diplomacy, we have gradually learned how to ease and assist the process of nation building in these vast areas. And we have simultaneously helped to prevent inroads through Communist subversion.

In the past 4 years, our instruments in this great struggle for peaceful development have been many: A reinvigorated Foreign Service, infused with skilled and energetic men and women who speak foreign languages and respect foreign cultures, and understand the vital importance of people in all walks of life.

An aid program that stresses community development and the essential ingredient of self-help.

Creative use of our agricultural abundance through food for peace.

And the excellence and compassion of America's youth in that most successful of foreign policy initiatives, the Peace Corps.

Those who view the developing nations as mere pawns in the cold war struggle or as mirror images of America have no understanding of men or nations. We cannot and will not create obedient satellites among these peoples. But we can and will assist in the growth of well-rooted, viable nations seeking their own destiny in freedom, in their own way, in allegiance to their own values and traditions.

HE – LINO -- 300
1 WBZ—LINO

Here again, as in Europe, the test of our success will be the strength of the independence that develops; and that means independence of Washington as well as Moscow, hard as some may find it to accept such independence. The test of our maturity will be our reaction to that independence.

A sixth principle is that of unswerving commitment to support for the United Nations. In a complex, changing world the United Nations has time and again proven its unique value as an instrument for peace. It has become the primary forum where men and nations can daily reason together to avert catastrophe, a unique peacekeeping mechanism that has helped to blunt more than 13 different threats to the peace over the past 19 years.

The survival of the U.N. is dependent upon the financial responsibility of its members. We must press for payment from those who have failed to meet their obligations. And we will never permit those who default on their dues to cause the organization to collapse. And we must do all in our power to strengthen the peacekeeping machinery of the U.N—realizing that a stable professional U.N. peacekeeping force is the preferred instrument for restoring peace when explosive local disputes erupt.

A final principle of bipartisanship is commitment to the pursuit of effective, safeguarded arms control.

Mankind lives today under the dark shadow of a spiraling armaments race. One fact of our age is the proliferation of power and weapons. In the past such races have ended in war. Our obligation, as never before, is to break the ancient cycle.

Under this administration, as under its predecessors, we have relentlessly sought an answer to this human dilemma.

We have taken a first great step in the test ban treaty—a treaty that was possible because both sides clearly benefited from a lessening of atmospheric poisoning. We must take further steps. We must patiently press forward in our search for new areas of mutual agreement to reduce the threat of war.

In recent years we have moved to attain such agreements. We have joined with the Soviets on a resolution to prohibit the orbiting of nuclear weapons in outer space. And we established a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to lessen the chances of miscalculation which might lead to war.

This, my friends, is the record and shape of bipartisanship in our Nation's foreign affairs.

Yet where do we find the Republican candidate for President in relation to this record? He is totally at odds with it; for, in spirit and in action, he has drastically departed from the tradition of his party.

He has told us where he stands: He rejects foreign aid; he disdains negotiation; he dismisses the United Nations; he opposes our bridges to the people of the Communist nations; he terrifies our partners and allies; and he condemns our efforts to end the armaments race.

Recall for instance the solid bipartisan backing for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—the support of President Eisenhower and 25 of 33 Republicans in the Senate. And recall, as well, the moving words of Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican Senate leader. "I want to take a first step, Mr. President," he said. "I am not a young man—one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, 'He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step.'"

Senator Goldwater knew what happened at Hiroshima. But he said "No" to the test ban. He refused to take a first step.

Yet his seeming callousness to this treaty is hardly surprising. For, astonishing as it may be, Senator Goldwater seems to believe that the escalation of international conflicts will bring peace. And, in so believing, he has talked the language of nuclear irresponsibility.

Senator Goldwater blames his critics for making the control of nuclear weapons the central issue of this campaign. Yet, he is wrong on two counts:

First, it was he, himself, who injected the issue by his own demands for delegation of Presidential control. The injection of the issue has

now been deplored by General Eisenhower. I agree with General Eisenhower that detailed discussion of the specifics of nuclear command and control should not be injected into the campaign.

And, second, control of nuclear weapons is only part of a far larger issue: the qualities of mind and spirit required of a candidate for the Presidency if we are to protect our interests, advance freedom, and keep the peace in our tradition of bipartisanship.

Does Senator Goldwater have such qualities of mind and spirit? What value does he give to the rationality, wisdom, and restraint of his predecessors on matters of war and peace?

Let me quote to you a few of his most carefully considered ideas. They appear in the concluding chapter of his book, "The Conscience of a Conservative":

> A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective.

Or:

> We must, ourselves, be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes.

Throughout, Goldwater declares that our main objective must be "not 'peace' but victory."

Or again, hear these more casual words from a newspaper interview in May 1961:

> Someday, I am convinced, there will either be a war or we'll be subjugated without war * * * real nuclear war * * * I don't see how it can be avoided—perhaps 5 or 10 years from now.

Now any man living in our nuclear age who calmly says that "victory," not peace, is our objective—who often implies that war seems inevitable—does not possess a firm sense of reality.

In his frantic impatience with the world as it is, Senator Goldwater wishes to back the Soviet Union into a corner where its only alternatives would be retreat or nuclear war. Indeed, one of Goldwater's main goals seems to be—and again I quote him—"To invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting a local defeat."

Senator Goldwater does not seem to realize that such juvenile games of nuclear "chicken" will eventually result in the annihilation of both players. Senator Goldwater does not yet realize that, in our age of quick and total destruction, there is no such thing as quick and total victory.

No rational leadership can promise us speedy escape from problems which demand prolonged and costly effort for solution. All that can be honestly promised is what President Johnson has given us: unremitting, constructive work, with hopeful advances, but with the continued need for vigilance and dedication.

It is the Republican nominee's predilection for the quick, easy solution, his penchant for diplomacy by ultimatum, that has impelled many longtime Republican newspapers and magazines to repudiate Senator Goldwater. Typical of such repudiation were the words of two editorials from the New York Herald-Tribune last weekend, in announcing its support for President Johnson:

Senator Goldwater, the Herald-Tribune said:

> Has shown himself, in sum, a poor risk for the most personal and most awesome of a President's responsibilities, the conduct of foreign relations, in an age when survival may, in crisis, depend on his judgment and his judgment alone.
>
> * * * to entrust America's future * * * to the vague negativisms of the Goldwater campaign would truly be a leap in the dark. It is a leap thoughtful Americans could not contemplate without a shudder.

My friends, this is a leap which Americans need not take. Our country is led today by a man of prudence and compassion; a man fully conscious of his responsibility to use our awesome power with reason and restraint; a man fully aware of the world as it is.

A year ago this autumn, shortly before his death, John F. Kennedy offered us all a prescription for responsible leadership in the years that lie ahead. "In a world full of frustrations and irritations," he said, "America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason."

Today, more than ever, this good counsel rings true.

America's challenge is indeed to make the world safe for diversity in freedom. Let us reject the voices of frustration and irritation. Let us make shine the lights of learning and of reason. We can do so, and we will do so, under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson.

Washington, D.C.
United Press International Editors and Publishers, Statler Hilton Hotel,
October 7, 1964.

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Thank you very much, Mr. Burnham. A man gets launched here rather quickly. [Laughter.]

My own hope is that the launching does put one in proper orbit.

This is a little different experience than I have been indulging in in the past few days, speaking from hastily constructed stands and podiums, in front of city halls before wildly cheering college audiences, but I do hope that I shall be able to at least this morning share some thoughts with the UPI editors and publishers on matters of American security and foreign policy that will be worthy of your consideration, and which may promote some questions which I am more than happy to entertain at the conclusion of my remarks.

The time has come in this period of national referendum, indeed it should have been all the time, to consider seriously the central questions of foreign policy which are at stake in this national election of November 3.

For nearly 20 years the Presidential candidates of both parties have agreed on our fundamental national goals of foreign policy and national security.

They have agreed on the necessity for a strong national defense to deter aggression, responsible managements of our powerful and awesome nuclear arsenal, unswerving support for the United Nations, the development of an Atlantic partnership, aid to developing countries, and effective arms control agreements along with sensible steps to reduce tensions with the Communist world.

Now, these are the basic guidelines of America's foreign policy for the past generation.

Republicans, leading Republicans, have played an important part in building a bipartisan consensus: men like Henry L. Stimson, Wendell Wilkie, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, many Members today of the Congress of the United States, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and then five Presidents since the time of Franklin Roosevelt, of both political parties.

The man that we elect as President this November must understand and I emphasize the word, he must "understand," the nature of this legacy, and he must be committed to its continuation.

In addition he must clearly perceive the nature of the world in which he seeks to apply this bipartisan policy. He must understand that although the United States is the world's most powerful nation, America is not omnipotent, and there cannot be an American solution to every world problem, and surely there cannot be an instant solution to long and lingering problems.

Now, the next President of the United States must be fully aware of the pernicious influence of world communism, and I doubt that there is anyone in America that isn't fully aware of that pernicious influence, at least anyone in responsible positions.

He must realize that many problems abroad would be with us today even if Marx and Lenin had never been born, and even if communism were to vanish from the face of the earth.

He must perceive that the character of the cold war has changed, and that we are moving from a period of simple, bipolar confrontation between two super powers into a period of greater diversity, and he

must know that there are a myriad of international problems to which the use of force provides no answer.

He must understand that most nations, if pressed to the ultimate choice, will choose like our Nation, like we Americans, to fight rather than surrender, and he must realize that diplomacy by nuclear ultimatum is a dangerous course, and could be the sure path to war.

Now, in the turbulent years since World War II, our Nation has been blessed with men of such understanding in positions of national leadership. These men have hammered out the principles of a bipartisan consensus. Their achievements are everywhere, in America's strength, in the new resilience of free nations, in the triumph of diversity and in the disarray of communism.

Now, what are the fundamentals of this bipartisan consensus? What are its most recent achievements, and what guidelines does it offer for the years that lie ahead?

A first principle is the commitment by both parties, by all Americans, to maintain our Nation's defenses. In recent years we have vastly increased the superiority of U.S. strategic power over that of the Soviet Union.

I trust that this is beyond debate. And may I digress for a moment to say that it does little good for Americans at home or for our policy abroad, to indicate by word or by innuendo from any responsible source that this Nation is losing its strength or is being weakened or is casting off its strength.

We have responded with power and precision to each Communist probe of our intentions: In Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam, in the Gulf of Tonkin.

We are today the strongest nation in the history of the world, and it goes without saying that we will take all necessary steps to remain so.

I say to the editors that are here, that the Congress of the United States, even further than the executives, and this Congress has in almost every instance of my 16 years in the Senate, we have added more strength, we have added more to the budget for national defense than was asked for by the Commander in Chief, so the American people support defense.

Yet military strength alone is never enough. The stuff of strength is a raw substance to be put to use for evil purpose or for good, with recklessness or with restraint, toward deepening chaos and war or toward order and peace.

The vital key to our national security is the responsibility in the use of strength, determination, wisdom, flexibility, restraint, and a clear sense of priorities.

Our power is relative, not absolute, and our every action must meet the supreme test of the responsible use of power.

Now, a second principle in our bipartisan consensus is that of partnership with the developed nations of the Atlantic and the Pacific communities. The new Europe and the new Japan are living proof of the success of America's postwar policy.

spectrum of problems. The world has changed and changed greatly

But history does not stand still. Success produces an entirely new since 1949, when NATO was created, and the time is coming for new solutions to these problems, and our European friends can and should be assured that within the great bipartisan tradition America is ready to share as a full partner in these efforts, and our allies need to be reassured time after time that our commitment to NATO in all of its application and meaning is unshakable.

Now, in our relations with the new Europe, the problem of foreign trade or commerce is fundamental. In the past 2 years we have made a historic beginning in the Trade Expansion Act, and if we can keep up our efforts to expand trade, to negotiate and break down trade barriers, a new Atlantic economic unity is inevitable, and a unity which will further strengthen our mutual security and enrich our lives.

I don't say that this is a goal easily attained. But it is one to which we must give our best efforts. It is not easy to break down old prejudices, old habits, old trade barriers, but at long last, because of a bipartisan, bipartisan consensus, because of bipartisan support, we have equipped the President of the United States with the tools to do the job of effective negotiation in trade expansion policy.

At the same time, we must also develop new ways to pool our Atlantic resources, along with those of Japan, in an intensive effort to assist developing continents, for we have a vital common stake in the peaceful evolution of these societies, and I would place this matter of the pooling of our resources as a high priority in the next administration.

A third principle is that of communication with the Communist-ruled peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, of bridge-building in behalf of greater autonomy, greater independence, and ultimate freedom.

In the past 4 years the present administration has witnessed and has treated with care and prudence one of the greatest changes of modern history, a change that aids the cause of freedom, the fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet empire.

Everywhere the forces of national independence and autonomy are slowly but relentlessly eroding the old Communist monopolithic unity.

Everywhere, the people living under Communist regimes have a new sense of hope and possibility.

Now, under the past three Presidents we have sought to encourage these hopes and this thrust toward national diversity. We have opened windows of light, air, and hope to these people through cultural programs, educational exchanges, travel, and trade.

In Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union itself we must and will do more to encourage this evolution toward increasing national freedom.

At the same time we must understand that the new fragmentation of the Communist world presents us with dangers as well as opportunities, all the more reason for the responsible use of power, for flexibility and wisdom in the application of our foreign policy.

This danger is to be found especially in Asia. The Sino-Soviet rift removes the restraints on Peiping, and increases the possibilities of recklessness, and of war.

Now, a fourth principle of bipartisanship relates to the priority placed on preserving unity, and promoting social and economic progress in our own hemisphere.

We have created the Alliance for Progress in cooperation with our neighbors to the South, an historic new partnership aimed at achieving economic and social justice for all people within the framework of constitutional government.

Through the Organization of American States we have isolated Castro's Cuba, and drasticaly curtailed his influence in this hemisphere.

A fifth principle of bipartisanship relates to the three-fifths of mankind who live in Asia and Africa, and our commitment to assist them in the difficult and complex tasks of nation-building, and I might add that this is no simple task that lends itself to immediate solutions or ultimatums. This will require the patience of a parent with a teenage child, and it will require the patience of a mature, responsible people, the American people.

Now, of all the revolutions of our time, none has altered the shape of the map more fundamentally than the march toward full nationhood in Asia and Africa. The thrust toward expanding economic opportunities, social justice, individual dignity, in those vast continents inspires our hopes and commands our sympathies.

One should understand that the birth of new nations is not necessarily painless. Ours wasn't, and theirs isn't. We must understand that these peoples do not come into the fullness of maturity and nation adulthood overnight. Surely a people as blessed as our people, and a nation as strong and responsible as America, ought to have some understanding of the evolutionary processes from colonialism to independence and nationhood.

Through deft American diplomacy we have gradually learned how to ease and assist the process of nation-building in these vast areas, and we have simultaneously helped to prevent the inroads through Communist subversion.

Now, our instruments in this great struggle for peaceful development have been many. There has been a reinvigorated Foreign Service, infused with skilled and energetic men and women who speak foreign languages, respect foreign cultures, and understand the vital importance of people in all walks of life, and a pat on the back to our Foreign Service occasionally might be of some help. It is a much-abused area of our Government.

We have a foreign aid program that stresses community development, and the essential ingredient of self-help; in creative use of our agricultural abundance through food for peace. Another one of our instrumentalities for the promotion of independence and nationhood is the excellence and compassion of America's youth, is that most successful of foreign policy initiatives, the Peace Corps, and I can't help but say it because I happen to be the author of this act and I do say that anyone that would call the Peace Corps "a haven for beatniks" has no comprehension whatsoever of what is going on in this world and, in case you don't know who that was, see me after the meeting. [Laughter.]

What a way to dismiss a thoughtful, effective proposal.

Now, those who view the developing nations as mere pawns in the cold war struggle or as mere images of America have no understanding of men and nations. We cannot and will not create obedient satellites amongst these peoples. But we can and will assist in the growth of well-rooted, viable nations seeking their own identity and freedom, in their own way, in allegiance to their own values and traditions and here again, as in Europe, the test of our success will be the strength of the independent that develops and that means independent of Washington as well as Moscow, hard as some may find it to accept such independent.

The test of our maturity will be our reaction to that independent.

Now, a sixth principle of bipartisanship is that of unswerving commitments and support for the United Nations. In a complex changing world the United Nations has time and again proven its unique value as an instrument for peace. It has become the primary forum for men and nations who can daily reason together to avert catastrophe. It is a unique peacekeeping mechanism that has helped to blunt more than 13 different threats to the peace over the past 19 years.

The survival of the U.N. is dependent upon the financial responsibility of its members as well as other factors. We must, therefore, press for payment from those who have failed to meet their obligations, and we will never permit those who default on their dues to cause the organization's collapse.

The United Nations is an international instrumentality that is in our interest as a peace-loving people; and, having anyone as a candidate for President that can't make up his mind, whether he is for it or against it, is incredible and unbelieveable in this, the second half of the 20th century.

And we must do, I say, all in our power to strengthen the U.N., particularly to strengthen the peacekeeping machinery, realizing that a stable professional United Nations peacekeeping force is the preferred instrument for restoring peace when explosive local disputes erupt.

Now, a final principle of bipartisanship is the commitment to the pursuit of effective multilateral safeguarded arms control.

Mankind lives today under the dark shadow of a spiraling arms race. One fact of our age is the proliferation of power and weapons and, in the past, such arms races have ended in war. Our obligation, therefore, as never before is to break that ancient cycle. History runs against us but we must change that pattern of history.

Under this administration, as under its predecessors, we have relentlessly sought an answer to this human dilemma. We have taken a first great step in the nuclear test ban treaty, and we must take further steps. We must patiently press forward in our search for new areas of mutual agreement amongst the great powers, the many nations under effective and safeguarded agreements, to reduce the threat of war.

In recent years we have moved to attain such agreements. We have joined with the Soviets in the United Nations on a resolution to prohibit the orbiting of nuclear weapons in outer space, and we established, following the Cuban crisis, a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, to lessen the chances of miscalculation, which lead to war.

Now, this is the record and the shape of bipartisanship in our Nation's foreign affairs and, frankly, this record of bipartisanship is the clear manifestation of our maturity as a nation and as a people.

Yet where do we find the Republican candidate? I hesitate to say that, where do we find the candidate of at least a part of the Republican Party for President in relation to this record? He is totally at odds with it for, in spirit and in action, he has drastically departed from the tradition of his party. He has told us where he stands; he is a very candid man. He rejects foreign aid; he disdains negotiations; he dismisses the United Nations; he opposes our bridges to the people of the Communist nations; he terrifies our partners and our allies; and he condemns our efforts to end the armaments race.

Recall, for instance, the solid bipartisan backing for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—as a matter of fact, that treaty was first offered by President Eisenhower—the support of President Eisenhower and 25 of 33 Republicans in the Senate came when that treaty was for final ratification.

And recall as well the moving words of Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican Senate leader, "I want to take a first step, Mr. President," he said, "I am not a young man—one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone 'He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step'."

Senator Goldwater knew what happened at Hiroshima, too, but he said, "No," to the test ban treaty. He said "No" to President Eisenhower and the policy of President Eisenhower and, gentlemen and ladies, the recent get-together doesn't prove a thing. I know that a man in public life is judged not by whom he puts his arm around most recently but by a record, a record that is in the Congressional Record, a record of votes, a record of statements, and a record of deeds, and that record, if anyone will examine it with any objectivity, is not a record of support of the Eisenhower policies during the period of Eisenhower's Presidency.

Mr. Goldwater refused to take that first step. Senator Goldwater blames his critics for making control of nuclear weapons the central issue of this campaign. He is wrong on two counts:

First, it was he himself who injected the issue by his own demand for the delegation of Presidential control. The injection of the issue has now been deplored by responsible men all over the Nation and by General Eisenhower and I agree with General Eisenhower that detailed discussion of the specifics of nuclear command and control should not be injected into this campaign. There are some things, it seems to me' that ought to be within the realm of national security classification.

And, second, control of nuclear weapons is only a part of a far-larger issue; namely, the qualities of mind and spirit required of a candidate for the presidency if we are to protect our interest, advance the cause of freedom, and keep the peace.

Now, does Senator Goldwater have such qualities of mind and spirit? What value does he give to the rationality, wisdom, and restraint of his predecessors on matters of war and peace?

Let us quote to you just a few of his most carefully considered ideas. They appear in the concluding chapter in his book, "The Conscience of a Conservative":

> A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people, including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective.

Or:

> We must ourselves be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes.

Senator Goldwater declares that our main objective must not be peace but "victory" under his definition.

Or again hear these more casual words from a newspaper interview in May 1961, and I am going to take the time this morning to review the interview in Der Spiegel, but if that doesn't make your hair stand on end, then I don't know what an interview will do to you.

May 1961:

> Someday, I am convinced, there will be either a war or we will be subjugated without war, real nuclear war. I don't see how it can be avoided—perhaps 5 or 10 years from now.

Well, 3 of those years have already gone by.

Now, any man living in our nuclear age who can calmly say that "victory" and in quotes as it is written in his publication, not peace, is our objective, who often implies that war is inevitable, does not possess a firm sense of reality, and such a man lives in a world, as my esteemed colleague, Senator McCarthy put it, in which the calendar has no years, in which the clock has no hands, and I might add a world in which the pale horse of death is indistinguishable from the white horse of victory.

Now, in his impatience with the world as it is, Senator Goldwater wishes to back the Soviet Union into a corner where its only alternatives would be retreat or nuclear war. Indeed one of Senator Goldwater's main goals seems to be, and I quote him exactly, "To invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat." End of quote.

Now, Senator Goldwater does not seem to realize that such dangerous games of nuclear "chicken" will inevitably result in the annihilation of both players. The Senator does not seem to realize that in our age of quick and total destruction, there is no such thing as a quick and total victory. No rational leadership can promise us speedy escape from the problems which demand prolonged and costly effort for solution.

All that can be honestly promised is what Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson have given us, unremitting, constructive work with hopeful advances, but with continued need for vigilance and dedication.

It is my view that the one thing that the Communist leaders are depending upon is a growth of national frustration in the United States, a weariness of the whole thing, and the one phrase that has characterized the statements of the Senator from Arizona more than anything else is the phrase "sick and tired."

Well, I want to say to the Senator and to the American people, this Nation is not sick and this Nation is not tired, and I think the Communists ought to know it, and if the leader of our political opposition here wants to peddle that kind of propaganda that is his responsibility.

But this person, this Senator, hasn't found America sick at all, and it isn't tired. In fact, it is bustling with vitality and energy. Possibly the Senator should attend some of our meetings.

[Laughter.]

Now, it is the Republican nominee's predilection for this quick and easy solution, his desire for diplomacy by ultimation, that has impelled long-time Republican newspapers and leading Republicans themselves to repudiate him.

Typical of such repudiation were the words of two editorials from the New York Herald Tribune last week in announcing its support of President Johnson. I am not going to quote the words of the Saturday Evening Post, because I would be accused of being too tough on the Senator from Arizona, but the New York Herald Tribute said this:

> Senator Goldwater has shown himself in sum a poor risk for the most personal and the most awesome of a President's responsibilities, the conduct of foreign relations in an age when survival may, in crises, depend on his judgment and his judgment alone.

The second editorial:

> To entrust America's future on the negativisms of the Goldwater campaign would truly be a leap in the dark. It is a leap thoughtful Americans could not contemplate without a shudder.

And this is a leap which Americans need not take.

I believe that the New York Herald Tribune has reached a conclusion shared by most Americans that Senator Goldwater is just not qualified to be the President of the United States.

Our country does have a President of prudence and compassion, a President fully conscious of his responsibility to use our awesome power with reason and restraint, and a man fully aware of the world as it is, not just as he wants it.

A year ago this autumn shortly before his death, John F. Kennedy offered us all a prescription for responsible leadership in the years that lie ahead. He said:

> In a world full of frustrations and irritations America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason.

Today more than ever this good counsel rings true.

America's challenge is indeed to make the world safe for diversity in freedom. And we must reject the voices of frustration and irritation. We must make shine the lights of learning and of reason. And it is my considered judgment that we can do so, and that we will do so, and I think we will continue to do so under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNHAM. I would like to remind those here once more that Senator Humphrey will receive questions from you, but from only delegates to the convention.

(At this time, a question and answer period followed.)

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, we hear it said occasionally and we read occasionally that we are losing the war in Vietnam, would you comment on this?

Senator HUMPHREY. There is no more serious problem facing our country today in terms of actual confrontation with Communist forces than in southeast Asia. Surely the problem in Vietnam is a very fundamental part of that whole Communist thrust in all of the southeast Asian sector.

I would like to say first the policy that we are pursuing in southeast Asia is one that was initiated in 1954. I reviewed this at some length here not long ago at a meeting in Los Angeles before the Town Hall. Our efforts were stepped up after 1959 because of the infiltration of Communist forces from Viet Minh. It is our view, the view not only of our country but of others, that the North Vietnam economy was very shaky, was not doing well, that South Vietnam was doing well, and, therefore, a program of terror and subversion and assassination and guerilla warfare tactics was launched by the Vietcong backed by the Viet Minh.

By 1961 this had reached rather staggering proportions, and the Government of South Vietnam asked us for continued and expanded help, both economic and military, and we have placed in South Vietnam to shorten this answer, about 18,000, I believe the present figure is, that may be 1,000 more or less, American forces that are essentially advisers and are working with the South Vietnamese military forces as well as their governmental structure to strengthen the South Vietnam resistance to the Communist forces.

I do not see any early victory, but I want to make it quite clear that I think to pull out under the conditions which presently exist would be a defeat. I think its repercussions would be unbelievably bad throughout all of Asia and Africa. I think we are being sorely tested in this faraway place. We didn't select it, but we need to understand that the Communist force is an international force and it cannot be met just where we choose to meet it. We have to meet it every place, with different means, and different instrumentalities, under different conditions.

I don't think we are going to lose it; if we have the perseverance.

I believe that President Johnson has indicated the determination of our country in the two instances of the Gulf of Tonkin, where we have repealed attack, where we have taken defensive action against the nests of the PT boats, and where we have made it crystal clear that we are going to maintain freedom of the seas and that is what this issue is about in the Gulf of Tonkin, the first time that the American Government permits an enemy force to attack our shipping at will in the high seas is the day that a policy of America of 175 years has been repudiated and lost.

And we have no intention as a naval power to permit this issue of freedom of the seas and the use of international waters to be curtailed or to be destroyed by Communist forces or Communist aggression.

I am hopeful that this war will not have to be extended. There are no plans of this administration to do so. But this administration is committed to the firm resistance and the effective resistance of Com-

munist infiltration, subversion, and aggression in South Vietnam. Once we have been able to restore some reasonable balance, where South Vietnam is safe and where its independence and territorial integrity is protected, then and only then are negotiations such as have been suggested by others desirable or even, I would say, plausible or acceptable.

So, if people want an easy answer, they can pull out. If they want a frightening one they can extend the war. If they want one that deals with the realities of Communist power, which is not to blow the world to pieces but to pick it up piece by piece, they will resist, and resist as we are doing, in cooperation with the South Vietnamese. It is their struggle. We are backing them. It is not basically our struggle, it is theirs. But we are assisting them and we ought to make it crystal clear that when a people have the courage to fight for their independence, a duly constituted government, that we are going to, if we have an agreement with them, and an alliance with them, and an understanding that we will back them. So, we may be at it a long time. I don't see an early solution.

QUESTION. Senator——

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

QUESTION. Yesterday Senator Goldwater said here as an illustration of administrative weakness that we sold wheat to Russia on Russia's terms and got nothing in return for it.

Would you care to comment?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, of course, that just demonstrates that Mr. Goldwater hasn't been doing his homework. [Laughter.]

We have sold some wheat to Russia and we have not had to use any credits. We have been paid for it. What is more is other people are selling wheat to Russia, and the world's wheat supply is one supply. The Canadians are selling wheat to Russia, the Australians are selling wheat to Russia, the Argentinians would have if they had had any surplus, the French have sold some wheat to Russia, the Germans transshipped some wheat to Russia that we sold to them. Apparently the Senator from Arizona doesn't think there is anything wrong in the United States selling wheat to Germany and then having Germany sell it to Russia.

Well, if you are going to have any middleman why not have a good American middleman, let him make some money.

Now, the truth is we are selling this wheat at world prices, and world prices are the only prices that you can get for wheat. We are not in a position of having the only market of wheat, and the only supply. Our Canadian friends, by the way, are going ahead and expanding their wheat production while we are asking our wheat farmers to limit our wheat production.

I would add also that Mr. Goldwater's statements fly in the face of the action of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the major farm organizations of our country, the leading spokesmen of American commerce and industry, and I don't think they are all appeasers, in fact, I havent found any of them; I know they are not soft on communism. [Laughter.]

They may be a little soft on keeping the American economy thriving and I would say as one old South Dakota farmer put it that it is not too bad to sell Russians anything that they can't shoot back at you. In other words, if they are going to use their hard currency, which they are using, their gold bullion which they are using, to purchase soft goods, such as wheat, a perishable edible commodity and we have that wheat which we are having to store, and we are having to ask our farmers to reduce their production, it seems to me that in light of the present trading conditions in the world with the Canadians and the French and the Germans and the Argentinians and the Australians and others that our position of sales behind the Iron Curtain of foodstuffs is a sensible position.

What is more is, the Russians are not going to—the system is not going to fall apart because they didn't get some wheat from the United States, I think Mr. Goldwater had better reexamine what has happened in the Soviet Union. If they don't get it here they will get it some place else. I am not saying we should sell all of it but the whole matter of trade policy with Eastern Europe is one which needs the careful analysis of American businessmen and American political leaders so that we get a sensible policy in cooperation with our allies.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, yesterday they had a lot of fun with me here because we were talking about computer operations and electronic devices, and I complained that on my small newspaper I found it impossible to buy just an ordinary cash register. Everything was too elaborate. Now, this is not an embarrassing question I am going to ask you, but it is fiscal.

Senator Goldwater didn't mention this and neither have you, and I haven't seen much about it anywhere through the campaign, but it is one that concerns me and that is this: the national debt is something in the neighborhood of $300 billion, it is going up 6, 7 or 8 billion a year, and nobody whom I have heard expresses any concern or has a solution to that.

I feel that cannot go on indefinitely, and, sincerely, what is the ultimate solution to balancing the Federal budget or is it necessary?

Senator HUMPHREY. I shall get to your question. May I just say first of all, that since World War II, the percentage increase in the national debt has been so—has been very slight as compared to the debt of Iowa or Minnesota or South Dakota or New York.

It is State and local government that have really added the expenditures; it is State and local government that have really added on the extra personnel. This is something, by the way, which for some reason or another you gentlemen don't write about or don't want to write about. It is a fact we ought to understand. I am not complaining about it but it is just a simple fact. You simply can't build more highways and have a simple increase of population, your school population just burgeoning, growing by leaps and bounds without more teachers and without more schools and you can't have more automobiles without more roads, and when you do this it costs more money.

Of course, in most instances in State and local government they put it off over in a bond issue and then they have a program of 20 or 15 or 35 years or so of amortization and they don't call it a debt.

But in the Government of the United States we just put it all in one great big package and we call it a debt that apparently has to be paid off tomorrow.

Now, of course, that isn't the way you operate a business or a government.

Now, I do think that one should be concerned about the rise of national debt and I know of no responsible person that isn't. But there are many ways to meet it. As a matter of fact, I think we have demonstrated this year that by a reduction in the tax rates and by an acceleration of the economy we will possibly have less of a deficit this year than we would have had if we kept the tax rates up.

The answer, it seems to me, is frugality in government, to the best of our ability, and also to increase the gross national product, which means that you have a larger amount of money, not a larger share, but a larger amount of money coming into the Federal coffers, into the Federal Treasury. The debt today as related to per capita income is much less today than it was in 1940, much less today than it was in 1950, and everything is somewhat relative.

For example, a businessman has an income, let's say that he is a retailer, he has an income of, a gross income of $250,000 a year. He has a debt of $50,000. If he gets that income up to $500,000 a year and has a debt of $75,000, he is not worse off, he is better off. His debt has gone up, but he is a whole lot better off.

Now, every major corporation that I know today that is really successful has a greater debt, that is in terms of its bonded indebtedness or of its borrowings than it had some time ago mainly because it has a higher velocity of trade. I was talking to one of the grain dealers in my city of Minneapolis not long ago, they are borrowing much more money than they used to but they are much richer than they were. They make money by borrowing it.

So, the Federal Government's debt, I think must be considered relatively, sir, without trying to underestimate it and when one says this he is generally accused of being unconcerned about debt. Not at all. Let me be exceedingly frank with you. If you have got a mortgage of your house at $10,000 and an income of 15 you are in trouble. If you have got a mortgage on your house of $15,000 and an income of $35,000 you are not in very much trouble. Your mortgage is up, but so is your income, and the Government of the United States today

has a much more viable productive economy from whence it draws its resources than it had 10 years ago or 20 years ago or 5 years ago. In fact, our debt has gone up very little in the last 4 years, but our gross national product has gone up $125 billion. Our debt hasn't gone up much more in the last 2 years than the increase in corporate profits in 1 year, $10 billion this last year. Not bad.

So, when you put it in terms of relativity or relationship, debt to income, debt to productivity, debt to investment, then I think we get a better focus on it. So, we have to keep it in hand and we hope that in the next 2 to 3 years we will be able to start to reduce that debt but then when we get to the problem of reducing it we have to be rather careful how rapidly because it would have some very deflationary effects.

QUESTION. Senator, how can we explain to our readers that—how can we explain to our readers that it is to our advantage to trade with Russia and yet it is not to our advantage to trade with Cuba or with China?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think this is a matter of political policy, of political policy. The Soviet Union today is presently trading with a large number of the Western European countries. I should start out by saying that you just have to face up to what is happening which frequently people do not want to face up to. West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, all of them are doing great big business with the Iron Curtain countries. In fact, while we are sitting over here arguing about it, they have trade missions in every one of these countries.

I have been to West Germany when they criticized us for even extending a little aid to Poland; and I am in Warsaw, and right out in front of the National Hotel in Warsaw are five cars from West Germany in there with a trade negotiation with the Polish Government.

As long as they can keep us arguing about it and they do the business, they figure, "Well, isn't that great? That is good political grist for the American politician and public while we do the business." And the deutsch mark has very, very, very good convertibility.

Now, it is my view that the Soviet Union and the Eastern European states do not have the happiest of relationships and, therefore, for us to try to wean away some of the Eastern European states presently controlled by Communist regimes through a limited trade policy in nonstrategic goods makes some sense. It is a calculated risk. I am not sure that it will work, but I am absolutely sure that to ignore the whole thing won't work because the rest of the world isn't going to ignore it.

Furthermore, I think that a few American businessmen going behind the Iron Curtain doing some dealing, making some trade arrangements might be the best advertisement we have for American capitalism. What are we so frightened about? Why do you permit to have American embassies and ministries behind the Iron Curtain with the Foreign Service that many people criticize us for being inept and not very practical, and yet being unwilling to let the most practical, successful, hard-hitting, thoroughly realistic people, according to our own definitions that we have, namely, the American business communities, go behind the Iron Curtain and do some business. I think it would be a sensible, reasonable arrangement if we could put it within guidelines that are agreed upon amongst our allies and ourselves.

Now, as to Cuba. Cuba represents a source of militant infiltration in Latin America. We have been able to curb much of that. Cuba also has a psychological impact in this country that other Communist regimes have not had, and Cuba is a threat to Venezuela, to Central America, it is a threat to each of these countries politically, not militarily as such because if it moves militarily it will be stopped cold. But politically, and ideologically. So we have sought by economic restraint and by the limitation of goods to Cuba, by working with our allies in the Organization of American States to strangle or at least to slow down the Cuban economy, and thereby hopefully to change the situation in Cuba and if we can't do that to isolate it.

Furthermore, to prevent the infiltration of Cuban infiltrators, Communist agents within the Latin American sphere.

I think our policy with Cuba has been rather successful. The OAS recent meeting has proven that.

As far as Communist China is concerned, they haven't sought to trade with us. They are aggressive, they are irresponsible, they are warlike, and I do not believe that they have demonstrated any fitness to be a dues-paying member of the family of nations, and I don't think that we ought to try to encourage them or strengthen them in any way.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey——

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

QUESTION. Knowing your leadership in the civil rights fight, would you care to make any observations as to the extent of the so-called backlash among various ethnic groups in this country at this time?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am sure that there are many people in all walks of life from different ethnic origins that have mixed feelings about the relationships between the races. There are some people that frankly feel the Negro is going too fast, trying to gain too much in too short a time. There are others who feel he has been very patient, and had to wait for too long.

There are some people that just don't like colored people, and you have to face up to these realities. There are some people who just don't like their fellow white people. [Laughter.]

There are just some people who just don't like. [Laughter.]

Now, some places we run into people who just don't like people of other religions than their own.

I don't deny that there is some of what you would call the backlash in terms of the feeling, the emotional feeling, because of civil rights. I think it is more in the south, I might add, than any place else.

But to be specific, I think if you go into the areas of Gary, Ind., and Milwaukee, or Buffalo, places that have been mentioned from time to time, or Chicago, that you will find that some of these groups that are known as ethnic groups while they may have some feelings about the civil rights issue they have other feelings that are overriding. In other words, they may not like what President Johnson did when he signed the civil rights bill but they liked other things that he did a whole lot more, and they add it up, and they measure it off, and every indication that I have seen indicates that they are going to vote overwhelmingly for President Johnson in the traditionally democratic areas where the so-called backlash is supposed to prevail.

I don't think we ought to ignore it. I think it is a fact, and, therefore, it seems to me that what is needed today is both candidates for President, both of them saying that they are for law and order and saying it very loud, it seems to me they ought to indicate and promote respect for the law, because make no mistake about it, if Mr. Goldwater is elected President of the United States he is going to have to lift his hands and put his other hand on the Bible and say he is going to live up to the law. That he is going to enforce the law. That he is going to abide by the Constitution, that he is going to enforce the statutes, and he wouldn't be able to repeal the Civil Rights Act overnight. Congress never does anything that fast. [Laughter.]

So he has got a job, if that day should ever happen that is indeed, to my way of thinking, a rather unlikely set of circumstances. But it might; it could.

I would, therefore, urge the two candidates for President, and I am sure that President Johnson has done this, I know I have, I know that Senator Ellender has, I know that Senator Russell has, these were men who fought against the Civil Rights Act—they have asked that people abide by the law. They have asked people to work within the law, and they haven't gone out after the law was passed and said it stirs up bitterness and hostility and violence and tension, which is only a way of saying, "Sic em." I think we need today people who ask people to respect the law as they preach to us about law and order. That will help a little on the backlash, too.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, talking about understanding reality, I suppose one of the most unrealistic things that confronts America today is our refusal to recognize the fact that today over 800 million people live behind the Bamboo Curtain. Why?

Senator HUMPHREY. This is a considered policy of our Government around which there are many differences of view. The late John Foster Dulles, in one of his publications before he became

Secretary of State, said that we ought to recognize the Communist regime of China, not because he thought communism was good, but simply because it ought to be recognized just as the Mexicans and British generally recognize on the basis of the de facto regime.

It is my view that because of the large numbers of Chinese nationals in vast areas of southeast Asia, Malaysia, Vietnam, Indonesia, Thailand, and elsewhere, that if we, the United States of America, in light of their vicious attack that has been made upon us by the Chinese Communists both on the battlefield and through propaganda, if we were to recognize or in any way to condone or encourage recognition of Red China or acceptance of Red China into the U.N. as a member of the Security Council, for example, that we would be doing a great disservice to the cause for which we have given so much of our treasure and our efforts, the cause of freedom.

I know that there are 800 million behind the Iron Curtain. There are other contacts with Red China. The French, the British, and their contacts haven't been very fruitful. Therefore, I do not support realistically or not, I think I am being a realist. The realism, as I see it, is that to recognize Red China would be to encourage the Chinese in other countries to be more sympathetic to the Communist-oriented or socialist-oriented regimes, that it would only strengthen the hand of Communist China in its propaganda efforts, since we, the United States of America, are the major non-Communist power, democratic power.

Also, I might add that at the present time with the fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet bloc that it might be very wise and prudent diplomacy to have our relationships with the Soviet Union and to have them firm and reliable as we refuse to have open diplomatic relationships with Communist China.

I believe that there is some possibilities of a successful diplomacy in that posture.

QUESTION. Senator, would you explain the background of the Americans for Democratic Action? I think some of these gentlemen would like to know the background as you have told it to me a time or two.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I have been reading a good deal about that little organization. [Laughter.]

It really has gotten out a lot of good publicity. I must say when I was active in it we tried to recruit members but we have never done as well as Senator Goldwater and Mr. Miller, they have given us more publicity and more interest in this organization than anybody ever, ever did.

Mr. Nixon came in a poor second on that.

The ADA was established, I believe, in 1947, it was established for one purpose primarly. Many of our—you recall the election of 1946, you recall the Progressive Party, the candidate of that party was Mr. Wallace. I never did feel that Henry Wallace was a leftwinger or a Communist, but I regret to say I think he was used. I know the kind of people that were in the Progressive Party manipulating it. Some of them were from my State.

I also know what happened to the Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota. I also know the leftist, the Communist infiltration from 1945 to 1948 in the Democratic Party, Democratic Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota, and anybody who lived in Minnesota knows what we had to do about it.

And I led the fight long before there were any others around that got this big fever about how we battled the Communists. We had it out in my State. The labor movement was infiltrated. I went to see Mr. Philip Murray on the 11th day of May 1947, in the William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh, and said to Mr. Murray, "I understand, sir, that you are a man of Roman Catholic faith." I had never met him. "I understand that you believe in good free trade unionism and I want to tell you something about your organization in Hennepin County, Minn.: it is Communist infiltrated. I am the mayor of Minneapolis. I don't intend to have them run my city, any more than I intend to have the hoodlums or the gangsters run it. They are taking out after me, and I want you to know that I am going to take out after them. There can't be two people running Minneapolis, there can't be two groups in charge and what is more I don't like what they stand for, and it is about time that somebody called a halt

to it. And I don't want to be branded antilabor or a redbaiter because I am not. I am a friend of labor, honest labor unionism, and I think that I am a pretty good American, but I am going to wage war on these people."

Mr. Murray put his around me and said, "I have been waiting for a man like you for 10 years," and he said, "I am going to send two men to Minnesota, one of them Darrell Smith and the other Smiley Chatek," both of them living today, "and we are going to wage war right now on that organization," and we set to work to clean them up.

A little later, the ADA came about. We had a meeting in Pittsburgh. There was a group known as the Union for Democratic Action first. What was its purpose? To work in liberal organizations to clean out the Communists, extreme leftwing influence, to bring in a number of people that were intellectuals. I maybe didn't qualify in that category, but to bring in people at least who were sound, progressive American liberals who could be for a housing program without being a Communist, who could be for fair employment practices without being a Communist, who could carry the liberal banner of American politics without being a Red, and we said we are going out and win, fight this war. And we went out in the labor movement, in the political parties, in many of the volunteer organizations in the country, and we cleaned them up. As a matter of fact, the ADA ought to be getting a medal, instead of the abuse that it has been getting.

Surely some members of the ADA are more liberal, more progressive than I am, many people in public life. I have disagreed with them many times. I disagree with them on the whole matter of Red China; they are more with Mr. Dulles. I disagree with him on that. I don't think that makes either Mr. Dulles or ADA Communists. I didn't think that made the man that asked the question one, either. It is a very thoughtful question.

ADA never believed in unilateral disarmament, and those people who say so know it. It supports NATO, it supports SEATO, it supports our efforts in Cuba, it supports a strong military posture, it supports civil liberties, it supports civil rights, it supports Federal Government programs. It has a checklist of what programs it believes are good for America.

They generally add up being programs advocated by a Democratic President. I generally come out voting for most of those programs. I hope that I shall always have the privilege of not only voting for them but sponsoring some of them.

This organization represents an independent progressive group of people in American public life. Men like Reinhold Neibuhr, the great theologian, Bishop Scarlett, Wilson Wyatt, Leon Henderson was one of the early ones; men like George Meany, Walter Reuther, Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, Eugene McCarthy. I think these are all pretty decent responsible people.

You may not agree with some of their points of view. But to have an attack upon this organization as if it were a Marxist, Communist-oriented, socialistic organization is an insult to the intelligence of responsible, thoughtful Americans, and those who peddle that kind of trash have disqualified themselves, it seems to me, from public trust or public faith, and we intend to see that that happens. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Do you think the Democrats will carry all 50 States in this election?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I don't. I doubt that we can do that. I think there are many very hard-fought battlegrounds yet in this election, and while I hope we will have a substantial victory, I sincerely doubt we would be able to fulfill the standard that you have just raised. I will bring that up to the President and may make him campaign a little harder. We may catch a couple of more.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, it has been the policy of the Government that American newspapermen were not permitted to go to Red China because the United States would not accept an equal number of Chinese newspapermen coming over here.

Would you favor a change in that policy?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

QUESTION. Thank you.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it would be a good idea to have some good observations made and I am not afraid of anybody observing our country.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, maybe I am not updated, but why is President Johnson seemingly so reticent about jumping on Senator Goldwater for his inconsistency on the one hand of bemoaning violence in the streets in northern cities but not saying a thing about bombings and beatings and burnings in, for example, McComb, Miss.?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I had the feeling that the President in his comments about Mr. Goldwater's statement was commenting about Mr. Goldwater's statement wherever they may apply. I think the question might be why is Mr. Goldwater more interested in talking about the violence in Harlem and a little less interested in talking about it in some other parts of the country.

The President comments upon the statement of the contender.

Frankly, the most reassuring thing I have seen is the tremendous acceptance and compliance with the law, with the civil rights law. This is the first year in the history of America that every State in the Union has now made some effort toward desegregation of its schools. We have gone a long way. I only wish that we can get people to understand that to break these patterns of habit, these long-established customs, is a major task and what we need today are people to inch along, so to speak, but keep moving along. We can't make a solid all-at-once breakthrough. I have learned in the Congress of the United States as one of the floor leaders that while you surely would like to go much further than you are apparently going to go, that the important thing is to get your foot off the brake and start making some progress.

Progress begets progress, paralysis begets paralysis, and retreat begets retreat.

So, Hubert Humphrey's point of view has been make some progress and come back for some more. It keeps you busy, too, and gives you something to do. [Laughter.]

Not only that the other fellow sometimes doesn't feel so bad if he has to yield a little and you have time to condition him for the next jolt, do you see?

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, yesterday Senator Goldwater said that President Johnson had been flying recently without his code clerk, his code clerk was in a plane 15 minutes behind him, and he implied this was a dangerous thing. Do you know anything about the alleged incident?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am sorry, I didn't quite get that.

QUESTION. Senator Goldwater yesterday said that President Johnson had made a flight recently but that his code clerk was not in the same plane with him—this was a dangerous situation in case any message came through immediately.

Do you know anything about this?

Senator HUMPHREY. Gentlemen, I really don't. I am not trying to duck the issue. I guess I haven't had a chance to see the President enough lately. He has had me campaigning. You remember what he said in Atlantic City, he told all those good folks that everybody is going to go home and take a rest, but not Senator Humphrey, and believe me he has really given me the task. I don't know how I even got back to town today.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Sharon, Pa.
October 7, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, thank you very much. Thank you, thank you very much, and all right, now. Boy, that's a lot of good Democratic pep. And you be sure you hold that good Democratic sign up there.

Well, I'm just delighted with this marvelous turnout and by the way, do you always notice that those Goldwater signs are way over to the far right?

And if you will notice, you know, my friends, when we were out in California last week, we found a number of young people carrying the Goldwater signs, and one of them came up to me and said, "They just pay me 50 cents for doing this."

I want you to know that we Democrats who support the minimum wage think it's worth $1.25 an hour.

Governor Lawrence, distinguished leader of this great commonwealth of Pennsylvania, our next U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, Genevieve Blatt, and I know one thing for sure, that here in the 24th Congressional District of this great Keystone State, you need a new Congressman, and Joseph Vigorito is the man. This is a man whose background and knowledge of the Government can truly give this great congressional district the wonderful representation it deserves.

I am very pleased also to see on this platform today the Democratic candidate for auditor-general of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Grace Sloan. We Democrats have always believed in equal opportunity for women and you will notice we have two of the finest women candidates, finest ladies, of America as candidates right here in the State of Pennsylvania.

Tonight, in the few moments that we have together, I want to talk to my fellow Americans in this great valley, these twin cities of Sharon and Farrell.

Now, which ones of you are from Farrell? [Appaluse.]

And which of you are from Sharon? [Applause.]

How many of you are Democrats? I see there is some work to do here, a few conversions have to be made.

Oh—Greenville? [Applause.]

Now, let's talk politics for a few moments. We deeply appreciate the wonderful cooperation that comes to us from our young people. I think one of the great developments, one of the most encouraging signs in this campaign is the fact that literally thousands and thousands of the young people of America are once again turning to the Democratic Party, and its candidates, and giving our President, Lyndon Johnson, the help that he so richly and justly deserves. We have a little less than 4 weeks to go in this campaign before it is concluded and in those 4 weeks, we must get our message to millions and millions of people. This campaign is hard fought and this campaign goes to the very heart of the future of our country, and therefore, I come to you tonight to talk to you in these few moments about the kind of leadership that America will need and must have in the years ahead.

Now, all of us know that our country, above all other countries in the world, bears a heavy responsibility. All of us know that we are living through a period of change.

Right here is this great valley, many industries have suffered from change. Workers have been displaced. Others have been retrained. And this administration, the Kennedy-Johnson administration, is pledged to a program that sees to it that in every area of America, in every valley, in every city, in every hamlet, in every region of America, that there will be a continuation of and, indeed, a stepping up of economic growth and economic progress so that the people who live in these areas may enjoy the benefits of the great prosperity which sweeps across this country.

When we come to an election, we have to make choices, and the choices in this election are as the spokesman of the Republican Party has put it, the choice is clear. It is a choice that the American people, the people of this country must make as to whether or not they want leadership that points to the future or whether or not they want leadership that points to the past; whether or not you want a man in the White House that will view America through a rearview mirror or whether you have a man in the White House that will look straight down the road of American progress and steer this great vehicle of American democracy to greater accomplishments in the 4 years ahead.

Four years ago, a young man went from one State to another in this great country: speaking to millions of Americans about our America. I think one of the most dramatic, one of the most exciting periods of American political history was in that campaign of 1960, when John F. Kennedy, a young, brilliant man, laid before the

American people the outlines of his vision of an America that was beginning to move again.

He laid before us his vision of the New Frontier, and when he became our President, he immediately started to implement that vision with one program after another.

First of all, to get America in high gear, to get this country off of dead center and in the main. That pledge has been fulfilled.

While it's perfectly true that some areas, indeed yours, have not received all of the benefits that it so richly deserves, it's still a fact that in America today, we have the highest production, the highest employment, the highest gross national product, that this Nation or any nation has every enjoyed in the history of the world. And this didn't come about by accident.

John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, a great American team—this great team set forth the program to work with the American people, not to view things for the American people, but to work with the American people so the American people could do things for themselves, and we set on the task of improving our education, of expanding our health, of rebuilding our cities, of helping, if you please, and modernizing our transportation.

And it's a matter of public record that the Kennedy-Johnson administration did more for health, did more for education, did more for the children of America, did more for the afflicted of America, did more for the elderly of America, did more for the workers of America than any administration in the history of this Republic.

And it is the proper role of government to be interested in its people. I find the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party telling us that the duty of government is not to serve the people.

Well—may I remind him that the greatest Republican of them all, the founder of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, said that it is the duty of government to serve the people. It was he who gave to us those immortal words in Gettysburg, Pa., "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

And any man that seeks the high office of the Presidency has an obligation as an American to follow in the footsteps of the great traditions of America, to follow in the footsteps of the great leaders of America, the leaders who have understood that government is a partner with the community, that government is a partner with people, and that the Government and the people of America are as one, and they ought to be looked upon that way rather than as many.

Now, it is not good enough to recite the past. I said to many young students that it is well and good to study ancient history, but don't vote it—no, no. Look to the future, and I am happy to stand here today as a representative of a political party and a President that believes in the future.

Our party is the party of hope. Our President is one that embraces the future. He wants to think of the tomorrows, not of the yesterdays. He wants to think, for example, of how we can make automation, which can be a bane, which can take a job, how you can make automation a boon, how you can make it an asset, how you can make it a help, not only for manufacturers but for the workers, and for the community, and for the Nation, and we are going to do it.

And while the Senator from Arizona was around the country telling the people what was wrong with America, President Lyndon Johnson was in America planning for the future, establishing a Commission to examine into the effects of automation, seeking ways to bring new industry to this great valley, seeking ways and means to expand America's frontiers, to lift America to new horizons, and that's the kind of a leader that America needs in this, the 20th century.

And, my friends, isn't it a little bit disturbing to hear a man who says he wants to be our President tell us, first of all, that immigration is bad, tells us that we don't need people from other lands, and I look out over this great audience and I see people who are second-generation, some first-generation, Americans. Isn't it something when a man who aspires to be President can state on a public platform that America is dominated by minorities?

Let me say right now that the minorities of people in America, of the Slovaks, of the Poles, of the Greeks, of the Italians, of the Hungarians, of the Norwegians, of all of these many groups, may I say that these people have built America, and they are good Americans, Mr. Goldwater?

I live in a State that has often been called a "little United Nations." I live in a State where we have over 50 different nationalities, and we find that these nationalities have made our State rich in culture and rich in substance. We have never found that these people that sought freedom in America and opportunity ever injured America, and I feel that a man that seeks to be President of the United States, that can talk about people as if they were little minority blocs, unneeded and unwanted, is a man that by his words and by his attitudes and by his philosophy, has disqualified himself for the high public office of President.

What we need in a President, my fellow Americans, is not someone to divide us; what we need in a President is someone to unite us. What we need in a President is not someone to make new wounds; what we need in a President is someone to heal old wounds. What we need in a President in America is someone that understands that these are the United States of America, that it is the people, not some kind of people and some other kind of people, but we, the American people, united in one great country, in one great Republic, in one great family, and that is what Lyndon Johnson preaches, teaches, and that is the way he lives.

Therefore, I come before this great audience tonight to tell you that seldom, if ever, in the history of our country have we had a man as well prepared for this high office, the Presidency, as we have today.

When John Kennedy, in Los Angeles in 1960, reached out into America and selected Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President, he was thinking of America. Any man that is nominated President of this country knows the hazards and the dangers of his responsibility and his job.

President Kennedy loved America and he loved it enough to think of its future. And he selected a big man; he selected an experienced man; he selected a man that could be trusted, a man that was responsible, a man that was reliable. He selected him as his Vice President, and why? So that he, the President of the United States, could be sure that if ever that terrible moment arrives, if that unbelievable hour should ever follow, that he should not be with us, that someone would carry on.

I think the greatest decision that John Kennedy ever made was the time that he selected Lyndon Johnson as his partner and as his Vice President.

And may I say that history has proven that statement to be right, because on that terrible, cruel day of November 22 in Dallas, Tex., when a young and valiant leader had given us 1,000 days of leadership, was struck down by the assassin's bullet, and the whole Nation faltered, the Nation was in pain and grief, the tears flowed like a mighty river, there stood a man tall and strong, a man trained and skilled, a man who knew his business.

And there was Lyndon Johnson to take up the torch of leadership of the American Republic under the most demanding, under the most unbelievable circumstances, and I ask you, my fellow Americans, hasn't he done it well? I think so.

So, as we think of these weeks ahead, I want to forewarn you. The opposition is becoming more desperate by the hour. They spread rumors. They attack our President. They spread smear. They seek to divide the American people.

The American people do not want a leader—they do not want a spokesman—that thrives on discontent, that spreads suspicion and doubt. The American people want a President that loves his country with all his heart, that works for every American, and one that can lead us at home and guide us abroad, and I have a feeling that deep down, Barry Goldwater knows that man is Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

20 WBZ—LINO

Erie, Pa.
Erie Airport Rally
October 7, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, gentlemen.

May I say that, to make this campaign a little more even, I think we ought to give a little more of this vitamin pep that we have around here to the opposition so that the fight becomes interesting.

I am glad to hear my young friends say "No," and I am very, very happy; I want to thank them very much for their wonderful song and for all the enthusiasm that you put into it. I want to tell you that you look like the finest Democrats I have ever met in my life. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, it's just marvelous and wonderful of you to come out tonight in such large numbers. This is good, brisk, October air. It's the kind of climate that makes you want to hurry up and vote Democratic early and often.

I am just so honored to be here in Erie, Pa., to be here with the former great Governor, truly Mr. Pennsylvania himself, Gov. David Lawrence. It is an honor. He's just wonderful.

There is one thing about Governor Lawrence. He never, ever challenged any Democratic nominee for President to a debate.

Now, you will notice that the Governor of this State, he was the man who suggested that he might debate the pretender of the Republican Party, and I think that before the Senator from Arizona gets along much further in his campaign, it would be a good idea if he would finish up that debate schedule, first, with Governor Scranton, second, with Governor Rockefeller, third, with Governor Romney, and after he's finished some of his spring training, because that's when all the votes will take place, in the spring. I would be glad to accommodate him in an exhibition match, and we will give all the proceeds to the Cow Palace out there in San Francisco.

It is a joy to be on this platform with a lady that has served this great State of Pennsylvania with such distinction and such honor and integrity. I know that the people of Pennsylvania are going to want to support the programs and the policies of President Johnson, and I know that if they are going to support the programs and policies of President Johnson for another 4 years, there is no doubt about that.

You know, I notice that if the people of this States wish to support those programs and policies, they are going to see to it that they have in the U.S. Senate another Senator that will work alongside of the Senator, Senator Clark, that will work there to help our President to build a better America, and I know the person that can help.

And I know the person that will do the job. I know the person that has the ability to do the job and the people of Pennsylvania know her, too, and her name is Genevieve Blatt.

And I believe in her, too. Don't you worry about that. [Applause.]

Now, my dear young friends, I'm going to give you somebody else to believe in, because our Congress is not made up only of the Senate. There are time that we Senators act as if it is only made up of the Senators—and there are times that the other Chamber, the other body, wishes that the Senate wasn't even there. But I can tell you that the representative of the people, the representative closest to the people, the representative that keeps in constant touch with the people is the Representative for the House of Representatives, the Congress, and this, the 24th Congressional District of the great State of Pennsylvania, this district deserves to have in the Congress somebody that can work hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder with the President of the United States. And you have him right on this platform and his name typifies his whole spirit, Joseph Vigorito, and you are going to elect him. [Wild applause.]

I know that when Joseph Vigorito was nominated, I know that he went from door to door and house to house. I know that he went and talked to people and I know that that kind of man is the kind of man you need for you, to work for you, and fight for you, and I want you people to back him up.

By the way, since most of these charming, lovely young ladies, Joe, can't vote for you, I have a suggestion for you. When you go home tonight, you tell your mother, your father, your grandfather, and your grandmother, and anybody who is over 21 years of age, to vote for Genevieve Blatt and Joe Vigorito.

I want to pay my respects to a great State senator, a gentleman who served this area very well, and one, I am sure, that you will want to again give your whole confidence in. You have placed your confidence in his trustworthy service to his district. I, of course, refer to William Sesler.

Well, Bill, I can see that Joe doesn't have all the loyalties of these girls, nor does Genevieve. These young ladies have enough pep for anybody, but don't you give any of that pep to that man from Arizona. You save that for the Democrats.

CHORUS OF VOICES. No.

Senator HUMPHREY. Before I speak to you this evening on what I consider to be the most serious issue of this campaign, may I just take a moment to thank the many young people that have come here, and, in particular, to thank the bands that are here tonight. I know that these young folks have been waiting a long time. Some of them have come some distance. There is a McDowell High School Band, and there is the East High School Band, of Erie.

I want these dear young friends to know, I want these young friends to know, in the presence of their parents, in the presence of their neighbors, that we, of the Democratic Party are proud of the fact that when the tabulations are taken, when the polls are taken, when the public opinion surveys are made, we find that three out of every four young people in America are for the Democratic Party, and for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

This is what keeps us young. This is what keeps us happy, and this is a great young Nation and this is a happy Nation. I saw a sign down here tonight that says: "Happiness is being a Democrat." And, believe me, it is.

One of the things that I noticed as I have traveled across this country, and I have been in many States and traveled thousands of miles, I notice that the people that are supporting Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party are people that have a sense of joy and happiness on their countenances. Every once in a while, I find someone who is carrying a Goldwater sign and I see occasionally that person smiling, and I say to them: "Deep down in your hearts, you're going to vote for President Lyndon Johnson." [Applause.]

There is good reason for America to be happy, good reason for America to be grateful, good reason for Americans to be ever-thankful. We ought to be grateful. We ought to be thankful. We ought to be happy, because no nation on earth is so pleased as the Nation of which we are privileged to be citizens.

No nation in the history of the world has ever enjoyed such prosperity; no nation has ever enjoyed such respect; no nation has had power; no nation has had such responsibility. We are, indeed, my fellow Americans, one of the most privileged, one of the most fortunate peoples that ever graced this earth, and we ought to be humbly grateful and prayerfully grateful to God Almighty for the privilege of our citizenship and for the opportunity that we have as Americans to help one another and to help this world be a safe and a peaceful world.

And let's never forget that. [Applause.]

Tonight, I want to speak to you about what I consider to be the central issue of this campaign. What is that issue? That issue is what kind of leadership do you want?

What kind of a man do you want in the Presidency? What philosophy of life? What philosophy of government?

We have, as is the tradition in our country, spokesmen for two parties, but may I say that in this instance, one of the spokesmen does not speak for a whole party? The Republican Party has a great tradition. We have had our arguments and we battled it out good and hard and clean. The Republican Party points with justificable pride to the founder of its party, Abraham Lincoln.

But may I say that the present spokesman, the temporary spokesman, of the Goldwater faction of the fraction of the Republican Party, does not walk in the footsteps of Abraham Lincoln. He has forgot-

ten him. He has never been associated with him in his philosophy and in his deeds. [Applause.]

Is it any wonder that great publications that have historically been Republican in their political preferences, the New York Herald Tribune, Life magazine, Saturday Evening Post, and others too numerous to mention, that have from year in and year out, election in and election out, supported the Republican candidates, this time say they cannot, and why?

Because they say the spokesman of the Republican Party, in this instance, does not speak for Republicans. He does not walk and work in the traditions of a great political party. He represents a group that has, for all practical purposes, just moved in and taken over for a time being.

The Governor of this State, in his primary campaign, told the truth about the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party. And the people of Pennsylvania know it. [Applause.]

The Governor of New York, in his primary campaign for the Presidency, told the truth about the gentleman from Arizona.

Now, every man is entitled to his point of view in this country, and, indeed, any man that stands for high public office is entitled to the courtesy of a platform and the courtesy of the respect of an audience. But let me say again, once again, that Mr. Goldwater is not a conservative, that Mr. Goldwater is not a Republican. He is a radical, and he violates every tradition of the great party that he says he represents.

Abraham Lincoln said the duty of the government is to serve the people. Abraham Lincoln gave us those immortal words of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Barry Goldwater has forgotten that this is a government for the people. He is even somewhat confused as to whether or not it is by the people. [Applause.]

So, what is the issue, then, in the campaign? What are we finally going to decide this election upon? The issue is which of the two men nominated for the high office in the Government of the American people genuinely possesses the qualifications of experience, of training, of background, of temperament, to direct the destiny of this Nation and of our Government?

This is important business, friends, and this is not the kind of politics that can just be treated with cheers and jeers. It isn't the kind of an election, if you please, that should be the plaything of idle jest. We are talking about an America today that is the hope of the world. We are talking about an America today that must maintain a high degree of prosperity. We are talking about an America today that is growing in population, where there is greater demand for education, where science and technology is changing the very image of our country, the life of our country.

We are talking about an America that is becoming urbanized and industrialized. And we need as a leader someone that can look to the future and be unafraid, not someone that spends his time reviewing the past, and then being sick and tired of it all, as he says time after time.

Oh, no, my fellow Americans, you have too much at stake.

May I address myself for a moment to every mother and father in this audience? This Nation will be tested in the years ahead as never before. Your children will need an education and better than you ever dreamed. America must produce 300,000 new jobs every month. America must find ways, if you please, to make her cities livable. America must take on the terribly difficult burden of maintaining the peace. Unless we maintain the peace, what is everything else for? Why beautiful cities? Why lovely homes? Why car? Why bring up our young in education if it all be destroyed by some fickle temperament, by some miscalculation, by some nuclear holocaust?

We have serious problems ahead of us but we have a man in the White House today, ladies and gentlemen, that knows his business and knows what to do about it.

I say to this audience in the moments that are remaining to me that we have in the Presidency today, in the Office of President, a man who is more qualified for that job than any man I can remember. He is a man that has served his country well, first as a youth administrator

back in the days of the depression, as a teacher working with the young, as a Member of the House of Representatives, and a confidant of the late President Roosevelt, and one who served in the U.S. Senate with distinction that no one can deny, a majority leader that knew how to lead, and a majority leader under a Republican President who knew how to be responsible.

The one word that characterizes Lyndon Johnson's life is responsibility and integrity, and, my fellow Americans, don't you ever forget it.

I know the attack that is being launched upon him. I smell it in the atmosphere. I know what the Republican leader, the temporary spokesman of this little fraction of the Republican Party, intends. I know what his henchmen are doing. They intend to attack our President. They intend to try to divide America. They intend to try to place in your minds distrust and doubt and confusion.

Do not be confused. Think of what you have: A man who has served in Congress for years, one who has served on the greatest committees of the armed services, atomic energy, and space, a majority leader of the Senate, a Vice President of the United States, selected and trusted by our late and beloved President, John Kennedy. I submit those are his qualifications.

[Applause.]

My friends, and fellow Americans, this man has served on the National Security Council, where the great decisions of America have been made. He was a trusted confident, as I said, of the late President Roosevelt, and of President Eisenhower. And in man in the memory of any person in this audience ever came to a Presidency more prepared for the job, but he came under the most unbelievable and the most difficult and the most challenging of circumstances.

Place yourselves, my fellow Americans, for just a brief moment in his position. The day is November 22, 1963. The scene is Dallas, and a brave and brilliant and wonderful young man is there to see the American people and he is struck down by the assassin's bullet.

America faltered and cried and wept. The whole world was in tears, and there stood a man who had been selected by John Kennedy as his Vice President, and that man stood tall and strong, and that man was Lyndon Johnson, and he took over the job of this Government: and with calmness and courage, with humility and with strength, he directed the affairs of this Nation.

And, my friends, no person that is fairminded can deny that he has given us exemplary leadership, that he and his wife and his family are not something and are not a family that we can be proud of and we ought to be grateful, extremely grateful, that such a man guides our country today and tomorrow.

So, the issue is simply this: What kind of a man do you want as your President? Do you want one who says what he means and means what he says? Or do you want one that says something and wonders what he means, and then says again what he thought he meant when he said it?

[Applause.]

Do you want as your President someone who is strong and resolute without being belligerent and arrogant?

[Applause.]

Do you want as your President someone who understands the America that we live in, and the world?

I think Americans want as their President someone who unites us, someone who calls us to betterment. I think America wants someone who knows no North, no South, no East, or West, someone that doesn't divide us, someone that doesn't speak in terms of races and religions, someone that doesn't speak in terms of minorities and blocs. I think we want as a President, Lyndon Johnson, who is a great American and a great leader.

[Applause.]

So, may I just leave you with this word? What we want is what we have, if we will it. These elections are not won by cheers. These elections are not won by signs. These elections, my friends, are won by votes and those votes must come when you are convinced that you're voting for what you believe is best for your America. And I submit to this audience that the record of Lyndon Johnson is so far superior

to the record of his opponent that it almost seems ludicrous to even compare them.

I submit to you that Lyndon Johnson stands like a mighty oak in this forest of American democracy and he stands there strong and he stands there able. He stands there as a gifted and talented leader and I don't believe that you want to let that leadership get away from you.

So I ask the people of Erie County, I ask the people of Pennsylvania not to forsake what we have; I ask you again as John Bailey said, "Give us your hands, give us your hearts, give us your judgment." Go in the voting booth on November 3, and deep down in your heart, you know that what is good for America is the election of Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States.

[Applause.]

Astabula, Ohio
October 7, 1964

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

A few days ago I raised the question: "Is Senator Goldwater really a Republican?"

I then analyzed the votes of Senator Goldwater on 25 specific positions set forth in the 1960 Republican platform as compared with the votes of Senators Dirkson, Kuchel, Saltonstall, and Hickenlooper.

An honest appraisal of what republicanism means is found in this 1960 platform. It was a conservative platform—but is was a responsible platform too. It reflected the fact that a Republican administration had been in office 8 years, and had dealt with the complex problems of a great nation in a turbulent world.

The record shows that Senator Goldwater voted against every one of the 25 major positions adopted by the Republican Party in the 1960 platform.

The record shows that Senator Kuchel supported his party's declared position on every one of these major issues. And Senator Saltonstall supported the platform on 20 occasions.

Of course, Senator Goldwater has called Senator Kuchel an "extremist" (presumably because he was loyal to the party platform) and Senator Saltonstall comes from the eastern seaboard—which Senator Goldwater, in the spirit of good all-Americanism—once suggested should be cut off from the United States and set adrift.

But what about Senator Dirksen and Senator Hickenlooper?

They are neither extremists nor easterners. They come from the Midwest; they are deeply committed to the tradition of the Republican Party; and they are universally and rightly known as solid conservatives.

Senator Dirksen voted for the party's platform 18 times, and went against it only 4 times.

Senator Hickenlooper voted 17 times for his party's platform, and went against it only 8 times.

In short, Senator Dicksen, Senator Hickenlooper, Senator Saltonstall, and Senator Kuchel—all supported the 1960 Republican platform, an overwhelming majority of the time.

But not Senator Goldwater. He opposed the party platform all 25 times when these major issues came before the Senate for a vote. Always the same refrain: "No, no, a thousand times no."

So I come to the conclusion that Senator Goldwater is neither a Republican nor a conservative. He is a radical, not a conservative—and he'd rather be "right than Republican"—at least as the 1960 Republican platform defined the policies of the party. And in terms of that platform, he is right—far, far right.

Radical Goldwaterism does not equate with responsible republicanism. The Goldwaterites have, in short, kidnaped the conservative tradition and are using it to mask a radical assault upon the very fabric of the American community.

This contention is reinforced by citing Abraham Lincoln's thoughts on the proper role of government. He said:

25 WBZ—LINO

> The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all—or cannot so well do—for themselves.

Contrast Lincoln's philosophy with the observation of a businessman who was recently transferred to a community which is a hotbed of Goldwaterism. He said:

> I always thought of myself as a conservative * * * but these Goldwater people aren't my kind of conservatives. They don't seem to believe in any kind of government.

Now, Senator Goldwater doesn't go so far as many of his followers. But he has said:

> I fear Washington and centralized government more than I fear Moscow.

He doesn't propose to dispense with the modern, positive government all at once. He merely proposes to dismantle it in easy installments. As he has written:

> The Government must begin to *withdraw* from a whole series of programs that are outside its constitutional mandate—from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal. * * * We should establish by law a rigid timetable for a staged withdrawal.

I think Senator Goldwater must have skimmed through the Constitution too hastily. He evidently hasn't read the Preamble, which sets forth the promotion of the general welfare as one of the great purposes for which our Government was established.

This is *positive* government, as Abraham Lincoln—not only a Republican, but the greatest of Republicans—defined it.

To Senator Goldwater, however, this kind of government is "the greatest threat to freedom."

What is this freedom which Senator Goldwater sees as threatened?

To me it sound like the freedom against which the noblest spirits of Senator Goldwater's favorite century—the 19th—rebelled. The great French writer, Anatole France, said with deadly irony:

> The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the *poor* to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread.

This is freedom for the sweatshop proprietor, the slum landlord, the robber baron of a century ago. This is not liberty for the many—it is a license for the privileged few.

I think most of us have a deeper understanding of freedom today.

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

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

We know that a can cannot be fully free if he faces an old age of poverty and insecurity.

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

We know that true freedom is achieved only in a society where each and every person has an opportunity to develop his or her native abilities to their fullest extent, to put them to work in a decent job at decent wages, and to look forward to an old age of dignity and comfort.

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

Certainly we do not and need not always look to Washington. There are many problems best dealt with closer to the people they concern—and, under President Johnson's concept of "creative federalism," they are being dealt with that way.

But the United States is a nation as well as a Federal Union of 50 States. It is a big country with big problems and bigger opportunities—and they are getting bigger every year.

When we elect a President of the United States, and only then, we choose a man to act for all of us—all the people of the United States.

In his 10 months in the White House, President Johnson has proven that he accepts that responsibility in full measure. He does not propose to withdraw from it by retreating into the 19th century or by dismantling the Federal Government so that it cannot fulfill its constitutional mandate to promote the general welfare.

Above all, I can assure you that he does not and will not delegate to any other man—in uniform or not—the awesome responsibility a President of the United States bears day and night in this nuclear age.

That is why Democrats, responsible Republicans and clear-thinking Independents will cast their votes for the one man qualified to be President of the United States.

They will vote for Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Ashtabula, Ohio
October 7, 1964

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very, very much. [Applause.] They just put Senator Goldwater in orbit. [Applause.]

May I just take a moment to express to the city manager, Mr. DeLuca, my gratitude for this key that unlocks the city hall. I gather that he feels that this key will unlock the White House.

Well, may I say that there is a whole lot better chance for a gold key to get into the White House than there is a Goldwater? [Applause.]

I am very happy to be here in Ashtabula, this home of the good Swedes and Norwegians and Italians. Coming as I do from Minnesota, I can really appreciate this snappy weather that you have. This is about the temperature we have in Duluth on the 4th of July. I am particularly pleased this evening to see some of the young people here. [Applause.]

I understand that about 50 carloads of young students came over from Penn State University. I like that, and I'm sure that others came from other parts of this great State of Ohio.

Senator Young, it's good to see you here again. I have been traveling along the State of Ohio a good deal these past weeks. It has been my privilege to go into this great State, and I like to see my old colleague and friend from Ohio in the U.S. Senate there on the platform with me.

If the people of this State have the good judgment that I believe they have, they are going to keep in the U.S. Senate a man who works ceaselessly for the people of Ohio, who is known for his courage, who is known for getting thing done, who is known for staying on the job and serving the people, and of all the young men that I can think of that do that job and do it well, none is better than Steve Young. [Applause.]

And I might add that this man knows how to get over to the White House, and see the President, and he is going to be seeing a Democratic President, not a Republican, so you'd better have a Democratic Senator. [Applause.]

Now, this great 11th Congressional District of Ohio ought to have a man representing it down there in the House of Representatives that can speak to our Government, can work for you, can give you the kind of service and the kind of leadership and representation that this 11th District—that is so well balanced between agriculture and industry—that this district deserves. We have on this platform the next Congressman from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, C. D. Lambros, and I know you're going to elect him. [Applause.]

He is a fine looking man. You put down there Steve Young and Lambros, and with Johnson in the White House and Humphrey presiding over the Senate, you're going to have quite a team down there. [Applause.]

By the way, Senator Young has been very good to me. In case you see the way things are working out as they are planning, and I think they will, I'll be the man that administers him the oath, so between now and that happy day in January when the Senator from Ohio appears in the U.S. Senate to take his oath of office for his second term in the Senate, he will have to be very, very considerate of Hubert Humphrey.

I want you to know, Steven, that no matter what you may do between now and the election, as long as you get Democratic votes and as long as you get elected, and as long as you behave the way you have these many years, I'll be very happy and very honored to administer the oath as the great Senator from the State of Ohio, representing this great Buckeye State.

By the way, is my friend Bob Sweeney around here tonight? He couldn't make it?

Well, let me tell you that Bob Sweeney is the candidate for Congressman at Large from Ohio.

That's good. Put that sign up good and high down there, young lady.

That's the man you want to vote for for Congressman at Large from Ohio. Get that name clear.

We have had quite a time tonight. First of all, we were over there at Sharon and Farrell, Pa. Then we were at Erie, Pa., and then we are over here in the great State of Ohio, at Ashtabula.

Each place that we have gone, there has been a great audience, enthusiastic, happy-looking people. You can just plain tell that the Democrats are doing well because there are so many people that look so happy, and one of the ways that you find a Democrat, the difference between a Democrat and a Goldwaterite, is just by looking in their eyes, looking in their faces, and when you see a fellow that looks like he has just swallowed a turnip, you know that he is most likely carrying a Goldwater sign. [Applause.]

But when you see somebody whose eyes are shining, whose countenance is happy, who is an outgoing, joyous individual, you know that that person can hardly wait for November 3 to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Now, friends and neighbors, a few days ago—they just got the message back there.

A few days ago, I raised the question in a neighboring State: Is Senator Goldwater really a Republican? And this question deserves thoughtful analysis. I raised the question because literally hundreds of thousands of people of Republican persuasion are joining in the ranks of the Democratic Party and supporting President Lyndon Johnson for election.

Great newspapers across our land that traditionally have supported Republican candidates are today announcing openly and happily their support of Lyndon Johnson for President of the United States. And I think we have a reason to ask why that has taken place.

And the reason it has taken place is quite obvious. The reason is, first of all, that President Johnson has given this Nation remarkable leadership, that the Nation is enjoying a new era of prosperity, that great progress is being made, but also, people who are traditionally Republicans sense that their party is in hands that do not really respect Republican tradition.

Now, my fellow Americans, we don't expect a candidate of the opposition party to vote for Democratic programs most of the time. That would be asking too much of an opponent. You don't expect a leader of the opposition to carry the banner of the Democratic Party.

But you should have a right to expect that when a man says that he is the spokesman of the Republican Party, that he has a record that indicates support for the principles of that party.

We have a candidate today, as the temporary spokesman of a faction of a fraction of the Republican Party, that does not speak for the Democratic Party and he doesn't speak for the Republican Party. He apparently speaks for a small core group, hard core group that is his group, that goes his way despite the great traditions of the two political parties.

Now, I make this charge tonight that Senator Goldwater, the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party, really does not represent that party in terms of its platform committee, in terms of its traditions. He surely doesn't represent the Democratic Party. He has made no pretense of that, and he is an honorable man. I take him at his word.

Let's see where he stands then, in terms of his own party, and let's see where he stands in terms of the great issues of our time.

The 1960 Republican platform to which the Senator from Arizona had pledged his support during his service in the United States, a

service, if you please, that was characterized primarily by being a spokesman for his particular point of view, that 1960 platform had 25 specific commitments or positions that were given to the American people.

In that 1960 platform, we ought to compare the votes of Senator Goldwater with the Republican leaders in the U.S. Senate. Let's see who those leaders are. Senator Dirksen of Illinois, Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts, Senator Kuchel, the minority whip, of California, Senator Hickenlooper of Iowa. These are the elected representatives of the Republicans in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Dirksen is their leader. Senator Kuchel of California is their minority whip. Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts, a distinguished Senator, is the chairman of their conference committee, and Senator Hickenlooper, a man who has served in the U.S. Senate for four terms, is the chairman of their policy committee.

These are the leaders of the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States. These are the men who served alongside of Senator Goldwater, and these men, like every other Senator, make a commitment in terms of party program and platform.

Twenty-five issues, an honest appraisal of what Republicanism means, is found in that platform. It was a conservative platform, but it was a responsible platform, too. It reflected the fact that there had been a Republican President. It had responsibility. It reflected that a Republican administration had been in office 8 years, but had dealt with the world as it was, not this world of mythology and fiction that the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party today talks about.

What does that record show? The record shows that Senator Goldwater voted against every one of 25 positions adopted by the Republican Party in the 1960 platform. The record shows that Senator Kuchel of California, a great Republican, supported his party's declared position 25 times, for every position.

Senator Saltonstall, a man of great integrity, this man supported his party platform on 20 issues.

Of course, Senator Goldwater is called the Republican leader. Senator Kuchel from California—he is called an extremist. Extremists, in the eyes of Mr. Goldwater, are those that don't agree with him, apparently. He was an extremist that supported the Republican platform.

Senator Saltonstall comes from the eastern seaboard. That is the area of the country which Senator Goldwater said in a spirit of good old all-Americanism, he suggested that they cut off the whole Atlantic seaboard, and let it float out to sea.

Well, may I say, he is going to think that happened when the votes come in from the Atlantic seaboard in November. [Applause.]

But, my dear friends, what about those two midwesterners, Senator Dirksen and Senator Hickenlooper? Neither one of them is an extremist. They are avowed conservatives.

Senator Dirksen voted for the party's platform 18 times. He went against it only four. Senator Hickenlooper voted for it 17 times, voted against it 8. In short, Senators Dirksen and Hickenlooper supported the 1960 platform an overwhelming majority of the time.

But one man was always out of step. One man was always on the sidelines, the far right. One man, on 25 major commitments of his party, the party that he says he leads, on 25 showdown votes, 25 issues in their own platform that he said and that the leader of his party, Mr. Nixon, said should be the platform of the Republican Party, and the commitments to the American people, on 25 occasions, the Senator from Arizona said, "No," "No," 25 times, "No."

So, I come to one conclusion, that Goldwater is neither a Republican nor a conservative. He is a radical, and he is a very, very definite radical. Radical Goldwaterism is what we face and it doesn't mean conservative Republicanism.

The Goldwaterites, in short, have kidnapped the conservative tradition in the GOP and are using it to make an assault upon the very fabric of the American community.

You know, there was a time when the "GOP" stood for "Grand Old Party." Now, it stands for "Goldwater's Our Problem." [Applause.]

Somebody is going to tell you, "Well, now, the Senator just picked up 25 positions. Senator Humphrey picked up 25 positions and he found that Goldwater voted wrong on them 25 times, and from that, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Humphrey, draws conclusions that Mr. Goldwater is not even a good Republican."

But let's go a little further. Who is the father of the Republican Party? Abraham Lincoln, the finest of them all, a great American, one revered by Democrats and Republicans alike. What did Abraham Lincoln say about the proper duty of the Government? He was a great exponent of the duty of the Government.

I quote his words, the words of the great Abraham Lincoln:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves."

I think we have to recognize that there are people, frequently, who support a candidate that go much further in their extremism than the candidate himself.

But here is what Senator Goldwater has to say:

> I fear Washington and centralized government more than I fear Moscow.

Too, here's a man, my fellow Americans, that wants you to give him your vote, wants you to give your vote to him so that he can be President, and he says that he fears Washington, he fears our own Government more than he fears Moscow.

Well, let me say from this platform that I think our Nation is blessed by the finest government that was ever created by the hand of man. I believe in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I don't think the Government in Washington is a greater threat to our freedom than the Communist government in Moscow, and I say to Mr. Goldwater, "Shame on you for even intimating such a thing."

Now, friends and neighbors, Senator Goldwater says, however, that he doesn't propose to do away with the Government at once. He merely proposes to dismantle it in easy installments. And here's what he has written—one of the most interesting aspects of this campaign is to quote what the Senator from Arizona has written. Of course, you're not always sure you get the same story, because there have been many things written.

You know, I feel many times that what the Nation needs today is a President who says what he means and means what he says, not a President who means something, and then says it, and you don't know what he means after he has said it.

Now, what did the Senator from Arizona say? He said:

> The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs that are outside its constitutional mandate.

Listen here, my friends, he says the Government must withdraw from "social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal."

I think Mr. Goldwater must have skimmed through the Constitution too hastily. I was a teacher at one time and if any student of mine had given as poor a description of the duties of the Government under the Constitution as Mr. Goldwater has, I would have flunked him, or at least, I would have given him some remedial reading.

Now, the Constitution sets forth in the preamble the general welfare, the promotion of the general welfare, as the one great duty of a government. It is the major purpose of the Government.

There are only two directions in the Constitution, just two, to the Government of the United States: To provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare. Those are the two directives. Mr. Goldwater seems to have forgotten one.

Now, this is the government that Abraham Lincoln talked about, not as a Republican but as a great American. He defined it and he defined it for us as positive government. But Senator Goldwater finds this kind of government to be our greatest threat to freedom.

Now, what is this freedom that Senator Goldwater seems to think is threatened? To me, it sounds like the freedom against which the noblest spirits of Goldwater's favorite century, the 19th, rebelled. This is the freedom from the sweatshop proprietor, the slum landlord, the robber baron of a century ago.

This is not liberty for the many. It is license for the privileged few.

I think most of us have a deeper understanding of freedom today. We know that a man cannot be fully free if he is ill housed, ill fed, and ill clothed.

We know that a man cannot be fully free if he faces an old age of poverty and insecurity. We know that a youngster cannot be fully free if he grows up in an urban slum or a rural slum, and if he gets an inadequate education with inadequate teaching and ill-equipped schools.

We know that true freedom is achieved only in a society where each and every person has the opportunity to develop his or her native abilities to their fullest, to put them to work in a decent job and at decent wages, and to look forward to an old age of dignity and comfort.

The freedom that America wants is the freedom of choice, the freedom of opportunity, not the freedom that the Senator from Arizona talks about, where you are left behind, where no consideration is given to your needs, but a freedom, if you please, where the American people can at least have the opportunity for a gainful job at fair wages, where industry can expand and grow, and where our youngsters can be educated.

And the record of the Republican candidate in this election is not one that indicates a sympathy with that course of freedom.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the United States is a big nation, and it requires a big leader. It is a big country with big problems and bigger opportunities, and they are getting bigger every year. The country is getting bigger; the problems are big, and the opportunities are unlimited.

When we elect a President of the United States, and only then, we choose a man to act for all of us, all the people of the United States.

In his 10 months in the White House, President Johnson has proven that he accepts that responsibility of working for all of us and that he accepts it with the spirit of a government that has as its duty to serve the people.

He does not propose to withdraw from this duty by retreating to the 19th century or by dismantling the Federal Government so that it will fail its constitutional mandate to promote the general welfare.

I say to this fine audience tonight and to this splendid community that you are privileged this year of 1964 to have in the White House a man that has demonstrated by his leadership and by his performance the capacity to be a great President of the United States.

And I don't think the people of America are going to turn away from him. In fact, I am convinced the people of America are going to embrace him and they are going to elect him as their President for 4 more years.

Finally, now, my friends and fellow citizens, let me say this: our country has tremendous responsibilities these days. We live in a different time than those that preceded us. There isn't a thoughtful citizen that doesn't know that America cannot afford a depression. There isn't a thoughtful citizen that does not know that with a growing population, we must be able to provide more jobs.

There isn't a thoughtful citizen that doesn't know that the children of this generation must be better educated than of another generation. There isn't a thoughtful citizen that doesn't know that the peace of the world, indeed, the safety in this world, is in the hands of the people of the United States, and their elected leaders.

Therefore, when we elect a President, we need a man that will unite us, that will bring us together, that will develop a national purpose and great national goals. We need a President that can speak for all of us, not one that divides us, not one that plays off one group against another.

We need as a President of the United States one that understands the problems of today and doesn't propose to be a student of ancient history. We need a President, we need a man in the White House, who clearly understands his responsibilities as Commander in Chief to keep our country strong, but to use that power with restraint.

Every mother and father in this audience tonight knows that everything that we hope for and pray for can be lost if a President of the United States is impetuous, if he makes a wrong decision, if he is irrational, if he is unreliable, if he is irresponsible, and we cannot afford to make any mistakes.

George Washington told the people of America in his time that during 7 years of the War for Independence, he knew every day that that war could be lost and that the hope of independence could be lost if he, the Commander in Chief, the Father of our Country, ever made a major mistake of judgment. And he prayed for divine guidance. He thought through every problem.

And today, may I say, even more than in Washington's time, with the nuclear power, with the unbelievable potential of destruction, the President of the United States must be a man that is calm, he must be a man that is steadfast, he must be one that is skilled in the art of government, he must be one that our allies respect, he must be one that will command attention and respect at home, and above all, he must be one that pursues the paths of peace.

He must be one with a great heart as well as a strong mind. And I sincerely believe that John Kenndy, in selecting Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President, made the greatest decision of his life and it has been proven by history.

Because, when President Kennedy was struck down by the assassin's bullet, and America was left faltering for those moments, everybody wondered, "What will happen?"

Then, as if we were protected by divine providence, itself, a strong man was there, one who under the most difficult of circumstances, stood up, took the oath of office, and became our President and has carried on in a masterful manner.

I don't believe there is a fair-minded American that does not honestly believe deep in his heart that Lyndon Johnson has been a great President and has served our country well.

I ask you to have the same faith in President Johnson that John Kennedy had in him. John Kennedy said to Lyndon Johnson, "Stand alongside of me and help me."

I ask the American people now to stand alongside of President Johnson and help him. Give us your hands. Give us your hearts. Give us your help.

Thank you, friends.

Camden, N.J.
Walt Whitman Hotel
October 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Joe. First of all may I pay my respects to your very fine Governor Hughes. [Applause.] I shall never forget your efforts when this election goes to Lyndon Johnson and he will be living at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue—wherever they put the Vice President.

I want you to know that all doors will be open to you on every occasion at any time 7 days a week. [Applause.] Of course, in case we don't have the keys to either one of these doors, you can always come over and get Pete Williams' because he will have one at all times and we will see that you get one.

I can't think of a State that could have two more able and effective representatives for the economic and social progress of the State of New Jersey than Governor Hughes and Pete Williams, your U.S. Senator. [Applause.]

While I am thinking about it, it wouldn't be a bad idea, in fact, it would be a very good idea to elect a Congressman from this district that is for Lyndon B. Johnson, and you know who it is. [Applause.] Bill Procaccia is that man. He doesn't have to wait around. He hasn't had to make any split decisions, any last moment understand-

ings. He has been with us right down the line and I have been in Congress long enough to know that when you need a vote and when you need some help, you want a man that has made up his mind, and Bill Procaccia is just that kind of a fellow. [Applause.]

My thanks to your fine mayor, Mayor Pierce, and that good mayor from Hoboken is around here, Johnny Grogan, and the labor movement for Johnson and Humphrey. Also Monsignor Daugherty graced our meeting by his presence. It is wonderful to have a great churchman alongside us and it is also good to have the former heavyweight champion of the world along with us, that great champion. He fought hard, fought clean, and that is exactly what Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are doing in this campaign. [Applause.]

May I say, Mr. Champion, that when I came into this great hotel, Walt Whitman Hotel, I was greeted outside by a throng of young people and also by some of our senior citizens and the Democratic Party and the program of Lyndon Johnson for a better America, for the fulfillment of the commitments and promises of the New Frontier, that the program of our President and our party is a program which extends the hand of fellowship and friendship to the young that opens up the pathways and opportunities for the young, and also is one that without any equivocation at all stands for the dignity and for the security of our elderly. A political party that is worth its—that is worth anything, a political party—a leader that works with respect to the American people, is one that will commit itself unequivocally, wholeheartedly, to doing everything it possibly can to aid those who are in the dawn of life, our young people, as they seek to improve their minds, to strengthen their bodies, find out the truth, and a political party worthy of our respect is one that will always take into consideration the needs of those who have given their lives, the fullness of their lives, to their communities and their families and their country, our senior citizens, and a political party and political leadership that is worthy of the respect of the American people is one that is committed to social justice, to human decency and for concern and compassion, and may I say that compassion is not weakness, it is strength, and concern for the afflicted and the unfortunate, is not socialism, it is good solid Americanism. [Applause.]

I make these statements and make them clearly to you because I have been reading the press. I have been reading, and may I say the press has been very accurate and very fair in the reporting of this campaign, and I have noticed that the man from Arizona, the Republican pretender to the Presidency, that this man came into the State of New Jersey, and he said that we are on the road to socialism. I guess that is why Henry Ford supports Lyndon Johnson. What kind of nonsense is that? A man who confuses compassion, a man that confuses humanitarianism, a man who confuses charity and compassion for the afflicted and for the needy and for the unemployed and for the elderly, a man that confuses that with socialism is a man that doesn't know enough about the American heritage, American traditions, or American Government to be worthy of the office of the President of the United States. [Applause.]

May I say to this misinformed and misguided leader of the opposition, this country doesn't have any creeping socialism. What it has got is creeping patriotism. We are moving in this country and we are going ahead. In fact, we are going ahead so fast a fellow can't get hold of a—well, I want to talk to you a little bit this morning about some of the things we want to do, because it isn't good enough to talk about the yesterdays. It is a fact, of course, the great gains that have been made in this country for the past 30 years are on the line. That is why this election is important. This is an election, my dear friends, in which the leader of the opposition has repudiated his own party. He is not a Republican. He is a radical. And he knows it. [Applause.]

Nor is he a conservative. He is an extremist, and we ought to label it as it is. In this election the gains of 30 years, every one of them, are on the block. This man stands for the so-called right-to-work laws, which means death to the trade union movement, if not immediate, slow.

I am a pharmacist originally and there are many ways to poison. [Applause.] You take a little atrophine sulphate and you will drop dead like this or you can take a little arsenic and it takes a few moments. But when you are dead, you are dead, and you are dead a long time, my dear friends. The opposition can't make up his mind whether he is for the social security program. Oh, he says he is now. Beware of those men that wait for such late conversion.

Why, may I say that we fought the battle of social security in 1936, not 1964. [Applause.]

Beware the political leader that comes to you and says the Government must withdraw from a host of programs, the welfare programs, education, from urban renewal, from agriculture, from labor-management. Beware of that kind of leadership.

Indeed, you have a choice, you have a choice as to whether or not you want to go ahead or whether or not you want to cut off all that you have gained and start slipping backward. You have a choice of whether you want to build the prosperity of this country or whether or not you want to invite depression and recession. That is what it really boils down to. That is why I keep after the opposition.

I know that this great community of Camden has done much for our country. This community in peace and war has strengthened America. I also know that this community like the northern part of Minnesota, my own great State, has suffered in recent days from some unemployment, but let me say the difference between the two candidates and the two programs in this campaign is this, that Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and Pete Williams and Bill Procaccia, we know what these problems are. We know that in the main there is general prosperity in America but we know that there are pockets of difficulty. Some places, pockets of poverty; some places, temporary unemployment; some places, because of the change in industry or technology or due to automation, that people have been left behind, and we are not going to sit idly by and let these things happen. We don't believe that the way you remedy these problems is to move people, Monsignor, out of their homes and their parishes. We don't believe that you break up a community. We believe that the way to answer these problems is to retrain the workers, help industry come to an area, build prosperity, provide the jobs and put government and industry and labor together in a partnership so that Camden can be as prosperous as Phoenix or New York or Los Angeles or San Francisco or any other place. [Applause.]

May I say to this fine audience, you have our pledge that we will work ceaselessly to see to it that this great industrial area right here and all the neighboring communities share in the bold prosperity of America, and you will have our commitment as Americans, and I want this word to spread throughout this land, that we are not content with what we presently have. We want it better. What we have done thus far is but a plateau. This is the beginning, as John Kennedy said, and we are going to continue and we are going to move forward and may I add this, that the Democratic Party and President Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey, the Vice President candidate, and your U.S. Senator, Pete Williams, and your candidate for Congress, Bill Procaccia, and the others, that we love a United States that is made up of many peoples. We love an America that has all the different ethnic groups and religious faiths. We love an America that knows no color and that has no prejudice. We love an America that fights against intolerance. And when I see and hear the leader of the opposition say within only a stones throw of this city of Camden that America is governed by minorities or bossed by minorities, what does he mean?

Oh, he explained it. May I say to you we need a President that says what he means when he says it and means what he says when he says it. [Applause.]

We want an America in which our families can be behind us. We want an immigration law that if there is a mother or father in Italy that would like to join their son and daughter here, that they can come. We want an America that if there is an uncle or grandmother in Greece that wants to join her son that is here, that they can join them.

We are not afraid. We love our America of many peoples. There is room in America for the great symphony of American people. Everybody doesn't play the violin and everybody doesn't play the tuba or the cornet. This symphony is made up of many parts and America the Beautiful is made up of many peoples and a campaign ought never to set people against people, race against race, ethnic groups agains ethnic group, religion against religion. I thought we were over those days. I thought we proved in 1960, for example, that never again should a man's faith bar him from the Presidency. I thought we proved that, and I thought we had [applause] and I thought we had proved in America that we welcome the people of every land. That is what makes America great.

And how shameful it is to have a spokesman, one or two spokesmen, of a political party that demeans people by saying minorities, as if it is a word—today as Leif Ericson, the Norwegians are a minority. My mother was born in Norway. She is a minority person, too. Soon we come to Columbus Day. The Italians, the Spanish, the Portuguese, all minorities.

But they are all a part of the great majority of the citizens of the United States of America. [Applause.]

I will conclude on this note, my friends. The leader of the opposition has said all that Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and the Democrats have going for them is labor and business, farmers, the minorities, that is all. [Applause.] The heavyweight champion was a minority of one, but he was a minority of one that licked the whole world.

And I must confess that even Texas is a minority in this country, and it is going to lick the whole opposition come November 3, don't you think so?

Go to work. We have got a job to do. There are going to be some rough days ahead of us. The opposition are already beginning to show the signs of desperation and when they get desperate, they start to dig down into the barrel of muck. That is right. They haven't brought an issue, they haven't discussed your schools, they haven't discussed the problems of your cities. They haven't discussed the problems of the farmer. They haven't discussed the problems that come—they haven't discussed how you provide jobs, 300,000 new jobs every month. They haven't discussed a single one of the major issues. All they say is mean, personal, nasty things about Lyndon Johnson and a few little unkind ones about Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

Let me tell you my views of that kind of treatment. And I fear not what they say. I trust the judgment of our people and I will tell you why, because I think the American people know their destiny. I think the American people know that this is the greatest country on the face of the earth and that we are going to make it greater. We don't have anybody else's standards. We have our own.

I think the American people know there is going to be peace in this world and if we are going to stop the onward rush of the Communist aggressor and imperialist, we will have to do it.

I think the American people appreciate our role at home and abroad, and they want a leader, an experienced leader, and they want a man that builds unity, not disunity. They want a man that unites us, not divides us. They want a man that understands American history and doesn't distort it. They want a man that can believe in the future of America and not one that has constantly said "I am sick and tired." That is the theme of the opposition. [Applause.] Maybe the opposition is sick and tired, but I want to tell you something; we are well, and we are happy, and we are vigorous, and we are vital, and we are going to make this election a reaffirmation of the goals of John F. Kennedy, and we are going to make them [applause] we are going to make this election a mandate on the part of the American people. John Kennedy said "I need Lyndon Johnson. I think that was his greatest decision. He protected the future of America by that decision. Now I think the American people are going to prove by their votes or should I say they are going to ratify by their votes the decision that John Kennedy made in 1960, because as John Kennedy needed Lyndon Johnson in 1960, as history, cruel that it was, has demonstrated, let me tell you

35 WBZ—LINO

America and the free world needs Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party in 1964 for the next 4 years.

Thank you very much.

Camden, N.J.
TV Tapings, Walt Whitman Hotel
October 9, 1964.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. The United States is a young country and more and more the population of this country is youthful. With our growth in population there is an ever larger number of people under the age of 21, and frankly a majority of the people under the age of 30. So that it is fair to say that just looking at it on the basis of the age of contemporary society or of the citizens now with us, that America is young.

But it is young in many other ways. It is a nation of vitality and of ingenuity, of creativeness, of adventure.

Our Constitution, while the oldest written Constitution in the world, actually is a modern Constitution. It is a living document. It says "We the people of the United States do ordain and establish." It doesn't say "We did." We constantly do new things. Each day we reaffirm our sense of justice. Each day we reaffirm our sense of freedom and of individual liberty and opportunity.

Now, I am pleased that in this campaign so many young people are taking an active part. There are the Young Democrats and there are the Young Citizens for Johnson and Humphrey, and there are many other young people in other independent groups, and they are attending our meetings in large numbers, and I want to say to these young people that you are needed.

The first thing that you can do that will be of vital importance is to make yourself like a minuteman of Concord and Lexington to see that freedom prevails on election day. See that your parents get out to vote. As I have said many times, parents give young people lots of advice. I have given my three sons and daughter all sorts of advice. And once in a while I think it is their turn to advise the parents. And in this instance on election day I want every young man and woman, every boy and girl of high school age, yes, of elementary school age, of college age, to advise their parents that on that day these parents have the obligation to protect the future of the young people, the children of America. And they can do that by their vote.

Now, if we can get young people to see to it that their parents vote and that their older brothers and sisters, their aunts and uncles, and members of the family of voting age vote, I haven't any doubt but what American will be stronger and the better.

One other point I should like to make is that young people can do a great deal in the campaign by working at headquarters, attaching themselves to candidates, being available for the many little chores that come with politics.

Politics ought to be fun in America. That is, good wholesome activity. It ought to be creative, it ought to be friendly, and it ought to be informative. And I think young people by their sense of enthusiasm, their wholesomeness, add a depth of decency and of cleanness to American politics.

May I advocate also that our young friends be of good cheer and when you are of good cheer, and ought to be of good manners. Let the other fellow have his chance to say his speech, to appear and make his case.

Now, I know of no better way to win an election than to win it by a free exchange of ideas, to permit not only our own candidates to state their views and to state them forcefully and to state them in whatever time is needed, but to permit the opposition to do so too.

I have advised the young people who support the Democratic candidates to be happy people, to pursue this great sense of happiness, and to cheer and not to jeer, to applaud and not to boo. Booing in American politics is really unfortunate. It is not needed. It doesn't prove anything except that you are unwilling to listen. But to cheer and to listen I think is the—well, they represent the signs of maturity and of friendliness and responsibility.

Well, with that I believe that it might be a good idea if we turn this program over to some of the young people that are here with us, and see if we can get some questions.

I want to thank the young people for their active participation. All right, Howard.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am Howard Mitchell.

Senator, we have heard during this campaign and during many years about the Russian question or some call it the Red threat. We hear that we are soft on communism or Khrushchev is conciliatory or we are on the brink of war or he is fighting for his life with Red China. In all this fact and fancy, sir, what do you feel is the true issue of relations with the Soviet Union, and how will you and President Johnson deal with it?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think one of the great issues in this campaign is this whole question of our foreign policy, of our programs of national security, and you have put your finger right upon one of the most difficult and complex of all the issues. The difference between the two candidates on the issue of communism is that President Johnson recognizing that communism is a threat, recognizing that its spread is a danger, that he follows the course that has been established since the time of Franklin Roosevelt up through Truman and Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy of firmness, of strength, but also of flexibility, of wisdom, of judgment, of negotiation, recognizing that the power of the free world, if brought to bear, peacefully, and perseveringly upon the Communist areas, that that tends to change the Communist areas and tends to splinter them and tends to weaken their position.

The task of statemanship is not to involve America in a war, Howard. The task of statesmanship is to win this struggle over the long road without a war. There are no instant answers to the complex problems between ourselves and the Communist bloc. There is only instant annihilation if you get into a nuclear war.

So a brave man and a courageous man and a wise man is the man or leader that pursues a course that on the one hand seeks to weaken the Communist bloc, and we surely have, and on the other hand doesn't press the case so far and so hard that it explodes.

We can't afford to have a nuclear holocaust because there will be no Howard Mitchell. There will be no future. There will be no schools. There will be no freedom if that should happen to us.

So we believe in firmness and resoluteness without being belligerent or arrogant. We think that wisdom and reason and responsibility backed by strength and the capacity of our Nation to constantly build that strength in the long run will build for peace and for our own security and freedom.

Mr. GREENBERG. William Greenberg.

Do you think in the long run, say 10 to 15 years, we have more to fear from Red China than from Russia, sort of the old idea of the have-countries versus the have-nots?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. I think so. And that goes right back to the question asked by your friend there, Mr. Mitchell. There is a split today in the Communist bloc. We used to talk about communism as if it were one just solid, you know, piece of granite, so to speak. They called it a monolithic bloc. Well, that has been broken today. There is a serious split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Even the Soviet Union today can't control its own satellites; as Krushchev said, they are getting too big to spank. So each of these countries, Rumania, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries that had been under the iron grip of the Soviet Union, today are really enjoying some sort of semiautonomy. They are trying to have a little independence of their own.

The force of nationalism is greater than the force of Communist internationalism, and there is today a very serious split between Red China and the Soviet Union, and I do believe that in the future, Bill, that we will have more to fear in terms of aggression, of rash and irresponsible action, from the Chinese than we have from the Russians, and actually, the Russians themselves are deeply concerned over this. Right at this present moment they are deeply concerned.

Yes; now we ought to get over here and see what we have.

Miss STENZLER. Terry Stenzler.

Senator, one of the things which disturbed me in the Goldwater nomination was how various men would support one particular view, policy, and then it was the idea of maintaining their position in the party, completely reversed their views, and it appeared that their politics—I am using the term in a rather derogatory sense, was ruling their policy.

Now, I am sure, I am aware of the same thing happening to many degrees in the Democratic Party.

How will you and President Johnson deal with something like this if that policy should be more important than politics alone?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Miss Stenzler, it is a fact that we do have a good deal of party unity. There is an attempt to try to bring it back together and both political parties are somewhat guilty of this. We fight hard in primaries.

But I do think in the Republican Party you have seen a basic split over fundamentals. Mr. Goldwater does not follow the traditional national Republican position. He repudiates bipartisanship, for example. He really is not a conservative. He is a radical. He is as Mr. Scranton of Pennsylvania put it, out of the mainstream of Republican thought and the Saturday Evening Post put it I think more bluntly. They said he was a stray—I mean, he was alone by himself.

I don't think it helps a political party to try to get unity at the expense of basic policy. Now, little differences, that is one thing, but where there is a basic policy difference, I think it is very dangerous, and I believe you are going to find that large numbers of Republicans, millions of them, will not support Mr. Goldwater because they cannot go along with what they consider to be his radical and extreme views.

John?

Mr. LACY. John Lacy.

Senator, in Atlantic City, you called Senator Goldwater a temporary spokesman of the Republican Party.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. LACY. And downstairs just now you called him a fraction of the faction of his party. Now——

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. LACY. Now, could you tell us why you think he is temporary? His office as the leader of the party and whom do you see as replacements?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I can't give you any predictions as a replacement. But, John, I can say this, that he does not represent the majority view of his party. He does not follow within the tradition of President Eisenhower. He certainly is not within the tradition of the late Arthur Vandenberg in foreign policy. He does not carry on what I consider to be the middle-of-the-road type of Republicanism which has been so characteristic of a large number of Republicans. So that he is, I think, a temporary spokesman.

I believe he will be defeated in this election, and then I think that others in the Republican Party will come to reclaim their party later on.

John, I do believe that Senator Goldwater is but a temporary spokesman because I am convinced that while his group was able to move in and sort of capture the organizational department of the Republican Party, that there are millions of Republicans in this country that do not agree with his extreme views because he has repudiated whole areas of Republican policy over the past 30, 40 years, and I go right back to the question that Miss Stenzler asked your friend Terry here, earlier. Some of the Republican spokesmen today, Governors, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Scranton, and others; have been campaigning for Senator Goldwater despite their vast difference on issues. I think one of the reasons they are doing it is to sort of keep contact with the Republican organization in the knowledge that Mr. Goldwater is going to suffer a smashing defeat and somebody ought to be around to pick up the pieces.

But I also think that this is rather dangerous on the part of, let's say Governor Scranton who opposed Mr. Goldwater very vigorously, not on just detail but on basic fundamental principles.

Now, it is one thing to be able to make peace with a man who disagrees with you on one issue or two issues or even three, but when you have as Mr. Goldwater did, he repudiated 25 separate points in the Republican platform of 1960, right down the line. The record is in the Congress. He just voted against 25 commitments of his platform.

Now, Mr. Scranton comes along and disagrees openly with Mr. Goldwater, not on one or two issues. Not just on civil rights or not just on Federal spending but on a whole category of issues. I think that is very dangerous for a man to go on out and support a candidate who is in such complete opposition to his philosophy. I think you are sacrificing your principle and philosophy for political expediency and I believe that is a most unfortunate thing to do.

Well, now let me just summarize this and say that the program that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are trying to present to the American people is one of continuity within the programs of the past 30 years of the Democratic Party. In foreign policy it is the continuation of our bipartisan foreign policy. In national security it is the building of the strength not only of our own country but also of our allies.

At home we are committed to a program of opening up new paths of opportunity for our young and I might say that we consider that to be primarily in the field of education, of retraining workers that are victims of automation and change in industry. We are seeking, in other words, to have a government that doesn't take over the responsibilities of other people but helps people fulfill their responsibilities.

Lincoln said the duty of government is to serve the people. I think Mr. Goldwater repudiates that great principle of Lincoln's philosophy, and I believe that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey feel that government can be an effective helper, can be a partner with industry and labor and agriculture, with young and old, in the building of what President Johnson considers to be the Great Society.

Philadelphia, Pa.
15th and Chestnut Streets
October 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Members of the Democratic Party, my good citizens and fellow Americans of Philadelphia, Pa. It is wonderful to be with you.

Goldwater to the far right. A little while ago I saw one of our young friends carrying one of the signs of the opposition, but he had a smile on his face, so I know that deep down in his heart he is going to vote for Lyndon Johnson.

It is a wonderful, wonderful day, and I see before me a throng of happy people which indicates to me that what—about the tremendous majority that Philadelphia will give to President Johnson and that the majority will indeed be true.

I want to at this time thank the citizenry for the wonderful, generous, fine friendly reception. And I want to make it perfectly clear that in this election we not only need the election of President Johnson, but we need the election in the State of Pennsylvania of Genevieve Blatt. And we also need the election of your Democratic Congressman and your entire Democratic slate. [Applause.]

Four years ago in this very area a fine and great man appealed to the people of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania for their help to get this country moving again. That young man went on to be elected President of the United States, and on January 20, 1961, he spoke to the American people and indeed to the whole world and he asked that world and he asked the American people to once again begin the forward process of democracy, to get America moving. He asked us not to think only of our own welfare but to think of the welfare of this, the greatest of all peoples and nations. This young man went on for 1,000 days of dramatic service to his country and at the end of those 1,000 days, after he was taken from us by the assassin's bullet, America stood trembling, faltering, in pain and in grief. On that particular moment when it appeared that our America and indeed the whole

world might be without a leader, a man tall, strong, and able came forth as then the Vice President of the United States and took over the mantle of leadership.

It is my feeling that the greatest decision that John Kennedy ever made, the decision that protected the future of America, was when in Los Angeles in 1960 he reached into the State of Texas, into the U.S. Senate, selected a great Majority Leader and asked him to give up that responsible position to become the Vice President of the United States.

John Kennedy loved America enough to protect and think of its future, and he protected it by selecting as his strong right arm a man he knew that he could rely on, that one he knew could carry on if anything should happen to him, and that man is today the President of the United States. His name is Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

President Kennedy believed in Lyndon Johnson. He put his faith in him. He selected him, and may I say that this election of 1964 gives us the opportunity to reaffirm our faith in the late, beloved President, gives an opportunity to reaffirm the decision of that President. [Cries from the audience.]

May I say that this is as high up as they will ever get. They will fall right out of the roost. They know deep in their hearts that America today is more prosperous than it has ever been in all of its history. They know deep in their hearts that America today is stronger than it has ever been before in its history. And they know deep in their hearts that on November 3 Lyndon Johnson is going to be elected President. [Applause.]

Now, let me just say very seriously to you that in this very City of Brotherly Love, some very unbrotherly statements have been made; not long ago the temporary spokesman of the faction of the Republican Party came here and spoke to the people of this great State in words that should be shocking to every single American. He said to the people of America that America today is ruled by minorities. He said to the people of America, through himself and his spokesmen, that America was today dominated by the minorities of this land. Let me say right now that I am looking upon people who represent those minorities. [Applause.] The minorities of America, of race, creed and nationality, the minorities of America of religious faith, and the minorities of America are what make up the great majority of Americans. [Applause.]

They have more faith in this country's economy than to call it socialism when American capitalism is leaping forward at unprecedented rates. A man who has no understanding of America, its soul, insults its people by saying every little minority in this Nation somehow or another is wrong because it wants to be respected.

I say to you that that kind of thinking makes a person unworthy of the highest office of the Presidency.

Now, America needs as a President someone that unites us and not divides us. America needs as a President someone that can work for the common goals of our Great Society. America needs as a President someone who will make the White House the house of labor, the house of business, the house of agriculture, the house of every race, creed, and nationality in this land. [Applause.]

Is it any wonder, my friends, that thousands, yea millions, of people who voted the Republican ticket are not going to vote that ticket this year? And why? I will tell you why, because the man who speaks momentarily for the Republican Party no longer is a Republican. He is a radical. [Applause.]

We need as our President one who will continue our bipartisan foreign policy. We need as our President someone who is firm and resolute without being belligerent and arrogant. We need as our President someone that understands that this is the second half of the 20th century and not the 19th century. We need as our President someone who will think of the future and plan for that future rather than someone who distorts the history of the past. I come to you today to appeal to you regardless of your political persuasion, whether you may be Republican or Democrat, I ask you to think of your country today, think of whether or not you want to elect a man that will repudiate 30 years of progress in America, whether or not you want as your President one who will speak in words that bring this prospect and confusion in America.

I ask every person within the range of my voice to consider this election its most serious decision. America must make up its mind what kind of a man it wants in the White House. Do you want in the White House someone who is impetuous? Or would you prefer to have one in the White House who understands by experience in Congress and as Vice President of the United States and as President how to guide the destinies of this, the greatest Nation on the face of the earth? [Applause.]

Now, on election day you are going to have the opportunity to make your choice. I think Republican friends, many of them, have already made it. GOP used to stand for the Grand Old Party. Now it stands for Goldwater Is Our Problem. [Applause.]

The party of Abraham Lincoln deserves better than a spokesman that repudiates the philosophy of Lincoln, who said that this was a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

And surely our friends of the Democratic Party are going to remember that this election should be a living memorial and tribute to the work and the words and the deeds of a man that was taken from us in the prime of his life and for those of us who will see the unfinished work of John Kennedy, for those of us who want to move America forward from the New Frontier to new horizons, to new goals, to new aims, to new achievements, for those that want that, there is just but one decision. Vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Article

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

October 9, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Since the day when James Madison (Princeton, 1771) took the road from Orange County, Va., to attend the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Princeton University has loomed large in the annals of American constitutionalism.

There is also an old Harvard story about the Cambridge lady who announced that the President had gone to Washington to see Mr. Wilson. But Princetonians know they sent their president to be the President. And the late Edward S. Corwin, whose scholarship and incandescent teaching illuminated your campus for generations, set the standards for all subsequent discussions of Presidential power.

I am not here today to talk abstractly about the Presidency. Politics, in the last analysis, always comes down to a choice between human beings.

Two men confront each other on election day. The simple minded often say that only a choice of personalities is involved. But while personality is important, hidden behind a personality is a body of ideas, a whole set of attitudes toward politics, toward political ideals, indeed, toward the nature of a society and the proper relationships which should exist between its members.

The American people on November 3 are not merely choosing between President Lyndon B. Johnson and Senator Barry Goldwater; they are choosing between two philosophies of government, between two attitudes toward modern American life, between two concepts of the Presidency.

One of these philosophies could be described as the "Princeton tradition" of responsible nationalism.

James Madison, 1871, saw that if absolute power in government can corrupt absolutely, the absence of power in government can corrupt just as thoroughly.

Madison realized that corruption rising from weakness was precisely the result of the Articles of Confederation—a government without a head—a government where each State in the name of its own rights was free to strike at all other States—a government where all States were leagued together as architects of their common ruin.

But Madison also saw the remedy. A feeble grouping of self-centered States must be transformed into the living tissue of a Federal Union. Each State would contribute to, and draw strength from, the totality.

There must also be a national Chief Executive chosen by the Nation—responsible to the courts in his legal character—to the Congress and Nation in his political character—but always working for a national interest larger than the sum of State and local interests.

Later it was your great President—and ours—Woodrow Wilson, who translated this philosophy into terms relevant to 20th century America. Wilson saw in America in the throes of industrialization and urbanization. He saw an America gripped by new problems—problems which were national and international in scope and could no longer be solved by the habitual responses of rural America.

These novel conditions posed grave dangers to our governmental system. But, Wilson argued, our system could prove equal to these challenges if the Presidency became not only an administrative office, but the "vital center of action" in the Government. Listen to Wilson's credo:

> "A great nation is not led by a man who simply repeats the talk of the street corners or the opinions of the newspapers. A nation is led by a man who hears more than those things; or who, rather, hearing those things, understands them better, unites them, puts them into a common meaning; speaks, not the rumors of the street, but a new principle for a new age; a man (to whom) the voices of the nation * * * unite in a single meaning and reveal to him a single vision, so that he can speak what no man else knows, the common meaning of the common voice. Such is the man who leads a great, free, democratic nation."

What of the other concept of the Presidency?

This approach sees the President as passive, inert, weak—lacking the authority to serve as the heart of the Republic, lacking the driving force to give definition and meaning to America's sense of national purpose.

This position—as it is set forth in the present campaign—echoes the debates on the Constitution in 1787–88. It was repudiated decisively then—and lives on only as an exhibit in the museum of constitutional oddities.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, George Washington inaugurated the Presidency of a new, weak, and contentious republic. In 1964, Lyndon B. Johnson presides over the destinies of the greatest Nation on earth.

Although we are still a relatively young country, the President of the United States holds the world's oldest elective office of political leadership. It is an office which has grown in authority and prestige without any sacrifice of that responsibility to the people which gives democratic leadership both its strength and its legitimacy.

Elsewhere in the past 175 years, one nation after another has been racked by revolution and turmoil.

Confronted by the emergence of a new civilization—built around industries and cities—many systems of government have faltered and collapsed. Some, trying to establish an executive with power adequate for their needs, have created a "Leviathan," that "mortal God" whose total power Thomas Hobbes hoped would bring peace and security. Others, fleeing "Leviathan," have fallen into the abyss of anarchy.

Many have veered from one polar position to the other, leaving a community riven by conflict with no established principles of public order, no standards of legitimacy; in short no real constitution.

The American Constitution, and the President it established, have in contrast stood throughout these tumultuous years providing energy without tyranny, flexibility without autonomy, responsibility without dependence.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson—Wilson's heirs in the White House, understood that the Presidency is our principal link binding the past to the present, and the present to the future.

They understood that the Presidency is the only office in our constitutional system that holds together the many divided parts of the executive—that connects the executive with the legislative and judicial branches of the Government—that binds the Government to the people—and that represents the Nation as a whole in the international arena.

They understood that if there was any slack in executive energy, the contagion of weakness would spread from the person of the President throughout the Nation and the world.

They understood that a man called to the Presidency must cast out from his heart and mind all narrowness of spirit. He must be the natural enemy of those men who flatter the lowest prejudices of the people only to betray their highest interests. Presidents in the Wilson tradition understood, in short, that the very word "President" is a summons to greatness.

Will the man elected President this year understand the fearful obligations of a President? Will he understand *why* the framers of the Constitution broke with the precedents of their time and established a strong executive? *Why* in the perilous world of 1964 their wisdom has been confirmed a thousandfold? And *why*, above all, a great people and a great nation need a strong President?

Lyndon Johnson's entire career demonstrates that he surely understands these things. He has been in public life for over 30 years.

The first of his mentors was President Franklin D. Roosevelt. From Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson learned in close, intimate detail the nature of the modern Presidency, its capabilities, and its limitations. More important, he learned how the limitations can best be met, and the capabilities best realized.

Lyndon Johnson's next great mentor was the Senate of the United States. His Democratic colleagues in the Senate elected him their leader while he was still in his freshman term.

If there was anything wrong with Lyndon Johnson—if there was any flaw in his character—any weakness in his nerve—any pettiness in his heart—any myopia in his vision—any stammer in his thought processes, I can assure you from first-hand knowledge that Lyndon Johnson would not have been acknowledged by his Senate colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, as one of the greatest legislative leaders America ever produced.

If Lyndon Johnson had not practiced the responsible exercise of political power as Senate majority leader, our political history during the Eisenhower years would have been far different than it was.

Lyndon Johnson was in a position to harass the Eisenhower administration mercilessly if he believed in the irresponsible, anarchistic, nihilistic, jungle doctrine of opposition for the sake of opposition.

Instead—often at the expense of cloakroom criticism by certain members of his own party—Lyndon Johnson used his strength as majority leader to brace the Eisenhower administration when it faltered, to indicate to it better courses of action, to buttress it when our national interests were at stake in a world racked by urgent crises.

We saw another aspect of Lyndon Johnson when he served as Vice President under President Kennedy. We saw Lyndon Johnson, despite his long years of preeminence at the head of the Senate, as a scrupulously faithful lieutenant to a man who had been his junior in the Congress. For this was another thing Lyndon Johnson always knew—the President of the United States is not a committee but one man—and this one man is the captain on the bridge. The second-in-command must support the captain, lighten his burdens, counsel him, but never forget who is captain.

An then we all bore tragic witness to the sensitive but quietly authoritative manner in which Lyndon Johnson assumed the Office of President of the United States when John F. Kennedy was murdered.

No man, except a born leader, could have done what Lyndon Johnson did in the critical days following President Kennedy's death. No man could have guided and sustained us except one who knew by heart the meaning of the Presidency, who knew all the intricacies of our Government, who knew all the subtleties of Congress, who had an affection for the Members of the Congress of both parties and understood their individual problems. No man except one who understood all this, could have made the 88th Democratic Congress what it became

under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson: One of the most productive Congresses since Woodrow Wilson took the helm after his 1912 election.

We have in Lyndon Johnson a President who will continue John Kennedy's policy of making the world "safe for diversity"—who understands that there cannot be an American solution to every world problem—but who also understands the need to oppose Communist aggression and subversion with strength, determination, wisdom, flexibility, restraint, and a clear sense of priorities.

Finally, we have in Lyndon B. Johnson, a President who realizes that mankind is walking down an uncharted road into the future with destruction lurking at every crossroads—who appreciates the appalling responsibility that rests upon the judgment of the President of the United States—responsibility not only to the American people but to humanity.

For the first time in history, one man possesses the ability to destroy the past, the present, and the future—literally to bring time to an end—and that man is the President of the United States.

I submit to you that on the basis of both reason and experience Lyndon B. Johnson has shown himself eminently qualified for these awesome responsibilities—he is a courageous, experienced, responsible President who has earned the right to America's continued trust and support.

As President, he will not only uphold and defend the Constitution, but also sustain the vision of Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy who saw the Presidency as the moral nucleus of the American community.

Princeton, N.J.
Dillon Gymnasium, Princeton University
October 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator Williams. May I thank the student body. Both for those that cheered, those that hissed, and a couple that booed. I want to thank all of you.

It is wonderful to be on this platform today with the chief executive of the State of New Jersey, to be here with my esteemed colleague in the U.S. Senate, Senator Pete Williams, and also to be here with the gentleman from the House of Representatives that has a record of outstanding service, one of the most able and one of the most gifted Members of the House of Representatives, Frank Thompson. [Applause.]

I have looked forward to this unique privilege of speaking in Princeton at this great university. [Applause.]

Some years ago, I believe it was around 1953 or 1954, I was fortunate to be invited to speak at one of the meetings of the great Clio Society, and I have recalled it all of my public life, and I had a good time, I might add, too. There were a few misguided souls there, but we were able to convert them.

And I am delighted today to be here with our chairman of the Young Democrats, Mr. Coulser, and with Mr. Etten, the president of the Whig-Clio Society, and I gather that the vice president, as well, and I want to mention him because I am strong on vice presidents, Charles Whitebread. [Applause.]

I understand that you have had some sort of a poll taken here, and at long last the effects of higher education are taking place. [Applause.]

I want to say I have never had any doubt as to the competence and the intelligence of the students, but I have also been somewhat worried about the factuality when I find that those who have been privileged to have a higher education fall into the paths of political sin by voting for reactionary Republican candidates. It is most unfortunate but you are entitled to transgress a bit. Now that you have learned the error of your ways, you can return to the home of your fathers. [Applause.]

Ordinarily a man seeking public office or as a candidate ought never to enjoy the friendliness and the hospitality of a good home before

he makes a speech. But today I was privileged to be the guest of the Governor and Mrs. Hughes and they were kind enough to give me the first good meal that I have had in several months and like most people, when you have such good Democratic food, you start to feel like a Republican, a little dead and a little lazy. I am not sure that I am up to my task today. [Applause.]

Of course, there is another way of saying it; vote Democrat so that you can live like a Republican. [Applause.]

I should forewarn the student body that has been kind enough and solicitous enough to gather here today to tell you I am a refugee from a classroom, and one of the reasons that I seek these opportunities of speaking at universities or colleges is because politics is a precarious enterprise and I would sort of like to just keep my employment blank in, sort of, you know, in living status all the time. I want any members of the faculty that are here and the administration to take note of the fact that I am a student of government. And if things should go from bad to worse or should I say from bad to unbelievably worse—[Applause]—I might very well apply.

I would like to put in a plug with the students. I am an easy grader. [Applause.]

I have taken the privilege of using this platform today to talk to you on a subject that I believe should be of some interest to all of us. I want to talk to you on the subject of the American Presidency. Now, I am not going to spend too much time reviewing ancient history, or even the American past. I have said from every platform, with few exceptions, that it is very appropriate and proper for every student of either high school or college level, undergraduate or graduate school, to become knowledgeable in ancient history. It is an interesting pursuit. It adds to one's understanding of culture, civilization. Study it. Learn it well. But for goodness sakes, don't vote it. [Applause.]

And I don't think you will. I think you are contemporaries and I think you are interested in the future.

But to come to Princeton, one of the truly great universities of this land, and just to give an ordinary political speech, I think would do a disservice to this great campus and this great institution of learning. So I come to you today not to arouse your emotions, not to make you more partisan, but may I say to add to some understanding of a better—some understanding of the Constitution of the United States, of the role of the President of the United States, in the affairs of this Nation, and the development of the Presidency of the United States as an institution of government.

Since the day when James Madison, the class of '71, that is 1771, at Princeton, took the road from Orange County in Virginia to attend that Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Princeton University, your university, has loomed large in the annals of American Government and American constitutionalism. The father of the Constitution was James Madison. The late Edward S. Corwin, whose scholarship and incandescent learning illuminated this campus for generations, set the standards for all scholarly discussions of the Constitution and of the office of the Presidency. So there is no more fitting and appropriate place for a public figure who is on the national scene to discuss this important office, the most important office in the world, which by the way has not been adequately discussed in the campaign or in recent years.

I am here not to talk to you abstractly about the Presidency. Politics in the last analysis always comes down to a choice between human beings. Two men confront each other on election day. We are going to have to make that choice. Some say only a choice of personalities is involved, but while personality is important and it always is in a democracy, hidden behind a personality is a body of ideas, a whole set of attitudes toward politics, toward political ideals. Indeed, toward the nature of our society. And the proper relationships which should exist between its members.

45 WBZ—LINO

I hear all too many people say, "Oh, I think he is a good fellow." The world is full of good fellows. That is not enough for being President of the United States. We cannot afford to indulge ourselves in mediocrity. Mediocrity is commonplace. The Presidency requires excellence, and therefore, I think it is proper that we should review the qualities of the office of President and the demands upon the individual who occupies that office.

The American people on November 3 are not merely choosing between Lyndon B. Johnson and Barry Goldwater, President and Senator. They are choosing between two philosophies of government, between two attitudes toward modern American life, and between two concepts of the office of the American Presidency.

Now, one of these philosophies could be described as the Princeton tradition of responsible nationalism. James Madison saw that if absolute power in government can corrupt absolutely, Lord Acton's law as we put it, than the absence of power in government can corrupt just as thoroughly. And this seldom is mentioned.

Time after time we are told about the use of power as a corrupting influence but how many people have told you of the cities, of the States, of the villages, and the nations that have collapsed because of the failure to exercise responsible power? Or because of the absence of responsibility in office?

Now, Madison, not your contemporary, but surely of your tradition, realized that corruption rising from weakness was precisely the result of the Articles of Confederation. A government without a head, a government where each State in the name of its own rights was free to strike at all other States, a government where all States were linked together as architects of their common ruin, the first extreme position of States rights at the expense of national unity and of national respectability and responsibility.

But Madison also saw the remedy, a feeble grouping of self-centered States must be transformed into the living tissue of a Federal union.

This is the work of James Madison. Each State would contribute to and draw strength from the totality. There must also be in the constitutional tradition of our country a national Chief Executive chosen by the Nation, the only representative of all the people, might I add, not a President chosen by States but chosen by all the people, responsible to the courts in his legal character, responsible to the Congress and the Nation in his political character, but always working for a national interest larger than the sum of State and local interests.

Later it was your great President and ours, Woodrow Wilson, who translated this philosophy into terms revelant to the 20th century America.

I have said on a number of occasions when I have been interviewed by our esteemed journalists, they have asked me, "Who is your political hero?" Well, it is difficult to select one. But I would say in the 20th century it was Woodrow Wilson.

My father, not privileged to have all the higher education of some, but a man of great insight, brought me up on the works of Woodrow Wilson. I longed to attend this great university because Woodrow Wilson was its spirit and gave it new meaning in the 20th century. And Woodrow Wilson understood as few have the Constitution of the United States in its present-day application. He understood that it was a living document and not a dead one. He understood that it was a contemporary document and not of the past. And every student of government would be well to remember that the preamble of the Constitution is not written "We the people of the United States did ordain." It is written "We the people of the United States do ordain." This hour, this day, this moment, this week, this month, this year of 1964. Not 1864, Senator, 1964. [Applause.]

Woodrow Wilson saw an America. He saw an America in the throes of industrialization and urbanization. He saw an America gripped by new problems, and he wrote of the new freedom, problems which were national and international in scope and could no longer be solved by the habitual responses of rural America. It was Woodrow Wilson who wrote the last definitive work on congressional government. It was Woodrow Wilson who defined once again, as Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln had, the power of the Presidency and its importance, and it was Woodrow Wilson who understood Amer-

ica's responsibility to the world. He was, they said, ahead of his time. He was not. His enemies were behind the times, and we paid a terrible price because of the shortsightedness of those who had political power in the 1918 to 1920 period.

I pray to God Almighty that America will never have to pay that price again, and yet there are voices today, loud voices, irrational voices, that would ask us to return even further back than the days of the 1920's.

Now, these novel conditions of urbanization and industrialization pose great problems to our governmental system, but Wilson argued our system could prove equal to these challenges if the Presidency became not only an administrative office but as he put it, "the vital center of action in the Government." This is the same theme that Adlai Stevenson talked to the American people about when he sought to talk sense to our people, "the vital center of action." The Presidency is not an administrative office alone. It is the center of a nation. Education, persuasion, inspiration, action. And it needs to be understood in those terms.

Listen to Wilson's credo—and these words could have been spoken as of this hour.

"A great nation is not led by a man who simply repeats the talk of the street corners or the opinions of the newspapers. A nation is led by a man who hears more than those things; or who, rather, hearing those things, understands them better, unites them, puts them into a common meaning; speaks, not the rumors of the street, but a new principle for a new age; a man [to whom] the vocies of the Nation * * * unite in a single meaning and reveal to him a single vision, so that he can speak what no man else knows, the common meaning of the common voice. Such is the man who leads a great, free, democratic nation."

My fellow Americans, those are the words of a prophet. Those are the words of greatness. Those are the words of a man of vision. And Woodrow Wilson will be known as having inspired not the people of his generation alone but the people of a century yet to be born, and even today we are inspired by this man's intellect, his courage, his spirit.

Now, what of the other concept of the Presidency, because there are other views? This other concept sees the President as passive, inert, weak, lacking the authority to serve as the heart of the Republic, lacking the driving force to give definition and meaning to America's sense of national purpose. This is the concept of the Presidency which tells us that the Government should get out of many activities. This is the concept of the Presidency which tells us that the job is to repeal laws, not to pass them. Perish the thought. We lived through that and almost lost a nation.

Now, this position as it is set forth in the present campaign echoes the debates on the Constitution of 1787 and 1788, and I mention this because I notice how the opposition loves to wrap itself in the history of America as it rewrites it, as it distorts it. [Applause.]

I did not spend many years in my life in studying, in under-graduate and graduate school, to rewrite the history of this country. I spent my time in study to learn the history of this country and I would say that those who seek to be national leaders in America know their country and not try to redefine it and rewrite the history of peoples that have lived before us.

It is tragic to hear people who say they speak for a great party to be so completely oblivious of the facts of our national life. [Applause.]

This position of the glorification of States rights at the expense of national unity, of a weak President at the expense of national purpose, was repudiated decisively by the Founding Fathers of this Republic and it lives on now only as an exhibit in the museum of constitutional oddities. [Applause.] And might I add that Senator Goldwater is the curator of this museum. [Applause.]

Even though I might paraphrase to say he even voted against museums.

For this reason amongst others he is clearly unqualified to be the President of the United States. Now, I do not rest this judgment on personal grounds. I repeat, he is a good man. He is a fine, sociable human being. He is a patriot. He loves his family. He is a moral man. I don't make any personal accusation against this man at all. I would like him as my neighbor but not as my President. [Applause.]

His whole attitude toward Government and specifically toward the American Presidency which he seeks is totally out of step with the Constitution, with the constitutional debates on the Constitution, with the record of his own party, with the interpretation of the Constitution by that first great Republican, John Marshall, the Chief Justice, Abraham Lincoln, any Republican that anyone can think of.

His record and his attitude is completely out of step. Is it any wonder that Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania said that he is out of the mainstream of the Republican Party and that the Curtis Publishing Co., in the Saturday Evening Post, said that he was "astray," from American tradition. [Applause.]

I don't think I would have gone that far. But I have said and I repeat this man is neither a conservative nor a Republican. He must stand on his own. I would have to say that in light of our constitutional history, he can be classified in only one category, a radical in the sense of departure from what we know to be our system. [Applause.]

Now, his concept of the Presidency, I repeat, is out of step with American traditions. It is out of step with the realities of the present, and I believe that it is out of step with the needs of the future. Indeed, the only American Government in which the Senator from Arizona would feel at home is the Articles of Confederation which expired with a whimper in 1789. [Applause.]

Now, let me move along. A man is not qualified to be President because he merely wants the job. Or because he is put up to it by his friends. He must understand the Presidency. He must know its responsibilities, its complex and frustrating dimensions, and it is my conviction that Senator Goldwater does not understand the office. He has no sense of history and no feeling for our constitutional traditions. He is a rigid and at times a resentful radical in full revolt against the 20th century and the traditions of his party.

His glorification of extremism, his readiness to rip the fabric of our community, demonstrates beyond doubt that he lacks a responsible spirit, the inner controls, that are indispensable to a Chief Executive vested with enormous discretionary powers.

Some 175 years ago George Washington inaugurated the Presidency of a new, a weak, and a contentious Republic. In 1964 Lyndon Johnson presides over the destiny of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. Although we are still relatively a young country, the President of the United States holds the world's oldest elective office of political leadership. It is an office which has grown in authority, responsibility, and prestige without any sacrifice of that responsibility to the people, which gives democratic leadership both its strength and its legitimacy. Elsewhere in the past 175 years one nation after another has been racked by revolution and turmoil, confronted by the emergence of a new civilization built around industries and cities. Many systems of government in these 175 years have faltered and collapsed. So trying to establish an executive with power adequate for their needs has created a Leviathan. That mortal god whose total power Thomas Hobbes hoped would bring peace and security. Others fleeing the Leviathan have fallen into an abyss of anarchy. Many have veered from one polar position to the other, leaving a community torn by conflict with no established principles of public order, no standards of legitimacy, in short, no real constitution.

The American Constitution and the office of President that it established have in contrast stood throughout these tumultuous years, providing energy without tyranny, flexibility without autonomy, responsibility without dependence.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Wilson's heirs in the White House, understood that the American Presidency is our principal link binding the past to the present and the present to the future. They understood that the Presidency is the only office in our constitutional system that holds together

the many divided parts of the executive, that connects the executive with the legislative and judicial branches, that binds the Government to the people and that represents the Nation as a whole at home and in the international arena. They understood that if there was any slack in the executive energy, the contagion of weakness, or should I say the corruption of weakness, would spread from the person of the President through the Nation and the world. They understood that a man called to the Presidency must cast from his heart and mind all narrowness of spirit. He must be the natural enemy of those men who flatter the lowest prejudices of people; let me repeat it: he must be the natural enemy of those who flatter the lowest prejudices of the people [applause] only to betray their highest interests.

Presidents in the Wilsonian tradition understood, in short, that the very word "President" was a summons to greatness.

Now, will the man elected President this year understand the fearful obligations of a President? Will he understand why the framers of the Constitution broke with the Presidents of their time and established a strong executive? Why in this perilous world of 1964 their wisdom has been confirmed a thousandfold. Will he understand why above all a great people and a great nation need a strong President?

I think these are the questions that need to be asked. With all the shouting and all the booing and all the cheering, we are dealing with the most serious business of our times, the nature of our Government, the responsibility of government, whether or not America will be up to the demands of international leadership because, make no mistake about it, what Lincoln said in his second inaugural is still true. America is the last best hope on earth, and that America cannot falter because of weakness in its people or in its Government. [Applause.]

I come here today to say that Lyndon Johnson's entire career demonstrates that he surely undertands these questions and their answers. He has been in public life for over 30 years. The first of his mentors was President Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt. From Roosevelt [applause] Lyndon Johnson learned in close intimate detail the nature of the modern Presidency, its capabilities, its limitations. More important, he learned how the limitations can best be met and the capabilities best realized.

Lyndon Johnson's next great mentor was the Senate of the United States, and his Democratic colleagues in the Senate elected him their leader while he was still in his freshman term. If there was anything wrong with Lyndon Johnson, and my how we now hear how wrong he is, if there was any flaw in his character, any weakness in his nerve, any pettiness in his heart, any miopia in his vision, any stammer in his thought processes, I can assure you from firsthand knowledge that Lyndon Johnson would not have been acknowledged by his Senate colleagues, jealous of their rights, on both sides of the aisle, as one of the greatest legislative leaders that America has ever produced in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

If Lyndon Johnson had not practiced the responsible exercise of political power as the Senate majority leader, our political history during the Eisenhower years would have been far different than it is and was. Lyndon Johnson was in a position to harass the Eisenhower administration if he had believed in an irresponsible, anarchistic, nihilistic jungle doctrine of opposition for the sake of opposition.

Instead, he taught me and he taught others, he taught the Senator from this State, Pete Williams, he taught us to be responsible and not to be opposition for the sake of opposition.

Often at the expense of cloakroom criticism by certain members of his own party, Lyndon Johnson used his strength as the majority leader to brace the Eisenhower administration when it faltered, to indicate to it better courses of action, to buttress it when our national interests were at stake in a world raked by urgent crises. [Applause.] And I might add we saw another aspect of Lyndon Johnson when he served as Vice President under President Kennedy. We saw Lyndon Johnson, despite his long years of preeminence as the head of the Senate, as a scrupulously faithful lieutenant to a man who had been his junior in the Congress, for this was another thing Lyndon Johnson always knew: the President of the United States is not a committee but

one man and this one man is captain of the ship of state, and this one man is the captain on the bridge. The second in command must support the captain, lighten his burden, counsel him, but he must never forget who is President and who is captain.

And then we all bore tragic witness to the sensitive but quietly authoritative manner in which Lyndon Johnson assumed the Office of President of the United States when our beloved late President, John F. Kennedy, was the victim of the assassin's bullet. No man, no man except a born leader could have done what Lyndon Johnson did in those critical days following President Kennedy's death. No man could have guided and sustained us except one who knew by heart, by experience, the meaning of the Presidency, who knew all of the intricacies of our Government, who knew all of the subtleties of our Congress, and who had an affection for the Members of Congress of both parties and who understood their individual problems. No man except one who understood all of this could have made the 88th Congress what it has become under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson, one of the most productive, one of the most responsible and far-seeing Congresses since Woodrow Wilson took the helm of Government after the election of 1912. [Applause.]

Now, let me summarize this by saying to you, we have in President Lyndon Johnson a President who will continue John Kennedy's policy of making this world safe for diversity, who understands that there cannot be an American solution to every world problem but who also understands the need to oppose totalitarian and Communist aggression and subversion with strength, with determination, with wisdom, with flexibility and strength, and a clear sense of priorities.

We have, in Lyndon Johnson, a President who realizes that mankind is walking down an uncharted road into the future with destruction lurking at every crossroads—who appreciate the appalling responsibility that rests upon the judgment of the President of the United States, a responsibility not only to the American people but to the world community.

For the first time in history, my fellow Americans—and we must remember this, because this is a unique era, a unique period—for the first time in history one man in our country possesses the ability to destroy the past, the present, and the future, literally to bring time to an end, and that man, because he is Commander in Chief, because he is in charge in this nuclear age, is the President of the United States.

And I submit to you that, on the basis of both reason and experience, Lyndon Johnson has shown himself eminently qualified for these awesome responsibilities. I know him, not just as a politician, not just in public life, I know him as a friend, as a father, as one that has been in my home, and I have been privileged to be in his. He is courageous; he is, no one doubts, experienced. And he has demonstrated beyond any shadow of a doubt to any fairminded American that he is responsible, a responsible President who has earned the right to America's continued trust and support. [Applause.]

I say to this audience, to this distinguished audience at this great center of learning, from whence should come leadership, you should set the pattern. You have been privileged, may I say, to sup at the table of civilization's culture. You have an obligation second to none. You as undergraduates of this university or as students, you cannot take a narrow-minded partisan view. You have an obligation to your country, to your Constitution, to the history and the heritage of this country. And I say that in the knowledge of that heritage, because you are learning, because you have been privileged to know, because you are students, you cannot possibly, you cannot in your heart possibly turn your back upon the realities of our time. You can't do it. [Applause.]

And may I say that as a President, as a President, Lyndon Johnson will not only uphold and defend the Constitution as it is, historically, as it is in contemporary life, but he will also sustain the vision of an Abraham Lincoln who said that government's duty was to serve the people. He will sustain the vision of a Woodrow Wilson who envisaged a League of Nations international peace. He will sustain the vision of Franklin Roosevelt who saw government as a helper and as a partner to a people that needed help. And he will sustain the vision

of a Harry S. Truman who had the courage of a giant to meet the problems of his day. [Applause.]

And Lyndon Johnson will sustain the vision of the man that selected him, that really in fact gave him the awesome responsibility that he now holds, the vision of John F. Kennedy who saw the Presidency [applause] as the moral nucleus of the American community.

I say that students of government, those who are privileged to have a higher education, cannot possibly turn to the past. You cannot accept the leadership of retreat. You cannot accept the leadership of discontent, doubt, and suspicion. You must, indeed, by your moral commitment to your country give the leadership to one who wants to lead America forward as a united people and a united Republic in the future. [Applause.]

Trenton, N.J.
Statehouse
October 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Well, thank you very, very much, Governor Hughes, for your warm reception, your fine and gracious introduction, and may I also say thanks to that wonderful orchestra down here, and all these good, singing, happy people.

By the way, Governor, I saw a person back there carrying a Goldwater sign with a smile on his face, and deep down in his heart he knows he is going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Now, don't send them home. We want to give them a few of the political facts of life, a little truth.

These good folks are here just to put down their sword. They know the fight is all over. They have come here to surrender, that is all. [Applause.]

Yes, my good friends and Governor, we must be very, very charitable these days. Everyone in America is entitled to feel like we do. Everyone is entitled to feel happy. Make them happy, too. You can do it by just electing Lyndon Johnson President of the United States. [Applause.]

And may I say to my young enthusiastic friends down here that we can also—you know, that poor fellow down there is going to hurt his voice if he keeps shouting like that—we can also make them even more happy if we just back up that election of President Lyndon Johnson by giving him the support in the Senate and the House that he needs, and I know that the people of New Jersey are not going to let themselves down. I know that they are going to send back to the U.S. Senate one of the most respected, admired, and able Members of the Senate, their own Senator Harrison "Pete" Williams. [Applause.]

And when they are doing that, they know full well that they have got the finest Congressman that you could ever get at any time, any place, in any district, in any State, and they are going to send back to the Congress of the United States that good man from their district, Frank Thompson. [Applause.]

And then they are going to do a little job here in the State, too, by seeing to it that Rev. Howard Woodson is also elected, and, Reverend, we want to wish you the best in your endeavors here in this campaign. [Applause.]

Governor, I know that Trenton is your hometown. I know that this great city of Trenton bears the mark of American history. As you have indicated to us, this great city of Trenton was a battleground in the Revolutionary War and indeed was the turning point in our War for Independence, and I have a feeling that the State of New Jersey will be a very crucial and critical State in this election, and I say right here that the State of New Jersey, starting right here in Mercer County, in Trenton, can be the turning point in this election to make sure that Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party is elected with an overwhelming vote. [Applause.]

Now, if you keep those signs down so I can look back at those misguided souls [applause] they are getting back further and further. They are going right through that building the next time.

51 WBZ—LINO

Now, it is a joy to be in this, the great Garden State of the Atlantic seaboard. Just about an hour ago I visited the campus of one of the greatest universities in the world, Princeton University. [Applause.] Your State is known for its many fine educational establishments. Your State is known for its great industry. The State of New Jersey is known not only for its educational establishments, its universities, its colleges, its public, private, and parochial schools, it is known for its industry, it is known for its cities, and it is known for its agriculture.

The great State is a blend of what makes up America. It is a State that represents the many different nationalities and ethnic groups. It is a State that represents in its makeup of people every known religion and faith. It is a State that has been a part of the great American dream and a part of our heritage. And because it has been a part of the great America of progress, because this State has symbolized throughout its whole history, progress, because it has represented opportunity, because it has symbolized hope for the future and because it is a part of the great history of this Republic, accurately represented and accurately portrayed, because it is all of these things, this great State cannot possibly find itself voting for a man that has forgotten or does not know our history, cannot possibly find itself voting for a man for President that has left his own party, repudiated the principles of our bipartisan foreign policy and one, if you please, who threatens by his voice and by his action 30 or more years of social progress in America.

I know that the great State of New Jersey with its fine Governor, Governor Hughes, with its excellent Senator, Senator Williams, with its Congressman from this district, Frank Thompson, with the kind of people that represent you in the Halls of Congress and in your statehouse right here, I know that the State of New Jersey is going to vote for the future, it is going to vote for progress, it is going to vote to continue our prosperity. It is going to vote for the people of America, and it is going to vote for the peace of the world and in doing that, it is going to support Lyndon Johnson as President. [Applause.]

It is soo good to have these young folks with us, and I mean it. I want them to know [applause] I want our young people to know this, that in this election, your enthusiasm, your vitality, your sense of idealism, your willingness to help these candidates, your willingness to give us encouragement, and you do, and your willingness to stand by us during these days of the campaign, all of these things mean so much to the President of the United States and to the man that is speaking to you.

These campaigns are not easy. At times they are fatiguing. At times they are very trying. At times they are very distressing, particularly when the opposition reaches down into the barrel of mud and muck and fails to discuss the issues, but seeks only to divide us, seeks only to spread suspicion, seeks only to spread doubt, and in these days let me tell you that the bright and shining faces and the clear eyes of young people that believe in America, that think that their President and that think possibly that this candidate for Vice President is worthy of them, that these young people give me faith, give me hope, and I want you to know that I am deeply grateful to you. [Applause.]

You will be happy to know that one young man took off his Goldwater button out there right now. [Applause.]

Now, let me say to this audience—that is two of them, good—it is a slow process, but it is working—let me say to this great audience that we have during these years of the 1900's since the time of Franklin Roosevelt been attempting to build in our country, in its Government, a sense of social consciousness, a sense of social justice. The duty of Government is not what the opposition in this campaign says; namely, to withdraw from responsibility. The duty of Government is as Abraham Lincoln put it—a great man and a great Republican—he has repudiated the principles of the Republican Party, of that great Abraham Lincoln, this great emancipator, this great man who stood for equal rights, this great man who said that government's duty is to serve, this great man who said it is the duty of government to do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves or nearly so well

for themselves. This philosophy of Abraham Lincoln has been embraced, has been accepted and made a part of the American life. It is a part of the Government of the United States. It is a part of your life. And Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson have lived by that philosophy. [Applause.]

Now, this is not a philosophy that says that government guarantees you success. This isn't a philosophy of government that says that government will do it for you. It is a philosophy of government that says that it is the duty of government to blaze the pathways clean so that young people can have opportunity and if they will work, if they will try to make something out of themselves, then opportunities will be there without impediment, without hindrance. It is a philosophy of government that says that compassion is not weakness. It is a philosophy of government that says that concern for the afflicted, the sick, is not socialism.

My dear friends, let the opposition call it what they will. Let them say their ugly words about those of us that believe that those who are maimed and afflicted and crippled and disabled, that those who through no fault of their own cannot stand on their own feet, that those people should have the help of government, let them call it socialism if they will, but I call it good solid Americanism, and I am proud of it. [Applause.]

I would hate to think of the day that a man was in the White House who thought that this Government should stand idly by while people were without work. I would hate to think of the day that a man should be President of the United States who thought that our elderly should not have an opportunity to live in dignity. I would hate to think of the day that someone may be elected President of the United States who would even contest, who would even have doubts, about the value and the importance of social security for our people. [Applause.]

And let me say that this month of October sees such a man asking for the people's support. There are voices in this land today, my friends, who say that the Government should turn back, who say that this great partnership between a government of the people, by the people and for the people should be broken with the people. There is a voice in this land that says education is not the responsibility of government. There is a voice in this land that says that some children would be better off without it. And that man seeks to be President.

There is a voice in this land that says the Peace Corps is a haven for beatniks. There is a voice in this land that says the duty today is not to pass laws but to repeal them. And that man from Arizona asks you for your support.

I say to you never, never, never. This man must never be President of the United States. [Applause.]

It seems to me that what we ought to expect from a candidate who aspires to this high office is a discussion of the issues. What does he propose to do about our growing cities? A city like Trenton, for example, that is now in the throes of urban renewal. A man that votes against it. And a man that has no thoughts whatsoever—if he has ever had any of them, he has not expressed them—on this subject of the growing city with all of its problems. Here is a man that says he is for free enterprise and cries socialism and says America has gone socialistic at a time when America is more prosperous, has a greater gross national product, has more people employed in private industry than ever before, when business has greater profits and more dividends than ever before, and yet here is a man who asks the people of the United States to support him for President when he screams the false words of the false gods, of the false prophets, socialism. Bunk, hogwash, and you know it. [Applause.]

America deserves better. Is it any wonder, my friends, that great segments of the great Republican Party have shifted over to support the Democratic nominees for President and Vice President. Why? Because these people, my friends, have put their country above a fraction of a faction of their party. These people see that the present spokesman of the Republican Party is not in the mainstream of his party. They see him repudiating policy after policy of the Republican Party as well as the Democratic Party. They see Mr.

Goldwater who on 25 rollcall votes in the U.S. Senate voted 25 times against the commitments of the Republican platform of 1960. They see a man who says of the eastern seaboard that it should be cut off from the United States and let it drift to sea.

What kind of talk is this? What we need in the White House today, my friends, is someone that doesn't divide America but unites it. That is what we need. [Applause.]

We need someone in the White House today, and we have him there, that seeks to heal the wounds and not to open them. We need a man as President of this country that understands the promise of America and doesn't distort its past.

It would be very interesting if the candidate of the opposition would tell us the true history of America because history can be interesting. Even though you ought not to vote it, it can be interesting, but the candidate of this minor fraction of a faction of the Republican Party, and he does not represent his party, this candidate distorts our history, misrepresents the role of American Government.

This is a man that says that your Government in Washington is a greater threat to your freedom than Moscow. Any man that will say that has disqualified himself from the Presidency of the United States, and you know it. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, before I leave you I ask you this. I ask you to help us in this fight. The coming weeks will be difficult ones. I sense what the opposition is doing. They say of the many ethnic groups in our country, of the many racial groups, they say of them they rule America, as if somehow or another people of Italian or Norwegian or of Portuguese or of Spanish or of Polish or of whatever extraction it may be should have nothing to say about America. They say that the Civil Rights Act promotes violence rather than ask for its observance. They say of America that the National Government is your enemy. I say to you that a program and a policy and a statement of that kind is beneath the respect and the dignity of the American people.

I ask the American people to believe in a President who sees this country as one nation, who sees these great American people that are striving so hard to make greater gains as a people that are dedicated to even greater progress than we have made thus far.

I know that the man that I support for President is not afraid of the future and he understands our past. I know that the President that I support has hope for the future and plans for it and I know that he see the role of Government as one of working together with the Federal, State, and local government, with private industry, with labor and agriculture, with people everywhere, to build a better America.

We are going to need your help and as John Kennedy said, from this very ground, and as he said to us in his inaugural address and as he said time in and time out, give us your help. Give us your hearts. Give us your hands. Help us fulfill these promises. We pledge to you a full measure of devotion and dedicated service. We pledge to you to help build America to even greater heights. We pledge to you to finish the unfinished task of those 1,000 days of John Kennedy's administration. We pledge to you, if you will give us the chance to lead America to even greater goals, greater dreams, and greater achievements. It can be done. We can do what we want to, my friends.

No people on the face of the earth has been so blessed. No nation so strong, no nation so rich, no nation so privileged. We should stand up and be counted, not for mediocrity, not on the basis of condemnation and criticism, but we should stand up and be counted for achievement, for noble goals, for high ideals, for great promise, and I tell you that if you will help us, if you will give us your help on election day and if you cast your vote for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and Pete Williams and Frank Thompson and Democrats that want to work with you, we will give you everything that we have to make this come true.

Thank you. [Applause.]

54 WBZ—LINO

Trenton, N.J.
War Memorial Auditorium
October 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. I am going to say just a word. I just heard my good manager and my assistant say to me, he said, "There is no mike." I think maybe we ought to save this voice because I have got to make a speech at Jersey City.

I want to say that it is a real pleasure to come to Mercer County. It is a real pleasure to be introduced by Thorn Lord, and it is a great honor to be here in the State where a Governor was kind enough and considerate enough to me to give me a very helpful boost when I thought maybe that it might be good if President Johnson heard a kind word from New Jersey. And he went all the way with us. And your great Senator, Pete Williams, is one of my personal close friends. I want to make it crystal clear. This man is needed in the Senate and you fight like you never fought before. Put a tiger in the tank when it comes to this one. I mean it. [Applause.]

I don't think I have to remind you that Frank Thompson is one of the finest members of Congress. [Applause.]

I have got the man right up here that you are going to elect, too, Reverend Woodson.

By the way, I forgot something. Don't forget Johnson. President Johnson. [Applause.]

And if you elect President Johnson and Pete Williams and Frank Thompson and Reverend Woodson, you get me tossed in for nothing. [Applause.]

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

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, JERSEY CITY, N.J., OCTOBER 9, 1964

There have been many times when I have been proud to be an American but I think tonight of two unforgettable occasions.

One was when President Kennedy stood upon the steps of the Capitol one snowy day in January 4 years ago and said:

> Now the trumpet summons us again, not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in life but patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of mankind, tyranny, poverty, disease, and war istelf.

Taking us to be responsible, he spoke to us in words of high responsibility. Taking us to be intelligent, he did not insult our intelligence with easy answers to hard questions. Taking us to be mature men and women, he beguiled us with no fairy tales, but confronted us with all the complexities of a complex world.

He offered us no panaceas, no shortcuts to Utopia—whether through the byways of the dead past or the future horrors of a thermonuclear Armageddon.

He did not ask us merely to be ready to die for our country—he asked us a much harder thing, to live for it. He challenged each of us to give our best, not for a hundred days, and not for a thousand days, but as long as the tasks facing us remained undone.

And then he said, in words which remain in my memory as if they were etched in fire:

"Let us begin."

President Kennedy was granted little more than a thousand days to serve us and to serve mankind.

And then, in the time of our greatest need, President Johnson stood before us and expressed in three simple words all that we felt and all that we hoped:

"Let us continue."

55 WBZ—LINO

America has responded to the leadership of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Working together, we have been making real headway against tyranny, against poverty, against disease, and against war.

Three times in these 4 years totalitarian dictators have put to the supreme test the will of a free people to defend their freedom—over Berlin, over Cuba, and in the Tonkin Bay.

Three times we as a people have met that test, supporting our leaders in a firmness which our immense power made credible, but supporting them also in the restraint with which they used that power.

Working together these past 4 years—Government and business, farmers and workers—we have maintained our economic growth for 44 straight months—the longest sustained expansion in our peacetime history. Profits, wages, and farm incomes are up. Unemployment is down.

In these past 4 years, we have stepped up the war against disease. We have taken measures to improve our hospitals and community health facilities to see that mothers and children get better medical care, and to treat, and where possible, to prevent mental illness and retardation.

We have also—and I have been as frank and forthright about this in the South as I am here—made a great breakthrough in the battle against racial prejudice, which can warp men's souls as sorely as physical disease can warp their bodies and minds.

Above all, we have—with the nuclear test ban treaty—taken a giant step toward peace.

These have been good years for America. These have been years which united rather than divided Americans, enhanced the confidence of our friends and insured the respect of our enemies.

But some Americans, I regret to say, don't see it that way. They say that America is weak, demoralized and divided. Admitting that times are good, they don't think we should feel good about it. They complain that everything that has been done, not merely in the past 4 years, but in the past 30 years, is all wrong. I call these people "sick and tired" Americans. After all, that's just what they call themselves. Over and over again, we've heard them say that they are "sick and tired" of this and "sick and tired" of that. They are "sick" of the kind of American Government which seeks to fulfill one of the key mandates of the Constitution—the promotion of the general welfare.

They are "tired" of the unrelenting, patient, demanding and successful struggle to contain communism—and hanker to bring it to a climax with one big bang.

But I know from this campaign that America is not "sick," and Americans are not "tired."

I know that America will send the "sick and tired" candidates to a crushing defeat on November 3.

What we vote *for* on November 3 is far more important than what we vote *against*.

Yes; we shall reject—and by a tremendous majority, I hope—all that is retrograde in American life. But we shall reaffirm what is good and forward looking.

Recognizing that America has great problems, we shall affirm that it has great opportunities.

Remembering that it has a glorious past, we shall affirm that it has an even more glorious future.

Jersey City, N.J.
Jersey City Armory
October 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you for that wonderful reception and may I thank—may I just take a moment to thank the grandest Democrat of them all, your own John Kenny. What a wonderful man. [Applause.]

Mayor Kenny, Mayor Whelan, the esteemed and distinguished Governor of this State, Gov. Richard Hughes, Senator Harrison P. Williams, Congressman Daniels, and this fine State senator, Senator Kelly, my fellow Democrats, mayors, city officials, labor leaders, young people [applause], old people, friends, may I thank in particular the students that are here from Jersey State, St. Peter's College.

My friends, thank you very much.

Now, let's talk a little Democratic politics for a while.

The other day there was a sad soul speaking in some beautiful American city, and he said the Americans are unhappy. I ask you tonight, are you happy? [Applause.]

You should never do that. You ought to leave those Goldwater people in here so we can tell them the truth. [Applause.] Are we going to have a Democratic victory? [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, just sit down. There aren't many of those people.

Mayor Kenny, my fellow Democrats, I come here tonight, I come to this great meeting at Jersey City tonight, in the full knowledge that this city and Hudson County represent a powerful force for the Democratic Party and for progressive and humanitarian government in the United States. [Applause.]

Our late and beloved President, John Kennedy, told me that whenever you feel a little tired, whenever you have any doubts about America, whenever you wonder what the future will offer, go on up to Hudson County and see John Kenny and the Democrats. [Applause.]

And he was right. He was right. This great county is the source of inspiration and strength for our party, for our President, and for our country.

It is said that this year is "All the way with L.B.J.," and this year [applause] this means not just President Johnson, not just Hubert Humphrey, not just Harrison Williams, not just your Congressmen, but it means the entire Democratic slate to be elected on November 3. [Applause.]

And friends, this year we don't have to do it alone. This year we have thousands, yes, millions, of people who ordinarily vote a Republican ticket, that this year are going to vote for their country rather than their party, and that means they are going to vote for President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party. Things have changed. GOP now stands for Goldwater, Our Problem. [Applause.]

With millions of Republicans knowing this, with millions of Americans knowing this, people of all parties, Republicans and Democrats and independents, people that love their country, people that want to see this country move forward, people that believe that the gains we have made in the last 30 years should be maintained, have made up their minds now that the way to get that job done is to vote the Democratic ticket and put Lyndon Johnson back in the White House for 4 years. [Applause.]

Now, there have been many times in my life and there may have been many times in your lives when you have been very, very proud to be an American. But tonight I want to call to your attention two occasions when every one of us were very proud, two unforgettable occasions in the life of our Nation. One occasion was when President Kennedy stood upon the steps of our Capitol one snowy day in January 1961, almost 4 years ago, and said to you, and said to me, and said to the whole world—listen to his words—

> Now the trumpet summons us again, not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in life but patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of mankind—tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

President Kennedy knew and believed that Americans were mature, responsible people, and he spoke to us in the words of high responsibility, and taking us to be intelligent people, he did not insult our intelligence with easy answers to hard questions, and taking us to be grown up and mature people, he beguiled us not with fairy tales but confronted us with the complexities of a difficult and troubled world.

This good man that spoke here in this city twice, this good man offered us no easy panaceas, no shortcuts to some Utopia, whether through the byways of the dead past or the future horrors of a thermonuclear Armageddon.

He did not ask us merely to be ready to die for our country. He asked the young Americans for a much harder thing—he asked them to live for their country. He challenged us, each and every one of us [applause] to give our best, not for a hundred days, not for a thousand days, but for as long as the tasks facing us remained undone.

And then he said, in word which remain in my memory as if they were etched in fire, he said these famous three words, "Let us begin," and America started to move again. [Applause.]

But this good and brave man, a man that loved his country so much, and that you loved so much, and that America grew to love so much, was granted little more than 1,000 days to serve us and to serve mankind. He was struck down as has been said tonight in a bitter and cruel way by the assassin's bullet, the victim of hate and of a destroyed mind.

And then a second unforgettable occasion comes to mind. In the time of our greatest need, when this Nation wept, when it faltered for a moment, when the world wondered what next, when we wondered whether there would even be continuity of government, when we stood as if we were paralyzed in horror and shock, a tall, strong, brave man stood before us and became our President under our constitutional system, and I remember when that man who was John Kennedy's Vice President took that oath of office and came back to Washington with tears in his eyes, with pain in his heart, and with dedication in his soul, and I remember that day, November 27, 1963, when Lyndon Johnson stood before the Congress assembled and he rallied the people of America and he gave us one of those unforgettable moments, a historic occasion, that is seared in our memories as if by fire, and just as John Kennedy had said "Let us begin," Lyndon Johnson picked up the torch from the fallen leader and said "Let us continue." [Applause.]

And my fellow Americans, that is what this election is all about. That is what we are here for. We are here to complete the unfinished tasks of John Kennedy's beginning. We are here to carry on the work. We are here to continue the struggle that was launched, and this election, my friends, will determine whether or not the people of America stand by the words and the deeds and the works of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. [Applause.]

And I believe I know the heart of America. I believe I know the heart of these young people. I believe that I can read what is in their heart and minds. They want to finish the task, don't you? [Applause.]

America has responded. It has responded magnificently to the leadership of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. These men were a team. I know. I sat alongside of these two men week in and week out. I was privileged, as Senator Williams could tell you, to be one of the legislative lieutenants of President Kennedy and now of President Johnson. I know when I say there was a Kennedy-Johnson program I speak the truth because I was there when they hammered it out on the anvil of political experience and necessity for America. [Applause.]

Working together, these two bold and brave men, with the people of America and with the Congress, we have been making real headway. America is moving ahead. We are making headway against charity, against poverty, against disease, and against war. Three times in these past 4 years totalitarian dictators have put us to the supreme test. They have tested the will of the free people of America. They have tested whether or not we would defend our freedom—in Berlin, in Cuba, and in Tonkin Bay—and three times we as a people have met that test, supporting our leaders in a firmness which our immense power made credible but supporting them also in the restraint with which they used that power.

Working together, that is the theme of our Government, working together, Government and the people, these past 4 years, Government and business, farmers and workers, we have maintained our economic growth and expansion. We have maintained an ever-increasing prosperity for 44 continuous months, the longest period of economic growth and prosperity in the history of the world. [Applause.]

Profits, wages, farm incomes are up. Unemployment is down. Despite what the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party may say, America is moving ahead. America is prosperous. America is strong. And the people are strong enough to defeat him on November 3. [Applause.]

In the past 4 years we have kept our promises. We have fulfilled our commitments. We have waged war on disease. We have taken measures to improve our hospitals and our community facilities. We have waged war on mental illness and mental retardation. And, my friends, we have kept another commitment that was made in this very city by the late President Kennedy when speaking to you 4 years ago this month. He said here in Jersey City that America must erase from its countenance, that America must remove from its vision, every vestige of prejudice, racial and religious, and we have made that fight. [Applause.]

Might I add that Americans of both parties rally to that pattern. Republicans and Democrats alike in the House and in the Senate, with few exceptions, stood up and were counted. Republicans and Democrats alike said we believe in only one kind of citizenship, first-class American citizenship. An overwhelming majority of Democrats, an overwhelming majority of Republicans said we believe in the equality of opportunity, but not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

But above all, in these past few years, we have made a first step and an important step in the lives of these young people and in the safety of our Nation and the peace of the world. Our President, our late President, in June of 1963 launched a mighty offensive for a more peaceful world and he didn't do it from weakness. He did it from strength. He did it from conviction. And he did it with the power of the spirit as well as the sword. And President Kennedy backed up by President Lyndon Johnson, then the Vice President, they negotiated a nuclear test ban treaty, a giant step forward toward peace. And may I say once again, three-fourths of the Members of the Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for the ratification of that test ban treaty. [Applause.]

A man who seeks to be President of the United States, a man who seeks the highest office as a gift of the American people, that will vote against first-class citizenship for every American, a man who seeks to be President of the United States and revolt against a major step toward peace, that man is not qualified to occupy that office and we shall not let him. [Applause.]

These have been good years for America. These past 4 years have been dramatic years for America. You have lived through an exciting time, a memorable experience, these beginning years which have united rather than divided Americans, years that increased the confidence of our friends in America, and gained the respect of our enemies, but some Americans—few they are indeed, but loud—don't see it that way. Some Americans say America is weak, America is demoralized, America is corrupt, America is divided. I say to you that America is not weak. I say to you that America is not weak. I say to you that America's spirit is good. And I say to you that America is united tonight as it has never been before in its history. [Applause.]

This Republican pretender to the Presidency knows that times are good. He knows that profits are up. He knows that there are 72 million people working. He knows that business is good. But he says we ought not to feel good about it. We are supposed to feel as miserable as he does. [Applause.]

And these few Americans with their leader complain that everything that has been done, and not merely in the past 4 years but that everything that has been done in the last 30 years by our Government, since the days of Roosevelt and Truman and Kennedy and Johnson, all they say is wrong. I say to you that they are wrong and Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson are right. [Applause.]

Now, what can we call these people that complain so much? What can we call these people who are so grouchy, so grumpy, so miserable, so unhappy? Well, I call these people sick and tired Americans.

After all, that is what they call themselves. Over and over again I hear the spokesmen ——— — — ——— — —them say they are sick and tired of this, they are sick and tired of that, they are sick of the kind of government which seeks to fulfill one of the key mandates of the Constitution, the promotion of the general welfare.

They are tired. They are tired of the unrelenting, patient, demanding, and successful struggle to contain communism and they hanker to bring it all to a big climax with one big nuclear bang.

Well, I know from this campaign that America is not sick, that America is not tired. The people that are sick and tired are the ones that are doing the talking about it. [Applause.]

And let me tell you, my dear friends, that I find the Americans healthy and happy. I find them vigorous and active, and I find them healthy enough and vigorous enough and active enough to prove it on November 3 when they defeat Goldwater. [Applause.]

I know and you know, we know that America will send the sick and tired candidates to a crushing and devastating defeat on November 3 which is what they deserve. [Applause.]

But what we vote for on November 3 is far more important than what we vote against. Yes, we shall reject by a tremendous majority all of this backwardness, all of this retreat in American life but we are going to reaffirm what is good and forward looking. Recognizing that America has great problems we shall also affirm that it has great opportunities, and remembering that America has a glorious past, we shall affirm that it shall even have a more glorious future.

And as I leave you tonight, let me quote to you the last words that John Kennedy ever said in this city, and listen to them because they are prophetic. Speaking here in this city on November 6, early in the morning, the last day before the election, this dear and good man we trusted said these words:

> The next President of the United States may well determine not only the great issues of war and peace but may also determine what kind of a country we shall have, which direction we are going in, and what economy we have.

"This country," said John Kennedy:

> is about to begin another great march forward and in the lead of that march will be the county of Hudson and the city of Jersey.

I say to you tonight you owe it to the memory of this, our dear departed friend, you owe it to his memory, this man that gave his life for us, and you owe it to the man that he selected as his successor to see to it that this election is a living memorial, a living tribute to John Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Levittown, Pa.
Rally
October 10, 1964

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

There is one overriding issue in this campaign and it is a very simple one:

The American people must decide which candidate is best qualified by experience, training, and temperament to be President of the United States—which man shall we trust to lead our Nation through a valley shadowed by a mushroom cloud.

I am confident the American people will place their trust in Lyndon B. Johnson and will give him an overwhelming mandate on November 3.

Not since Thomas Jefferson has a candidate for the Presidency possessed as much experience as Lyndon B. Johnson.

No candidate in modern times has applied himself with as much energy, and with such responsibility, to become a professional public servant.

Lyndon Johnson has been in Government service for more than 3 years. He was an able executive in the National Youth Administra-

tion under Franklin D. Roosevelt in the early 1930's.

As a Congressman, Lyndon Johnson learned from President Roosevelt in intricate detail the capabilities and the limitations of the Presidency.

While still a freshman Senator, Lyndon Johnson's Democratic colleagues elected him their leader. And Senators on both sides of the aisle regarded him as one of the greatest legislative leaders America ever produced.

This could not have happened if there had been anything in his character men could not trust—any weakness in his nerve—any pettiness in his heart—any vindictiveness in his spirit—any narrowness in his vision—or any stammer in his process of thought. Lyndon Johnson led many men of strong and different convictions. He led them well. He earned their respect.

Without Lyndon Johnson's concept of responsibility the record of the Eisenhower years would have been quite different. Lyndon Johnson led an opposition party that held the majority in Congress. To some, the job of the opposition is simply to oppose. But not Lyndon Johnson.

Lyndon Johnson used his strength as the Democratic majority leader to brace the Eisenhower administration when it faltered, to suggest better courses of action, but always to buttress it when the national interest was at stake in a world of urgent crises.

We saw another aspect of Lyndon Johnson when he served as Vice President under President Kennedy. Lyndon Johnson understood loyalty. He expressed it simply when he became Vice President:

> If there is only one man on whom Jack Kennedy can depend, I want it to be me."

John Kennedy chose well. On last November 22, a nation and a world had reason for profound gratitude for the choice and for the man who suddenly assumed this fearful burden.

In 10 months of the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson, you have a record of unparalleled accomplishment and achievement in all areas of endeavor.

Finally, we know that in Lyndon Johnson we have a man to whom we can delegate with confidence and safety the awesome responsibility as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. We have a man of maturity, restraint, and responsibility to whom our nuclear arsenal can be safely entrusted.

Levittown, Pa.
Shopping Center
October 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, my good friend, Ralph Samuel, and thank you, my dear friends of Levittown. You have been most wonderful in your reception. I am extremely grateful. And thank you, too; the young lady is for Hubert Humphrey. Thank you.

And I want to thank the ladies that are more my age, too.

Well, I am so very, very happy to be here at this great shopping center in Bucks County, Pa., on this beautiful morning when the sun is shining brightly, when the air is brisk, and when the whole atmosphere seems to be Democratic. [Applause.]

Yesterday in Philadelphia, we had a wonderful gathering at noontime. You may have read about it in the Philadelphia papers. So I don't know how many thousand people. All I know is that with few exceptions, they were all going to vote for Lyndon Johnson and Genevieve Blatt and the Democratic ticket.

They get Humphrey along with that.

Now, you notice again that we are blessed and fortunate to have with us just a little of the static of the right. [Applause.] May I say that it is so wonderful to have them here because it gives them an opportunity, it gives them an opportunity to hear the truth. [Applause.]

They have been living, they are loud but they really don't have much judgment, so don't worry about them.

They have been living in that—you are apt to hurt your voice that loud, young man.

They have been living in this never-never land so long that it is kind of hard to bring them back to reality, but on November 3 they will know what reality is. [Applause.]

Now, Ralph, I want to read to you and to your friends a little clipping that was brought to my attention about 3 weeks ago from a newspaper that is published nearby. It is called the New York Times. It, too, by the way endorses Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. But it carries an Associated Press dispatch dated September 24, dateline, Grand Rapids, Mich., and it reads as follows: "State officials have outlawed the sale of Gold Water."

Now, just one minute. I didn't get a chance to finish that sentence. "A new soft drink promoted by the backers of Senator Barry Goldwater. Some 350 cases of beverage have been ordered withheld from distribution on the grounds that the pop is 'grossly misbranded' "—[applause]—"and because it lists as ingredients only artificial coloring and a preservative."

I should like to say that is the shortest and the most explicit and the most profound description of the Republican candidate and the platform that I have ever heard read. Of course, I should say that most Republicans, most Republicans, are not going to vote for the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party. [Applause.]

Many of these Republicans, millions of them, and thousands in your own neighborhood, they love their party but they love their country more. They remember that GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party. Now to those Republicans it stands for Goldwater, our problem. [Applause.]

So may I say that we welcome into the ranks of the great multitude of Americans, the majority of Americans, that are going to back our President. We welcome into that great majority thousands, yea millions, of people who are of Republican persuasion, who in this election see it to be so important, see the issues to be so vital, and see the candidate of their party repudiating the heritage of that party, doing exactly what the Governor of this State said when he wanted to be the nominee of his party, they see the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party out of the mainstream of Republican thought, out of the mainstream of American thought, and these good Republicans are joining with millions of Democrats and independents to elect Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

Now, let me say that I am here today not merely to speak for our President but I am here today to say what Genevieve Blatt so appropriately said, and Genevieve, you sounded the message that needs to go throughout this State. There isn't a shadow of a doubt, in fact, deep down in the heart of every Goldwaterite, they know that Lyndon Johnson is going to be President. They know that. [Applause.]

And because they do know that, because they do know that, it seems it is important to have in the Congress, in the U.S. Senate, and in the House of Representatives, people that are going to work with our President, people who are going to back his programs, people that are going to help put America forward, people that are going to work for the future, and I know from my long personal knowledge and friendship of the fine lady that is here as your candidate for the U.S. Senate on the Democratic ticket—[applause]—I know that Genevieve Blatt will serve with distinction. She will serve with ability. She will serve with honor the great State of Pennsylvania in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And I also know that this great community of the Eighth District, these two great counties of Bucks County and Lehigh, that these two counties and this great district will want to have as a Congressman no somebody that puts his arm around Mr. Goldwater but somebody that can have the hand of friendship of Lyndon Johnson, and you have him in Ralph Samuel. [Applause.]

Listen, they haven't made up their minds which Barry they want, "Straw Barry" or "Razz Barry."

Now, dear friends, if those who with the closed mind will close their mouths, we can get on with the show.

You know, I looked at a voting record and I saw something that told me why this district needs new representation. I also saw why this district is going to get new representation. The people in this district, every businessman in this shopping center, want to see this country move ahead. Every worker, and there are thousands of you, want to see this country prosperous. This country today is enjoying unprecedented prosperity. Millions of people at work, high dividends, high profits, the largest gross national product in our history, a prosperity 44 months in duration, the longest in the history of America. And yet that prosperity didn't come by accident. It came because government and business and labor and the community worked together. The Congressman in this district voted on certain issues just exactly as the negative spokesman of the Republican—temporary spokesman and a negative man he is, of the Republican Party. How did he vote on the tax cut? Well, most Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, in the Congress of the United States voted to give American business a better chance, a better opportunity. Most Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike in the Congress, voted to give the consumer more purchasing power, but not, no, not Senator Goldwater, and not the Congressman from this district. They voted no. They voted to throttle. They voted to stifle the progress of American business. And this meant, my friends, had their vote prevailed, it would have meant fewer jobs, it would have meant less income. It would have meant fewer revenues, less revenues for our Government. The kind of representation that this community needs is representation for better minimum wages, for better business, for better homes, for better urban development, yes, for better things for more and more Americans. And that kind of representation is here in Ralph Samuel, if you will give him a chance. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, in 1960 the Republican Party adopted a platform in its great convention. That was the Republican Party that had been in power, that knew the realities of the world in which we live. That platform was an authentic Republican platform. It was a conservative platform but it was a Republican platform. Twenty-five major commitments were made in this platform. Twenty-five definite positions taken. On all 25, on all 25, the temporary leader of the Republican Party, the pretender to the Presidency, this man on 25 Republican commitments voted no 25 times. This is why—[applause]—great Republicans by the thousands are not for him, because he is not a Republican. He is a radical. And America doesn't need any radicals. [Applause.]

Now let's see. The minority leader, the leader of the Republicans in the Senate, Mr. Dirksen, on those same 25 issues that I mentioned, 25 where Mr. Goldwater voted no, Mr. Dirksen voted yes 18 times, 7 times no. Thomas Kuchel, the great Senator from California, Republican minority whip, second man in the power structure of the Republican Party—he voted 25 times to support his party platform. Of course, Mr. Goldwater says that Mr. Kuchel is an extremist. [Applause.]

Yes, a man that voted to sustain the commitments of the party is called an extremist. I am not talking now about votes for a Democratic program. I am talking about votes for a Republican program. And Mr. Goldwater, the man who asks the American people to support him, denied his own party 25 times on 25 issues, on 25 rollcalls, a man who has repudiated Abraham Lincoln and Dwight Eisenhower. [Applause.]

And now, my friends, I notice that he not only repudiates his own party, but he comes out here into Bucks County and it says here, "Barry here blasts minorities." He says to the people of America, the minorities rule our country. Well, my dear friends, apparently Mr. Goldwater must feel that he alone is a majority. [Laughter.]

You know, yesterday, my friends, was Leif Ericson Day, in honor of the great Scandinavian people. My mother is a minority. She was born in Norway and came here as an immigrant girl. And very shortly, I should say, we will be celebrating on Monday, Columbus Day. There are thousands of people of Italian extraction, Spanish, Portuguese, Greek, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Austrian, Hungarian, of all the Scandinavian groups, Czechoslovakian, Russian, Slovakian—

there are thousands and thousands of people, my friends, who are in this country because they came here because they loved freedom and we, some of us here, some of us in this audience today, are the children of immigrants. Some of you are immigrants yourselves. Some of you are Catholics, some of you are Protestants, some of you are Jewish. Most of you are white, some of you are colored but we are Americans, every one of us. [Applause.]

Yes, we may be proud of our ancestral heritage. You are of Polish extraction, you may be proud of that, or if you are of French or Italian, you may be proud of that, but my dear friends, and, Mr. Goldwater, get this message straight, America is made up of many peoples. It is like a little United Nations. We are proud of our families, proud of our religion, proud of our ethnic background, proud of our heritage, but, Mr. Goldwater, these minorities make up the great majority that is the great American people, and we are proud of our America. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, we do not want as President anyone that divides America. We do not want as President of America, this great United States, people that lose hope in different nationalities or different ethnics. We want as President someone that unites America, someone that heals our wounds, someone that appeals to our best, someone that asks us to do more and more. And that is a kind of a President we have and that is the kind of a President we are going to keep. Let me say to you, never in the history of America have we had a man better prepared for the Presidency since the time of Thomas Jefferson. This man, Lyndon Johnson, after 30 years of public service, starting out as a teacher in a country school, as a youth administrator in the National Youth Administration, as a Member of Congress, and one of the proteges of the late and beloved Franklin Roosevelt—[applause]—our President serving in the House of Representatives and then in the U.S. Senate as was said here, as the whip, and then as the majority leader, and there isn't a single person that ever served in the U.S. Senate, as Joe Clark, who is here with me today, will testify—[applause]—not a single person who served with Lyndon Johnson that didn't come away admiring his great ability as a leader, the most powerful leader that the U.S. Senate has ever had. [Applause.]

And he learned well as Vice President. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, John Kennedy selected Lyndon Johnson in Los Angeles 4 years ago as his nominee for Vice President. John Kennedy reached into the heart of Texas and said "I want this man." Lyndon Johnson gave up being majority leader to be the Vice President and the nominee of his party. I think the greatest decision that John Kennedy ever made, the decision that stood the best for America, was when he selected as his strong right arm the man who today is our President of the United States. [Applause.]

I say to this audience that if Lyndon Johnson was good enough for the late and beloved John Kennedy, he is good enough for you and he is good enough for me. [Applause.]

And now as I leave you today, and now—listen, folks. All they are saying is "Back to the store in '64." [Applause.]

And now as I leave you, let me just repeat a few words. This is going to be a hard-fought election and it is. We are going to need your help. And I want to say to my young friends and I want their attention, you make yourselves the guardians of American democracy between now and November 3, every boy and girl in this audience, regardless of your age; you see to it that your parents are there on election day at the ballot box. Let's see to it that every single person of voting age exercises their great right in America to vote and then on November 3, let's vote for Ralph Samuel. Let's vote for Genevieve Blatt. [Applause.] Let's vote for this entire Democratic ticket that is here with me on this platform. [Applause.] And by the way, don't forget, I wouldn't want you to forget it for a single minute, vote only once but vote early, be there, and vote for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey.

64 WBZ—LINO

Philadelphia, Pa.
Lit Bros. Shopping Center
October 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. I am very, very happy to be on this platform today with some of the finest Democrats, some of the finest citizens, some of the finest leaders not only of the State of Pennsylvania but of the United States of America. I am honored to be in the presence of your great county leader, your great city leader, Frank Smith, who has done such a remarkable job at building our party, and being here with this fine man, the Congressman, son of a great Congressman and a man who stands in his own right, a man that will be elected overwhelmingly, William Green.

And, my friends, we are not going to forget, too, that down in the U.S. Senate, down in the U.S. Senate we need some help for President Johnson and we need good reliable help. We need some good sensible help. We need some good progressive help and Genevieve Blatt as Senator from Pennsylvania can help us.

I am so pleased, too, that I can bring my greetings here today to Herman Toll, the Congressman from the Fourth District, and I hope you remember me to him and I am pleased to be on this platform with two former mayors of the city of Philadelphia. I was the mayor of Minneapolis, Minn., at one time, and when I can be with Richardson Dilworth and Joseph Clark at the same time, I am happy.

Now, my friends, just a few words about politics. I have come here for one purpose primarily and that is to help advance the fight that was started, that was launched, that was initiated by our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy. I am here for that purpose.

The people of Philadelphia gave this wonderful man, this courageous, brave President of ours the greatest single majority that any man could have ever received out of this great community, and I know that what you did for John Kennedy in 1960, you are going to do for the man that was selected by John Kennedy in 1960. You are going to do it for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

I come here to ask this great audience, I come here to ask this great audience to preserve, to help us preserve the gains that have been for the American people these past 30 years. I come here to ask you to help us preserve and to expand our social security system, to help us preserve and expand our minimum wage system, to help us preserve and expand our programs of aid to education; I come here to ask you to help up build better cities, a better countryside, a better America, and the way that you do it is to repudiate the forces of darkness, the forces of retreat, and you back up the forces of light, the forces of progress, the forces of hope, and those forces today are led by Lyndon Baines Johnson, the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, friends, there isn't any doubt but what you are going to get out and help us. Your leaders have asked you to do that. But let me say this, dear fellow Americans, this election is a crucial one. This election is not just between two men. It is an election between two philosophies of government. It is an election, if you please, that will decide whether or not you believe that the Government of the United States, in cooperation with State and local government, should be a partner with business and with labor and with agriculture, with the young and with the old; in other words, are we going to pull together or are we going to listen to the voices of division and disunity. [Applause.]

I am sure that you know that the President of the United States, President Johnson, is well qualified for this great role of leadership that he occupies. I am sure that you know that he speaks to us as one people. He doesn't denounce us as minorities. He speaks of us as Americans. [Applause.]

He doesn't talk to us about our respective religious faiths or our ethnic groups. He speaks to us as a united people. President Johnson seeks to unite America, not divide it. He seeks to heal the wounds, not to open them. [Applause.]

And President Johnson and his partner in this fight, Hubert Humphrey, have but one dream for America and that is to open up more pathways of opportunity.

We believe that America is the greatest hope on earth, and we believe that what we have done thus far as a people we can do more if we but will it. We believe that we can build on the progress that we have made. And we ask you to help us build. We ask you to help us build for the second half of the 20th century. We ask you to help us build for the young. We ask you to help us care for the afflicted. We ask you to help us provide dignity for the elderly. We ask you to help us complete the task that was launched by John Kennedy. We ask you to help Lyndon Johnson, if you please, move America forward, forward, and forward. [Applause.]

Now, folks, you don't do that by just talking. We do it by work. We do it by votes, and I want every man and woman in this audience to redouble their efforts and I ask the young people in this audience to make it your business to see to it that anyone in your family, mother, father, grandfather, grandmother, aunts or uncles, that you get them to vote on election day.

Youngsters, let me tell you something. "Mom" and "dad" have been telling you what to do a long time. Now you tell them what to do on election day. [Applause.]

And when you tell them what to do, when you tell them what to do, be sure you tell them to vote for a Democratic Congressman. Don't forget it. Here is one right here, Bill Green.

And don't forget to tell them that you think you need someone in the U.S. Senate that will support Lyndon Johnson and not Barry Goldwater. And when you get all done with it, you just walk up to "mom" and "dad" and say, "Now, here is the chance of a lifetime. Now do something for me. Do something for my future, mother. Do something for my future, dad. Do something for America." And what do we mean? We mean to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson on November 3.

Thank you.

Cheltenham, Pa.
Cheltenham Shopping Center
October 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, Genevieve. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

May I just ask each and every one of you to keep in mind that the lady that just introduced me is very, very, very much needed in the Congress of the United States. I have known Genevieve for years. [Applause.] And I want every good citizen and voter in Montgomery County, yes, in Philadelphia County, in any other county of this great State of Pennsylvania, to cast their vote for Genevieve Blatt for the U.S. Senate to help our President. [Applause.]

I am so pleased to be on this platform today with a number of our distinguished leaders from Pennsylvania. I am delighted to be able to share this platform with two of the former mayors of Philadelphia, two men that gained a great national reputation for outstanding ability as public servants. One of them, well known to you, Richardson Dilworth. [Applause.] And the other, my colleague in the U.S. Senate, both of them good friends but this distinguished Senator of yours, Joe Clark, who is with us today. [Applause.]

And may I say that as I speak of my friends and your friends and your able public servants, that there is a man here on this platform from Montgomery County, Pa., that deserves your help and your support. He can come down to Washington in the House of Representatives and give you the kind of representation that will spell progress, that will help keep our prosperity, that will help sustain our peace, and you know who I speak of, your own Bill Searle. [Applause.]

I am so pleased to see on this platform today Mrs. Herman Toll, and I want you to bring Herman my best wishes and that man has been a tower of strength for your whole State and for this whole country. [Applause.]

I want Jim Hoffman to know how pleased I am that he is with us. He is a fine, distinguished public servant and to be in his presence and here with all these good folks is a joy for me.

Now, I am here for one reason, or I should say for two. First of all, I am here to help redeem these poor misguided souls out here. [Applause.]

The second reason that I am here is to tell you—listen. Don't deny them the chance. They don't know whether they want "Straw Barry" or "Razz Barry." [Applause and laughter.] You know what the slogan is in Arizona. Back to the store in 1964. [Applause and laughter.]

My dear friends, I notice back here a sign that this is thinking Republicans for Johnson and Humphrey. [Applause.] And may I say there are millions of them, there are millions of these thinking Republicans. There was a time that GOP—attaboy. That is a good Democrat there.

There was a time GOP for Republicans meant something noble and high and honorable. It meant Grand Old Party. But now, my dear friends, there are millions of people that know that GOP means to them "Goldwater, Our Problem." [Applause.]

So be of good cheer. Be of good cheer. Bring these dear beloved souls into our midst and may I say, friends, now in all seriousness, let's level with one another. This great country of ours is not going to fulfill its promise by having leadership that tells us of a never, never land that never existed. It is not going to fulfill its promise by turning its back upon reality. This great America of ours that has grown and prospered is today at a mighty crossroads. You have to make up your mind whether or not you want to have a President that leads you forward or whether you want to have one that takes you backward. [Applause.]

You have to make up your mind whether you want to save the gains of the past 30 years or whether you want to build on those gains. You have to make up your mind in this election, whether you want to preserve the prosperity that is ours and build on it or whether you want to lose it. That is what your question is in this election. [Applause.]

And now, friends, may I just say this, that the great issue before us, while the issues are prosperity, jobs, homes—and schools mean everything to us—the biggest issue that faces the American people is the issue of the security of our country and the peace of the world. I think the American people are going to decide this election primarily on the issue of which of these two candidates can be trusted with the responsibility of safeguarding American freedom and safeguarding and protecting the peace of the world. [Applause.]

You are going to have to ask yourselves now and November 3 whether you want a man in the White House who is responsible, who is calm, who is strong, who knows his business, or whether you want a man in the White House that is as loud as that fellow out there. [Applause.]

And I think you know the answer. The answer is that the American people want a President that unites our country and not divides it. The American people want a President that will build America, not hurt it. The American people want a President that will safeguard the peace of the world and not destroy it, and that means they want Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
Bala Cynwyd Shopping Center
October 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very, very much. Thank you, Genevieve.

I thank you. I want to thank that Haverford College Marching Society over there, too.

Ladies and gentlemen, I can't quite compete with that band. I can plainly hear, however, they are good Democrats because they have got happy music over there. [Applause.]

67 WBZ—LINO

My friends, my friends of Montgomery County, of Philadelphia, Pa., we have had a wonderful, wonderful visit throughout your community today. We have had great audiences. We have had enthusiastic audiences. We occasionally have a few souls that come here to confess their political sins, put down their signs. [Applause.] But in the main I would say that we have had one of the finest receptions that you could ever hope to have. And I want to thank not only those who are for us, but I want to thank those who oppose us for being so considerate, for being so hospitable, and for being so genuinely good mannered.

Now, friends and neighbors, I have been introduced here today by a lady that has served this great Commonwealth, this great Keystone State of Pennsylvania, with great honor and distinction, and I hope that as you contemplate your ballot, as you consider what you are going to do on election day, that you will remember that the Government of the United States is not only in the Presidency. It is also in the Congress. And that you have an opportunity here to back and support the programs of the Kennedy-Johnson administration and the programs of President Lyndon Johnson by electing Genevieve Blatt to the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And may I also say—oh, I am glad to see that Brandeis University sign up there. Fine, young lady.

I am also very happy to say that you have an opportunity to strengthen the programs of progress in the House of Representatives. You have on this platform today a candidate for Congress, a young man that is making a wonderful fight of it, that supports our programs, that supports our President and supports our platform, and I do hope that you give this man your cooperation, give him your active support and your vote, and that is Bill Searle. [Applause.]

And you are well familiar with, of course, your Congressman Byrne, and he is indeed deserving of the help that you can give to him.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have been waiting here quite a while. This is a fine audience. I thank the number of young people that came out here. I thank you so much. We depend on you a great deal in this campaign. May I just make one suggestion to you, particularly now to our young friends of high school, college age, yes, of any age, elementary school age, including these fine little Cub Scouts that I see out here. A wonderful group. [Applause.]

Let me say that the greatest privilege that a citizen of America has is the privilege of casting a vote. This is what we mean by representative government. This is what we mean by democratic government. And I hope that the young folks that are here today will make up their minds to be the precinct workers, in fact, to be the household workers on election day. Your parents have given you a lot of advice during your life, and I am sure that you consider most all of it good. Now it is your chance to give your mother and your father and your older brother and sister some advice. You tell them on election day that you want them to think of your future, that you want them to think of the progress of America, that you want them to think of the peace of the world, and you want them to go to that election box and you want them to cast their vote and to cast it intelligently and to cast it for a man that believes in progress, for a man that believes in a united America, that you want that vote to be cast for your friends, Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

And then don't you forget—now, isn't that something back there. You know, what those young folks are trying to do? They say they want Barry, and they don't know whether it is "Straw Barry" or "Razz Barry." Now, what do you think of that? [Applause and laughter.]

You know, dear friends, you know one thing about this campaign that is a lot of fun. You can always tell the Democrats—you can always tell the Republicans that are going to vote for President Johnson, and I will tell you how. All you have got to do is look in their faces. Those that are smiling, those that are happy, they are going to vote for Johnson. [Applause.]

You know. Yes. You know. But here, oh, there is a girl down there that is smiling and she has got a Goldwater sign, and you know what? Deep down in her heart she is going to vote for Johnson. [Applause and laughter.] And she is pretty too. She is pretty, too.

I think my friend Barry is entitled—you know something? I want to make it quite clear. I think that Barry Goldwater is a fine fellow. He would make a wonderful neighbor. He would make a wonderful neighbor, but I don't want him for President, do you? [Applause.]

Now, let me be serious with you, very serious for a brief moment. We have many, many problems facing us, and we have many challenges in the future. Every citizen in this audience knows that this America of ours has the heaviest responsibilities in the world. We have responsibilities at home to build a better America, responsibilities for better educational facilities, for better housing, for building our cities. We have a big responsibility to keep America growing and prospering. We need 300,000 new jobs in America every month, my fellow Americans, and we can't afford to have leadership which just tells us about some yesterdays. We don't want a President that distorts our history, and I don't think my friends who are Republicans in this audience want a man to be President who has repudiated his own party. I think you want a President that is going to look ahead. I think you want a President that grasps the future. I think you want a President that unites our people. And I think you want a Government that will work with all of the American people. I don't think we want to divide America up into regions and sections and classes. I think what we want in America is a great country, a great brotherhood, a great symphony of Americans, of all races, colors, and creeds, of every nationality group, working together, working together as citizens of the United States of America for a better America and for a better world. [Applause.]

We need in the White House, my dear friends, someone who is experienced in government. We need in the White House someone that is strong and calm, someone that is certain and decisive.

We cannot afford irresponsibility, and, if I may say, the one thing that Lyndon Johnson is known for above all others is that he is a man of responsibility. He is a man that when he was majority leader of the Senate and Dwight Eisenhower was President of the United States, he conducted himself responsibly. He conducted himself honorably. He didn't oppose for the sake of opposing. He tried to build a better America. He tried to strengthen the hands of the President, and I suggest to this audience now that the kind of a man that you want as your President is one that is big enough for the problems at home and has the vision for a greater America and is strong enough to sustain the peace abroad and that man is Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, go to work. Go to work. Let's get out and vote. Let's get out and do some work between now and November 3. And in the meantime, have a good time while you do it. Enjoy it. Be happy Americans. Be good. Go to work. [Applause.]

Upper Darby, Pa.
Upper Darby Terminal
October 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very, very much. I just see a very beautiful mother down here with a fine-looking young man who has got a black eye and he says: "We'd rather fight than switch." [Applause and laughter.]

Friends, if you will just notice, way in the back to the far right—you know what I mean? [Applause.] Democrats don't boo. We cheer. [Applause.]

I just can't tell you how happy I am to be here today. I don't know what the final score is, but the last I heard in the first of the ninth it is 1 to 1 in the ninth, right? Now, that isn't Johnson and Goldwater. That is the Cardinals and the Yanks.

On the 3d of November, however, it will be 2 to 1 for Johnson. [Applause.]

69 WBZ—LINO

Say, I sure want to thank that Catholic high school boys' band. [Applause.] Let me find out from that band, are you going to get Lyndon Johnson elected President? Let's hear your noise. [Applause.] I just heard one sour note. That must be one of the Goldwater folks out there. [Applause and laughter.]

My dear friends, listen, friends, we have had a wonderful day. If I seem to be very happy, the fact is I am. You have made me happy in Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

I have said, from every platform, that American politics, these great campaigns that we conduct for the high offices of this land, these campaigns ought to be conducted in good spirit. They ought to be conducted in an atmosphere of friendliness. And one of the things that I have noticed, every time you see somebody with a Democratic badge on, every time you see somebody with a Johnson pin, or with a pin for Genevieve Blatt or with a pin for Leonard Bachman or with a pin for Bill Barrett, every time you see one of those, it is a Republican that is going to Johnson, they always have a smile on their face. [Applause.] And why not? And why not? We are living in the greatest country in the world. We have the greatest opportunities in the world. And one of the opportunities we have is to save those poor wayward souls with those Goldwater buttons from voting the wrong way. [Applause.] So now, my friends, let me just say a very few words to you. It is a beautiful afternoon, wonderful day, and I come to one of the greatest States of our country. The State of Pennsylvania is going to play a very critical and crucial role in this election.

This State has a history that tells us of the great glory of our country, and this great State does not live on its past. It lives for the future. And I am here to tell you that the issue in this campaign is whether we want to retreat or whether we want to go ahead, whether we want to have progress or whether we want to turn backward. And I think I know what you want to do. I think I know that you want to do what John Fitzgerald Kennedy asked us to do, to move America forward. [Applause.]

I come here today as one who sat at the table in the conference rooms when our—can't you always tell them? Poor souls. [Applause.] Rave on, folks.

You know, let me just say a word to you. Senator Goldwater is a nice man. He would make a wonderful neighbor but not a good President. [Applause.] "Back to the store in '64." That is what we are saying. [Applause.] Now, what we want to do in our country, what we want to do in this great country of ours, is to not only preserve what we have gained, and I see as I look into this audience people who today have every reason to be concerned about their social security, people today that have every reason to be concerned about the prosperity of this country, and I say to these people that if you want to turn back the clock of time, you can do it. You can do it. But if you want to march into the future, protect what you have, and gain more, you can do it. And the way you do it is to vote for Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

Let me speak to these young folks for a while. [Applause.] Let me just say to my young friends that the nicest thing that has happened to Hubert Humphrey, the nicest thing that has happened to me is the friendship of these wonderful young people. They are marvelous. [Applause.]

Now, those of the opposition can tell us how bad our country is. They can complain about us. They can say that our country is demoralized. They can try to make all kinds of mean comments about our President. They can talk about the American people as if somehow or another we people had lost our way and don't know what we want.

But I know one thing. I am the father of three sons and a daughter, and I am happy to tell you I am the grandfather of two beautiful little girls, too. [Applause.]

And I love young people. I like them. They are good for us. They make our politics more enthusiastic. They make it cleaner. They make it better. And let me just say to these young people—that is good, that is good; I am not that weak; I can hold that

up.—Let me say to these young people, I have given my sons and daughters a lot of advice. I have told them what to do just as their mother has. But it is your turn now. You give dad and mother some advice. Yea, boy. On election day I ask every young man and woman in this audience, every one of you who is too young to yet vote, I ask you to be a voter in proxy. I ask you to go to your mother and dad and say: "Look, Dad, Mom, today I want you to follow my advice. I want you to be a good citizen. I want you to think about my future. I want you to work for my education. I want you to think about the peace of the world. I want to live in a world of peace, Dad and Mom," and the way that we can make that possible, the way that we can encourage that, is for dad and mother and grandfather and grandmother and older brother and sister to get out and vote, and you tell them to. [Applause.]

And when you tell them to get out and vote, you start right down the line. You tell them to vote the Democratic ticket. You tell them to vote for Leonard Bachman. You tell them to vote for Genevieve Blatt. You tell them to vote for Bill Barrett. You tell them to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

And if you think about it, if you think about it, just mention the name "Humphrey," too.

South Bend, Ind.
St. Joseph County Airport
October 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Congressman Brademas, Senator Birch Bayh, and thank you to the St. Joseph High School Band that is over here giving us some good warm music even though it is a little chilly out. And my friends of South Bend, of Notre Dame, and of St. Mary's, and of Bethel, and all of you here.

I am simply delighted to be here. I haven't heard the latest score, but I have a feeling that the Johnson-Humphrey team is going to do almost as well as Notre Dame is doing today. [Applause.]

What is the score now—34 to 7? That is just about the ratio we want. That is, we will do just about as well if you folks will get in there and play just as hard and do just as good a job as the boys are doing out there today battling for this great University of Notre Dame.

I am happy, very happy, to come here this early evening. We are going to have a wonderful meeting tonight. I have just come away from a series of wonderful, wonderful, enthusiastic meetings in Philadelphia. We had literally thousands of people all afternoon in one meeting after another in the suburban section and what they call the shopping centers.

Yesterday at Philadelphia we had the largest meeting that we have had there for years, thousands of people out in the streets. We were in New Jersey, people were enthusiastic. We have had a real good, real good, old-fashioned Democratic reception. [Applause.]

President Johnson told me that he looked upon the State of Indiana as one of the most important States in this entire election. We know that if we can carry Indiana, and if you can carry it for us——

VOICE. And we will.

Senator HUMPHREY. Attaboy.

Well, if you do just that, and if all of our friends who are here today from the Democratic organization, from young people's groups, from organized labor, from business, the many groups, if you will get in there and pitch, we know that we can win this election. But we are going to have to have your help.

Now, one word I want to say before I leave you. We are going to be with you tonight. We are very honored and proud to have in the United States Senate these two wonderful Senators from Indiana. We have, as you know, Senator Vance Hartke who is up for reelection this year. [Applause.] And we have this fine new young Senator, Birch Bayh, who is with us today. [Applause.]

But we also have in the Congress of the United States a special friend right from this area, one that is much loved here and much respected and much respected in Washington, D.C., and I look upon him as one of my closest personal friends and one of our strong allies in the efforts for progressive and honest and decent government.

And I want to say to the people here that this Congressman of yours has worked ceaselessly. He has worked day and night for his district, for his people, for industry, for labor, for agriculture, for students, for education, all over this great State and particularly here in his own district.

I know of the work that he performed in an effort here to be of help in the Studebaker plant. I know how he has fought for jobs and defense contracts and other business for this area. I know of his record in education. And I want to say that if there is any place in America that I could go where I thought I might be of some help, or should I say if I could be of some help, to be of some help to a Congressman, I would like it to be here, right here at South Bend for my friend John Brademas who is one of the best Congressmen we have.

You take good care of this fellow, Johnny. That is right. You get in there and pitch now. Give him that stuff. You take good care of him. You back him up.

He has got a fight on his hands this time. We know it. He knows it. But you folks don't want to let him down because he has never let you down and when you are in there pitching and working for Johnny Brademas, don't forget there is another man that you shouldn't let down either, and his name is Lyndon Johnson.

South Bend, Ind.
Press Conference, Pick-Oliver Hotel
October 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, Senator Goldwater is making a speech tonight in Salt Lake City, Utah, and making a very strong recommendation that there be a constitutional amendment to allow prayers in public schools. What is your feeling on it?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, this matter, as I recall, was before the House of Representatives, one of its subcommittees of the full committee, and if my memory serves me correctly, rather a substantial number, a large number of church leaders of all faiths came in and testified in opposition to such an amendment.

As I recall, too, the committee when it started its hearings had considerable support in this subcommittee for the amendment but as the hearings went on and the religious and spiritual leaders of the Nation were heard from, leaders that are deeply concerned about the matter of separation of church and state and the Constitution of the United States, the committee changed its mind.

I am sure that Senator Goldwater knows these things. It would appear to me that the American people would support most of their spiritual leaders in this matter.

QUESTION. How do you feel about it, Senator? Are you favoring such an amendment?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I am not. And I might add that I don't really feel that I need to get any spiritual advice from Senator Goldwater. I have been able to get that from my mother, from my ministers, my church. I even hesitate to take any political advice from him. When you feel reluctant to accept political advice, I don't think you really ought to venture into spiritual consultation with one like Senator Goldwater.

QUESTION. Senator, you have been out for several weeks now and 3 weeks are left to go. Could you make any appraisal of how you think the campaign is going, maybe in terms of the States that you think the Democrats will carry, the number?

Senator HUMPHREY. Joe, that is kind of a guessing game. I just would say that we will carry enough. We hope that we will carry a rather substantial number of them, but we have a lot of work to

do. I would want to encourage those who are the supporters of President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and the Democratic ticket to redouble their efforts. I would want to warn them that in the next 2 to 3 weeks we can expect the opposition to become desperate, as they are. They are already indulging in the politics of desperation, reaching hither and yon for anything they can get their hands on to hit us with.

It would be very good if they would discuss some important issues before the country, issues relating to the growth of our cities, the expansion of our economy, improvement in the expansion of our education, the health of our people, communication and transportation, fiscal policy, international relations, and discuss these matters thoughtfully.

It would be very helpful to the American people if such a discussion could take place.

QUESTION. Senator, how do you feel about sending former President Eisenhower to Vietnam to assess the situation?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I really think somebody ought to have asked President Eisenhower about that before the announcement was made. I am sure that he is always intrigued by the interest which a declining candidate has in a great man.

Mr. Goldwater reached in and pulled that one out of his grab bag without ever having consulted the former President.

I am sure that President Johnson has been in consultation with President Eisenhower and President Truman and others about Vietnam. These are little tricks and gimmicks that really don't indicate a great deal of thought but again indicate politics of desperation. Next?

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, during John F. Kennedy's administration there was a great deal of theaters, Federal aid to theaters, and there was a great deal of thought about it, and with the assassination this seems to have died.

What are the chances of this being enlivened, then, once—if you are to get in?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, with all due respect, may I say that we have passed for the first time in the history of this country a bill to establish an Arts Commission and with some beginning aid to the cultural activity on the domestic level.

We had aid prior to that in terms of our international programs but never before in terms of our domestic activities.

Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, Senator Javits of New York, and myself, along with Senator Pell of Rhode Island, were the authors in the Senate and Frank Thompson of New Jersey was the author in the House of Representatives. Your own Congressman, John Brademas, was keenly interested in the strong support of our cultural activity in the Arts Commission bill.

We think that this is the first forward step that has been made by our Government in reference to supporting cultural activities in the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. The late President supported this, as you know, very actively. I was more or less his agent in the Congress on the Senate side.

QUESTION. Senator, Senator Goldwater has been saying lately that the undecided voters are switching over to him. Do you think that is true, and if so, what can you do about it?

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't think it is true, and I don't think he thinks it is true, but I appreciate his predicament and if it encourages him so that he can carry on until November 3, I think it is fine that he believes this.

I really believe that when November 3 comes around that there will be a substantial majority for President Johnson.

Mr. Goldwater changes his mind often. Sometimes he has the undecides. Sometimes he feels he doesn't. Sometimes he admires the late President Kennedy, and then at other times he attacks him.

It is very difficult to keep up with this moving target.

QUESTION. Senator, if the Democrats win in November, the November 3 general election, as you predict, do you foresee a reorganization of the Republican Party?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would surely foresee, as I am sure you do, the very bitter struggle within the Republican Party for the control of that organization. I have a feeling this is the only reason that Mr. Nixon is out on the stump, because Mr. Nixon's views as expressed in writing and in word are so contrary to what Mr. Goldwater says that if those two can stand on the same platform and say that they agree, then one of them is misleading the American public, one or the other.

QUESTION. How about Bill Scranton?

Senator HUMPHREY. It would go for Mr. Scranton. Mr. Nixon and Mr. Scranton are both traveling around the country quite a little indicating their support of Mr. Goldwater, but I think what they are really doing is keeping in touch with the party organization, and I want to say that I don't blame them.

I believe that the party organization would be in more responsible hands if either one of them were in charge, but that is a matter for the internal housekeeping of the Republican Party.

QUESTION. Senator, what kind of reception have you had in the Midwest when you discussed the farm problem? I represent New Paris Farmers Exchange.

Senator HUMPHREY. Very well, sir. The Midwest, of course, today is not only agricultural. It is a balanced economy. There is a great deal of industrial development in the Midwest.

But we all recognize, those of us that live in Midwestern States, the importance of the agricultural sector to the total economy, and I have had good reception when I have discussed, for example, the feed grain program in the Far West and in the Midwest where the wheat producing areas are.

In the main the wheat program is looked upon favorably, but I want to make it clear that this administration feels, and the new administration of Johnson and Humphrey feels, that we ought to reexamine our farm programs without any preconceived notions or any wedding to the past.

I believe that we ought to examine them in terms of our commercial exports, in terms of the type support programs that we offer, and try to get as much of a free market as possible, that is, so that the forces within the free market can operate, and that whatever protection there is from the Government should not interfere with those market conditions. And I believe we can do it.

I have asked for the establishment of a National Food and Fiber Commission, Agricultural Policy Commission, upon which we would have prominent agriculturists as well as economists and legislators and others to serve, to examine the entire agricultural program.

So may I say in conclusion that we are going to give it a brand new look but in the meantime we are not going to throw overboard policies and programs that sustain farm income.

QUESTION. Senator, on this control—on the authorization to use factual, so-called tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, are there conditions aside from total nuclear war under which the NATO commander will have the authority to use these? Do conditions exist now under which the NATO commander might have the use of nuclear weapons without getting permission, express authority from the President?

Senator HUMPHREY. Sir, nothing that I know of. And I think that General Eisenhower, again, along with other responsible officials, or other responsible Americans, has made it quite clear that the details of these matters ought not to be discussed too much because you involve national security and highly classified information.

But speaking for myself only, I know of no such conditions, and I know of no authority that is given to field commanders or NATO commanders.

I only know that the President of the United States has the responsibility for the control of the nuclear weapons. And I want to make it quite clear that nuclear weapons are not conventional and no one ought to associate them as conventional. There isn't any such thing as a conventional nuclear weapon, and once you have used one, whether it is small or large, you open up the whole matter of nuclear warfare and we ought to face that. You don't have any cutoff point.

QUESTION. Senator, would you say that this current campaign has been a more vindictive type of campaign than campaigns that you have seen in your political past?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I would say that the campaign of the opposition has been based primarily on personalities, innuendos, half-truths, distortions, innuendos.

How in the name of commonsense can anybody have any respect for a man that says one week, as he said in Seattle, that John Kennedy used the Cuban crisis, that he managed—of 1962—for his political purposes and then only a night or two ago, to praise John Kennedy for having been so courageous in the instance of the Cuban crisis?

How can you have any respect for a man that on one day says he thinks President Johnson is soft on communism and then says, "Well, let's wait a while and see how that works, and if it would, good, we will repeat it."

What kind of cynicism is this?

This is an utter lack of respect for principle and I consider that kind of a campaign a very low level campaign in American public affairs.

I would hope that something might be done to amend it, but I don't see that. I see the opposition viciously attacking our President, injecting every possible innuendo and half-truth into it, and we are prepared for that.

I think the American people will reject that kind of talk. They expect more from their President than that.

Well, I believe that is it.

Thank you.

QUESTIONER. Thank you, Senator.

South Bend, Ind.
University of Notre Dame
October 10, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

THE PURSUIT OF PEACE

In the present era as in the past, no issues move men more deeply than those of war and peace. The Bible tells us to "pursue peace"—and mankind has since the beginning of time condemned the horrors of war. If discord and strife, wars and the threat of wars have persisted throughout history, it is perhaps as St. Augustine says: that men make war not because they love peace the less, but rather because they love their own kind of peace the more.

Today a new era has come. Since that day at Alamogordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And the vision of it has sobered all men and demanded of them a keener perception of mutual interests and a higher order of responsibility.

In the nuclear age, the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become an absurdity. Originally a means to protect national interests, war today can assure the death of a nation. Although we will continue to repel all threats of intimidation, we shall continue to realize that the threat of nuclear blackmail should play no part in our own conduct of affairs with other nations.

Today, in the year 1964, our vision of the absurdity of war and the necessity for peace is enlarged because two great and good men have given us their vision of the path to peace—Pope John XXIII and John F. Kennedy.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy asked friend and foe alike to "begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction."

In his Encyclical "Peace on Earth," Pope John XXIII proclaimed:

> Justice, Right, Reason, and Humanity urgently demand that the race should cease, that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned, that nuclear weapons should be banned, and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of controls.

The world will long remember the Presidency of John F. Kennedy—because he did "begin anew" to explore the problems which "unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us."

He did begin anew to formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms.

He did begin anew to initiate negotiations with the Soviet Union to restrict the spread of the deadly atom.

He did begin anew to focus the machinery of our Government on the question of peace and disarmament—by establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a measure which, I am proud to say, I proposed in 1959.

In all these undertakings, John Kennedy moved us forward on the long, hard path to peace.

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

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

The range of our power and the determination of our leadership were proven in the confrontations with the Soviet Union over Berlin and Cuba. Our strong resolve and steady restraint convinced the Soviet leaders of the folly of further provocation. Faced with this massive array of strength, Chairman Khrushchev concluded that an all-out war with the United States must be avoided—for in such a war "the survivors would envy the dead."

But strength is a means, not an end. It can only open the avenues to peace; it is up to us to walk the path of peace.

John Kennedy understood this. In the wake of the Cuban missile confrontation, he moved to press for sanity. In June of 1963, at American University, he issued an historic plea to both sides to "reexamine our attitude toward peace." He called for renewed efforts toward a "more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned."

His plea was not in vain. In October 1963, President Kennedy signed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. It was just 1 year ago today that the test ban treaty entered into force.

Through this treaty, we have curbed the radioactive poisoning by contamination from nuclear tests of the air we breathe and the milk our children drink.

Because of this treaty, the development of effective nuclear weapons systems by other nations is today less likely.

This treaty has won respect throughout the world for the United States as the guardian of peace. It has inspired increased hope for the future of mankind on this planet.

The people of this country overwhelmingly supported the test ban. More than four-fifths of the Democrats in the Senate voted in favor of the treaty. So did 25 of the 33 Republican Senators, including the distinguished Republican leader, Everett McKinley Dirksen, who said: "I want to take a first step, Mr. President. I am not a young man—one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone: 'He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step.'"

I regret that Senator Goldwater failed to follow the leadership of Senator Dirksen and his colleagues. He knew what happened at Hiroshima. But he voted against the treaty. And he has indicated that if he were to be elected President, he would consider repudiating it.

It is not surprising that Senator Goldwater would consider repudiating the test ban treaty, as he apparently believes that war was inevitable. He stated in an interview for the New York Post in 1961:

> Some day, I am convinced, there will either be a war or we'll be subjugated without war * * *. I don't see how it can be avoided—perhaps 5 or 10 years from now.

I do not believe war is inevitable. And I am convinced that most Americans—whether Democrats or Republicans—do not believe that war is inevitable.

The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was the first step in the path to a more enduring peace. We have taken other steps as well.

We have agreed to prohibit the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in space. A United Nations resolution, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union, called on all countries to refrain from such action. It was adopted by acclamation—without a single dissenting vote.

This resolution was hailed by leaders of the free world as a vital step toward keeping the world of space open to peaceful exploration, not to military exploitation.

This year, in addition, the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union announced cutbacks in their planned production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. This was the first concrete pledge to slow down the race for larger nuclear stockpiles. As President Johnson has stated, such a race can be provocative as well as wasteful.

The need for instant communication between the United States and the Soviet Union—to avoid the miscalculation which might lead to nuclear war—was proven during the Cuban missile crisis. Since that time, we have established a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to avoid such miscalculation.

The agenda for the future is long, and President Johnson has let the world know that it will not go unattended.

We must seek additional measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation or accident. We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by restricting transfer of nuclear weapons, by converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing underground tests, with adequate inspection and enforcement.

If we desire a breakthrough in arms control, we should lend our support to regional arms control agreements. We might well begin with Latin America.

Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose whatsoever in preserving the security of this area. Any possible external military threat to the security of the Latin American Continent can and will be repulsed by the United States.

The introduction of nuclear weapons would provoke a rivalry that would imperil the peace of the hemisphere. It would endanger the precarious economies of countries which already possess military forces too large for their security needs and too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance.

The first and foremost task in the pursuit of peace, therefore, is to control nuclear weapons. But nuclear rivalry is not the only barrier to peace in the world today.

As Pope John XXIII stated in his encyclical "Mater et Magistra":

> Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists.

If control of nuclear weapons is not the central issue in improving relations between East and West, the narrowing of the gap between rich nations and poor is essential to harmony between north and south.

In Latin America, in Asia and Africa, the threat to peace lies in the shocking inequality between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. The challence to peace—yes, the threat to peace—in these areas is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order, a social order in which true peace—peace based on justice—is impossible.

As a people who have been "more blessed with this world's goods," we must heed Pope John's pleas to assist—

> those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery, and hunger and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person.

We must do this out of compassion—for we *are* our brother's keeper. And we also do it out of self-interest as well—for our lot is their lot, our future their future, our peace their peace. This planet is simply too small for the insulation of the rich against turbulence bred out of injustice in any part of the world.

Our efforts to preserve lasting peace must continue to include substantial economic and technical aid to the southern half of the world. And among our programs of assistance, none have matched the success of the Peace Corps.

Here at Notre Dame, which is a training center of volunteers going to Latin America, you are well aware of the role which American young men and women have played in bringing health and education, in inspiring hope and lightening the burden, for countless thousands of underprivileged people in farflung nations of the world. These young Americans realize that there is a moral imperative to service beyond that of mere self-service, that individual Americans can make a daily personal contribution to promoting peace throughout the world.

If the memory of John F. Kennedy is revered around the world, it is in great part because he initiated programs which furthered the pursuit of peace—the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the signing of the Test Ban Treaty, the establishment of the Peace Corps, the launching of the Alliance for Progress, and the reorganization of our foreign-aid program to enable us better to meet the challenge of social revolution in the nations of the southern half of the world.

John Kennedy's legacy is a living legacy and each of these programs was supported by, and now commands the firm support of President Johnson.

The dual challenge to peace posed by the arms race and the threat of violent revolution can only be met in the long run through a stable and effective system of international law. The basis for that system—the great hope for that system—is the United Nations.

The United Nations has proven its value as an institution for peace.

Our faith in it is strong, and our hope is firm that it will one day become what it was intended to be—a world society of nations under law—not merely law backed by force, but law backed by justice and by popular consent.

The final alternative to world war can only be world law. And the best hope of achieving world law is through the United Nations.

This was the plea of Pope John and his predecessors.

This was President Kennedy's great dream. Again and again, he affirmed the ideal of world law as the most essential goal of mankind in our time. He said that we must end the arms race or the arms race will end the human race. He called for the creation of a workable world law as the one best way to achieve that purpose.

But until world law holds sway and until more comprehensive arms control agreements are achieved, we are still faced with the task of keeping the peace. My pledge to you is that this administration will always seek to blunt the conflicts which may lead to war, not to escalate them. We will always strive to avert war by using our awesome power with prudence and restraint. We shall always seek to avoid a position which would leave no alternative but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. And we shall seek to avoid provoking holocaust by the reckless use of nuclear ultimatum.

Today, in the great tradition of Pope John and John F. Kennedy, President Johnson has asked that we look beyond the cold war which has "consumed our energies" and "often limited our horizons." While remaining strong, he understands that we must focus attention on problems which will persist well beyond the cold war. These are:

> The obstacles to man's effort to build a great world society—a place where every man can find a life free from hunger and disease, unhampered by the degradation of bodily misery.

President Johnson has announced that the United States intends to make 1965 International Cooperation Year—to renew our policies and to plan for the future. He plans to call a—

> White House conference to search and explore every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace.

President Johnson knows that it is easier to destroy than to build. It is easier to make war than to think, persuade, reconstruct, and act responsibly. President Johnson knows, and we know, that responsible action is the only way to proceed. President Johnson knows that most Americans—indeed most people on this planet—yearn to build a world where peace is more than simply a hiatus between wars.

To those who ask: "Why not victory?"—we reply—why not victory, indeed—victory over war itself, victory for peace, victory for mankind?

South Bend, Ind.
University of Notre Dame
October 10, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. I just wanted you know how much television time costs.

Congressman Brademas, and Senator Bayh, the students, faculty and friends of these great universities and colleges, Notre Dame and St. Mary's, Bethel. [Applause.]

I am just delighted to be here on this great campus of Notre Dame University [applause] that has as its president one of the truly outstanding men of our time, Father Hesbergh. [Applause.]

And what a privilege it is to be in this great Stephen Hall, such a marvelous structure [laughter] to see this great audience and to know that tonight we can discuss matters of serious import.

Before I do that, may I say that Notre Dame did very well today. [Applause.] What you did to the Air Force Academy Lyndon Johnson is going to do to an Air Force Reserve general. [Applause.]

To permit me just to sneak in a little praise for the hometown team, Minnesota won, too. [Laughter.] [Applause.]

I am singularly honored to be on this platform with the Congressman from this district. I heard how he was introduced here as the favorite son, so to speak, of a very fine college and he quickly amended that, but this gentleman, John Brademas, is known in Congress as one of the hardest working, most talented and gifted Members. [Applause.]

His work in the field of education is known to all of you. And his tremendous effort on behalf of this community of South Bend, where many a worker through no fault of his own was laid off the job at the Studebaker plant, this gentleman through his own efforts has been able to convince both the President and the Congress that because of the special nature of the problems in South Bend that the President will appoint a special commission and committee to look into this local situation and to bring about some remedy for people that need that help.

This is the kind of a Congressman you ought to support. [Applause.]

I am sure you know that we have a little election going on and in a few weeks it will be over, and we do hope that by the time that great day arrives we will have had an opportunity to discuss the great issues that face the American people. It seems to me that in a campaign besides just the shouting and the booing or the cheering and

the jeering, there ought to be some thinking. And tonight I want to talk with you about a problem that I think is central to our time, and that issue is the one of war and peace because no issue moves men more or more deeply than the concern over the future of our planet, over the future of our people.

The Bible tells us to pursue peace, and mankind has since the beginning of time been condemned to the horrors of war. But let me set the record straight. The horrors of war are different now. A new era has come and we ought to talk in terms of that new era. [Applause.]

Since that day at Alamogordo, out in the desert of New Mexico, when men acquired the power to obliterate themselves from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face, and the easy shoptalk or platform talk about the issues of peace and war do not become a nation that has the responsibility today for peace.

In the nuclear age the deliberate initiation of a full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become an absurdity that even to talk about is mad. War today can assure the death not only of armies, not only of a nation but of several nations.

Although we will continue to build our strength as an instrument of peace and continue to repell all threats in any form of intimidation or aggression, let it be clear that we shall also continue to realize that the threat of nuclear blackmail should play no part in the conduct of the affairs of this Government with other nations.

Today our vision of the absurdity of war and the necessity of peace is enlarged because of the lives and works of two great men, Pope John XXIII and John F. Kennedy. [Applause.]

In that memorable inaugural address, President Kennedy asked friend and foe alike to—

> begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleased by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

That ought to be a warning and a challenge to every living soul.

In his great encyclical, Pacem in Terres, Peace on Earth, Pope John XXIII proclaimed for all mankind and all time:

> Justice, right, reason, and humanity urgently demand that the race should cease, that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned, that nuclear weapons should be banded, and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of controls.

I say to this audience that if a great man, the greatest spiritual leader of our time, can ask us to think in terms of arms control, the control of nuclear power, could ask us to think in terms of peace, then to talk of peace is not cowardice or appeasement but to talk of it is the noblest work of mankind and the courage of giants. [Applause.]

Now, the world will long remember the Presidency of John Kennedy because he did begin anew to explore problems which unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us.

Oh, how I wish that some spokesman today would remember those words. Unite us rather than belaboring problems that divide us.

He did begin anew to formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms. He did initiate negotiations for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. He did begin anew to focus the machinery of Government on the question of peace by establishing an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which I was proud to have sponsored and successfully so. In all of these undertakings, John Kennedy moved us forward and he moved us forward on the long hard path of peace, that path of peace which he said we must pursue, that peace is the process to be sought and to be gained.

History teaches us that peace is best preserved through strength, but strength used with restraint, strength used with wisdom, and with a clear sense of perspective, and in 1961 President Kennedy and the Congress moved to insure that our strength would be preeminent, that our balanced military power would be able to deter or defeat any foe in any foreseeable situation.

The range of our power and the determination of our leadership has been proven again and again, in Berlin, in Cuba, in the Gulf of Tonkin, but strength is a means, not an end. It can only open up the avenues to peace, and it is up to us to walk in the paths of peace.

President Kennedy understood this. In the wake of the Cuban missile crisis he moved to press for sanity. In June of 1963, in that memorable address at American University, he issued a historic plea to both sides to reexamine our attitude toward peace. He called for renewed efforts toward a more practical, a more attainable peace based on not sudden revolution in human nature but upon a gradual evolution in human institutions, on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are the interest of all concerned.

His plea was not in vain. It was only a few months later that the test ban treaty was signed and tonight we celebrate the first anniversary of its effective date. [Applause.]

Through this treaty we did curb the poisoning of the atmosphere from radioactive debris and indeed kept the purity of the milk that our children might drink.

This treaty won respect for America. It won us the respect as the guardian of peace. It gave new inspiration and new hope for the future of mankind on this planet, and our people supported it overwhelmingly, and the Congress supported it, the Senate supported it.

So did 25 of the 33 Republican Senators, including the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, Mr. Dirksen.

But the Senator from Arizona failed to follow that leadership. He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he voted against the treaty, and he has indicated that if he were elected President he would seek to have it repudiated.

Apparently the Senator believes in the inevitability of war and he stated so in an interview in the New York Post in 1961. Listen to these sad words:

> Someday, I am convinced, there will either be a war or we'll be subjugated without war * * * I don't see how it can be avoided—perhaps 5 or 10 years from now.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey do not believe that war is inevitable and I do not believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people believe that war is inevitable.

We believe that it is the task of statesmanship to see that freedom is preserved without the terrible tragedy of thermonuclear war that can destroy all of life on this planet. [Applause.]

But we did not stop with this first step. A resolution was adopted in the United Nations to ban the orbiting of nuclear weapons of mass destruction in outer space. We insist on keeping outer space not for the exploitation of war but for the exploration of peace. Also have nations entered into agreement to cut back on the production of fissionable material because a nuclear arms race is not only wasteful, it could be exceedingly dangerous. To avoid miscalculation which might lead to war, we established the "hot line" between Moscow and Washington. This was brought to our attention, the need of it, in the Cuban crisis, but the agenda for the future is what we should think of, and it is long.

President Johnson has let the world know that it will not go unattended. We must seek additional measures to prevent war by miscalculation and accident. We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of observation posts, and we must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by restricting transfer of nuclear weapons, by converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing, under proper international controls and safeguards, underground testing.

Now, if we desire a breakthrough in arms control, we should lend our support to regional pacts, and I have suggested from time to time one in the Latin American area. How foolish it would be for Latin American countries, impoverished as many of them are, to engage in the costly process of nuclear weaponry. If there is any threat to any country in Latin America, this Nation is committed to the defense of that country and to repel every form of aggression.

The first and foremost task we face, therefore, is the control of nuclear weapons, but nuclear rivalry is not the only barrier to peace in the world today. Pope John XXIII stated in his encyclical "Mater et Magistra":

> Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists.

And you and I know that the narrowing gap between the rich nations and the poor is essential to harmoy between the nations of the world.

In Latin America and Asia and Africa the threat to peace lies in the shocking inequality between the privileged and the impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. The challenge to peace, yes, the threat to peace in these areas is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order, a social order in which true peace, peace based on justice, is impossible.

Now, as a people who have been blessed with this world's goods, I think we need to heed Pope John's plea to assist those who are less blessed, and we must do this out of compassion, but we should also do it out of self-interest, for our lot is their lot. Our future is their future, and our peace is their peace.

Here at Notre Dame, which is the training center for the volunteers of the Peace Corps going to Latin America, you are well aware of the role which American young men and women have played in bringing health and education, in inspiring hope and lightening the burden for countless thousands of underprivileged people in the far-flung nations of the world. And may I say as the legislative author of the Peace Corps how everlastingly grateful we are to Notre Dame for having taken this great initiative in giving support to the Peace Corps as our best effort of America overseas. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, the memory of John Kennedy is revered around this world. It is in great part because he initiated programs which furthered the pursuit of peace.

The creation of the Arms Control Agency is on the great historical record of John Kennedy. The signing of the Test Ban Treaty, the establishment of the Peace Corps, the launching of the Alliance for Progress, the reorganization of our foreign aid, the strengthening of the United Nations, the inspiration to millions of people throughout the world that America stands for peace: all of this breathes as the life and the works and the words of a man who gave his life for peace, our late and beloved President John Kennedy. [Applause.]

But we do not speak of the dead. John Kennedy's legacy is a living legacy. And each one of these programs was supported by Members of Congress, some of them in the Republican Party, some of them in the Democratic Party. Most Members of Congress saw the need of following this initiative of peace, and now this great legacy of John Kennedy commands the firm support of the man that he selected as his helper, as his strong right arm, President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

The dual challenge to peace posed by the arms race and the threat of violent revolution can only be met in the long run, as we know, through a stable system of international law. And the basis for that system, long range as it may be and the great hope for that system is the United Nations.

The United Nations, my friends, has proven its worth. It has proven its value. And even though the spokesman of the opposition may have his doubts about it, in fact, has recommended that we abandon it, let it be clear that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey feel that the United Nations is a worthy institution and ought to be supported and strengthened by the United States of America. [Applause.]

We have been reminded by scholars and spiritual leaders alike that the final alternative to war can only be world law and the best hope for achieving world law is through the United Nations.

This was the plea of Pope John, his predecessor, and now the Holy Father. This was President Kennedy's great dream. Again and again he reaffirmed the ideal of world law. He knew that we must end the arms race or the arms race may well end the human race. And he called for the creation of a workable world law system as the one best way to achieve that purpose.

But we are realists, and until the world law holds sway, and until more comprehensive arms control agreements can be achieved under true, effective international inspection, we are faced with the task of keeping the peace with what means we have.

And my pledge to this wonderful audience at this great university dedicated to peace and to understanding and to tolerance and to the good life, my pledge is that this administration will always seek to blunt the conflicts which could lead to war. We will never seek to escalate them. We will always strive to avert war by using our awesome power with prudence and restraint.

We know that our power is not for the purpose of conquest. Our power is for the purpose of justice and of peace. In the great tradition of Pope John and John Kennedy, President Johnson has asked that we look beyond the cold war, which has consumed our energies and often limited our horizons, and while remaining strong, he understands that we must focus attention on problems which will persist well beyond the cold war, and these problems, as he said, are the obstacles to men's efforts to build a great world society, a place where every man can find a life free from hunger and disease, a life offering the chance to seek spiritual fulfillment, unhampered by the degradation of bodily misery.

I wonder, my fellow Americans, why it is not proper even during the heat and the turmoil of the campaign for us to have ideals, to dream, to plan, to reach out to new horizons of human endeavor. Why is it that we must only view with alarm as some do or merely defend the status quo as others? Why should we not try to build from where we are? Why should we not dedicate our knowledge, our enlightenment, our bodies, our souls to a better world, to a better lot for humanity?

It seems to me that this is the spirit of a young nation.

President Johnson has announced that the United States will make 1965 the year of international cooperation. Oh, I know I can hear some people say that this is but another further indication that we are soft on something or other. But let me make it quite clear, those who are soft are those who are always talking so tough. They are the ones, if you please, that have no confidence. They are the ones that lack faith. They are the ones that underestimate the true power of America.

Only the strong can afford to be kind. Only the strong can afford to be just. Only the strong can afford to negotiate and lead in the paths of peace, and thank God that the United States of America is blessed with the strength to fulfill this purpose. [Applause.]

I am sure that our President knows, and he knows that most Americans, indeed most people on this planet, yearn to build a world where peace is more than simply a pause between wars. Peace must be more than the absence of hostilities. It must be more than just the lack of arms. It must be in a sense a positive life in which the harmony of people builds what President Johnson calls the Great Society.

Our Nation has been built by people who believe that they could accomplish the impossible. I know the doubters will say, "Why do you have talk of peace in a time like this?" Because the time to talk peace is when the world faces the dreadful spector of its own destruction. The time to arouse men's minds and hopes is while there is yet time to be used to save us from destruction.

We have everything to lose and yet we have so much to gain, everything to lose if by miscalculation or impulsiveness the nuclear trigger should be detonated, and everything to gain if we can use science and technology and our knowledge and enlightenment through the humanities.

If we can use these great forces of culture and science, we can build a world fit for God's finest creation, mankind. And I say to those who ask as they do from public platforms why not victory, as if instant victory could come like some proprietary or patent medicine, as if instant victory could come by the wish of it, I ask them and reply to them why not victory indeed? Victory over war. Mankind had better contemplate that. Victory for peace. Because that is the only way that humanity ought to live. And indeed victory for mankind because without the victory over war, without the victory for peace, there is nothing for mankind except death and destruction and misery and pestilence and disease.

I am everlastingly grateful that I have been able to live in a time and serve in a Government when two Presidents, yea, more than that, when every President within my memory from Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman to Dwight Eisenhower to John Kennedy to Lyndon Johnson, every President has planned and worked for the cause of a just and enduring peace, and I say to you that anyone that feels that peace is not possible, anyone that feels that war is inevitable, has already forsaken his right to even think of serving in the highest office of this land. [Applause.]

As we leave this hall tonight, I ask those of you that believe in the future to feel that the gains that we made are worth preserving and feel that the opportunities of tomorrow can be ours, I ask each and every one of you that are in that faith to redouble your efforts.

I ask you not to match, not to match the innuendo and the half port a man who unites our people rather than dividing them. I ask you to think in terms of the good of this country. I ask you to support a man who unites our people rather than dividing them. I ask you to support someone who labors to unite us rather than belabors division, and I ask you to support a President of the United States who had the confidence of a man who served us for 1,000 dramatic days.

I have said from every platform and I repeat it from this one tonight that if Lyndon Johnson was good enough to have the trust and the confidence and the faith of John Kennedy, and I watched these two men work together for better than 3 years, then I say to this audience tonight if he was good enough for our late and beloved President, he is good enough for you and he is good enough for me and he is good enough for America, and I think America will elect him.

Thank you.

Article

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

October 12, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY TO SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS FOR JOHNSON-HUMPHREY

It is a great privilege to sit here this afternoon. Your support of Lyndon B. Johnson and myself is deeply gratifying.

This significant moment marks the success of an innovation in American politics. Never before has there been such an organized and extensive network of scientists, engineers, and physicians involved in political action.

You are men and women of outstanding professional achievements. You have raised U.S. science, technology, and medicine to the front rank among nations in basic research, in military power, in health, in space, in an array of civilian engineering triumphs.

In physics, in medicine, in chemistry, in electronics, in the exciting new perspectives in life sciences, earth sciences, atmospheric sciences—in all these. I marvel at the broad base of competent research.

I am proud that Americans have won half the Nobel Prizes granted since 1953. But our excellence is no accident. The prosperity of our science and technology is rooted in our fundamental freedom. Your talent and creativity have enjoyed a hospitable environment.

Due to your many contributions to the betterment of our society, I know you are deeply disturbed by the statements, beliefs, contradictions, and oversimplifications of the Republican candidate for President.

And your alarm is fully justified.

Senator Goldwater has little understanding of fundamental scientific research and development. He has voted to slash funds for health research. He has supported those who undermine academic freedom. He is indifferent to the peaceful opportunities in space. He would radically inhibit international scientific exchanges.

His views pose a grave threat to America's continued leadership in science, technology, and medicine. But, with your active help, his importance will drop below the threshold of detection in early November.

Thomas Jefferson, a century and a half ago, declared that—

> a public institution can alone supply those sciences which, though rarely called for, are yet necessary to * * * the improvement of the country, and some of them to its preservation.

President Lyndon B. Johnson shares with President Thomas Jefferson an awareness of the Federal Government's responsibility to American scientific and technological progress.

President Johnson has called for the building of the Great Society. He is counting on American science and technology—and its allies, American industry and education—to accept a share, an indispensable share, in the achievement of this goal.

The future of technological advance in American civilization defies the imagination. We can be sure of our ability to build safer cars, cheaper houses, faster railroads. We know we can cleanse the air we breathe, desalinate the sea, and put more electric power to work for us in many new ways. We can design better apartment buildings and more efficient hospitals. We are determined to encourage and support this effort.

Within your ranks are many outstanding physicians, medical educators, medical researchers, and practitioners. For biomedicine, we have bright hopes for further superlative achievement. Let me express but one: It is that the decade, 1965–75, be made the golden era of medical progress for those 65 to 75 and older.

You know that most recent medical advances have occurred for the earlier—not the later—years of life. The principal infant-killers have almost been wiped out. Science is advancing on the causes of dreaded and congenital defects. Science has almost exterminated many of the infectious diseases. Now, we must assault the citadel—degenerative diseases—the chronic diseases of later years. We must not only extend the life span from 65 onward, but help enrich it. This will also require the broadest contributions of the behavioral sciences.

Is this possible? The real stumbling block has not been the traditional lack of material resources. Today science has almost abolished our dependence on traditional resources. Modern society is limited by its own decisions, not by its resources.

American agriculture, for example, is the most advanced in the world. This happened because the Federal Government established a policy, devised the mechanisms, and supplied the funds. Science and technology supplied the knowledge, the farmers did the rest, and the American people have reaped the reward.

Scientists and engineers have the capacity to do for business and industry what they have done for agriculture. In a nation whose ultimate concern is the general welfare, a large measure of its technology must be consumer oriented. New products, whole new industries are needed both to supply our needs and to keep the economy healthy. To our support of military and space science we must also add stimulation and support of this consumer-oriented science and technology.

For some tasks, we need scientific enterprise that is vast and great. But in other tasks, size does not always correlate with achievement. A single great individual—a single thinker at a desk of a drawing board—or in the laboratory—can turn the corner of scientific history. He can usher in a peaceful revolution. He can transform this planet.

Whether some people like it or not, it is probable that the creative thinker will not be a conformist. If we would have thinkers, we must welcome and foster individuality. No assembly line can produce excellence in the human brain.

We reject positively the 19th century practice of letting human beings face the massive consequences of technological innovation on their own.

We will not throw Americans on the scrap heap.

We will not tolerate mass unemployment in an industry drowning in the wake of our technological progress.

If technology means labor-saving devices, it must also mean more jobs.

If it means cheaper construction of houses, it must also mean homes available to the ill-housed.

If it means the conquest of disease, it must also mean that medical care is available to those who need it.

If it means the development of better dams, cheaper books, warmer clothes for winter and cooler clothes for summer, then these new processes cannot remain in a laboratory, on a drawing board, or in a technical journal. They must be put to work.

We reject also the policy of 20th century disaster suggested by the attitude of Senator Goldwater to the control of nuclear weapons. You know the power of nuclear weapons. You know the horrors of radioactive extermination. You know the dangers of living under the dangling damoclean bomb.

The Presidential voice at this end of the "Hot Line" must never be belligerent; the vision must never be nearsighted; the mind must never be cloudy with foggy notions of what an ultimatum might really mean.

If civilization is to endure, there must be no World War III.

But we want not merely peace, but a great peace, a peace of abundance, a peace of progress. These are Lyndon B. Johnson's goals. These are my goals and your goals.

Science, engineering, and medicine are usually valued only for their tangible results. But for a society to be great, it must make substantial contributions to human knowledge and the arts by encouraging and supporting the creative activities within it. The search for theoretical knowledge must be supported and encouraged by the Government.

A society which lives in ignorance and discourages the creative search for knowledge is a weak one.

The society which allows untrammeled inquiry is a strong one.

The society which actively encourages and supports it is a great one.

We must allow the scientists to spend their time in research. Research is a venture into the unknown. If one knew the answers in advance, research would not be necessary. It has been shown time and again that nothing is more practical than pure theory.

The values of science lie even deeper than its theories. To concentrate solely on the military, health, economic, and political benefits is to miss the meaning of science for a scientist and to miss the power of science as a pervasive influence in society.

How narrow, how naive, to see science and technology as simply a fount of gadgets. The values of science—the nonmaterial values—are tolerance, systematic applications of reason, moderation, a sense of nature disclosed and explained, dedication to the truth. All of us learn from these values.

Frequently, science pursued just for the thrill of discovery, produces knowledge, and theoretical knowledge, which has been gained without concern for its uses, frequently lead to applications of great social value.

It must be understood that the money invested in basic research is a speculative investment in the best sense of the term. While no single project can be guaranteed to pay off, in the long run no other investment is so valuable.

The investment process must be continuous; it must be applied in all of the sciences: In the physical sciences, the life sciences, the information sciences.

It must look to the twin goals of obtaining more knowledge and of making sure that all the people reap the benefits. In this process there is a partnership between the Government and the scientists.

Of the $15 billion in research and development supported by the Federal Government, a very small portion is devoted directly to the needs of the civilian economy.

Only between 3 and 5 percent is related to strengthening a thriving industrial economy. It is clear that the Nation must give more attention to this problem. Without weakening our support of defense, space, atomic, and medical research.

We have just begun to consider the mechanisms by which the Nation's scientific policy are to be put into action.

The administration will use a special task force in its quest for the appropriate mechanisms of development and research.

One, we will explore the encouragement of industrial associations to represent to research interests of management and labor in a given industry.

Two, we will study the use of research councils for channeling funds into technological research.

Three, we will make an intensive survey of tax policies, to encourage the free flow of money into research and innovation.

We will not—let me assure you—be deterred by ill-informed denunciations of Government planning or other bogies of reactionary minds. We want not a planned society, but a society that plans—not compulsion, but consensus. We will examine any idea so long as it is consistent with our traditions of freedom and is faithful to our free economic system.

Industrial clinics, taking advantage of the resources in engineering, business, economics, and other academic specialties possessed by our fine universities, can be established on campuses around the Nation. These clinics can serve the plurality of industrial needs in different regions of the United States.

The contributions of science, technology, and medicine to the Great Society are unlimited. But every American—regardless of his vocation or profession—must care about the nature of that society, the quality of our leadership, and the policies of our Government. No one in a democracy has the luxury of remaining silent or aloof when the achievements and policies of the past 30 years are threatened so blatantly.

I recall the words of that French officer who directed his gardener to plant a fruit tree on the following day. But the gardener responded: "Why tomorrow?" It won't bear fruit for 100 years." "In that case," the officer answered, "plant it this afternoon."

Let us join in the public life of America. And let us begin this afternoon. President Johnson and I ask for your help and support in this campaign. We ask you to join us in laboring for the Great Society.

Washington, D.C.
Scientists and Engineers for Johnson-Humphrey
October 11, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Dr. Bronk, and the committee of distinguished scientists and engineers and my fellow Americans, this is the first time that I have ever marched onto a platform to a march that was writen by a Nobel Prize winner, Dr. Szent-Gyorgyi, and I want to thank him very, very much. [Applause.]

The wonders of American public life. They never cease to amaze me.

Doctor, I do want you to know that your thoughtfulness, your kindness, is deeply appreciated, and I shall look forward to hearing that march many, many times until Lyndon Johnson marches right back into the White House next January. [Applause.]

I have been backstage for a little while complaining bitterly because I wasn't out here in front so that I could see this amazing performance. [Applause.] I know you have had a great time, and I am a very selfish man about these things. I see no reason why those of us that come in sort of on the tail end of the show shouldn't have an opportunity to see the main event.

But you have had great fun and permit me now just to take a moment to thank our entertainers, to thank these talented artists that have given so generously of themselves and their great gifts of talents to this wonderful meeting today. [Applause.]

I want to thank, in particular, Fredric March and his wife, Florence Eldridge. I surely want to thank the one and only Carol Channing for her remarkable performance here again [applause], and my old friend, Louie Armstrong [Applause]. And that gifted entertainer, Tony Bennett. [Applause.] They are all wonderful.

And by the way, you shouldn't forget the man behind the whole show, too, and that is Richard Adler, the producer. [Applause.]

I am going to hand this little folder over to one of my good friends. Will you hold that for me for a while? And then I want to talk to you today in a serious vein.

You have had so much fun and that is the way politics ought to be. I have said, from every platform across this country, that American public life and American politics ought to be the occupation or at least the experience of happy people, people that have faith in their country, and that faith is revealed by the joy and the happiness of their countenance and their performance, and I have found as I have traveled across America in these weeks of the campaign, and even before, that you can always spot a member of the opposition. They sort of look like they have got cramps. [Applause.] And you can—or at least a slight indication of dyspepsia [laughter] and you can always spot someone who is going to vote for President Johnson. They look like they know the world is theirs and they love every minute. [Applause.]

I regret that my wife can't be with me today. She just was dashing over to Virginia where she worked with Gus Johnson over there who is a candidate for Congress. [Applause.] And I understand that Gus is dashing back here while Muriel dashes home to get ready for the next event of the day. Busy days, but most interesting ones.

I have said that this campaign, like all others, ought not only to generate enthusiasm, it ought to provide some inspiration. It ought not only to arouse people's emotions but it also ought to be an educational experience. I can think of no higher honor that can be paid to a candidate, or may I be permitted to say to two candidates, a President and a vice-presidential candidate, than having a committee of such distinguished scientists and engineers as have been willing to offer their support and their encouragement to President Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. I want them to know how honored we are. [Applause.]

These are men and women of science and technology and medicine that have made a remarkable record for themselves and for our country and the world. They have raised U.S. science and medicine and technology to the front of all nations, in basic research or in military power, in health, in space, and in an array of civilian engineering triumphs.

I think it is fair to say that our great country has made outstanding contributions in physics, in medicine, in chemistry, in electronics, in the exciting new perspectives of the life sciences, and the earth sciences, and the atmospheric sciences.

In all of these as a layman I stand in wonder, and marvel at the achievements of these men of research, these men and women of science. Indeed, this is the age of discovery, and as we have just celebrated Leif Ericson Day, and tomorrow it will be Christopher Columbus Day, isn't it the appropriate time to think about discovery and the ever-new discoveries that are ours as a people and as a civilization?

On this platform sit the men who have made discoveries greater than any that Columbus ever dreamed of, conquering whole new worlds in the field of science, or of medicine, or of technology.

But the future is what we want to talk about. Where do we go from here? And the future of technological advance in American civilization defies the imagination.

We can build safer cars. This we know. Cheaper and better houses, and better transportation. We are learning how, and we will soon be able to cleanse the air that we breathe. And what a blessing that will be to Los Angeles and a few other places. [Laughter.]

We will be able to desalinate the water of the sea, and we will be able to put more electrical power to work to ease the burden of mankind. We are going to be able to design better apartment buildings and more efficient hospitals.

I saw in the paper here the other day where Washington will have its first automated hospital. Might I add that out at the great Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn., there is an experimental hospital now under construction that may very well revolutionize hospital management and hospital service. We are just beginning to open up these new vistas of discovery, and I have a feeling, my fellow Americans, that the man in public life 10 years from now, 20 years from now, will be talking about, not only talking about but will be pointing with justifiable pride to the rebuilding of whole cities, making cities worthy of mankind, a place to live in and to live the good life rather than just a place to work in. [Applause.]

Now, in my limited knowledge of these matters, as a chairman of a subcommittee in the Congress that at least delved into somewhat the scientific matters, I found out a great deal about biomedicine and we have bright futures in that area. Let me express one that I can foresee. The decade from 1965 to 1975. I think that this can be made the golden era of medical progress for those who are aged 65 to 75 and older.

We know that the most recent medical advances have occurred for the earlier—that is, for the younger and not the later years of life. The main infant killers have almost been wiped out. Science is advancing on the causes of dread congenital defects and what a blessed day that will be when mothers can be sure or at least more sure that that life within them will be a life that is healthy and normal. And science has almost exterminated many of the infectious diseases.

But now we are prepared to assault the citadel of the degenerative diseases, the chronic diseases of the elderly, of the later years. I happen to believe that we shouldn't only seek to extend the span of life, but we must find days to enrich it and this will, of course, require the broadest contributions of public figures and private individuals and indeed the behavioral sciences.

Today science has minimized our dependence on traditional resources. In fact, what science has demonstrated is that the wealth of the Nation and the power of the Nation is in knowledge, and not merely in those traditional resources of land and water and minerals. The new power of any country, of any society, is in brain power, in accumulated knowledge that can be put to practical work. Modern society is frankly only limited by its own decisions, never by its resources.

I give you a good example of what we mean by utilizing resources and indeed minimizing our traditional dependence upon them. American agriculture is the most advanced in the world and how did this happen? Well, it happened by a partnership between Government and the farmer, a partnership that devised the mechanisms and supplied the funds on the part of Government, and then science and technology supplied the knowledge and the farmers did the rest, and the American people and the whole world have reaped the harvest and the reward.

In fact, it can be said from this platform today that mankind has progressed so far that if he would but put himself to the task, that hunger can be banished from the earth and famine never again shall stalk the land or punish the people. [Applause.]

It seems to me that in a period of electioneering, that we have an obligation to dream these big dreams, to have these big hopes, and to lift our sight a little bit away from the more mundane things, and I am hopeful that somehow out of all this noise of public debate and public criticism that a few lasting thoughts can be found and will remain, thoughts of a better day ahead, thoughts of how we can energize this great society of ours to do better.

In fact, as I stand on this platform, I am constantly reminded that the reason that we have Nobel Prize winners, the reason we have scientists, is because they will settle for nothing less than excellence, the best. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, in a Nation whose ultimate concern is the general welfare, even though apparently one candidate forgets that on occasion, and the Constitution directs us to promote the general welfare, a large measure of our science and technology should be consumer or citizen oriented. New products, whole new industries, are needed both to supply our needs and to keep this economy healthy. And may I say to our friends of science and engineering that it is going to be their responsibility in cooperation with Government through public policy, through private industry and labor and agriculture, working together not as antagonists but as partners in a common enterprise, it is going to be their responsibility to see to it that we can provide a minimum of 300,000 new jobs every month for the foreseeable future. This is the task that we face. [Applause.]

Thus I say that to our supporting of military and space science which is so important to our security, we must also add stimulation and suport of the consumer oriented science and technology. Now, for some of these tasks we need scientific enterprise that is vast and great, but in other tasks, size does not always correlate with achievement. A single great individual, as I heard Dr. Kendall say today on a television broadcast that we made, a single thinker at a desk or in a lab or at a drawing board can turn the cover of scientific history. He can usher in a peaceful revolution all by himself. He can transform this planet.

Now, whether some people like it or not, and I gather some don't, it is probable that this creative thinker, this one man that can revolutionize a period or an epoch, that this one man will not be a conformist. He won't always fit the predesigned pattern of conduct and attitude that some of our more limited minds design for him. [Applause.]

But I say that if we would have thinkers, then we must welcome and foster individuality. No assembly line can produce excellence in the human brain nor can any assembly line produce the kind of artistry that we have witnessed here today even in the form of good wholesome entertainment. [Applause.]

This is the second half of the 20th century. Again we need to be reminded of it because some voices would deny it. [Applause.]

And this administration and the one that will come in in January 1965, the Johnson-Humphrey administration rejects positively—[applause]—rejects unequivocally and positively the 19th century practice of letting human beings face the massive consequences of the technical innovation on their own. [Applause.]

Just as we believe that Government is designed to serve the people and is the servant and not the master may we say with equal vigor and fervor that science and technology and medicine are to serve the people and not to enslave it. [Applause.]

We will not throw Americans on the scrap heap and we will not tolerate mass unemployment in an industry drowning in the wake of our own technological progress. If technology means labor-saving devices, it must also mean better and more jobs and better living.

If it means cheaper construction of homes, it also means homes available to those that are ill-housed.

If it means the conquest of disease, it must also mean that medical care is available to those who need it the most.

And if it means the development of better dams and cheaper books and warmer clothes for the winter and cooler clothes for the summer, then these new processes must not remain in a laboratory or on a drawing board or in a technical journal.

In a country of the people, by the people and for the people, these great achievements must be put to work, put to use for the people. [Applause.]

We also reject the policy of the 20th century disaster suggested by the attitude of the Senator from Arizona in relationship to the control of nuclear weapons. [Applause.]

These men—or maybe I should say the absence of adequate controls—the men that are on this platform, the scientists that have graced this platform today, and many more like them, they know the power of nuclear weapons and we should know that war after the first explosion of a nuclear bomb changed its face.

War as it was known in the history books before 1945 is no more. The war that we face in the future, if ever one should come, and pray God it may never, will be a war that is beyond the wildest imagination, the wildest imagination or nightmare, of any living mortal.

War has changed and so has the power of weapons. These scientists know the horrors of radioactive contamination and they know the dangers of living under the dangling Damoclean bomb, and I say that Americans should know those dangers and repudiate anyone that seeks high public office that seems not to sense those dangers. [Applause.]

The presidential voice at this end of the "hot line" must never be belligerent. The vision of that President must never be nearsighted. And the mind of that President must never be clouded with foggy notions of what an ultimatum might really mean.

America needs a President that means what he says and says what he means. [Applause.]

And America cannot afford to even contemplate the thought of electing a President who assumes the inevitability of war. If civilization is to endure, there must be no world war III. [Applause.]

Oh, I can hear the voices of some who say, but what we want is victory, instant victory. The only thing instant in our time, my fellow Aemericans, in light of the power that man through his genius has unleashed, is instant annihilation.

Victory we want, yes, but it is a victory over war itself. It is a victory for peace. It is a victory over disease and it is a victory over man's meanness, his prejudice, his sense of bigotry or discrimination.

The victory we want is the victory of the Great Society and the good life. [Applause.]

We want not merely peace, but we want a great peace, a peace of justice and of freedom and of development, a peace that provides abundance, that unleashes and unharnesses the tremendous energies of mankind and emancipates man from his fears and his doubts. A peace of progress.

And I can say from this platform today that the words I speak outline and articulate the goals of our President, Lyndon B. Johnson. They are his goals, they are my goals, and they are yours, I know. [Applause.]

A society which lives in ignorance or fear of learning and discourages the creative search for knowledge is a weak one. The society which allows untrammeled inquiry, freedom of inquiry, is a strong one. And a society which actively encourages and supports this freedom of inquiry, this openness of mind, is a great one. We must allow our scientists to spend their time in research. Research is an adventure into the unknown and if one knew the answers in advance, research would not be necessary

It has been shown time and again that nothing is more practical in the long run than pure theory. The values of science lie even deeper than its theories. To concentrate solely on the military, the health, the economic, and the political benefits of science is to miss the meaning of science for a scientist, and to miss the power of science as a pervasive influence in society.

How narrow, how naive, to see science and technology as simply a fount of gadgets. The values of science, the nonmaterial values which we must cherish and nourish, are tolerance, systematic applications of reason, moderation, and a sense of nature disclosed, explained, and dedicated to the truth.

These are the values of freedom of inquiry and science itself. [Applause.]

This means that we must be willing to invest in basic research, but the investment process cannot be hit and miss. It must be a continuous one and applied to all sciences, the physical sciences, the life sciences, the information sciences, and it must look to the twin goals of obtaining more knowledge, and of making sure that all of the people reap the benefits.

In this process, I repeat, there is a partnership between the Government and the scientists. Of the $15 billion of research and development expanded by this development, only a modest part, very small indeed, goes directly to the needs of the civilian economy. It is clear that this Nation must give more attention to this problem of the needs of the civilian economy, and do it without weakening our support of defense, space, atomic, and medical research.

To put it in the vernacular, America is rich enough to pay for both guns and butter, to pay for both defense and science. [Applause.]

And this administration will consider mechanisms that are needed to amplify and to carry out the Nation's scientific policy. We will appoint special task forces in quest of the appropriate mechanisms of development and research. We will explore the encouragement of industrial associations to represent the research interests, of management and labor in a given industry.

We will study the use of research councils for channeling funds into technological research.

We will make an intensive survey of tax policies to encourage a greater flow by private industry into research and innovation.

In other words, we will do what needs to be done. We will not, let me assure you, be deterred by ill-informed denunciations of Government planning or other bogeys of reactionary minds. [Applause.]

We do not want a planned society, but we do think we need a society that plans, not by compulsion, but by consensus. And we will examine any idea so long as it is consistent with the traditions of freedom and is faithful to our free economic system.

Industrial clinics, sponsored by business and engineering and other forms of social organization, can be established on our great university campuses and these clinics can serve the plurality of industrial needs in the different regions of the United States. The contributions of science and technology and medicine to the Great Society are unlimited. But every American, regardless of his profession or vocation, must care about that society, must care about the quality of leadership of that society, and every citizen must care about the policies of his Government.

Now, we can be proud that Americans, ably represented here today, have won half of the Nobel Prizes granted since 1953, but our excellence is no accident. The prosperity of our science and technology is rooted in our fundamental freedom, this freedom of mind, this freedom to research, this freedom to inquire, this freedom to be yourself, this freedom to be different if you want to be. [Applause.]

And I say to our scientists, and doctors, and technicians, your talent and your creativity has enjoyed the most hospitable environment, the environment of intellectual freedom, freedom of movement, and freedom of choice.

Now, due to the many contributions to the betterment of our society by our scientists, I know you must be deeply disturbed by the statements, the beliefs, the contradictions and the oversimplifications of the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party who seeks the office of the Presidency. [Applause.]

And may I say that it is my view that your alarm is fully justified. Senator Goldwater seems to have all too little understanding of the fundamental scientific research and development. He has voted—not only has he spoken out but he has voted to slash funds for research, for health research, and he has supported, and I consider this much more serious, he has supported those who would undermine our academic freedom, our freedom of inquiry, and he seems all too indifferent to the peaceful opportunities for the exploration of space. He would radically inhibit international scientific exchanges. In other words, his views represent a grave threat to America's continued progress and leadership in science, in technology, and in medicine. That is just too much to take. As I have said a number of times, this man undoubtedly would make a good neighbor, but I don't want him for my President. [Applause.]

But now to get back into the language of modern science, with your active help his importance will drop below the threshold of detection in early November. [Applause.]

But President Johnson knows that the Government has a responsibility to American scientific and technological progress. President Johnson knows the meaning of responsibility, and in his call for the Great Society, his dream, his hope for America, he is counting on American science and technology, our scientists, and their allies, American industry and education to accept a share, an indispensable share, in the achievement of this worthy goal of the Great Society for Americans and for humanity.

No one in a democracy has the luxury nor should they be permitted the luxury of remaining silent or aloof when the achievements and the policies of the past 30 years are threatened so blatantly.

I recall the words of that French officer who directed his gardener to plant a fruit tree on the following day. But the gardener responded "Why tomorrow? I won't bear fruit for 100 years."

"In that case," the officer answered, "plant it this afternoon."

Yes, we have work to do and any delay is a delay in the realization of the hopes of a better tomorrow.

So I ask you to join in the public life of America this great pursuit of public happiness and let us begin that great pursuit and adventure this afternoon.

President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey ask for your help and support in this campaign. We ask you to join us in laboring for the goal of modern America, the Great Society.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Article

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

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY AT A DINNER OF THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 11, 1964

This is a night to remember. We honor a great lady whom mankind will never forget.

Mrs. Roosevelt would have been so proud—not merely that you remember her, but that you do so in this meaningful way.

This fund-raising dinner and others like it across the land are giving this noble foundation the vital resources to carry on her work. Your presence tonight means good deeds tomorrow.

Mrs. Roosevelt's life was like a great symphony. It had many varied movements. But it had one underlying theme which always recurred—the rights of human beings.

It was an international symphony—played on the world scene, admired by the world's audience. No language or other barrier ever separated Eleanor Roosevelt from any human being on earth. The distinguished Ambassadors gathered here tonight attest to that fact.

The last great movement—her last great work—was as Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

Just 1 year ago today, the Commission's report was released—appropriately enough, on her birthday.

Unfortunately, she had not lived to see the report's completion. But her indelible imprint was upon it.

So significantly did she regard the Commission that it was the only working group which had ever met in that shrine which she and the Nation hallowed—Hyde Park.

The rights of women were to her, not something apart. They were, fundamentally, the rights of individuals. She fought for those rights, not as a champion of her sex, but as a defender of the worth of the individual, irrespective of sex.

No arbitrary factor—no accident of birth—neither sex, nor race, nor color, nor nationality, nor religion, nor condition of parents, should ever fetter a human being. This was her view. This was her cause.

For it, she won triumph after triumph. The President's Commission on the Status of Women gave enormous impetus to the final enactment of the long-pending equal pay bill.

The Commission led to the formation of 33 Governors' Commissions on the Status of Women. The then Vice President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, met with the Commission, worked with the Commission. And, as President, he has fulfilled letter and spirit of the Commission by appointment of so many outstanding women to high posts in Government.

We recall that Mrs. Roosevelt's own post as Chairman of the Commission was allowed to remain vacant after her death. President John F. Kennedy expressed well the judgment of the Nation when he said that no successor could adequately take her place.

93 WBZ—LINO

A nation is measured by the greatness—not just of its men, but of its women.

Leadership is not just born: it is made, and all too often it is unmade. It goes unidentified in the early years when it should be nurtured. It is denied fair opportunity. It is discouraged. It is shackled.

We need superior education for all levels of ability. We need better counseling and guidance for the girls and young women of this Nation. In every facet of education, we need as high standards, as much inspiration, as much encouragement—if not more—for our young ladies, as for our young men.

The needs of the Nation tomorrow cannot be fulfilled by the girl who drops out from high school today.

In the arts, the sciences, and engineering, in government, in business and in labor, in every field of human endeavor, we need to open still wider the doors of opportunity for talented women.

Why? So that each girl, each woman may make a truly free choice, may realize her full potential, may strive for her heart's highest desire.

Why, also? So that, we as a nation will not be deprived of the fullest contribution and the fullest strength of womanhood.

Mrs. Roosevelt stressed that the family of man is engaged today in an epic effort—for peace and for a fuller life.

The free world is simultaneously engaged in a vast competition with tyranny.

If the United States maximizes the contributions of American womanhood, we can assuredly tip the balance on the international scale—in favor of freedom.

The strength of American women—in youth, in careers, as wives, as mothers—is an asset beyond calculation to the Nation.

You remember the rousing old song:

> "Give me some men who are stouthearted men,
> Who will fight for the right they adore;
> Start me with ten who are stouthearted men,
> And I'll soon give you ten thousand more."

The time has come to add to the words. We want not only 10,000 men, but 10,000 more *women* leaders who will fight for the goals this Nation adores.

With 10,000 more women leaders, this country can wipe out its slums and beautify its cities. We can clean up our polluted rivers, our polluted air, and, yes, a lot of polluted thinking—hate-filled thinking—fear-filled thinking.

With 10,000 more women leaders, we can give this Nation more wholesome recreation—parks, playgrounds, forests, better beaches. We can enrich the Nation's culture. We can lower the Nation's accident rate, the crime rate, the rate of broken families.

We need 10,000 more women leaders—not because they are women, but because they have talent, ability, potential—which we too often waste. No longer should we ignore this vast underdeveloped asset.

By each new victory, we gain for women's rights, for human rights, we "plant a rose" in Eleanor Roosevelt's gardens. We remain faithful to her immortal memory.

Tonight, 80 candles glow in what would have been her birthday cake.

We recall Ambassador Stevenson's unforgettable words:

> She would rather light a candle than curse the darkness
> and her glow has warmed the world.

So long as a light like hers shines, "there can be no night." There can be no darkness.

Let us so live that we light up the sky of all mankind with hope. Let us build. Let us create; let us advance.

Thus will Mrs. Roosevelt abide in our deeds forever.

Washington, D.C.
Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation Dinner
Shoreham Hotel
October 11, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Secretary Hodges, and this very distinguished list of dignitaries at the head table, and the equally distinguished guests at this wonderful dinner.

I find myself in an unbelievable predicament. First of all, I have been told something that no man ever ought to be told, particularly Hubert Humphrey—take all the time you want. [Laughter.]

This is just a way of forcing me to exercise a modicum of self-discipline, and I feel far too weak and tired for that.

Secondly, I must follow the splendid inspiring remarks of our good friend, Adlai Stevenson, and to do that, well, that is not the job that a man ought to take on without at least several months' adequate preparation.

But I have some advice for my friend, the Ambassador. I have noticed, may I say to George Meany, that since Adlai Stevenson is up at the U.N., he has forgotten some of the rules of domestic politics. I wish he would leave the plumbing to the Plumbers' Union. [Laughter and applause.]

Frankly, you have been listening to Orville Freeman. Now there isn't much chance in farming. You ought to stay off that farm, Adlai.

I think you ought to leave the peacekeeping to Dean Rusk and leave the dogs to President Johnson. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, if you are going to injure your right hand, Adlai, I have got some places where I think you could do that. We need a few hefty blows.

But things have changed. I can remember when ambassadors used to be able to engage openly in politics. Now one has to be much more adroit. And I am very pleased that some of our diplomats have such skill that they are both good diplomats and also good educators.

Tonight I would like to give a definition of happiness, too. I can think of it. The night of November 3 with the right election results. [Applause and laughter.]

I don't ask for much. [Laughter.]

But I can hardly wait. [Laughter and applause.]

I have been trying to think through what I might say to be worthy of your attention. There has been so much said already that possibly I should attempt to make mine a sort of layman's benediction.

I would say first of all that this is a night to remember. It is a night that will be remembered in many communities because what we do here is being done elsewhere. But I don't look upon this evening as a memorial as such because memorials always convey to me a note of sadness.

I look upon this as a birthday party and a birthday party is always a moment of joy.

There was something said in the early days of our Republic by John Adams about the pursuit of public happiness and I think that of all the people that I have ever known in public or private life that exemplify the true meaning of the pursuit of public happiness, happiness in its richness, in its fullness, in its purity, in its decency and its kindness, I think it is the life of Eleanor Roosevelt. And so I want to wish her a happy birthday. [Applause.]

I think she would like our party. I know she would have found great joy in the remarks that have been said thus far.

But as has been indicated she would have said, "Hurry up, let's get along. Get on with the work."

You know, Eleanor Roosevelt's life is hard to describe because it had so many facets to it. It was like a symphony, a great symphony, and it had many varied movements.

But I think there was one underlying theme in this beautiful symphony of the life that was hers. It is a theme that recurred time and again, and it is that theme of human rights, the rights of human beings, human dignity, and it just seems to me that that is the theme that ought to be emphasized in this, the second half of the 20th century.

Of course, it has really been the theme of life since the first spark of life because really the whole quest of man throughout all of this existence has been to make life more beautiful, to make life a dignified existence.

This was the spirit of the Judean Christian thought. It is truly the motivating philosophy of most of the great social and political philosophers.

And if there is one principle to which this country is dedicated above all others, at least the principle of our commitment, and most of the time the principle of our action, it is the principle of human dignity, of individuality, of personality, and of the right to be one's self and of the right to be respected because you are a spirit, a soul, a person; not just flesh and blood but a spark of the infinite encased in flesh and blood and mind and heart.

I also think of Eleanor Roosevelt's life being sort of an international symphony, too, because it was played on the world scene and it was admired by the world's audience.

I am sure Ambassador Stevenson could tell you again and again of the many moments of respect and admiration the many ambassadors and dignitaries of the great nations of the world at the United Nations had for Eleanor Roosevelt even when they disagreed with her.

She was a woman of principle. She did not always seek to be agreed with or seek accommodation with everyone. She respected principle but as she respected principle and also respected others, she received respect, and I think that is the most important of all. It is not always so important to be liked as it is to be respected.

No language or any barrier ever separated Eleanor Roosevelt from any human being on earth. In fact, it is well known that she would travel almost any place under any conceivable condition or set of conditions to see people.

She knew what was the most important part of the earth. She knew who needed the attention and what needed the attention, it wasn't things. It was people. And her whole life was given over to people, and the people that are gathered here tonight are adequate testimony to that fact because in this great hall this evening are people who have known Eleanor Roosevelt and knew our late and beloved President, Franklin Roosevelt, and they loved and respected these two great personalities because of the dedication of both of them to people.

I noted that the last great movement in this symphony of her life, her last great work, was as Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. In fact, it was just a year ago today that the Commission's report was released and appropriately enough it was on her birthday.

Now, she wasn't only interested in the rights of women. Those rights were to her not the—they were not something apart from the rest of life. They were fundamentally the rights of individuals. And she fought for those rights, not as the champion of her sex but as the defender of the worth of the individual irrespective of sex.

I think she taught us that no arbitrary factor, no accident of birth, neither sex nor race nor color nor creed nor nationality nor condition of parents, should ever fetter or limit a human being.

This was a woman of great commitment and a woman of great causes.

Just a few moments ago we heard again the title of her last writings, her book, "Tomorrow Is Now."

A woman that thinks that tomorrow is now really sets the pattern for what we ought to be thinking about as individuals now.

I can't help but, of course, think a bit in terms of political developments of our time and what disturbs me more than anything else is how anybody in America could be moved or could be entranced by a voice that asks us not only to forget today but also to distort the yesterdays.

Tomorrow is now. In fact, life moves so quickly and the rate of changes so rapidly that unless we are thinking about many tomorrows, we have already lost any chance for now.

And I believe that as we celebrate this birthday of this great lady, what we really ought to be thinking about are the continuing causes for which she worked that are causes that will possibly never be fully answered but always will be challenges to us. Tomorrow, now, and in the days to come.

Eleanor Roosevelt, I mentioned as her final act of public service, headed this President's Commission on the Status of Women. That wasn't her greatest work but it was another one of her many projects. And I think she did something again for the women of the world. She reminded them that there were unbelievable fields of opportunity in the arts, in the sciences, in engineering, in government, business, and commerce, in every field of human endeavor.

And she sought to hold open those paths of opportunity those gates of opportunity to everyone.

I have tried in these few weeks that I have been permitted to travel around our country to give a theme for what I believe should be the endeavor of our public servants at this time and I believe that theme is this matter of opening the gates of opportunity.

I have always felt that the role of government was to remove impediments, not to guarantee success, not to assure one of the soft and easy life, but rather to assure one that if they put themselves to the task of doing something with their talents, of attempting to make something out of their lives, that those individuals could in a sense have true opportunity.

Eleanor Roosevelt is a continuing inspiration to me. One of the reasons I have great faith among others is in our present is because its true heroes are those that we admire so much and I think the most are the late President Roosevelt and Eleanor Roosevelt.

[Applause.]

I can recall the days, as you can, when Eleanor Roosevelt took such severe criticism, a mark of greatness. One that is not criticized by contemporaries is one century behind. Mrs. Roosevelt was always a bit ahead.

I like to think of her contribution to American youth, not only to American youth: I want to broaden that horizon; to the youth of the world.

We often talk about our country being the world leader but a country doesn't really lead. It is people that lead. And it is the thoughts and the ideals as expressed by people that represent leadership.

Eleanor Roosevelt was a leader of the youth of the world. She inspired them. She gave them hope. She gave them comfort. She literally shared of her unbounded energy with them.

I think it is fair to say that wherever there was a group of young people, if she were called to that group she would go. And, therefore, she knows not death. She lives in the hearts, in the souls, of millions of people, millions and millions, who were touched by her greatness and by her spirit, and eternity, an immortality that is visible, that you cannot possibly miss if you but will to see it.

Eleanor Roosevelt stressed the fact that the family of man today is engaged in an epic effort, an effort for social justice and for peace.

I like to repeat those words social justice. I get a little weary of hearing about our efficiency, even our prosperity.

I sometimes wonder why we, the sons and daughters of people that say we seek justice, hesitate so often to speak of it.

Because what is needed more in the world than anything else, more than efficiency or even prosperity, is a commitment to justice.

Justice in the abstract is not enough. It must be social justice. Justice in society, in social structure, justice with individuals. And social justice does encompass, does it not, a respect for human dignity.

And when we get all through with all the descriptive phrases about what we have been trying to do in the field of civil rights or civil liberties or human rights, what it all boils down to is that we are talking about the respect for God's finest creation, humankind.

That is what we mean when we say civil rights. That is what we mean when we say human rights. And that is what we mean in America when we say constitutional rights, because this whole structure of government is predicated upon the sovereignty of the individual, and that sovereignty means the rights and the liberties of the individual. [Applause.]

Eleanor Roosevelt lived this story. She really didn't have to teach it because she lived it, and by her example she was the greatest teacher of them all.

You just couldn't fail to understand it and appreciate it.

Tomorrow is now. Surely this tells us of the urgent necessity for the peacemakers to succeed.

Yes, Ambassador, even at such cost as you have gone through.

Peacemaking is a difficult task and the peacemakers are seldom blessed in their time, but blessed are the peacemakers.

Now, I feel that I have been privileged—and all of us have been privileged—as few of us, to live in a time when the great names of our time were the peacemakers, not the warriors, the peacemakers, and within these last few years, these last 4 years, four of the greatest peacemakers of all time have been taken from us, yet their work continues.

In fact, I think it is fair to say that one of the great peacemakers of the world is on this platform tonight and he is a better peacemaker because he was inspired by the words, the life, and the deeds of Eleanor Roosevelt, and I refer to Adlai Stevenson. [Applause.]

In fact, I think our whole Government is the better because of this inspiration.

But have you ever stopped to reflect for a moment what has happened to us in these few months of the last few years.

Dag Hammarskjold, a peacemaker, a man truly dedicated to peace. Sometimes his work is not fully understood, possibly he may have erred. But here was a man that gave his life in the cause of peace, No braver soldier ever went to the battlefield. A true peacemaker. And his works live on.

The United Nations is stronger because of him and the world is better.

A second great peacemaker, Pope John XXIII. There was a peasant priest. I doubt that there shall ever be another like him in our time. This simple man and yet so profound, this man that gave us these great encyclicals, Pacem in Terres, this great encyclical of peace, Mater et Magistra, this great encyclical of social justice.

I think that every person that talks of peace and those that seem to doubt whether the pursuit of peace is worthy of a brave people ought to read Pope John XXIII's encyclicals. [Applause.]

I think if they did, I think if they were read and if they were understood, there would be much less foolish talk on the part of some who are so weak that they have to beat their breasts to prove that they are strong. [Applause.]

And then, of course, there was this wonderful lady of peace that I have spoken of, Eleanor Roosevelt. Her every word, her every action, was peace with justice, to do it right as God gives us to see and do the right.

She led many a struggle against injustice but she was the voice of peace with justice and the voice of peace with dignity and the voice of the spirit of peace with freedom, and she will be remembered for centuries to come because of her calm, quiet courage, because of her infinite patience and forbearance, because of her understanding and her tolerance, and above all, because of her ideals and principles.

And then may I say that we, too, in this great Nation have given yet another in the cause of peace. I happen to believe that the turning point in contemporary history was on the 10th day of June 1963, at American University, when a President of the United States delivered a masterful address, a plea for reason, a plea for understanding, for forbearance, a plea to humanity to spare itself lest it destroy itself, and on that 10th day of June 1963 when John F. Kennedy said that peace is a process and he reminded us that the pursuit of peace required the courage of warriors and the sacrifice of saints, on that day the world had a glimpse of a continuing life of peace.

Whether or not we will be able to keep that flame alive depends upon those of us who yet survive. But at least the candle was lighted. At least opportunity for a better life was given.

So, in our time, in 4 years or less, four princes of peace, four apostles of peace, have lived and died.

But their works and their deeds live on.

I can think of no one that has more beautifully expressed what I have tried to say in so many words and expressed them in such few,

Adlai Stevenson's words about Mrs. Roosevelt, Eleanor Roosevelt, on that day in the United Nations.

I think you recall them. They are unforgettable. They are here mounted in this room tonight.

> She would rather light a candle than to curse the darkness and her glow has warmed the world.

And may I say that so long as a light like hers shines, and it is up to us to keep it shining, there can be no night, there can be no darkness, and we, those that loved her and admired her, can be the children of light.

So my plea is let us live so that we light up this sky of mankind with hope. Let us make our lives one of building, of creation, and of advance.

Thus will Eleanor Roosevelt's deeds abide with us forever.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Washington, D.C.
"Science and the Great Society," TV Station WTTG
October 11, 1964

Moderator: Senator Hubert Humphrey.

Participants: Nobel Prize winners:

Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi (Saint-Georgie), Ph. D., M.D., Nobel in medicine and physiology, 1937; director, Institute for Muscle Research, Woods Hole, Mass.; work on chemical physiology of muscle; work on submolecular biology.

Dr. William Shockley, Ph. D., Nobel in physics, 1956; director, Shockley transistor, Clevite Corp., Cleveland, Ohio; work for Bell Labs; work for Columbia in antisubmarine warfare operations research; work for Department of Defense; inventor of the transistor.

Dr. Edward C. Kendall, Ph. D., Nobel in medicine and physiology, 1950; visiting professor, Princeton, N.J.; work at Mayo Foundation in Minnesota, 1914–51; work on hormones; discoverer of cortisone.

Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Ph. D., Nobel in chemistry, 1961; chairman, AEC, Washington, D.C.; work at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, Calif.; work on radioactive materials; identified nuclear reactions through experiments at Berkeley accelerator.

Dr. James Watson, Ph. D., Nobel in medicine and physiology, 1962; professor of biology, Harvard; work in molecular biology, attempt to understand life in chemical and physical terms; discoverer (with Crick) of the double helix structure of basic "life molecule" (DNA).

Senator HUMPHREY. The Nobel Prize is awarded for great achievements which benefit mankind. It is recognized throughout the world as the distinctive honor. It is given to only a few men for their especially creative contributions.

I am honored to have with me five of America's Nobel Prize winners. Modern science, technology, and medicine have revolutionized our lives. These men have contributed significantly to that revolution. They and their colleagues in many fields have made a Great Society possible.

Now we will explore some of the challenges and opportunities that science offers.

But permit me first to introduce these five distinguished Nobel Prize winners.

First, Dr. Edward C. Kendall, Nobel laureate in medicine and physiology.

Secondly, Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Nobel laureate in medicine and physiology.

And third, Dr. James Watson, Nobel laureate in medicine and physiology.

And fourth, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Nobel laureate in chemistry.

And finally, Dr. William Shockley, Nobel laureate in physics.

Now, these are five of the Nobel Prize winners, distinguished Americans, that have honored our country by their significant achievements, achievements which have bettered the life of all mankind.

I would like first now to interrogate these distinguished guests, ask them some questions relating to their own field of endeavor.

Dr. Shockley, first to you. You will combine both a background in basic physics and industry. As an expert on what are to most of us only magic words like semiconductors and transistors and as one of the inventors of the transistor, could you briefly sketch your view of the impact of the transistor on modern society.

Dr. SHOCKLEY. Well, Senator Humphrey, I would like to make some remarks putting the transistor into perspective in terms of what I regard a very important course of man's conquest of nature. I think an aspect of the transistor that is not realized by the general public is the direct relationship it has to the control of energy, and if I step back to the earliest stages in man's conquest of nature, I would say one of the first things that separated him on an evolutionary scale from the animals was in his control of energy, particularly in the form of fire.

If man has a supply of logs of wood, he can put these together, he can release under his own control large amounts of energy.

We go on later, and man replaced the use of beasts of burden and his own muscle by use of electric motors.

Now, in electronics, the vacuum tube and later the transistor control the flow of electrical energy in a very precise and exact way of high quality, in fact, the word "high-fi," high fidelity, used in radio sets is related to this precision of the control of the flow of energy.

Now, in this area, the transistor, whether it is in your hearing aid or in a computing machine, controls the flow of energy in one of the most efficient and compact ways that man has discovered.

Senator HUMPHREY. And you get those transistors smaller and smaller and smaller, Doctor.

Dr. SHOCKLEY. That is right, and there are specialists, skilled engineers and scientists, who make these into more compact little units so you have many of them in a very tiny space, a scale of resolution that does not yet approach the human cells, cells of the brain, but are approaching this area.

And what I see in the future is that the transistor will be able to undertake tedious jobs which at present are done by human brains just as electric motors and machines have replaced jobs that were tedious in the use of muscles.

The impact will be broad, I think.

Senator HUMPHREY. Dr. Shockley, we are going to come back to you because that is a fascinating area of discovery and of modern science. But I want to move over here to our good friend, Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, and ask him a little bit about some of his remarkable achievements in the field of molecular biology.

What are you really trying to do in this field, Doctor, and what are your goals and how will the achievement of these goals affect society? Now, that is a man-sized question, several parts.

Dr. SZENT-GYORGYI. Well, we have learned that our body is built of very small units, exceedingly small, we call molecules, and we believe if we know more about molecules we will understand more about life and control some of its deficiences.

And our methods have become refined enough lately to penetrate into these molecules.

To give you an example, my left neighbor here, Jim Watson, he found out something about the DNA molecule and that has opened up first an enormous big field in genetics. And my righthand neighbor, he found out something about molecules, steroid molecules, and that opened up enormous vistas in human therapy and control of disease and regulation and all that.

So we believe if we learn more about these molecules, that we understand life better.

My work, moving around to molecules, vitamin C which I partly discovered which I think is health and happiness to many, many thousands of people, and later my muscle and after these, my studies, I think we understand muscles a little bit better than we used to before.

So I think this molecule biology is an excessively important field.

Senator HUMPHREY. Vitamin C you mentioned, Doctor. What is its particular application to a better life and healthier life?

Dr. SZENT-GYORGYI. I should answer the first negative. We don't have it when we get ill and we can't develop a healthy body.

Now, usually human food is not rich enough in vitamin C and we have to supplement it. Very good to supplement it. And under special conditions like disease we need more of it.

And now I have found out what these molecules are and now industry produces them by the ton, hundred ton, and makes it available to everybody and makes on a statistical basis human life happier and better.

Senator HUMPHREY. So we get new industry, new jobs, new investment and happier lives.

Dr. SZENT-GYORGYI. Exactly.

Senator HUMPHREY. Now, that is what I call the practical application of science.

Dr. Seaborg, I have the privilege of seeing you from time to time as the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission on leave I think from Stanford isn't that right?

Dr. SEABORG. I think you have got that wrong. That is the University of California.

Senator HUMPHREY. California. I thought I would get a little correction from you out of that.

I would like to ask you a question in reference to the peaceful application of nuclear energy. I know of no one more qualified to speak on it.

You have been—you just returned from the Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, and what can you report on that?

Dr. SEABORG. Well, Senator Humphrey, I would like to begin by pointing out that these fissionable materials, the uranium 235 and the plutonium, which are the explosive ingredients in the nuclear weapon, can be used through their generation of heat which is changed into electricity in central generating plants for the generation of electricity, and a great deal of progress has been made in this field in the last 10 or 15 years, and particularly in the last year or two.

And as you have indicated, there was a conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the third conference. There was a big conference held in Geneva in 1955 and one in 1958 and then just one last month that I attended. And the results of that conference were optimistic, that is, the participants, the representatives from some 80-odd nations, emanated an air of optimism, a feeling that great progress is being made in the use of fissionable material for the generation of electricity.

The papers brought out the fact that we now have millions of kilowatts of electricity generated in this way and throughout the world some 5 or 10 million kilowatts of electricity will be generated from the nuclear source of the end of this decade, and something over 800 million kilowatts by 1980.

So that there was a great air of optimism there.

However, I do want to make the point, and this is very important, that this source of energy will not displace the use of coal but will supplement the use of coal in that the use of coal and gas and oil——

Senator HUMPHREY. Hydro.

Dr. SEABORG. Hydro for the generation of electricity will continue to increase also during this period.

Senator HUMPHREY. I wanted to just ask one other quick question here before we get to another point.

So much talk has been made, so many comments have been made about the desalinization of sea water. Is atomic energy and its peaceful uses of relevancy there?

Dr. SEABORG. Yes; this is one of the areas where atomic energy does have relevancy, particularly in large sizes when you have in a nuclear plant as compared to a conventional plant that operates through the burning of coal to generate the heat energy that is changed into electricity. The nuclear plant has more of its investment in the initial plant and then has cheaper running costs. So that when you go to large sizes, you overcome this and it becomes more and more relatively economical compared to conventional sources.

So large nuclear plants, particularly, have great prospects for the desalting of sea water, usually together with the generation of electricity in the so-called dual purpose applications. But smaller plants also have prospects for being economical in certain parts of the world where the price of electricity and water is relatively high.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, let me ask you about a question that bothers so many people today and that is this whole matter with this ever increasing supply of fissionable materials and the spread of the knowledge, of the technology of nuclear weaponry.

What about this proliferation of nuclear weapons? Is this as dangerous as we hear?

Dr. SEABORG. Well, this is a very important area. These nuclear power reactors that generate electricity by their very nature also produce plutonium which is one of the ingredients for the nuclear weapon, and so we then have the problem of assuring that this plutonium is not used for such weapons purposes.

And in order to do this, we have what we call a safeguard system, a system of inspection, particularly in the arrangements that we have in the bilateral arrangements that the United States has with various countries.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do we have any arrangement with the Soviet Union on that?

Dr. SEABORG. We have bilateral arrangements with the individual countries where we are aiding them in the nuclear energy production, and we have the hope that the Soviet Union will be doing more and more of the same thing in the arrangements that they make with various countries.

I think the important point here is that there is an international agency called the International Atomic Energy Agency with headquarters in Vienna which has some—has membership of some 80 or 90 nations which is beginning to exercise the safeguard controls over the nuclear power reactors in a number of countries.

In fact, a number of countries already have placed their safeguard function in the hands of the International Atomic Energy Agency, countries like Norway and Greece and Austria and Japan, and so forth. So although most people haven't taken note of this, there actually is an international inspection system in operation now with great hope for the future and the important—a very important thing here is that the Soviet Union is participating——

Senator HUMPHREY. Very much so.

Dr. SEABORG. Whereas 3 years ago they were dead set against this whole system of safeguards. In the last conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency which I attended the Soviet Union stood shoulder to shoulder with the United States in their support for the safeguards and for the expansion of this safeguard system.

Senator HUMPHREY. We are going to come back to you, Dr. Seaborg, because that is a fascinating subject. It is on the minds of every person. But I want to get to our friend Dr. Watson here to see if we can't bring you into this discussion. Through your great work with yourself and Dr. Crick, modern genetics has been given a tremendous impetus and I wonder what do you believe are some of the implications to society of genetic studies, of the code of life at the molecular level of the life process?

Now, that is an intricate question.

Dr. WATSON. Well, I think they are very profound in two senses. One, I think for the first time we are beginning to understand how a cell can exist, that life is not—still somewhat mysterious but not completely. I think we have gone over the great barrier of really understanding how life can exist. So conceptionally it has tremendous importance.

Biology used to be a very, oh, chaotic subject. There were people interested in trees and in animals and everything. Now there is a sort of unity. There is a great unity to biology which is somewhat similar to what came into existence in physics and chemistry much earlier.

Now we have a unified chemical way of looking at it. Now, this enables us to look at various problems of disease I think with a perspective which is optimistic, that is, we now really know what a virus is. It is not a mysterious thing. We can tell you almost its exact structure and if we know what it is, then we can ask a question, well, how could a virus possibly cause a cancer? And we can make schemes which are I think not ridiculous. We can't answer them yet but there is—I think we are going to

Senator HUMPHREY. In other words, you feel that the studies that have been made in the scientific research already in the molecular structure have given us some beginning, some insights into further advances, let's say, for example, in the field of cancer research. Is that correct?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I think so.

Senator HUMPHREY. For the layman now, a man like myself that is deeply concerned about these matters, that is, all of us are, that affect life, and so many people are the tragic victims of these diseases, the knowledge that we are gaining out of the study of the molecule and of the life process itself is giving us some keys—is that a correct way to put it—to unlock other secrets?

Dr. WATSON. Yes. I think we can go at it in a rational way now. We can go at it sort of in a good scientific problem, not just because we are afraid of it. That is a really different approach.

Dr. SEABORG. I might say that Dr. Watson's work has done a lot to place us in that position, too.

Senator HUMPHREY. I know. And that is surely true and we have here Dr. Kendall and Dr. Szent-Gyorgyi all working relatively in somewhat the same area, we might say, on the whole life process, molecular structure.

Well, now, we have got to come back to rework you men a little bit here. I want to ask some other questions.

Dr. Kendall, it is good to see you again, may I say, as one who did such wonderful work at our Mayo Clinic in my home State, Minnesota. Your work on thyroxin, as I recall, consumed about 4 years and on cortisone, which you discovered, about 18 years.

Now, what is the significance of these rather long periods of work on the problem of the need for continuity in basic research?

Dr. KENDALL. Well, I should like to emphasize the position held by the individual. The individual must assume a responsibility in research and devote his entire energy to this single objective as I see it, is the best way. That is, no committee ever wrote a successful opera. But the individual can devote his time and regardless of how many decades are required, if it is a problem which can be built up with an obvious solution, it is the duty of the scientists to pursue that problem.

It so happens that this is the 50th year after the discovery of thyroxin.

Senator HUMPHREY. I was going to ask you about that. Fiftieth year after your discovery of it.

Dr. KENDALL. Fiftieth year. But what I want to say about those 50 years is that in spite of great effort to discover what it does and how it does it, that solution has not been reached until the work of Dr. Watson opened the door, and I now believe that the function of thyroxin will be shown in a relatively short time. Well, 50 years is a bit of time, and it is an example of how these things must be pursued by individuals until the answer is secured.

With cortisone, there was no assurance that it would be good for anything, and for 17½ years the work was interesting but without reward, and then suddenly it was in demand. Well, that is where the scientist gets his reward, in the work itself, no matter what prizes come his way. It is the buildup of the work itself which brings the satisfaction.

Senator HUMPHREY. It must be a great source of satisfaction when you see the wonders that come from these great discoveries. We will get back to you again here, Dr. Kendall, before we wind this up, but I want to ask Dr. Shockley sort of a continuing question from your earlier comments.

One of the important points which I have heard you make from time to time concerns the relatively small cost of nuclear explosives. Now, most people have a different point of view, you know. They think it is very expensive.

What do you have to say about that, doctor?

Dr. SHOCKLEY. Well, this subject of cost of nuclear explosives is a matter of energy and this has been an underlying topic that has gone through our conversation in the last—during our discussion. Dr. Seaborg discussed the production of energy in electrical forms and Szent-Gyorgyi is concerned with the liberation of energy in muscles, and energy sometimes comes in a very organized way as in the transistor and computors and in the genetic coding and cells.

Now, from the point of view of this world impact of the nuclear explosive, the important thing is that this common denominator of energy as used in explosives is approximately hundreds of times cheaper in terms of human energy, human resources, than explosives have ever been before, and this is the thing that is the basis which makes the nuclear age so dangerous, which—the things I have heard you say, that now mankind has the potentiality to practically destroy life on earth.

This because he can make this explosive power so cheaply. It is the economics of the production of this form of energy that poses——

Senator HUMPHREY. I see.

Dr. SHOCKLEY. The great threat.

Senator HUMPHREY. And this process which you might call the economical production continues to improve and expand, doesn't it?

Dr. SHOCKLEY. Yes. And this is where the really great danger to humanity lies in the future, that this can become so cheap and so easy that any nation in the world, you see, might be able to make explosives that could be carried around in a satchel to threaten any capital in the world.

It is the economics of this and the efficiency of it that I think pose the really great threat.

Senator HUMPHREY. So when we talk about control of nuclear weaponry and nuclear power as was discussed here a moment ago by Dr. Seaborg and as is being discussed from every public platform, we are really discussing the possibility of the continuity of life itself, aren't we?

Dr. SHOCKLEY. I think that is right. Certainly the continuity of the more highly organized forms of life.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, those are the ones I was primarily interested in.

Dr. SHOCKLEY. Assuming that we are members of that group.

Senator HUMPHREY. That may be a false assumption, but let's make it for a while.

Dr. Watson, to come back to you, some scientific media have pointed out that never before have scientists been more interested in what government does or does not do. How do you view the role of the scientist today in public policy? In other words, the role of government and the scientist?

Dr. WATSON. Well, it is absolutely necessary. So many of the questions of government now are scientific questions. If you try and avoid science, it would be like, you know, playing baseball without a first baseman. You just couldn't win. You are bound to lose unless scientists participate in government, and I think we are going to see an increasing number. Otherwise our society just won't exist.

Senator HUMPHREY. And do you feel that—Dr. Kendall, may I just bring you in on this—do you feel that government today can be of supplemental assistance, so to speak, can assist in this great scientific development? I say this in light of your comments of how necessary it is for the individual scientist to follow through, but the role of government with that individual scientist I think is very important.

How do you see that?

Dr. KENDALL. Well, the moment a new thought or a new substance is created, then is the time when government is helpful, necessary, to develop that for the public good.

Dr. SEABORG. The government might enter earlier than that in the general case because of the need for the support of the basic research in which an idea——

Dr. KENDALL. Quite so, yes. The creator has got to have backing, yes. That is very true.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to get over here to our good friend, Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, and ask him about a question he has commented on on other occasions.

Some people seem to think it is impossible for us to arrive at any understandings with the Soviet Union. What is your view about this, doctor?

Dr. SZENT-GYORGYI. I think under Stalin it was quite impossible. One couldn't believe what he said, it was so unreliable. Not even the first years of Khruschchev. But I think now there is a genuine chance to get to an understanding, and this I build on several reasons.

First, after every revolution the first generation is very tough and you can't talk to them. They are imperialistic, tough, and want to spread their new doctrine over the whole world and dominate everything. But then they soften up, and Khrushchev is now the late second generation.

And my second argument is that I can see the Soviets need us just as much as we need them. We just have to get to terms if we want to go on living. And so what dominates politics is the need, really, actually, in the last analysis.

And my third reason is that Krushchev is a grandfather and he dosen't want to see his grandchildren killed as all our grandchildren will be killed if we don't get to some better arrangement with the Russians and the rest of the world.

Now, of course, this question always comes up, can you trust them?

Well, there are two answers to that. First, we have to look at it from the Soviet point of view. They ask the same question. Can they trust us? And they have just as much reason for distrust as we have.

But in looking from their point of view——

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think we can trust them?

Dr. SZENT GYORGYI. I do think we can trust because they need us and they want us and they really want to make friendship with us.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I am going to have to interrupt this marvelous discussion.

Dr. Seaborg, you indicated a while ago, too, that the Soviets have come in on this international conference which, of course, I think ties right in with Dr. Szent Gyorgyi's comments.

I must conclude this discussion by thanking you, first of all. You have brought to us once again the wonders of science and technology and medicine by your comments, and you have given us through your tremendous research and outstanding efforts the power to master nature, to control our environment, to enrich and extend life, and I think you have opened up whole new frontiers for mankind if we put this knowledge to constructive good, and I know that is your aim and that is the goal of our Government.

Thank you gentlemen. Thank you very very much.

Newark, N.J.
Robert Trent Hotel,
October 12, 1964.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. For just a moment there I thought that was the press and I thought somebody might—press being too biased. But we know you are very objective.

Governor, I am very honored and pleased once again to be in your State, be here with many good friends. I saw my friend Pete Williams. We are going to rename Pete as Pietro for today so that he will be in tune with this great Columbus Day.

Well, go right ahead with your questions.

QUESTION. Senator, this is Columbus Day. I wonder if you would give us your views on what you plan to do on wiping out the immigration quotas, your stand on this?

Senator HUMPHREY. I trust that a statement that I am going to make, at the steps of city hall has been circulated among the members of the press, that is—if it hasn't, I would ask my staff to see that it has been.

In that statement I make some comments in reference to present immigration policy.

The immigration policy of today is based upon the census of 1920 and the act of 1952 which maintains what I consider to be and what President Johnson considers to be discriminatory features that discrimination against Eastern Europeans and Southern Europeans.

This Immigration Act was the subject, as you know, of concern by President Kennedy. When I was in the Senate, privileged to serve in the Senate with President Kennedy when he was a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, we cosponsored what we called a short immigration bill which would have pooled the unused quotas, which would have abolished the so-called quota system based upon ethnic origin, and which would have permitted a much more equitable immigration policy.

Now, that bill that was the Kennedy-Humphrey bill during the 86th Congress and the 85th Congress has become the administration's immigration bill and it has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Philip Hart of Michigan, along with a number of other Senators, and in the House of Representatives by Congressman Celler, Congressman Rodino—and others have demonstrated their interest in it by producing similar legislation.

What the immigration bill of the administration does is not to open the floodgates. It merely makes the gates fair so that there is not discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin. It abolishes the restrictive quota system. It limits the total number of immigrants to a very reasonable figure, I think some 5,000 more than the present law. It permits family reunification.

To put it quite simply, there are many people here in the United States right in this district, in this area, of Italian extraction. Under present law the Italian quota is used up. It is very limited.

The new bill, the administration bill, would permit, for example, a larger number of Italians to come into the United States but it would also permit family reunification.

If there was a grandfather or grandmother or a father or a mother in Italy, that would be a priority group so that they could—a younger family here could bring in the relative, providing that the person could be provided for.

It would also permit the entrance into the United States of qualified people of skills and scientific background, people that were needed in our commercial, industrial, scientific, professional areas of American life.

Simply put, it abolishes bigotry, discrimination, and it recognizes that America was built upon the sons and daughters of immigrants and immigrants themselves.

And the State that I am privileged to represent in the U.S. Senate, sir, has been frequently called the little United Nations.

We have in our State over 50 different races, creeds and nationalities. There are maybe more than that in New Jersey. And we have built a great economy and a fine social structure on the basis of the great symphony of the many Americans from different nationalities and groups.

I am very shocked at the comments of our political opposition on minorities, comments of Senator Goldwater about minorities, makes the word minority sound ugly, unwanted.

Well, let me make it quite clear, every part of America is filled with a minority. There are no majorities in America except the majority of American citizens.

You have to add up the minorities to get the majority. And when you speak of minorities, what you are really speaking about are different groups of people, of different backgrounds, different ethnic origins, different nationalities, all of which become fine American citizens if given the opportunity.

So, this party that I represent on this platform today feels that the minorities make the majority and we are might happy that America has diversity at the same time that it has national unity.

Question. Senator, do you have any comment on the launching of the three-man Soviet spaceship this morning?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, it demonstrates once again that there is a great competition going on in the world between the United States and the Soviet Union and other countries in the field of science and scientific development, space exploration.

We have known for some time that the Soviets had great capabilities in terms particularly of the thrust of their rockets. Essentially this is what has taken place.

I mean, it is the power of the rocket to be able to put that capsule of such size, capable of carrying three men into orbit.

This shows great proficiency and efficiency and competence on the part of the Soviet scientists and engineers.

It also demonstrates the importance of the continuity and the expansion of our own space program, and I am happy to be able to stand on this platform and say that I have been one of its stanchest advocates, voting for the necessary funds, never voting to reduce them, and never making disparaging remarks, may I say, about them.

I know that the Senator from Arizona, when questioned about space in the U.S. Senate, was quoted as having said, "I don't want to hit the moon. I just want to lob one in the men's room in the Kremlin."

Speaking of the attitude on space programs, well, I think that is a very crude way of dismissing a very important scientific endeavor.

You don't lob things into the men's room of the Kremlin or any place else unless you have the competence to do it and the space program that was given the impetus by President Kennedy and by President Johnson and President Johnson above all since he was the chairman of the space program as Vice President, he emphasized the importance of adequate funds for the research activities which are necessary for the development of our space activities.

I havn't any doubt but what we will be able to do the same as the Soviet. I don't think this is a matter of great military importance at the present moment.

It has military potentialities, but what is most important is the scientific development that has taken place.

We will, I believe, demonstrate our capacity to get to the moon. I think our moon shot will succeed.

I think we will be able to do that before the Soviets do, and we will be able to come forth with a good deal of scientific observation that is worthwhile.

QUESTION. Senator, Mr. Miller says he has found a rising tide of support for the Republicans in his travels around the country and the latest polls, published polls, show an increase in support for Senator Goldwater. Do you have any reaction to that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, those of us that have been in public life understand that polls do fluctuate some, but may I say if we do no worse than the present poll shows, we will have the greatest victory in the history of American politics.

I would expect that we would not do that well. I would hope that in American public life there was enough good, honest competition to make the race highly competitive, but a 2-to-1 or almost a 2-to-1 majority is, I believe—it really works out about a 5-to-3, is about the ratio, or a majority, very substantial one in the recent poll.

I am pleased that the Republican candidates find something to be happy about.

May I say that the President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, and his candidate for Vice President, are not at all unhappy with what we read in the polls. I would hope, however, that it would be a warning to Democrats and to supporters of President Johnson to redouble their efforts, to get out and go to work.

The one thing I have worried about in this campaign is lethargy on our part, on the part of our supporters. I have worried about the people might take this election for granted, that a victory was just in the offing and there was no need to do any additional work.

So, let the warning flags fly. Let the storm warnings be clear and unmistakable. We have work to do. We had better get busy and get the job done.

Our main task is to get people out to vote and to have them understand the issues.

QUESTION. Mr. Humphrey, do you think that in view of the fact that the Russians are able to put three up and our next step is to put two up and that is next year, that there is any such thing as a space gap at this point?

Senator HUMPHREY. I couldn't answer that question honestly and scientifically. I can only say that we have had some advances in space that the Soviets have not had. We have made many more flights of unmanned objects.

Our satellites in the sky, those that are for the purpose of weather observation and international inspection, are the best in the world. They are far superior to anything that the Soviets have launched.

They may have some competence in one area that we do not have and we have it in another area.

Actually, in much of this space endeavor there is a good deal of international cooperation and there ought to be in the so-called peaceful exploration of space, and this I believe is where we need a good deal of emphasis because as a result of the peaceful exploration in scientific developments, you also gain defense information and security competence or security information.

QUESTION. Senator, Senator Goldwater is quoted as saying that political pledges of a better material life have no place in a presidential campaign; that the issue is morals and religion. What is your opinion on that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Goldwater obviously would like to ignore the matter of material benefits because the record of the Republican Party doesn't do much to demonstrate any fulfillment of those pledges.

But the fact of the matter is that America today has unprecedented prosperity, production, distribution, profits, dividends, wages, farm income, and workers' income.

We have reduced unemployment. Our country is better today. It is stronger today. It is richer today. In the meantime, we have been able to exercise frugality in Government.

The President held his budget to the commitment that he had made to the Congress which was a budget below $100 billion which was substantially less than had been predicted earlier.

The President is a man of frugality. He is a man of prudence.

Now, when it comes to this issue of morals and of deceit, I would say that President Johnson and the Democratic Party will stand well in comparison to the others.

I did not feel that I needed spiritual guidance from the spokesman of the opposition. I was in my own church yesterday and I got my guidance there and I feel that Mr. Goldwater would do well to have a little introspection just like all the rest of us.

We all need it. The issue of morality in government deals also with how you treat people, the compassion that you have for the unfortunate, the sense of concern that you have for the afflicted, the concern you have for the unemployed, the children, the dependent children of unemployed fathers, the concern that you have for the sick.

Morality is a very broad concept. It includes not only the morality of the purse but of the soul and of the mind and of the concern for other people, charity.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, in New York State there has been a good deal of speculation that Robert Kennedy is having some problems with voters of Italian descent because of the Velacchi hearings in the Senate. Many people say the hearings were dragged on too long and were not properly handled. What is your feeling about the conduct of the hearings?

Senator HUMPHREY. I really have no comment to make on that. I wasn't particularly familiar with the proceedings. I had other things to do with the Senate.

I think Mr. Kennedy will take care of himself pretty well. I expect he will be elected as U.S. Senator in New York. All indications are that he will be. He will make a good Senator. He has a good record.

I think he will do a good job and when the votes are counted I expect to see a U.S. Senator from New York by the name of Robert Kennedy.

QUESTION. Senator, do you think the issue of reapportionment will be a dead issue in Congress since the first move to redress the Supreme Court was dropped from the foreign aid bill?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I would say that this is a matter now that will be handled by the respective State legislatures.

There may be some efforts made in a constitutional amendment but so far as the legislative process is concerned, I think that what was done was the final chapter in that.

From here on out it is a matter of proper action on the part of legislative bodies and there is a possibility, as I said, of some effort as a constitutional amendment.

QUESTION. Senator, did you confer over the weekend with the President on campaign strategy?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I did not, sir. I conferred with my own staff. I conferred with members of the President's staff. But the President was en route to Phoenix, as I recall, and then into San Francisco.

I would hope to be in touch with him before the next day or so.

QUESTION. Senator, if Red China does explode a nuclear device, what would be a realistic U.S. policy?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, of course——

QUESTION. What was the question?

QUESTION. The question concerns Red China exploding a nuclear device as it has been predicted will happen in a few years.

What would be a realistic U.S. policy?

Senator HUMPHREY. As I was about to say to you, the President and others have indicated that we would like to make the nuclear test ban treaty inclusive of all nations so that there would be no further testing of nuclear devices or nuclear weapons in the air, on the surface, or under water.

The Soviets to date have not shown considerable interest in this nor have the French, but our policy remains the same and it has been my view that a nuclear test ban treaty should be all inclusive and we would surely press for that.

In the meantime, it should be clearly understood that the detonation of a device does not mean nuclear weaponry overnight. Weaponry—the technology of weaponry and the capacity to deliver with any degree of accuracy the weapon is a very complicated matter and requires a high degree of industrial efficiency and technical competence.

QUESTION. Senator, with the election 3 weeks away, will you assess what you feel the Democratic prospects are in the South right now?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think the President will carry, the Democratic Party will carry most of the Southern States.

It is my view that the South will not turn its back upon the first southerner to be elected President in a hundred years. They are very proud of President Johnson.

President Johnson understands the South. He has a sympathetic understanding of their problems as he does of the problems of the Nation. And I have a feeling that the strength of sentiment, the ties of blood and of region will overcome the temporary flirtation, this last weekend, that some of these southerners are having with Senator Goldwater.

When it is all through, they will come home to the party of their fathers and leave this temporary flirtation back in the blinds.

QUESTION. Would you include Mississippi and Alabama in this?

Senator HUMPHREY. No. Obviously Alabama you can't because President Johnson's name and the Democratic Party electors are not on the ballot. I doubt though that we could carry Mississippi. But I wouldn't exclude any other States.

I am of the opinion that President Johnson will sweep every Southern State with the exception of those two.

QUESTION. What about New Jersey, Senator? Are you carrying that firmly in your column, or is that a doubtful State?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I talked to your New Jersey political leaders and with a fine Governor such as you have here and with Pete Williams up for reelection and doing very well, and with your congressional delegation of enlightened Democrats, plus the great county leadership and State leadership that you have here, I expect that President Johnson will be able to send an early note of congratulations and thanks to the State of New Jersey provided that everybody gets in and goes to work.

There is no substitute for work, may I say. W-o-r-k. That sign ought to be in the home of every Democrat and every political independent and every Republican that is going to vote for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey between now and November 3, and just look at it about 20 times a day.

When I see a Democrat that is perspiring, I will know that we are getting something done.

If I see any of them looking too comfortable, I will know that we are in trouble.

QUESTION. Senator, do you have any preference in regard to the outcome of the British elections?

Senator HUMPHREY. We have enough problems to take care of our own elections. I want to leave the British handle their own problems, thank you.

QUESTION. Thank you, Senator.

(Press conference terminated at 10:35 a.m.)

Article
News release from the Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.
October 12, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, COLUMBUS DAY RALLY, NEWARK, N.J.

Buongiorno discendenti di Colombo.

What a great day for America.

What a scene to warm the heart of every patriot, of every human being who admires greatness.

You march today to honor the great discoverer.

You honor the man who transformed the history of the world.

He is the man who defied fear. "Sail on," he said. "Forward." "Continue."

What a message for America and for the world.

How proud every American should be of the great Genoan, Columbus—the "admiral of the ocean sea."

How particularly proud every American should be who shares his ancestry.

Today, we are all honorary Italians. I would be proud to be so—365 days a year.

I would be proud to have this day be a national holiday. The Senate has approved the Columbus Day bill.

The 89th Congress should enact it next year.

No nation can be great if it fails to honor greatness.

The sons of Italy, the daughters of Italy have enriched the earth with greatness.

American would not be America without you. How fortunate we are to have you.

Most of your parents or grandparents landed in the New World—not far from where we stand—on Ellis Island. Many came with only the most meager possessions.

Whatever this country gave them, they—you—have returned a thousandfold.

In peace and in war, Italian-Americans have yielded to no group in proving their—your—love of this Nation.

All about me, I see the greatness of your people, my people, our people.

Your dean of New Jersey's delegation in Congress, outstanding as a NATO parliamentarian, and in forward thinking, domestic legislation, Congressman Peter Rodino.

Your able mayor, Congressman Rodino's friend and colleague for so many years, Hugh Addonizio.

Your distinguished grand marshal, Congressman Joseph Minish—and so many others.

You are the living proof of the success of the American dream—the dream of yesterday's immigrant who has become today's leader.

We call it a "dream." But it is no fantasty; it is a fact.

There are those who reject this fact; there are those who speak of tomorrow's immigrant—not with faith, not with friendship—but in fear and sometimes even with ill-disguised hate. These anti-immigrant forces have a tool. It is a law. It is the old immigration and nationality law.

This law discriminates against many would-be immigrants—against those from eastern or southern Europe, including Italy. The law decrees that these Italian and other immigrants are not entitled to equal opportunity to join their kinsmen in our land.

How unfair, how cruel. This 1952 law is based upon a 1920 census and 19th century bigotry.

This law has created "an anti-Italian wall." The wall must come down.

We are going to take it down. The wall is a disgrace to our country's good name. It is a blot on our image abroad.

It is offensive to millions of Americans of Italian and other extraction. Fortunately, Christopher Columbus did not have to show an immigration quota number.

Fortunately, the gate of America was not shut in Enrico Fermi's face. Twenty-two years ago, from Chicago, a message flashed on Fermi's achievement.

His genius had made possible the first atomic chain reaction. What was this message on his historic experiment? It was this:

"The Italian navigator has just landed in the New World."

Thus, the brilliance of the Italian "navigator" of the 20th century recalled the courage of the other Italian navigator of the 15th century.

We are so grateful for "Italian navigators."

They have led us into new ages of discovery.

The greatest discoveries—the most exciting adventures of America are still ahead.

Still greater abundance, prosperity, freedom, and fulfillment are ours to achieve.

We will never turn back. We will never listen to the voices of gloom and fear.

The pessimists were wrong. Columbus did not "fall off" the globe. And we have no intention (even in jest) of trying to "stop the world," so we can get off.

"Sail on," said the master of the Nina, the Pinta, and the Santa Maria.

"Forward"—Avanti—is the creed of Italian-Americans.

And, fortunately, as you go forward, you do not forget your past.

Columbus Day helps preserve the best of the past. And Columbus Day salutes the future.

Forward now—in his spirit. Let us—together—build. Create. Achieve. Prosper.

Godspeed in the voyage of your lives.

Thank you, my fellow Americans. Thank you, for permitting me to share this great occasion with you. Buono Fortuna.

Arrivederci.

Newark, N.J.
City Hall
October 12, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much.

Congressman Rodino, and my good friends, buon giorno, arisi mi amici.

And Mayor Addonizio, Senator Williams, Governor Hughes, Congressman Minish, and our good friend Paul Krebs.

Ladies and gentlemen of this great city of Newark and this great State of New Jersey, 2 years ago, as I recall, a great American, a brave and brilliant, courageous young man, the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, stood on this platform and was greeted by you. [Applause.]

He told you then that he felt that his ancestry came from the Geraldines; that is, the John Fitzgeraldines, and today the best that I can say is that my name should be changed to Umberto Humphriano. [Applause.]

What a great day this is for America and what a scene I have before me to warm the heart of every patroit, of every human being who admires greatness.

Your march today to honor the great discoverer, Christopher Columbus, is a great landmark in the history of our country. You honor the man who transformed the history of the world. He truly was the first immigrant and look what has happened since.

He is the man who defied fear. He said, "Sail on. Forward. Continue."

He refused to turn back or to look back. And what a message this is for America and for the world. How proud every American should be of that great Genoan, Columbus, the "admiral of the ocean sea," and how particularly proud every American should be who shares his ancestry.

Today we are all, if you will permit, honorary Italians. I would be proud to be so 365 days a year. I would be proud to have this day, Columbus Day, be a national holiday, and may I say that the U.S. Senate in this recent session approved a bill that establishes Columbus Day as a national holiday and the 89th Congress should enact it into law next year. [Applause.]

Now, no nation would be great if it fails to honor greatness. The sons of Italy, the daughters of Italy, have enriched the earth with their greatness and their genius.

America would not be America without you and how fortunate this great Republic is to have you.

Most of your parents or your grandparents landed in the new world, not far from where we stand, at that great place of entry in America called Ellis Island.

Many came with only the most meager of worldly possessions but whatever this country gave them, those who came here to live, have returned it a thousandfold and America is all the richer.

In peace and in war Italian-Americans have yielded to no group in proving their love of this Nation, their love of freedom, their love of justice, their love of home, and love of God.

All about me I see the greatness of your people. My people, our people.

Your dean of the New Jersey delegation in Congress, outstanding as a NATO parliamentarian, and in forward thinking, domestic legislation, Congressman Peter Rodino, who introduced me today, is typical of what I spoke of—the greatness of America, the greatness of your people. [Applause.]

Your able and gifted mayor, Congressman Rodino's friend and colleague for so many years, Hugh Addonizio, is another one that has made his mark of greatness.

And your distinguished grand marshal, Congressman Joseph Minish, is another one that we can point to with great pride.

And there are so many others.

I say to this great audience that our Italian-American friends and fellow citizens are living proof of the success of the American dream, the dream of yesterday's immigrant who has become today's leader.

Now, we call it a dream, but it is no fantasy. It is in fact a fact of American life.

Now, there are those who reject this fact. There are those who speak of tomorrow's immigrant, not with faith, not with friendship, but speak of him with fear and sometimes with ill-disguised hate.

These anti-immigrant forces have a tool and a wicked one. It is the law, it is the old immigration and nationality law.

The old law discriminates against many immigrants, against those of eastern and southern Europe, including the great Republic of Italy.

The law decrees that these Italians and other immigrants are not entitled to equal opportunity to join their kinsmen in our land.

How unfair. How cruel this law. This law has created an anti-Italian wall and I say to this audience today that wall must come down. [Applause.]

And my fellow Americans, with your help we are going to take this wall down. The wall is a disgrace to our country's good name and it is a blot on our image abroad.

It is offensive to millions of Americans of Italian and other extraction.

Fortunately, Christopher Columbus did not have to show an immigration quota number.

Fortunately, the gate of America was not shut in Enrico Fermi's face. Twenty-two years ago, from Chicago, a message flashed on Enrico Fermi's achievement. His genius had made possible the first atomic chain reaction.

Now, what was this message on his historic experiment? It was this: "The Italian navigator had just landed in the New World." Thus the brilliance of the Italian "navigator" of the 20th century, Enrico Fermi, and more like him, recalled the courage of another Italian navigator of the 15th century.

I say as a Member of Congress and as a fellow American that we are ever grateful for the "Italian navigators." They have led us into new ages of discovery and the greatest discoveries and the most exciting adventures of America are still ahead.

Still greater abundance, greater prosperity, greater freedom and fulfillment are ours to achieve, and may I say, we will never turn back. We will never listen to the voice of gloom and fear.

The pessimists were wrong. Columbus did not "fall off" the globe and we have no intention, even in jest, of trying to "stop the world" so that we can "get off."

"Sail on," said the master of the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*.

"Forward," "avante," is the creed of the Italian-Americans.

And fortunately, as you go forward you do not forget your past. Columbus Day helps preserve the best of the past and Columbus Day salutes it further.

Forward now in his spirit.

So I say, let us together build and create, achieve and prosper.

Godspeed the American people in the voyage of our lives, and I say, thank you, my fellow Americans. Thank you for permitting me to share in this great occasion with you.

Arrivederci, arrivederci, buona fortuna.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

New York, N.Y.
Americana Hotel
October 12, 1964

Foreign Language Press Conference of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Participants: The Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York City; Robert F. Kennedy, candidate for the U.S. Senate from the State of New York; the Honorable Averell Harriman; Julius C. C. Edelstein, executive assistant to Mayor Wagner; and members of the foreign press.

Mr. Edelstein. Ladies and gentlemen, this is, as you know, the press conference called by the All-Americans Council for the foreign-language press for the candidate for Vice President, Senator Humphrey, and so the first round of questions will, of course, be for the foreign language press, and to Senator Humphrey. Mayor Wagner as the chairman of the All-American Council [applause] will preside and present Senator Humphrey.

Mayor Wagner. Ladies and gentlemen, before introducing our next Vice President [applause] I know we are very, very pleased, too, to have the distinguished candidate, our candidate for the U.S. Senate here, too, Bobby Kennedy [applause] and a very distinguished statesman and former Governor of the State, our good friend, Averell Harriman [applause] and our national committeeman, Ed Weisl. [Applause] city councilman, Klaus Screvane [applause] and Bill Ryan here. [Applause.]

I know you want to get on with the questions, but as chairman of the All-Americans Council, which as you know is the former nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, I am very, very proud to have this opportunity to introduce an old friend, and I am sure all of you know well, and all of you admire.

I know of no one who has made greater contributions in the Senate to liberalism and progress, who understands the problems of our people and the problems of the world better than the one I am to introduce. And I know that I introduce him, too, as an old friend and as chairman of the All-American Council which as you know is dedicated to bringing to all of our people the principles of our party and the platforms of our candidates.

He is a former chairman of our old nationalities division, and therefore he has had a unique opportunity through that service and also his great knowledge and experience traveling to know all of the problems that face the world today, that face us nationally, and I know of no one better equipped to assume the position of Vice President with Lyndon Johnson than our dear friend, Hubert Humphrey. I am delighted to have him here. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. I don't know which one of these is working. You have got such a galaxy of electronic instruments here.

I must say that it is a wonderful privilege to not only be with my good friends of the Democratic Party, these esteemed and distinguished citizens, but with this very notable representation of the foreign language press of the fourth estate, and I shan't take any more of your time with any particular statement on my part. I merely want to say how pleased I am for the opportunity of being with you, and I hope that during this brief discussion that we may have it that I can be of some help in either clarifying a position or of answering your questions appropriately and properly.

I am very pleased to be here with Mr. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, who is our friend and our candidate for the U.S. Senate, and a very distinguished public servant, one that we owe a great debt of gratitude to. [Applause.]

And I can say with equal sincerity and depth of feeling what a rare privilege it is to be with this good mayor of the city of New York, a longtime friend. [Applause.]

Now, let's get on. I am sure that Eddie and Averell know that I love them dearly, and I don't need to take any more of their time. They are such fine and great citizens.

Yes, sir?

QUESTION. Senator, Senator Goldwater has made some rather controversial statements about the role of minorities in this country, once in Pennsylvania and once again in a different sense in California. Would you care to comment, please?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. I read what the Senator had to say—Senator Goldwater—and I must say that I made a response to this both in Cleveland and in Philadelphia and Newark. Senator Goldwater has made the word "minority" appear as if it were a mean or ugly word and which it is not. It is but a word that is used to indicate that there are many different groups of people in America, people of many origins, backgrounds, nationalities, ethnic groups, but they are all Americans.

Just as I reviewed today in part the Columbus Day parade, I saw people there of Italian extraction, but they are Americans of Italian extraction, Italian-Americans, and the minorities to which Mr. Goldwater referred in a rather demeaning and derogatory manner, these minorities make up the great majority of Americans.

They are like separate instruments in a great symphony of American life.

I like to compare our population in this Nation of ours to a great symphony orchestra. You need many, many instruments, many musical instruments, to bring out the beauty of the music. It wouldn't be much of an orchestra if they were all french horns or if they were all just violins or all tubas.

But you need the balance and the diversity and the variety and out of that begets a harmony, and I want to make it very clear that the administration that I speak for and the party that I am privileged at this moment to speak for believes in an America in which there is room for differences, in which there is a unity, but also a diversity.

We don't ask everybody to look alike, be alike, or think alike, or come from the same place, and very frankly, if Mr. Goldwater's views had prevailed as the law of the land when his grandfather sought entrance to this country, Mr. Goldwater couldn't be a candidate for President right now. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Senator Goldwater told many times that if and when he will be elected, he will send to Khrushchev an ultimatum for the captive nations, especially for the Hungarian people.

I ask you, sir, can you send a message to the Hungarian people on responsibility on the anniversary of the uprising of the Hungarian people against the Communist tyranny, because the Hungarian people suffered from both tyrannies, from Stalin and from Hitler.

Senator HUMPHREY. First, my friend, ultimatums in this day and age of the nuclear bomb and nuclear power, ultimatums are not designed to aid the cause of justice or peace. It could precipitate a war, and it could be of great damage to the very people that we would love to help and protect and ultimately gain—help them in their fight for freedom.

Diplomacy by ultimatum is reckless, irresponsible——

QUESTION. That is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. And will not help anybody.

Now, what should we do? Well, the other day I noticed that the Holy Father, the Pope, went to—had negotiations with the government in Hungary, the regime, not because the Catholic Church condones communism. To the contrary, it is one of the—it is possibly the most effective enemy of the Communist force in the world.

But the Pope negotiated with the purpose in mind of being able to help in the spiritual life of the people of Hungary, to maintain the Church for spiritual guidance to the people of Hungary.

Now, I mention this because some people say that when you talk to these Communists, or these regimes, that somehow or other you show yourself to be soft on communism.

Not at all. What the Holy Father sought to do was to help with the spiritual life of the people, not to condone communism, not to have relationships on a friendly basis with the Communist regime, but to help the people in their spiritual life.

Now, what is our policy as a government? Our policy is to build bridges of contact with the people of these countries. Our policy is to aid in every way that we can through diplomacy, through pressures, through contacts, through individuals, through any force that we have outside of outright military force, to bring greater independence and ultimate freedom to the peoples of these captive nations.

I know that it isn't the easy answer, but, my friends, I don't think there are any easy answers, and I believe that what we are seeking to do is the right.

QUESTIONER. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

QUESTION. I have two questions. First, is the economic and educational assistance to the satellite countries helpful to the Communist government or to the people, and should such bridging, the building of bridges, be considered an objective in itself or just a means to obtain changes in the system of government and in the degree of dependence on the Soviet Union? That is the first question.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

As you know, I can now speak for my own public record. I have voted for and supported cultural exchanges, some economic assistance, particularly in the instance of food in a country such as Poland, and we did so in Yugoslavia and in other areas of the world. I feel that this assistance is basically helpful to the people, and let me say that the people of these countries, the peoples of these countries, do love the United States of America. There isn't any animosity, any hatred on the part of the people with our country, and it is right and proper that we keep in touch with these people. The gentleman here that is with me, Mr. Kennedy, when he was in Poland, he was loved by the people. They rose up as like a mighty army to welcome him. And why? Because he represented the United States; because he represented, may I say most respectfully, a wonderful country and a wonderful President in his beloved brother, and he represented himself.

Now, that example, it seems to me, tells us that we must keep in touch with these people. Now, we don't build bridges just to build bridges. We build bridges so that we have a way to travel, so that we can help people help themselves to greater freedom, to less dependence upon the Soviet Union, to more independence for themselves, to more freedom for themselves. And I think the policy that we are pursuing is sensible. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Second, the West Germans clamor for a revision of the Polish-German border on the Oder-Neisse line endangers the peace of Europe. Do you feel, Senator, that the U.S. Government should recognize officially the Oder-Neisse frontier?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is a very difficult question for me to answer in my position, and the reason I say that is because that line is a part of many other areas of disagreement and, we would hope, ultimate solution in Central Europe. The Oder-Neisse line is related to other factors in all of Central Europe that is under negotiation and under study. I have a feeling that our Government has a very open mind on this matter, and I know, for example, that General de Gaulle in one of his statements some years ago openly recognized the Oder-Neisse line as the line of demarcation, and we have close relationships with the French Republic, but I don't feel that as an individual in the position that I am now that I ought to speak definitively, authoritatively, on that subject except to say that it is part of the general consideration of a settlement that we hope some time to be able to obtain in Central Europe.

QUESTION. Are you against revisionism?

Senator HUMPHREY. Sir?

QUESTION. Which means war: again, revisionism which means war?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I have not been too sympathetic with the revisionists, may I say.

QUESTIONER. Thank you. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Our readers are very anxious to find out your opinion, first of all, about the American policy on Cyprus and after that about the new immigration bill.

Senator HUMPHREY. Let me say first in reference to the American policy on Cyprus—what we have sought to do is to maintain through negotiation the peace in the area because the bloodshed that has taken place has been very dangerous, both to the people on Cyprus and also to the alliance, the NATO alliance, and our policy is one, of course, of an independent Cyprus—to support an independent Cyprus—and to see if we can't work out through negotiation and diplomacy a reasonable settlement in Cyprus so that both the people of Turkish extraction and of Greek extraction can live in peace.

Now, how that is going to be done, sir, is not something that I can answer quickly. We have had men like Mr. Harriman working on it, Mr. Ball working on it, Mr. Acheson working on it, President Johnson working on it, but I can asure you that our desire is to maintain the peace of the area and in no way to sacrifice the people of the area, and we fully recognize that the Greek people are the majority people in the island.

QUESTION. You do, above all, recognize the right of self-determination.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is right. Of self-determination.

QUESTION. The great majority of the Greek-American persons must prss in this direction, if not——

Senator HUMPHREY. This Government has always supported self-determination since the time of Woodrow Wilson, which is the basic policy of this Government.

Now, may I answer your immigration question because we are getting right down now to legislative policy.

The gentleman that is here with me, Mr. Kennedy, as the Attorney General of the United States, speaking for two Presidents, Presidents Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, sent to the Congress of the United States from the executive branch of the Government a revised immigration bill, a new immigration law, and that immigration bill was one, by the way, that had the support of the late John Kennedy when he was U.S. Senator.

If I may just for a moment take your time, I was a cosponsor with John Kennedy when he was in the U.S. Senate of an immigration bill very similar to the one that his brother, Robert Kennedy, as the Attorney General sent over to the Congress on behalf of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

So we feel that revision of the Immigration Act is absolutely essential. This administration and the Democratic Party is committed to the bill that was sent to the Congress by John Kennedy as President of the United States through the Attorney General. The President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, is committed to that bill. We think it is fair, and may I say we don't think that it opens up floodgates at all. What we do think is that it makes the gates that are open fair gates. We abolish the ethnic and racial discrimination features. We increase the amounts, the number of immigrants slightly. We permit family reunion. And my goodness, why not? We permit people of skills and competence that are needed in the American economy and the social structure to be given some priorities, and we abolish the old 1920–52 system which discriminates against Eastern and Southern Europeans. [Applause.]

QUESTIONER. May I——

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes? Good to see you again.

QUESTIONER. Thank you, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. We almost had an interview out here on the avenue today.

QUESTIONER. I work for Pronsa. You know that. I don't have to tell you. And we Puerto Ricans don't have to worry about the immigration law.

Senator HUMPHREY. No.

QUESTIONER. But we are supporting, well, maybe Mr. Goldwater wants to get rid of us, too. That would be very difficult. [Laughter.] But we are very much interested in helping our Spanish friends, I mean the Spaniards from Spain. We spoke to, shall I say, Senator Kennedy the other day, and he was very much interested, and I know you are, too, because you are working on the same thing. They get only a quota of 250 a year, and if this law is revised, will that mean that that quota will be increased?

Senator HUMPHREY. There will be—indeed it would. There will be no quota as such based upon the 1920 census population. In fact, we pool—one of the—I believe I am correct in that, am I not, Robert, that we pool the unused quotas.?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Senator HUMPHREY. So that where there were areas not used, other nations will be able to use those quotas so there will be a substantial increase in the number of people of Spanish extraction that will come.

Mr. KENNEDY. All of the countries will be treated equally. It will be over a 5-year period of time. All countries will be treated equally.

QUESTIONER. But I always hear Western Europe. I mean just don't speak about Eastern Europe or Southern Europe. I would like once in a while to hear Western Europe because that is where Spain is.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well——

Mr. KENNEDY. From now on.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think we just talk about Eastern Europe but the bill treats all parts of Europe.

QUESTIONER. All the people here, they all have representatives. The poor Spaniards don't have anybody. So I am here——

Senator HUMPHREY. My dear, with you, with you such representation——

QUESTIONER. Ole, ole.

Senator HUMPHREY. Marvelous.

QUESTIONER. And I want to ask something about that, the Commission established in Puerto Rico—you asked the question the other day and so did——

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

QUESTIONER. Mr. Kennedy about the letting of people of Puerto Rico decide but I would like to know after the referendum, after the Commission presents its report, what is going to be done by the Congress? Do you have any idea? The Commission——

Senator HUMPHREY. I will have to wait until I see what the report is of the Commission, what recommendations they make to the Congress, my dear.

QUESTIONER. Thank you very much; thank you, Mr. Kennedy.

QUESTION. Mr. Senator——

Senator HUMPHREY. May I just say, we are very, very pleased that the Puerto Ricans have such an effective representative and we like the Puerto Ricans.

QUESTION. Thank you very much. We like you, too.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, my dear.

QUESTION. Mr. Senator, my name is Oslin, and I am from the Latvian nationality group.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

QUESTION. I would like to ask you a few questions and that is remind our memories, refresh our memories about during the period of the Second World War. When the Russians and the Nazi Germans signed an agreement and the secret pact about inclusion of the Baltic States in the Soviet Russian territory, about the partition of Poland, to take part away from Rumania, this Bessarabia, that time the President Roosevelt gave a statement through his Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinus, that he doesn't recognize the inclusion of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union and as far as I understand, still this recognition exists. But nevertheless, during the war, I think in 1945 or so, there was several statesmen and Senators who expressed and agreed with Stalin at that time that the Soviet Union after the war needs a friendly government around the Soviet Union. That means Poland, all Eastern Europe, Baltic States; and at that time there were several Senators and statesmen who said, "Yes, we agree. Stalin is right. The Soviet Union has a right to incorporate the Baltic States in the Soviet Union." Partition of Poland and so on.

Please, how could you explain now, does that kind of a code still exist or do you repudiate that or what is the present situation?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, those were the views of individuals. Those were not the views of the Government of the United States.

QUESTION. That is right.

Senator HUMPHREY. And the Government of the United States does not believe in sacrificing any people or any country for the accommodation of any other people or country. And believe me, we do not believe in the sacrifice of the independence of any nation state in order to make it more convenient for somebody else as they—according to their idea of convenience.

So to make it simple, we believe in an independent Poland. We still recognize the representatives of the Baltic States. And one of the greatest things that has happened to America is the large number of people from Latvia and Estonia and Lithuania that have come to the United States.

QUESTION. So, Mr. Senator, so you don't agree for that incorporation, do you?

Seantor HUMPHREY. No.

QUESTION. You exist for independent states.

Senator HUMPHREY. I do.

QUESTION. That is your present solution, reason.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

QUESTION. Thank you, very much. That is very important.

Mr. Senator, what is the position of the Government today toward Israel and especially to the threats of Nasser to annihilate Israel?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, we have lived with those threats for a long time, my friend, and may I say that the position of the Government of the United States toward Israel is for the protection of the territorial integrity under the Tripartite Agreements of 1950 backed up, may I say, by a strong commitment of the American people who have a great friendship for the State of Israel and for the people of Israel.

We seek above all, sir, to keep the peace in the Middle East. We think that peace in the Middle East is the only way that any of the people in the Middle East are going to be able to prosper and to thrive, and we think the example that the Israelis have given of developing a viable, effective, productive economy is one that stands very well in the world today for many other nations, and many other small nations in particular. And you can rest assured that this Government is still committed unequivocally to the commitments that were made in 1950, that as far as the territorial integrity of the nation states in the Middle East is concerned, we are prepared to defend it. [Applause.]

I think we will take one more here.

QUESTION. One more before you leave, Senator.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

QUESTION. I am sorry. My question then is you know we have got a hot senatorial race here in New York.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir; I have heard about that.

QUESTION. And the Valacchi hearings have become quite a thing involved in the race, involving the alleged Italian voters supposed to be running against the Democratic candidate. What are your views on the Valacchi hearings?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, let me say I have heard something about this, and it is really kind of surprising to me because first of all, the Velacchi hearings were conducted by a committee of the U.S. Senate, not by the Justice Department, and the committee that conducted them is the Permanent Investigating Committee of the U.S. Senate.

Now, I don't serve on that particular subcommittee. I know this, that when a subcommittee of the Senate that is established by law requires of a department of Government information or a witness that is in the custody of the Government of the United States, that that committee or that department of government has an obligation to comply with the request of the committee. And I do believe if my memory serves me correctly that such a request was made of the Attorney General. He didn't initiate it. The request was answered and if he hadn't have, he would have had more trouble than he is having right now, I can tell you, because the Senate treats some of the Cabinet officers with the kind of treatment that Senators like to deal out to Cabinet officers occasionally, and Mr. Kennedy was required by the rules of the Senate and the laws of the United States to produce a witness.

Now, it is just utterly ridiculous, may I say in all candor, and I am not being asked to defend anybody, but I read about this and I am not so openly involved in all of the local elections up here, but I am for Bob Kennedy. I want that crystal clear. And President Johnson is for him, too. [Applause.]

I think it is really playing very loose with political truth and political honesty to try to fix the blame for anything that may have happened in the Velacchi hearings upon the former Attorney General of the United States. That just isn't right. Now, had he conducted that within the Department of Justice, on his own volition, then they can take him apart as they see fit. But there were several Senators on that subcommittee, and I think I recall a statement in the Senate at one time on the part of several of them relating to that hearing and one of them from my good friend here—I believe Senator Javits, of New York, made some statements in reference to it. He said that he thought the hearings had been conducted well. I can't remember the exact words. But he was a member of the committee.

Now, if there was such complaint about those hearings, why wasn't the complaint made in the Senate? We have two Senators from each State. I want to just say one other thing. Italian people never had a better friend in their lives than John Fitzgerald Kennedy and his brother. [Applause.]

Unless I can just crowd in a little bit myself. I think I am a pretty good friend, and I know that President Johnson is, and his No. 1 aid in the White House is none other than Jack Valenti to stand alongside of him every hour of the day, and I hope what I said here will be not misunderstood. I want to make it clear.

The Senate conducted that hearing. If there are any complaints about it, it should have been made in the Senate.

The Attorney General didn't conduct that hearing, and had he not have responded to the request of the Senate, he would have had more trouble than he is getting in the New York campaign, and I hope that somehow or another he can be treated fairly on this question.

QUESTION. Senator, can you tell me how many electoral votes you predict in New York?

Senator HUMPHREY. I hope we will get them all.

QUESTION. Can you predict how many?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well I—we want them all.

Now, may I just conclude. If you will bear with me, I have a very heavy schedule ahead of me tonight. I have to get up into Connecticut and two meetings yet in New York. I want to conclude my remarks here by first thanking you for giving me this forum to visit with you. There are many subjects that we could have still covered. The foreign language press does a great service for the people of America, a great service, and it does a great service, may I say, for people in other lands that want to know how we are thinking in America. And it does a great service to preserve some cultural and national identity. And we are deeply indebted to you. And I hope that you will keep that fight up on the immigration bill.

You help us and I guarantee you that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey as Vice President and Robert Kennedy as U.S. Senator—we will get something done about it. [Applause.]

Article

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

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, WESTCHESTER COUNTY DEMOCRATIC RALLY, WHITE PLAINS, N.Y., OCTOBER 12, 1964

In presidential campaigns it is traditional to look ahead to the next 4 years. But in 1964 this would be shortsighted indeed.

The problems which beset us in 1964—and our responses to them—will shape America not just for the next 4 years, but far into the future.

This is not a time for failure of nerve. This is no time to begin demolishing our remarkable accomplishments of the past 30 years—accomplishments which represent the consensus of both Democratic and Republican Parties.

Yet what does Senator Goldwater propose? What are his plans for America? Listen to his own words:

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

Or: "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them."

Is this the time to begin tearing apart the better society we have struggled so long to build? And is this the time to ignore the challenge of building the Great Society?

America will not retreat—we will not turn back—we will not experience a failure of nerve.

We surely cannot now ignore the challenge of making life more meaningful and pleasant in our metropolitan areas.

The traditional distinction between urban and rural life has disappeared. And the distinction between suburb and city is fast being eroded.

The growth of our population—the change in the economy of our cities—the growth of managerial and service occupations has created a new phenomenon called the urban complex—the supercity.

Every day you encounter and experience the problems of living in a supercity—problems of transportation, education, recreation, and even in Westchester, pockets of poverty.

We cannot allow the massive problems of the metropolis to remain unattended. These are not just Westchester problems or New York City problems. They are problems which affect every metropolitan area in the country. And, as a national concern, these problems require the cooperative efforts of Federal, State, and local governments working with private groups and individuals to develop effective solutions.

This cooperative assault on the problems of the exploding metropolis has been launched by the Congress under the Kennedy-Johnson administration. It is a record we can be proud of: enactment of programs for mass transportation and open spaces in urban and suburban areas; expanded low rent public housing; increased Federal

assistance for local planning; expanded housing for the elderly; a humanized urban renewal program; moderate income rental housing; increased housing starts; and a comprehensive antipoverty program stressing local community action.

Yes, we have begun. But now we are confronted by a spirit of negation and reactionary nostalgia from the Goldwater faction. Their leader has opposed resolutely almost every positive proposal to improve the quality of life in our urban and suburban areas.

He voted against the mass transportation act.

He voted against the program to acquire open spaces in urban and suburban areas.

He voted against the housing act of 1961.

He voted against legislation to help provide housing for the elderly in urban areas.

He voted against funds for urban renewal.

He voted against the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

By this record, the leader of the Goldwater faction has demonstrated his total lack of concern for the problems of our metropolitan areas. He has given specific documentation for his statement of September 30, 1961:

> Sometimes I think this country would be better off if we could just saw off the eastern seabord and let it float out to sea.

Second, the urban complex faces the problem of public education. Our chlidren are the future of this country. They need and deserve the best education we can provide. It is our responsibility. A first-rate public system of education is the bedrock of democracy.

Here is the record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration: we have provided more college classrooms, we have improved programs for vocational education, we have increased loans to needy college students, we have supported a substantial increase in public library facilities.

Senator Goldwater, however, has seldom missed an opportunity to express his lack of concern for American education.

He voted against the National Defense Education Act and subsequent amendments.

He voted against the School Construction Act of 1960.

He voted against the School Assistance Act of 1961.

He voted against the work-study and vocational education programs of 1963.

He voted against aid for colleges and universities in 1963.

He voted against the medical education act of 1963.

But these votes are expected from a man who could tell the citizens of Jacksonville, Fla.:

> The Government has no right to educate children * * * The child has no right to an education. In most cases, the children will get along very well without it.

None of his votes on education, it should be added, reflect official Republican policy. Senator Goldwater's attitude, in fact, repudiates a Republican tradition which goes back to the Land Grant Act of 1862. Had he been in the Senate then, Goldwater would probably have denounced Abraham Lincoln as a "socialist."

Senator Goldwater has not limited his program for dismantling the social accomplishments of the past to the areas of metropolitan life or education. By no means. He has consistently opposed responsible governmental programs in a variety of areas—even those proposed by his own Republican Party.

I have analyzed the votes of Senator Goldwater on 25 specific positions set forth in the 1960 Republican platform as compared with the votes of Senators Dirksen, Kuchel, Saltonstall, and Hickenlooper.

An honest appraisal of what Republicanism means is found in this 1960 platform. It was a conservative platform—but it was a responsible platform too. It reflected the fact that a Republican administration had been in office 8 years, and had dealt with the complex problems of a great nation in a turbulent world.

The record shows that Senator Kuchel supported his party's declared position on every one of these 25 major issues. And Senator Saltonstall supported the platform on 20 occasions.

But what about Senator Dirksen and Senator Hickenlooper?

They come from the Midwest; they are deeply committed to the tradition of the Republican Party; and they are universally and rightly known as solid conservatives.

Senator Dirkson voted for the party's platform 18 times, and went against it only 4 times.

Senator Hickenlooper voted 17 times for his party's platform, and went against it only 8 times.

In short, Senator Dirksen, Senator Hickenlooper, Senator Saltonstall, and Senator Kuchel—all supported the 1960 Republican platform an overwhelming majority of the time.

But not Senator Goldwater. He opposed the party platform all 25 times when these major issues came before the Senate for a vote. Always the same refrain: "No, no, a thousand times no."

So I came to the conclusion that Senator Goldwater is neither Republican nor conservative. He is a radical and he is a Goldwaterite. And radical Goldwaterism simply does not equate with conservative Republicanism.

Fortunately, the American people have a choice on November 3. But what we vote for is far more important than what we vote against.

Yes, we shall reject all that is retrograde and reactionary in American life. But we shall also reaffirm what is constructive and forward looking.

Recognizing that America has great problems, we shall affirm that it has great opportunities.

Remembering that it has a glorious past, we shall affirm that it has an even more glorious future.

President Johnson has asked us to join with him in building the Great Society. He faces these challenges with courage, determination, responsibility, and confidence. He believes in America. He believes in her people. And he believes this Nation wants to continue moving forward.

I believe the American people share this vision of a better tomorrow—this vision of the Great Society. I believe the American people will say "Yes" to Lyndon B. Johnson on election day.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT WESTCHESTER COUNTY CENTER, WHITE PLAINS, N.Y., OCTOBER 12, 1964

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Bill Liddy, for your generous and gracious introduction, and may I thank this wonderful audience in Westchester for this great reception, a wonderful reception to Mrs. Humphrey and myself and a tumultous reception to the next U.S. Senator from New York, Bob Kennedy. [Applause.]

I am delighted to share this platform tonight with two of the new Congressmen that will serve this area in the House of Representatives, particularly—wait for their names, now—for Frank Caniff [applause] and Dick Ottinger [applause].

Apparently somebody thinks that I need to add a few more inches to my height. [Laughter.]

I want to thank them. I thought I had grown up but apparently not.

Tonight is a wonderful, wonderful evening for the future of our country. I come to one of the most important counties, one of the most important areas of the United States. [Applause.]

And I come here for a very, very good and worthy purpose.

I come here to cite the record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration and to ask your support for the man that I am sure with your help will be the President of the United States for the next 4 years, Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

I also come here, in the words of my wife, to ask you to support the whole ticket from top to bottom and from bottom to top. [Applause.]

I am delighted to have the privilege of meeting the splendid county committee, the candidates for public office in the Westchester area, and as I have stated, to ask you not only to support your President, not only to support the man that seeks the office of Vice President, not only to ask you to support your local candidates but to back your President and to back that program by giving the President in the Congress the kind of stalwarts, the kind of courageous and able men that he needs, and I have three upon this platform—Robert Kennedy, Frank Caniff, and Dick Ottinger. [Applause.]

Let me say just a word or two here in opening my remarks about the gentleman that spoke to you just a few moments ago, Bob Kennedy.

Senator Kennedy—I want to get used to calling you that—and by the way—[applause]—I insist that you make him Senator Kennedy because when Lyndon Johnson wins, that means that I get to be Vice President and that means that I can swear in Bob Kennedy as U.S. Senator. [Applause.]

Bob Kennedy is honored tonight as few men in public life are ever privileged to be honored. He is honored every day, every day that I have been with him, and his illustrious and great brother before him and his younger brother who is a dear and personal friend of mine. [Applause.]

The honor that I speak of is one that every parent, every person of voting age in this State ought to be fully aware of and most appreciative of.

I have yet to find a man in public life that has the support, that has the trust, that has the enthusiastic affection and admiration of the young people like Bob Kennedy has. [Applause.]

Now let me say a word to these young people. Let me speak just a word to our young friends. I personally greatly enjoy the fellowship and the friendship of these young people.

As I travel around the country, it has been noted and written that a number of the young people attend our meetings.

Now, some people make light of this. Others even scorn it. Some say, "Oh, all you have are the bobby-soxers or all you have are the Beetle lovers, and some of these others."

But let me tell you what you have. First of all, I want to say to the young people anybody that speaks disparagingly of you and your participation in the political life of America, that kind of a person is unworthy of the trust and of the support of your parents, and you see to it that they remember it. [Applause.]

I don't know what greater honor could be paid a person than to be loved and respected by the youth. The Bible speaks of it, the prophets speak of it, the philosophers speak of it, and yet I notice that when someone has that affection there is always a cynic, there is always someone that turns a phrase and makes it appear as if all you have are the youngsters.

Well, let me say right now that if I have my choice between some of the cynical oldsters that support the old, old, old Goldwater line—[applause]—or can't make up their minds who they support, and those who know who they are for and what they are for, let me say right now I enlist with the young people of America for a better future of America. [Applause.]

Now let me say to my young friends your job is cut out for you. For those that laugh at you, for those that make fun of you, all you need to do is make yourself individually committees of one to go home and advise your voting age brothers and sisters, your mother and your father, your grandfather and your grandmother, your neighbors, advise them about the election.

They have been advising you for years. It is now your turn. [Applause.]

And may I as an old friend just pass along a suggestion. The best advice that I can give to you, which I hope you will pass along to your family, is to vote for President Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Robert Kennedy, Frank Caniff, and Dick Ottinger. [Applause.]

Bob Kennedy has spoken of the years, those 1,000 dramatic days, of the leadership of our late beloved President. He has spoken of those days since November 22, 1963, when we had amazing, competent, able, effective leadership from President Lyndon Johnson.

I want to testify tonight that this leadership not only had the support and the help of Members of Congress, and I was very fortunate to be included in that selected group or select group of congressional leaders permitted to meet with our President Kennedy and our President Johnson, but this Senator can testify as witness to the fact that the great programs of education, the programs of immigration legislation, the programs of housing, the programs that relate to our cities, mass transit, the programs of civil rights, the program of the Peace Corps, the programs of health that put America forward, and as John Kennedy said, got America moving again, that those programs had the help and the advice and the counsel and the support and the enthusiastic backing of the man who ought to be the U.S. Senator from New York, Bob Kennedy.

[Applause.]

I say this because I know what happened and when I hear some people say, well, I wonder whether or not Robert Kennedy will help us in housing, or whether or not he played an important role in civil rights, or where was he when the Peace Corps was being designed and passed, I can tell you where he was.

He was in the thick of the fight and he was there.

[Applause.]

So, I come here in New York, at Westchester County, to tell you that there is a team in the field and it is a team that needs your support and I believe it is a team that has earned your support, and it is the team of Johnson, Humphrey, and Kennedy.

[Applause.]

Now, my friends, you know, ordinarily in every presidential election year somebody either wants you to look back at what we have been doing or occasionally somebody says let's look ahead 2 or 3 years.

In this election year, my fellow Americans, it is not enough to look ahead 4 years. Time moves on rapidly.

Last night Mrs. Humphrey and I were privileged to attend a dinner in Washington, D.C., the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial dinner, and tonight when we leave this building [applause] Senator Kennedy, Bob Kennedy, will go to a dinner honoring the memory of Mrs. Roosevelt in the city of New York.

[Applause.]

Last evening Adlai Stevenson reminded us—[applause]—of the fine book or writings of Mrs. Roosevelt, and I wonder how many of the audience recall the title, because the title of that book is the message of this election year, and I think it poses the question and the answer in a few words.

The title of Mrs. Roosevelt's book of writings is "Tomorrow Is Now."

[Applause.]

"Tomorrow Is Now." This is a simple and yet profound way of saying that this world of ours in changing so rapidly, that matters are changing so much both at home and abroad, that if all you are going to do is to stop and think about the problems of today, you have already missed the tomorrows.

You must think ahead. You must plan ahead. You cannot afford the luxury or the extravagance of thinking only of the yesterdays.

Nor can you have the luxury and the extravagance of only praising yourselves for the accomplishments of today.

That is why I say this election is more than looking ahead 4 years because 4 years will go by like that, and in 4 years, whole new worlds can be created and discovered or old worlds destroyed.

What we need to be thinking about is the fact that in this election we will fashion the shape of our society and indeed we may very well fashion the future of the world for decades to come and that is why we need your help.

[Applause.]

Now, if that is true, surely this is no time, my friends, to talk about demolishing that which we have accomplished over some 30 years.

Surely this is no time to ask America to look backward and repeal the yesterdays, and yet what does the leader, what does the temporary spokesman of a fraction of a faction of the Republican Party propose. [Laughter and applause.] Let me ask you to listen to his own words. They are incredible. They are unbelievable. But this is what he said.

[Laughter.] [Applause.]

I take this man at his word even when he changes his word.

[Laughter.] [Applause.]

Listen to the words of the man that says he wants to be President.

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

Here is a man that wouldn't only repeal the 20th century. He wants to go back to the Articles of Confederation. [Applause.]

This gentleman goes further. He says: "My aim is not to pass laws. It is to repeal them." [Laughter.]

And I think that every person in this audience ought to say seriously, what laws?

Well, he has spoken with some doubt about social security. I don't say he wants to repeal it but he is suggesting that he wants to repeal laws.

Minimum wage—he hasn't voted for it. It is entirely probable that he would like to repeal it.

Housing—he says get out of it.

Education—oh, no, none of that. [Laughter.] [Applause.]

Now, my friends, it is having to have a man standing for public office that reminds us of the glories of yesterday, but I would suggest that if he is going to do it, he study history and report accurately. [Applause.]

And may I also say most respectfully to the students that are here, and to those who are of voting age and college students—[applause]—that it is having, my enthusiastic young friends, to study ancient history, but for goodness sakes, don't let your parents vote for it. [Laughter.] [Applause.]

I think it is about time that both candidates for the Presidency clearly understood that the rural life of America has changed and that a metropolitan era is upon us.

Now, one understands that, the man who is President. He knows that America is growing. He knows that America is becoming more and more urbanized. He knows that American cities are becoming more and more industrialized.

But the gentleman from Arizona is still back at the covered wagon staking out homesteads. [Applause.]

The growth of our population, the changes in technology, industry, the change in the economy of our cities, has created a new phenomenon called the urban complex or the supercity, and I believe that it is time that people in public office discuss the problems of cities.

They are here. They are not getting smaller. They are getting bigger. And I have a feeling that they are even going to last longer than Barry Goldwater, so maybe we had better go to work on them. [Applause.]

Robert Kennedy spoke to you of them. He told you of the problems of transportation, of education, of recreation, and all of these problems are here in this great Empire State of New York just as they are in every other major State in the Union.

Our country is growing. And it is going to continue to grow and it is growing younger, not older. The percentage of population under age 25 increases every year.

The need for new home units increases. The need for recreation, the need for educational facilities and teachers, every one of these great needs expand and increase, and these are not just the problems of Westchester.

Even in this great community, known for its wealth, known for its cultural attainment, even here you have problems of poverty, problems of low income, and these problems are a part of the great modern America, and we need people who seek public office that at least are aware of the problem and then once they have an awareness of it, start to propose solutions to the problems.

But what are we getting? We are getting lectures on the moral tone of America.

I wonder if the spokesman of the new Goldwater morality has ever thought that morality also includes being concerned about the poor, being concerned about the unfortunate, being concerned about the ill clad, the ill housed, and the sick.

I wonder if we have forgotten that we have some social and moral obligation to the illiterate, to the hungry, to the naked, to the sick, to the blind. I hope we haven't. [Applause.]

These problems remain with us and everyone of these problems offers a challenge and everyone of these challenges offers an opportunity, and this is why there are literally thousands of our young men and women studying in the great universities to equip themselves to meet these problems, studying nursing, medicine, engineering, studying to be a doctor, studying to be a social worker, studying to be an architect, or a city planner, and I think we need from people who seek the highest office of this land an expression of their concern and their interest in those who seek to come to grips with the problems of tomorrow because tomorrow is now. [Applause.]

I am happy to say that those of us on this platform speaking for the Democratic Party tonight and those, by the way, in this audience who have put their country above party, and there are many, that we can point to a record.

President Kennedy, when he spoke to the Nation on January 20, 1961, asked this Nation to begin, to begin to do things for people, to begin social progress, to begin to expand our economy, to begin to pursue peace, and the beginnings were made.

And those beginnings were not just words. They were programs, programs that have been mentioned from this platform tonight, programs with which Hubert Humphrey and Bob Kennedy had something to do and helped do it. [Applause.]

We did pass a program for mass transportation, for open spaces in urban areas, in suburban areas, for low rent public housing, for increased Federal assistance for local planning, for expanded housing for the elderly and for our college students in their dormitories, for increased housing starts, for middle income, and comprehensive Economic Opportunity Act to strike body blows at the poverty areas of America.

That is a record of accomplishment. [Applause.]

And now what is the record of the voice of the past? Let's take a look.

The man who says follow me—right back into the 19th century—what is his record?

He voted against mass transportation; against the open spaces, against the housing, against the urban renewal programs, against housing for the elderly, against the Economic Opportunity Act.

You name it.

And I can assure you of one thing, that if you are a betting person, if you will bet he voted no, you will win 99 times out of a hundred. [Applause.]

But my friends of the eastern seaboard, don't be too upset. You shouldn't have even been surprised, if you were, because this is the gentleman who said when interviewed about this attitude toward this great section of America, this great section of pioneer America, early America, here is what he said:

> Sometimes I think this country would be better off if we could just saw off the eastern seaboard and let it float out to sea.

[Laughter.]

These are the words of a man that asks you to vote for him for President, the Senator from Arizona.

What an easy way to solve problems—just saw it off. [Laughter.] [Applause.]

But may I suggest that the party that has been at sea and apparently is lost without a compass or any sense of navigation is the man that made the statement that I just quoted. [Applause.]

Now a word about the subject of education which has been discussed here this evening.

Imagine, my friends, placing the trust of this country, the responsibility of this country, in the hands of an individual who says—

> The government has no right to educate children and the child has no right to an education. In most cases the children would get along very well without it.

What kind of an attitude is this? Are these the words of a person you want to be your President?

[Chorus of "No" from audience.]

Well, thank goodness I'm talking to educated people.

But might I add that this response is not just what you would expect from a Democratic audience. It is the response that you would receive from any responsible citizen because Senator Goldwater's attitude that I have read, not paraphrased but read word for word, these attitudes repudiate a Republican tradition in the field of education which has gone back to the Land-Grant Act of 1862.

I think that had Senator Goldwater been in the Senate in 1862, I mean physically—he has been there somewhat psychologically. [Applause.] [Laughter.]

I really believe that the Senator would have probably denounced Abraham Lincoln as a Socialist. [Applause.]

It is an interesting exercise in the study of a political record to take a note of how close Senator Goldwater adheres to the traditional Republican line.

I have analyzed 25 votes on 25 specific issues of the Republican platform of 1960. That was the platform that was an authentic conservative Republican platform. It was the platform that came of an administration that had to deal with the tough problems of the turbulent postwar years. Eight years of administrative responsibility.

That 1960 platform therefore stands up as a reasonable, responsible, conservative Republican document.

Now, what is the record of Mr. Goldwater relating to that. And maybe this tells us why one out of every three registered Republicans says today that he is going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

On 25 Republican platform commitments, 25 times they were brought up in the Senate and Mr. Goldwater has a remarkable batting average. Twenty-five times he fanned out. Twenty-five times he voted no.

Now, there were others in the Senate of Republican persuasion, like Senator Dirksen, the leader, Senator Kuchel, the whip, Senator Saltonstall, the conference chairman, Senator Hickenlooper, the policy committee chairman, elected Republican leaders.

Senator Kuchel voted 25 times for the platform. Of course, Mr. Goldwater dismisses him as an extremist. [Laughter.]

Senator Saltonstall voted 20 times. He is dismissed as an easterner.

How about those two from the Midwest? Senator Dirksen—you can't call him an easterner and you surely wouldn't call him an extremist. I would say that he is a rather responsible conservative.

Senator Dirksen voted for his party platform 18 times, 7 times against it.

Senator Hickenlooper voted 17 times for his party platform and 8 times against it.

At least these men had better than a two-thirds voting record for their party. They are Republicans.

But Mr. Goldwater voted 25 times against the commitments of his own party on 25 major issues. [Applause.]

So we come to but one conclusion. Senator Goldwater is surely not a Democrat. [Laughter.]

Senator Goldwater, having repudiated his own party 25 times on 25 platforms, surely is not a Republican. He can only live under one label. He is a radical, a Goldwater radical. [Applause.]

And Goldwater radicalism is not responsible Republicanism, and therefore we see today why some of the leading figures of the Republican Party either hide out when Mr. Goldwater comes to town [laughter] or they sign up and say they are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

My friends, lest I seem to be too personal, let me make it crystal clear that I think Mr. Goldwater is a patriot. I think that he is a fine gentleman. I think that he would make a good neighbor, but I don't want him for our President. [Applause.]

What America needs and what America has and what America can continue to have is a President that looks to the future, a President that is equipped by background, training, and experience for the job of leadership, a President that unites our country rather than divides it, a President that lifts the hopes of our people rather than darkens them, a President that asks us to do better rather than scolding us for having done so badly, a President, if you please, that calls from us the very best that is in us rather than chastising us as if somehow or other we are unruly children.

I submit to you that you have that President and you have a President that asks you to work with him to plan the future.

You have a President that is responsible in the defense of this country and in the conduct of foreign policy.

You have a President that understands that today is the beginning of tomorrow and that tomorrow is now, and I suggest that you take that President to your hearts.

I suggest that you do for him what you did, so many of you, for John Kennedy, that you back him with your hands and your hearts and that you elect him President of the United States on November 3.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Article

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

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, SMITH COLLEGE, NORTHAMPTON, MASS., OCTOBER 13, 1964

As a spokesman for the politics of hope—and an admitted optimist—I would like today to put to you an important proposition about the contemporary American life. I submit that *choice* is the foundation of freedom, and that never in our history has the individual American had the range of choices and the capacity to choose, that he has today.

Every presidential election confronts us anew with the cogency of Alexander Hamilton's opening sentence in the *Federalist* papers:

"It seems to have been reserved for the people of this country," said Hamilton, "by their conduct and example, to decide the important question: whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their constitutions on accident and chance."

The founders of the Republic considered Americans to be a chosen people because they were a people capable of choice, a people who could voluntarily assume the burden of liberating human potentialities. To them, to be an American was to accept a moral vocation—a life of choice.

I am not talking about choice as an abstraction—the choice which Anatole France derided when he noted that "rich and poor have an equal right to beg in the streets and sleep under bridges." I am talking about specific, concrete alternatives that have always confronted Americans—and that confront young Americans in 1964.

Let me be specific. In 1900, 4 young Americans in every 100 between the ages of 18 and 21 attended college. In 1920 this figure rose to 8; in 1940 to 14—and in 1961 it was over 32. Now in 1900, rich and poor alike, if adequately qualified by the standards of that time, had the right to attend college. But how much real choice did a poor boy, or worse, a poor girl have, no matter how talented?

These are bloodless, formless statistics, but I want you to try to understand their human meaning. The function of an education is, indeed, to make vicarious learning possible, to enable you to flesh out dry historical abstractions, to visualize and internalize the hopes and sufferings of others. Remember that the opportunities, the choices, that you fail to appreciate could be your own.

Put simply, in 1900 seven-eighths of you would not be here listening to me, seven-eighths of you would not have the choice of attending this university, seven-eighths of you could not look forward to the opportunities that are open to university graduates.

These opportunities are not merely materialistic. True, your standard of living will profit from higher education—and this is not to be sneered at—but above and beyond living standards you will benefit from your ability to pursue excellence in all its forms.

Hopefully, your education has opened before your eyes the vistas of spiritual enrichment to be found in Western, and other cultures.

Hopefully, you will find the time—as millions of Americans do—to continue your education so that the old ideal of graduation as a "commencement" will be realized in your lives and in your children's lives.

Hopefully, the use to which you put your talents and your opportunities will belie the Communist accusation that the American is a demoralized, atomized materialist, lost in a lonely crowd of conformist status seekers.

And it is my earnest conviction that young people privileged to receive a fine college education bear obligation to return to their communities and participate actively in bettering the society and the Nation which is America. Education can never be just receiving; to be truly meaningful, education must also involve giving—of one's knowledge, talents, abilities, faith, and compassion.

We must never forget the obligation which each privileged person bears to those who are less privileged—the obligation to use his knowledge and ability in a manner which perfects and humanizes the society of which he is a part.

And what of this society? What is our vision and our dedication? To a degree unknown to our ancestors, the acts of choice before us have a range which can be exhilarating—or terrifying. The word "leisure" comes from the Greek word for school, because in ancient times only those who entered the academy had leisure, time to think, time to create, time to pursue excellence.

Are we prepared to face the crisis of universal leisure? A whole society, for the first time in human history, can "go to school," can move beyond the drudgery of extracting an existence from nature to the exercise of dominion over nature. We can ask realistically what kind of an environment do we want to create for ourselves and our posterity. But are we prepared to shift from a preoccupation with quantitative standards to the quest for quality? Are we prepared to infuse the life of our society with the idea of excellence?

Some are willing. But others are not. Some face the future joyously. Others quiver at the prospect of change and desperately attach themselves to the slogans of the past. Some are stimulated by the great challenges that face us. Others, living in self-imposed mental exile from modern life, picture the typical American as old, tried, bitter, and defeated.

This is the real issue in this campaign. The whole Goldwater attack is built around the policies of desperation.

At a time when we have never been stronger, and the Communist world system is coming apart at the seams, the Goldwaterites see us sliding down the slope to defeat.

At a time when we have reached a breakthrough in the struggle against our ancient curse of race prejudice, they talk of nothing but race riots and street violence.

At a time when we are reaching forward to eliminate poverty, the despair of old age, disease, and poor education, they say we are becoming a nation of slaves.

At a time when human survival depends upon the exercise of restrained, responsible power, they encourage nuclear adventurism and shooting from the hip.

In every area of foreign and domestic policy, the Goldwater faction cultivates catastrophe.

Around every pronouncement of the Goldwater faction, there is an atmosphere of defeatism, of negativism, of distrust in government, of our elected officials, in our judges, in the people themselves.

In short, the free spirit which invigorates American life and provides the environment for our great accomplishments does not exist for the Goldwater faction—they live in the conspiratorial police state of their own imaginations.

No one who has spent as much time as I have working on the fundamental legislative issues of our time can say we Americans have achieved Utopia. But, if one leaves the somber nightmare world of the Goldwaterites, there is no question we have made immense progress. We have made progress toward the establishment of a free community in which human beings can dedicate themselves not merely to the pursuit of a living wage and decent living conditions, but also to the pursuit of excellence.

I would like you to compare the American as seen by Goldwater with the realities of your own lives, and the realities of our national life. When you do, you will realize that yours is the generation of hope, the generation of fulfillment.

In his historic inaugural address, President Kennedy spoke to the youth of the Nation and the world when he said, "I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation."

Despite the senseless act which ended his days amongst us, his spirit today echoes this gallant challenge to the past, and to the future. Let us continue in that dedication with President Johnson toward the achievement of the "Great Society."

This vision calls upon all of us to repudiate the politics of despair and move forward under the banner of hope to the great creative task of building an America worthy of our dreams.

Northampton, Mass.
Smith College
October 13, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Governor Bellotti, Governor Peabody, my good friends of these many campuses that are represented here but, of course, on the campus here in the environment of the great Smith College. I know that I have just come into one of the greatest educational areas of America and lest I forget, may I just say that a few months ago it was my privilege to deliver the commencement address at a neighboring college, university, the University of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

I consider it a rare honor and a high privilege today and I am pleased to see students from Mount Holyoke, from Amherst, the University of Massachusetts, and Smith College. And I am also pleased to see that somebody thinks I have got a good middle name, Horatio. [Applause.]

It makes me so happy.

As a matter of fact, I have considered my secret weapon in this campaign to organize all the folks in America that got stuck with middle names they didn't like. And if that were the case, the opposition wouldn't have a chance, and they really don't anyhow. [Applause.]

Well, I heard a dying gasp over there. [Laughter.] I just can't tell you how pleased I am to see once again those that have been walking in the paths of political transgression and sin to come and repent and join with us. [Applause, laughter.]

I know that if this campaign can last long enough, we will be able to save most of those souls. [Laughter.]

Today I want to take the opportunity of speaking to young Americans not about the yesterdays, even though an accurate portrayal of the history of yesterdays would be a refreshing matter in this campaign. I think that if one is going to study history, he ought to at least get a passing grade before he talks about it. [Laughter.]

But I prefer to speak to you about the politics of the future, the politics of hope, and the pursuit of excellence, because when one addresses a college audience, those that are so closely associated with the college or university environment, it gives a beautiful opportunity for the expression of thought, conviction, not about the mistakes of yesterday or even the achievements but rather the promises of tomorrow.

I am happy to share a platform with able, aggressive, intelligent, enlightened young leaders of American democracy. I am happy to be associated here on this plaform with two of my good friends in public life, the Governor of this great Commonwealth, Governor Peabody—[applause]—and the gentleman that will succeed him, the Lieutenant Governor, soon to be Governor of the State of Massachusetts, Governor Bellotti. [Applause.]

I am also very happy to come to the State that has given to the United States of America so many illustrious leaders. The most recent of those great leaders, of course, has been taken from us, and I don't mention his name to appeal to your sentiment. I only say that a State that can produce leadership of the quality of John Kennedy is a State that has given much not only to America but to the whole world. And I am pleased to be here in the State of the younger member of that family, he young man that I first met at the University of Virginia when he was studying in the law school of that great university, the law school of Thomas Jefferson. I refer to Senator Edward Kennedy, Ted Kennedy, who is one of my close friends. [Applause.]

I happen to believe that this young man will have one of the greatest futures of any man in American public life and I look forward to that great day.

Also, I share the friendship and enjoy the precious gift of this friendship of Eddie Boland, Congressman, and I just want to say a word about him. He is a fine man, working hard for our ticket, giving of himself unselfishly.

Now, I said I wanted to talk to you about the future. I do this because it seems to me that in this campaign period, we ought to have more than just heat, more than just an appeal to prejudice or emotion. We ought to also have some light; we also ought to make it an educational experience.

I have heard from the public platform again and again that we are losing our freedoms, that this country is in mortal danger of tyranny. I have even heard it said by a spokesman for a faction of a political party, I have heard it said that Washington, D.C., your Federal Government in Washington is a greater menace to freedom than Moscow. I must say that I consider that an insult to the United States of America. [Applause.]

Any person thinking objectively, any person that makes an honest evaluation of this great Republic, of its Government with any of its limitations, knows deep down in his heart that that statement is not true. [Applause.]

Every once in a while I hear somebody holler out, "Yea, Barry." I never know whether they mean "Straw Barry" or "Razz Barry." [Applause, laughter.] It wouldn't make much difference. They will both be out of season in November. [Laughter.]

Now, may I say that political leadership worthy of the respect of a young nation, of intelligent people, is a leadership that does look to the tomorrows.

Eleanor Roosevelt, in her final writings before her departure from this earth, Eleanor Roosevelt wrote a book entitled "Tomorrow Is Now." And anyone that doesn't comprehend the meaning of that phrase is really in the 19th century and not in the 20th because this life that we live moves rapidly.

The world in which we live changes quickly. The changes resulting from science and technology, the changes resulting from the breakup of the power structure of the Old World, those changes are made and pass like a fleeting moment, and anyone that doesn't think ahead has already lost the todays. And it doesn't do enough even to think ahead, may I say, just a few months or a few years.

I said to a good audience last evening at Westchester County, N.Y.—[applause]—I am glad you are a great crowd—I said to that audience that this election of 1964 will not only determine the next 4 years but what really happens in the next 4 years may determine the balance of this century, because we are at a point where things are moving rapidly, where there are great developments among the nations of the world, where there are tremendous scientific breakthroughs, where the possibilities of even scientific exploration into other planets are within our grasp.

So we have to think ahead.

That is why I talk to you about the politics of hope, the politics of the future. That is why I say that today you have more choices, more opportunities as American citizens and particularly as young people than ever before in the life of this Nation.

The fact that we have great universities which open their gates to thousands and thousands, yes, millions of people, indicates that freedom not only lives but freedom is strong and it is vital, it is vigorous, and the nonsensical talk about the loss of our freedom comes from sick and distorted minds. [Applause.]

I think that it would be well for us just a moment, since I am a bit of a refugee from the classroom, once having been a teacher and professor of political science, to just mention a word or two from the Federalist Papers of Alexander Hamilton. Now I picked Alexander Hamilton because here again he is considered to be at least the spiritual and the philosophical father of the Republican Party. However, may I say that Alexander Hamilton would not be able to understand the present temporary spokesman of the Republican Party.

Alexander Hamilton said in the opening sentence of the Federalist Papers:

> It seems to have been reserved for the people of this country by their conduct and example, to decide the important question: whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflexion and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their constitutions on accident and chance.

The Founders of this Republic considered Americans to be a chosen people. They considered them to be people capable of making a choice, and a people who would voluntarily assume the burden of liberating human potentialities. In other words, to be an American, then as now, was to accept a moral vocation, a life of choice.

Now, I am not talking about choices in abstraction. You have heard plenty of abstract theory. I want to talk about choices of reality. Nor am I talking about the choice which Anatole France derided when he noted that the "rich and the poor have equal right to beg in the streets and sleep under the bridges."

I am talking about choice in terms of specific concrete programs and alternatives that have always confronted Americans and that confront you now in 1964.

Now, let me be specific. In 1900, 4 young Americans out of every 100 between the ages of 18 and 21 attended college. In 1920 this figure rose to eight. In 1940, to 14. In 1961, to 32. Presently in 1964 it is 35.

Now, in 1900, the rich and the poor alike all had supposedly the opportunity to attend college. That is, if they qualified for the standards, they had the right to attend it. But I ask you how much real choice did they have? How much real choice did a poor boy or more so a poor girl have, no matter how talented? The fact of the matter is there wasn't any choice and people were condemned to a life of less than enlightenment. People were condemned to work long hours. People knew little of what we call the concept of leisure.

Now, these figures that I have given to you, they are bloodless, formal statistics but they have some human meaning. The function of education after all is to make vicarious learning possible, to enable you to put some flesh upon the dry historical bones, to visualize and eternalize the hopes and sufferings of others. I think that you are to remember that the choices that you fail to appreciate now could be your very own.

To simply put it, in 1900, seven-eighths of you who are here would not have been listening to any speaker. Seven-eighths of you would not have had the choice of attending a university or college. Seven-eighths of you could not look forward to the opportunities that are open to the university graduate.

Now, these opportunities are not merely materialistic. It doesn't mean just a better living even though that is surely worthy of our consideration. I talk about the opportunities to pursue excellence in all of its forms. You have an opportunity and you have a privilege just as this great Nation does and anybody that has been given the privilege today of an education, a college education, also has responsibilities.

I can forgive some people who have never had a break in life, who have never known what it was to be able to feast upon the cultural heritage of our civilization. I can forgive these people for bigoted attitudes, for prejudiced minds. I can forgive them even for their selfishness. I can forgive them for even their backwardness because they never had an opportunity to know better.

But let me say to those who have been privileged to drink at the fountain of learning, those who have been privileged to feast at the table of Western culture, those who have been privileged to be in the classrooms of great professors, and to read in the libraries; in other words, to enjoy a higher education, those people have an obligation to a country, to a society, and to a world, and that obligation is one to make it a better world, to give of yourself, to share of yourself in making this the kind of a world in which humanity can realize its potentialities for good and for service. [Applause.]

And I must say that it is shocking to me when spokesmen for a political party or any other group who have been privileged, who have been able to live the good life, can stand before their fellow Americans, many of whom have not had these privileges, and say to them that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, has no responsibilities. And that is what we are being told.

When a candidate for the office of President can say that Government has no responsibility to the youth of America for education, when he can say that it might be better if some people weren't educated, I say that he has disqualified himself for public leadership [Applause.]

Anyone running for public office who can say openly that he considers it his duty not to pass laws but to repeal them, then I say that he understands little or nothing about the processes of American Government or the responsibilities of American Government.

But I say with even more emphasis that when a man that seeks the highest office within the gift of the people of the United States can ignore the mandate of the Constitution, and there are but two mandates in the Constitution, to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare, and when he can ignore the mandate, the directive of the Constitution, to promote the general welfare and in fact heap ridicule upon the concept of promoting the general welfare, I say that he has disqualified himself for the highest office of President of the United States. [Applause.]

And then there is the whole matter of one's philosophy of government. I wonder why it is that some in this day and age of the second half of the 20th century, living in a Nation blessed with unbelievable prosperity, living in a Nation blessed with what we call the good things of life, living in a Nation that has the privilege of being a world power and a world leader, I wonder how it is that they can be so negative, so defeatist, so full of concern and scorn, so full of being sick and tired of this and sick and tired of that rather than reaching out and welcoming the future and coming to grips with the problems that beset us and turning those problems into real opportunities for public service.

This Nation, like students in a college, is blessed, and this Nation needs to turn itself not only to the pursuit of the good things of life but also to the pursuit of excellence in everything we do, with leaders that inspire us to do better, that call upon us to do our best, that will not settle for mediocrity. And when I hear candidates for public office who fail to realize the age in which we live and the amazing achievements of it, it bothers me, and I come to young people to talk to them about it.

I think the real issue in this campaign is the issue of whether or not we are going to have leadership that senses there is a future for America and reaches out to grasp it and to welcome it, or leadership that has repudiated the present, ignores the future, and gives a distorted representation of the past. I think that we can talk about these matters in concrete terms. At a time when we have never been stronger, and at a time when the so-called monolithic communism is coming apart at the seams, the Goldwaterites see us sliding down the slope to defeat and tell the world so.

Now, this is not only a distortion of fact, it is a disservice to the United States of America in its role of world leadership.

At a time when we made a breakthrough for the struggle against our ancient curse of race prejudice, I think we have a right to expect from a man who seeks the high office of President that he will encourage people to observe the law, that he will encourage respect for the law rather than just talking about riots in the streets. [Applause.]

And surely, my friends, one who says he is the representative and the leader of the party of Lincoln has a responsibility to make sure that Lincoln's promise of emancipation which was translated into the fulfillment of an emancipation by the Civil Rights Act, that that promise and fulfillment will receive his wholehearted support. Instead of that, what does he say? He says that law breeds hate and violence and he encourages people by indirection to have little or no respect for the law.

I cannot tolerate that kind of leadership nor can you. [Applause.]

And at a time when we are reaching forward to eliminate poverty—I know that poverty is not new. What is new is that we have the means to do something about it. And at a time when we are seeking to eliminate it, at a time when we are seeking to eliminate the despair of old age, at a time when we are seeking to strike mighty blows against disease and poor education, we are being told that we are a nation of slaves and we are being told that a government that seeks to help education, that a government that pours through the people's contributions, millions of dollars into research for better medicine, that a government that is willing to see the pockets of poverty and sense the injustice of this, we are being told that that government is a menace and a greater menace to freedom than Communist Moscow itself.

I say this is beneath almost human comprehension. It is incredible and it ought to be repudiated by young people. [Applause.]

May I say that at a time when the world longs for peace, because every responsible person in the world knows that in this age we have created the means of total destruction, that man has been able to unleash mighty power, power for evil, power for death, unless he disciplines himself, unless he can control that power, and at a time that the nations of the world, fearful of what could happen with continued nuclear testing, fearful of the contamination of the atmosphere, fearful of radioactive debris, concerned lest future generations may be adversely affected, and a great President takes the lead and calls upon the humane and decent people of America and of the world to join with him in trying to find a way out, a way of curbing this madness, an arms race, if you please, that could destroy us instead of save us, and we negotiated a treaty and this treaty was signed by over 100 nations, and the late and beloved President Kennedy in that memorable address at American University on June 10, 1963, broke the Iron Curtain.

He broke the stalemate of the cold war. He led America on as a great conqueror for peace. And out of that great speech came the hope of sanity, came the hope of reason, came the hope of peace, and out of it came a nuclear test ban treaty, a treaty that was supported overwhelmingly by the American people, a treaty that had four-fifths of the U.S. Senate in support of it: a treaty, if you please, that the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate said that he was ratifying because he didn't want it written on his tombstone that he was given this chance and that he failed to take it.

And yet when that treaty, that little flickering hope of peace was before the Senate of the United States this man who today says he speaks for a moral America, this man who talks of morality, cast his vote not for morality. He cast his vote for death. He cast his vote for trouble. He cast his vote, my friends, for war if war should come. [Applause.]

Now, I say to you that a man that can turn his back upon one of the great advances for peace, that a man that can turn his back upon civil rights, that a man that can ignore the needs of education, that a man that can ignore the needs of people who have been trying for better than a century to become full-fledged Americans in full citizenship, that a man that can ignore the needs of people, poor people, people because of their color who have been discriminated against, a man that can ignore the needs of humanity that seeks a peace, that man is not the man that ought to be President of the United States. [Applause.]

I shall leave you shortly, but before we leave, may I say this: that I occasionally hear one of these voices of despair [laughter] one of these voices of retreat. There are those voices in America now as there were in the days of our fight for independence. There have always been those voices.

The question is whether those voices will prevail, whether the voices of darkness, the voices of retreat will prevail or whether or not the voices of freedom and of light and of progress will prevail. And I think I know which voices you want. Freedom and progress.

Around every pronouncement of the Goldwater faction there is this atmosphere of defeatism, of negativism, of distrust in government, in our judges, and in people themselves; in short, the free spirit which has invigorated American life and now invigorates it and provides the environment for our great accomplishments does not exist in the minds of this Goldwater faction.

They live in the conspiratorial police state of their own twisted imaginations. [Applause.]

And that police state is just as corrupt and just as immoral as the police state of the police themselves. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, I ask you do you want a political leader that thinks in terms of programs? Do you want one that gives you inspiration? Do you want one that forwards a Peace Corps? Do you want one that forwards the hope of peace?

I think you do. I am sure you do not want one that offers no program and we have yet to hear one item of program in this campaign from the opposition. [Applause.]

I think we do not want a political leader that offers no inspiration. I do not imagine that we want a political leader that could call the Peace Corps nothing but a haven for beatniks. [Laughter and applause.] And these are the phrases of one who says today "Follow me."

My dear friends, to follow him is to retreat over the precipice of disaster.

But I submit to you that to stand up and to think of your country, to think of its future, and to give your trust and faith to a team that believes in the future and to a President that is qualified by experience, by background, by knowledge, a President who has the trust of the people, a President who is responsible in the exercise of his authority and of his power, that is the path for thoughtful Americans to follow, and I come to you today to tell you that on that path is the leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, I think we have just a very few minutes, and I don't ever believe that you ought to come to an enlightened and intelligent audience like this without throwing it open to questions which gives the opposition a chance to be heard and also gives a chance to learn.

Anybody wish to ask a question?

(No response.)

Well, maybe I will read a telegram, then. I have a telegram that says:

> Welcome to Massachusetts. I am sure that the warmth of your reception, the reception you will receive today, will only be surpassed by the size of your vote on November 3d. Senator Edward M. Kennedy. [Applause.]

I believe that there seem to be no questions. So may I——

QUESTION. How about Lyndon Johnson's voting record before the became President on civil rights?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I am just simply delighted that the gentleman asked the question because it gives me an opportunity to say that Lyndon Johnson—would you give that man a cough drop. His throat is getting dry. [Laughter.]

I will send my man out for cough drops.

Lyndon Johnson's record on civil rights, Lyndon Johnson, majority leader of the U.S. Senate in 1957 under Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, Republican, Lyndon Johnson as majority leader with the votes to defeat Republican programs didn't make opposition his creed. He had as his creed responsibility and he taught us responsibility. And we acted responsibly.

We didn't spend our time snarling like sort of emaciated tigers. We spent our time working.

Lyndon Johnson was the floor leader, the majority leader for the passage of the first civil rights act since the Civil War in 1957. [Applause.]

And may I go a little further. Lyndon Johnson in 1960, majority leader of the U.S. Senate under Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, Republican administration, Lyndon Johnson was again the floor leader and successfully passed the second civil rights act since the time of the Civil War. [Applause.]

And Lyndon Johnson, Vice President of the United States, leading the fight for civil rights, Lyndon Johnson of the United States signing the most comprehensive civil rights bill in our history. [Applause.]

QUESTION. What about Lyndon Johnson in the late 1940's? He voted against every one.

Senator HUMPHREY. Poor fellow. You know, the trouble is, my friends, you see, some people feel that a man has no right to mature and to grow. And the reason they feel that way, they occasionally get attached to a leader that demonstrates just that weakness. [Applause.]

No, Lyndon Johnson's record in the Congress of the United States is one that any good American can be justly proud of, and I say that his record today as President of the United States is one that has commanded the respect of Republicans and Democrats alike. We love it. He is going to be reelected and we are going to give him a chance to even make a better record.

Thank you.

One of the reasons that I was selected as the candidate for Vice President is that I was the one candidate that had more experience being vice president than any other one. Here is the president of the Humphrey house. [Introducing Mrs. Humphrey.] [Applause.]

October 13, 1964
South Hadley, Mass.,
Mount Holyoke College,

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. You have convinced me. [Applause.]

Dr. Catrell, members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke and members of this fine, wonderful, enthusiastic, enlightened student body [applause] yes, that includes you, too, my dear. You know, I am so happy to see these smiling young ladies that carry the banner of the opposition because whenever I see one smile I know deep down in their hearts they want to vote for Lyndon Johnson.

I am very pleased to share this platform with the Governor of your great State, Governor Peabody. [Applause.] And may I say I am very honored also to be here with the president of your student body, Miss Barbara Price, who served in Washington in the Peace Corps. Am I correctly informed that this community is the home city of the President of the State Senate of Massachusetts, Mr. Donaghue, Governor, is that correct? [Applause.]

Well, I knew he wasn't a graduate of Mount Holyoke, even though may I say I would like to enroll here. [Applause.]

When your illustrious professor in the field of government takes a—[applause]—they came over and lassoed me. There is a neighboring school here that—listen, they were really very nice. They asked me to bring you their fondest regards. Now I have done it. [Laughter.]

Well, what can I talk to you about in just these very few moments except to first of all thank you so much for your enthusiastic welcome and for the song and for the cheers and also thank you for thinking that Horatio is a very good name.

I think that is simply wonderful because I wasn't sure of it. I think I owe Senator Goldwater many things. He has done so much for me. He gave me a chance to travel around the country, popularize my name, and by the way, I want to make it quite clear I think that Senator Goldwater is to me really a fine man. I think he would make a wonderful neighbor. I just don't want him for President. [Applause.]

Let me say that I notice the sign over here that says something about modern Republicans for Johnson and Humphrey, and I am very grateful for that because one of the great factors in this election is the number of people of Republican persuasion that are going to vote this time, maybe for the first time, for a Democratic candidate. [Applause.]

When you can get the Saturday Evening Post that hasn't endorsed Democrats since 1787—they didn't have any then—and the New York Herald Tribune and a few others of that vintage and of that thinking and the Life magazine and others to come out and support a President on the Democratic ticket, there must be something to that man and there must be some reason that they are doing this. They are not on the payroll of the Democratic National Committee, and they are not under any partisan pressure.

Publishers and educators and editorial staffs of these great magazines have maybe analyzed the record. I think they have. I don't think it was easy for them, very frankly, to make this decision. It ran against tradition, it ran against their long term commitments, and it surely ran against many of their backers and supporters.

But one thing that makes one proud of his country is that in moments of crisis, people put their country above their party, and I happen to believe this is a moment of crisis.

I happen to believe that this election will not only affect the next 2 or 3 years, but it may very well affect the balance of this century.

I also want to make it quite clear that I do not consider the spokesman of the Republican Party, and he is not the spokesman of the whole party [applause] I do not consider this man to be a bad man. We can have our disagreements politically. We don't have to get personal about it, and I don't intend to. I know his family, I know him. I have served in the Senate with him. He has many very fine admirable qualities but I want to say quite frankly what does disturb me is the kind of support, the kind of militant support that comes from some areas.

I say this most thoughtfully, and I almost hesitate to say it lest I be misunderstood, but when I see some of the most rabid voices in America, when I see people who follow the line of Ku Klux, when I see people who follow the line of Christian Frontiers, when I see people who follow the line of the John Birchers, all out there vigorously day in and day out fanatically supporting the candidate and the candidacy of the Republican candidate, it bothers me.

I don't say that he enlisted that support. I don't want to have to be on this record. I don't say he asked for it. I simply say he hasn't repudiated it. And I simply say that it is there, and it bothers me.

I do not want the voices of hate and bigotry and intolerance in America to have a respectable platform. I don't want it. [Applause.]

Very frankly, I think this is why many of the traditional Republicans have left their candidate and their party. They have done it with sadness at heart. They are maybe not fully happy with the Democratic candidate but they have to make a choice and we have to make choices in elections. That is what they are about, to make choices. And you are going to influence people in making that choice.

Some of you are going to make that choice. And you are going to influence your parents and are going to influence the people in your community, in your circle of friends, and when you do make that choice or influence, you have a heavy responsibility.

I notice that in 1960 the Republican platform of that year reflected the 8 years of responsibility of the Republican leadership in the executive branch of Government. When Dwight Eisenhower became President and those who were associated with him served in the executive branch, took on the responsibilities of governing this Nation, they had to come to grips with the realities of the Nation, not with myth ology, not with fiction, but they had to deal with the problems that beset the world. And the Republican platform of 1960 was an authentic Republican platform.

Now, frankly it was maybe more conservative than Hubert Humphrey would have liked. I think that is fact. But I want to make it quite clear it was an authentic conservative Republican platform that was built upon and predicated upon the experiences of Dwight Eisenhower and his Cabinet and the Republican administration and that platform made 25 specific commitments to the American people, and 25 specific commitments were brought up on the basis of votes in the Senate of the United States, every one of them, and of those 25 commitments in the Republican platform, the leaders of the Republican Party had an opportunity to vote them in the Senate of the United States; the leader of the Republican Party, Senator Everett Dirksen—now, he is a middle-of-the-roader, I would say a rather conservative man but he is a fullfledged Republican. His whip is Senator Kuchel of California, I think one of the most gifted Congressmen the Republicans have. Your own Senator Saltonstall, conference chairman. And I want to make it crystal clear that both Mrs. Humphrey and myself not only look on Senator Saltonstall as a friend, we admire him. I don't expect him to vote for the Democrats. I don't expect him to say a kind word in a campaign. Yet I admire his courage, his intellect, his integrity.

And then there is Senator Hickenlooper of Iowa who is the chairman of the Republican policy committee. This is another middle-of-the-road conservative, you might say Republican, authentic Republican, a man that served for years in the Senate on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Now, what is the record? What is the record on 25 issues?

On 25 issues, Senator Kuchel voted 25 times to support his platform. Now, remember, he was elected by the Republicans of the Senate to be their whip, just as I was elected by the Democrats in the Senate to be the Democratic whip. Twenty-five times Senator Kuchel voted yes.

Twenty times Senator—21, I believe it was, Senator Saltonstall voted yes, Now, of course, Mr. Goldwater displeases Mr. Kuchel as an extremist and he says so. [Laughter.] And he had something to say about easterners in general. He said that the eastern seaboard might be better off if we just sawed it off and let it float to sea.

Yes, it sounds ridiculous, I know, incredible, but it was actually said; I hope it was said in jest. [Laughter.]

But might I add that Senator Saltonstall voted, let's say, 20 times to be on the conservative side, for the Republican platform. Senator Dirksen, the leader, voted 18 times. Senator Hickenlooped, the policy committee chairman, voted 17 times for the 1960 Republican commitments, 25 of them in the platform.

Senator Goldwater voted 25 times no—25 times no.

Now, why do I tell you this? Because I think people have a right to ask why is it that the New York Herald Tribune, why is it that the Saturday Evening Post, why is it that the Luce publications Life and Time, why is it these traditional Republican publications are supporting Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States? Why is it that they have left the standard bearer of their party?

And may I say they haven't left their party. The man that left the party is the man who temporarily is the spokesman of the party. [Applause.]

Quite frankly I expect that in another election they will be right back where they ordinarily were, supporting the Republican candidate if that Republican candidate is a candidate of responsibility, if he is a candidate that hasn't repudiated our bipartisan foreign policy, if he is a candidate in the tradition of a conservative candidate, because it is the view of this Senator, and I speak now to an enlightened college audience and I am not here to arouse your emotions about it, it is my view that Senator Goldwater does not fall within the path of the Republican Party just as Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania said, and he said it again and again and again. He said he is not in the mainstream of Republican tradition.

And I might add he is not in the mainstream of the tradition of the national consensus of this great Republic on programs of welfare, of education, on programs of community development and even a knowledge of our Government.

This Government of the United States, my fellow Americans, is a government not only in Washington but at the State level, the county level, and the local level. It is a government in cooperation, a government that is synthesized, a government that must harmonize its activities.

The standard bearer of the Republican Party in this election doesn't seem to sense that. I cannot really be very happy about a person that says that the Government of the United States in Washington is a greater threat to our freedom than Moscow. I don't believe that. [Applause.]

The Government in Washington may have its limitations and weaknesses and it does. Neither political party has a monopoly on virtue or wisdom. I think we ought to understand that before we start.

I don't know any candidate that qualified for sainthood. I am not running on that ticket. [Laughter.]

And I don't know anybody else that is, even if some of them pretend they are. [Laughter and applause.]

But I will say this to this audience, that we have built in this country a pattern of government and a social structure for some 30 or better years of recent days that is pretty well accepted by the American people and we ought to continue to build on it.

Now, it isn't good enough just to talk about the yesterdays. If you are going to talk about them, you ought to talk accurately at least. And it isn't good enough to talk just about the todays. I think, as I have said a couple of times in talking to younger people, that the writings of Eleanor Roosevelt, that final book of hers before she passed away, that "Tomorrow Is Now," tells you the kind of a world that we are living in.

In other words, you just have to move fast. You have to think ahead. Science, technology, the breakup of social structures, political power structures, all of this has made this world change and change rapidly. And this is a world in which you don't gain peace by serving notice on people, do as I say or else. [Applause.]

You don't prove yourself to be worthy of world leadership and the mantle of world leadership by diplomacy, as Walter Lippmann put it, the diplomacy of ultimatum. This just doesn't work in this world.

Nor is it very sensible to view modern warfare as if it were the kind you had in World War I.

The atomic bomb changed all of that. [Applause.]

Now, the real question before humanity is whether or not we can do something constructive with the new forces that are available to us with modern science and technology. Will this great release of human intelligence, will this be used for constructive good or will it be used for destruction?

I think that in a campaign like this we ought to hear from the candidates about their views on education, about their views on the cities that you are going to live in. Very few people live in rural America anymore, and fewer are going to live there when you are 40 years of age and 35.

This Nation is going to have a population by 1980 of 275 million people. There will be one solid city from Boston to Washington of 96 million people. There will be vast areas of America in which population increases.

The whole problem of representative government is before us. We ought to be talking about that. We ought to be talking about how we can improve the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, rather than how you repudiate it. [Applause.]

Quite frankly, rather than bemoaning the troubles that we have, the riots, the difficulties, none of which we like or condone, what we really ought to be talking about, and everyone of us here, particularly those of us that have been privileged to have a college education—I got one. I owe humanity a good deal. I owe my community a good deal.

Nobody ever paid for their college education, you know. Don't kid yourself. The library in this school is an inheritance of 5,000 years. You have inherited a whole culture. You will never be able to pay for it. What you will have to do somehow or other is try to give enough of your life to somebody else, to your community, to your Nation, to your world, so that you can pay back a little of what you received.

Now, the person that never got an education, he doesn't owe anybody very much. He doesn't owe them anything. But those of us that have been privileged to get a bachelor's degree, a master's degree, a doctor's degree, most of which has been paid for by somebody else, by contributions, by gifts—your tuition doesn't even come close to paying for it. Everybody knows that that has the sense to go to college.

We have some responsibilities and therefore we ought to be thinking about how we can improve the world in which we live. We ought to be thinking about what is our commitment to this world. We ought to be thinking about how can we do something to make sure that true justice really prevails?

We ought to be asking ourselves how can we redeem ourselves for having demeaned humankind in this Nation since its inception through slavery and through bigotry and through discrimination and through intolerance because we did, you know.

Let's quit kidding ourselves. There is only one kind of humanity, not brown or write, not red or yellow, just one kind. People. That is all. [Applause.]

Just one kind of citizenship in the United States. Just one kind.

I have read the Constitution. I took an oath to uphold it. I have taught constitutional law, American government. I am a refugee from a classroom. I know. [Laughter.]

Let me say very strongly you can read that Constitution over and over again and it doesn't talk about the past. It says "We the People of the United States do," this hour, this hour, this moment, "do ordain and establish," not "did." [Laughter.]

And it doesn't say we the white people or we the Protestant people or we the Catholic people or we the Jewish people or we the agnostics. It says we the people.

Now, there is just one kind of citizenship in that great Republic and that is a citizen of this American Republic, American citizenship, and we have passed a bill in the Congress last year 100 years late, 100 years late. [Applause.] And that bill—I don't say that it solved the problem. I say it merely provided a framework within which men of reason and justice and decency and fairplay can work to solve the problems, and I want to make sure [applause] that a leader or one that poses as a leader for this country is one that will ask us to work with him within that framework, not to tear it down, not to say that it promotes violence and hatred but to know that that framework of law must be used to seek observance, to build respect for one another, to build respect for all.

And I say that in this campaign this is an issue because Americans ought to be challenged to do their best. Americans ought to be challenged finally to take on the great role of the peacemaker in the world.

We have to make a choice. Do we want to be a Sparta or an Athens? [Applause.]

Remember this, that while military power is important and we need it and we built it, the power is not an end unto itself. Power must be a means to a just end. [Applause.]

Quite frankly when I say a candidate voting against the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which is the first step toward any—or at least controlling the arms race, and a candidate that can vote against the Civil Rights Act and denounce it as a police state act, when I can see that and see a candidate which calls the Peace Corps a haven for beatniks—that is what it was called. [Laughter.]

I was the author of the Peace Corps, and I stood there in the Senate—[applause]—I took the slings and the darts and the arrows of the opposition. I heard them say that all this will do is turn loose on this world a lot of young wild Americans. I heard it said there that this is a haven for beatniks.

Well, I will tell you that it is not. I think it is the finest expression of American idealism and American optimism.

I have got to go. I would love to stay here and visit with you, you are a wonderful audience, but we have got to go up to Vermont, and may I just say before I leave here, may I make this one request of you.

I ask you to analyze the records of people that seek public office. I ask you to take a look at the record, and I ask you to take a look at what happened in America on November 22, 1963, when our President through a mad act of a madman was struck down.

Everybody was in tears. The Nation faltered. People wondered what was going to happen. The whole constitutional system of this country was being tested.

Could we pass power from one to another without trouble, without violence, without disorder, without hesitation? And I believe the acid test of Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, came at that hour when he without faltering for a moment humbly, in pain, in grief, under the most difficult of circumstances, took over the leadership of this country, and I tell you that while John Kennedy had 1,000 days of dramatic service to humanity, and they were grave days, they were great days, Lyndon Johnson has now had 10, almost—well, almost 11 months of brilliant leadership of the Government of the United States, and he has led it well.

He put through the Congress of the United States by his great leadership and persuasion the most amazing legislative program that America has ever known and he has conducted our foreign policy well. He has spoken to the American people not in terms of dividing us, but uniting us. He has spoken to us of our responsibilities, not of our luxuries.

He has spoken to us of the prospects of the future, not just the achievements of the past.

Every man has limitations but I submit that Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, has demonstrated qualities of leadership that commend him in the history of our country as one of the great Presidents and I hope that you will help him be elected again.

Thank you.

Rutland, Vt.
October 13, 1964.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. First of all, Mr. Mayor, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Senator and Congressman, Reverend Clergy, I first want to apologize for not having the time today to get around to each and every one of the tables in this room which we had said we would do, but I hope that you realize that there are times that even the best laid plans of Democrats go astray. [Laughter.]

This morning when we left New York we were supposed to get out of there about 40 minutes before we did. They just plain forgot to refuel one of the airplanes. And these planes run better when they have fuel in them. [Laughter.] And that slowed us up.

Then when we got to Massachusetts, our planner and our advance men decided that instead of making one speech at Smith College, I should speak at Mount Holyoke as well, and then also that I should speak in Holyoke City. So we were held up.

I can't possibly tell you how much it has meant to me to come to your community of Rutland. This wonderful, beautiful State of Vermont. And to see you and to see your other fellow citizens that waited so long under the most adverse conditions.

I am an old campaigner and I have been around a lot. I have campaigned in snow storms and sleetstorms and cyclones and hurricanes and windstorms and duststorms, but when I see people that will wait this long just for someone that they really haven't met to come along, it makes your heart very warm, and I am a sentimental fellow about it. [Applause.]

We have to get along to Concord and we have to get up to Lewiston, Maine, and back to New Haven, Conn., yet tonight, and I guess there are a couple of other places.

You know, the man that I am working for, you may recall what he said, some of you, at the Democratic Convention. I use that line but not Senator Goldwater's, and when there was a meeting of the Democratic National Committee he said, now, every one of you deserves a rest and every one of you go home and take a rest. Every one but not Senator Humphrey. [Laughter.] And he meant it.

He hasn't given me a day off. We have really been on the road.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE. Join the union.

Senator HUMPHREY. I trust I am going to get paid overtime. [Laughter.]

You have a great opportunity in this election, an opportunity to make it a real chapter in history. It has always been said, you know that—well, we always remember that great election of 1936 when Franklin Roosevelt won every State but Maine and Vermont.

Well, now, I have got news for you. Maine is going to go Democrat and I think Vermont is, too. [Laughter and applause.]

But I want to forewarn you that we are going to have 2 or 3 tough weeks ahead of us. Our opposition, regrettably, doesn't want to discuss the issues. They want to talk about our President. They want to destroy, if they can, his image and his reputation. And I am not going to let them do it and neither are you.

Oh, they have been around working on me but I have been somewhat accustomed to it and I told the Preisdent for a while that if I could act as his lightning rod, just to take all the bolts they were throwing, I think I would be doing a great service.

They haven't said a thing about me that hasn't been said before and some of it is just about as effective, so I am not worried about it.

But I do not want to see a campaign end up where the attack is upon the Presidency itself, and this is the first time that I have sensed that such a thing was going to happen.

I guess this is just another way of telling you that you can expect the opposition to reach pretty low down into the barrel of mud.

We are not going to respond that way. I am not going to spend my time talking about the personal matters relating to any candidate. I happen to think that all the men that are running for public office are reasonably good men. There are none of us that don't need a little improvement. That is why we have the monsignor here and the rabbi. [Laughter and applause.]

And I become a little weary when I hear people acting as if somehow or another they had the monopoly on virtue, because I have never met anybody like that. Really I haven't. And I have been around quite a little bit.

But I do know what America needs and so do you. This country needs a President that is responsible, that is understanding, that is forbearing, that understands the greatness of this country.

If all you want to do is talk about the mistakes, you can ruin any family, any business, any town, any institution. We wouldn't have a cathedral, a church or a synagog is all we did was just talk about their mistakes.

You have to appeal to people's goodness, their bigness, their sense of greatness. You have to try to bring the best out of people. That is what we try to do as parents and this is what we really ought to do in a government. And this is what national leadership ought to do.

President Johnson has spent his time in these difficult months since the loss of President Kennedy—and believe me, I want to say this was a traumatic loss. It shook the whole world. It left this country almost, well, heartbroken and left it staggering.

President Johnson moved in and took command and he did it with grace. He did it with firmness. And he did it with brilliance. And I think the record of the 88th Congress is a record that any Democrat, any citizen, can be proud of. It is a good record.

Now, we want to build on that record. President Kennedy said, "Let us begin." Lyndon Johnson, our President, said "Let us continue." And now when he is elected in his own rights, he is going to ask you to help him move this country forward even further in the paths of social progress. And in the days ahead, my dear fellow citizens, there are going to be tough decisions.

Nuclear weaponry—it may spread. There are many madmen in this world. It is not easy to even be a U.S. Senator much less be a President, and we need men of decision, men of good judgment, men of prudence, men of experience, men who truly understand the mission of this country, and the mission of this country is to set an example at home by the manner in which we live and work and play so that we can go abroad and give people leadership, political leadership, moral leadership, economic leadership.

And I know that we have in President Johnson, a man that I have known intimately for 16 years, a man that meets these qualifications and these standards.

And I am not here, as I said at the platform, not to run down the man. I am up here to run up the flag of a great President who is carrying on in a great purpose and who wants to do a good job, and he needs your help. [Applause.]

He needs it badly.

So you go to work. I will make a deal with you. We are going to carry Minnesota. I will guarantee it. We are going to carry Minnesota.

And I think that you have it within yourselves to make a grand new chapter in American political history by having it said that in the year 1964, the great State of Vermont, a progressive State, a sensible State, a State of good judgment, has cast its electoral votes, its popular vote, for the Democratic ticket for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

Concord, N.H.
October 13, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Charles Officer, and may I thank my good friend who is the candidate for Congress in the First District, Mr. Huot, and I want to especially thank the distinguished Governor of the great State of New Hampshire, John King, for his proclaiming this Hubert Humphrey Day.

Did you make it Hubert Horatio Humphrey Day? [Laughter.]

And I am just delighted that I could be greeted when I came here to your airport, this fine community of Concord, by my colleague in the U.S. Senate, a gentleman that has made such a splendid record already for his State and for his Nation, your own U.S. Senator and my personal good friend, Tom McIntyre. I am delighted to see him. [Applause.]

I want you to know that I have friends on both sides of the aisle. I don't come here just as a Democrat. I come here as a fellow citizen. And there are times, of course, that we have to battle it out as party contestants, but I have known the Senators from this State for many, many years, and I know the other Senator, the senior Senator, Mr. Cotton, and I know your fine Members of the Congress, and I don't come here to cast aspersions upon them. I come here to speak for our ticket and for our party.

By the way, I notice that the mayor of this great city was kind enough to come here and present me with one of the medallions, one of the coins commemorating here the 200th anniversary, and I am so honored to receive it. It is beautifully done, the engravings, the moldings are marvelous, the Concord Coach, and I notice that these horses on that Concord Coach are putting their legs up high, they are sure footed, and they are going forward. Every one of them is a Democrat. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Mayor, may I say I once served as mayor of Minneapolis, and I want the good mayor, Mayor Davie, to know that I am singularly honored whenever the mayor of a community takes time out of his busy official day to come and say hello and to more or less present the keys to the city. I am just delighted.

I am going to talk to the mayor a little bit about his politics. He is going to talk to me about mine. We are going to pray together over these things and we will see how we come out. [Laughter and applause.]

Then may I just say that I am delighted to see the Milford Spartans here that have done such a good job. We are very proud of them. They gave us wonderful entertainment. [Applause.]

Well, Charles Whittemore has taken on a big responsibility in New Hampshire, taken on a responsibility of seeing to it that this State stays within the paths of political honor and political progress by casting its vote and subsequently its electoral vote for the next President of the United States, President Lyndon B. Johnson. [Applause.]

But I want you to know that we not only want you to work hard for President Johnson, but we want you to keep in office that fine gentleman that has given your State such outstanding leadership as the Governor of your State, your own Governor King [applause] and then send us down, send us to Washington a couple of good Congressmen that will be able to work with the President of the United States, that will be able to back his program, and thereby to make things better for the great State of New Hampshire.

Well, friends, I noticed as I came here a couple of signs that indicate there may be one or two folks here who are politically misguided [applause]. We welcome them. Every once in a while I hear somebody say, "You know, isn't it too bad that some of the folks of the opposition turned up?" I say, "Not at all." The purpose of every meeting is education [laughter] and if there is something that we can say here today that will brighten their lives, I think that would be good.

You know, I even heard that they were going to have a trainload of Republican Congressmen come here. They call them the truth squad. That is a play on words, of course. [Laughter.] It is a conflict of interest.

To put those fine gentlemen, all personal friends of mine, in charge of the truth is like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop. [Applause.]

I don't expect that they will agree with me but that is part of the joy of American political life.

Let me just say that when I come to a community like this and see happy faces, I feel better. I have seen happy faces all across America. And when I see happy faces I know that these are the people that are looking to the future. These are the people that feel America is on the move and moving forward. These are the people that are going to vote to keep in the White House a man who has demonstrated unusual qualities of great leadership. They are going to see to it that America has for the next 4 years as the leader of this great Republic the man from Texas, President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

And when I see a young friend holding one of those Goldwater signs, and they have a smile on their face, I know that deep down in their heart they are going to vote for President Johnson, too. [Laughter and applause.]

But in case they shouldn't, in case they shouldn't, we will all get along all right after the election is over, anyhow.

Now, dear friends, what a great honor it is to come to this State, the State that gave us a President, Franklin Pierce, gave us a great U.S. Senator in the past, Daniel Webster, and by the way, they are putting gold on the State capitol dome, not Goldwater. Gold leaf, I want you to know. [Laughter and applause.] And if you are going to fool around with gold, make sure that it is the right kind. [Applause.]

You notice also up there in the capitol dome that there is that great eagle, that healthy strong American eagle that knows how to take off and knows how to go forward, never flies backward, knows how to spread its wings and come to grips with the realities of the day. No scrawny old sparrow, that one, believe me. [Applause.]

And no dodo bird either. [Laughter.]

So, ladies and gentlemen, this State has captivated the American Nation by its politics. My goodness, you put on a presidential primary up here the likes of which no one else has. I am sort of sorry I didn't enter here because if I was going to be beaten, I ought to be beaten where they do a god job of it, see. Instead of that, I went out to Wisconsin and West Virginia and got messed up. [Laughter.] But I notice that you had quite a presidential primary here this year, and you folks in New Hampshire surely exercise some mighty good judgment. You started out doing what the whole country is going to do. You voted against the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party. [Applause.]

Now, of course, you didn't have any choice on that Republican ticket at that time to vote for President Lyndon Johnson, but you are going to have that choice, and one of the most gratifying developments in this whole political year is the fact that millions and millions of people who are traditional Republicans, who think the world of their party,

who have fought the good fight for the party, millions of these people are not going to vote for the standard bearer of their party in this election, and the reason is quite simple. The reason is because the present standard bearer of the Republican Party that has the label on him of Republican is not a Republican. He is a radical. And he ought to be so known.

Why do I make that statement? Well, let's take a look at the 1960 Republican platform, a platform not conceived in the emotionalism of the Cow Palace of 1964, but a platform conceived after 8 years of responsible leadership by a Republican administration where a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of State and Republican officeholders had to come to grips with the world as it is, where they couldn't go around and dream about a never-never land, where they couldn't rewrite history, where they had to make history, and that platform of 1960 represents authentic Republicanism.

I thought it was a little too conservative. I didn't support many of its principles. But I do know this, that it represented the thinking of Republicans who had to take on the burden of responsibility.

Now, that platform has been before the American people and it was before Mr. Goldwater. It is before every Senator of the U.S. Senate. And it just appears that when the Senators made their votes on the 25 items in that platform that a most amazing development occurred.

Now, the leader of the U.S. Senate, on the Republican side, is Everett Dirksen. No one ever accused him of being a radical or an extremist. He is a relatively middle-of-the-road conservative gentleman, a good Senator.

The minority whip, the second man in command of the Republican Party in the Senate, is Thomas Kuchel, of California, a great Republican.

The third man in command is Leverett Saltonstall, Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts, a distinguished patriot, a fine man.

The fourth man in charge is Bourke Hickenlooper. Senator Hickenlooper of Iowa.

These are the four elected Republican leaders of the U.S. Senate.

Now, these men had to vote on issues that were involved in the Republican leaders of the U.S. Senate.

Now, these men had to vote on issues that were involved in the Republican platform. Twenty-five of them, twenty-five major commitments. Twenty-five times Mr. Kuchel, Republican from California, second in command of the Republicans in the Senate, 25 times he voted for his platform. The Senator from Massachusetts, he voted for his platform 20 times. The Senator from Illinois voted for his platform 18 times. The Senator from Iowa voted for his platform 17 times.

Now, of course, the Senator from Arizona dismisses the Senator from California by saying he is an extremist. [Laughter.] Oh, yes, he voted for the Republican platform. That makes him an extremist. tremist.

The Senator from Massachusetts was dismissed by the statement, by the Senator from Arizona, that the trouble with—dismissed by this statement, that what you ought to do with the eastern seaboard is to cut it off and let it float out into the ocean. I must say that is a rather far-reaching type of surgery. [Laughter.] I never felt that the eastern seaboard deserved that kind of treatment. But I will say this. If you want something looking good floating in the ocean, you couldn't do better.

But let me make it clear that the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper, and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, were straight down the line, they are authentic conservative Republicans. They voted for their platform three times out of four. They voted for their platform 18 times out of 25, 17 times out of 25 issues.

What about the leader, the new-found leader of the Republican Party? How did he vote?

Well, I will tell you. He never voted for a Democratic measure, so you can't accuse him of being a Democrat. I am sure he is happy about that. And he voted 25 times, no, 25 times against his own platform on 25 issues.

So how can you call him a Republican?

I suppose you could say he is a rather independent, so independent that he holds a caucus of one. [Laughter.]

I say, my friends, this is the reason that a great newspaper like the New York Herald Tribune, as Republican as McKinley, Republican as Hoover, Republican as Thomas Dewey, Republican as Dwight Eisenhower, that great newspaper did not endorse Mr. Goldwater. And why? Because Mr. Goldwater has yet to meet the standards of authentic Republicanism as defined in their platform. [Applause.]

Well, somebody may say, well, you know, the New York Herald Tribune can make a mistake. Yes. They have made a lot of them.

Well, what about the Saturday Evening Post? They have been published since 1797 and they never endorsed a Democrat until this time, once in better than 150 years, and why? Because as the editorial in the Post said, the Senator from Arizona is not only out of the mainstream of Republicanism, he is out of the mainstream of American political thought and practice. [Applause.]

So let me just extend my arms in welcome. I don't expect that our Republican friends are going to be too happy about everything that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey may stand for but they are wise enough to make a choice and in this election they are making an honest choice. They are not saying that everything that the Democratic candidates do or have done they like. But they are saying that that choice that they make is one of putting their country above the temporary control of their party.

I expect those Republicans to go back and fight the good fight. I expect that is why Mr. Nixon is out speaking. I don't think he is speaking for Goldwater. I think he is speaking for Nixon. [Applause.]

I expect that is why others—and I am not being critical of that. I must say that I can well understand that. Mr. Nixon, Mr. Scranton, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Lodge, these are authentic Republicans and they have a right to fight for their party. They have a right. They have earned it.

But let me say right now that we are faced in this election with a candidate in the opposite that surely can't qualify as a Democrat, can't qualify as a Republican.

Now, how he qualifies I don't know. I guess we will just have to say that he is the temporary spokesman of a fraction of a faction of the Republican Party. I guess that is about all we can say. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, what are the positive issues in this campaign? This election is going to determine not only what happens now, not only what happens next year, but years to come.

It was in this State that the Senator from Arizona expressed his doubts about social security. Oh, I didn't think anybody had any doubt about that since Alf Landon. [Laughter.] I haven't found anybody that ever doubted that we ought to have social security.

Oh, now the Senator from Arizona says, well, I didn't mean it. You are trying to misinterpret what I said.

It is very difficult to keep up with what he last meant. [Laughter.]

I happen to think that America needs a President that says what he means when he says it and means what he says. And I think we have got one. [Applause.]

It was in this State; yes, it was in this State where the doubt was cast upon social security. Now, again I repeat that the opposition says this is foul, this is a low blow for any Democrat to say that the Senator from Arizona is against social security. I don't know if he is against it. All I know is he said he had some doubts about it and he thought it ought to be voluntary. Now he says he didn't mean that.

Well, when he makes up his mind what he means, I wish he would let everybody know so we can clear the record.

This I do know, that he said that he conceived his idea of government to repeal laws, not to pass them. I want to know what law he is talking about. Which laws? It was in this State, my friends, that the issue of the United Nations was fought out. Now the Senator from Arizona has said, "We should withdraw from the United Nations."

Then a little later he said, well, it isn't very good, maybe we should withdraw, maybe we shouldn't. And now he says, no, I think we ought to stay.

Well, I know this, that in this State of New Hampshire the former Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, was given a vote of confidence by the people of New Hampshire in the presidential primary and he stood up for the United Nations. And I think everybody in this audience knows [applause] I think everybody in this audience knows that the United Nations is one of the great hopes of peace in our time, peace for the world.

Yes, my friends, the issues are clear. The question is do you want leadership that takes you ahead, moves you along the path of progress, or do you want somebody that is looking out the rear view mirror? Do you want leadership that is strong and constructive or some that is indefinite and indecisive and negative?

President Lyndon Johnson came to the White House under the most difficult of circumstances. Remember this, my fellow Americans: President Johnson was selected in Los Angeles, in 1960, by the late and beloved President Kennedy as his Vice President.

Remember this: that John Kennedy said, "He is my strong right arm."

He reached down into the great State of Texas and he said to President Johnson, I need you as my Vice President.

President Johnson was then the strongest man in Congress, the majority leader, and his whole life as majority leader was one of responsibility, one of constructive responsibility. He was one of the most powerful men in government, but President Lyndon Johnson, then a Senator, gave up that post and he stood side by side through the campaign of 1960, through the one thousand days of John Kennedy's dramatic leadership. He stood side by side with President Kennedy, and I am here to say that if President Kennedy had faith in President Lyndon Johnson, I have got it, too, and I think you have. [Applause.]

So I ask this great audience to ratify, to reaffirm that faith. John Kennedy said to us, "Let us begin," and we moved America forward. Lyndon Johnson said to us, "Let us continue," and we have continued.

We passed the Kennedy-Johnson program and it is a great program. The President of the United States now asks us to go forward even further. He doesn't ask us to stand still. He says we must go further down the road of domestic progress, more social justice, bettter education. We have to provide new jobs. We have to find ways of helping American industry, to encourage business, to be fair to labor.

And I am here to testify not against the opposition. I am here to testify for the man that is President of the United States.

I watched him in Congress. I saw him at the head of our great governmental institutions. I witnessed him as Vice President. I have sat at the same table as he and President Kennedy worked out the Kennedy-Johnson program. And I have witnessed President Lyndon Johnson taking over the mantle of leadership in this country under the most unbelievable of circumstances.

Put yourself for a moment in that situation. November 22, 1963, Dallas, Texas. An assassin's bullet takes the life of our beloved President. The whole world faltered. It was as if somehow or another we had missed life itself. The whole world was in pain and uncertaintly, and then stood up a tall big man. He took the oath of office. He came back to Washington as the President of the United States under our constitutional system, and I will leave it to any fairminded American, I will leave it to any reasonably fairminded American, as to whether or not he has done a good job.

I think the American people appreciate the sacrifice. I think they appreciate the sense of integrity. I think they appreciate the ability, the experience, the knowledge, the calmness, the strength, this great of responsibility which President Lyndon Johnson has exemplified in these months of his executive leadership. [Applause.]

So, as I leave your capital city, I ask you will you do for this great President what you did for John Kennedy? Will you give him your hands and your hearts? Will you help us? Will you help us to lead America? Will you help us to build America? Will you help us to open up opportunities for our young? Will you help us provide dignity for our elderly? Will you help us to build American enterprise? Will you help us sing the praises of America?

We need a President, my fellow Americans, that loves our country. We need one that unites our country. We need one that tells the American people to do better every day. We need someone that sings the praises of America rather than to tell of its evils, and I submit to you that we have that man.

And I come here as his partner and I come to this great State of New Hampshire and ask every voter in this State to judge this man and to judge him on his record of performance, and I ask you to give him your vote of confidence on November 3. [Applause.]

Lewiston, Maine
October 13, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator Ed Muskie. I want to thank you and thank you and thank you for that wonderful introduction.

I know that your Senator is a great legislator. I have know that he was a great Governor. I know that he is a fine gentleman. But I never knew that he was the cheerleader for Lewiston.

I can't say how glad I am to see you folks still standing in this little Republican dew that is coming down on you.

May I assure you that both Mrs. Humphrey and myself are signally honored by your willingness to withstand this weather to be with us.

May I first of all just express my thanks to the young people that are here from Lewiston High and Edward Little High School. And may I say when you go home tonight, all you good young folks, when you have a chance to talk with your parents, I want you to give them a little of your enthusiasm and I want you to tell them, I want you to tell them that you have been at a meeting and that you have heard Senator Ed Muskie, that you have seen Bill Hathaway, Member of Congress, and that you have seen Ken Curtis, a candidate for Congress, and you have heard Senator Humphrey. He is running for something, too.

And you tell them that every last one of these men told you that the duty of every good father and mother on election day is to go to those polls and vote, and then you can tell them that you have a good suggestion for them, to vote for President Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

You know, I can say to these young friends to Saint Dominick High School [applause] ladies and gentlemen, I am not going to keep you long because what I have to say to you may be said concisely, briefly, and I think to the point.

I haven't come here tonight to tell you about the evils or the wrongdoings or even the mistakes of others. I don't come here tonight to tell people who may carry the banner of our opposition that they are bad people, because they are not. I happen to think, for example, that Senator Goldwater, the standard bearer of the Republican Party [applause] wait a minute. I think that he would make a good neighbor but I don't think he would make a good President. [Applause.]

My friends, I come here tonight to talk to you about the Kennedy-Johnson administration. I come to talk to you tonight about the Democratic Party. And I come to talk to you about a program and a policy.

This party is not content to just look to the past. This party believes that the future is what should concern us. We believe that today moves rapidly by and we believe that if America is to maintain its greatness, if we art to fulfill our mission as a leader for peace and justice in the world, and if we are to fulfill our mission at home for a better America, for our young, for our elderly, and for our unfortunates, if we are to fulfill our mission for a more prosperous America, for more jobs, for better industry and for better schools and better hospitals, and better recreation, we believe that if we are going to do these things, then the Democratic Party must think with the future, think about the future, and plan for the future, and that is the mission of our party.

I come tonight to represent a party that cares about America, that cares about people, that cares about people who are less fortunate.

I come to represent a party tonight who believes that compassion is not weakness and who believes—a party that believes that concern for the afflicted and the sick and the needy is not socialism but rather is good solid Americanism. [Applause.]

I come to this platform that was graced 4 years ago, 4 years ago by one of the greatest men of our century. I come here tonight as a friend and as a legislative colleague of the late and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

John Kennedy said when he took the oath of office in January 20, 1961, he said to you, he said to me, he said "Let us begin. Let us get America moving once again."

And then he said to all of us, he said "I accept this responsibility. I welcome it."

And then he told us that none of us would be willing to change with other people in the world for the privileges that we had here as Americans.

John Kennedy was privileged to serve America and the world 1,000 days as our President. He served America and the world a full life but he was taken by the assassin's bullet just almost a year ago.

Now, since that time, my friends, another man who was the partner of John Kennedy has taken up the torch of freedom and the mantle of responsibility in this country.

I remind this great audience that it was John Kennedy that selected Lyndon Johnson 4 years ago as his Vice President.

I remind you that Lyndon Johnson was a faithful ally to our beloved President. He once said, if everyone else should desert President Kennedy, then I will remain an ally. I will be by your side. [Applause.]

I ask you to remember, I ask my fellow Americans here to remember that fatal day in Dallas. I ask you to remember how the whole world was in grief and pain. I ask you to remember how many people in America wondered what would happen to our country and our Government, and then I ask you to remember that sight of seeing a strong man, a good man, with eyes filled with tears, with soul filled with grief, stand and take the oath of office as President of the United States.

The man that John Kennedy selected to safeguard America in case something happened to him, that man was there, and that man became President of the United States, not because he wanted it but because a cruel assassin had taken the life of our President.

And Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, has proven himself to be a faithful man to the legacy of John Kennedy and he has proven himself to be a strong President.

He immediately approached the problems of our country with a steadfast hand. He didn't falter. He didn't back down. He didn't retreat. In fact, he said to us, we must not hesitate. We must not falter. We must continue. And we have been continuing, my fellow Americans, to carry out the program of our great and beloved President.

We have done our job. And on this platform tonight stands with me a U.S. Senator, your Senator, who was faithful to the late and beloved President as a member of the family, who carried out his every responsibility and who with President Johnson has helped to build a great legislative record for the American people and for the entire world, your own Senator, Ed Muskie. [Applause.]

My friends, let us not let anybody take this away. We have made progress in America. Maine is more prosperous. America is more prosperous. Our country is more just. Our country is stronger. Our country has more social justice.

Let nothing happen to disturb this forward movement. And above all, let us not have in the White House someone who is impetuous, someone who will represent forces of irresponsibility.

What America needs now is a President that unites us, a President that strengthens us, a President that appeals to us, a President that thinks for the future, a President that thinks for the young, and a President that cares for the elderly; a President that encourages enterprise and a President that advances the cause of education.

I say you have got that man and that man deserves our help and he needs it. He will need your help in the weeks ahead.

On November 3, my fellow Americans, we are going to decide whether America moves forward or whether America retreats to the past.

We are going to decide whether this Nation is young and vital or whether it is sick and tired.

We are going to decide whether America will lead the crusade for a just and enduring peace or whether or not America will play war games.

I think I know what that decision will be and I ask this audience tonight, will you help me? Will you help your Senator? Will you help Mr. Hathaway and Mr. Curtis? Will you help those of us regardless of your political persuasion? Will you help us? Will you help us elect Lyndon B. Johnson? [Applause.]

I believe I heard your answer. And if that is the case, then I can only say one more thing. Let's go to work. Let's make sure that the victory of November 3 is a victory that will remain in the history books of America as a victory against the forces of hate and intolerance and for the forces of progress and peace, and let us help elect President Lyndon Johnson for 4 more years to carry America forward.

Bridgeport, Conn.
October 13, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much.

You know, Senator Dodd—don't pay any attention to that static from the far right. [Applause.]

You know those folks keep hollering "We want Barry" and nobody has been able to make up their mind whether it is "strawberry or "rasp-barry." [Applause and laughter.]

The truth is "barry-picking" time is all over. You know that. [Laughter].

All right, friends. May I just first of all—may I just first of all thank your distinguished Governor for his welcome, and may I thank your great Senators for their welcome. I am very honored to be in their presence. I am very honored to be here as the associate and the friend of Senator Abraham Ribicoff and Senator Thomas Dodd, two of the truly great men of the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And it is a joy also to be once again with a friend of ours in the House of Representatives. I know this isn't his district, but he is a great friend and we are going to be with him shortly in one of your neighboring communities up at New Haven, and I want to say to Bob Giaimo what a joy is to see him, and I hope that you folks here in this great industrial city will get yourselves in line, will get yourselves on the line and send a man to the House of Representatives that can work with President Lyndon Johnson, and that man is Don Erwin, and you know it. [Applause.]

You know, it is good to have a mayor down here to welcome you when you come to town, good to have a mayor that is not only the mayor but also Lieutenant Governor. You know, it kind of takes care of everything. And I want to say to Mayor Tedesco what a joy it is to see him, and I hope now that when you go to the ballot box those of you that are of voting age, and when you folks go home that are not of voting age, when you advise your parents that you will remember that on November 3, this great State of Connecticut has a special obligation.

This State was the first State in 1960 to come in with a smashing victory for John F. Kennedy. [Applause.]

And let me say it was the same John F. Kennedy who selected Lyndon Johnson as his strong right arm. [Applause.]

So on this November 3, what I want you to do is to ratify, to reaffirm, to demonstrate by your votes that what John Kennedy did in 1960 was what we are going to do in 1964 [applause] and that is elect Johnson.

You know, folks, we have had a wonderful day, just a wonderful day. We started out—you know, you have got to let those dear souls have a little fun. They are not going to have much between now and the next few years. [Applause.]

And you know what? They are really out here to repent. They have been walking in the paths of political sin. They want to be forgiven. Let's forgive them, huh? Let's forgive them. [Applause.]

Now, friends, my friends, we started out this morning at New York City and from New York City we went to Rutland—we went first to Springfield, Mass., to Westover Air Base. We went to Smith College. We went to Mount Holyoke. And then we went to Rutland, Vt., and then to Concord, N.H., and tonight at Lewiston, Maine, now in Bridgeport. A little bit later at New Haven.

Now, that is the way to work and to win elections. That is the way to do the job. [Applause.]

You know, at Lewiston, Maine, they had a little of that Republican dew. That's right, turn that thing up. That is the thing to do.

They had a little of that Republican dew up there. It was raining and we were a little late getting in, but you know, there were thousands of people there even in the rain waiting for a message about their Government, about their country, waiting to hear about their President, and I am here tonight in these few brief moments that I have with you at this great industrial city of Bridgeport, out here at this great gathering that we have, I am here to talk to you not about our opposition. I am here to talk with you about our President, and I am here to talk with you about the party, the Democratic Party and its program.

Why, I have said from a thousand and one places I am sure that the leader of the Republican opposition is a pretty decent fellow. We know him in the Senate. He is a nice fellow. He would make a good neighbor. But I don't want him for my President and I don't think that you do either. [Applause.]

I will tell you what we want. What we want to do is what we started to do and continue what we were doing. We started in 1961 in this country to get America moving once again. We started in 1961 to make this Government once again responsive to human need. We started in 1961 to work with our cities. We started in 1961 to retrain workers. We started to take an interest in youth.

We started to do something for our elderly. We started to rebuild the cities. We started with better housing programs and hospital programs. We have made beginnings in all of this. And we have continued and we are progressing and we don't intend to let somebody that is still thinking in terms of the 19th century take us back.

We don't intend to give it up. [Applause.] We intend, my friends, to build. We intend to move forward. We intend to build on the base that we already have constructed.

Today this country is more properous than it ever has been, but it isn't good enough. We intend to work together and make it better. Your Government with industry, your Government with labor, your Government with people, this Government of ours belongs to us. You wouldn't think so when you hear the spokesmen of the opposition. Why, they fly in the face of Abraham Lincoln, Lincoln who said this was a Government of the people and by the people and for the people. Lincoln said that this Government was designed to serve the people. But to hear the spokesman, the temporary spokesman of a small fraction of a faction of the Republican Party, to hear him talk, you would think this Government was a mortal enemy.

In fact, what has he said?

Give them the raspberries. [Applause.]

You know something, folks? You know, it is really interesting, isn't it. You know, when you get right down to it, when we are talking program, when we are talking about schools and education, when we are talking about health care, when we are talking about social welfare, when we are talking about transportation and rebuilding our cities, when we are talking about a bright new tomorrow for our young, when we are talking about a growing America and a strong America and an America that is for freedom and for peace and an America which makes room for people of every race, creed and nationality, what does our opposition say? "We want Barry." [Applause and laughter.]

What kind of nonsense is that? I will tell you what we want. I will tell you what we want. We want an America that has room for everybody. We want an America where there isn't a leader, a man that is a candidate for President that insults the minorities of this country. [Applause.]

We want an America that is strong and yet it is just. We want an America that has power and uses it for peace.

We want an America, if you please, that has a Senator like Tom Dodd who had the courage to sponsor in the U.S. Senate the nuclear test ban resolution which, along with the words of John Kennedy and the work of some of the rest of us, made possible the first great step in the path of peace. That is the kind of an America we want. [Applause.]

You know, my friends, this is just to touch it up a little bit, you know, we don't want to give them too much at one time. Some of those fellows in the opposition are slow learners. You have got to take it easy. [Laughter and applause.]

I want to tell you this, though, I want to be very frank about it. What we do want is when this campaign is all over, we want to be able to say that we conducted it in such a manner that we can look our neighbor in the eye and say it was well done. We want to conduct ourselves in such a manner that the way that we speak is with joy and cheers, and not jeers and boos. Boos and jeers belong to somebody else. I have heard boos and jeers in other countries and those are not the words nor is that the tone of a free America. Free people cheer. Free people are happy. Free people have optimism. Free people have confidence, and that is what we have. [Applause.]

Now, listen. You folks go to work. You folks go to work. We don't intend to let America be taken down the hill backward. I want you to go to work and make sure that on election day the State of Connecticut gives the greatest majority that any State in the Union gives to our President. We have got a good President. We have got a brave President. We have got an honest President. We have got an experienced President. We have got a warm-hearted President. And we have got a great President.

And you are here to help him and so am I. So let's get President Lyndon Johnson relected for 4 more years.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Article

News Release From the Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

SPEECH TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, NEW HAVEN, CONN., OCTOBER 13, 1964

Twenty-one days from today we shall go to the polls to choose the next President of the United States.

We shall choose the man who, for the next 4 years, will be the leader not only of our Nation but of the whole free world.

We are told that, this time, we are offered a choice and not an echo. I agree. We do indeed have a choice.

We have the choice between a dedicated professional in the art and science of government and a part-time, off-and-on, now-and-then amateur and hobbyist.

We have the choice between a man who for more than 30 years has dealt responsibly with the complex problems of a changing Nation in a changing world and a man who had made no effort to comprehend these problems, let alone do anything about them.

We have the choice between a man who has demonstrated his talent for working constructively with others, and particularly with his colleagues in Congress—and a man who has been almost perpetuually out of step with the Senators, the platform, and the President of the party to which he professes to belong.

Above all, we have the choice between a man who understands and accepts the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency in this nuclear age—and a man who, all too clearly, does not.

President Johnson has devoted over 30 years to the service of his country. In the National Youth Administration, he helped young people to find their place in life during the depression.

As a young Congressman, he sat at the feet of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Sam Rayburn. He shared their ideals and learned from these great teachers how to put them into practical effect.

Four years after he entered the Senate he was chosen by his Democratic colleagues as their leader—and almost immediately won recognition on both sides of the aisle as one of the ablest leaders who had ever served in that body.

As Vice President, his advice and counsel in great issues of government was sought—and given. As President, his record speaks for itself—and speaks eloquently.

To every post he has held, President Johnson has dedicated all his great talents and all his abundant energy. He has given every waking hour—and that includes many that most of us would have slept—to the job in hand, whether as a National Youth Administration official or as President of the United States.

Contrast President Johnson's more than 30 years with Senator Goldwater's 12 years in public service.

Senator Goldwater has had 12 years to learn and to achieve in one of the greatest practical schools of government in the world—the U.S. Senate.

His attitude toward this opportunity has been very much like his earlier attitude toward college—of which he once said: "I wasn't exactly lazy, but I preferred doing something else."

He has never sought leadership—never even taken any significant initiative—in the Senate. No legislation of any consequence bears his name.

For the most part he has been content simply to vote "no" when he is around—and much of the time he hasn't even been around.

Even before he became an active candidate for the Presidency, he was missing many rollcalls—58 out of 192 in 1960, 65 out of 207 in 1961, 63 out of 141 in 1962, and 66 out of 163 in 1963.

He has been for 12 years a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee—one of the most important in the Senate. He was absent 42 percent of the time, and again and again his vote was cast by proxy, recorded later, or not recorded at all.

Just as Senator Goldwater has been half in and half out of the Senate, so he is half in and half out of the 20th century.

Technologically, he's in the jet age. In terms of his social understanding, he's stuck in the early 19th century.

Indeed, the word "modern" seems to him to apply only to things, not to people and their problems. For instance, he once complained:

"Just what does it mean to be 'modern,' anyway? I think of myself as modern in the true meaning as outlined in the dictionaries. My brother and I have just built a new store. I am building a new home. I fly an airplane. I like new things and new gadgets."

Yet, on the other hand, he has said:

"The basic problems are no different in our times than under Lincoln or Washington—we have merely changed the horse for a tractor, the handtools for a machine."

My friends, I ask you to meditate a moment on that word *merely*.

Senator Goldwater just hasn't noticed that the industrial revolution—and the agricultural revolution that followed it—have had a profound effect on people as well as on things.

It's quite natural, therefore, that he wants Government to secede from the 20th century and its problems.

He has said, "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them." And he has urged that the Government must begin to withdraw from social welfare, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal, and many other activities.

Contrast Senator Goldwater's acceptance of only half—the technological half—of the 20th century with President Johnson's wholehearted identification with all of it.

He is determined to use the resources of Government to make us first on the moon. But he is also determined to use those resources to eliminate poverty on the earth, beginning right here in the United States.

With Senator Goldwater's keen interest in gadgets and his lack of concern for people, it's not surprising that he is perpetually out of step with his colleagues.

He rejected the Eisenhower administration, calling it a "dime store New Deal." And he rejected the 1960 Republican platform, casting his vote in the Senate against 25 of its key provisions.

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

Our English word "radical" is derived from the Latin word "radix," meaning root. And Senator Goldwater wants to pull things out by their roots, whereas a true conservative wants to conserve the fabric of the past.

Contrast him again with Lyndon Johnson. At all times throughout his career, President Johnson has worked with people rather than against them, has sought to unite them rather than divide them.

Finally, we must consider seriously the awesome responsibility a President bears with regard to our nuclear weapons.

In all the many thousands of words Senator Goldwater has spoken on this issue, I can find no trace of recognition of the harsh and inescapable fact that our enemies possess nuclear weapons capable of destroying us, just as we possess weapons capable of destroying them.

President Eisenhower recognized this fact, and frankly declared that there is no longer any alternative to peace. President Kennedy recognized it, and worked patiently and ultimately successfully, for a test ban treaty as a first step toward peace.

President Johnson has recognized his responsibility in its full and awesome dimensions, and has made it clear, in deed and in word, that he will not delegate it to any other man, in or out of uniform.

Senator Goldwater doesn't seem to grasp the fact that we are living in a nuclear age. Indeed, he has actually questioned whether it is any more dangerous to risk war today than it was 200 years ago.

Yes, my friends, we do indeed have a real choice on November 3.

We have a choice between a whole-time President and a part-time Senator, between a leader and a loner, between a wholly modern President and a man who thinks only gadgets are modern, not people and their problems.

Above all, we have the choice between a man who fully recognizes and accepts the responsibilities of a President in this nuclear age and a man who simply does not understand these responsibilities, let alone measure up to them.

And I believe the people of America will choose Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States.

New Haven, Conn.
New Haven Green
October 13, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you.

VOICES FROM AUDIENCE. We want Humphrey.

Senator HUMPHREY. If you wait a little while, you will get him. Thank you very much, Senator Dodd.

My dear friends, Governor Dempsey, one of the advantages of a college education is you can holler louder when you want Barry, you know, over here. [Laughter.]

Now, friends, may I say to those that chant, those that chant "We want Barry" they can have him back on November 3. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, having disposed of the static to the right [laughter], may I proceed.

Mayor Lee, Governor Dempsey, Congressman Gianio, Senator Ribicoff, and my good friend, Senator Tom Dodd, the citizens of New Haven, friends and neighbors of the great State of Connecticut, I am simply delighted to be here and I consider it a rare opportunity to speak in this great city square here in one of the great communities of America. [Applause.]

We are now—we are, believe it or not, engaged in what is known as a political campaign which should offer one the opportunity for enlightenment, for a review of the record, and which should permit thoughtful citizens to think and after some careful thought to make a decision.

I come to you tonight to talk about that decision and to talk to you about the program of our country. I come to you this evening as one who has served in the Congress of the United States with your distinguished Senators, and I say to this audience that the State of Connecticut—the State of Connecticut is privileged to have in the United States Senate two of the most able, gifted, distinguished, and conscientious Members of the Senate of any State in the Union, and I am proud to be their friend. [Applause.]

I am singularly honored to have been introduced by the distinguished Senator, Thomas Dodd, a personal friend and a gentleman that I have long admired and whose friendship I cherish as a precious gift, and Governor Dempsey, may I say that your leadership in this State has been a landmark in terms of good government and progressive government for your great State, and we are proud of you. [Applause.]

To Dick Lee, to my friend Dick Lee, the mayor of this great city, let me say that all over America people know the name of the mayor of New Haven. [Applause.] They know him because he gets things done. They know him because he has programs. They know him because he thinks and he acts, and I am proud to be associated on this platform with the mayor of this metropolitan center. [Applause.]

You know, we have traveled around the country a good deal in this campaign and I have found that most people who have a smile on their face, whose countenance exhibits some joy and optimism, that those good people—and they are in the vast majority—those are the people that have made up their minds regardless of party to vote for Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

And I have also noticed that those with political gastritis that have cramps, are voting for Barry Goldwater. [Laughter and applause.]

Thank goodness that most people are thinking and not griping. This is very helpful.

Now, friends, you know, if you boys would just quiet down over there you might catch on to something. [Laughter and applause.]

There is not a thing wrong with these folks that a little thinking couldn't cure you know. [Laughter.]

The trouble with these boys is they have been studying ancient history and they want to vote it. [Applause.]

Now, once they have gotten over their jag they are on, we will settled down to some sober thinking.

Thank you. For a minute I thought I was on Harvard campus.

All right. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am quite sure that even the noisy opposition is willing to restrain themselves momentarily. And might I suggest that their voices are getting as hoarse as mine. If the local druggist will bring them some cough drops, it will relieve their agony. [Laughter.]

Are you through? All right. Let's pay no attention and we will go to work.

All right, ladies and gentlemen. I thought they were entitled to a few moments. Now let's talk about our country for awhile and what we are trying to do in this great Nation.

For the past 30 years the people of this great Nation have been attempting to adjust the policies of our Government and our social structure to the great changes that have taken place, changes that have taken place in industry, changes that have taken place in rural America, changes that have taken place in metropolitan American. And over these 30 years most Americans have come to some semblance of agreement. And there has been a consensus arrived at.

It is now understood by responsible leadership in both political parties that this Government has the responsibility to its people, that the duty of Government is to serve, and that the responsibility of Government is to encourage the development of industry, of commerce, of the cultures, of our fine educational establishments, and as we put it, of a better society. [Applause.]

Franklin Roosevelt [applause] found this country, found this country in dire straits. But he did not look back. Our great President, the late Franklin Roosevelt [applause] took this country forward. Our President saw the possibilities of a cooperative relationship between the Government and the people. And as a result of that cooperative relationship, America was in a sense rebuilt.

Since that time, whether it was a Democratic or Republican administration, it has been considered the duty of Government to try to be of assistance to the American people where that assistance was required.

It has been the duty of Government to try to protect those who were unfortunate, to extend a helpful hand to the sick and to the needy, to be willing to exhibit a sense of compassion, and this Government stands today in America and indeed in the world as an example of humanitarian democracy that has neither sacrificed the liberties of the people or the enterprise of the Nation.

I think it can be fairly said that the gains that we made over the 30 years are now on the election block, that those gains will be either protected and extended or those gains will be lost.

There is a choice for the American people in this election. [Applause.] And that choice, my friends, that choice will not be settled by the chanting of the know-nothings. It will be settled by the thinking people who are something, and I think I am talking to those people tonight, people that think. [Applause.]

When John Kennedy became our President [applause], he found a Nation that was faltering. He found an economy that was in recession. He found a country that was not growing. And this great man said to the American people in words that will be forever remembered, he said to the American people on that day in January, "Let us begin. Let us start to move America forward."

He asked us not to think of what our country can do for us, but he asked us to think what we might do for our country. [Applause.]

He extended the hand of Government in friendship and in cooperation, and in 1,000 days of his dramatic leadership, John Kennedy was able to get this country moving. America was a better country. America did start to grow. America's economy did start to prosper, and that is the record of 1,000 days of John Kennedy's leadership. [Applause.]

This good man that stood in this very place, and may I say went through the same kind of diatribe that you hear tonight, this good man led America to the new frontiers that he had promised. He made commitments to the American people and he kept those commitments. He committed to the American people that not only would our economy move forward but he also committed to the American people that social justice would be the rule of his administration, and it can be said [applause] that possibly the greatest achievement of John Kennedy's administration was the fact that he had the courage to launch the program that guaranteed every American, regardless of race, color, or creed, or national origin, full rights, equal rights, under the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

John Kennedy saw fit to redeem the promise of the American Constitution, and John Kennedy saw fit to have alongside of him as his selection a man who would follow through on that promise, and while it is, of course, true that our beloved President was taken from us before his work could be completed, it is a fact that the man that he selected as his partner, as his strong right arm, was able to do as he said, to continue and to carry on the work so that today the United States of America can say to the world, we come to you with clean hands.

We have made available under the law every privilege and every guarantee of the Constitution regardless of your race, your color, your creed, or the section of the country that you come from.

I say this was an amazing achievement and one that Americans ought to be proud of. [Applause.]

And yet, friends, there was yet another. I believe that our times will be marked by two significant advances. Oh, yes, I could pick off the record of economic achievement. I could cite the great work in the rebuilding of our cities such as we see here at New Haven. I can cite the advantages of higher education, aid to education, but it appears to me that there were two significant developments, two significant developments that separate those who believe in the future and in progress from those who believe in the past and in despair.

The first was the commitment of this country to civil liberties and civil rights and full rights for every American. This was the moral conscience of America. [Applause.]

The second great achievement came when our President, the late John Kennedy, spoke at American University on June 10, 1963, and in that memorable message he challenged the people of the world to break down the walls of hostility.

He opened up the first paths of peace. He proposed in that immortal message that the peoples of the world think of how they could pursue the paths of peace.

He outlined for us the process of peace, as he put it, and as a result of that message, very shortly after the President of the United States, inspired in part, may I say, by the resolution of your own Senator Thomas Dodd, started to negotiate the nuclear test ban treaty as the first forward step in the path of peace. [Applause.]

Human rights through a civil rights program, the paths of peace opened, ever so little but at least somewhat through the negotiation of the very important treaty known as the nuclear test ban treaty.

Now, these two great events, these two great events, my friends, marked a new era in the world. What is it that is the difference between the free man and the totalitarian?

The first difference is respect for human dignity. I might say the first difference is just respect, just plain respect. [Applause.] But the difference between the philosophy of freedom and the philosophy of totalitarianism is essentially the regard that you have for human personality, for the human being, and the civil rights program as one of several was placing emphasis once again through an action of government of the people and by the people and for the people upon the concept of human dignity.

The second program of the nuclear test ban treaty was designed for but one purpose, to try to bring sanity and reason in the affairs of nations, to give people some little ray of hope, to give them some assurance that there was not to be the catastrophe of nuclear warfare.

And I am happy to say, my friends, that the overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats alike in the Congress of the United States voted for the civil rights program, but not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

I am happy to say that the overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats in the Congress saw the civil rights issue as a moral issue, not as a partisan issue. They saw it as the fulfillment of the promise of democracy.

They wanted to move forward. They wanted American to open up the pathways of opportunity, but not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

And when we come to the great issue of sanity and reason in foreign affairs, four-fifths of the Members of the U.S. Senate, four-fifths of the distinguished members of that body, saw fit to ratify man's first ray of hope and peace in the 20th century. Four-fifths gave their word of support to the nuclear test ban treaty for peace, for honor, for life, for a future——

Voices From Audience. But not Senator Goldwater.

Senator Humphrey. But not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

And ladies and gentlemen, the answers to these questions are not made by a chant and by condemnation and by the extremist views and utterances of a handful of people who will be rebuked in this election on November 3. [Applause.]

I am proud to stand on this platform tonight and be the advocate of a Government and of an administration that thinks well enough of humanity to believe that American citizenship should be first-class citizenship.

I am proud to stand on this platform tonight and say that I was privileged amongst many to stand side by side through those 1,000 dramatic days of leadership of John Kennedy to help build a better America. [Applause.]

And I am humbly proud to be on this platform tonight with the Senator from this State who had the courage and the vision to offer a resolution in the Senate of the United States calling upon the Congress of the United States to support our President in bringing a halt to the dangerous nuclear arms race by a nuclear test ban treaty, your own Senator Dodd, and we stood together and was passed that resolution. [Applause.]

And I am proud to be here tonight not to speak unkindly or unfairly of an opponent, but to speak, may I say, words of praise and earned praise for a great President.

I ask you to remember what happened on November 22. I ask you to remember America's pain and its grief. And I ask you to remember how Lyndon Johnson, then the Vice President of the United States, rose up like a tower of strength and was able to give this country leadership, was able to give this country sensible direction, was able to give the American people and the world reassurance that America would continue to fulfill her responsibilities. [Applause.]

And I come to this platform tonight, I come to this great city of New Haven, a city they say of learning, and I hope it is—I come to this wonderful city, I come here tonight to cite the record of a man who today has such tremendous and awesome responsibilities.

This man has served over 30 years in public service, first, with the youth of our country, second as a Member of the House of Representatives, third, as a Senator and the leader of the U.S. Senate, and may I say during those years of majority leadership, Lyndon Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate, acted responsibly.

He rebuked and refused to have opposition for the sake of opposition. Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader—he worked with the President, helped a President to help America, to unite America, to make it a better country.

I say that is the mark of a statesman. [Applause.]

And then, my friends, came the day when he was selected as Vice President, and Lyndon Johnson took on those responsibilities and fulfilled them with dignity.

I remember the time when he said, if only one is left to be your ally, Mr. President, this one I shall be. This one I shall be. I shall be your ally.

And I know of President Johnson's fidelity and his loyalty and his competence.

And then came the hour, the terrible and dreadful hour of the assassin's bullet. America did not stop. Our President asked us to continue in the faith of our fathers. Lyndon Johnson proved himself worthy of the respect and the confidence of John Kennedy, and remember it was John Kennedy who selected him and John Kennedy provided well for the future of his country. He not only provided through his own training and his own insight and brilliance but he provided through his Vice President, and Lyndon Johnson has proven to be in the months that he has served as our Chief Executive a great leader, a powerful leader, a gifted leader and a responsible leader of the American people. [Applause.]

Now, my fellow citizens, we make a decision, we make a decision on November 3. We are going to make a decision as to whether or not we want a man in the Presidency who senses the changes that have taken place in this world. We need to make a decision as to whether or not we want a President in the White House who understands that the duty of America is to open up the pathways of opportunity. And we must decide in this November, in this election, what kind of a man will be there to guide our foreign policy, what kind of a man will be there to conduct the affairs of this Nation abroad.

And I submit to you that in the nuclear age, we cannot afford a man that is impetuous or irresponsible, nor can we afford one that is indecisive. We need in this age above all other times a President that knows what he says when he says it and means what he says when he says it. [Applause.]

And I suggest that you have such a President.

And then may I say to my fellow Democrats and to the thousands, yea, millions of Republicans, that are putting their country over their party, and there are those people by the millions, people who traditionally would vote the Republican ticket but not this time, and I will tell you why, because they see the spokesman of their party as the man that has repudiated Lincoln and his Emancipation Proclamation.

They see as the spokesman of their party a man who has repudiated bipartisan foreign policy. [Applause.] And they see and they hear, and they hear the followers of this man that know only how to boo and not the cheer. [Applause.]

So, friends, may I say to my fellow Democrats and may I say to those good people of Republican persuasion that are putting their country above their party, let us make this election campaign worthy of our country, and may I say in all respect that I don't think it is very worthy of a great enlightened democracy when all you can hear is "We want Barry." [Applause.]

It doesn't take much brain power to arrive at that gutteral utterance [applause] but I do think the American people have a responsibility to set some standards, and may I suggest the standards that we ought to set? I think that we ought to so conduct ourselves in this campaign, discussing the issues, so that whether we win or lose, we can honestly say that we fought the campaign with honor and dignity. And I say to those that believed in the ideas of John Kennedy and that believe in the works of Lyndon Johnson, let us carry on this campaign in such a manner that it will be a lasting, living memorial to the memory and the words and the deeds and the works of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. [Applause.]

And I say to this audience, I say to my good friends in this audience, that if Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, was good enough to have the respect and the admiration and the trust of John Kennedy, he is good enough to have the respect and the trust and the support of the American people, and I say he will have it on November 3.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Article

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

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, RALLY, DUNDALK, BALTIMORE COUNTY, MD., OCTOBER 14, 1964

On November 3 the American people will decide whether Lyndon Baines Johnson or the leaders of the Goldwater faction will guide the destiny of this great Nation for the next 4 years.

Never has so much been at stake—perhaps even the very existence of an American future or the existence of mankind itself.

Let us make no mistake about it: the Republican Party has fallen into the hands of reckless men, men who have been inscribed clearly on the public record their willingness to gamble with the American heritage.

You have a choice on November 3 and its terms are before you.

On one hand, the Goldwater leadership, the rearguard of a defeated past, calls upon the American people to repudiate the massive achievements of 20th century democracy.

They want to turn the clock back—they want to abandon the challenges of tomorrow for the fantasies of yesterday. They want to establish a kind of selfish irresponsibility in both domestic and international relations which violates the fundamental principles of the American tradition—both conservative and liberal.

Prophets of despair and defeat, they have no understanding of or affection for the vital new America which has emerged from fruitful cooperation between the many minorities and peoples who have built America.

It is paradoxical that their leader, a spokesman for a minority of radicals and reactionaries, should so bitterly condemn "minorities." What a shameful page in American political history.

On the other hand, Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party are proud to be the partisans of hope—we are proud to welcome all Americans.

Senator Goldwater says that Americans are "sick and tired." *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that the "moral fiber of the American people is beset with rot and decay."

We deny it.

Senator Goldwater calls the President of the United States a "phony," a "faker," and a barefaced liar."

We deny it.

Senator Goldwater says that social security has brought slavery and should be made "voluntary."

We deny it.

Senator Goldwater says that Washington is more dangerous than Moscow. *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that the Peace Corps is a "haven for beatniks." *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that a child has "no right to an education." *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that nuclear war is inevitable. *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says he is equipped to guide the destinies of this Nation and the free world in these perilous times. *We deny it.*

We do more than deny. *We affirm!*

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

We believe that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a ringing affirmation of the historic American dedication to freedom. In the same way that the first amendment and early State constitutions forbade religious discrimination, we have used the authority of the Nation to widen the meaning of freedom for all citizens, without regard to race, color, or creed.

Legislating morality is an ancient American custom—incorporated in every provision of every criminal code—and we have employed the methods of our ancestors to fulfill their ideal of equality and their passion for freedom.

No principle is more deeply imbedded in the American past than this: that government exists to promote and sustain the welfare of the citizens. Not just a few citizens—that is the Goldwater doctrine—but all the citizens, the majorities and the minorities who accept the ground rules of the democratic system.

To Senator Goldwater, government is an enemy agent. But in our view government is an instrument of liberation. Government is and must be compassionately concerned with every man's freedom.

It is our conviction that government's responsibility for freedom encompasses every man's right to develop his capabilities to the fullest: to receive the best possible education regardless of ability to pay, or the vocational training that will enable him proudly to take his place in a productive society.

It is our conviction that no man is truly free unless he can live and work in dignity, fearing neither sickness nor old age—neither man nor machine.

It is our conviction that the business of government will remain unfinished business so long as there is a hungry child, a lonely old man, a person who "never had a chance."

It is our conviction that freedom is ever the right to question, to challenge, yes, even to dissent—openly and without fear.

It is this view that enables us to boldly envision, and plan for, a Great Society in which the marvels of automation will be balanced with full employment and the continued development of new horizons—a society that will enable all men to enjoy not only the rewards of their labor but the sweetness of their leisure.

This is American freedom. As Adlai Stevenson wrote:

> When an American says he loves his country, he means not only that he loves the New England hills, the prairies glistening in the sun or the wide rising plains, the mountains and the seas. He means that he loves an inner air, an inner light in which freedom lives and in which a man can draw the breath of self-respect.

This is the freedom we live—and we love. This is the freedom which affects every man's family, every man's happiness, every man's dignity and integrity.

How shall we attain and implement these freedoms?

Shall we do this under the leadership of a man who vilifies the past, distorts the present, and shrinks from the future—who curses the darkness and never lights a candle?

Or shall we do this under the leadership of a man who has been tested as few men in our history: by public service under four Presidents, by leadership in the Congress of the United States, by sudden elevation under tragic and dreadful circumstances to the White House itself?

Shall we choose a leader who specializes in driving away those with whom he disagrees, who scorns the path of moderation and accommodation, who sows the seeds of disunity and discord even within his own party?

Or shall we choose a leader who possesses the qualities to create unity from division and consensus from conflict, who pursues his duties as Commander in Chief with responsibility and restraint, and who understands that compassion is not cowardice and concern for others is not weakness?

This is the great question which the American people must answer, And I have great faith in America and her people.

We Americans are children of light—we shall put from us forever the children of darkness.

We shall select the one man superbly qualified to lead our Nation and the world toward the noble goals of the Great Society.

We shall select Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Dundalk, Md.
October 14, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you.

VOICES FROM AUDIENCE. We want Hubert.

Senator HUMPHREY. You've got him.

Thank you very much, Senator Tydings. It is just as well to get used to saying that.

It is a great joy to be here and to be introduced by a very great citizen of this State, an illustrious man in his own right, and the son of one of my closest friends when I first came to the U.S. Senate.

I would have been for Joe Tydings and would vote for him if I could live in Maryland if only because of his wonderful family and the kindness of his distinguished father, the patriotic service of the late Senator Millard Tydings, but I am here for him for better reasons even than that because Maryland needs a progressive, forward-looking, hard-working, young, active U.S. Senator to back up Lyndon Johnson as our President. [Applause.]

And may I say to the Senator-to-be Tydings, may I say what a joy it is to sit on this platform today, to stand here with Democrats from all over Maryland, men who are known for their hard work in this party, men who on other occasions have fought hard in primaries. I see your distinguished former primary poller here, a gentleman that I admire and love very much, a great public servant of this State, and when I see Louis Goldstein on the same platform with Joe Tydings, I say it is good news for Maryland. [Applause.]

And I have been around Maryland almost as much as I have at Minnesota. I lived here 16 years in Montgomery County and I have loved every day of it.

This is a great State, it is a great people, and this State of Maryland is one that ought to be in the Democratic column on every single election, and it is just about time that we redeem the sins of the past and in 1964 make Maryland a good solid Democratic State. [Applause.]

You know, as I came here I noticed one or two signs out here. I noticed one or two boys out here carrying a sign that just showed that they were ready to repent for their political transgressions. [Laughter and applause.]

You know, every time I see one of those Goldwater signs go up I say that is as high as he is ever going to get. [Laughter and applause.]

By the way, let me say to my good friend out here that he is the happiest looking Goldwaterite that I have ever seen and deep down in his heart you know that he is going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Laughter and applause.]

Well, all right, pal, you are a good body. Now let me just go along and say a word here with reference to some of our other friends that are here.

I am so pleased to be here in the presence of George Fallon, the dean of your delegation, who in the coming Congress will be the chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, and let me say also to Joe Tydings that you have a partner running with you at large in this election and that partner is a distinguished Congressman who has already gained a splendid reputation for public service, and I want to say just this word, that of all the people that I know that have given of themselves to the good causes of good government for our Nation and for this State, none stands higher on that roster than Carlton Sickles, and I hope that you will give him the support that he so justly deserves. [Applause.]

My old friend, Sam Friedel is here. We have been partners before in many a campaign, Sam, and there isn't any doubt but what you are going to win again. Baltimore City could never let you down or Baltimore County. [Applause.]

And Ed Garmatz; Ed, I haven't the slightest doubt because of what you have done for the port of Baltimore, for the great city here in this great area, that you will be returned to the Congress with a smashing majority.

So let's just go down the line. You start out with Joe Tydings and then you have got George Fallon and Ed Garmatz and Clarence Long from this district here, Clarence that represents this district with the kind of spirit and effectiveness that every district ought to have.

So, Clarence, you are going to get reelected. There isn't any doubt about it.

And Carlton Sickles and Sam Friedel.

All right. Now let me talk to you a little bit about the politics of tomorrow. Where is my friend Dan Brewster around here. I was hoping that Senator Brewster could be with us, but let me say that you helped America when you sent Senator Brewster to the U.S. Senate, and I think he deserves a good round of applause from the good people of Maryland for the work that he has done. [Applause.]

Well, friends, we have been busy on the campaign hustings and it is perfectly obvious what is going to happen in this election, perfectly obvious that the American people are going to continue to support the programs and the policies of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, that the American people are going to make the right choice on November 3, and on that day of November 3, our people will decide whether Lyndon Johnson or the leaders of the Goldwater faction—they are small in numbers, they are rather vocal but they are small in numbers—will guide the destiny of this great Nation for the next 4 years.

Never so much—never has so much been at stake. Perhaps even the very existence of the American future or the existence of mankind itself.

So let's make no mistake about it, friends. The Republican Party, a great party, has fallen into the hands of reckless men, men who have inscribed clearly on their public record their willingness to gamble with the future of America and with the heritage of this country.

So you have a choice, my friends. You have a real choice. No echo this time. A choice on November 3 in terms that are before you. On the one hand, the Goldwater leadership, the real god of a defeated past, calls upon the American people to repudiate, to repudiate the massive achievements of the 20th century democracy that is ours.

They want to turn the clock back. In fact, I might add that this is an amazing type of performance. The leader of this Goldwater faction, and it is but a faction, this is why thousands and thousands of Republicans are voting for Lyndon Johnson; they are putting their country ahead of their party; but the leader of that faction makes these incredible statements and does some of the things that you see happen for the following reasons.

He is the only man that I know that has a calendar without any months or weeks on it. [Laughter.]

He is the only man that I know that has a watch without any hands on it, and he is the only man that I know that has glasses without any lenses. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, when you are in such circumstance, my friend, you are bound to lose your vision, you bound to lose sense of time, and you are even bound to lose sense of history. So be of good tolerance and be of good cheer with these dear souls. They will be back with us after November 3.

They will be there asking for forgiveness and saying, bring us, too, back to America, because they have been leading it for quite a while, as you know. [Applause.]

Yes, this vocal, articulate little minority here, they are always present, never say much, but they are loud. They want to abandon the challenges of tomorrow for the fantasies of yesterday, and they want to establish a kind of selfish irresponsibility, both in domestic and international relations. And this irresponsibility, this selfish irresponsibility, frankly, strikes at the very fundamental principles of the American tradition, both conservative and liberal.

They are prophets of despair and of defeat and they have no understanding of or affection for the new vital America which has emerged as a result of cooperation between Government and labor, and industry, and agriculture, between the people of this country and the great Government that represents these people.

It is paradoxical that their leader—it is paradoxical that their leader, a spokesman for a minority of radicals and reactionaries, should go around bitterly condemning minorities and making the word "minorities" sound as if it is an ugly term.

Mind you, Senator Goldwater condemning minorities, what a shameful page in American political history. And what a pity it is that this great symphony of America that is made up of people of many races and many creeds and many national origins should have to listen to the words of one who says he wants to be President and says that the minorities of America dominate it and run it.

Let me tell you who runs America. The majority of the people run this country and they are going to continue to do so. [Applause.]

I might add, my dear friends, in all respect that had the position of the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party prevailed some years ago, I am afraid that Senator Goldwater's grandfather wouldn't have even been admitted. But thank goodness that it didn't because America is made up of people, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, white and colored, of every country on the face of the earth, and the reason America is what it is today is because we have learned how to work together and live together, not as minorities but as Americans proud of our heritage. [Applause.]

You know, the key phrase of this vocal little opposition, you know, they are going to get just about as many votes as they have people at their meetings; what a pitiful display that will be; the key phrase is that Americans are sick and tired.

Oh, my, my, my. Dr. Goldwater goes around telling us how sick we are [laughter], how tired we are.

Sometimes one should say, look at thineself, old friend. Look at thineself. Sick and tired they say Americans are. Well, I say we deny it. I say that this is the healthiest, happiest-looking group of people that you will find any place on the face of the earth.

Americans aren't sick. They are a little sick and tired of the nonsense that is being peddled by the Goldwaterites, but we are proud to be Americans and we are strong and we are vital and we are healthy, aren't we? [Applause.]

Senator Goldwater says that the moral fiber of the American people is beset with rot and decay. I don't know who he is talking about. It must be some friends of his. [Laughter and applause.]

I find the American people doing all right. I find them as moral and as decent and as forward-looking as any generations of America, and so to Mr. Goldwater we say nonsense and we deny emphatically your ridiculous ugly charge on the American community.

Senator Goldwater calls the President of the United States a phony, a faker, and a barefaced liar, and then he says he doesn't want to indulge in personalities. [Laughter.]

May I say that this is the talk of the defeated politician. It is the talk of the man that knows he is done, he is through, he is washed up. He is defeated. It is the talk of desperation. [Applause.]

And Senator Goldwater says that social security has brought slavery and should be voluntary.

Of course, he now says that he didn't mean it. It is very interesting to try to keep up with this moving target. [Laughter.]

You know what this country needs? It needs a President that says what he means and means what he says. [Applause.]

Well, let me say to Senator Goldwater, we are proud of social security. We don't think it has brought slavery to anyone. We don't think it ought to be weakened. We think it ought to be strengthened and we think it has been a blessing to America and I believe the American people agree with that, too. [Applause.]

And the Senator from Arizona says, and I quote him, "Washington is more dangerous than Moscow."

What kind of a man is this that can say such ugly things about our country? More dangerous than Moscow. This man proves he knows little about Washington and less about Moscow and that kind of a man ought not to be President of the United States.

Senator Goldwater says that the Peace Corps is a haven for beatniks, and I want to say to the people of this fine audience that the Peace Corps has been one of the finest demonstrations of American life, that American young people and others who have joined the Peace Corps have helped the world, have helped America, and have proven to the people of the world what a great and wonderful Nation this is.

Shame on you, Mr. Goldwater. [Applause.]

Senator Goldwater says that the nuclear war is inevitable. I say we deny it. We believe that war is not inevitable and we believe that the task of statesmanship is to make sure that this catastrophe of nuclear destruction does not befall mankind.

Senator Goldwater says he is equipped to guide the destinies of the Nation in the free world in these perilous times and this we emphatically deny, and we do more than deny it. We affirm.

We say that he is by training and by statements and by commitment not qualified to lead the free world and America during these perilous times, and I don't think you are going to let him do that on November 3, are you? [Applause.]

My friends, let me just summarize by saying that we come here not merely to recite the many contradictions of the Senator from Arizona, because quite frankly, in all seriousness, I do not think the American people are going to tolerate that kind of would-be leadership.

I think that we as citizens, and most of us as Democrats, here should point to the fact that the Democratic Party has demonstrated under the Kennedy-Johnson administration its loyalty and fidelity to the ideals of our country and its responsibility to the challenges of the present, and its commitment to the opportunities of the future.

We have done things. We have passed great legislation that has helped our country so much. We passed a Civil Rights Act that established in this country for the first time full and equal guarantees of law to every American citizen. We only know one kind of citizenship in America, thank God, and that is first-class citizenship for every American. [Applause.]

And, my friends, the record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration establishes once again or reaffirms the principle that government exists to promote and sustain the welfare and the well-being of the citizens, not just a few of the citizens, the formula of the Goldwater faction, but all of the citizens, the majorities and the minorities, who accept the ground rules of the democratic system.

Now, my friends, Senator Goldwater says that the Government is an enemy agent. Our Government. This man needs a basic course in civics. I would say that if he were to take it, we would have to do some remedial reading to pass it if you think in terms of what he has said, but in our view, our Government is not an enemy agent. It is an instrument of freedom, an instrument of emnacipation, an instrument of liberation and opportunity, and Government is, Senator and my fellow-citizens, Government is and must be compassionately concerned with the needs of people, with every man's freedom, and it is our conviction that the Government's responsibility for freedom encompasses every man's right to develop his capabilities to the fullest, to receive the best possible education for these children that are here, or vocational training for a worker that may be displaced that will enable him to proudly take his place in a productive society.

When we talk about opportunity, we are talking about education. We are talking about training. We are talking about healthy citizens. And it is our conviction that no man is truly free unless he can live and work in dignity, fearing neither sickness nor old age, fearing neither man nor machine, and it is our conviction that our Government and the business of our Government will remain unfinished so long as there is a hungry child, a lonely old man, or a person who never had a chance.

That is the kind of a government that is worthy of the American people. [Applause.]

Now, friends, let us just ask ourselves this question. How will we keep that Government? We can't do it by turning back. Shall we do this under the leadership of a man who villifies the past, distorts the present, and shrinks from the future and curses the darkness and never lights a candle?

I think not.

Or shall we do this under the leadership of a President who has been tested as few in history, by public service under four Presidents, by leadership of the Congress of the United States, and by sudden elevation under tragic and dreadful circumstances to the White House itself?

I think so.

Shall we choose a leader who specializes in driving away from him those with whom he disagrees, who scorns the path of moderation and accommodation, or who sows the seeds of disunity and discord in our country and even within his own party?

Or better, my friends, shall we choose a leader who possesses those rare qualities to create unity from division and consensus from conflict, who pursues his duty as Commander in Chief with responsibility and with restraint, and who understands that compassion is not weakness, and that concerns for the afflicted is not socialism but, rather, is good, solid, decent Americanism.

That is the record of Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Now, may I add that I ask this audience not to merely listen to the exhortation of speakers. The days ahead between now and November 3 are going to tell you and tell your family what the future of this country will be, not for 4 years but maybe for a generation or longer.

I don't think there is a mother in this audience that wants to thrust the Office of Presidency into the hands of an impetuous, reckless, irresponsible man. I don't think that the people, the working people in this audience, want to see undone the great things that have been done in behalf of working people over the past 30 years.

I don't think you want as President a man that would vote against a minimum wage law, one that would destroy your union, one, if you please, that sees no place for government in education for your children. And mark my words, my friends, that is the record of the man who seeks to be President on the Republican ticket in this campaign.

I think I know the kind of man you want. You want one who could fill the responsibilities of that Office of President, and I think it can be said without fear or equivocation that President Lyndon Johnson on that day when he had to take on the duties of President, on that day of November 22 when an assassin's bullet killed our beloved President Kennedy, that on that day Lyndon Johnson stood tall, stood strong, and proved himself to be a great American and a great leader. [Applause.]

And I resent, I for one resent the vicious, unprincipled muckraking attack that is being leveled on our President by those who are afraid to discuss the issues, who refuse to tell you of their plans for America.

Of all the campaigns that I have ever been in I have never seen one quite like this—an opposition that does nothing more or less than attack, attack, attack, and spread false rumors about our country, says our country is weak, says it is corrupt, says that it is morally debauched, a spokesman for a political party that frightens his own partisans, that spokesman that talks recklessly of a nuclear weapon, a spokesman that issues ultimatums as a way of settling the problems of the world.

What unbelievable circumstances. Listen, mother and father, this isn't just an election between a Republican and a Democrat. Senator Goldwater is no Republican. He is a radical and he is a dangerous one and he ought to be repudiated. [Applause.]

And President Johnson is not just a Democrat. President Johnson is not just a Democrat. He is an American and he is a great one and he has built America stronger and stronger every day of his leadership. [Applause.]

So I ask this great audience to repudiate the radicals, to repudiate these intemperate, impetuous men, to repudiate these haters, these that would spread disunity, and I ask you to join with me, to join with me and help unite America, to help make this country truly America the beautiful.

I ask you to join with President Lyndon Johnson in providing more jobs through cooperation with industry, in helping our great labor movement do yet a better job, in helping us to build better and more communities, more homes, better schools, and better hospitals.

We can do it. But we can't do it unless we go to work, and don't you take anything for granted. Don't you relax. Redouble your efforts. Remember that those that oppose us are driven by fanatical zeal. Remember they will stop at nothing. Remember they attack your President. They try to make him look bad. I say to you there is only one way to answer that kind of foul play and that is to give them the whipping of their life on November 3, 1964. [Applause.]

Thank you.

Penn Square,
Reading, Pa.,
October 15, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, my friends.

All right. Thank you. Congressman Rhodes, ladies and gentlemen, my good young friends, may I suggest that you just hold up that enthusiasm.

Congressman Rhodes, members of the county committee, the fine and good people of Reading, Pa. [Applause], Senator Joseph Clark, who has been here with you today to speak to you and my distinguished colleague in the Senate, and may I add a new Member of the U.S. Senate, if you go to work on November 3, Genevieve Blatt. We are very pleased to see you, Genevieve. [Applause.]

I am particularly happy to come to the district of one of the able and dedicated Members of the House of Representatives. I have known your Congressman for many years in Washington, and I have never known him to do anything else but to serve and serve and serve the constituents of his district with fidelity, with energy, with ability, and with results.

And I am pleased to be here on the platform today to ask the people of this great area of Pennsylvania to once again give their vote of confidence to a faithful, honorable, effective Member of Congress, your own Congressman George Rhodes. [Applause.]

And when you are doing that, and when you are doing that, may I also suggest that you keep in mind the necessity of having in the U.S. Senate someone that will dedicate her life to the progressive principles of government, the sound principles of government, of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and I know that you are going to do that by sending to the U.S. Senate one of the most experienced, one of the most trusted, and one of the most talented public servants in the history of Pennsylvania, and that is your own Genevieve Blatt, democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

Now, my dear friends, this is a wonderful audience and I am eternally grateful to you. I want to thank my young friends today and ask for their cooperation. We love to see our young people with us. I am very fond of them. After all, I have a houseful of them, and I think I appreciate their enthusiasm and their energy But I think the time has come in this campaign, may I say quite honestly, when we need to have some very serious discussion of issues. We also need to take into consideration our great responsibility as citizens of this Republic on election day.

So I say to my younger friends how grateful we are for their presence and I ask them to do a civic service, not only in this gathering but in the weeks ahead.

I ask these young friends that are here to go to their respective homes and to talk with their parents and to talk with their brothers and sisters who may be of voting age. And I ask them to appoint themselves as a committee of one, a committee of one, to safeguard the institution of American democracy in the home of America which, by the way, is the backbone, is the strength of this great Republic.

Now, your parents many times have advised and counseled you, just as I have advised and counseled my three sons and daughter. I would like to say that this is your chance.

How many of us realize that in the last election in this country in 1960, the presidential election, less than two-thirds of the American voters eligible to vote took time out on election day to think of their Government, to think of their country, and to act one way or another. Of course, we all have our point of view as to how we would like the election to come out, but I think it is equally important that we have an expression not just of a few of the American people, not just of 60 percent, but that we have an expression of every eligible voter in America.

So I say to my young friends, if the Republic of Italy could cast 93 percent of the total electoral vote on the part of its adult citizens in the most recent election in Italy, if France could cast 90 percent of all of its eligible votes, if the Scandanavian countries can cast 95 percent of all of their eligible votes, if in Belgium they can cast 87 percent of all of their eligible voters, then I ask my friends of the United States of America, and I ask my young friends in particular, what is wrong in this great Republic of ours where we enjoy more freedom, where we enjoy more prosperity, where we enjoy more of the blessings of life, what is wrong with us when only 63 percent of the total electorate in 1960 in that great election between President Kennedy and Vice President Nixon, what was wrong with America then when we were so slack, when we were so limited in our political expression?

So, my dear young friends, as a friend of young people, and I am eternally grateful for your help and your enthusiasm, your smiles, your idealism, your pep, will you take some of this home with you now? Wil you contact your mother and your father and your neighbors and say that if they can do it in Italy, if they can do it in France, and I predict that today in Great Britain where they are holding a great national election that not less than 85 to 90 percent of the voters of Britain will turn out to the polls, if they can do it in Norway, in Sweden, in Denmark, in Holland, in Germany, in Belgium, for not in a single country does less than 85 percent of the total electorate turn out, why can't we do it in America?

Make it your business to be a good citizen. Get your parents, my friends, to stand up and be counted one way or the other on election day for your future. What do you say, young men and women? [Applause.]

All right. I thank you. Now let me talk to you a little bit about what I think are some of the great issues in this campaign. We have gotten to a point in the election process where the American people are entitled to know where we stand on foreign policy, fiscal policy, domestic economic policy, where we stand in terms of the future of this Republic.

Let me start by saying that we live in the greatest land in the world and everybody knows it. That is not a partisan question. Both candidates for the office of Presidency know that.

And let me start also by saying that I do not contest the patriotism or the devotion to this country on the part of either candidate.

We have differences of views, sharp differences of views, and I think we ought to talk about them.

One of the things that I have noted is a substantial number of people who call themselves and are Republicans that this year have indicated they are going to vote for President Lyndon Johnson. And I think the question may be asked, "Why?"

They are not running away from their party, not at all. They feel their party has run away from them. And may I add that one of the [applause] and may I add that this feeling goes across this land.

Great newspapers that have long supported Republican candidates for President are this year supporting a Democratic candidate. The New York Herald Tribune, Life magazine, the Saturday Evening Post, just to mention three, but many more, all across this land, in your own State of Pennsylvania, newspapers that traditionally, consistently have supported Republican candidates this year say "No." This year they say "We are going to support President Johnson."

And I think the answer is quite simple. The standard bearer of the Republican Party in this campaign has not followed the Republican policy.

The 1960 platform had 25 specific commitments on the part of the Republican platform, 25 issues, 25 commitments, 25 points that were laid down in the Republican platform, and each of them brought up for a vote in the Congress of the United States, and on all 25, the Senator from Arizona voted "No."

On all 25, the Senator from Illinois, Senator Dirksen, the Republican leader in the Senate, he voted 18 times "yes."

On those 25, the Senator from Massachusetts, the distinguished Senator Saltonstall, one of the truly great men of the Senate, the leader of the Republican conference, he voted 20 times "yes."

The Senator from Arizona voted 25 times "no."

The Senator from California, the second man in command of the Republican Party in the Senate, Senator Thomas Kuchel, one of the most enlightened and able men of our country, and I say it in California to my Democrats just as I say it in Pennsylvania because a good man deserves praise, Senator Thomas Kuchel voted 25 times "yes" for his platform of the Republican Party. But the Senator from Arizona voted 25 times "no."

The Senator from Arizona says that Mr. Kuchel, the Republican Senator from California, is an extremist. But what can he say about Senator Dirksen who nominated him? What can he say about Senator Hickenlooper who was one of his strong supporters?

The Senator from Iowa, conservative Republican, Senator Hickenlooper, voted 17 times for his Republican platform. The Senator from Arizona voted 25 times "No."

And, ladies and gentlemen, this is why thousands, yea millions, of Republicans that love their party, that are going to come back and work in their party, that most likely again will never support another Democratic candidate, but those Republicans have left the standard bearer of their party, the Republican Party today, because that standard bearer does not represent responsible, middle-of-the-road, moderate, constructive, conservative Republican. He represents a new brand of American radicalism, and it is being repudiated throughout the land because there is no room for it. [Applause.]

Now let me give you some specific evidence. This great community of Reading, Pa., has three elderly housing projects to help give better decent homes and housing to people that are our senior citizens: elderly housing, a program sponsored in the Congress, bipartisan, not just Democratic, bipartisan.

Those three elderly housing projects of Reading, which mean so much to this community, could have never been built if you depended on the vote of the Republican standard bearer today. He voted "No."

He voted "No" on urban renewal. He voted "No" on issue after issue.

Your distinguished Republican Governor in this State served in Congress from 1960 to 1962, Governor Scranton, Republican, who had some very, very tough things to say about Mr. Goldwater—but I shall not repeat what he said because it was Senator Goldwater who said "By your votes you can judge us, not by our talking."

Senator Goldwater said that on May 26, 1964, and I agree with him.

I think that you do judge people by their votes. I think you do judge them not only by words and by the printed material that they put out in a campaign. I think you judge men who have served in the Congress, who have served in government, by their deeds and by their votes, and everybody is entitled to take his position.

In the Congress we vote aye or nay, yes or no.

Now, listen to this. Governor Scranton when Congressman from 1960 to 1962—take that 2-year period—area redevelopment, which has meant so much to Pennsylvania, thousands of jobs, Scranton voted "Yes." Goldwater voted "No."

The Housing Act of 1961, middle-income housing, elderly housing, college dormitory housing for your students, public housing for underprivileged, Scranton voted "Yes," Goldwater voted "No."

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 to train the workers that were the victims of automation or the change of industrial patterns, workers that had lost their jobs through no fault of their own, workers that needed new skills, and the Manpower Training Act has been a very effective act. It hasn't cost a dime. It has produced revenue. It has produced wealth.

On that issue Scranton as Congressman voted "Yes." Goldwater voted "No."

The Social Security Act. Oh, Mr. Goldwater says those Democrats are trying to make it look like I am against social security. "You shall know them by their votes," said Mr. Goldwater. By our votes you can judge us.

Well, Senator Goldwater in 1961 when we amended the Social Security Act, when we increased its benefits, when we increased its coverage, Governor Scranton, Republican, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, voted "Yes." Senator Goldwater voted "No."

This is the record, and it goes down the line. In recent years the Republican standard bearer voted "No" on higher education, voted "No" on the Economic Opportunity Act, voted "No" on the antipoverty program, voted "No" on the Peace Corps, listen to this: Not only did he vote "No" on the Peace Corps which is the greatest development of our foreign policy since the Marshall plan, which put our young people, the true voice and image of America, out around this world and every country in the world has praised the Peace Corps, every free country, as one of the greatest developments of American life.

What did Mr. Goldwater call it? "A haven for beatniks." "A haven for beatniks."

But more importantly, I can forgive a man for making a phrase, making some little statement that gets the headlines, but how did he vote on the Peace Corps? And how did he vote of the Arms Control Agency? He voted "No."

How did he vote on the Alliance for Progress for the help of our friends in Latin America? As he said, the menace is communism. How does he vote on the great programs to fight communism? He votes "No."

I submit that the record must be studied. How did he vote on sustaining the United Nations, which is one of the great hopes of mankind for peace, the United Nations that serves in peacekeeping functions throughout the world? The Senator from Arizona voted "No."

So, ladies and gentlemen, all that I can say is that if you want an America that repudiates the United Nations, if you want an America that will cut back or jeopardize social security, if you want an America in which there is no interest in housing for the elderly, if you want an America in which you don't care for workers, if you want an America in which education is downgraded, all you have got to do in this election, if that is the kind of America you want, is to vote for the Senator from Arizona.

But if you want an America, my fellow American, where we put a premium on education, where we are trying to give our young people the best chance in the world to make something out of their lives, if you want an America where we do something about the elderly and that we talk about them and work for them, for their dignity and their security, if you want an America where we care for the afflicted and the sick, if you want an America where we train workers for productive work, if you want an America where jobs are increasing, where wealth is increasing, if you want an America that pursues relentlessly the path of peace, then I say keep what you have got and you go ahead and back Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

Now, friends, my dear friends, most every campaign ends up in a flurry of vindictive. How unfortunate. The American people want to know what of the future. It isn't enough just to look at the yesterdays. It isn't enough even to be concerned with today.

I see in this audience, this great flow of audience and people here, I see hundreds of young people, and I want to say to the mothers and fathers that are gathered here, you had better make sure that in the Office of President you have a man who is responsible and not irresponsible, a man who is steady and not impetuous, and above all you had better make sure that America remains strong, strong for the purpose of one objective—peace—strong so that we might secure the peace.

Make sure that America is just, because if America stands for anything in this world today, it stands for justice, social justice.

This is the commitment of our religion. This is the commitment of our country. This is the commitment of our forefathers.

And this Senator that stands before you today says that it is not weakness to pursue peace. It takes courage. It is not cowardice to be for compassion. It takes strength.

And I want to say that I have never considered care for the unfortunate, the afflicted, and the sick as socialism. I consider it good, decent, honest Americanism. [Applause.]

And may I add as one who has grown up in a family business, and as I look up and down this street I see one thriving enterprise after another, America is not as rich and as strong as these retail establishments, important as they are. America is as rich and as strong as its people at work, in the constructive importance of employment, as investment of our businessmen and management of our enterprises.

We are all in this together. We have got a great prosperity. Let's maintain it.

I saw the morning's newspaper that told me that America's prosperity had increased another $8,900 million this last quarter. Every month it is better, and this is not by accident. It is because a government and a people, a friendly government has worked with industry. It is because of the tax cut that Mr. Goldwater voted against. It is because of area redevelopment that Mr. Goldwater voted against. It is because of foreign aid that Mr. Goldwater voted against.

It is because you have in the White House today a President that encourages American enterprise and doesn't discourage it, someone that says to America let's move forward, let's do our best, let's try to overcome our problems and let's make possible opportunities.

I appeal to this audience between now and November 3d to study this record. I ask every citizen in this great assembly today to be a good American, fulfill your political responsibilities, cast your vote.

I hope and pray that you will see possible to cast your vote for Genevieve Blatt for the Senate, for George Rhodes for the Congress [applause] and I hope and pray that you will be able to see fit to cast your vote for a man that has had 30 years of honorable public service in our Government, from Congressman to Senator to Vice President to President.

I hope that you make this election a resounding tribute to a man who is working every hour of the day for a better America, a more peaceful world and a more just society, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States. [Applause.]

Johnstown, Pa.
Airport
October 15, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very, very much. This is a good way to get up in the world. And it always takes somebody to help you, may I say, to get any place, and to get up in the world, and I learned that throughout my life.

I am very honored here to be in your fine community here at Johnstown at the Cambria County Airport, and I want to say how touched and how deeply moved I am to have the privilege of meeting Mrs. Strank here, the mother of one of our great heroes of American life, and Mrs. Humphrey and myself wanted to present to her just a little remembrance. We brought her some flowers. There is no way America can proprely repay a mother like that. I think we ought to keep that in mind in these difficult days.

Now, may I say to all of you that are gathered here, we are going to have a good rally. We are going to have opportunities to visit together. This election is the most important election that you will face for many, many years. You have here an opportunity to decide the future course of our country and everyone of us knows that this great country of ours faces tremendous challenges ahead.

And that is why I believe that you need leadership that is strong, reliable, and responsible. That is why I believe that every American has a special obligation to take a keen interest in this election, to look at the issues, to try to cut through some of this noise, some of this fanfare, some of these personal charges, and try to find out just where we are going, where we stand, and how we are going to come to grips with tomorrow, because every mother and father that is here has only one thing at heart.

What about the children? What is the tomorrow going to be?

How about that little baby right out there? That is what we are talking about. What kind of a tomorrow are we going to have?

And I think that when you contemplate the tomorrows, you will want leadership. You will want leadership that works for tomorrow, not leadership that spends its time reviewing the past but leadership that has some idea of how we keep the peace because it won't do much good, you know, to build a great America that is going to be falling to pieces. We need to think about how we continue the peace. We need to think about how we keep our jobs.

I am here in the great city built on industry, and industry requires prosperity, prosperity makes for industry. And industry makes for jobs. Jobs make for industry.

What I am trying to say is we all need each other. There isn't anybody that is much more important than the other fellow. And the lesson we need to learn in American politics is that you don't build a great America by tearing it apart. You build it by bringing it together and that is our message.

Now, I am going to talk to you more downtown. I just wanted to get out and thank you. I want to thank all these candidates. I want to say to Mr. McCaffrey how glad I am to be here with him. I want you to know that we have Genevieve Blatt with us, candidate for the U.S. Senate. We have Mr. Stephens; we have others.

We are going to talk to you about them, your Democratic ticket. In the meantime, good luck. See you downtown. Isn't this a beautiful day, though? Wow. [Applause.]

Johnstown, Pa.
Central Park
October 15,1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

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

I understand there may be a little competition here between St. Vincent's and St. Francis, is that right? [Applause.]

Well, I am simply delighted to be here today in this great, wonderful city of Johnstown, and I am very honored to have been introduced by the gentleman that is going to be the next Congressman, the Democratic Congressman, from this, the 22d District of Pennsylvania, James McCaffrey. Also we have on this platform a gentleman I don't believe was introduced, so let me be the introducer. He is the congressional candidate, that is, Democratic congressional candidate from the 12th district, from over in Somerset county, Paul Stephens. Where is Paul? [Applause.]

And you have all met before many times your wonderful public servant here in the State of Pennsylvania, a lady that has honored her State by service beyond the call of duty, and I ask my good friend and our candidate on the Democratic ticket for the U.S. Senate, Genevieve Blatt to stand and take another bow.

Now, if you will just translate all that enthusiasm into votes, we have really got this thing made.

And with this group today is your distinguished Senator, Democratic Senator, from Pennsylvania, my good friend, Joe Clark. Joe, stand up and take a bow. [Applause.]

And Mayor Thompkins, may I again personally thank you for the medallion that you were so kind to give to me. I shall cherish this as a memento of this campaign, but more importantly, I shall keep it in remembrance of the hospitality and the kindness of your city, the generous reception, the warm reception that has been given to me as I came to this great industrial community of Johnstown, Pa.

Mayor Thompkins, I was once mayor of Minneapolis. I always said it was the best job I ever had, the hardest job, and they tell me that this is your first term. Are you going to have some experiences! [Laughter.]

Well, I want to say how honored I was at the airport to have the privilege of meeting a very dear and fine lady who has given all to her country. She gave her son, the winner of the highest honor of our Government, the Congressional Medal of Honor. And I want this lovely lady to stand and be recognized, Mrs. Strank of your own community. [Applause.]

And I told her that she looked just exactly as my grandmother did, who I loved very much, and I can't pay a nicer compliment to any woman than that. [Applause.]

I just feel like I am in northern Minnesota. I come up here and see all these fine workers in the steel mills. I gather there are a few Slovenians here, a few Slovaks and Czechs and Poles and a few others. It is like in Minnesota, I see almost as many Democrats up there as I see here. Oh, that makes me feel good. Do you all feel Democratic out there today? [Applause.]

I understand when John Kennedy, our beloved President, when he was here in 1960, he made quite a speech. I understand that when he was here he called it Johnson City. Well, he was right. He is a prophet. It is going to be Lyndon Johnson City come November 3d. [Applause.]

As I say, I can plainly see you folks know just what to do and you look happy. You look healthy. You look like you are just going to vote the straight Democratic ticket for top to bottom and whenever in doubt, that is the thing to do. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Mayor, the medallion that you gave me commemorated the survivors—first of all, the 75th, I should say, anniversary of the great Johnstown flood and the survivors of that flood. Well, let me say that Johnstown back in 1889 may have been in a situation where a flood could have destroyed it and taken hundreds, yea, thousands of lives, but I wish to say now that Johnstown is flood free, free from floods, and one of the reasons it is, is because you have had a Government that cared about you, a Federal Government that worked with your State government, a Government that cared about you and it cared about you under a Democratic administration, and today Johnstown is flood free. [Applause.]

I am happy to say that a telegram that I have been waiting for just came in. You know, you have to be pretty nimble on your feet in this campaign business because once in a while a message doesn't get through to you on time. But I have a message here, Washington, D.C., and it tells us a story that I think you would like to hear.

This telegram came in yesterday. It was supposed to have been given to me promptly when I got off the plane. But here it is.

It says, "I endorse wholeheartedly and unqualifiedly for the Congress the Honorable James E. McCaffrey and Paul A. Stephens. I wish them the best and they have my sincere good wishes. Lyndon B. Johnson." [Applause.]

Well, now, boys, you have got that endorsement. All you have got to do is go to work and all you good voters, all you have to do now is to elect them and I think you are going to do it.

Today in the few moments that we have here I want to discuss with you seriously the issues in this campaign.

In less than 3 weeks, in fact, in about 2½ weeks, the American people are going to make a decision, a vital decision, about their future.

I have heard many people talk about the game of politics. Some people would have you believe that it is a sort of like baseball or football. It is not a game. Politics in a democracy is the most serious business of our time. Politics in a free country requires careful attention by the citizenry. Politics in a democracy requires an informed citizenry if that politics is to be worthy of a free people.

Every place I have been in these recent days I have tried to remind our people of our civic and public duty as citizens of this, the greatest country on the fact of the earth. America is not as strong as its banks or its industries. It isn't even as strong as its armies or its defense etablishment. America is as strong as its people. It is people interested in their country in their government. It is people educated and healthy and committed to the proposition of human dignity and political freedom.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this country was established on the principle of popular sovereignty. What do we mean by that? We mean that ultimately the powers of government must come from the people. Government by the consent of the governed.

Lincoln put it "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." If you want government for the people, if you want a government that is interested in the people, if you want a government that is concerned about the people, if you want a government that serves the people, then the people must take an interest in that government. [Applause.]

And that, my friends, means that on election day, that you perform your duty, not only your privilege but your duty to vote.

Isn't it a pity that in the greatest free country in the world we have the lowest voting percentage of eligible voters. No other free country in the world has as low a percentage of the eligible voters go to the ballot box as in America, a country that is rich, a country that God Almighty has showered his blessings upon, a country that has the responsibility for leadership in the free world, a country that is the hope of the world.

Yet this country, my fellow Americans, in the last election, a great election for the future of the world, this country had less than two-thirds of its eligible voters going to the ballot box.

Italy, 93 percent in the last election. France, 90 percent. The British will vote today in their national election, and I will wager that over 85 percent of the eligible voters in Britain will go to the ballot box. The Scandinavian countries, over 90 percent. Belgium, Holland, any country that you can think of in Europe, about 90 percent of the eligible voters age 21 or over go to vote.

But here we are in America where more people can gripe about government than any other place, where more people complain at times about government. Yet in this great country, one out of every three voters stays home and says "I don't care."

Now, my friends, if you don't care, who will care? I think we ought to make this election the greatest outpouring of voters that the world has ever known. I think we ought to tell the Communist world that we know how to be free, and I think we ought to tell the free world that we know how to exercise our duties and our privileges of citizenship, and therefore, I appeal to every boy and girl in this audience to tell their daddy, to tell their mommy, to tell their grandfather, to tell their grandmother, to tell their brother and sister 21 years of age and over, I ask every little boy and girl, I ask every young man and woman under 21 to go to their parents and say, "Do me a favor, will you? Be a good citizen on election day."

Election day ought to be known as Citizenship Day. We ought to change its title. We ought to determine then who are the good citizens.

Oh, I want you to vote for my ticket, but I think it is more important that you vote. I think the important thing is that we be good citizens and don't you take anything for granted, you people that say that Lyndon Johnson is going to win. I think he is going to win. I think President Johnson deserves to win.

I think that when John Kennedy selected President Johnson as his Vice President, he made the greatest decision of his life. He protected the future of America. And I say to you what if Lyndon B. Johnson was good enough for John Fitzgerald Kennedy as his strong right arm he is good enough for you and he is good enough for me. [Applause.]

This city proved it. This great city voted overwhelmingly for John Fitzgerald Kennedy. You loved him as I did. I worked with him. I know him. I knew him. I know what happened in America on that terrible day when he was taken from us, and I know that a strong man rose up. I know that the faith that John Kennedy put in Lyndon Johnson, that faith was proven to be sound and true because President Lyndon Johnson who came into office under the most incredible and terrible circumstances, proved himself to be a man of humility, proved himself to be a man of strength proved himself to be a man of experience, proved himself to be a man who was responsible, and ladies and gentlemen, to be President of this country is the most difficult task in the world.

You not only have to be President of the United States. You have to lead the world. And Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States of America, has proven to be a great President, a good President, a human President, a working President, and your President. [Applause.]

So let's not let this thing go by default. Don't let a single person stay home.

You know, in my State of Minnesota we had an election in 1962: 1,300,000 votes were cast and the Governor in my State was elected by a majority of 91. Ninety-one.

Every vote counts. Your vote counts. Make it an intelligent vote.

Now, let me ask you something. Do you want to see the gains, Mr. Worker? And I come to a city where the steel industry represents the backbone of the economic strength of America. And I come from a State where the iron ore comes from, where the taconite pellets come from. I have been in those iron mines. I have been with those steelworkers. I know. I have been there.

I know how important this industry is, and I know what this industry looked like in 1960. This city didn't have the employment it now has. Not on your life. And there was many a mother and many a father here who wondered where the paycheck was.

You had unemployment compensation. Why? Because you had a President like Franklin Delano Roosevelt that thought into the future. [Applause.]

And let me say to my friends who are merchants, my family has been in business for 63 years. We still operate a business. I am the head of that little family corporation.

I have never kidded myself for 1 minute. That business is no better than the customers that walk in the door. I don't care how smart you are, how many nice goods you have. If your workers that are there have no paychecks, you have no business, and if the farmers that come in don't have any price for their commodity, you don't have business.

There isn't anybody more dependent upon the workingman, upon the farmer, upon the schoolteacher and the clerk and the secretary and the stenographer and merchant on Main Street. Every one of them.

So we are in this together, and that is what President Johnson teaches us. He reminds us that we need to build this country together. And we have. We built a great system of social security, and if I went around this great assembly today and asked you how many of you want to lose social security, you wouldn't get one hand.

We know how important social security is and we intend to make it better, not to weaken it. We intend to improve it, not to downgrade it.

And what did Mr. Goldwater do when he had a chance? Well, dear friends, I will just give you one or two examples. You have got a Governor in this State that served in the Congress. He is a Republican.

You have got a Governor that in 1960 to 1962 voted in the Congress. On the Social Security Amendments of 1961, this Republican Governor who now says you ought to vote for Goldwater—but he didn't say that a few months ago, you know. Oh, no. He said Goldwater was worse than the plague. [Laughter.]

But now he says you have got to do that. You have got to vote for Goldwater.

Well, that is his privilege. I understand. I am a party man myself. I appreciate that.

I believe that really what Mr. Nixon and Mr. Scranton are doing is not asking you to vote for Goldwater. They are just out to pick up the pieces after Goldwater has literally wrecked the Republican Party. [Laughter and cries of "Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah."]

Senator HUMPHREY. Good. Good. I guess that must be part of the University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown Branch. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, listen to this. Why is it that so many good Republicans today are going to vote for President Johnson? It isn't normal. They generally don't switch ballots. But they are going to, and I will tell you why. Because Mr. Goldwater doesn't vote the way Republicans are expected to vote. Mr. Goldwater doesn't even vote for his own party. He obviously doesn't vote for John Kennedy's New Frontier program. He obviously doesn't support Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal or Harry Truman's Fair Deal. He condemns those programs as if they were consummate evil. But everybody in this audience with few exceptions knows that without them there wouldn't have been any Johnstown and you know what would be your lot. You good friends in the labor movement, do you want a man in the White House that is against you? [Cries of "No" from the audience.]

You good folks under social security, do you want that social security to be weakened or lost? [Cries of "No".]

And I ask my young friends who are students, Do you want your educational structure to be weakened or destroyed? [Cries of "No."]

Well, if you feel that way, then you had better make up your mind that you can't afford to have in the White House a man who is opposed to education assistance, who is doubtful about social security, who voted against social security. You can't afford to have a man in the White House who voted against minimum wages, who is against your organized trade union movement, who voted against tax reduction to help these business places on Main Street.

You tell me what he voted for. I will tell you what he voted for. A billion dollars for Arizona. [Laughter.] Oh, yes. He voted for a $1 billion project for Arizona. But when it came to California, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, he said, "oh, no, no, no. We haven't got any time for you folks."

You need a President that thinks of the future and will preserve the gains of the past.

You need a President that thinks and talks well and knew Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

You need a President that was a friend of and supporter of Harry S. Truman, and you need a President that when he was a Senate majority leader didn't snipe at and didn't make difficult the life of President Eisenhower.

You need a President who was the strong right arm of John Kennedy, and you need a President who today is doing a big job for you, a job for the world, a job for every American, and that President is none other than Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, I leave you with just this expression of hope. I say that everything that we talked about, every economic gain, everything about social security and wages, everything about the general prosperity which is ours today, all of this can be lost, all of it, if this world gets into a war. And we need in the White House someone that understands that the pursuit of peace is not weakness but is strength.

We need someone in the White House that understands that the peacemaker is the great man and not the little man.

We need someone in the White House that understands the use of power and how to restrain its use. We need someone in the White House that will try to stop or slow down this dangerous arms race, not someone that will speed it up.

We need someone in the White House that will unite Americans, not divide us, someone that will speak to us as citizens, not as Catholics and Protestants and Jews or white or colored.

We need a President that understands America, that loves America, and that asks us to do better every day.

And ladies and gentlemen, I know that man. I work with him. I have served with him 16 years in the Senate of the United States. I know what is in his heart. And let me say I know that deep down in the hearts of many people who carry a Goldwater sign they are going to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

Thank you.

175 WBZ—LINO

Street Rally
Aliquippa, Pa.
October 15, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Genevieve.

You know, my good friends of Beaver County, Genevieve Blatt introduced me so quickly that I didn't quite realize that I was on the program. [Laughter.] That is the kind of a Senator to have, someone who gets things done in a hurry. [Applause.]

I am simply delighted to be here today in this great area of Pennsylvania. I am particularly pleased to be here in the company of one of the finest citizens of our Nation, one of the greatest Democrats of all times, a great Governor of this State, a great mayor of Pittsburgh, and your own beloved David Lawrence, a great man for your State.

I also want you to know that I insisted that the mayor of Pittsburgh come down here too, so he could see some mighty nice people. [Applause.] And we have got Joe Barr with us. [Applause.]

And I see my friend, the Congressman here. I have been in Frank Clark's district so many times they got suspicious. People thought I was running for Congress instead of Clark. But I am delighted to see my friend Frank, and I want to say to you that you couldn't do better than to reelect this fine Congressman to represent you in Washington in the House of Representatives.

Frank, stand up here. [Applause.]

As I came through here, I saw an old friend, and I shook his hand, and I want Scott Thompson to know how good it was to see him. And I came walking down the line and two beautiful girls planted a kiss on my cheek. I like that. [Laughter and applause.] This is a great town. Then I see these fine bands. [Applause.] And I just want to—oh, we have three bands, of course. I want to compliment all three of them. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have had a big day and we have had a very wonderful day. Every place has been a generous warm reception, starting out this morning in Reading, Pa., and then going to Johnstown, Pa., coming through Homestead, Pa., in Pittsburgh, Pa., and now out here in this great area of democracy where they tell me they have got the best Democrats, the finest people in all of Pennsylvania right out here in Beaver County, Pa. [Applause.]

And I was so pleased to see so many of you here waiting for us so that we can talk a little politics.

Today I want to talk to you about your election. We are coming close to a time when we make a decision. This has been some election. It has been a difficult campaign. I think it has been different in many ways than any I have ever participated in.

First of all, the candidate of the Republican Party doesn't believe in being too much of a Republican. He has his own party divided, because his record, surely not a record of supporting the Democrats, is almost equally bad in supporting the Republicans.

I think he is rather comfortable, however, because those that do follow him are very, very zealous. Yes. They are very devoted to his candidacy.

The one thing that I hope, and you can make this hope come true, is that he will not have a following big enough to take away from every working man and woman and every businessman on this main street the great programs, the progress, which has been created and developed and built over the last 30 years in the United States of America. [Applause.]

The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party is not merely running against Lyndon Johnson. He is not merely attacking our President. He is attacking Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal. He is attacking Harry Truman and the Fair Deal. He is attacking Dwight Eisenhower. He is attacking John F. Kennedy.

He is against everybody that has done something for you, and I suggest that you keep that in mind on November 3, and that is the time you can do something to him.

Vote "No" when that man's name is on that ballot, and vote "Yes" for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and Genevieve Blatt. [Applause.]

You know, when you tell people these days that they could lose some of the gains they have made, some people say, "Oh, I don't believe that is true." Well, one thing I want to say for the man that heads up the Republican ticket this year, I want to say that he is determined to set this country back. He has promised you that. He tells us of the yesterdays. He talks about ancient history. He condemns every program of social progress.

He says, for example, that we should have a timetable to repeal the laws that relate to public welfare, agriculture, education.

He says we should get the Federal Government out of these things, which is just a nice way of saying to you, Grandmaw, that we are going to get rid of social security, which is a way of saying to the young student, we are going to get rid of national defense education assistance, which is a way of saying to the worker we are going to get rid of your union.

And let me say to every trade unionist in this city that the gentleman from Arizona means exactly what he says when he says he believes in those so-called right-to-work laws. He means he believes in the right to destroy your union and you had better remember it. Do you want that? [Cries of "No."]

And may I say to my friends in business, when President Kennedy asked the Congress of the United States to pass a tax reduction bill to help that store across the street, to help every one of these business places, whether it is Oliker's, whether it is Culp's, or whether it is the Vogue Shop or whoever it might be, every one of them got some help and so did you.

Remember, we reduced taxes $11½ million. We had the tax reduction for business. We have a tax reduction for consumers. We had a tax reduction for families. We have a tax reduction for workers, and every worker saw his pay envelope. Your withholding tax is down.

When that tax reduction bill was put through, it was put through for one purpose, to help American enterprise to expand, to help to create new jobs, to help to create new purchasing power, to help a businessman have a little more profit, to help a worker have have a little more take-home pay.

Most Members of Congress thought it was a good idea. The AFL-CIO, the Steelworkers, and the United Mine Workers and the Teamsters and all of them; they said it is a good idea.

The chamber of commerce endorsed it. The National Manufacturers Association endorsed it. Most Republicans voted for it. Practically all the Democrats voted for it.

They wanted to see America move ahead. They wanted to help President Kennedy keep his promise to get America moving forward.

But the vote came in the Senate, and I can still hear it because that man's name from Arizona comes before the name of Humphrey, and I can hear it when they said, "Goldwater." He said "No;" "No." No to every businessman, no to every worker, no to every farmer, no to every wage earner, no to every single citizen in this country.

He said, "No."

Now he is out campaigning for President, and now he says, "You know what? I think we should reduce taxes."

Well, Senator, Congress is out. They closed it up a few weeks ago. The time to have reduced taxes was when you had a chance to reduce them.

And one thing I noticed about the Senator from Arizona, he is always late. He is never there when you need him. He is always backward. [Applause.]

Now, we have done pretty well in this country. There was a time that America was plagued by depressed and recession. There was a time in America when young people like I see here today couldn't look forward to going to college, to the university.

We want those days to be gone forever. We want to have a government that serves the people. We want to be with Lincoln, who said that this should be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

We believe that a government should act as the partner with business and with labor, with young people and with old people. We want a government that has concern for the unfortunate, that has compassion for the needy. We want a government that wants to help the elderly and we want a government that wants to see that there is opportunity for the young.

We want a government that seeks to expand the American economy. We want a government and a president that believes in full employment. And you have got that kind of a government, and the man at the head of it is President Lyndon Johnson. I suggest you keep him. [Applause.]

Now, of course, if you want to go back, if you would like to go back to the days of the covered wagon, if you want to go back to the days of the open shop, if you want to go back to the days when there was little or no social progress in this country, you can do it.

The Senator from Arizona says he has given you a choice. I'll say. The choice of the 20th century or the 19th.

You can have it. He gives you a choice. You can have minimum wage laws or none. You can have a union or none. You can have a prosperous economy or you can go into a depression.

You can have a President who rattles the saber, who talks loud, who threatens people, or you can have a President who works for peace, who works to save this world from nuclear destruction.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you the stakes are high in this election. We need a President that unites this country.

We need a President that doesn't think in terms of sections or regions. We need a President that unites us rather than divides us. We need one that is proud of the people of America, that doesn't talk about minorities as if they were evil groups in our society.

We need a President that wants to humanize the immigration laws. We need a President that respects collective bargaining and the rights of labor. We need a President that says to business, grow, expand. You have the help of this government. We are going to give you a break. We are going to encourage you.

We need a President that says to the young people, you need an education and America is going to see that you get it because, mothers and fathers, let me say to this great audience of fine American citizens, the future of this Nation is in the hands of our young. The power of this Nation and the wealth of this Nation is in the brainpower of our people. And we need our young people educated.

We need better schools, more of them, better universities and colleges, more of them, and we are going to need government at every level, Federal, State, and local, to do its level best to see to it that every boy and girl in America, regardless of income, regardless of race, no matter where they come from, that if they want to go to school, they will have that opportunity. [Applause.]

Well, my friends, this is what we are going to do. We are not going to be satisfied with what we have.

We have got many good things now. We are the richest nation on the face of the earth. Of course, the Senator from Arizona says that is all an illusion. He says it is a phony prosperity.

Well, I want to tell you something. It may be phony, but when you have got money in the bank and you can write a check, the check is good. There is nothing phony about that.

It may be phony, my friends, but the automobile industry is selling more cars than they ever sold before. It may be phony, Mr. Goldwater, but this morning's newspaper has a newspaper clipping in it, a news story, and here it is. It says right now, $8,900 million increase in gross national product.

That is even a little money, may I say, to the folks in Arizona. [Laughter, applause.]

We are very fortunate. We are a blessed people. We are a people, my dear friends, that have had the blessings of a divine providence. And I say in all reverence, we ought to be eternally grateful. Much has been given to us, and much can be expected of it.

We are a people that have shared in the bounty of God's goodness. We are a people that are well fed. We are a people that are reasonably well housed. But we know there can be better days. And that is what we are talking about. We want to make sure that every American if he is willing to work and wants to work can have a job and a good job.

We want to be sure that every senior citizen has a decent place in which to live and has proper hospital and medical care.

We want to be sure that every child that is crippled or diseased will be cared for.

We want to be sure that every community can have modern facilities.

And, ladies and gentlemen, we can have it. We have got it if we want to go to work to get it done. We have built a great country and for goodness sakes, let's have leaders that take us forward. Let's have leaders that tell us we can do the impossible if we need to do it.

We can do anything in this country that we put our mind to. All we need to do is to get the people on the job, to get the job done, and I know we have got one who knows how to do it.

Thirty years in public life—30 years. He started out with young people, a teacher in a country school. Then with young people at university level. Then a Congressman, then a U.S. Senator, then the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. And a great majority leader. No Republican will deny that he was the best we have ever had.

And then a Vice President, selected by whom?

VOICES. John Kennedy.

Senator HUMPHREY. John Kennedy. Bless your heart. John Kennedy selected Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President. [Applause.] And I want to say to this audience that John Kennedy thought of his country every minute of his life. John Kennedy as our President thought of his America whether he lived or died.

And he knew as President that his job was dangerous. He knew that he lived constantly under the threat of some madman. And then on that cruel day of November 22 an assassin took the life of our President and the whole country wept.

You wept and I cried. We wondered what is going to happen to us. We wondered if our Government would survive. And then we realized how wise John Kennedy had been because there in Dallas, Tex., along side of a President that no longer lived, stood a strong man, tall, calm, understanding, knowledgeable in government.

He took his oath of office. He came to Washington and he went to the Congress and he said to us, "We must not hesitate. We must finish the unfinished tasks." He called upon that Congress and the American people in these words. "Let us continue." And Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, has lived every hour of his life since that day of November 22 to fulfill the promises and the commitments of John Kennedy to the people of America and the people of the world. [Applause.]

Well, I will tell you something. If Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, was good enough for John Kennedy, he is good enough for me, and he is good enough for you, and he is good enough for America. [Applause.]

So my friends, let's make this election a real reaffirmation of our beloved President Kennedy. Let's show the world that we have faith in him.

Let's make it crystal clear to the world that we believed in Kennedy and that we believe in President Johnson.

Let's make it clear to the world that we believe in statesmen. Let's make it clear to the world that we believe in progress. Let's make it clear to the world that we are a vital, active people, and you know how to do it? Elect Genevieve Blatt in the State of Pennsylvania to the U.S. Senate. [Applause.] Reelect Frank Clark. [Applause.] Elect these county commissioners and these Democratic candidates and then cap it all off. You go home, you young people, tonight and tell your mother and father that they have a duty to you and to the future and, mother and father, you might meditate a little bit about your country. You think about its future and when you are all through, you remember that November 3 is your day, not my day, when the citizen of America decides the future of his country.

It is on that day that you have more power than any person in the world. It is on that day that you will choose the leading public official of the world. It is on that day that you will make the decision as to the future of America, and I say that it is on that day that the American people are going to elect for 4 years the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, and, may I say, the Democratic ticket. [Applause.]

Go home and have a good time and vote Democratic.

179 WBZ—LINO

Pittsburgh, Pa.
Allegheny County Airport
October 15, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. My dear friends, this delegation from the county of the Pittsburgh area, it is such a joy to be here once again, to be here in the company of some of those distinguished Democrats and the most distinguished citizens not only of your State but of the United States. [Applause.]

You are right. When I can be met at the airport by the former Governor of this State who to my mind will always be Governor of Pennsylvania and Mayor—[applause]—Mr. Lawrence, that is a great honor. And then to be greeted by Mayor Joe Barr, one of the fine, good Democratic mayors of a great city, that is second to none, and then to be introduced from this platform by the lady that is going to be the next United States Senator from Pennsylvania, Genevieve Blatt—[applause]—ladies, I shouldn't do this because I am afraid I am betraying my sex, but it is just about time that you ladies had a Senator in the United States Senate to represent this great area of Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

It has been said a number of times that the women control most of the wealth and frankly we know you have the majority of the population which means you can control the vote, and we also know that you control the men. You can elect anybody you want to, and may I make a couple of suggestions to you.

Start electing Democratic Members of Congress. That is very important. Democratic members of the State assembly, Democratic members of the city council, Democrats wherever you see them. Just start electing them. That is a good idea and then when you get around to the national ticket I would like to just share one or two words of confidential information.

The information that I would like to give you is this, that if you want to preserve the gains that you have made, if you want to build on those gains, if you want to have American go ahead, if you workers want to make sure that you can still have a good strong effective trade union, if you businessmen want to make sure that we can continue to expand this economy, increase our national product and our profits, and if you students want to be sure that you have good colleges to go to, and good schools to attend, and if you elderly want to be sure that you have someone that is interested in your well-being; in other words, if you good Americans want to be sure that America will be a better place every year and a greater and a stronger country every year, then may I suggest that on November 3 you get out and vote for Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

VOICE. LBJ all the way.

Senator HUMPHREY. You have got the idea up there, young lady. You have got the idea. She says "LBJ all the way."

By the way, before I forget, I want to thank this band, this wonderful band that is here with us for their music. What high school is that? Homestead. I want to thank this sweet little girl down here for giving me that rose. That is just about the nicest thing that happened to me since my wife kissed me the first time. And I want to thank all of your many friends here from the different organizations that are here, the members of the city government, city council, members of our trade union movement, labor movement. Let me say to our friends in labor, we have got a fight on our hands. Don't take it easy. You had better get out and battle. I am going to give everything I have got. I know that, too; we don't intend to let this country fall into the hands of those who would take us back.

We intend to have this country move forward, and may I say to our friends who believe in an expanding economy, and this great area is one that needs it—we need more jobs. We need a stronger America. We need a richer America. We need a healthier America. We need a better educated America.

And I am here to tell you that the man that is in the White House, when he was asked what he was going to call his administration—a reporter said to him, Mr. President, Franklin Roosevelt had the New Deal. Harry Truman had the Fair Deal. John Kennedy had the

New Frontier. What will you call your administration? And he said, "My aim in life, my only purpose, is to have a better deal, a better deal for every American, and for all of humanity."

Let me say that is what President Lyndon Johnson is working for. He gets plenty of abuse. He gets a good deal of criticism. And I have known this man for 16 years in the Senate. I have known of his record for 30 years. A man trained to the job, one that loves young people, one that believes in the future, one that was a steadfast ally of our late and beloved President John Kennedy. Let me——

Voice. Hurray.

Senator Humphrey. That is right. Anybody that remembers the service of President Kennedy in those 1,000 dramatic days, they remember alongside of him through every one of those days stood this man from Texas, this great American, and when the hour came and President Kennedy was taken from us by a cruel assassin's bullet, there was the strong man, a faithful man, a good man to rise up and take control of this Government and manage its affairs.

I think the greatest decision that President Kennedy ever made was when he selected Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President. He protected America. [Applause.]

Ladis and gentlemen, let us protect America. Let us make sure that we don't give away what we gained. Let no one take it away from us. Let us make sure that we have a President that is responsible, a President that is strong, a President that is understanding, a President that unites us, a President that builds America.

And the way to do that is to get out and make sure that on November 3 the American people elect for 4 years in the White House President Lyndon Johnson, your President and mine. [Applause.]

Article

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

Speech Prepared for Delivery by Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democatic Vice Presidential Candidate, October 15, 1964, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Some of my friends ask me why I spend so much time talking to university audiences—talking to college students who are not eligible to vote.

Students have a lot to teach politicians—and sometimes vice versa. I find university audiences receptive to new ideas and willing to face world realities, but at the same time they ask me probing question and give me new perceptions that sharpen my own thinking.

In speaking to you, I know that I am not speaking to a group whose brains have atrophied from disuse—from cerebral unemployment. It's not like speaking to that collection of Goldwater supporters housed across the street in the dinosaur section of the Carnegie Museum.

When I talk to university audiences, I am not only refreshed by new ideas—I am restored by new zest and energy. Our opponents in this campaign are going around this country saying that Americans are "sick and tird of this," and "sick and tired" of that. After speaking to any audience, and especially to student audiences, I know once again that Americans are not sick, and Americans are not tired. Beware of those who peddle the politics of despair. Choose those who offer the politics of hope, of enthusiasm, of joy.

Let us always remember that it was the new energy and enthusiasm which men brought to America that gave new realities to the old dream of human freedom. The American dream was not conceived in the conscience of conservatives but in the hope of enthusiasts.

Yet in place of the American dream, we are now being offered an American nightmare by the peddlers of despair.

Some time ago, we heard complaints about the complacent and self-indulgent generation of the 1950's. But this accusation was ill directed. American youth has always been willing to meet the challenge—if they are made aware of the shape of the challenge.

181 WBZ—LINO

Under the administration of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson the challenge has been presented and accepted. The most dramatic evidence of this acceptance is seen in the response to the Peace Corps.

President Kennedy lent the full weight of his office to the Peace Corps, and President Johnson has maintained this strong support. But the people who bear primary credit for its success are the Peace Corps volunteers themselves—those Americans who realize that there is a moral imperative to service beyond that of mere self-service.

Yet the Peace Corps was only a beginning. Into the older programs of America's foreign relations, this administration poured a new vigor and new excellence. In our recruitment and placement of men and women abroad, we demanded and obtained a greater knowledge of relevant foreign languages and greater sensivity to the problems of the new nations. We refashioned the foreign-aid program; we created the Alliance for Progress; we made use of our agricultural abundance by sending food for peace to more than 100 million people.

We have been able to recruit—and equally important—to keep good men in high positions because President Kennedy and President Johnson brought back to American life the spirit described by John Adams as one of "public happiness." It is this spirit, said Adams, that produces delight in public discussion and public action—a joy in citizenship and self-government.

Historians who write of our turbulent era will note another milestone in our conduct of foreign affairs: our renewed effort to tame the atom—through the test ban treaty, the "hot line," and the prohibition of nuclear weapons in outer space—before it maims us.

Now where do we find the nominee of the Goldwater faction on these vital issues of foreign policy?

He has told us where he stands: he rejects foreign aid; he disdains negotiation; he dismisses the United Nations; he opposes bridge building to the peoples of the Communist nations; and he condemns our efforts to end the armaments race.

Recall, for instance, the solid bipartisan backing for the nuclear test ban treaty—the support of General Eisenhower and 25 of 33 Senate Republicans. Recall, as well, the moving words of Everett Dirksen, the Republican Senate leader:

> I want to take a first step, Mr. President—

he said.

> I am not a young man * * * one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, he knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step.

Senator Goldwater knew what happened at Hiroshima. Yet, he refused to take this first step.

His seeming callousness about this treaty is hardly surprising. For Senator Goldwater has often talked as if he believed peace could best be achieved by escalating conflicts that might well lead to nuclear war.

Senator Goldwater now bemoans the fact that most of the American people have turned against him because of his recklessness. He claims to have been misinterpreted and misquoted.

Senator Goldwater deludes himself. He has acquired his reputation for recklessness not by misinterpretation, but through his own statements. Let me quote to you from his book, The Conscience of a Conservative:

> A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective.

Or—

> We must—ourselves—be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes.

And remember what happened when the reporter from the German magazine Der Spiegel asked him, "But would you go to the brink of war?"

"Yes," Goldwater replied. "Just as your country has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully."

What kind of a statement is that? What kind of man could make such a statement? You don't have to major in history to know that any man who offers the disastrous examples of imperial and Nazi Germany for us to follow is a man who has no understanding of past history or current reality.

In his frantic impatience with the world as it is, Senator Goldwater wishes to back the Soviet Union into a corner where its only alternatives would be surrender or nuclear war. Indeed, one of his main goals seems to be—and again I quote him—"to invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat."

Those who have not yet reached the age of 21 realize what Senator Goldwater never seems to have realized—that such juvenile games of nuclear "chicken" will eventually result in the horrendous death of both players. Senator Goldwater does not yet understand that in our age of quick and total destruction, there is no such thing as quick and total victory.

Let us reject a candidate and a foreign policy which offer us nothing better than glib slogans and the risk of nuclear war. Let us continue our great peaceful plans to tame the atom, to explore the stars, and to make the benefits of abundance and education open to all men.

All our great plans require creative ideas and willingness of the spirit. These are the qualities that we must continue to demand of our leaders—and of ourselves.

We need an America with the wisdom of experience. But we must not let America grow old in spirit.

When I was in Washington yesterday, I noticed that the wooden stands for next January's presidential inauguration are now being constructed in front of the Capitol Building. Four years ago, we all watched as our brave young President accepted the torch of leadership for a new generation of Americans. Although his own life was brutally extinguished, the torch he bore burns on in the programs and ideals which his successor carries on.

At next January's inaugural, the world must not witness the extinction of that torch by a man who has never realized that the American dream is progression and renewal, not stagnation and reaction. And America must not witness the extinction of the torch of our world leadership by the bitter whirlwind of holocaust.

The time of true national testing is close at hand. Remember the message of the Scriptures—without vision, the people perish. Let us hold fast to our vision of America. Let us preserve that vision against those who would so casually destroy it.

If we work with diligence this autumn, this glorious American vision—conceived in hope—forged in battle—tested in adversity—shall not soon perish from this earth.

Pittsburgh, Pa.
University of Pittsburgh
October 15, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Genevieve Blatt, for your gracious introduction, and may I say thank you to our band. I haven't heard the "Minnesota Rouser" played so good on the Pittsburgh campus for many, many years.

But it is great to be here today. It is a great privilege to be here in the presence of a distinguished citizen of your State, former Governor, former mayor of this city, truly one of the remarkable men of our country, Gov. David Lawrence. [Applause.]

And I am delighted to be welcomed to this campus, not only by its students but also by the fine mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, Mayor Joseph Barr. [Applause.] And to be here in the presence of and along side of one of the best Members of Congress, a Member that knows the world that we live in, has some ideas what to do about our problems, has the courage to initiate those ideas, and has represented this great district in Pennsylvania brilliantly, and I refer to your own Congressman Bill Moorhead, and you know he is a good man. [Applause.]

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that you will take to heart the suggestions that were made a moment ago about our friend Genevieve Blatt who has such a remarkable record of public service in this State. She will make a fine U.S. Senator, and she is the kind of a person [applause] she is the kind of a person that understands the responsibilities of public service.

Well, now, just a word or two. I understand this campus today is not only graced by the presence of the students of the great University of Pennsylvania, one of our wonderful institutions [applause] but I also understand that you permitted on the sacred premises students from Duquesne and Carnegie Tech [applause] and Mount Mercy and Chattham. [Applause.]

So all of these wonderful schools are gathered together here.

You would be interested to know that the last score I heard, it was the St. Louis Cardinals 5, Yankees nothing. [Applause.]

Now, friends, I only hope that on election day the odds can be that good for Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

I almost let it slip my mind but for goodness sakes, after looking into those beautiful eyes of Sylvia Shapiro and hearing her wonderful voice and having her sing to me and to you as she did, I want to thank her very, very much for making this visit just a little better, even as good as you can make it. Sylvia, you did a wonderful job. You have got a lovely voice. I know that you are quite a girl. I know you are going to vote Democratic. [Applause.]

VOICE.—She's too young.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, if she isn't old enough, we will wait. It is worth waiting for. [Laughter.]

Now, I also understand that on this Saturday the students of this campus are being asked to help in a voter canvass. I can think of no more worthy endeavor between now and election date, and I hope that all of you who are involved in that effort will be on the job, and I might now encourage additional volunteers.

Saturday the voter canvass.

Well, I am delighted to see so many wonderfully good, intelligent citizens with a smile on their face. It means that this is almost a solidly Democratic audience. [Applause.]

Now, I did see a sign or two of the opposition, but may I say that the people that were carrying those signs had a smile on their face, so I know that deep down in their heart they are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

This is quite a day for Americans. Last night as I was getting the midnight news I heard that our athletes at Tokyo, our great Olympic athletes, had captured five gold medals, and America today leads in those Olympics.

I kind of wonder how they feel when they hear that they are sick and tired old Americans, as the opposition says.

Frankly, they are wonderful representatives of our country and you know what? They represent every race, creed, and nationality of America. There is no color line. There is no religious line. There is no ethnic line. As a matter of fact, two or three of them were members of what they call minorities [laughter] and they are winning for America. [Applause.]

Now, I do not come to this campus to speak to you in just a light vein. I come here as a representative of a great political party, and I come here seeking an office that is a very important office.

Therefore, it is my view that when a man seeks this office or when he asks others to support a candidate for President, that he has an obligation to speak responsibly, that he has an obligation to the best of his ability, whatever that may be, to talk about the issues, talk about the great questions of our day.

I could sit here and hurl invective, but it will do no good. I happen to disagree with the spokesman of the opposition. I find many other people do, too. I find that many people in the Republican Party, regular Republicans, authentic Republicans, disagree with the temporary spokesman of that party.

I find, for example, that at one time the great Governor of this State disagreed with him not only in word but in the Congress of the United States. They have a record, as I recall, of never voting the same on any major issue. [Laughter.]

Not one. They didn't vote the same on education, they didn't vote the same on area redevelopment, they didn't vote the same on the Peace Corps, they didn't vote the same on the Arms Control Agency, on the Alliance for Progress, on any major issue before the Congress. When the present Governor of this State served as Congressman, he voted opposite of Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Goldwater voted opposite of him. But Mr. Goldwater said, and I think I should quote him from his own record, he said, "By our votes you can judge us, not by our talking."

Well, I think that is a fair statement. [Laughter.]

And my good friends, if you want to judge someone on the basis of how many no votes he can cast, why then I would say that everybody that believes that you should sit under the "No-No Tree" [laughter] and bask in the shadows of your own indifference, that if that is your feeling, then you have a candidate. He is the fellow that planted the tree. [Laughter.] He is the little acorn. [Applause.]

But if you should believe, as I think you do, and as I hope you do, that we ought to look ahead, that we ought to look into the sunshine, that we ought to look into the atmosphere of hope, that we ought to come to grips with the problems of today and tomorrow, if you believe that America has even better days before itself, better days ahead, then I have got a candidate for you there, too, and his name is Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, lest I be misunderstood, and there are always those that at times try to make people a little more, oh, a little more sarcastic and cryptic than the words would justify, let me make it clear I happen to know the Republican pretender to the Presidency. [Laughter.]

I know this gentleman, and he is a gentleman. I know him as a patriot, and that he is. I know him as a decent man. I know him as a fellow Member of the Senate. I know him as a sociable human being.

I will tell you this. I think he would make a wonderful neighbor, but I sure don't want him for my President. [Applause.]

And now having made that statement, I want to tell you why. Don't pay any attention to the static to the right back there. It always comes out. [Laughter.]

Let me tell you why. You know, many people have asked me, they say, "Senator, when you have a choice of speeches, you always want to speak to a university audience. Why?" I have some of the good professionals of politics that say to me, "Don't you know these young folks are too young to vote?" But as I said about Sylvia Shapiro, she may be too young. But we will wait. [Laughter.]

Not only that, my friends, but I find when I speak on university campuses that I find alert, intelligent, active, interesting people. I happen to think that university audiences are good for politicians, and I think sometimes that it might be vice versa, that politicians can be good for university audiences. We can talk about the realities of the world as we see them.

I believe that the university audience compels you to do a little fresh thinking. I also think that it gives you some fresh thoughts and what this Nation needs today and in this campaign, what it needs more than anything else right now, is an honest discussion of our position on these issues. What we need—these fellows don't know that "Barry-picken" time is over out there. [Laughter.]

They are always a little late, always a little late.

Now, you be patient with him. He may still be in meditation. We will get him into the 20th century yet.

You see, it was when I mentioned new ideas that it scared them a little bit. [Laughter.]

But what I wanted to say to you before we were temporarily and momentarily interrupted, what I meant to say to you was that it appears to me that in a campaign, that it is somewhat of an insult to the intelligence of the American people to just go around casting aspersions upon a person's character, just to go around talking innuendo and personalities and smears and half-truths. Don't we have some other things to talk about? Don't we have the problems of education where we have to double the facilities of our universities in the next 30 to 40 years? Don't we have problems relating to the growth of our cities? Shouldn't we talk about those things? Shouldn't we be talking about how this country is going to be able to come to grips with automation to make it a boon instead of a bane?

How are we going to provide 300,000 new jobs every year? This is what we need to do. Shouldn't we be talking about problems, even relating to our public health, the pollution of our streams, or our air? The public health facilities of our cities and counties and the health needs of our people?

I think these are some of the issues that need to be talked about, and I think other issues that need to be talked about are our foreign policy, our defense policy, our fiscal policy, and I want to talk to you just a little bit about them.

When I talk to these university audiences, I come away refreshed physically as well as spiritually, and a man needs both in this business, I will tell you.

Our opponents in this campaign, they are going around the country acting as if somehow or another they are selling patent medicines. They say, and I quote them, that Americans are sick and tired. I have a sneaking suspicion they have an interest in Geritol. [Applause.]

Tired blood. It is bad enough to have tired blood but to have tired ideas, that is inexcusable. [Applause.]

And after speaking to many audiences, after speaking to many audiences in this country, I find that Americans aren't sick. I find that Americans aren't tired. I find that they are just about like those champions we have got over in Tokyo today. I find that they are the kind of people that know the kind of a world they want to live in, that feel they have the spirit and the vitality to carry on in that world.

Would you excuse me for a minute? I do have an urgent call. Will you stay here until I finish this call? [Applause.]

Okay, let's go. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentleman, I hope you will forgive me, but I did have a call, and it was a rather important one. I indicated that we had a little important meeting, that I would call right back after it was over, and I will tell you his name after the meeting is over. But it was the President and he wanted to have a little visit, and I need to have a little visit with him. We will talk afterward.

In the meantime I told him that I was talking to thousands of good Democrats that are going to vote for him. Is that right? [Applause.] When I have the privilege of talking to an audience like this, I like very much to be able to converse with you, as I have said, on some of the problems of our day. My fellow Americans, this country wasn't built out of pessimism. This great America of yours and mine didn't come out of the "Conscience of a Conservative." It came out of the hope and the dreams of an idealist and of people who had enthusiasm for the future.

Yet in place of this American dream, born out of idealism, this American dream born out of optimism, this American dream that told the American people that we would alter our own destiny, in place of that American dream I say we are now being offered an American nightmare by the peddlers of despair and this is not the philosophy of this young Republic.

Some time ago we heard complaints about the complacent and self-indulgent generation of the 1950's, but this accusation was ill directed. American youth has always been the subject of criticism of every older generation. I think it is a fact without doubt that this generation of American young people with all of its vitality, with all of its ability, is the best generation that this Nation has ever known and I am sure that the history books of the future will so record it. [Applause.]

What this generation wants is what President Kennedy gave to it, a challenge. I think you remember with me those days of the early days of the Kennedy administration. I think you remember with me when John Kennedy took that oath of office. I think you recall his clear eye and his clear vision. I think you remember when he asked us to have the courage to take responsibility. He said, "I welcome responsibility. I do not run from it." He asked us to begin and then he listed the beginnings that he wanted America to have, and he asked us to be unselfish.

He asked us to remember that it wasn't what our country could do for us but what we could do for our country, and I believe that no man in this century has so inspired the young, given them such challenge, offered them such opportunity, given them such hope as the late and beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy during his 1,000 days. [Applause.]

I would remind this audience of the tragic circumstances under which President Johnson took on the mantle of leadership as the President of this Republic

I remind you of November 22, 1963 I remind you how Lyndon Johnson had to take on the duties of the Presidency at a time when millions of people wondered if our constitutional system could survive the assassination, when the whole world faltered, and make no mistake about it, my dear friends As Americans and as visitors from other countries that I see here, it is a fact of history that the world wept and the hopes of peace seemed to be dashed, but as the world wept and as people prayed for this great world of ours, and for the possibility of keeping the peace, a strong man, a good man, an experienced man, a trusted lieutenant of President Kennedy, the man he had selected as his Vice President stood tall, stood strong, and he stood up well, and he accepted the responsibilities of leadership under the most incredible, under the most unbelievable of circumstances, and I say to you that any fairminded American will have to admit that President Lyndon Johnson has done what he said He has continued the Kennedy-Johnson program, and he has done well by it. [Applause.] This administration of which I have been a part, I have been in on the councils of this administration, it did not run from responsibility. It did not act from fear. We saw unemployment, and we did something about it. We saw an economy in stagnation, and we did something about it. We saw young people needing inspiration and needing challenge, and we did something about it. I am proud to stand on this platform and say that I am the author of the Peace Corps, a great proposal that was sent to the Congress by President Kennedy. [Applause.]

I introduced that bill at the request of our President. I handled that bill on the floor of the Senate. I was there when we counted the votes, and I saw the Senator from Arizona brand that bill a haven for beatniks. He wasn't for it. He didn't see the hope that it offered. He didn't see the inspiration that it provided. He didn't believe in you. He didn't believe in a volunteer corps of trained and dedicated young Americans.

He said it is a lot of razzle-dazzle. He said it was a haven for beatniks. He said it wouldn't work and he voted against it.

But how wrong he was. [Applause.]

This program is one of the greatest successes of our Government and it isn't a Government program only. It represents the success of volunteers, thousands of them, voluntary agencies. The American people are a good people. They want to do good things, and they want their Government to help them in the achievement of these good goals. I remind the standard bearer of the Republican Party that it was his party that gave us Abraham Lincoln and yet it was Abraham Lincoln who proclaimed the Emancipation Proclamation, and yet today in 1964, 101 years later, the standard bearer of the great Lincoln Republican Party voted against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He repudiated Lincoln. [Applause.]

And everybody in this audience knows that the only purpose of the Civil Rights Act, its only purpose, was to fulfill the moral commitment of this Nation to the doctrine of human equality. What we sought to do was not to give special privilege. What we sought to do was to eliminate discrimination and at long last the people's representatives in Congress assembled, Bill Moorhead, yes, the Senators from this State, they voted for a civil rights bill regardless of party. Republicans and Democrats alike. They voted for it because it was right because it was needed, because it was constitutionally imperative, because if America was going to go to the rest of the world and offer leadership, it had to come with clean hands.

And may I say that an overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats alike supported this measure, but not Senator Goldwater. He stood alone. He stood over there and said, "Oh, no, oh, no."

It makes him popular in some areas of the Ku Klux Klan. [Applause.] But it doesn't make it right, and deep down in his heart he knows he is wrong. [Applause.]

Now, my friends I say that the administration that I am privileged to represent did not rest on the accomplishments of yesterday. We pioneered. We did seek new frontiers, and we went to those new frontiers.

We have the Peace Corps. We have the civil rights program. We passed the Alliance for Progress, the greatest single foreign aid program to our brothers and sisters in Latin America which President Kennedy described as the most serious area of the world, the most critical area of the world. The Alliance for Progress supported by Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, supported by the chamber of commerce and the AFL–CIO, supported by every reasonably intelligent forward-looking person in this country, supported overwhelmingly in the Congress of the United States, supported as a policy of the good neighbors, Republicans, Democrats alike in Congress. Four-fifths of them voted for the Alliance for Progress. But again the Senator from Arizona would not vote for an alliance and "progress" he can't spell. [Applause and laughter.]

The food-for-peace program—a man that complains about American costs of government, the food-for-peace program designed to aid the hungry, to carry out Scriptural admonitions of feeding the poor, feeding the hungry, America's agricultural abundance produced on our farms, one of the great forward-looking programs of your Government.

Today, my fellow Americans, we are helping to feed 100 million children in schools. In other parts of the world these young people are learning that America is a nation of love and of compassion, that America is a nation of peace and of hope, and they are learning it through the gift of American food, food for peace, supported by Dwight Eisenhower, started under his administration.

I was one of the authors of the act. Food for peace, expanded under John Kennedy. Food for peace, expanded under Lyndon Johnson. Every person in Congress with few exceptions, with the exception of a hard core of reactionary radicals, everyone voted for food for peace. Churches, every religious organization in America supports it. Every business organization. But again the Senator from Arizona said "No, no food for peace. No food for people."

What kind of leadership is this? Is it any wonder that people turn from him?

Then we go a little bit further. We have tried in our public life, in our Government, to add to education, to implement our universities, to help our young people, and we voted a great program of higher education, the first higher education assistance since the Morrill Act of 1862, and again the vast majority of Democrats, the vast majority of Republicans, voted to put America's Government on the side of learning, on the side of education.

But once again the man from Arizona says "No." In fact, at Jacksonville, Fla., this man made the unbelievable, incredible statement that he did not think it was the responsibility of government to provide education. He thought that it was only the responsibility of parents, and then he added insult to injury by saying some folks would be better off without it.

It seems unbelievable. When I say it people say, "Why do you say these things, Senator? Why are you so unkind?"

I am not unkind. I repeat that this is a statement of the Senator from Arizona, just the same kind of a statement that he said he recommends that the Government withdraw from a whole series of programs of social welfare, of agriculture, of public health, of education.

I guess he forgot to read the preamble to the Constitution. The preamble to the Constitution lays down two mandates, to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare. And let me say it again, that the great Abraham Lincoln made it crystal clear as to the duty of government. He said government's duty is to serve the people, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Government must do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves or so well for themselves, said Abraham Lincoln.

I have a feeling that if Lincoln were living today, the Senator from Arizona or one of his adherents would have to brand him a Socialist because Lincoln thought that government ought to serve the people.

Well, let me say I think Lincoln was right, and I think Goldwater is wrong. [Applause.] Historians who will write of our turbulent era will note another milestone in these recent years and that milestone is the negotiation of the nuclear test ban treaty, our effort to tame the atom, this powerful weapon, this incredible power, for good or evil, and what was the Senator's reaction on that?

Four-fifths of the Senators of the United States, 25 of the 33 Republicans, General Eisenhower, Christian Herter, Mr. Wadsworth, Henry Cabot Lodge, all came down before Congress and testified, asked that the Government of the United States negotiate that treaty, asked that the Senate ratify it. The firs step in curbing the arms race, the first real effort, successful effort, to tame the atom.

And what happened? The Senator from Arizona, the Senator said "No."

If his vote had prevailed, the atmosphere today would be polluted with more radioactive fallout. The land on which we depend for our food would become corrupted and adulterated with radioactive debris.

Thank God that better minds prevailed. [Applause.] I say thank God for those that put humanity above prejudice, that put their country even above party.

I remember the words of Senator Everett Dirksen. He is no radical. He is a good Republican and he is a responsible leader. And here is what he said as he voted for that treaty in a moving speech in the Senate: "I want to take a first step, Mr. President. I am not a young man. One of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone that he did not take a first step."

Now, Senator Goldwater knew what happened in Hiroshima just as did Senator Dirksen. Yet he refused to take that first step. His seeming callousness to this treaty should not have been unexpected, for the Senator from Arizona has often talked as if he believed that peace could best be achieved by ultimatums, by being tough, ultimatums that could lead to nuclear war.

Senator Goldwater now bemoans the fact that many American people have turned against him because of what they call his recklessness. He claims to be misinterpreted, to be misquoted.

Well, may I say it is kind of hard to keep up to him. [Laughter.] It would be nice—it is very good, you know, to be able to have a consistency, but one thing I think this country needs above all other things, it needs a President who means what he says and says what he means instead of having to reinterpret his statements every other day. [Applause.]

But the Senator from Arizona makes the point, and I think it needs to be answered, he makes the point that he is being misjudged.

He makes the point that he is being accused of being reckless.

But may I say that he acquired this reputation not by misinterpretation of what he said, but through his own statements.

Let me quote to you from "The Conscience of a Conservative.":

> A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people, including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective.

Happy landings, boys. [Laughter.]

Secondly, "We must—ourselves—be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes."

And remember, now, friends, what he had to say to a reporter in that German magazine, "Der Spiegel," when they asked him, and I quote the question, "But would you, Senator, go to the brink of war?"

And listen to the words of the Senator from Arizona: "Yes." "Yes."

Yes, he says, but that isn't half of it. "Yes, just as your country has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully." Ye, gods.

VOICES. [Chorus of "boos."]

Senator HUMPHREY. Germany, that two times in one century under imperialism and under nationalism brought this world to a blood bath; Germany that used under the Kaiser and Hitler brinkmanship, and the Senator from Arizona says "Just as your country has used brinkmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully."

What success have they had? What misery, what unbelievable terror has been brought to this world because of brinkmanship.

I say to you that a Senator or a person that can vote gainst the Civil Rights Act, that can vote against the nuclear test ban treaty, and that can applaud the brinkmanship of Imperial Germany and Nazi Germany, I say to you that that man has demonstrated the lack of judgment, the lack of understanding, the lack, may I say, of responsibility and he cannot possibly be called upon to serve as President of this country. [Applause.]

Now, may I just conclude with these words. One of the main goals set by the standard bearer of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party is, and I quote him, "to invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat."

This is why the great Walter Lippmann wrote the article entitled "Ultimatum Diplomacy." This is why newspapers like the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Saturday Evening Post, the Life magazine, historically Republican papers, this is why they rejected the Senator from Arizona.

They don't reject him because he is a man that you couldn't like as an individual. They don't reject him because he is a Republican, because he is really not. He has rejected his own party. He has left his party. He is not a Republican. He is a Goldwater radical, and he knows it. [Applause.]

To my young friends, I say this. We must reject any candidate and a foreign policy which offers nothing better than ultimatums and a risk of nuclear war. Our purpose must be to continue our great peaceful plans to tame the atom, to explore the stars, and to make the benefits of abundance and education open to all men.

When the Senator from Arizona was asked about the space program, he said he wasn't interested in getting to the moon. He wanted to lob a bomb in the Kremlin's men's room. [Laughter.]

What kind of talk is this for a President?

What kind of thinking is it? It would be interesting and it would be a fine joke if our lives weren't at stake.

All great plans require creative ideas and a willingness of the spirit and these are the qualities that we must continue. And added to those qualities of creativeness and willingness of the spirit must come the quality of responsibility, responsibility in word, responsibility in deed. We need an America with the wisdom of experience, but we must not let America grow old in spirit.

When I was in Washington just yesterday I saw that they are building the stands for the inaugural in January 1965, in front of the Capitol. I remember 4 years ago as we watched our brave young President accept the torch of leadership for a new generation of Americans. I was there.

Although his own life was brutally extinguished, that torch that he carried so faithfully burns on in programs and ideals which his successor carries on, and at next January's inaugural the world must not witness the extinction of that torch of hope by a man who has never realized that the American dream is one of progress, one of renewal, and not of stagnation and reaction.

And America must not witness the extinction of the torch of world leadership by the bitter whirlwind of a nuclear holocaust.

The time of true national testing is here. It will be here November 3. And I think we should remember the message of the Scriptures, "Without vision the people perish."

Let us hold fast, therefore, to the vision of America. Let us be like Mrs. Roosevelt in her final book when she said "Tomorrow Is Now."

And anyone that can't think in those terms, anyone that can't think in the terms—it must be a Goldwater technician in charge of this. [Applause.]

Well, I guess this is as good a way to tell me the time is up anyway. [Laughter.]

But as I said to you, Mrs. Roosevelt's final writings are in a book entitled "Tomorrow Is Now."

My young fellow Americans, you know that. You know that anybody that doesn't understand change and how to come to grips with it is dead and doesn't know it.

It is all right for you to study ancient history. I want you to study it. I hope you do well in it. I hope you learn all about it. But for goodness sakes, don't vote it. [Laughter and applause.]

So may I conclude, then, this message, by saying that if we work with diligence this autumn, and this is the autumn that is important, this glorious American vision, a world of peace, a world of plenty, and a world in which human dignity is more than a phrase, but indeed is a reality, if we work diligently this American dream conceived in hope, forged in battle, tested in adversity, shall not perish from this earth.

I ask you, therefore, to consider the questions of public policy. Look at the candidates. Look at the platforms. Look at what they said. Look at how they voted.

Come to a decision and I hope that when you do, you will come to the decision that I have come to, that it would be good for America to reelect or elect for 4 more years in the Presidency Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey, too. [Applause.]

Milwaukee, Wis.
Airport Reception
October 15, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Lynn. Thank you.

VOICES. We want Humphrey.

Senator HUMPHREY. You have got me. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I just respond to this warm greeting from my friends here in Wisconsin and Milwaukee. It is wonderful to be introduced by a friend who today is a candidate for Congress, in the first district, and I want to wish Lynn Stalbaum the very, very best, and I know he is going to have it and I know the people are going to work for him. [Applause.]

With me here is the lovely wife of the mayor of Milwaukee, Mrs. Maier. I am so glad to see you. Thank you for coming down. [Applause.] I am delighted, too, that we have here our good friend, the Governor of the State, who is a good Governor, who is going to be a good Governor, who is going to stay on as Governor, John Reynolds. [Applause.]

And it is always good to come to Wisconsin where there is a La Follette on the ticket, and I know he is going to be elected attorney general of this State, too, and I want to wish him the best. [Applause.]

I met my old friend Gaylord Nelson, your former Governor and a wonderful, fine Senator, and I also met the wife of a very good Senator, good friend of mine, Senator Proxmire, and I met Helen, and I am so glad that she was here, too. [Applause.]

Let me just put it this way. It is good to come to Wisconsin, the land of Kennedy and Humphrey. [Applause.]

And let me let you in on a secret. The late beloved President Kennedy would have wanted me to say this night that every vote that John Kennedy received here and every vote that Hubert Humphrey received here we want to go to Lyndon Johnson, our President. [Applause.]

Well, at last I found out which of these microphones to speak into.

My campaign has been marked by a search for the right microphone.

But I can assure you that even if we don't find the right microphone every time, we have got the right candidate, the Democratic candidate.

You know, every once in a while I hear some sort of a bellowing sound, and it indicates to me that it is those people that are way, way back in the 19th century, the Goldwaterites. [Applause.]

Now, may I assure you that the State of Wisconsin is going to perform its public duty and its great opportunity. The State of Wisconsin is going to reelect as its Governor, John Reynolds—[applause]—and it is going to reelect for the U.S. Senate, Bill Proxmire. [Applause.]

It is going to send Democrats to the House of Representatives in Washington. [Applause.]

And it is going to give Lyndon Johnson, our President, a smashing victory.

Thank you very much. [Applause.] Good-bye now. Good-bye.

---

191 WBZ—LINO

Article
News release from the Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.
October 15, 1964

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

There is, in this election, one question which the American people must answer: Which candidate and which party better understands the world of today and the role of Government in that world?

Never have the American people had such a clear choice.

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

The Goldwaterites—the rearguard of a defeated past—want to turn the clock back—they want to abandon the challenges of tomorrow for the fantasies of yesterday.

They want to establish a kind of selfish irresponsibility in both domestic and international relations which violates the fundamental principles of the American tradition—both conservative and liberal.

Let us make no mistake about it—the Republican Party has fallen into the hands of reckless men, men who have inscribed clearly on the public record their willingness to gamble with the American heritage.

On no issue is this more clearly illustrated than in the all-important field of education.

From our earliest days, we have believed in the central importance of providing an education for our citizens, and we have believed that government at all levels has a role to play.

As early as 1785, the Continental Congress provided for land in every township in the Northwest Territory to be set aside for public education.

From the very beginning of our present Constitution, Congress consistently ceded land both for public schools and for colleges.

In the midst of the Civil War, Congress enacted the Land Grant Act, laying the groundwork for a public university in every State of the Union. Today, those 60 land grant colleges enroll most of the undergraduates in the Nation. They grant the majority of all higher degrees.

Twenty years ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed into law the GI bill of rights. More than 10 million veterans of World War II benefited from that law and today we are clipping the coupons from our national investment. The increased earning power of those 10 million veterans is bringing in an estimated billion dollars of added revenue to our Federal Treasury every year. And what opportunities were created for millions who could not otherwise have continued their education.

Those are the facts of the American past. But the Goldwater candidate for President wants to rewrite that history. He wants us to believe that all those magnificent contributions to American education are unconstitutional. Any man who believes that simply does not understand American history. *He refuses to face the facts.*

But what about the future? By the end of this decade, college enrollment will almost double. Lyndon Johnson faced that fact. And so did the 88th Congress. It enacted a law providing funds for more college classrooms, more laboratories, more libraries.

But the Goldwater candidate refused to face them. He voted against the college aid bill—even though his Republican colleagues disagreed with him 2 to 1.

Lyndon Johnson also knows that "in the future the trained American will be the indispensable American." The 88th Congress knew that, too. It voted the largest expansion of vocational education in years—the number of vocational students will double by 1966—the number of vocational teachers will be increased by half.

Once again, the Goldwater candidate refused to face the facts. He voted against the vocational education bill—even though his Republican colleagues disagreed with him this time 7 to 1.

More than 61 million Americans are without access to any public library. Lyndon Johnson knew the meaning of that. So did the 88th Congress. It passed a law providing for more libraries.

So the Goldwater candidate again refused to face the facts. He voted against the Library Services Act—even though his Republican colleagues disagreed with him 4 to 1.

Senator Goldwater and his radical followers have kidnapped the Republican Party. Now he is their temporary spokesman. But—as General Eisenhower noted—something is strange—something is wrong. It's not the party that is totally out of step with the 20th century—it's their temporary leader.

Not only President Kennedy and President Johnson but President Eisenhower recognized the need for more college scholarships, for more scientists, mathematicians, and technicians to cope with the age of space and technology. They built on the lessons of the GI bill and they supported the National Defense Education Act. So did most of the Congress.

But the man who now holds the banner of the Republican Party was out of step. He voted against that act in 1958, and he voted against it again last year. And when he did, the Senate disagreed with him 20 to 1.

This temporary Republican standard bearer is out of step because he does not understand today's world.

On November 3, the choice is clear. You can vote for a man who believes that "the only way we can hope to deal with the population explosion is with the knowledge explosion."

Or you can vote for a man who says, "The child has no right to an education * * * and in most cases, the children will get along very well without it."

The man who uttered those words—Senator Barry Goldwater—is plainly and simply not qualified to be the President of the United States.

In the field of education, the function of Government is to create opportunities—to assist in the fullest development of our human resources.

The Government must play a similar role in opening the way for the fullest development of our natural resources. Here, too, the Democratic record is a proud one. The 88th Congress rightfully earned the title of "The Education Congress." It also deserves to be known as "Conservation Congress."

And the choice between the candidates is just as clear in the field of conservation as in the field of education.

The wilderness bill is surely one of the most important bills passed by the 88th Congress. I had the honor of first introducing this bill in 1957.

The wilderness bill recognizes that the wilderness areas of America are highly perishable, and that once they are gone, they can never be recaptured.

The wilderness bill assures they will be preserved for all time. It didn't provide for $1 to be spent. It didn't provide for 1 acre of land to be bought. It didn't provide for one additional person to be hired by the Federal Government.

But that didn't stop the out-of-step temporary Republican leader. He voted against the bill.

His Republican colleagues in the Senate disagreed with him three to one.

The Senate as a whole disagreed with him 6 to 1.

And the entire Congress disagreed with him 52 to 1.

On this vote, out-of-step Barry Goldwater was even out of step with his running mate.

The land and water conservation fund bill is another major achievement of the 88th Congress. As both population and leisure time grow, the need for recreational lands will grow, too. Recognizing this, the 88th Congress provided that certain funds will be earmarked for matching grants to the States to enable them to purchase recreation land—not only for the present, but for the future.

Ninety-three Senators out of a hundred were sufficiently interested in this bill to be present and pass it, 92 to 1. The Goldwater candidate simply failed to show up at all.

I am proud of the conservation record of the 88th Congress. We passed important measures in the fields of air and water pollution, of added protection and habitat improvement for fish and wildlife. We extended the national parks system, and provided for the control and prudent use of pesticides.

But our work is not finished. Nor will it ever be finished. Our country will continue to grow and its needs will grow, too.

So the question the voters must decide on November 3 is whether the future of this country should be entrusted to a man who despises the Government he seeks to serve, a man who dangerously misunderstands the world in which he lives, a man who is completely out of step within his own party—and with the hard facts of today.

Do you want to entrust your future to such a man—or do you want to continue it in the hands of a man whose very spirit echoes these memorable words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's inaugural address:

> In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility. I welcome it.

I believe the American people will place their trust in Lyndon B. Johnson.

Milwaukee, Wis.
Milwaukee Auditorium
October 15, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Governor Reynolds, I can't tell you how good it is, first of all, to be introduced by you, and, second, to hear a band of Wisconsin play the "Minnesota Rouser." That is marvelous. [Applause and laughter.]

I am simply delighted, my good friends of Wisconsin, to be here with you once again. I said at the airport when we came into this fine community of Milwaukee tonight that this was the land of John Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey, and I would like to add also of Governor Reynolds. [Applause.]

I hope, my dear friend, Senator Proxmire, and my dear friend, Gaylord Nelson, won't hold it against me if we just claim this land [applause] for a man that is no longer with us, a great President, and for one that was proud to be in this State arguing, fighting it out, and then joining that great President as one of his legislative lieutenants in the 1,000 days of John Kennedy's dramatic leadership of this Nation. [Applause.]

Permit me to take just a moment to express a personal greeting to the many people that are here, that are with us tonight on television, to the candidates of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin, and to greet each and every one. I wish I had the time to speak of each one. But I want to make it clear that one of the finest men that serves this State in the Nation's Capital is the gentleman that is the senior Senator from this State. He is up for reelection, and I haven't a shadow of doubt but what the people of Wisconsin are going to reward him with their support because this man, William Proxmire, works day in and day out for the people of Wisconsin. [Applause.]

And I can't express to you, adequately, my gratitude for your sending to Washington in the Senate a partner, one that is a friend of mine and a friend of yours and your former distinguished Governor, Gaylord Nelson. [Applause.]

And to your incumbent Congressmen, Congressman Reuss and Congressman Zablocki, Congressman Kastenmeier, may I say no finer group could you find anywhere in the U.S. Congress than these three distinguished men. [Applause.]

And you are going to send us some more. You are going to send us some more. I have the whole list of them and to save time and just to remind you, let's get busy and see to it that in every single district of this State there is a Democrat sent to the Congress of the United States to represent the State of Wisconsin. [Applause.]

And I come here tonight to pay tribute to a courageous Governor, to one that puts a premium upon service to the people of this State.

I know what Governor Reynolds has been doing. I know how he has worked for education for our young, how he has fought for care for the afflicted, and let me say to you, John Reynolds, that any Governor that will work to provide educational facilities for the youth and will work to provide loving care for those who are mentally retarded and for those who are sick, that man is a good and faithful servant and deserves the support of the people of the State. [Applause.]

I thank my friend, Jerry Bartell, and the reverend clergy, and all of you for your kindness to me.

Now I want to talk to you tonight about the serious aspects of this national election. I enjoy a good campaign, and I have been enjoying this one. We have traveled across America, north, south, east, and west, and I find a happy people. I find the American people strong and vital, optimistic confident, and happy.

But I also find them concerned about the future, and that is to be expected in the kind of a world in which we live, a world in which there are changes that take place so fast that it is almost impossible to keep up to them, changes today in the Kremlin, changes in every part of the world.

If ever there was a time that we needed a steady hand on the ship of state, if ever there was a time that we needed experience on the job, if ever there was a time that you needed someone who knew the art and the science of government, that time is now, 1964. [Applause.]

And I am happy to say that we have just exactly that kind of a man as the captain of our ship of state, as our President, Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Now, there is one basic question in this election the American people must answer: Which candidate and which party understands the world of today and the role of the Government in that world?

I think the American people have a clear choice, and I think they are going to make the right one. We believe that the Democratic Party has demonstrated, under the Kennedy-Johnson administration, its fidelity to the ideals of the past, its responsibility to the challenges of the present, and its commitment to the opportunities of the future. [Applause.]

The Goldwaterites, the rear guard of a defeated past, they want to turn the clock back. They want to abandon the challenges of tomorrow for the fantasies of yesterday. They love to live and talk in their never-never land of a mythological America that never existed. They want to establish a kind of selfish irresponsibility in both domestic and international relations which violates the fundamental principles of the American tradition, both conservative and liberal.

So let us make no mistake about it. The Republican Party has fallen into the hands of reckless men, men who have inscribed clearly on the public record their willingness to gamble with the American heritage, and I have said from every platform in America that the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party has repudiated his own party, fails to live by the great inspiration of Lincoln, the founder of that party, fails to follow the traditions of that party.

Mr. Goldwater is not a Republican. Mr. Goldwater is a radical. And he ought to be so called. [Applause.]

On no issue is this matter of recklessness and this willingness to gamble with the American heritage more clearly demonstrated than in the all-important field of education, and, Governor, I speak of education in Wisconsin because this State is known for its outstanding educational achievements, and your administration, Governor Reynolds, is known for its great achievements in the field of education. [Applause.]

From our earliest days we Americans have believed in the importance of providing education for our citizens, and we have believed that government at all levels has a vital role to play.

As early as 1785, and that should have been early enough for the Republican standard bearer, the Continental Congress provided for land in every township in the Northwest Territory to be set aside for public education, Federal aid, if you please. From the very beginning of our present Constitution, Congress consistently ceded both for

the public schools and the colleges the public lands. In the midst of the Civil War, fighting to preserve this Union, Abraham Lincoln and the Congress enacted the famous Land-Grant College Act, laying the groundwork for a public university in every State of the Union, one in Wisconsin, one in Minnesota, our great land-grant colleges, and today there are 68 land-grant colleges, and they enrolled most of the undergraduates in the Nation and in many areas provide the doctor's degree, the graduate study. They grant the majority of all higher education degrees.

Twenty years ago Franklin Roosevelt signed into law the GI bill of rights. More than 10 million veterans of World War II benefited from that law, and today we are literally reaping the dividends from our great national investment.

I am of the opinion that much of the present prosperity is due in a large measure to the education that was obtained under the GI bill of rights by 10 million veterans. [Applause.]

The increased earning power of those 10 million veterans has not only helped our economy but it is bringing an estimated billion dollars a year of added revenue to the Federal Treasury, and what opportunities were created for millions who could not have otherwise obtained an education.

Now, these are the facts of the American past, but the Goldwater candidate for President wants to rewrite history or forget it. He wants us to believe that all of those magnificent contributions to American education are unconstitutional, and any man who believes that, and he does—let me quote him. He said: "Federal intervention in education is unconstitutional. Federal aid, however desirable it may be, must be regarded as unconstitutional."

Any man that doesn't know any better than that is not qualified to serve as President of the United States. [Applause.]

What is more, he simply does not understand American history.

Now, what about the future? By the end of this decade, college enrollment will almost double. President Lyndon Johnson faced that fact. Governor Reynolds has faced that fact. And so did the 88th Congress.

It enacted a law providing for more college classrooms, more laboratories, more libraries, but the Goldwater candidate voted against the college aid bill, voted against the medical education bill, even though his Republican colleagues disagreed with him 2 to 1.

President Johnson also knows that in the future the trained American will be the indispensable American. The 88th Congress knew it, too. Governor Reynolds knows this in Wisconsin. That 88th Congress voted the largest expansion of vocational education in years. It voted manpower retraining for workers that were displaced by automation or a change in industry.

The number of vocational students will double by 1968. The number of vocational teachers will be increased under that bill by 50 percent.

Once again the Goldwater candidate refused to face the facts. He voted against manpower training. He voted against the vocational education bill even though his Republican colleagues disagreed with him 7 to 1.

If this man is a Republican, then I have never met one.

He is just himself, and he stands alone like an iceberg. [Applause.]

I said that because an iceberg is rather cold, two-thirds submerged, unknown [laughter], and one-third visible. [Laughter and applause.]

And it is the invisible part that causes you the trouble. [Laughter and applause.]

More than 61 million Americans have no public library facilities, and a library is the center of learning. You can't have an enlightened America without libraries. President Johnson knew this. So did the 88th Congress. It passed a law providing for aid and assistance to public libraries.

So the Goldwater candidate again refused to face the facts. I am beginning to think he is antibook. [Laughter and applause.] There is some reason to believe he is antipeople. [Laughter.]

Senator Goldwater and his radical followers, they fight against these programs of education. But they have kidnaped the Republican Party. Now he is their temporary spokesman. GOP which stood for so many years for Grand Old Party has now a new definition: "Goldwater, our problem." [Applause and laughter.]

Is it any wonder that General Eisenhower said recently, "Something is strange, something is wrong. [Laughter.]

But, my friends, it is not the Republican Party that is out of step with the 20th century. It is their temporary leader. Not only President Kennedy and President Johnson but President Eisenhower recognized the need for more college scholarships, for more scientists, for more mathematicians to cope with the age of space and technology. They built on the lessons of the GI bill and they supported the National Defense Education Act.

I was one of the sponsors of that act. The Congress supported the act. But the man who who holds in his faltering hands the banner of the Republican Party was again out of step. He voted against the National Defense Education Act in 1958 under a Republican President, and he voted against it last year once again. And when he did, he disagreed with the Senate 20 to 1.

So on November 3 I say the choice is clear. You can vote for a man who believes that the only way we can ever hope to deal with the population explosion is with knowledge explosion. That is President Johnson. Or you can vote [applause]—or you can vote for a man who says—and listen to this one: "The child has no right to an education and in most cases the children will get along very well without it."

That is the statement of the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party that says he wants to lead America. Lead it where? Back. Way back.

This kind of a statement indicates that a man is not qualified to be President of the United States. [Applause.]

In the field of education the function of Government is to create opportunities, to assist in the fullest development of the human resources. Every President that I have known of, surely in this century, has understood that fact.

The Government must also play a role in opening the way for the fullest development of our natural resources, and just as the 88th Congress has earned the title of the education Congress, Senator Nelson, you a great conservationist, you would be pleased to know, as you do know, that this 88th Congress has been called in many places the conservation Congress. And here again [applause]—and here once again the choice between the candidates is just as clear in the field of conservation as in education. A wilderness bill passed to preserve the great primitive areas of America, a wilderness bill that doesn't cost the taxpayer one nickel. But needed for future generations. Needed to preserve the beauty of our great wilderness areas.

But the Congressman, or the Senator, from Arizona, he was out of step once again. His Republican colleagues disagreed with him 3 to 1. The Senate, as a whole, disagreed with him 6 to 1. The entire Congress disagreed with him 52 to 1.

As usual, Senator Goldwater voted "no." [Laughter.] Most people voted "yes." The land and water conservation bill, supported so openly by your two Senators and your congressional delegation is another achievement of the 88th Congress. As both population and leisure grow we must provide funds for recreational areas, provide for the great out-of-doors. What State should know more about this or be more interested than Wisconsin and Michigan and Minnesota or Illinois? We know the importance of recreational facilities. We know the importance of our lakes and our streams and our forests. But not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

So, my fellow Americans, let me say in every area, in education, in conservation, yes, Governor, in mental health, and mental retardation, the Democratic Party has stood for progress, has worked with the people. The Democratic Party and President Johnson know the importance of responsible leadership.

I ask you now—[applause]—I ask you now as you decide this issue of November 3 whether the future of this country should be entrusted to a man who distrusts the very Government that he wishes to head, or do you want to put it in charge of a man who believes in it, who understands it, and who knows how to work with it?

Do you want to entrust your future to a man whose hands are unsteady, whose temperament is one of impetuosity, or do you want to entrust the future of this country to a proven leader, to a President who understands the role of a President, who understands responsibility, who understands that government at all levels must work together for the American people? I think I know your answer. [Applause.]

I believe, I sincerely believe, that what John F. Kennedy said in that great inaugural address is still our challenge. Listen to his words.

> In the long history of the world only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility. I welcome it.

That is the credo of a responsible political party. That was the credo of John Kennedy. And I say to you it is the credo of Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States. [Applause and cheers.]

Dubuque, Iowa
Airport Rally
October 16, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

VOICES. We want Hubert, we want Hubert.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I want to say that Dubuque, Iowa, not only has a wonderful group of people, but it has without a doubt the best cheerleader in the United States. [Applause.]

I hope that our good friends out there in that old steam engine will save a little of that steam for November 3. [Applause.]

Oh, it is great to be a Democrat. [Applause.]

By the way, I want to first of all, of course, thank my esteemed friends and your great Governor for his introduction. He makes me so happy every time I come to Iowa that I almost forget about those bitter football games that Minnesota and Iowa have. [Applause.]

But I can tell you that it is a joy to be back in Dubuque. It seems to me that the last time I was here was about 1959, and since that time you have been doing wonderful things. You have got a lot of good Democrats here. You are electing them to public office. [Applause.]

And I can tell you one other thing. You are about ready to elect another great Democrat to public office, and he is a Congressman and his name is John Culver. [Applause.]

John, anybody that can get that beautiful, lovely, gracious, intelligent, charming young lady, Joan Kennedy, to come out and campaign for him, he is a cinch to win. [Applause.]

I have known Joan and Ted Kennedy for years, ever since they were students, and I can't think of nicer people, more wonderful people, and I consider her one of my real favorites, and when she is for Culver, so is Humphrey [applause]. And more importantly, so is President Johnson. [Applause.]

Governor Hughes, you were introduced as the most popular man—[cries of "yea"]—you have got an enthusiastic supporter out there. [laughter]. You were introduced as the most popular man in Iowa. There isn't any doubt about it and the election results on November 3 will show that in unmistakable fashion. [Applause.]

I hear you also had out here Cyrus Ribert. [Applause.] Well, I am glad that he was able to come out to this beautiful area of Iowa, giving new inspiration, giving new confidence, new strength. He has got a big job on his hands, but he is one of the trusted lieutenants of President Johnson, and he is one of the finest administrators in the Nation's Capital. And I am proud to know him as a friend. [Applause.]

Before I forget it, I want to thank these bands that have been doing such a good job around here. You have been great, all of you. [Applause.]

I will get around to talking to these young people in just a few minutes, but in the meantime I just want them to know that I not only prefer their colorful uniforms and their enthusiasm but I also appreciate their skill as musicians.

I remember when I was a young fellow they started a band at our local school, and I was one of the members. They dismantled it next year. [Laughter.] I didn't do much for culture and much for music.

Well, let me pay my respects to all these good Democrats, to your county chairman who is with us here, Tom Mulgrew. [Applause.]

And I was delighted to see our State chairman, Lex Hawkins, here this morning. That makes me feel good when the State chairman comes here. [Applause.]

You have got that Mr. Democrat of Dubuque himself, the one and only Mike Hogan, and whenever Mike is around—[Applause.]

And I was introduced this morning again to one of your great public servants, Joe Bahl, chairman of your county supervisors. All I can tell you—[Applause]—Joe, I should tell you that when I ran for the Senate in 1948 I ran against a fellow by the name of Joe Ball, and I wondered if he was back again. [Laughter.] But you spell your name a little differently, and not only that, I think you have better politics. [Applause.]

I want to thank the mayor, Mayor Horgan, for his presence. I am so deeply appreciative of these kindnesses that come to us as we campaign; to be an honorary citizen of the city of Dubuque is something that I treasure. I want to thank him also for those etchings and cuts of some of the historic places in your great community.

Then, too, I want to thank Ray Rozanka for giving me an honorary membership in the Young Democrats. [Applause.]

Ray, after a long day yesterday, making many speeches and ending up in Milwaukee last night, and you know, the folks in Milwaukee like to stay up late and so do I, I want to tell you that it sure made me feel good today to know that I qualified as even an honorary member of the Young Democrats. [Applause.]

And I want every laboring man and woman in this audience, every union member to know that I had something happen to me that you haven't had happen to you. I got a membership in the Dubuque federation here, the central federation, but I didn't have to pay anything. I don't even have to pay dues. [Applause.]

I suppose now Mrs. Humphrey will say that I can fix anything at home, that I am no longer trying to break in on jurisdictions, that I will be the fixit, Mr. Fixit, back in the Humphrey household, but really I am not going to do that. I tell here that I am totally incapacitated on these matters.

Say, I like your sign back here, don't you? Read it. [Applause.]

If you follow what that sign says, if you will do exactly what that sign tells us in each and every word, from the White House to the courthouse, there will be happy people throughout America and happy Democrats and Democrats of leadership in responsible positions in this Nation.

Don't you think that is a good idea? [Applause.]

Mr. Mayor, my fellow citizens, there is a former Minnesotan in this audience that ought to have stayed in Minnesota but thought he wanted to come to the beautiful State of Iowa, and I want to say it was good to see my old friend Gordon Gounod, who was for years the editor of the Alexandria Park Region in Minnesota, about the only Democratic paper we had up there when he left. [Applause.]

Oh, yes. I just got a note here of an old friend of mine. I will pay my respects to him when I get off the platform.

Dr. Van Allen is with us, the discoverer of the great Van Allen belt which is one of the great achievements, of course, of modern science, and Dr. Van Allen from your own State university is the chairman there of the scientists and engineers for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.]

Well, now, let's get down to talk about a little politics. We are not going to be here long. We have got to go on to Sioux City, Sioux Falls—[cries of "yea"]—oh, thank you. Aren't you happy with Dubuque? [Laughter.]

I want to talk to you because this is going to be a full day, and in just the few minutes that we have I should like to say a few things about where I think we are going in this campaign.

First of all, this is a hard-fought campaign. It is very unusual. In most campaigns we generally discuss issues, but it is pretty difficult to have a debate over issues if one of the participants in the debate doesn't want to do that.

And we have found that to be the situation. Because really what we are talking about today in America is where do we go from here? What have we been doing? Where are we going? How do we get to where we want to go? I think every person here, particularly our young people, know that we are living in a world of rapid change, change, I should say so, on the international scene, change in every conceivable way, change due to science and technology, change due to the power structure change in the world, and all of this places upon America a very heavy responsibility of world leadership.

I think somewhere along the line we ought to emphasize in this campaign as we have ordinarily in our daily lives that America has the responsibility for leadership and that leadership requires that you have policies and programs, that leadership means that you must be strong, not only strong materially but you must be strong in commitment, in conviction, in ideals.

Leadership means also that Americans must know of their own country, of their own policies, of their own programs, of their own commitments to public policy. And I regret to say that in this campaign the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party, and that is what he is, that temporary spokesman has refused to discuss the great issues that affect us.

He has refused to discuss a single one of them. So today in the few minutes that I have, let me say that we intend to discuss them.

Back in 1961 when President Kennedy came in as our President, he found a Nation that was faltering. He found a Nation that was weak. He found a Nation the economy of which was more or less at a dead standstill or a dead center. And what did he say to us? He not only asked us to get this country moving again economically. He asked us to accept the burdens of responsibility on the world scene. And he also said that he did not shrink from that responsibility and he meant it.

He proved himself in 1,000 days of dramatic leadership to be one of the most courageous, one of the most farsighted, one of the most prophetic Presidents that America has ever known. [Applause.]

And my friends, America did get moving again. Our economy is buzzing, so to speak. It is growing. The gross national product is up. The wage level is up. Personal income is up. Every area of our economy is better. And I think this isn't an accident. It came because a President and a Congress and an administration worked with industry, worked with labor, worked with agriculture, because a government saw its responsibility to the people, and today because of that, America is richer, America is stronger, America is better than it was 4 years ago. [Applause.]

On the international front our President saw the need of doing some dramatic things. He launched the Peace Corps, the Arms Control Agency, the Alliance for Progress, revised our foreign aid, spoke to the nations of the world responsibly, with idealism and conviction, and America once again gained the prestige of world leadership. America once again was on the move.

And may I say, my dear friends, that with all of this talk about our weakness from the opposition which is, of course, only an insult to the intelligence of the American people, with all of this talk, it is not the United States of America that is having troubles all over the world. It seems to be the Soviet Union—the Soviet Union having trouble at home, the Soviet Union having trouble in Europe, the Soviet Union having trouble everywhere.

I think American foreign policy under the Kennedy-Johnson administration has proven to be strong, has proven to be effective, has proven to be a work of a great nation, a great people, and we ought to be proud of it. [Applause.]

Now let's ask ourselves what is the program of the opposition? Well, the main thing they talk about is that we are sick and tired. Yes, the leader of the opposition says we are sick and tired of this, sick and tired of that. I tell you, a fellow who talks about being sick and tired so much may be explaining himself. [Applause.]

I see a lot of healthy Americans. I see vigorous Americans. I see Americans that are unafraid. I see Americans that want to do things. I see Americans all over this Nation that know that this Nation has, as Franklin Roosevelt put it, a rendezvous with destiny and we accept this challenge. We are not sick. And, Mr. Goldwater, we are not tired, and we will demonstrate it to you on November 3. [Applause.]

It seems to me that we have a right to ask where do you stand? Oh, we have read what you said. It is kind of hard to keep up with what that gentleman says. You have to read every day. [Applause.]

This man makes more explanations of what he said the day before and what he intended to say, what he hopes to say, what he hopes he meant, what he hopes he thinks he said, and what he hopes you meant you said. [Applause.]

Now, if what I said sounded kind of confused, it was so intended. I was trying to state what the candidate of the Republican Party is trying to say.

What is he saying? He is just saying let's go back. He is just saying, "Oh, go back to those good old days to which I am accustomed. Gather the covered wagons in a circle. The enemy is coming." [Applause.]

Now I ask you, what is his program for education with a growing student population in this country. He has never mentioned it except to say that he doesn't believe the Government has any responsibility for education. What a noble thought that was. Prehistoric, may I add. Prehistoric.

There hasn't been a civilized society in the last 300 years where the government didn't have responsibility for education. [Applause.]

He says the Government of the United States should withdraw from a whole series of programs. There ought to be a timetable of withdrawal. What programs? Agriculture, he says. Education, health, social welfare.

Apparently Mr. Goldwater never read the Constitution or if he did, he failed to comprehend it, because that Constitution says the Government of the United States has the responsibility to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare. And so to do that—and so to do that requires Government action. Government action. [Applause.]

It is a fact, at least it is so stated throughout the centuries, that absolute power corrupts absolutely. But let me also say that the failure to exercise authority, the failure to have positive government also corrupts. And what Mr. Goldwater seems to fail to understand is that this Government has a responsibility to the people. It is what Lincoln said, "a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—a Government designed to serve the people.

It is what Lincoln said. [Applause.] The duty of government is to do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves or nearly so well for themselves, working with the people, a partnership. Mr. Goldwater doesn't understand that. And I say that anybody that doesn't understand that basic lesson in American civilization which we teach our children in the sixth grade, that man is not qualified by background, by knowledge, by understanding of the American governmental structure, to be President of the United States. [Applause.]

I will tell you what his program is. He recites it day after day. He recited his program in Congress. There is one word that Mr. Goldwater knows and can spell. "N-o." No. No. No. [Applause.]

Had he ever said "Yes," it would be a traumatic experience. [Applause.]

He said no to minimum wages, no to education, no to manpower training, no to every health program.

He said no to the Alliance for Progress, no to the Peace Corps, no to the Arms Control Agency, no to the United Nations.

He said no to the nuclear test ban treaty.

He says, no, no, no, no, no. [Applause.]

Well, he has convinced me. I say no to Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, we need a party and a President that has a program for our cities, for our farms, for our children, for our elderly.

We need a party and a President that has a program for education, for health, for agriculture, for workers, for the young that drop out of school, for the elderly that need decent housing and hospital care.

We need a positive Government and we need an affirmative President, and we've got him, and his name is President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

So, my friends, let's have no more of this talk. Let's get to work. The only way you win elections is work.

My father used to tell me that if you are just a little bit short, son, on money, or even ability, just work a little harder. [Applause.]

Just work a little harder. And I am an advocate of hard work, intensive work, 24 hours a day if the Lord will give me the strength, and since sometimes He thinks I ought not to work that hard, 18 hours a day. [Applause.]

I want my fellow Democrats to make this election a memorable one. I want you to get people out to those polls, and I want the young people in this audience to tell their parents that their parents owe them something. They owe them responsible citizenship, and to be a citizen in this country means that you must take on the responsibilities of representative government. It means your mother and your father; it means everyone 21 years of age and over must be a voter and must exercise it as a social, civic, and private and public duty, to be a voter on election day. Make that our business. [Applause.]

I leave you with this thought because I know—I know what this community meant to our late and beloved President, Gov. Harold Hughes, respected by the late and beloved President and a friend of our late President Kennedy. These are great people. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, the man who is in the White House today came there because of an unbelievable cruel act of history. He got there because of the death of the beloved President. But I think one of the great decisions that President Kennedy made was when he selected his Vice President so that when that tragic hour befell us, when this life of this brave young man was taken from us, that there was a tall, strong man, experienced in Government, knowledgeable in the arts and sciences of Government, a man of courage and strength, who could take up the torch and who could carry it and hold high that light of American freedom and progress. That man is in the White House today.

He was selected by John Kennedy. Don't forget that. And I want to see us make this election a living memorial, a living tribute, to the works and the needs and the words and the program and the policy of our late and beloved President.

And I think the way that we can demonstrate to all Americans and to all the world that we believed in the inaugural message of John Kennedy, that we believed in his speech at American University, "The Path to Peace," that we believed in the policies and programs that he set before us, I think the way that we reaffirm that, I think the way that we prove it is by electing the man that he selected as his Vice President, electing him President of the United States. [Applause.]

Sioux City, Iowa
Airport
October 16, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much.

Well, I am simply delighted to be in Sioux City, Iowa, one of my favorite communities, and I have been here many, many times, many times while I lived in South Dakota, while I was mayor of Minneapolis, and I am particularly pleased to be here with your fine mayor, your mayor that is going to be the next Congressman right from this district, Mayor Greigg.

By the way, let me just tell you that we have had a poll on the airplanes that came in here, amongst all the newsmen, all the TV people, including all the young ladies that are stewardesses, and they all agreed that Governor Huges is the best looking Governor in the United States.

And I want to say we agree that he is the finest Governor that any State could have.

There is only one that I can think of that compares with him and that is the Governor of Minnesota. Other than that, there is none other. He is a marvelous Governor, marvelous.

Really, I am delighted to be here, and I am looking forward to the privilege of speaking in your city. An old friend of mine is either coming to the airport now or is boarding his plane. I want—[laughter].

Now, I want you to know that I served in the Senate with this man from Arizona for a long time, and I have no feelings of animosity, no feelings at all of unkindness toward him.

As a matter of fact, the Senator and his wife Peggy are very, very fine, nice people, and their sons, their family, wonderful people.

I say he makes a wonderful neighbor for anybody, a wonderful neighbor, but not for President. We don't want him for President. [Applause.]

So, friends, just come on down if you can to our meeting. It is good to be here for the Sioux City "Rivercade." Good to have a chance to see this wonderful Iowa countryside.

You know, I wish you could all fly with us. It is simply beautiful when you come in here, just beautiful. The land looks so rich and fertile. You just can't help but be proud that you live in the Midwest. I am a Midwesterner; I love this part of America. I have been here with you, as I said, many times.

Now, I want you to do something, particularly these young folks that are here. I don't know whether I will get a chance to talk to you again or not.

You know, your parents, they advise you all the time what to do. Anyway, I always advise my children what to do, and I have three sons and a daughter, and I also have two granddaughters, and I am going to see those granddaughters in another week which makes me happier than anything that has happened in this campaign.

But now when you get home, you get hold of mother and dad and you say I think it is time that we have a little private talk. Have you heard that before? And you get them off in a side room there, either in the kitchen or the dining room, the living room or off—oh, not the woodshed. No. Not for dad and mom. That is for you, young fellow. And you get them off in the corner and say, "Look here, November 3 is election day. That is citizenship day."

Here we go.

You tell them that if you were 21, you would fulfill your duties as a citizen. You would be an intelligent, alert, on-the-job citizen ready to vote on November 3. And you say, "Now, look, dad, it is just about time that you buckled down to business here and took care of our country, and look here, mom, you have been doing great. You have been bringing me up fine, feeding me well. You are a wonderful mother. Now be a good citizen."

You just get hold of them. You do this. You say you had had a talk with Senator Humphrey and you want them to be voters on November 3, and then you tell them you have got some suggestions as to how they ought to vote. [Applause.]

And tell them that you think the best thing to do is to keep that wonderful Governor that you have got right here in Iowa, Harold Hughes, and keep him on the job and tell them you have got such a wonderful man that served here in your local government in Sioux City as mayor that you think it is time you gave him a promotion and you send him down to Congress to represent you down in Congress. Mayor Greigg. And then when you get around to it just tell him you met that fellow Humphrey, and he was out here and said he, too, wanted to change jobs, and I want to be the Vice President candidate with our President, and you tell them that you expect them to show good sense, good judgment, and to vote for President Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey for President and Vice President.

Thank you very much.

203 WBZ—LINO

Sioux City, Iowa
Municipal Auditorium
October 16, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you.

I thank you very much, Governor Hughes, for your cordial welcome once again in this beautiful State of Iowa.

May I say how singularly honored and pleased I am to share this platform today with a very illustrious, able, and talented public official, the mayor of the great Sioux City, Iowa, your own mayor, Stanley Greigg. [Applause.]

I am well aware of the fact that—if my engineer down here will turn up this volume I may be able to talk to this audience.

I am well aware of the fact that only a very short time ago the candidate of the Republican Party, Mr. Goldwater, was here in this particular vicinity in this auditorium. I am also aware of the fact that he suffered an indignity which is unbecoming an American audience.

Let me say that as this campaign comes to a conclusion, as we proceed to the date of November 3—can you hear out there? [Cries of "No."]

Not let's see if we can hear out there. I don't know. We must have the opposition in charge of the microphones. [Applause.] [Laughter.]

I was saying to you just a few moments ago that I understand that the distinguished Senator from Arizona in his visit here suffered an indignity in this campaign which is not becoming any American audience. I hope that as this campaign proceeds to election day that we Americans may be able to conduct ourselves in a manner that is worthy of our finest traditions of free discussion, of free debate, of open meetings, where people of different persuasion, of different political attitudes, may come before a responsible American audience and at all times be heard and be respected for their views.

Now, I want to make it quite clear that I know the Senator from Arizona and know him well. In fact, I was hoping that I would have a chance to say "hello" to him out there at the airport.

I know him as a patriot. I know him as a friend in the Senate. I know his wife, his fine wife Peggy, and I know his family.

I want to say that I consider the Senator from Arizona to be one that would make a wonderful neighbor, but I don't want him for my President. [Applause.]

Now, friends, I am so honored to be with Governor Hughes of your State. Somebody said to me earlier today that Governor Hughes was the most popular man in Iowa, and I think he should be. [Applause.] And I am confident that the people of this State will in their good judgment, because they respect a man of principle, they respect a man of progressive persuasion, I think they will and I hope they will elect, reelect as Governor of Iowa that fine Governor, Harold Hughes, who has served you so admirably. [Applause.]

I am very pleased that a young man who is the dean of men at Morningside College, who today serves as the mayor of this great city, who was able to get the largest vote of any public official in the history of Sioux City, I hope that the people of this congressional district now that they have an opportunity to elect a new Congressman will elect Stanley Greigg to the Congress of the United States in this district. [Applause.]

Well, now, let me talk to you a little bit about your great "Rivercade" celebration. I have had the privilege of saying hello to some of your officials that are responsible for this festive day.

I come from a city along the river. I was once mayor of the city of Minneapolis along the mighty Mississippi. In fact, as you know, the Mississippi River has its headwaters at Lake Itasca of Minnesota. I believe that I have some appreciation of the importance of river transportation, of the great importance of a city that is built along the banks of a mighty and a great stream. And today in the moments that are allotted to me I want to talk to you a little bit, not so much about partisan politics as I prefer to talk to you about but how we build a better America, how we build a richer commuinty, richer in spirit, richer in material goods, richer in commerce, richer in education, and the charms of fine living.

The wonders of electronics. I will never cease to be amazed. [Laughter.]

You know, William Jennings Bryan had it right. He had a voice on him that could be heard for 3 miles. The Lord took care of him. Now we have to rely, some of us, upon these electrical instruments.

Well, I want to talk to you today about the progress of this community.

Let me say first of all that I know that only a few years ago in this great city of Sioux City that you were inundated by waters, the floods of the Floyd River and the Missouri. In fact, if I am not mistaken, the very place where I now stand was under water a little over 10 years ago.

The flood waters were damaging the countryside, destroying industry and property, taking lives. And the Missouri River was a menace instead of an asset. The Floyd River was a danger instead of a friend.

And then what happened? Your Government, your Federal Government, in cooperation with your State authorities, set to the task of seeing if we couldn't tame the rivers, of seeing if we couldn't harness these waters and seeing if we couldn't do something to make the rivers an asset rather than a liability, to see if we couldn't put to constructive use the waters of the Missouri and the waters of the Floyd.

I believe that the last flood here of any great significance was back in about 1953. I think you recall that in Congress legislation was introduced to provide for flood control, and may I say that I had the privilege of voting for that legislation. [Applause.]

This legislation wasn't partisan. This legislation didn't relate to a Republican or a Democrat. This legislation to harness the waters of the Missouri and of the Floyd, this legislation to have a diversion channel for the Floyd River, it was only designed to help people, to protect property, to make sure that this great community of Sioux City should not be the victim of flood waters.

That legislation was appropriately introduced. The Corps of Engineers made the survey. The planning was completed and then the construction work for the diversion channel was undertaken.

And I am happy to say, my dear friends, that that construction work was completed and today as I drove in from the airport I saw the diversion channel of the Floyd River coming in off the Missouri. And I saw, my dear friends, I saw where you could bring barges into that Floyd River making Sioux City a port.

Now, let me say, I voted for that legislation. The man that was here before [applause] the man that was here before me, the man that rode the barge on that river, he didn't vote to give you flood protection. He didn't vote to make your river navigable. He didn't vote to harness the waters of the Missouri and the Floyd.

He voted no, just as he has voted on issue after issue.

But my dear friends, when it came to Arizona, it was a little different.

Oh, yes, friends. The Floyd River is a total project of $21 million, $21 million, $16 million of Federal funds, $5 million of local participation. That is a small project in terms of flood control.

But when it came to the central Arizona project for the State of Arizona, the Senator from Arizona didn't hesitate. He didn't worry about the fact that it was going to cost a billion dollars, $1 billion, to help Arizona. But not one nickel to help Iowa. Not 1 penny to help Sioux City.

Think it over. [Applause.]

Now, let me be very frank with you. Let me be very frank. I voted for the program in Arizona as well, and I will tell you why. I think it is good for America to harness the waters of its rivers. I think it is good for all of America to develop the rivers, for irirgation, for reclamation, for recreation, for transportation, for power.

I know the people of the Colorado River area. I know the people of Arizona and New Mexico and California need water. And the Senator from Minnesota doesn't vote just to help Minnesota. The Senator from Minnesota has voted for every flood-control project

that has been asked for by the Army Engineers and by the Bureau of the Budget. Any project that you can justify as saving money, as saving resources, as protecting property designed to increase the wealth of communities, those projects are not expenditures. Those projects do not represent spending. They represent investments just exactly as if you invest in a corporation. [Applause.]

But my friends, we are not only talking about flood control. What we are really talking about is cooperation between the government of the people, by the people, and for the people with the people. And the gentleman that addressed you has a different philosophy of government than President Johnson or Hubert Humphrey and that is the issue in this campaign.

I respect his right to state his opinion. I am a member of the Senate. We have open and free debate. And may I say quite candidly my social friendships are frequently with those with whom I disagree politically.

I do not come here to say derogatory things about the personality or the personal life of the candidate of the Republican Party. As a matter of fact, I would praise him. But let me say that I disagree wholeheartedly, I diagree strongly with his attitude about government.

Here is a man that says that he feels the duty of a man in public life is not to pass laws but to repeal them. Which laws? Social security? Agriculture? Public health? Flood control?

I don't know. He didn't say. But he says that he thinks that his responsibility is to repeal laws.

Now, when a man makes a statement like that I want him to give me the bill of particulars because that is a pretty wide-range attitude. Here is a man that say that the Government, the Federal Government, has no business being in such programs as agriculture, education, social welfare. He says that these programs are unconstitutional despite the fact, may I say, that President Eisenhower advanced them, despite the fact, may I say, that President Hoover advanced them, that Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and John Kennedy, all men of character, all men students of government, Republicans and Democrats alike, have never denied up until now that the Federal Government had a responsibility in the field of agriculture, in the field of education, in the field of health, in the field of social welfare, in the field of transportation, in the field of the development of our natural resources.

But now we have a man that says no, and he says it honestly. I do not contest his motives. I just contest his judgment. I think he is wrong. [Applause.]

Let me show you how wrong I think he is. Here is a man that says that the Government in Washington is a greater threat to our freedom than Moscow.

Now, you don't believe that. I don't believe that. Our Government may at times be wrong. Our Government may make mistakes. Our Government may at time be inept, but, ladies and gentlemen, it is our Government, and we can elect it or defeat it.

It is a government that is responsive to the will of the American people. Every 2 years you can change the whole House of Representatives. Every 6 years the Senate. Every 4 years the Presidency.

Don't you, Mr. Goldwater, compare our Government in Washington with Moscow. What a travesty upon Republican government, representative government. [Applause.]

Yes, my friends, let me say that the partnership between the Federal Government and the people is one of the great assets of America. It is the wealth of America. It is the strength of America. It has been good for America. Since the early days of this Republic, since the first Northwest Ordinance when land was set aside for education, since the first Tariff Act of Alexander Hamilton when tariffs were established to promote infant industry, from the first roads, post roads and highways when highways were developed for commerce—and what are we doing on the mighty Missouri? To develop another highway, another arterial highway of commerce.

Let me give this audience just a few particulars. The airport that I landed on, that Mr. Goldwater came to, the one that his jet left, does he think that was built by Sears & Roebuck? [Applause.]

Does he think it was built by Goldwater's Department Store? Or Humphrey's Drug Store? I want to get that in, too. [Laughter.]

No, my friends. That was the product of cooperation between the Federal Government and the State and local governments—cooperation.

I don't claim that the Federal Government did it all, but I say that without it, without the help of the Federal Government, there would have been no airport. And the tower that controls the flight of planes, Federal Government. And the weather service that tells you whether you dare to fly, Federal Government. The Government is not our enemy. It is our helper.

And right here in this great city, the sewage disposal plant which protects your health, which prevents the pollution of your land and water, Federal aid. The Interstate Highway 29, 90 percent of that highway is paid for out of Federal funds.

Now, maybe Mr. Goldwater still thinks that we ought to have Indian trails. [Laughter.] But I think that the Federal highway system which is a grant-in-aid program between Federal and State Government, it makes good sense, a partnership. It is good for business, good for people. [Applause.]

The urban renewal project, urban renewal right here where I speak. This was a flooded area, and when the Floyd River channel was diverted to prevent floods and to provide transportation, a great program of urban renewal, most of the funds in urban renewal are Federal. That is not bad. That is good.

We have one country. This isn't 50 separate States. These are the 50 United States of America. One people, one nation indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all.

That is what we say. Then let's believe it. [Applause.]

It is the farmer out in your part of the great State of Iowa, watershed projects, soil conservation, farm price supports, Federal participation. The Federal Government doesn't do it all. The Federal Government helps you do it.

The purpose of the Federal Government is not to take over. The purpose of the Federal Government is to be a partner, a helper, assistant, and believe me, that is what it is. And any man that seeks the office of the Presidency that doesn't understand the great heritage of America, the great tradition of this country over the many, many years of the partnership between a Federal Government, State and local government, and the people, labor, capital, business, farmer, student, teacher—people that don't understand that, my friends, those people have already forfeited their right to lead America because America needs leadership that understands the purpose of American Government. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, let me say a word about the mighty Missouri. I was born in South Dakota. I lived in the Missouri Valley. I lived there many years of my life, and may I say that the mighty Missouri, the mighty Missouri has been a source of wealth, but it has also been a source of tragedy.

When my grandfather came to Minnehaha country in South Dakota from Norway, he was a Norwegian sea captain and he came here for one purpose. He came here to enjoy the opportunities of America, but he also came here to run a barge on the Missouri River.

He didn't know about the shifting sands. He didn't know about the lack of depth of channel. He thought he could be a barge captain.

Well, Grandpa, you died too soon. If you could have waited until 1967, or 1966, you could have been a barge captain, granddad, right on the Missouri, because now we are making the Missouri navigable.

We are going to make it an arterial highway. We are going to make Sioux City just like St. Paul and Minneapolis. We are going to make it a port for the people of the Midwest. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, my father was in the State Legislature of South Dakota. He was the mayor of his town, Stanley; he was a great believer in the Midwest.

We lived in a rural section. We know the dependence of farmers and businessmen, the interdependence. We learned early through experience, not through reading books, but through experience. We learned that you can't have a prosperous Main Street unless you have a prosperous agriculture, and we also learned through experience that if your transportation rates are too high, you can compete anyplace else.

So my dad before me was a champion of the development of the Missouri River. He was 20 years ahead of his time. But he was right. And when his son was mayor of Minneapolis, his son Hubert Humphrey—they say Hubert Horatio. Oh boy, I am proud of that middle name. Very few people have it. [Applause.]

And I want to thank Mr. Goldwater for popularizing it. More people call me Horatio now than call me Hubert. I think it is wonderful. [Applause.]

By the way, all the folks who have got middle names that they don't like, just vote for Johnson, and we will have a majority. [Laughter.]

Well, I am beginning to like mine. I have to be careful. I may slip and vote the wrong way. No. I don't think so.

Now, I want to say when I became mayor of Minneapolis I went to Washington to testify for the development of the Missouri. I didn't testify for the development of the Missouri for Minneapolis because the Missouri doesn't go through Minneapolis. It is the Mississippi. But I knew that what was good for the Missouri River areas, the seven States of the Missouri River Basin, was also good for Minnesota, because we build this country together. And when I became U.S. Senator, the first speech that I made in the Senate, one I guess that some people didn't like, but I am proud of it, the first speech was for the development of the Missouri River to help Sioux City, to build Fort Randall, the dam, to build the Garrison Dam, the Oahe Dam.

Oh, yes, my friends, I had people say, "Well, what is that Senator interesting himself for in the Missouri River? Doesn't he know he is from Minnesota; there is the Minnesota River, the St. Croix, Mississippi."

Ladies and gentlemen, there is no room in America for people that are narrowminded. We need to build this great country together and Hubert Humphrey, the man that stands here today, voted for the development of the Missouri River as did Lyndon Johnson from Texas, from the very first day. [Applause.]

And what is this going to mean? This means not only transportation. You are going to have a 9-foot channel. You are ging to cut transportation rates. It is going to help business. It is going to save your farmers millions, millions of dollars.

It is like a tax reduction to reduce your transportation rates. You are going to make this great city one of the thriving commercial metropolises of the Midwest because it takes highways and airports and river transportation. It takes communication and transportation to build a great commercial center, an industrial and agricultural center. The Missouri River, the waters that flood the lands, the waters that were treacherous, the waters that destroyed, are now being harnessed to be the waters that make possible fishing, recreation, swimming, boating; that make possible power, cheap power for your homes and your farms and your industries; that make possible navigation, irrigation, and reclamation in other areas.

What a wonderful development and how is it being done? By the Government of the United States of America through the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Reclamation Service and the Department of the Interior, by appropriations voted by Congress, and this Senator, and Lyndon Johnson when he was Senator, voted for Missouri development, voted for flood control.

Ask the Senator from Arizona how he voted. Ask him how he voted and then see where you want to put your trust and your faith. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, let me comment upon what I consider to be one of the truly most important areas of our development here, agriculture. I heard that the Senator from Arizona while speaking here said that our President was accusing him falsely on his views on agriculture. I believe he said as follows: "Speaking of President Johnson, he said I want to put an immediate end to farm-price supports. This is not true and he knows it." I quote the words of Senator Goldwater.

Well, now, maybe that is the case, Mr. Goldwater, but let me read to you what you said. It is hard to know what you mean but I know what you said. [Laughter.] And I want the farmers of this area to know what he said. And then I will tell you how he voted.

This man, Mr. Goldwater, entitled to his views, speaks very candidly, said as follows—he said, "We must do something about agricultural policy and doing something about it means"—and I quote him exactly—"there can be no equivocation here. It means prompt and final determination of the farm subsidy program." End of quote. Now, I didn't say that. Senator Goldwater said that. And he meant it.

Oh, he got up to Hershey, Pa., here about a month ago when both Republican Parties met up there, the Eisenhower party and then the Goldwater party. [Laughter.] The Eisenhower party is the responsible part of the party. And President Eisenhower said to him, "Look, Barry, you just can't do this. If you do this, you are going to lose every farm vote in the Midwest." And Mr. Goldwater said, "Well, I have already written what I think about it. I have never been for farm price supports." He says that he doesn't believe in them. I respect his judgment. I think his judgment is wrong, but I respect him for saying it.

But now when he comes here in this great food-producing section of America—I lived nearby here. I know a little something about this part of America. I was born in a rural village. My parents and my people were farm people. I think I know something about Midwest agriculture.

And when he comes here and says, and I quote him, about President Johnson, he speaks of President Johnson in these words. "He said I would put an immediate end to farm price supports. That is not true, and he knows it."

Now, maybe there is a difference between the word "immediate" and "prompt." [Laughter.] There may be, but I want to tell you when you are in school, my dear friends, and teacher says get here immediately, she means promptly. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Goldwater said right here in this city just a few hours ago, speaking of President Johnson: "He said I, Senator Goldwater, wants to destroy or wants to kill the electrification program."

He said our President accused him falsely.

Well, let us see what he said. I am going to make a speech up in Sioux Falls very shortly, and I am crimping from it right now. But here is what Mr. Goldwater said. I didn't say it. I think he was wrong in saying it, but he said it. He said, "The time has come to dissolve the REA. In most states the REA has outlived its usefulness."

I didn't say that. I think the REA is the greatest thing that happened to American agriculture. I think the REA ought to be expanded. I think it ought to be improved. I think it is good for business, it is good for farmers. It is good for the electrical industry. It is good for America. It is good for everything except I gather that Mr. Goldwater's department store still has some old kerosene lamps left. [Applause and laughter.]

But, ladies and gentlemen, when the Senator from Arizona says that our President accuses him falsely—I quote the Senator's own words. Now, listen, "dissolve" means getting through with it, doesn't it? "You ought to dissolve the REA," he said. Well, in my simple language that means get rid of it, kill it.

Well, Mr. Goldwater, you never are going to have the chance. You are going to have to—[applause]—you are never going to turn the lights off in rural America, Mr. Goldwater. You can keep those kerosene lamps. We sold ours in Humphrey's drugstore back in 1936. [Applause.]

And listen, my fellow Americans, as we draw this message to a close, let me say that one of the great programs for this area in agriculture has been the feed grain program.

Now, the Senator from Arizona says he doesn't want any farm programs that are mandatory. The President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, and his Vice-Presidential candidate, Mr. Humphrey, have said repeatedly that we support the voluntary program and we support the feed grain program and that feed grain program added $180 million, $180 million of new income to Iowa.

Now, if you think Mr. Goldwater is that important to you, vote for him. If you think you can lose $180 million and not have it hurt—this is a feed grain State. So is southern Minnesota. So are the Dakotas. And Mr. Goldwater voted against the feed grain program. Mr. Goldwater says he doesn't want it. That feed grain program has brought $180 million of new capital to the State of Iowa. He is a pretty expensive candidate, that fellow. [Laughter and applause.]

My dear friends, it isn't only feed grains. It isn't only REA. It isn't only price supports that he is against. But I ask every thoughtful decent humanitarian soul in this audience, do you think it is right for this country to have an abundance of food in its warehouses when a world is hungry, when God's children cry out from the pain of hunger? Do you think it is morally right—let me repeat it, morally right—when God has blessed this land with an abundance and we have the food and we can produce the food and children die of hunger, that we should deny them food?

And yet the Senator from Arizona is voting against the food for peace program. Every church, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, every religion in America has stood up for the food for peace program, said it was good, said it was Judean-Christianity in action, said it represented the heart of America, the compassion of America. But the Senator from Arizona said, no, no food for peace. No food stamp for our own needy at home.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud to represent an administration that believes that it is good to give milk to our schoolchildren, that believes that it is good to have a school-lunch program, that believes that it is right and proper for a food-stamp plan for our own needy, that believes it is right and decent for a food for peace program for the hungrey children of the world wherever we can be of help. And I stand here as the advocate of a Government that cares, of a Government with a heart—[applause]—of a Government that has a sense of social justice. [Applause.]

And we can be called every name in the book and we are. I have been called this and that. I have seen the signs and the placards, and I have heard the epithets. I have heard them say, "Oh, this Government is just pampering the people." I have heard us been called Socialists and Communists.

Well, let me say to every God-fearing person in this audience, a Communist never fed a hungry person just because they loved people. A Communist never extended a hand of fellowship and friendship just because it was the decent, godlike thing to do. And I am proud of a Government and proud of my country that loves God's children so much that we are willing to help the unfortunate here or abroad.

Oh, yes, some people say that compassion is weakness. Some people say, and there are only a few, thank goodness, some people say that concern for the afflicted and the unfortunate is socialism.

But Senator Humphrey and President Johnson say that it is good, decent, wholesome Americanism, and we are going to continue to care for these people. [Applause.]

And finally I say to you, friends, that the great issue of our time is peace. You and I have lived in a time, dear friends, when four of God's great people have given their lives to peace. Four great heroes.

First there was Dag Hammarskjold of the United Nations, a man of peace, who sought peace in Africa and lost his life.

There was Eleanor Roosevelt, a woman of deep conviction, who labored all her life for decency and human dignity and peace. She has been taken from us.

There was that blessed peasant priest, none more blessed, Pope John XXIII, who tried to lead this world in the paths of peace. His great encyclical "Pacem en Terres", "Mater and Magistra"—and I am not Catholic, I am a Protestant, but believe me, no greater voice in 2,000 years has been raised for peace than that of this beloved man, Pope John XXIII. [Applause.]

He didn't think working for peace was appeasement. He didn't think that working for peace was soft on communism. He didn't think that working for peace proved that you were a coward. He knew that it was the right way. He knew that it was the way of strong men, good people.

And that fourth great apostle of peace was our late and beloved President, John Kennedy, who led this Nation in the paths of peace, who proposed at American University that great program of "peace is a process." John Kennedy will be remembered in the years to come, may I say to my young friends, as the President of the 20th century that broke the cold war, that broke through the Communist curtain,

that penetrated into the hearts of humanity. John Kennedy's program for peace, food for peace, Peace Corps, arms control, the Alliance for Progress, his words, his deeds for peace, they will be remembered long after his critics are forgotten. [Applause.]

And may I say to you in all sincerity that John Kennedy's partner in this whole effort was the man who is now President of the United States. John Kennedy needed his comfort, his advice, his strength. I know. I sat with these men. I worked with them. I was there. I was one of their legislative lieutenants, and I say to this audience that possibly the greatest decision that the late and beloved President ever made was when he selected as his Vice President a man experienced in the art and science of government, a man of courage, a man of conviction, a man of peace, a man of progress, and that man today is the President of the United States, and I come to this audience to ask you to help him by your votes.

Help him lead America forward. Help him lead this world in the paths of peace.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Joe Foss Field
October 16, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator McGovern and my good fellow South Dakotans, my friends of the Democratic Party, and the good people of Sioux Falls and this area and these lovely young ladies that have come here to welcome us. We thank you very much.

May I say, Senator, that I think I am the only candidate that comes to South Dakota in this national election that can say first that I have my own private band. [Applause.] And I don't want to downgrade anybody else, but I will just say this. There isn't a better band in any city, town, village, or hamlet in the United States than the band of Doland High School. [Applause.]

Secondly, I want to say that I am the only national candidate that can come to the State of South Dakota and say I have at least a part of my own drugstore. [Applause.]

Any time you are in Huron, stop in. The name is Humphrey's Drugs. Thank you. I'm getting in a few commercials. I hope this is not a conflict of interest, fellows, that nobody will bring this up.

But I am just simply delighted to be here in Minnehaha County in Sioux Falls. I am looking forward very much today to the opportunity of speaking at the corn picking contest.

We have just been on a wonderful whirlwind tour, this morning speaking at Dubuque, Iowa, and then at Sioux City, Iowa, and now out here at this great city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., one of the most thriving and progressive cities in the Midwest. [Applause.]

And I am here to say a few things about the Democratic Party and its program. I am also here to say a few things about the opposition, all of which will be true, some of which will be complimentary, the majority of which will not. [Applause.]

May I say that I know that you have had quite a political day here. A friend of mine is going to be coming here shortly. He lives in a different part of America, but he is quite an American, a good patriot. He is a fine gentleman. He has a lovely family. We know his family. We like his family. I think they are really a credit to our country. I think he would make a wonderful neighbor, but I don't think he ought to be President of the United States. [Applause.]

And I might just as well tell you we are depending on you to see that he is a neighbor, a neighbor in Arizona, and not in Washington. [Applause.]

Well, George McGovern presented me, and may I just say this, that one of the best things that South Dakota has ever done in its glorious history is to send George McGovern to the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And I do hope and pray that you are going to see to it that you have a Democrat out here for Governor. My friend John Lindley is just ready for the job. He is just ready and willing.

And we can stand a new Congressman, too, to work with President Johnson down there in Washington, D.C., in the Nation's Capital, and our good friend Mr. May will do just a real good job there in that congressional district.

And by the way, I don't think our candidate for secretary of state is going to have any trouble with the men vote. And you girls will stand by her just because she is one of you. But we men take a different view of it. She deserves to win not only because she is brilliant, not only because she is able, not only because she knows what to do but she just deserves to win. You know why. [Laughter.]

All right, now. I just want to thank you very much. We are going to run along and go out to the contest. I hope you can come out there and hear our message, not only on agriculture but on America, and I want my friends in Doland to do me one big favor. I want you to get everybody in that town to vote, just once, that's all. I want them to vote only once. But I want them to go there early so when the polls come in from South Dakota, I want to be able to pick up that voting list and see Doland, S. Dak.

We ought to give them two or three votes up there but not more than that. Just to keep it honest, no more than that. Down here in Minnehaha County I want you to know that my grandfather was a homesteader in this county and so I have got some claims here, too, right down here. And I won't get into the subject of Swedes or Norwegians. You never should ask a fellow from Minnesota that question. You know what the difference between a Swede and Norwegian is in Minnesota? Well, I will let you in on the secret, and this is something you really ought not to peddle around.

We had an election in 1962. There was a fellow by the name of Anderson. He is a Swede; he was the Republican Governor. How he got in I don't know, but somehow he got in. I don't mean to downgrade the Swedes. He is just a Republican. That is what I was holding against him. Then we had a Carl Rolvaag, a full-blooded, 100-percent Viking, and he ran on the Democratic ticket. We had an election, 1,300,000 votes cast. When the first count was made, when the Republicans were making the count, we were a little bit behind and our candidate, Mr. Rolvaag, was down in the boondocks, sort of a government in exile, but he did more down there than the other fellow did upstate. Then we had a recount, and, believe me, after the recount we found out that our man, Mr. Rolvaag, the Democrat, won by 91 votes.

So mark my words, friends, the difference between a Norwegian and a Swede in Minnesota is just this—91 votes—that is all. [Applause.]

Okay. I hear that they have got a little presentation. I was wondering when George was going to come up with something. I have been stalling here hoping that he had some little gift. But Ralph, I want to say to Ralph, I am sure glad to meet your granddaughter out there. That is really great. And she really looks fine, and she looks just like a Democrat.

I don't think we can vote her yet, but we will wait. We will wait. It is wonderful to see your family, and this wonderful friend of ours. Ralph Humphrey was the Governor of this great State and we are just as proud as can be that he today held up rural America for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey. [Applause.] And may I say how pleased and proud we are to have Mr. Kennedy, John Kennedy, one of the most illustrious citizens of this State as our State Chairman of Citizens for Johnson and Humphrey. Those are high honors for us. Thank you very, very much. [Applause.]

(Remarks following presentation:)

Senator HUMPHREY. Let me say how grateful I am for this membership. You know, my name in the Chippewa Tribe, Red Leg Chippewa Band in Minnesota, is Chief Leading Feather, and that is an honorable name amongst the Chippewas. He was a great chief, and just a year ago this last Fourth of July I was up there and became a chief, and I did dances, and we had a big time for a whole hour.

I am sorry that we can't go through some of that here, but I wanted to be a member of the Sioux Tribe because the Sioux are noted for their bravery, noted for their courage. They are noted for their

fighting spirit. And to be a member of this tribe makes me exceedingly proud. And may I say to every young person here if you didn't know it, that the man who won the gold medal in the Olympics, the first gold medal for long distance running since 1904, Lt. Billy Mills, was a member of I believe the Pine Ridge Band of the Sioux. [Applause.]

I tell you, it is great. I hope I can run as good as that lieutenant did.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
National Corn Picking Contest
October 16, 1964

SPEECH PREPARED BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

It is wonderful to be back here where I spent my youth. As a native son, I share with you a love of this land and its people.

It was here in South Dakota and in the rest of the Midwest that historic decisions were made in 1932 and 1936.

We decided to take positive steps to move America forward so that all of us might enjoy a better and more productive life. Now the temporary spokesman of a faction of the Republican Party is proposing to reverse that decision.

Senator Goldwater tells us he wants to go back to the "good old days." I remember those days of drought, dust, crop failures, and depression—they don't bring back fond memories.

Once the tides of human affairs are running strongly forward, nations which attempt to reverse that flow do so at their own peril. The American people must ask themselves: Shall we continue to move ahead, or shall we turn back—shall we register a failure or nerve?

In the thirties we faced two disasters.

First, we were struck by the great depression, with its jobless army of 15 million, its starving children and soup lines, the collapsing banks, the stricken businesses everywhere, the 12-cent wheat, the 5-cent hogs, and farms falling under the foreclosure hammer.

Second, mid-America suffered from the drought of the 1930's. Many of us still remember the drought-stricken years—the dry wells and streambeds, the cropless fields, the burned pastures, the dying cattle, and the dust storms. We can never forget the savagery of those natural forces.

The individual—no matter how rugged—found that he could not cope with those forces of drought and depression.

Alone, individuals were helpless. But united, we could save mid-America.

We reached historic decisions which this campaign will either ratify or reverse. We decided—in 1932 and 1936—to use the institution of democratic government to help us meet those urgent needs.

The Government was recognized as an instrument of the people, capable of acting for them in crises. And we made this decision consciously and confidently—for we know government is the people.

We are gathered today in one of our country's great river valleys which have been the cradles of so much of our history. But these rivers, too, with their recurrent waste of precious water and soil in devastating floods, have required the common constructive action of all the people through the processes of democratic government.

In 1936 two famous Americans faced a vast campaign rally a short way down the Missouri from here.

Both men had demonstrated the vitality of democratic government in meeting urgent human needs. Both men had achieved stirring results in harnessing our tremendous river systems and putting them to work for the people.

One man was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The other was George Norris of Nebraska, father of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In 1936, the people of America said "Yes" to Franklin Roosevelt and George Norris.

And the people of America also said "Yes" to the system of rural electric cooperatives that light and energize the Nation's farms.

And the people of America said "Yes" to the TVA which is now the model for such systems of flood control, powerplants, irrigation, and navigation are are now a reality on the Missouri.

213 WBZ—LINO

And the people of America said "Yes" to the nationwide system of soil and water conservation which helped farmers preserve their land.

Rich blessings have come to every American from the wise decisions made in 1936. Before the advent of Roosevelt and Norris, the great Missouri River was more of a threat than a priceless asset. We called it the "Big Muddy" and quipped that it wasn't thick enough to walk on nor thin enough to swim in. While we dreamed of blue water fish, we fished for bullheads. It was a flooding, foul, and polluted river.

Now it is a powerful, resource-rich river, and it will become even greater unless the clock is turned backward. In the great plains around our rivers—once parched and eroded—we find a succession of clean lakes behind the Missouri's power dams—full of fish, priceless for recreation. We see sailboats and motorboats on trailers everywhere in farmyards and town driveways in the once dry Dakotas.

Wind and water erosion have been checked by soil conservation systems and shelterbelts. Manmade farm ponds sparkle in the sun. Every one of the Missouri's big cities has a modern sewage system either built or in the process of being built.

The once undisciplined river now flows through the powerplants. Everywhere REA electricity from those powerplants lights and gives energy to the Dakota farm homes that for so long were dark and powerless. The REA is a matchless asset to us all.

Need you wonder why this election is looked on as a time of trial? Senator Goldwater comes as a candidate seeking to persuade the country to turn its back on the blessings that have flowed from our learning of the hard lessons of yesterday. Senator Goldwater would seek to repeal the past and veto the future.

Senator Goldwater says he intends to sell the TVA. He intends to sell this magnificent system that has tamed floods and lighted farms of a vast Southland. The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party also opposes REA. He says the REA has outlived its usefulness.

His policies would destroy our hopes of expanding the Missouri Valley system, the dams and reservoirs so vital to all of us.

No one can overestimate the importance of your vote on November 3.

The leader of the Goldwaterites intends to make a shambles of agriculture and all related business.

He was the author of these immortal words:

> Doing something about it means—and there can be no equivocation here—prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program.

This declaration has revealed a chasm between him and every national farm group. It has separated him from the ablest Republican farm spokesman in Congress. You know that such a Federal policy would bankrupt American agriculture and erode the businesses that depend upon agriculture for their income.

The cries of alarm over his statement have forced Senator Goldwater to initiate a predictable series of revisions, retractions, and re-explanations. But his votes in Congress, as well as his public statements, show one thing: The Goldwater wrecking crew is ready to roll. And the wreckage would be something to see.

Imagine the impact on the main streets of South Dakota if the American people should ever ratify Senator Goldwater's philosophy—getting rid of the farm problem of the farmers.

Imagine the empty stores, the empty cash registers. Imagine the farm foreclosures, the abandoned farmhouses.

We had a trial run of Goldwater's final solution to the farm problem back in the Benson years. Managed deflation of farm prices and income was the policy—and this policy had one objective: To force farmers off the farms, reduce farm production, and thus eventually boost farm prices and income for the few lucky ones who survived.

And what happened during the Benson years?

In 1960 there were 25 percent less farms than there were in 1952 and the total number of those working on farms decreased 23 percent from 1952 to 1960. Meanwhile, total net income of the remaining farm operators fell 26 percent, and the total personal income of the farm population fell about the same amount.

The merchants lost about 25 percent of their farm customers—and their remaining farm customers had 25 percent less income to spend.

The Benson program came close to meeting its objectives—too close.

But the leader of the Goldwaterites would make Benson look like a bush-leaguer.

Fortunately, America has a far better alternative on November 3.

We have a President with his own family roots deep in the soil. He understands you. He understands your problem. And he cares. That is the most important fact of all. Lyndon B. Johnson cares about American agriculture.

He showed the depth of his understanding during his recent speech in Iowa, when he said:

> Farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system.
>
> Farmers are farmers in the first place because they have the deep-seated instinct to raise crops, not to cut them back, not to leave the land unproductive.
>
> America's farmers want and need and deserve—not promises—but more income and more opportunity.

President Johnson is not going to let your farm economy collapse. And neither am I.

President Johnson and I are not just concerned with getting you fair prices for what you now produce.

We are even more concerned about developing expanding markets, to make fuller use of your potential to produce. We are determined to improve and broaden our food-for-peace program that has already meant so much to you, the Nation, and the world.

Winning the war on poverty means expanded domestic consumption. Raising living standards of developing countries means large new export markets.

President Johnson has shown his awareness of the future in telling Iowa farmers:

> I look forward to the day when we can rely less on cutbacks, and more on programs to sell abroad all we produce above our own needs * * * we will continue to develop new ideas, new approaches, and new solutions.

These are the words of President Lyndon Baines Johnson—the man rural America and all of America will keep as President of the United States.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
National Corn Picking Contest
October 16, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. [Cries of "We want Barry."]

Thank you very much. Thank you, George, Senator McGovern.

You know when I hear my young friends, Senator, out there saying "We want Barry," I don't know whether they are meaning "Straw Barry" or "Razz Barry." [Applause and laughter.]

Possibly I should tell them that the "Barry picken" season is over. [Laughter.]

But before we go on much further, I think they would like to know that at the airport in Sioux Falls, it was my privilege to have the opportunity of meeting and talking with a colleague in the U.S. Senate.

You know, sometimes those of us who become involved in these campaigns get so heated up that we forget that there are human beings involved, and I thought it might not be a bad idea if somewhere along the campaign route at least two of the candidates, one, the candidate for President on the Republican ticket, the other the candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket, should stop just a moment to shake hands, to say a kind word to one another, to wish each other well, but not too well; just well enough [laughter] and to at least let the American people know that when this election is all over, we

intend to have a great free country, a beautiful and wonderful America, and we don't intend if we can help it to set patterns of conduct during this election that breed antagonism and bitterness and hatred.

I would suggest that it might not be a bad idea for the next couple of weeks for every American, candidates and voters alike, to pause just a moment as they start to condemn or criticize, particularly if it seems to be a personal comment.

We have got enough to talk about on the record. We have got enough to talk about in terms of the difference of view on public policy, and we shouldn't get our blood up at the boiling point.

It is a whole lot better to keep your minds alive than it is to keep your blood hot. So I thought I would just pass that suggestion along. [Applause.]

Senator McGovern, I am delighted to be here in your State of South Dakota, in the State where I was born. I am delighted to be here in the presence of a former Governor of the State, Gov. Ralph Humphrey, to be here in the presence of a gentleman that aspires to the office of the Governorship of this State on the Democratic ticket, John Frank Lindley. I think these are fine and good citizens, and indeed you know very well that I wish them the best of all good fortune.

And I am delighted to be here with George May, who is your candidate for Congress in the East River district on the Democratic ticket.

But let me say frankly to you that the people of South Dakota have done something for America that will always be remembered. They have sent to the Congress of the United States as one of their Senators one of the most gifted, talented, one of the most idealistic and yet practical men that has ever served any State, and I am proud to be a friend of George McGovern and proud to be his colleague in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And I do want to say to Mr. and Mrs. Burton Ode how pleased I am to be on their farm. I have had the privilege of meeting the host and hostess to this event and to meet Mr. Ode's parents, and when I was introduced to them, I said, "Ode," I said that sounds like it might be Scandinavian. In Minnesota we always sort of, you know, straddle for a little. We say "Scandinavian" because we have Norwegians, Swedes, and Finlanders, and Danes. And then I said, "I believe it sounds Norwegian." And you know, I was right. I was right. And I couldn't help but think—I couldn't help but think and I did say that my grandfather pioneered in this very area right down here in Minnehaha County.

He came here from Christianson, Norway, and he settled here in this area and had his first farm in Minnehaha County.

It was here where my mother was born—I should say my mother lived. My mother was born in Norway. It was here that she first lived as a girl, so I do feel some close association with this land and the people that now inhabit this area.

And I want to say, too, that I am proud to come to South Dakota to salute the real native Americans, because today I was made a member of the Sioux Tribes of South Dakota. And I want to say that every one of us are proud of Lt. Billy Mills of the U.S. Marine Corps who won the gold medal for the 10,000-meter race at the Olympics in Tokyo. [Applause.]

I only hope that I can run as well as Lieutenant Mills. [Applause.]

Now, my fellow Americans, Mr. Gordon Olson spoke to us, I think, in the measured tones of citizenship responsibility that we ought to adhere to. He said the time is here now for us to give thoughtful attention to the views of those who speak to us in reference to these great public policies.

May I say that there has been an awful lot of shouting in this campaign and both sides have been involved in it, and I think we are coming now to a point where it might not be a bad idea if we quit shouting and started doing some more thinking.

Now, we have differences of views, we have differences of views, and this is the way this country has grown. I said that and I repeat it, that I think that the gentleman that heads the opposition is a fine patriot. [Cries of "hurray."] I think that he and his family—you really did not need to do that. We agree. [Laughter.]

I think we will agree that he is a fine family man. Mrs. Humphrey and I are privileged to know Senator and Mrs. Goldwater. We call them in friendly circles Barry and Peggy. We know them as friends in Washington, as Members of the Senate, and very frankly I will tell you that I think that Senator Goldwater would make a fine neighbor, but I don't want him for my President. [Applause.]

And now let me tell you why. Now let me tell you why. [Cries of "We want Barry."] Well, you are very few in number. [Applause.]

Now, let me tell you why I made the statement that I did. It was here in South Dakota, back in the thirties, in the elections of 1932 and 1936, that some basic decisions about the future of America were made. We decided then to take some forward, positive steps to make America a better land, to make it a more productive land. It now appears to me that the temporary spokesman of a faction of the Republican Party, and I say that respectfully because there are millions, yes millions, of Republicans that are putting their country over their party and are voting for Lyndon Johnson this year [applause] the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party is proposing to reverse that positive direction.

Senator Goldwater makes no bones about his commitments. For this we should respect him. He tells us quite frankly—he tells us quite frankly that he wants to go back to the good old days.

Well, Senator, I don't know where you were living in the thirties, but I remember where I was living, and I remember those good old days. Good old days of drought, of dust, of crop failures, of low prices, and of depression. And frankly they don't bring many fond memories to me.

Yes, in the thirties we faced two disasters. First we were struck down by the great depression with the jobless of 15 million, starving children in soup lines, collapsing banks, stricken businesses everywhere; 30-cent wheat, 10-cent corn, if you were lucky, 4- and 5-cent hogs, and farms falling under the auctioneer's hammer. There was a second disaster; America suffered from the drought of the thirties. Many of us still remember the drought-stricken years. I still do. I lived in Doland and in Huron, S. Dak., during those years; great communities, fine people, but I saw the land blown away. I saw the crops destroyed. I saw people dispossessed through no fault of their own. And I saw dry wells and dry rivers and cropless fields and burned pastures and dying cattle and unhappy people.

And I shall never forget the savagery of the forces of Nature, the dust, the winds, the drought.

Ladies and gentlemen, I learned a lesson there, and many a man and woman in this audience learned that lesson if they will but ponder a moment and be fair with their conscience.

The lesson that we learned was that the individual, no matter how proud, no matter how good or strong or rugged, found that he alone could not cope with those forces of drought and depression. Alone individuals were helpless, but united, sometimes in their farm cooperatives, sometimes in their communities, but united in their government, we could, working together, government and the people, farmers, businessmen, and laborers, working together we found that we could save this mid-America and we could build it. We could make it a very productive area.

We reached historic decisions, and this campaign will decide whether we ratify or reverse those decisions. We decided in 1932 and 1936 to use the institution of free government to help us meet the urgent demands. We followed the policy and the philosophy of a great Republican, a great American, one that apparently has no home today in the Republican ranks. We followed the policy of Abraham Lincoln who said that the duty of government is to serve. The duty of government is to serve.

And may I say to my young friends, you had better learn it because if you don't, you are going to flunk the civics course. [Applause.]

We followed the course and philosophy of a great Lincoln and a Teddy Roosevelt who told us in so many words that Government must do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves or do nearly so well for themselves.

We have a philosophy in this country of government. Government of the people, government by the people, and government for the people—government working with the people. This is the American way. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, we are gathered here today in one of the great areas of the Midwest. In fact, it is in the basin of what we call the Great Missouri River Basin. We gather from time to time in these great river valleys which have been cradles of so much of our history, but these rivers, just as I found when I was in Sioux City where the Missouri and the Floyd come together, these rivers can be a bane or a boon. They can be an asset or a liability. They can help make life better or they can destroy it; these rivers with their recurrent waste of precious water and soil, in devastating floods, that require constructive action of all of the people to keep the rivers tamed and to harness their forces for good.

In 1936 two famous Americans spoke to a vast campaign rally just a short way from here. Both men had demonstrated the vitality of democratic government in meeting human needs. Both men achieved stirring results in harnessing our tremendous resources of water, the river systems, and putting them to work for their people.

One of those men was the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a Democrat. The other was George Norris, Republican of Nebraska, father of the Tennessee Valley Authority, father of the REA. Both of them worked for the people. [Applause.]

In 1936 the people of America said "Yes" to the policies of Roosevelt and Norris, and the people of America all said "Yes" to the system of rural electric cooperatives that light and energize the Nation's farms, and the people of America said "Yes" to the TVA which is a model for the development of river valleys, and the people of America said "Yes" to the nationwide system of soil and water conservation that we celebrate here today which helps farmers preserve their lands.

And, my fellow Americans, there was nothing un-American about this. These great programs of water conservation, these great programs of soil conservation, they are the products of a partnership between a Government in Washington, a government in Pierre, and the people on the land, and that is the way American Government should work.

Prior to the years that I speak of, indeed, prior to the years of the 1940's, the great Missouri River was called the Big Muddy, and it was quipped that it wasn't thick enough to walk on and it wasn't thin enough to swim in.

And while we dreamed of blue-water fish, we fished for bullheads. It was a flooding, foul, and polluted river.

Now that river, yes, some miles from here, but so much a part of the economy of this great area of the Midwest, that river now is a powerful resource. It is a rich river. And it will become even greater unless the clock is turned backward. And let it be a matter of record that the then Member of the Congress in the House of Representatives, Lyndon Johnson, and Hubert Humphrey later on in the U.S. Senate, voted for the development of the Missouri River, voted for these great programs of soil conservation and irrigation, and let it be equally clear—[applause]—and let it be equally clear so there can be no doubt about it, the Senator from Arizona characteristically voted no. No. No. [Applause.]

Yes, my fellow Americans, yes, my friends—$1 billion for the central Arizona project at the sponsorship of the Senator from Arizona, but not one nickel for the Missouri River, not one nickel for the Sioux, not one nickel for the James River, not one nickel for the Mississippi River. What kind of leadership is that? [Applause.]

Well, my dear friends, the great plains around our rivers, ones that were parched and eroded, we now find a succession of clean lakes, full of fish, priceless for recreation. We see sailboats and motorboats. We see the development of recreational resources all over this great area. And why? Because America went socialistic? Not on your life. Because America developed its resources, and today there are thousands of business firms that are making handsome profits because the rivers have been harnessed, the land has been conserved, and rural America has rural electricty. America is richer, business is freer, people are happier, and America is stronger. These are the programs. [Applause.]

Now, my dear friends, just a word about the REA. It is a matchless asset to all of us. But Senator Goldwater has some views about the REA. Oh, I know, I know. I got a copy of the speech. I read where he says that our President, President Johnson, says that—he says that President Johnson says that he wants—"he said that I want to kill the rural electrification program," and the Senator from Arizona says, "This is not true and he knows it."

Well, let's see. That is a very serious charge. And if the President of the United States falsely accused the Senator from Arizona, then he should apologize. But if the Senator from Arizona has misrepresented what the record is, then he should stand in apology. What did he say? Well, I am not going to quote what Humphrey has said. I will quote exactly what the Senator from Arizona said in Denver, Colo., on May 3, 1963, in one of his several hundred speeches. Here is what he said: "The time has come to dissolve the REA."

Now, my dear friends, maybe the Senator from Arizona, maybe the Senator from Arizona thinks that the word "dissolve" doesn't mean kill. Well, let me tell you that most of us that have been around here know that if you dissolve it, you have finished it, you have killed it. Those are his own words. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, let's go a little further. The Senator from Arizona said, "In most States REA has outlived its usefulness." Is that what you think in South Dakota? No more REA? [Cries of "No."] I should say not. So, has the President of the United States been unfair? I think not.

What the trouble is that Mr. Goldwater, as he traveled around America, has found out that some of those ideas that seem to go over so good in those limited audiences that would attend his meetings have no sense and no relationship to the problems of America once you see it. And I am delighted that the Senator from Arizona is getting an education in rural America. [Applause.]

The Senator from Arizona says, and I hope he doesn't mean this, but I can only tell you what he says: he says, "I intend to sell TVA." He says, "I would sell it for a dollar."

Oh, of course, a little later he said no. No. I didn't mean that. But then he got back down there again, and he says, "Yes, I did mean it." He intends, in other words, to sell this magnificent system that has tamed the floodwaters, lighted the farms, built up industry, made that great pipeline of TVA the most prosperous area of America. He intends to sell it for a dollar. Well, I have got news for him. He is never going to get a chance. [Applause.]

Now, dear friends, I say that his policies would destroy our hopes of developing our river systems. And the record speaks for itself. No one can overestimate, therefore, the importance of this election on November 3. The leader of the Goldwaterites intends to change American agricultural policy and change it drastically. He intends to make a shambles of this policy for agriculture and all related business. He was the author of these immortal words concerning agricultural price supports, and may I say again that the Senator says the President has been unkind, the President has misrepresented him. The Senator from Arizona says—the Senator from Arizona said, speaking of President Johnson, "He said that I would put an immediate end to farm price supports. This is not true and he knows it."

Well, let's see what he said. Let's see what the Senator from Arizona said. I quote from a book, "Conscience of a Conservative," a large-selling book. And what does it say? What does he say concerning agricultural price supports? Here are his words:

"Doing something about it"—relating to agricultural price support—"Doing something about it means"—and there can be no equivocation here—"prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the Senator from Arizona says the President misrepresents him when the President says that Mr. Goldwater would give immediate termination to the farm program. And the Senator says it is not true, I never said it. Well, what did he say? He said he wanted prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program, and may I say to every student here, when your teacher says, "I want you promptly in the classroom," she means immediately. And you know it. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this declaration has frightened many a farm leader and farmer, split him from major farm operations. It has separated him from the ablest Republican spokesman. Such a Federal policy would bankrupt American agriculture.

In fact, the land--grant colleges of America, nonpolitical, the great universities of this country in their report to the U.S. Senate said that if there was a prompt and final termination of the agricultural price support policies, it would reduce farm income net from $12.6 billion down to slightly over $6 billion.

I don't think America's agriculture and American businessmen, I don't think the American people want that kind of a disastrous calamity to befall the American agricultural community.

Now, the cries of alarm over this statement have forced the Senator from Arizona to initiate a series of revisions, retractions, and reexplanations. I am of the opinion that America needs a President that says what he means when he says it, and knows what he says when he says it. [Applause.] Rather than one that revises, retracts, and reexplains.

But as the Senator from Arizona said, "We shall know them by their votes. And not by their words."

And what about his votes? As the Senator from South Dakota has told you truthfully, the Senator from Arizona has yet to vote for a single farm price support measure—cotton, tobacco, wool, yes. Corn, feed grains, wheat, no. Any farm program for this area, no.

And what is it in the alternative? The free market. Take your bumps. Take your chances, Mr. Farmer. Just pitch in and see what happens. So we see the wreckage could be something to behold.

The Goldwater farm program is like many others. It has got a very simple statement. No. Just no.

Imagine the empty stores, farm foreclosures, the abandoned homes.

Now, we had a trial run on some aspects of that program back in the Benson years. We remember that. Inflation of farm prices and farm income. The policy had one objective, and it worked, tragically to force farmers off the land, to reduce farm production, thus eventually boost farm prices and income for the lucky ones that survived. The law of the jungle.

We repudiated that, my dear friends, when we wrote the Constitution, and we don't intend to return to it.

So ladies and gentlemen—[applause]—fortunately for this great country, America does have a choice. We have a President with his family roots deep in the soil. He understands the problems of rural America. And above all, he cares. And the party that he represents, the party that he is the standard bearer for, cares about America.

He showed that depth of understanding in his recent address in Des Moines, Iowa, when he said, "Farmers are farmers in the first place because they have deep-seated instincts to raise crops, not to cut them back, not to leave the land unproductive. America's farmers want and need and deserve not promises but more income and more opportunities."

President Johnson is not going to let your farm economy collapse and neither am I. We have a program. [Applause.]

And, ladies and gentlemen, we are not just concerned with fair prices. We are also concerned with new markets. We are concerned with the better use of our farm production, and we are determined to improve and broaden our food-for-peace programs, our school lunch programs, our food stamp programs, our food grants to the needy.

And I ask every thoughtful, fair-minded American here today, I ask you what do you think of a candidate for the high office of President that will vote against food for peace when we have this abundance in a world of hunger, that will vote against a food stamp plan to help our own needy, that will vote to curtail the school lunch program, that will vote to curtail and limit the school milk program.

Ladies and gentlemen, if that is the kind of a farm program America wants, then I don't know America. I don't think you want it. [Applause.]

But it is not just agriculture that concerns us. I leave you with this thought. America is not merely a land of wealth and production. America is not just a land of farms and factories. America is a land of heart. America is a land of ideals. America's great role in this

modern world is to save this world from war, to save it from Communist totalitarian destruction, to save this America to help people live a better life.

Ladies and gentlemen, the prime issue in this great election as it has been in others, but more so in this, is whether or not we can have the leadership that will guide America along the paths of peace. I say to this audience that in these last few years, great people have sacrificed themselves for peace. There was Dag Hammarskjold, the Secretary General of the United Nations, who spoke bravely and worked for peace, and he died fighting and working for peace in the heart of Africa.

There was Eleanor Roosevelt whose whole life was dedicated to human dignity and to the pursuit of a just and an enduring peace. And there was that blessed man of the Catholic Church, the holy father, Pope John XXIII, who in his great encyclical, "Pacem en Terres," outlined for the whole world, for Catholic and Protestant and Jew, for freemen and those behind the Iron Curtain, outlined a process for peace.

Ladies and gentlemen, the pursuit of peace is not the work of weaklings. The pursuit of peace requires the courage of giants. The process of peace requires sacrifice and it requires infinite patience and it requires wisdom and judgment.

I think John Kennedy's greatest message to America was on June 10, 1963, when this beloved man in his address at American University told us that peace is more than the absence of war, that peace is harmony, that peace is a process, and then he reminded us that it will take maybe generations for us to achieve the noble goal of a peace.

But ladies and gentlemen, peace is not to be obtained by irresponsibility. Peace does not come by ultimatum. Peace does not come by just brandishing the sword.

The power of America is not for conquest nor is it for war. America's might and America's power has as its purpose the attainment of peace. Power as an end in itself is evil. Power as a means to achieve a noble goal is honorable.

And I say that these four great apostles of peace have set for us standards that it would be well for us to repair to. Dag Hammarskjold—if ever there was a man that loved this world and gave his life for it and for peace, it was Hammarskjold.

Eleanor Roosevelt, the first lady of the world, whose whole life was tied up with the well-being of humankind. That is God's work.

And there was that great man, that peasant priest, who became like a giant, the great ideal of all people, as he pleaded with humanity to beat their swords into plowshares and to seek the peace, to seek it courageously and to seek it wisely.

And John Kennedy, all four men and women warriors taken from us, all four, my friends, dedicated to the United Nations, all four dedicated to the paths of peace.

I say to you ladies and gentlemen and my fellow Americans that food for peace, the international health program for peace, the Arms Control Agency, the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, these are the deeds of a peaceful nation, and I heard, I heard, yes, the jeer as it was mentioned that this Senator that speaks to you is the author of the Peace Corps.

Well, I am and I am proud of it. I am proud it was my privilege to author that bill. [Applause and boos.]

And may I say, with sadness, may I say with sadness, I am sorry that the man from Arizona voted against it and branded it only, as he put it, a haven for beatniks. He knows better than that.

The Peace Corps is America's finest demonstration of its ideals and of its youth, and why should a man who seeks to be President downgrade it?

The Arms Control Agency with the nuclear test ban treaty, the first feeble step, yes, a halting one, but a step to peace. And the Senator from Arizona voted no. Voted no on arms control, voted no on the test ban treaty, voted no on the Peace Corps, voted no on food for peace.

221 WBZ—LINO

Ladies and gentlemen, a man that seeks to be President of this country must be a man that not only wants peace, that understands it, will work for it, by deeds and not just by words, and I submit to you that anyone that has the record, the record of voting against every measure that this country has taken in the past 5 years, in the Eisenhower administration, and in President Kennedy's and President Johnson's administration, of having voted against the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, food for peace, the Arms Control Agency, the nuclear test ban treaty, that man is not qualified to be President of the United States. [Applause.]

But I can say—I can say that there is somebody that is qualified to be President and that man today with all his trials and tribulations is one who believes in the United Nations and doesn't say we should get out of it, is someone who supports the Peace Corps, is one who supports the process of peace, is one who joins with those who have departed.

He stands today as the living embodiment of America's quest for a just and honorable peace and freedom and honor, and I am proud to be on this platform before this multitude of noble American citizens to say to you that I speak to you today without apology, with pride and humble pride. I speak to you on behalf of the man that is now our President and that I know will be the next President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Article

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

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., OCTOBER 16, 1964

On November 3 the American people will decide whether Lyndon Baines Johnson or the leaders of the Goldwater faction will guide the destiny of this great Nation for the next 4 years.

Never has so much been at stake—perhaps even the very existence of an American future—or the existence of mankind itself.

Let us make no mistake about it: the Republican Party has fallen into the hands of reckless men, men who have inscribed clearly on the public record their willingness to gamble with the American heritage.

The issues of the campaign are clear:

First, the American people must choose between the proven *responsibility* at home and abroad as manifested in the policies of Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party or the unquestioned *irresponsibility* of the Goldwater faction—both in social and economic policies at home and the wild brandishing of nuclear weapons abroad.

Second, the American people must choose between the commitment of Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party *to provide all Americans opportunities for a better life* or the express determination of the Goldwaterites to repudiate the massive social and economic achievements of 20th century democracy.

Third, the American people must choose for President of the United States between *a dedicated professional in the arts and science of government—Lyndon B. Johnson*—and a part-time, off-and-on, now-and-then amateur and hobbyist—Barry Goldwater.

The Goldwaterites—the rearguard of a defeated past—want to turn the clock back—they want to abandon the challenges of tomorrow for the fantasies of yesterday.

They want to establish a kind of selfish irresponsibility in both domestic and international relations which violates the fundamental principles of the American tradition—both conservative and liberal.

Senator Goldwater says that Americans are "sick and tired." *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that the "normal fiber of the American people is beset with rot and decay." *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater calls the President of the United States a "phony," a "faker," and a "barefaced liar."

We deny it.

Senator Goldwater says that social security has brought slavery and should be made "voluntary." *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that Washington is more dangerous than Moscow. *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that the Peace Corps is a "haven for beatniks. *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that a child has "no right to an education." *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that nuclear war is inevitable. *We deny it.*

Senator Goldwater says that "small conventional nuclear weapons are no more powerful than the firepower you"—he was speaking to the Veterans of Foreign Wars—"have faced on the battlefield."

We deny it.

And since there has been some confusion and controversy on the issue recently, let me state the facts. Just one average size tactical—*not strategic*—nuclear bomb in Europe has greater explosive power than all the bombs the U.S. Army Air Force dropped on Germany during the month of our heaviest air assault in World War II. And 12 average sized *tactical* nuclear bombs would approximate all the explosive power of all the conventional bombs the United States dropped on Germany and Japan during World War II. Fifteen such tactical nuclear bombs would exceed all the bombs, conventional and atomic, we used in World War II.

I deny that there is anything conventional about any nuclear weapon.

The world entered a new era at Los Alamos in 1945, an era fraught with greater peril than any mankind has known before.

Senator Goldwater cannot deal responsibly with the most fearful crisis of our time if he ignores its existence, if he argues that a tactical nuclear weapon is just an oversized hand grenade. He is either deliberately or accidentally misleading the American people—and I am not sure which is more dangerous.

Senator Goldwater says he is equipped to guide the destinies of this Nation and the free world in these perilous times.

We deny it.

But we do more than deny. *We affirm.*

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

No principle is more deeply embedded in the American past than this: that government exists to promote and sustain the welfare of the citizens. Not just a few citizens—that is the Goldwater doctrine—but all the citizens, the majorities and the minorities who accept the ground rules of the democratic system.

It is our conviction that Government's responsibility for freedom encompasses every man's right to develop his capabilities to the fullest: to receive the best possible education regardless of ability to pay, or the vocational training that will enable him proudly to take his place in a productive society.

It is our conviction that no man is truly free unless he can live and work in dignity, fearing neither sickness nor old age—neither man nor machine.

It is our conviction that the business of government will remain unfinished business so long as there is a hungry child, a lonely old man, a person who never had a chance.

It is our conviction that freedom is ever the right to question, to challenge, yes, even to dissent—openly and without fear.

It is this view that enables us to boldly envision, and plan for, a Great Society in which the marvels of automation will be balanced with full employment and the continued development of new horizons—a society that will enable all men to enjoy not only the rewards of their labor but the sweetness of their leisure.

This is American freedom. This is the freedom we live—and we love. This is the freedom which affects every man's family, every man's happiness, every man's dignity and integrity.

How shall we attain and implement these freedoms?

Shall we do this under the leadership of a man who vilifies the past, distorts the present, and shrinks from the future—who curses the darkness and never lights a candle?

Or shall we do this under the leadership of a man who has been tested as few men in our history: By public service under four Presidents, by leadership in the Congress of the United States, by sudden elevation under tragic and dreadful circumstances to the White House itself?

Shall we choose a leader who specializes in driving away those with whom he disagrees, who scorns the path of moderation and accommodation, who sows the seeds of disunity and discord even within his own party?

Or shall we choose a leader who possesses the qualities to create unity from division and consensus from conflict, who pursues his duties as Commander in Chief with responsibility and restraint, and who understands that compassion is not cowardice and concern for others is not weakness?

This is the great question which the American people must answer. And I have great faith in America and her people.

We Americans are children of light—we shall put from us forever the children of darkness.

We shall select the one man superbly qualified to lead our Nation and the world toward the noble goals of the Great Society.

We shall select Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Indianapolis, Ind.
Murat Shrine
October 16, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. These are the partiest Democrats that I have run into in many months.

Senator Hartke, I am simply delighted that you have given me such a resounding introduction. As a matter of fact, if you weren't going to be reelected U.S. Senator from Indiana this year, I would just like to take you along with me as my official introducer. [Laughter and applause.] You make me sound so good, I am happy all night, particularly after some of the things I hear.

Senator Hartke and Senator Bayh, Governor Welch, members here of the Marion County committee and the State committee, the honorable mayor, the very fine good Democratic mayor of Indianapolis, Mayor Barton, and Jim Beatty, the distinguished and effective chairman of Marion County, I want to pay special tribute to the work that you are doing.

And my good young friend, a fine distinguished son of an illustrious father and a good Democrat, Andy Jacobs. [Applause.]

Well, things surely look better in Indiana, that is all I can say. [Applause.]

And then I look around, and I see my good friend Roger Branigin—[applause]—who surely ought to be and will be Governor of this State. [Applause.]

This is a man that has a rich knowledge of your great State. He is Hoosier from the tip of his toes to the top of his head, and he is truly an outstanding man. He is gifted and talented, and I would say that everyone here can look upon Roger Branigin with trust and confidence, and I know enough about the Hoosiers to know that when they find a good man, they don't turn him aside. They take him and they elect him. [Applause.]

I would hope that you would maintain this Democratic leadership in the State House. You have had a fine Governor, and you have an opportunity to have another fine Governor, and one that will be welcome in the White House any day of the week for the good of Indiana. [Applause.]

And, Roger, just in case that you lose the key, come over and see the Vice President—[applause and laughter]—and I will take you in.

Well, I thanked Vance Hartke for that introduction privately here as well as publicly, and he said to me, "Hubert, my voice is just about giving out." And I looked at him and tried to tell him without saying very loudly that mine was near that, too.

We have been working very hard. We have been campaigning from one end of America to another, speaking outdoors, speaking where it is warm, hot, and then where it is cold and rainy. One day in New England, drenched with rain, the next day to Pennsylvania, perspiring from the heat, and the warmth of the reception, may I say.

So that it is a little wonder, some wonder that we have any voice left.

But we have got so much to say and so many good things to talk about that I am sure the Good Lord will continue to give us voice so we can tell the people the truth about what is going on in our country. [Applause.]

Today I had a most amazing thing happen to me on the way to the corn picking contest down in Sioux Falls. I am sure many of you remember that play on Broadway about what happened to the fellow on his way to the Roman Forum. Well, you ought to have seen what happened to me. I was there at the Joe Foss Airport, magnificent airport, built with Federal funds—[laughter]—and while I am there I notice a large jet airplane, one of the new ones with one of the jets in the tail of the plane. And I came in with our little old Electra, reliable, not quite so fast but reliable, responsible, and we landed there, and I found out that they had a visitor from Arizona. [Laughter.]

And so help me, before I left to go out to tell those good farm folks what the Democratic Party had been doing for them and what the spokesman of the Republican Party had done against them, why, here he came, and we had a sort of a reunion. [Laughter.] It was a pleasant experience, and I came away convinced, Vance, that our friend from Arizona—and Birch, you know, after all, the Senate is a great club. We have real fine fellowship there. I came away convinced that this man from Arizona would have made just about as fine a neighbor as a man can have, but I want to tell you something, I don't want him for our President. [Applause.]

No, the street address can't be 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is "back to the store in '64" for Barry, I am afraid. [Applause and laughter.]

Well, we are depending on you good folks out here in Indiana. The President has been here. You gave him a thrilling experience. He has told me about it. We know that Indiana is going to do its job and do it well in this election, and we are depending upon the leaders of this party. We are depending upon your Governor and your Governor-nominee, and we are depending upon your two Senators and your Congressmen of Democratic persuasion. And we are depending upon Andy Jacobs, and we are depending upon the county committees. We are depending upon Democrats and Republicans to give Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States, 4 more years in the White House and with him comes Hubert Humphrey, too. And we are depending on you. [Applause.]

And we are depending on you to send back to the U.S. Senate one of the most fearless and one of the most honest, one of the most able men that has ever served any State in the U.S. Senate, and that fellow is here alongside of me, and he is your friend. He speaks for the people. He works for the people. He works for his State, and besides that, he works as a great U.S. Senator, and you get the votes out to see to it that Vance Hartke is returned with an overwhelming majority. [Applause.]

And don't forget to send Andy Jacobs, too. [Applause.]

And any other Democrat in any district that is running, because this time we have got some things to do.

John Kennedy asked us in January 1961, to get this country moving again. He said to us like a command, "Let us begin." And it was a command.

People started to move. The country felt a pulsating experience. It was like an electrical pulse or electrical shock. We became alive. The paralysis of industry, the stagnation of the economy, all of it ended and with programs and with direction and with leadership, with policy, with a commitment on the part of the President and his Democratic majority in Congress, we put together one of the best programs that any administration has ever had. The 87th and the 88th Congresses will go down in the history of this country as two of the most productive Congresses in the history of this Republic. [Applause.]

We have done more for education, more for health, more for conservation, more for national security, more for peace than any Congress in my memory, and surely than any in the 16 years that I have served in the Senate, and we did it because we had leadership and we were able to accomplish it because we had vision, and we were able to do it because we had a majority, and we want to have all of those factors working for us in 1965.

Leadership in Lyndon Johnson, a majority of Democrats in Congress, and with your help and God willing, we are going to keep this country moving forward, building a better America, and building a better world. That is our commitment. [Applause.]

This is just another way of saying that on November 3, the American people will decide whether Lyndon Johnson, our President, or the leader of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party, will guide the destiny of this great Nation for the next 4 years.

But let me add that the decisions made in the next 4 years, dear friends, will be decisions that affect this Republic for many a decade. This is a fast-moving world, a fast-changing world, as Eleanor Roosevelt said in her final book, "Tomorrow Is Now," and anybody that doesn't think of tomorrow has already lost today.

We are going to make decisions about cities, about transportation, about fiscal policy. We are going to make decisions about agriculture, about health, about education in the next 4 years that will set the pattern for America for a generation. And we can't afford to miss. [Applause.]

Now, let's make no mistake about it. The Republican Party has fallen into the hands of reckless men, men who have inscribed clearly on their public record their willingness to gamble with the American heritage. Why do you think great Republican newspapers like the New York Herald Tribune or a magazine like The Saturday Evening Post or a publication like Life, why do you think these traditionally conservative, most of the time Republican-oriented publications, why do you think they are supporting President Johnson?

I will tell you why. Because Mr. Goldwater is not a Republican. He is a radical. He is out of the mainstream of American life. [Applause and hurrahs.]

Repudiated his own party platform of 1960. Of 25 rollcalls never voted once for his party, not once. Repudiated the bipartisan foreign policy which was created by men like Arthur Vandenberg, Republican. Denounces his own Supreme Court Justice, the great Earl Warren, Republican Governor of California.

Is it any wonder that the great Republicans say "No," we won't have anything to do with him. They repudiate him, and why? Because they love their country more than they love their party. They are patriots, thank God. [Applause.]

So the American people are going to make a choice. Mr. Goldwater says we are going to give you a choice. I will say so. [Laughter.] What a choice. The choice is between responsibility and irresponsibility. The choice is between the discarding, the setting aside of 30 years of economic and social policies in this country that have been created through two great parties. The temporary spokesman of a faction of the present Republican Party neither represents the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. He is off on his own in the wild blue yonder. [Applause and laughter.]

The American people are going to make a choice on November 3. They are going to choose between the commitment of President Johnson and the Democratic Party to provide all Americans, regardless of race, color, religion, or ethnic origin, we are going to provide all Americans as Americans, not as minorities, not as white, not as colored, not as Catholic, not as Protestants, not as Jews, but Americans—we are going to provide them with new opportunities.

This is the commitment of the Democratic administration. [Applause.]

And we are going to have another choice. The American people must choose as President of the United States between a man of unquestioned competence, unquestioned competence, in the art and science of government, a man of 30 years of experience in Congress, Congressman, Senator, majority leader, majority whip, Vice President, and President.

Or they can take a part time off and on, now and then, amateur adventurer. [Applause and laughter.]

And my friends, that is a generous description. [Laughter and applause.]

The Goldwaterites, not the Republicans, my friends—I want to tell my Democratic friends we are getting a lot of help from our fellow Americans of Republican persuasion—the Goldwaterites, they are a breed unto themselves. They are no longer—they do not represent the party of Lincoln because the party of Lincoln stood for the Emancipation Proclamation.

This man voted against making citizenship first class in America, the full and equal opportunities under the Constitution of the United States for every American.

Lincoln said government must serve the people. Lincoln said this is a Government of the people, by the people and for the people, but the leader of the Goldwaterites says the Government ought to get out of these programs of welfare and agriculture and education and health and all these other things. Get out.

He says, "My objective is not to pass laws, it is to repeal them." [Laughter.]

I think we have a right to ask him what laws do you wish to repeal, Senator? There is quite a list of them. No. Abraham Lincoln believes that government is a negative force for evil. This is a man believes that Government is a negative force for evil. This is a man that said to you and to me and to America that the Government in Washington is a greater threat to our liberties than Moscow. And any man that says that has disqualified himself for the high office of President. [Applause and hurrahs.]

Yes, there is now some kind of selfish irresponsibility that is supposed to take on respectability. Well, I say it violates the fundamentals of American traditions, conservative or liberal. This is no fight between conservatives and liberals. This is a fight between the American consensus, the great American partnership of people, a continuing partnership, and a handful of radicals. And this country rejects radicals. It rejects the radicals of the right, and it rejects the radicals of the left. We don't need the leftists, and we don't need the American people marching right down the road. [Applause.]

This man that says he wants to be President on the Republican ticket, the Goldwater ticket, I should say, he says the Americans are sick and tired, sick and tired of this, sick and tired of that. I wonder sometimes if a person talks enough about that but what he might be describing the very faith, philosophy, and personages that he represents. Who is sick? Who is tired? I see a lot of healthy American people every place I go, and I see them happy with the exception of a few. And if I carried a Goldwater sign, I wouldn't look happy either. [Applause and laughter.]

But the Senator from Arizona says he doesn't want to indulge in personalities. So he says of the President of the United States: "He is a phony, he is a faker, and he is a barefaced liar." Is that what we want? Is that the way American politics should be? [Cries of "No!"]

The Senator from Arizona says the social security program has brought slavery and should be made voluntary, and then he says we misrepresent when we say he is against social security. Senator, I don't know whether you are against it or for it. I just know what you are saying. [Laughter.]

The Senator says that Washington is more dangerous than Moscow. He says that the Peace Corps—the Peace Corps, our very finest example of Americans at work building a better world, our best example of American youth helping other people help themselves, I know of no responsible citizen that condemns the Peace Corps, and yet this man says: "It is a haven for beatniks."

What a fine way to talk about the 10,000 volunteers who risk their lives every day for God's children all over this earth. [Applause.]

The Senator from Arizona says that a child has no right to an education. The Government has no responsibility for an education for a child. It is a responsibility of the parents and that some children would be better off without it. Is this the kind of a man, Senator Bayh, you that have given so much of your life for education, is this what the teachers of America want? Is this what the PTA's want?

Is this what the mothers and fathers want? Do you want a President [cries of "No"] that doesn't even think that education is a responsibility of the organized society of the American Republic? I hope not. [Applause. Cries of "No!"]

Senator Goldwater says that nuclear war is inevitable. Senator Humphrey says, and President Lyndon Johnson says, that the task of statesmanship in this, the nuclear age, is to maintain the peace, to prevent nuclear war, to save us from annihilation.

There is no instant answers to any problem. The only thing that is instant is instant annihiliation and a nuclear catastrophe, and statesmanship says we must avoid it. We must prevent it. We must pursue relentlessly and courageously the paths of peace in honor in a desperate effort, may I say, to save the peace, to work for peace.

This the Scripture says is right, and this commonsense tells us is right. [Applause.]

Oh, yes. The Senator from Arizona says: "But don't get so excited about what I say about nuclear weapons. I have been misunderstood." He said that nuclear weapons are no more powerful than the firepower that American veterans have faced on the battlefield.

Those are the words of a man who says he wants to be President. Let me just say one thing. One average size tactical—not strategical—nuclear bomb in Europe has greater explosive power than all the bombs the U.S. Army Air Force dropped on Germany during the months of the heaviest air assault in World War II. The 12 average-size tactical nuclear bombs would approximate all of the explosive power of all the conventional bombs the United States dropped on Germany and Japan during World War II. Just 12 of those little conventional nuclear bombs.

Fifteen such tactical nuclear bombs would exceed all the bombs, conventional and atomic, that were used in World War II. And yet the Senator from Arizona says: "Why, don't be afraid of those. Let's play war games."

Oh, no, my friends. It doesn't take courage to play war games. It takes courage to be a peacemaker. It takes courage to try to lead the nations of the world in the paths of peace.

Blessed are the peacemakers. And we have had some great ones and every one was very courageous. Dag Hammarskjold who gave his life for peace in Africa, Eleanor Roosevelt who lived the life of peace and human dignity. Pope John XXIII in his great encyclical "Pacem in Terres," who outlined the courageous path of peace.

I don't think he was soft on communism. [Laughter and applause.] And, my dear friends, the late and beloved President of the United States who dedicated his life to inspiring people all over this world to work for peace, whose greatest moment was at that hour at American University on June 10, 1963, when John Kennedy appealed to mankind to search for peace.

He broke through the Iron Curtain in the cold war. He said peace is a process. Peace must be pursued relentlessly. Peace will require the courage of a soldier on the battlefield. Even more, peace will require sacrifice.

And let me say right now to Americans, Republicans and Democrats, Goldwaterites, or whoever you may be, that peace is the goal of this administration. Peace is the noble goal of all decent people, not peace with appeasement. Peace with honor, peace that we gain through strength, military strength, diplomatic strength, economic strength, moral strength.

We have all of it. And thank God we have a man in the White House that knows about it and knows how to use it, and I say to you, as one who has worked alongside of him during these many 16 years, that Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, is another apostle of peace. He seeks to build a strong America, not for conquest.

He seeks a rich America, not for pleasure.

He seeks a better world, not for himself.

He seeks to do all of these things for but one purpose, to save mankind from destruction and to save freedom. [Applause.]

So may I just leave you now, then, with this request. The stakes are high. This campaign is difficult. We have had such trouble arguing the issues because you can't have a debate if the other party won't state the issues.

But we know what the issues are. And the issues are progress for the future. What we have done thus far is only a beginning, and we have done much.

The issues are people, helping people help themselves with education for the young, with retraining for workers that are displaced because of automation. Making automation a boon instead of a bane. Making automation a servant of people rather than making people a slave to the machine.

We know what the issues are, rebuilding our cities so that they are livable. We know what the great issues are, my friends, extending the helping hand of a government that cares to the unfortunate.

And, ladies and gentlemen, compassion is not weakness or cowardice. [Applause.]

And may I say, may I say that concern for the afflicted, the mentally retarded, the lame and the halt and the blind and the hungry and the needy and the unemployed, that concern for these unfortunate souls—Senator Goldwater, that is not socialism. That is good old Judaic-Christianity Americanism, and everybody knows it. [Applause.]

So I ask the people of this great audience to rise up like a mighty army and do battle. We are not going to win this election easily. This is a fight to the finish. Make no mistake about it.

Why, my father always advised me that the sure way to success was work. Work, work, work, work. There is an old hymn, you know, "Work for the day is coming." Well, work. Get busy. Redouble your efforts. I don't care how hard you are working. There is plenty of time for rest after November 3 for a day or so. [Laughter and applause.] And stay up a little later—most people die in bed. [Laughter.]

Make up your minds that this victory is not only a victory for the Democratic Party, because that is the fact, it is not only for the Democratic Party. If this was just a normal old Republican-Democratic fight, people wouldn't be quite as deeply concerned as they are.

This is a battle as to whether or not America is going to continue down the path that it has followed for years of responsible social progress, whether we are going to continue to exemplify leadership in this world, leadership with restaint, leadership with perseverance, leadership with patience, leadership with fortitude, and whether we are going to be able to walk kindly even as we build massing power.

I want to say to this audience that the richer America gets, and the stronger we become, the more imperative it is that we walk humbly with our God and with ourselves, because power and wealth corrupt, and America must make sure that, as it is blessed by plenty and by power, and by riches and by privilege, that America shares, shares what she has with those who are less fortunate, shares of her means, yes, shares of her abundance, yes, not at the expense of our own because we have plenty, but, more importantly, that she shares of her heart, shares of her soul, shares of her spirit, so that the people of the world will know that democracy in America is not just a paycheck, and it is not just a dividend, and it is not just a day off from work. But democracy in America is a moral commitment to a better America, to a better world, and to what President Johnson says, the Great Society.

That is what President Johnson is fighting for, and that is what Hubert Humphrey is fighting for, and that is what Vance Hartke is fighting for, and I ask you to join me in this fight before it is too late.

Thank you very much. [Applause and hurrahs.]

Knoxville, Tenn.
Airport, Sky Chief Room
October 17, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Before we go, I just want to say a word to you. It is a little difficult to conduct political rallies out at airports, I found this morning for the umpteenth time, but we thought that, since we have a very heavy day, we could maybe save a little time, in light of the fact that you have so much traffic downtown.

I want to thank each and every one of you as individuals and the organizations that you represent for your great help in this campaign. It is an election I believe that is a good deal different than most elections, because in this election the opposition is not saying that he believes in the gains that have been made in the last 30 or 40 years. He says his ambition is not to pass laws but to repeal them, and I can't help but wonder which laws he is talking about that he wants to repeal.

I think that the comments that have been made on social security, the Senator's views on organized labor, his attitude on programs of education, I think that this is a different election than any we have ever had. I have never yet, since 1936, heard of a Republican candidate that felt that education was not the responsibility of government. This candidate says that education is not the responsibility of any government, local, State, or Federal. It is the responsibility of the parent.

And I have yet to hear of a candidate that believes that the Federal Government has no right to be in programs of social welfare, agriculture, education, just to mention a few, except this one on the Republican side.

What worries me more than anything else about this Republican candidate—and he is not much of a Republican, I want to make it clear. As I said out here, he is a radical. He is just as radical to the right as some others have been to the left.

We don't need either one of those.

This radical has a view of the world which does not face up to reality, and I think that if he were elected President of the United States, that our whole foreign policy would be in shambles, and that the Nation would have some very unsteady and nerve-racking days ahead.

That is why I think it is important that President Johnson be sustained and maintained in that White House. He is a man of experience, he is a man of calm temperament, patience, and of strength. He is a very responsible man. Believe me, whenever it is all said and done, it won't do much good to have good wages or good homes or good cities if you are going to have a nuclear war. What we need is a President that can conduct the affairs of this country in such a manner as to avoid that unbelievable catastrophe. [Applause.]

So I look upon you not just as representatives of the great American labor movement which is an honor within itself, but I look upon you as interested parties, interested citizens, about what is going to happen, and we surely have got a fight on our hands. Make no mistake about it. We can't afford to take everything for granted.

I watched the opposition refusing to discuss issues reaching down in that barrel of dead fish with their attacks upon the President and anybody else. So all I ask you to do is go to work. Fight a good clean fight and give them a good licking, and on November 3 when the votes are counted let's make sure that both Tennessee and Minnesota vote Democratic. [Applause.]

Article

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

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, KNOXVILLE, TENN., OCTOBER 17, 1964

The Democratic Party owes a debt of gratitude to the State of Tennessee. It was the Volunteer State which produced one of the founders of our party—Andrew Jackson. So I come today to the home of Andy Jackson—and I ask Tennessee to come back home where you belong.

I come not on the typical mission of the political candidate. About this time in a campaign I suspect that you've had enough pointing with pride and viewing with alarm to last you for at least 4 years.

I must confess that it was quite a temptation, though—particularly when I read that Dick Nixon was in Tennessee a week ago. He is at something of a disadvantage, of course. What in the world can he point to with pride in Tennessee?

Did he tell you which political party had transformed a parched, depressed, and flood-ravaged region into a fertile, productive center of industry, science, and agriculture?

And did he remind you—as if you needed to be reminded—that it was Coolidge who vetoed the TVA, and Hoover who vetoed it again, and Goldwater who'd sell it if he had the chance?

Did he mention which party has led the Nation and with the Nation, the State of Tennessee, to 44 unbroken months of economic expansion, to a level of prosperity unparalleled in history?

Did he talk about the tax cut initiated by John Kennedy and signed into law by Lyndon Johnson—which put more dollars in our pockets, and which will send more of us back to work, and provide more jobs for our young people entering the labor market?

Did he tell you which party supported the war on poverty, that humanitarian yet practical measure which will lift up those unfortunate citizens bypassed by the march of our economy, and put them back on the road to becoming useful members of our society?

He didn't mention any of these things? Well, then, I think it only fair that *I* too steer clear of partisan politics.

Instead, I'd like to talk about another subject which is dear to my heart: the history of this Nation. In particular, I'd like to talk about the three Presidents whom the State of Tennessee has given to the people of America.

The great Presidents from Tennessee—Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson—were determined to be the Presidents of all the people—and the Presidents of all the States.

Andrew Jackson, the hero of the Democratic West, was the father of the Nation of government for the good of the small man—the artisan, the farmer, the laborer. His actions were dictated by what he saw as the greatest good for the entire Nation—without regard to wealth or power. A firm supporter of our constitutional principle of the sovereignty of the individual State, he nevertheless clearly saw that the very concept of federalism required that *every* State recognize this Union of *all* the States. He fought Calhoun on the nullification issue—and modern America is eternally in his debt.

James K. Polk settled the Oregon boundary question, he reduced the tariff, and reestablished the independent treasury system. He provided firm leadership in the expansion of the United States in the Southwest.

Andrew Johnson was an indisputable man of the South. As a U.S. Representative and as a U.S. Senator from Tennessee, he voted with other southern legislators on questions concerning slavery. But, when he became President, he knew that the national interest demanded that his outlook be national, not sectional; that our Constitution's opening words, "We, the people," mean all the people—from *all* the States.

If your Presidents were similar in their determination to be the Presidents of all the people, they were also similar in another, more curious respect: *they were maligned, perhaps more so than any other Chief Executives in our history.* They were the targets of foul and vicious personal abuse—aimed at their morals, their integrity, and their honor.

Andrew Jackson's personal ordeal is well known; the firm, unflinching manner in which he refused to allow it to alter him from his conception of his role is worth a page in the annals of courage in the Presidency.

As Jackson was the only President whom the Senate ever officially censured—because he refused to let the bank at Philadelphia strangle the economic life of the country; Andrew Johnson was the only President whom the House of Representatives ever impeached—because he refused to liquidate the South. He would not accept the idea that this Nation was fated always to be split, for he knew that a divided people cannot grow. He was determined to resist the spirit of extremism, to embrace reason, and to hold fast to the golden mean.

And your other great President, James Polk—a man whose talents and accomplishments have only lately been discerned and documented—he, too, had to withstand considerable abuse. His attackers used a technique which is, interestingly enough, used occasionally in modern times.

His opponents circulated a myth that he was simply a "politician," raised to high office by accident. They sought, without much success, to spread a phrase, "Who is James K. Polk?" But President Polk ignored his critics and attackers. He never wavered from his determination to serve *all* the people—from *all* the States.

If all your Presidents were maligned, so were they all vindicated by history. Indeed, the State of Tennessee in a prophetic gesture returned Andrew Johnson to the U.S. Senate in 1875—as he has now been returned to his rightful place in the roll of our courageous and faithful Presidents.

Why? Why have the Presidents from Tennessee attained so exalted a rank in our history?

I think it was because each had a vision—a glimpse of a greater America. For Jackson it was the vision of an America in which the strong would not be able to oppress the weak; for Polk, an America which could grow and expand in inner strength as well as outer dimensions; for Johnson, an America in which every State would retain its previous identity—and none would fear the government of all.

I submit to you that Tennessee's three great Presidents exemplified the qualities of *responsibility* in their policies and decisions—and *competency* and *experience* in their exercise of this Nation's highest office. These three Presidents sustained a commitment to provide all Americans with an equal *opportunity* for a better and more productive life.

And I submit to you that Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" is the product of those three visions which your own three Presidents first glimpsed, a century and more ago.

But if the past is a guide to the future, it is not infallible—in Tennessee or in the world.

In 1784, the State of Franklin could be formed, and could last 4 years. In 1964, no State can go its own way—economically or emotionally.

In the war of 1812, Andrew Jackson could gain a great victory in the Battle of New Orleans—after peace had already been signed. In this nuclear age which is 1964, we cannot even contemplate the folly of allowing a commander in the field to run his own war, and choose his own weapons in the absence of clear direction from the Commander in Chief.

In 1829, it took Jackson 30 days to travel from the Hermitage to Washington. In 1964, it takes only minutes for missiles to be hurtled across the world, for astronauts—or cosmonauts—to circle this shrunken globe.

We cannot afford the luxury of a President who yearns for that simpler life, at the expense of the pressing demands which a changing world will unceasingly force upon him.

I ask you then, to join with Lyndon Johnson and with me in our resolve that, while the insights of history shall light our path, the pride and prejudice of a dead yesterday shall not stand in that path.

Listen with us to those insistent voices which summon us to a brighter tomorrow.

The citizens of Tennessee belong in the front rank of those who have heard these voices—but it was here, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, that the most perfect constitution of any State was drafted—and it was here that the names of Estes Kefauver, of Albert Gore, and of Ross Bass were added to that honorable roll of men who served their States *and* their Nation. It would be a travesty on your proud legacy if the home of the "Old Hickory" were to become the home of the "New Birch."

No State has known war as has Tennessee. From Missionary Ridge to Oak Ridge, from Sam Houston and Dave Crockett to Sergeant York, you have given the finest flowers of your mankind, and the finest products of your hands, to keep this Nation strong and free.

Keep your name—the "Volunteer State"—but give it a new meaning. Join with Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party in volunteering—not for the last great war, but for the first "Great Society."

232 WBZ—LINO

Knoxville, Tenn.
Airport
October 17, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Albert. Thank you, Senator Gore, Congressman Ross Bass, soon to be our U.S. Senator from Tennessee.

May I give a special note of thanks to your county judge, Howard Poseman, for his remarkable work in presiding over this gathering, and I do want to say that we are looking forward in the next Congress to having a House of Representatives to support the hand of the fine Democratic Congressmen from this State and of President Johnson.

We are looking forward to having Willard Yarbrough down there, and I know you folks are going to send him there.

Reverend Adkins, we thank you very much for your blessing this morning, the message that you have given to us.

May I just add how pleased I am to all of the party workers that are here today, to all of our friends from labor, from industry, to our young friends that are here from the great colleges and universities and the high schools.

These young friends, Albert, represent our future, and they have shown a great interest in the Democratic Party and in the Democratic candidates. I can think of no higher compliment that can be made to a man in public office than to have the affection, the respect, and the enthusiastic support of our teenagers and those of college age. [Applause.]

May I just add a word of thanks to our colleague in the Senate, Herbart Walters, for his presence here today. He has been a dear friend to all of us, and he has been a fine servant for the people of this State. [Applause.]

It makes me exceedingly happy to see him here, to have him greet us as we came off the plane.

Albert and Pauline Gore are two of the friends that the Humphreys have, and their daughter, Nancy, is very dear to us, and when we are greeted and when I am introduced by Albert Gore, I feel like this is a homecoming.

And may I say that we are looking forward to that same wonderful friendship with Ross and Avanell Bass because we know they are the same kind of people. [Applause.]

I understand that my wife was in Nashville yesterday. In fact, Albert told me, he said, "Well, Hubert, Muriel made all the votes you can get around here. Don't lose too many today." And I told him I would try to behave.

But I am pretty proud of Mrs. Humphrey. I am proud of the fact that she is willing to do her part in this campaign. She is primarily a mother. A dear wife and a sweetheart, but she also can get out there and do some work for her husband and for other candidates for the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

I say it takes a lot of teamwork these days. It is good to have families involved in politics. There is no more wholesome activity than to have it that way. It just depends upon how you conduct yourself.

Well, it is good to be in Knoxville, good to be in east Tennessee. I wish I could stay for the football game. I know it is going to be a pip, and I hope that Minnesota wins today, too. [Applause.] You see, as a national candidate I have to be a little careful. So I don't choose up sides too often on all of these teams, but I know about the Tennessee Volunteers. I know that great football team.

When I attended LSU, Louisiana State University, in 1939 and 1940, I remember when Tennessee came there to play the State university, and I remember how I saw them lay low one team after another, and I said to myself that Tennessee team is just like a Big Ten football team. I found out they always play to win. They went on to win the national championship, went on to whip one team after another. So I have sort of a prediction that the election of Ross Bass will come now, that Tennessee will not only be victorious on the gridiron, Tennessee will carry Democratic on November 3. [Applause.]

So this is the home of Sam Rayburn. You have many honors, many, many honors. But that is a high honor.

And I come here in the spirit of Sam Rayburn. You know, Sam Rayburn said, "I am a Democrat." Without prefix or suffix and without an apology. That is Hubert Humphrey. I am a Democrat. [Applause.]

I come here not to apologize for our party but to proclaim its achievements, to say that the Democratic Party has served the Nation well, and has served the Nation steadfastly. It is a party of progress. It is a party of hope. It is a party that cares. It is a party with heart, and it is a party which has given to America some of the great servants of the Republic.

You have one here in your own Senator, Albert Gore. You have others in the late, beloved Senator Estes Kefauver, one of my closest friends, who will go down in the history of this country as one of the truly great Americans. [Applause.]

Yes; the Democratic Party has a debt of gratitude to pay to Tennessee, the Volunteer State. You have produced one of the founders of our party, too. Your present is not only good. Your future is not only promising, but your past has added a glorious page to the American history. The founder that I refer to is none other than that good old fellow known as Old Hickory, Andrew Jackson.

So I come here to the State of Andy Jackson, and I ask Tennessee to come back to the land of its fathers, to come back home where you belong in the Democratic Party.

I come not on a typical mission, not a typical political mission, nor a mission of a political candidate, and at about this time in the campaign suspect that you have had enough pointing with pride and viewing with alarm. At least for a few days and enough pointing with pride and viewing with alarm to last you for at least 4 years. I must—pay no attention to that static to the right, my dear friends. [Applause.]

Those are just the lost souls of the second half of the 20th century. [Applause.] [Laughter.]

And now that we have dispensed with that noisy minority, let me go on to say, to point with pride and view with alarm is quite a temptation. Particularly when I read that Dick Nixon was here in Tennessee just about a week ago. He is somewhat, of course, at a disadvantage when he comes into Tennessee. He came here, of course, to talk about his party. But what in the world could he, what in the world could he point to with pride in Tennessee that the Republicans had ever done? [Applause.]

Now, did he tell you which political party had transformed a parched, depressed, flood-ravaged region into a fertile productive center of industry, science, and agriculture? Or did he remind you, as if you needed to be reminded, that it was Coolidge who first vetoed the TVA, Hoover who voted it again, and Goldwater who would sell it if he had a chance? [Applause.]

Did he mention to you which political party and which administration had led this Nation and the State of Tennessee to 44 months of consecutive unbroken economic expansion to a level of prosperity unequaled in the history of this country? And did he talk to you about the tax cut, initiated by John Kennedy, signed by President Johnson, which put more dollars into the pockets of the people of this Nation, the people of Tennessee, which will provide more investment, more jobs, as our young people enter the labor market?

And did he tell you that the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party voted against the tax cut, voted against business, voted against the consumer, voted against the worker, voted against the farmer, voted against the Nation?

I doubt if he told you that. [Applause, laughter.]

And did he tell you which party supported the war on poverty, that humanitarian yet practical measure which will lift up those unfortunate citizens bypassed by the march of our economy and put them back on the road to becoming self-sustaining, productive citizens? I gather that he didn't tell you about those things. I gather that he was afraid to tell you about those things because the record of the Republican Party when it comes to this great area of TVA is a record of saying no, no, no, to the people of Tennessee and to the people of this great section of America. [Applause.]

Well, since he didn't talk about them, I don't suppose I should, either. So I will just be nonpolitical.

I would like to talk about another subject that is dear to my heart and that is the history of this Nation, and no better historian do we have than my good friend, your Senator Albert Gore, who proudly points to the history of Tennessee and America on every occasion. And I imagine that when Ross Bass gets to the Senate, as the Presiding Officer of that Senate I will have to listen to two Tennessseans. [Applause.]

I want to talk to you a bit about three Presidents that came from Tennessee. You have been the home of Presidents, the great Presidents from Tennessee, Andrew Jackson, James Polk, and Andrew Johnson. They were determined to be Presidents of the United States of America, of all the people, and all the States.

Andrew Johnson, first. The hero of the Democratic West; he was father of the Nation, of government for the good of the small man, the man that represented the farmer, the artisan, the laborer.

His actions were dictated by what he saw as the greatest good for the entire Nation, for the greatest good for the greatest number. A firm supporter of our constitutional principle of the sovereignty of the individual State. He nevertheless saw that the concept of federalism required that every State recognize this Union of all the States.

He fought Calhoun on the nullification issue and modern America is eternally in his debt.

Let's talk about James K. Polk. By the way, I am sorry, you know, that we don't have more Goldwaterites when I talk about history because they know so little about it. [Applause.]

If they will just tarry with us, the few that are here, they will get a passing grade in the next test.

Now, James Polk settled the Oregon boundary dispute. He reduced the tariff and he reestablished the independent Treasury system. He provided great leadership, firm leadership in the expansion of the United States into the Southwest.

Andrew Johnson was undoubtedly, indisputably a man of the South; as U.S. Representative and as Senator from Tennessee, he voted with other southern legislators on questions concerning the South and slavery. But when he became President, he knew that the national interests demanded that his outlook be national and not sectional, that our Constitution's opening words, "We the people," mean all of the people, from all of the States. Andrew Johnson was President for all of the people.

Now, if your Presidents were similar in their determination to be President for all of the people, they were also similar in another curious respect. They were all abused. They were all maligned. They were the targets of vicious personal abuse.

Andrew Jackson's personal ordeal is well known. The firm, unflinching manner in which he refused to allow it to alter his conception of his role as President is a page in the annals of courage of the American Presidency. [Applause.]

As Jackson was the only President ever to be censured by the Senate because he refused to let the Bank of America at Philadelphia strangle the economic life of the country, so Andrew Johnson was the only President whom the House of Representatives ever impeached because he refused to liquidate the South.

He refused to be vindictive. He would not accept the idea that this Nation was fated always to be divided and split. He knew that a divided nation could not survive, and he knew that a divided nation could not grow.

Therefore, he was determined to resist the spirit of extremism in his day and to embrace reason, and to hold fast for moderation and the middle course.

He refused to be a radical.

May I suggest that the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party might well take a look at the pages of the history of Andrew Johnson and follow the lessons of those pages. Radicalism has no place in America. [Applause.]

And then there is your other great President, seldom heard of except in recent years, James Polk, a man whose talents and achievements have only lately been discerned and documented. He, by the way, is one of my favorite characters of history. He, too, had to stand considerable abuse from men whose names you can't remember.

Isn't it interesting that every single President that has been maligned and abused has turned out to be a great President. And those who were his accusers, those who were the ones that maligned him, and and those who were the ones that attacked him, you can't find their names anywhere. If ever you could find it, it would be in the gutter, and they would have been washed away. [Applause.]

But you know, his attackers, they use some of the same tactics being used now. As a matter of fact, I have a feeling that this may be one period of history that has been studied a little bit by the Goldwater public relations men. His opponents circulated a myth that he was simply a politician, raised to a high office by accident. Have you heard that lately?

They sought without much success to spread the phrase, "Who is James K. Polk?" But President Polk ignored his critics and his attackers and he became a great President. He became a great leader for the American people. He never waivered in his determination to serve all of the people of all of the States and to make America a better America every day of his administration. [Applause.]

So my friends, if all of your great Tennesseans who became Presidents were maligned, and they were, they have also been vindicated by history. Indeed, the State of Tennessee in a prophetic gesture returned Andrew Johnson to the U.S. Senate in 1875 as he has now been returned to his rightful place in the role of your courageous and faithful President.

Why, I ask, why have the Presidents from Tennessee attained such an exalted rank or place in our history? I think it was for one reason. Each of them had a great vision, and as the Scriptures say, a nation without vision shall perish.

But every leader from this State, Sam Houston, Davy Crockett, Sam Rayburn, Estes Kefauver, Albert Gore, you name them, every one of them has vision. [Applause.]

For Andrew Jackson it was a vision of America strong enough to protect the weak from the strong, to save the weak from oppression. For James Polk, an America which could grow and expand in inner strength as well as outer dimensions. For Johnson, Andrew Johnson, an America in which each State would retain its precious identity, and yet each State would be a part of a great Federal Union, the United States of America.

I submit to you that Tennessee's three great Presidents exemplified the qualities of responsibility in their policies and decisions, competency and experience in their exercise of the Nation's highest office.

These three Presidents sustained and maintained a commitment to provide all Americans with an equal opportunity for a better, a happier, and more productive life.

And I submit to this fine audience here in Knoxville, Tenn., Knoxville County, that President Lyndon Johnson's dream of a Great Society is the product of the three visions which your own three Presidents first glimpsed a century or more ago.

But if the past is a guide to the future, and it can be, it is not infallible and one should not study history for the purpose of voting it. You should study history for the purpose of learning lessons. [Applause.]

In 1784, my young friends, there was a new State created, the State of Franklin, and it lasted but 4 years; in 1964 no State can go its own way economically, emotionally, or politically.

In the War of 1812 the great Andrew Jackson could gain a great victory in the battlefield of New Orleans, even after the peace treaty had been signed.

But in this nuclear age where communication is instant, in this nuclear age of 1964, we cannot even contemplate in our wildest dreams allowing a commander on the battlefield to run his own war. [Applause.] Or more significantly to choose his own weapons in the absence of clear direction from the Commander in Chief.

Maybe the Senator from Arizona should study the lessons of Andrew Jackson. Maybe he should remember that Andrew Jackson lived in the 19th century. Maybe he should remember that whoever is elected President in 1964 will be the President in the second half of the 20th century. [Applause.]

In 1829 it took Jackson 30 days to travel from the Hermitage to Washington. In 1964 in 15 minutes missiles can come from the Soviet Union to the heartland of the United States. And we can hurtle around this shrunken globe of our astronauts.

Therefore, we cannot afford the luxury of a President who yearns for a simpler life at the expense of a temporary history and the pressing demands which a changing world will unceasingly force upon him.

So I ask you, then, to join with President Johnson and with me in the result that while the insights of history shall light our path, the pride and prejudice of a dead yesterday shall not stand in that path.

Listen, I ask my fellow Americans, with us to those insistent voices which summon us to a brighter tomorrow. The citizens of Tennessee belong in that age. [Laughter—applause.] Those are noisy little rascals, aren't they? Albert Gore just said to me, "Hubert, that is nothing but Democratic progress that you are hearing." [Applause.]

My fellow Democrats never give up.

Now, when you hear that motor whine out like that, that is the way the Goldwater campaign is fizzling out. [Laughter—applause.]

But, my friends, I asked just a moment ago to listen with us to those insistent voices which summon us to a brighter tomorrow, and that age within itself tells something about that tomorrow.

The citizens of Tennessee belong in the front of those who have heard these voices of a better tomorrow. It was here in the words of Thomas Jefferson that the most perfect constitution of any State was drafted and it was here that the names of Estes Kefauver, Albert Gore, Ross Bass, were added to that honorable role of men who have served their States and their Nation faithfully and well.

No State has known war as has Tennessee, from Missionary Ridge to Oak Ridge, from Sam Houston to Davy Crockett to Sergeant York. You have given the finest flowers of your manhood and the finest products of your hands and minds to keep this Nation strong and free.

So I ask this great State, the Volunteer State, to give it new meaning, to join with Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party in volunteering not for the last great war but for the first Great Society.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Chattanooga, Tenn.
Chattanooga Airport
October 17, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh boy, oh boy! Well, may I say, may I just say that happy days are soon to be here again. [Applause.]

Yes, indeed, the Chattanooga Choo-choo is rolling right down the Democratic track. [Applause.]

This is one of those days when you loosen your collar, relax your tie, and you just plain come out and just talk to the people.

You know, I heard a while ago that the Republicans had a little crew around here called the truth squad. [Laughter.] Well, my dear friends, to put a Goldwaterite Republican in charge of truth is like putting a fox in charge of the chicken coop. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, Buford, if those Republicans will stick around here, we will tell them the truth. [Applause.]

They are slow learners, but if we keep at it, they may catch on. [Laughter.]

Well, I am simply delighted to be welcomed here, first by your great mayor who was kind enough to give me a key to the city of Chattanooga, the dynamo of Dixie, this great city, and I wear it proudly in my lapel. I want to thank Mayor Kelly; I want to thank those of this city who have so graciously and warmly, hospitably welcomed us to this magnificent international airport, and if I recall, this airport was dedicated in memory of one of the truly great men of our time, a great Tennessean, a great American, my good friend and yours, the late Estes Kefauver. [Applause.]

Well, I am in good company today. I have been escorted here from one of your neighboring cities, at Knoxville, where I came in this morning. I am in the presence of and in the friendly custody of two of your great citizens, one that has been a friend of Mrs. Humphrey's and myself, of Muriel and Hubert, for many years, because Albert Gore, your U.S. Senator, and his wife, Pauline—Albert and Pauline are just about the finest and the best friends that Hubert and Muriel Humphrey have. And I know that the people of Tennessee are going to show America how much they appreciate this distinguished statesman and this excellent, able legislator, Senator Albert Gore, by reelecting him Senator from Tennessee. [Applause.]

And then, too, there is my friend, Congressman but soon to be in the U.S. Senate, a gentleman that has made a wonderful record, who understands that the purpose of America is progress and justice, and I am proud to be on this platform with the next U.S. Senator from Tennessee, Ross Bass. [Applause.]

And I will tell you this, that if Albert and Ross will just let Pauline and Avanell do the campaigning, they can't miss. [Applause.]

I know that you good friends are going to see to it that Robert Summitt, a Congressman, your candidate for Congress here, am I correct, the Third District, that here in this area—and we have 300 district leaders here—that you people are going to make sure that Robert Summitt is down in Washington to work with Albert Gore and Ross Bass and your other Democrats. [Applause.]

Well, this is a great, great city, and I know that the city of Chattanooga is represented—that is one of the Goldwater campaign managers there—[laughter]—I know that the city of Chattanooga represents the spirit of progress. I know that this great city is known as the new spirit of the greater Chattanooga.

I know that this remarkable city has set standards of public conduct and of civic progress that can be an inspiration to any American community, and, Mr. Mayor, Mayor Kelly, and your city officials and you fine citizens of Chattanooga, Hubert Humphrey from Minnesota wants to salute you for the good civic service and responsibility of this community. [Applause.]

I came here for another purpose or two also; I thought maybe if you didn't mind we would talk a little politics. [Laughter.] Is that all right? [Applause.]

Of course, I don't want to forget to thank that band for playing that "Minnesota Rouser." You know, I was a student at the University of Minnesota. I was there during the days of Bernie Bierman of the great Minnesota Golden Gophers, and I can remember that there was one team that we use to fear above all others, and it is playing up there now, and it is playing Alabama. Alabama and Tennessee are having it out today, but as a national candidate you wouldn't expect me to choose up sides too much, I am sure. Can I just say that my favorite baseball team is the Minnesota Twins, and my favorite football team is the Minnesota Gophers, but I have a sneaking suspicion Tennessee is going to do all right. [Applause.]

Well, I want to congratulate the good people of Tennessee on doing a tremendous service for this country. You have done it with your statesmen at Knoxville. I spoke of some of your great statesmen of the past, three great Presidents, three great Presidents who were maligned and abused, but history records that they were great men, and their accusers were nothing.

The great statesmen that I referred to there were Andrew Jackson, James Polk, and Andrew Johnson, three Presidents, all of whom—[applause]—all of whom have a great record of service to all the people of the United States, and all of their detractors, and all of their critics, were puny little people who mean little or nothing in the pages of history.

And let me say from this platform that the critics of President Lyndon Johnson, those who attack him personally, those who are his accusers, those who malign him, you will never be able to remember their names after November 3. [Applause.]

Now, lest I seem to be personal, which I don't want to be, may I say yesterday that the most amazing thing happened to me on the way to the corn picking contest in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. I was to speak there, and another man who frankly confessed that he knows nothing about agriculture was there to advise the farmers. [Laughter.] That man was the gentleman from Arizona. And the most amazing thing happened to me as I was at the Joe Foss International Airport in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

I was there shaking hands with the good citizens who are going to vote Democratic, some of them Republicans but like most good Republicans, this time they are putting their country above their party. They are going to vote for President Johnson. [Applause.]

As I was there, I met—I had the chance once again—because after all, we Senators you know are sort of a club down there, aren't we, Albert? We had a chance to say hello to the Senator from Arizona, and I must say that I can't help but say here so that you may know that I look upon this man as a good American, a patriot. I truly mean this. I think that Barry Goldwater would make a wonderful neighbor. But I don't think he would make a good President. [Applause.]

It may be true that he needs a change of address, but I don't want it 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. What I think—[applause]—what I think we ought to do for this man that likes his home so much is "Back to the store in '64" for Barry. [Applause.]

VOICE. In your heart you know he is nuts.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I must say that we are getting a little healthier. [Laughter.]

But dear friends I wanted to say what you folks in Tennessee have done for us. I don't know of any State that has done more for America. When I mention our late and beloved Estes Kefauver, this man of courage and of principle, this man that fought so hard for the people, fought so hard, my friends, that his life was ended far, far too soon.

Here is this man on this platform that I am so proud to call my friend, who on every occasion has by conviction and by personal integrity, by intelligence, and by knowledge, fought for the people, fought for the people of Tennessee, yes, but more importantly, if you will permit me to say it, more importantly, Albert Gore has been a Senator for the United States of America and that is the kind of Senator we need. [Applause.]

And Ross Bass will be the same kind of Senator and everybody in this audience knows it. [Applause.]

Well, did you know that you were the people that first revealed that the Republican candidate, that is the candidate of a fraction of a faction—[applause and laughter]—of the Republican Party, the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party, you revealed him as a candidate of contradiction. The people of Tennessee were among the first to realize that the Republican spokesman was not a conservative because he has violated every conservative tradition, that he is not a Republican and because on the 25 major issues of the Republican platform of 1960, a platform that came from a party that had been in power and had to deal with the tough questions of national and international policy, that on 25 major issues of the Republican platform, the Senator from Arizona voted no 25 times.

He can't be a Republican. He isn't a conservative. So what is he? He is a radical. [Applause.] And he ought to say so. America's No. 1 radical. [Applause.]

And ladies and gentlemen, in America we don't need any radicals from the left, and we don't need any from the right, and we don't intend to elect anybody that is one. [Applause.]

We don't need the presence of the Communists, and we don't need the playmates of the Birchers, and we don't intend to elect anyone—[applause].

Radicalism has no place in America, and the man that leads the radical forces of America isn't going to go very far except down to defeat on November 3. [Applause.]

Well, you folks surely took the—surely unmasked this man in Tennessee. You learned his views on TVA.

Oh, what a friend of river valley development. [Laughter.] Friends like this you need?

My dear friends, let me tell you if the Senator from Arizona had his way about TVA, had he been there when Franklin Roosevelt and George Norris and others put it through the Congress, had he been there, the Tennessee River would have been as dry as the bark on a tree in Tucson, Ariz. [Applause.]

But let me make it clear, this man from Arizona, he isn't against every river. He isn't against every project. Oh, no. He was for $1 billion for a central Arizona project on the Colorado; $1 billion. But not one living nickel for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

So, I saw a sign out here, and it says, "Barry, Friend of Dixie." Ho, ho. My goodness. "Barry, Friend of Dixie." [Laughter.] Let me tell you, what this man would do to Dixie would make Sherman look like a friend. [Applause and standing ovation.] Well, my dear friends, let's settle down now. [Laughter.]

This friend of the TVA, to the TVA that has brought more progress to the Tennessee Valley than any other area of America, the TVA that is responsible for the growth of private enterprise in this section of America faster than any other section of America, the TVA, it is the friend of free enterprise. The TVA, it is the friend of the farmer. The TVA that has tamed the rivers, put them to work instead of letting them destroy the land. The TVA that made possible Oak Ridge and the atomic energy plant. The TVA that, indeed, was one of the great unheralded soldiers of World War II. The TVA that made possible electrical power to produce bombers and aluminum for bombers.

And this man from Arizona, this driver of the covered wagon of the 19th century—[laughter]—this man says we ought to sell it.

Well, now, my goodness me. Ought to sell it. I wonder just to whom he expects to sell it. What friend? What friend could it be? Oh, I would like to know. We are going to look into that next week. I am not going to tell you everything now. You just keep listening next week because I think we know to whom he would like to sell it. [Cries of "Miller."]

Oh, we can't let him do that. This plant has to have some management.

Well, you know, there was a fellow here recently—let me see, he ran for something a few years ago. Oh, yes, Mr. Nixon. I had just about forgotten him. [Laughter.] The refugee from California, a man that introduced this new thought into this election that our President was soft on communism. What a—well—[laughter].

So what did he say? The man from New York or California—I am not sure where—but Mr. Nixon said that he came here to tell you what Barry really meant. That is quite an assignment. [Laughter.]

May I say that only a tricky fellow could do it. [Laughter and applause.]

But I want to say this: Mr. Nixon has never been interested in this area of America, anyhow. His record, like that of the man that he speaks for, is one that would have left this great area impoverished, would have left it to itself, unhelped. It was only a year ago in October, and now I am quoting Mr. Goldwater—and here is what he said, Richard. [Laughter.] You can explain this and you can write books about it. You can even tell about it with a cloth coat or with "Checkers." It won't make any difference.

But here is what he said. Mr. Goldwater said, "I am quite serious in my opinion that the TVA should be sold."

Now, one thing I will say for Mr. Goldwater, he sort of means what he says. Or sometimes he changes his mind on what he says, but he means what he says when he did say it.

Now, this wasn't the first time that the Senator from Arizona had attacked the TVA. He has done it enough and loudly enough so that everyone, at least in this part of the country, realizes that the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party is a man of radical views.

And who is a radical and what is he? He is one that would destroy what we have. He is one that would tear down what we have built. That is the definition of a radical, one that would charge in and ruin and destroy that which we have created.

And I don't think that the good, solid, constructive people of Tennessee are going to let any Goldwater radical destroy and ruin and sell the TVA. Are you? [Applause.]

But he got his lawyer, Mr. Nixon. He came through here, and he explained that Goldwater didn't really mean it anyhow.

Well, frankly I don't think we ought to take it too seriously because truly he isn't going to have a chance to do anything about it anyhow. [Applause.]

But my fellow Americans, this record of contradiction is classic, and it is also a record that is typical and consistent.

Let me give you another one. I don't need to come before any audience in the North or South and tell you what my stand has been no the issue of constitutional rights, equal rights for every American. [Applause.]

And I am very frank to tell you some people don't like my stand, and that is their right and privilege. But I don't try to peddle two stories. [Applause.]

And if there is one thing I have learned as I have traveled through the South and through the border States, it is they would rather see a man that is truthful even though they disagree with him than to see a man and to hear a man that talks out of both sides of his mouth. [Applause.]

Well, now, let's just talk a little bit about what has been going on. Take that issue of civil rights. When the gentleman from Arizona campaigns in the South, oh, he whistles "Dixie." Why, I will tell you my friends, he even tries to get a southern accent. [Laughter.] And he proclaims his devotion to States rights. But up North, his supporters are busy publishing civil rights pamphlets for distribution in areas that are heavily inhabited by our fine Negro residents, hailing Barry Goldwater's record as an ardent champion of civil rights.

Down South he says no, no, no. Up North he says champion, champion. [Laughter.]

He is one of these "have it both ways" boys. And he is one of these "have it both ways" schemers.

But it backfired last month in the District of Columbia. Their pro-civil-rights pamphlet was hastily withdrawn, and why? Well, first of all, we discovered it. Secondly, someone goofed. The timetable was wrong.

The original plan was to issue this pamphlet just a few days before the election and, so they said, so there couldn't be any backfire in the South. So that our friends from Georgia, so our friend from South Carolina, and North Carolina, and Alabama and Mississippi and other States in this Union, they would think that Barry was the friend of the so-called States righters. But up North, he was a flaming champion of civil rights.

But let me tell you, my friends, that kind of nonsense doesn't work in American politics any more. The American people want as their President a man who says what he means when he says it and means what he says when he says it, and speaks one language to one people for one program. [Applause.]

May I add that many people in America could afford to take a page from the fine history of this city and county. I want to congratulate you, mayor, and your commissioners, and I want to congratulate your biracial committee of leading citizens for setting such a fine example as to how Americans can work together and live together and play together and plan together for a better United States of America. [Applause.]

Yes, my friends. America has heavy responsibilities. This beautiful country of ours, and we sing the song, "America the Beautiful," we pledge allegiance to one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. May I just say that what we need in America is not someone that divides us, not someone that plays race off against race or religion against religion, not someone that runs down minority ethnic groups as if they were unwanted.

What we need in America is a leader, is a voice, is an educator, is a prophet that calls upon us to be good Americans, just one people.

We need in America someone to heal our wounds, not to open them.

We need someone in America to speak of us as one people and one country, not North and South, not East and West.

We need somebody in America to think of us not as rural and city, not as farmer and worker, but as Americans. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you now, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you the one thing I have learned in this campaign is that wherever I go, whether it is in Georgia or Texas or Tennessee or Washington or California or North Dakota or Maine, wherever I go, I find that most Americans, most Americans, yes, the overwhelming majority, want to learn how to work together, to live together. Most Americans want opportunity for everybody. Most Americans want America to be a better country every day. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, if that is your view, and I think it is, then let us join hands. Let's have most Americans—Republicans and Democrats, workers and business, farmers and teachers, young and old—let's unite as a mighty people and let's make up our minds that we are going to rebuke these forces of bigotry, these forces of division, these forces of retreat, these forces of the past, and let us elect as our President someone who loves America, believes in its future, unites us and makes us march forward to a better day for all humanity. [Applause.]

Chattanooga, Tenn.
October 17, 1964

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I'm here to congratulate the people of Tennessee for doing a great service for our Nation. The people of Tennessee were among the first to reveal the Republican presidential candidate—the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party—as the candidate of contradiction.

The people of Tennessee were among the first to realize that the Republican candidate is an extremist—a radical who is neither a genuine conservative nor a genuine Republican.

The temporary Republican spokesman was unmasked when the people of Tennessee learned his views on TVA. For most Americans, and certainly most people here, TVA is no longer a matter of political controversy. Almost everyone agrees TVA is a great regional development program, a model of enlightened progress throughout the world.

But not Senator Goldwater. The Senator from Arizona not only repeatedly calls the TVA a socialist adventure, he is ready to sell it.

He said only 1 year ago—in October 1963, that, and I'm quoting Mr. Goldwater, "I am quite serious in my opinion that TVA should be sold."

That wasn't the first time the Senator had attacked the TVA. He had done it often enough and loudly enough so that everyone—at least in this part of the country—realized that the gentleman from Arizona was a man of extreme views.

In recent months, the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party has retreated from his extreme ideas about TVA. He has tried to soft pedal this position by issuing one of those famous clarifying statements. He tried to explain what he meant in the first place.

This record of contradiction is a consistent one. His words on TVA are just an example of his sorry record of talking out of both sides of his mouth.

For example, take the issue of civil rights. When the gentleman from Arizona campaigns in the South, he whistles "Dixie" and proclaims his devotion to States rights.

But up North his supporters are busy publishing civil rights pamphlets for distribution in Negro sectors hailing Barry Goldwater's record as an ardent champion of civil rights.

One of these have-it-both-ways schemes backfired on Barry Goldwater last month in the District of Columbia. Their pro-civil-rights pamphlet was hastily withdrawn. Why? Somebody goofed—the timetable was wrong.

The original plan was to issue this pamphlet just a few days before the election so there couldn't be any backfire in the South.

I can tell you this: Hubert Humphrey will never talk out of both sides of his mouth.

And neither will our great President—Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson is a president of all the people and he doesn't have a special message for the people of one section and an opposite message for another section.

This apparently is something the Republican pretender to the Presidency does not comprehend.

I know the American people comprehend this. They are going to give Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party an overwhelming vote of confidence on November 3.

Chattanooga, Tenn.,
Address to Labor Group at Airport,
October 17, 1964,

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. First of all I want to thank Mr. Kamin for the wonderful reception he has given to us and seeing to it that we had this little gathering, and I know that I am talking now to many of the Democratic leaders from—how many States do we have here? 50-mile radius. That must bring in a few more, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama.

Believe me, it is a wonderful, wonderful privilege that I have. I wish all of you could go through the experience that I have been having in this campaign, traveling from one part of America to another, and with few exceptions I find happy people.

Once in a while I find someone that looks like he has got a stomach ache, and he is carrying a Goldwater sign. [Laughter.]

You know that is quite an ordeal. But basically the people of this country are looking for help and they want to do good things, and to tell the truth President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are trying to appeal to people to do better, to live a better life, build better homes, build better Americans, do better with our schools, do better with our children, do better for our elderly people, to do better in terms of employment. We have got big problems here. This problem of automation, to make a job—you can't just let these things, you know, go by the board.

But we have got a tough fight on our hands, and we know it. The opposition is desperate, to put it frankly. And they are reaching pretty far down into the barrel. And they will say many things and do many things between now and November 3 that are going to be very, very discouraging and distressing.

But I used to say when I was back home in Minnesota when I ran for election, and I have always had lots of support there, I used to say to my friends and supporters, if you have got to give me a political blood test every day and every week, then leave me because I will be politically anemic.

You have to believe. You have to believe. You have to have faith, and you have to believe in our party and its program. You have to believe in our present. You have to believe that those of us who are working our hearts out like we are doing, that we are in this thing to help our country and to do what we think is right and we want your belief, we want your support; we know we have that. But we want your unbelievable support so that no matter what they say or what they do, we just barge right on through.

There is one thing that this crowd needs to learn, that they can't take over this country by making all kinds of false accusations and by trying to divide our country on the basis of regions and economic groups and religious groups and racial groups. They won't get by with it, and we need to teach them a little. As my Dad used to tell me, when you run into one of those youngsters that is hard to do business with, there is nothing like a little session in the woodshed. I'll tell you something. There is nothing like a little session in the ballot box on November 3. [Applause.] When you get there I only want you to vote once. [Laughter.] Get there early and just vote it straight Democrat. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

---

243 WBZ—LINO

Asheville Airport
Asheville, N.C.
October 17, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you, Billy. Thank you very, very much.

My dear friends, I just can't tell you how pleased I am to be introduced on this day here in Asheville, N.C., by such a fine and good man and good Democrat as the gentleman that has just presented me, Billy Webb, and I want to thank you very, very much, Bill, for your wonderful presentation.

I am happy to be in North Carolina. I can see, however, that you must have had a Republican through here recently because it is sort of windy. [Applause—laughter.]

But you folks just stick with us Democrats and you're good Democrats, and we will have the sun shining again just like it always does in North Carolina. [Applause.]

You know, I just want you to know how beautiful it is to fly over these mountains and these hills and valleys, to come here during the time when there is the leaf change, when the colors of the trees and the leave make one realize, if we ever had any doubts about it, that a divine providence truly controls our lives and our world. It is simply beautiful.

You will have to pardon a little State pride, but it is awfully nice in Minnesota, too, awfully nice. [Laughter.]

We have lovely trees there, and there is no time of the year that is more beautiful in my State than the fall, and there is no time of the year that I like better than November when Democrats win on November 3. [Applause.]

I wish that my Muriel, Mrs. Humphrey, could be here with me today because she loves these mountains. You may not know it, but when she gets tired of me, she occasionally gets in the car—some years ago—she has become more accustomed to me now; I guess she just figured there is no use, you have just got to live with him. But she used to put the children in the car, and she would drive down into these hills in North Carolina, and they are beautiful hills, and she would tell me about them. She would come here during the spring when you had those rhododendrons, those beautiful, beautiful blossoms, and you know, you just can't help but like a part of America that is blessed with such natural beauty, and I am just so happy to come here at this time.

Well, before I go any further, may I say that I have a few North Carolinians, Tarheels, working in my office. I guess that is why we have an effective office. They say back home in Minnesota, even the Republicans say, "Well, we really don't agree with his politics, but he does get things done." [Laughter.] And I have never let them in on the secret. [Applause.]

I have never really let them in on the secret. I never did really tell them, and if any of you reporters report it, you are through; you will have to go back by Barry Goldwater's covered wagon. [Applause—laughter.]

I never did tell them that one of the reasons that we get things done is that we had some North Carolinians, some good "Tarheels," working for us, and one of them is here right here on this platform with me, and she has been with me a long time. She came with us as one of the acting members of the Young Democrats, and she is very pretty, too. That helps. And she is a wonderful secretary, a wonderful assistant, and I want you to stand up, now, Bess, and look all these good North Carolinians right in the eye, and you look at her and that is my Bess Autry. Bess, stand up here. [Applause.]

And her husband, George, works for one of the finest men that ever came to the Congress of the United States. Once in a while we have a disagreement, but Democrats always have a disagreement. My goodness, that is what keeps us healthy. This is why the Republicans are never in shape for a campaign; they never did their spring training. [Laughter.] We Democrats, we practice up on each other. [Laughter.] And then when we get down to about October, we work the Republicans over. [Laughter.]

And George Autry works with Senator Ervin, our good friend, Sam Ervin, the good judge, as we call him, and I am telling you something. I don't think I know a finer man in the Senate of the United States than that good man. And we have had some wonderful days together.

By the way, we were both commentators on one of the national television shows. He went on to be a commentator, and I just lost out. I went on to be a candidate for Vice President. [Laughter.]

Well, my dear friends, I know that I am here in the hill country. And I know also that I am here in the country that has such great promise for the future. I know that I am also in the country that has wonderful people, good hardy stock, and I know that I am here where you people look up and do not look down.

I know that I am very, very close to where, if I recall correctly from my high school geography, that you have—isn't it Mount Mitchell that is the highest peak east of the Mississippi? [Applause.]

Well, may I say that we used to when I was—I was born in South Dakota, and the highest peak around that area was Mount Hino, and it was just a little bit higher than Mount Mitchell. But of course, it is flatter out in South Dakota than it is in North Carolina. But anybody that has a mountain that high couldn't vote Republican. [Laughter, applause.]

They simply couldn't do it because when you look up, you never find a Republican. [Laughter, applause.]

And when you look ahead, you seldom find one. And when you look down, all you find are a few little old Goldwaterites, that is all. [Applause.]

Well——

VOICE. Lay it on, Hubert.

Senator HUMPHREY. I'm gonna.

I didn't come down here just to visit. I want you to know that, even though that is what I would like to do. I am frank to tell you I would rather just take some time off today and visit, but they tell me I have got some work to do.

You know, when I was nominated for Vice President you may remember I made a little speech at the convention, and I talked about "But not Senator Goldwater." And believe me, I could give you one like that, and I may before we are through, you can't tell. [Applause.]

And then President Johnson took me over and—Billy, you remember this—he took us over to the Asheville committee when we had that meeting, and he said, "Now I want all my good Democrats here to go home and take a little rest. We have worked real hard. We have had a great convention, and you all need a few days' rest, but not Senator Humphrey." [Laughter.] And I will tell you something: ever since that day, that man from Texas has been after me. He said, "Go out on the hustings, Hubert."

I want to say my name is not only Hubert. That man from Arizona has done something for me that nobody else could ever do and I am extremely grateful to him. He has made everybody in America know that my middle name is Horatio. [Laughter.] [Applause.]

And I want all the folks who have middle names that they wish they didn't have to vote the Democratic ticket. [Laughter.] And if that is the case, that fellow from Arizona will wish he never got in the race.

Well, it is just good to be here and have a chance to talk to you, and I am going to talk a little bit about a few of the matters that are of concern to us.

Billy, you said something about Clyde Hoey. I don't know whether you know that I served on the Committee of Government Operations and Agriculture in the Senate under Clyde Hoey for 8 years. I remember the day that he passed away. I think I was the first in the Senate to hear about it.

I still remember him with his morning coat. I remember that if there was one man in the Senate that looked like a Senator, it was Senator Hoey. How well I remember him, a gentleman, a Christian gentleman, a wonderful man.

And you mentioned here today this little story that he might be elected to the kingdom because he had no competition.

Well, last Sunday was Layman's Sunday in the Methodist church. My father was a Methodist layman, and he was stricken with a cerebral hemorrhage on the very day that he was to make the layman's sermon in our Methodist church.

So that when you mention Clyde Hoey to me, and his life, I can't help but think of another Democrat and a good one, my dad, who was every bit as good a Democrat, and I might add as good a Methodist, as Clyde Hoey.

So those are sentimental feelings that I have about days gone by.

I know that this great State of North Carolina has given us many good people. I know that this is a State of progressive government. I know that this is a State of Democrats, too. And I know that North Carolina represents the new South. [Applause.]

And I know that North Carolina doesn't have any time to give to people that want to take you back, back, back, back to where you have no chance for a future. And I am delighted to come here and talk to people that know that America is the land of promise and know that the only way that we build this country is with leadership that believes in the prospects of the future, that believes that we can do anything we want to do.

Oh, I know there are some that will come here and they will tell you, "Oh, you mustn't follow these new leaders. You mustn't believe in them. You must think of those old days."

Tell me, what was so good about those old days? Mr. Farmer, did you like it when you had to get up and pump the water by hand pump, or do you like it better with rural electrification? I think I know.

Worker, did you like it better when you were getting about 30 cents an hour or do you like it better when you are getting democratic wages?

Let me ask you, the people of Asheville, did you like it better before you had thee great programs that permitted us to rebuild our cities, or did you like it better when they didn't give a hoot what happened to our communities?

Did you like it better in the Hoover days or did you like it better with Franklin Roosevelt? [Applause.]

Oh, you know, I wish that fellow from Arizona would have spent a little more time studying history. I don't mind that he talks about the past, but he doesn't even remember what happened. [Laughter.]

And you know, he gets pretty angry with me. Oh, yes. He goes around saying all kinds of mean things about me. But he isn't saying anything new. I heard them all before. [Laughter.]

And you know what? So have the people of Minnesota, and they are pretty good folks, and I will be derned if they didn't elect me. And not only that, you know I got a lot of Republican votes.

And you know something else? Lyndon Johnson is going to get a lot of Republican votes, too. [Laughter.] And you know why? Because Americans are not just partisans. Americans are basically for their country first. And when they see this Republican spokesman who call himself a Republican, and I will talk about that in a moment, when they see him and then they see this man from Texas who is President, they say, "Oh, no, I love my country more than I love my party. I have never maybe voted Democratic before, but this year, 1964, I am going to vote for President Lyndon Johnson on November 3d." [Applause.] That is what they are saying.

So now I know you may have a few Republicans around here, and I want you to welcome them into our friendly fellowship. Just bring them in, invite them in for coffee. Invite them in for lunch. Talk things over because let me tell you, if you do it, you are going to find people that are thinking like we think.

Now, there is another problem. This man from Arizona—I want to say first of all so that you may not misunderstand me, I am a Member of the U.S. Senate, and as a Member of the Senate I belong to sort of an exclusive club. We like each other. We see more of each other per day than we see of our families per week. We learn how to get along with each other.

So I want to make it clear that I think Mr. Goldwater is a fine gentleman. He is a patriot. He loves his country.

Frankly I think he would make a good neighbor, but I don't think he would make a good President, and I don't want him. [Applause.]

I have heard him talk so much about home that I think that is where we ought to send him. [Applause—laughter.]

This is a man that ought not to change his address. He wants to go to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and he doesn't even know that the house is occupied. [Laughter.]

He talks to us about his department store, and I think we ought to help him. "Back to the Store in '64." [Applause—laughter.]

Now, I said just a moment ago that this gentleman indicates that he is a Republican. But I happen to think that there is some doubt about that. Great newspapers that have been more Republican than McKinley are now going to support President Johnson. The New York Herald Tribune—the last time they endorsed a Democrat, they forgot his name. [Laughter.]

The Curtis Publishing Co.'s Saturday Evening Post—it hasn't endorsed a Democrat since 1797, and they didn't have any then. [Laughter.]

Life magazine—it is not generally in the habit of endorsing Democrats.

Now, why do you think those publications plus many others, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Cleveland Press, Philadelphia newspapers—

Go across America and you will find them. Why? I will tell you why they are endorsing Prseident Johnson, and I will tell you why they are not endorsing Barry Goldwater.

First of all, Barry Goldwater has repudiated his own party. On 25 key issues in the Republican platform of 1960, 25 issues in that platform, Mr. Goldwater voted 25 times "No." That fellow is really a strikeout artist. [Laughter.]

Twenty-five times he repudiated his own platform, and so responsible Republicans say, "Look, this fellow isn't one of ours. He is a stray. He doesn't belong to our family."

And surely he hasn't voted for the Democratic platform.

You know whose platform he has voted for? Goldwater's platform. That is right. He can hold his convention for his platform in a telephone booth, and there would be room for another family to move in. [Laughter.] [Applause.]

So here we have a candidate who is the temporary spokesman of a fraction of a faction of the Republican Party. And this man comes around and says that he is a conservative.

Conservative? Why, my dear friends, one of the great conservatives was the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Marshall, and he said some things about the Federal Government and Federal Government responsibility which Mr. Goldwater repudiates.

A great conservative was Alexander Hamilton. But Senator Goldwater, if he met Alexander Hamilton, he would call him an extremist.

A great conservative was Abraham Lincoln. But my dear friends, Mr. Goldwater has repudiated Mr. Lincoln.

He is not a conservative. He is not a Republican. And I will tell you what he is. And this is why we ought not to have him as President. He is a radical. [Applause.] And we don't want him.

We don't need any radicals from the left, and we don't need any of them from the right. We don't need any Communist sympathizers, and we don't need any sympathizers of the Birchites, none at all. [Applause.]

There is plenty of room on the highway for Americans to go right down the main road. You don't need to get in the ditch. And when you get to the ditch of the right or the ditch of the left, they are both dirty.

What we need is to stay on high ground, and let me tell you, my fellow Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, millions of Republicans, many more millions of Democrats and millions of independents are going to march right down the highway of American democracy backing and supporting Lyndon Johnson for President of the United States. [Applause.]

Well, I will tell you something else. This gentleman that is our opponent, he is having quite a time. This is the only man that can make more speeches about his own speeches than any other topic. [Laughter.]

I will tell you something. He is having a ball just trying to interpret what he said. [Laughter.]

The nice thing—you know, Abraham Lincoln once said never lie and then you never have to worry about what you said.

Another thing to do is say what you mean when you say it and then you don't have to worry about what you said.

I know there are people down here in North Carolina that disagree with Humphrey. I know there are people here that disagree with President Johnson. But one thing I have found out about southerners, in fact, about all Americans. They don't mind so much that you take a stand that they disagree with. They are willing to respect you for that. But they don't want you to take a stand on Monday and then change it on Tuesday. [Applause.]

Now, everybody in this audience knows what my stand is on certain issues such as, for example, equal rights for all of our people. When I mention that, people say, "Oh, you ought not to do that. You will lose a vote."

Listen, I lost all those votes a long time ago. I never kidded myself about this. I have taken my stand, but I won't take one stand in Georgia or North Carolina and another one in Maine and California. [Applause.]

I think you people ought to know what you get when you vote for it, and what is more, I think you ought to know that in this great country of ours there is room for disagreement without being disagreeable. But you know, not long ago this gentleman from Arizona, he came down here and, oh, my gracious, every time I hear about it—oh, is that the—every time I hear anything whining, I know it is some part of the Republican Party going down to defeat. [Laughter—applause.] [Airplane noise.]

Let us hold up a minute.

Well, I just want to tell you a little bit about this fellow now. He says he would like to be President, and if you are going to vote for him, I think you ought to know what he has got. [Airplane noise.]

I will tell you what that is, folks. That is the Republican candidate screaming being dragged into the 20th century. [Laughter—applause.]

We made it. He is in now. [Laughter.]

Well, not long ago, I was down in Georgia. Oh, everybody had a great time about that. They said "I wonder if Humphrey will come out of there alive."

Well, I am very much alive. As a matter of fact, I never had more fun in my life. We have a few misguided souls down there but we have been praying for them, and they will come back, may I say, to the home of their fathers.

Georgia has never voted Republican, and it doesn't start to do—it is not going to do it in 1964. You can put that down right now. [Applause.]

Well, before I went down there, I found out that the Goldwaterites, they had been publishing a few pamphlets up in Washington, and what do you think they were publishing? They had some little deal going where they were going to publish hundreds of thousands of pamphlets to show that the Senator from Arizona was a great champion of civil rights. They were going to keep these pamphlets until about the last week of October.

But Hubert Horatio found out about them in September. [Laughter.]

And they had this pamphlet all locked up. Everything was good except their timing.

This man goes down into the South, and he says he is the friend of the South. He has even got some people fooled. He has never voted for your flood control. He has never voted for an agricultural program. He never helped you on tobacco. He never helped you on cotton. He never helped you on soil conservation. He never helped you on REA. He never helped you on business.

He voted against Appalachia. He voted against the Economic Opportunities Act. He is just against you.

VOICE. What did he vote for?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I will tell you what he has learned. He has learned how to whistle "Dixie" with a southern accent, and he comes down here saying "you all" or something else, and he says he is the friend of Dixie.

I saw a sign up at Chattanooga, and it said "Barry for Dixie." Well, I want to tell you, my dear friends, if Barry is a friend of Dixie, then Sherman was your best benefactor, believe me. [Applause.]

This man from Arizona has yet to vote for anything that has helped North Carolina. This is a State of education. He voted against the National Defense Education Act. He voted against the Higher Education Act.

This man paraded down here as a States righter. But up in the District of Columbia he is the champion of the civil rights movement.

You can't have it both ways, my friends.

You know where President Johnson stands and you know where I stand. And I think you ought to know and I think you had better find out where this in-and-out fellow stands.

You can't be on both sides of the road at the same time and live very long.

Here is a gentleman who only the other day up in Sioux Falls—I've got a copy of his speech right here. I was up there.

By the why, the darndest thing happened to me up in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. That was just yesterday. They had the corn-picking contest up there. So Mr. Goldwater, who says "I know nothing about farming," went up there to advise our South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa farmers on agriculture. [Laughter.]

And they came away knowing not one more thing than they knew when he started to talk.

Well, I was born in South Dakota. I went to high school and grade school in South Dakota. And I think I know those folks pretty well. And I think I know something about their needs.

I think I know, for example, their needs in agriculture. I think I know something about their needs of harnessing the waters of rivers.

And here is a gentleman that went up there and here is what he says. He was pretty unhappy with President Johnson. I quote from the speech. "He said," speaking of President Johnson now, "He, President Johnson, said that I would put an immediate end to farm price supports. Now, that is not true, and he knows it."

Well, now, Mr. Goldwater, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time.

Mr. Goldwater, you told the tobacco farmers of North Carolina and the corn farmers of Iowa and the wheat farmers of the Dakotas, you told them unequivocably that you stood for a prompt and final determination of farm subsidy price supports. That is what he said.

You know what that means to a tobacco producer? Chaos. Bankruptcy.

Now, my dear friends, if you think you would rather hear Barry Goldwater whistle "Dixie" than to get a good price for cotton, vote for him. I don't think you want to, do you? [Cries of "No."]

Mr. Goldwater can go around and explain all he wants to. I was in Sioux Falls, and he said, "He, President Johnson, said that I want to kill the rural electrification program. This is not true, and he knows it."

Well, Senator Goldwater, what did you say? He said we should dissolve the REA. He said in most States it is useless. It is not needed.

Now, I can forgive him for that because I will let you in on a secret. They have got several hundred old kerosene lamps left in the department store out there in Phoenix, and they need to get rid of them. [Laughter.] And I believe that any merchant ought to have a right to dispose of his product.

But maybe we can convince Luther Hodges to buy them up, you know, in the Commerce Department and send them over to the Smithsonian Institute as a part of living example of the Goldwater program. [Laughter.]

My dear friends, what did he say? He says President Johnson misrepresents him. He says the President says that he, Mr. Goldwater, is for killing REA. Well, that is right. The trouble is Mr. Goldwater hasn't studied enough the words. The words "kill" and "dissolve" mean about the same thing. If you are dissolved, you are dead. And if you are killed, you are dissolved. [Laughter.]

And then he goes on a little bit more. "He, President Johnson, said that I would cut farm income in half. And this is not true, and he knows it."

Well, now, all President Johnson said was that Barry Goldwater's farm program according to the land-grant colleges of America in a study that came to the U.S. Senate in October 1963, that land-grant college study, not by the Republican Committee, not by the Democratic Committee but by the professors, by the economists, by the specialists who are neither Republican nor Democratic, said that if you took off prompt and finally—promptly and finally the price supports, American agricultural income would be reduced from $12,600 million to $6 billion.

Now, I didn't know how good Mr. Goldwater is in arithmetic but if 12 to 6 isn't reducing it by 50 percent, my name isn't Hubert Horatio Humphrey. [Applause.] So, ladies and gentlemen, we have got some choices to make. The choice is very simple. The choice is whether or not you want your America to move forward or whether you want it to move backward. The choice is whether North Carolina wants to repudiate the program of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman and John Kennedy or whether you want to go back to Mr. Hoover and Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Harding.

The choice is whether or not you want to have a President that looks ahead, one that understands the needs of our youth.

I said earlier that this is a State of education. And, ladies and gentlemen, with our growing young population we are going to need help in our education.

Right here in your community you have a community college, unless I am mistaken, and these community colleges, mothers and fathers, mean the difference between college education and no college education for millions of young people.

Senator Goldwater says this is no responsibility of government. He says it would be better if some people didn't get an education.

I hope he didn't mean that. But when a man says these things, I say to you that it indicates to me that he hasn't the qualifications to be President of the United States.

I want a man in the Presidency, I want a man in the Presidency who was a teacher, who understands the value of education. I want a man in the Presidency who has had experience in the art and science of government.

I ask you to name me one bill, one law, that carries the name of Goldwater. I ask you to name me one single accomplishment in the field of government that has his mark.

But I can tell you this, my friends, that the gentleman from Texas who is our President served as a country schoolteacher and gave his first paycheck to the children of his school for books and for recreational facilities, that he served as a Congressman under the tutelage of Sam Rayburn, the man who said I am a Democrat without prefix or suffix and without apology.

That is the kind of Democrat Hubert Humphrey is too. [Applause.]

I speak for a man who served as a U.S. Senator since 1949, and I speak for one who had the praise of Republicans and Democrats alike as a great Senator and a great majority leader, and I speak of a man who was majority leader when Dwight Eisenhower was President and who as majority leader never harassed the President of the United States.

He didn't oppose for the sake of opposition. In fact, my fellow Americans, many a Democrat criticized him because they thought he was too considerate, too helpful, to President Eisenhower.

But Lyndon Johnson, as the majority leader, knew the meaning of responsibility. He didn't indulge in pettiness He didn't indulge in little nonsense. He thought of his country.

I speak of a man who has been the friend of the farmer on every rollcall vote. I speak of a man who has been the friend of independent business, and on this platform today sits a representative of the small businessmen for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey.

I come from a family of business, 63 years in the retail drug business. I don't need any lectures from someone who inherited a department store. I know about running a business, and I know what it takes to keep one going.

I speak of a man who was one of the godfathers of the rural electrification program. I come here to talk for a man that was chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, who initiated the legislation for our space program so that we could be advanced in space research.

I speak for a man who thinks of Americans as Americans, who doesn't think of you as southerners or northerners, who doesn't think of you as Catholic or Protestant or Jew, who doesn't think of you as white or colored, but who thinks of us as we the people of the United States of America, who thinks of us as one nation indivisible, one nation under God indivisible with liberty and justice for all. [Applause.]

That is the kind of man I speak of. [Applause.]

And I speak of a President and I speak for a President that sees America healthy and strong and sees hope for the future and works for peace.

Anybody can rattle the saber, and the biggest bully in town is generally the weakest.

I speak of a man who knows that power must be used with restraint, one who understands that the strength of America is not only in its armed might but in its sense of justice, and in its purusit of peace with honor.

And ladies and gentlemen, I am proud, very proud, to be on the ticket with a man who came to the Presidency through the most unbelievable, incredible, tragic of circumstances, the death of a President, and who has carried on, who has fulfilled his responsibilities under the most adverse of circumstances, who has produced the greatest legislative program of any President in modern times, and everybody knows that is the truth. [Applause.]

And I come before this great audience in North Carolina and I ask you to stand up once again for your country and for your party and for the future. I ask you not to listen to these false prophets. I ask you not to listen to those who would play upon our little inadequacies.

We all have some limitations, but I ask you to look to the future, and I ask you to join with the President of the United States. Join with him in building a better America, better schools for our young, better hospitals for our sick, better business for private enterprise, more jobs for our workers, better strength for the free world, better things for the elderly.

We have got such a President. I know him, and I have a feeling that if you will get out and go to work between now and November 3d that we will have that man as President of the United States for 4 more years, and we will have with him Congressman—your own Congressman Roy Taylor, a Congressman that you can elect right here, Mr. Davis, a Congressman that can back him.

Give your hands and your hearts and give your votes to Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States on the Democratic ticket. [Applause.]

(Remarks following presentation of gift:)

Senator HUMPHREY. Let me tell you, I will tell you right here—isn't that beautiful.

My friends, let me tell you something. My good friend here has made me, for all practical purposes, a brother in one of the greatest Indian tribes of our Nation, one that is known with great faith and honor, the Cherokees.

In Minnesota we have the Chippewas, and I am a member of the Red Leg Band of the Chippewa Indians. My name is Chief Leading Feather. And yesterday I was made a member of the Sioux Tribe, and you will be interested to know that the first American to ever win the 10,000-meter race in the Olympics since 1904 was a chap by the name of Lt. Billy Mills of the Sioux Indians of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

So when a Senator can be both a Chippewa and a Sioux and a Cherokee, what chance does Goldwater have? [Applause.]

Let me tell you, this is one of the joys of public life, the nicest thing that happens to you when people like this lovely family come on up and say hello.

I just can't tell you how much I appreciate the thoughtful little things that are done along the way, and the El-Khouris are wonderful people, and they are dear friends of one of my closest friends in Maine, and if I can be of any help to you all, dear friends, it surely will make me happy. And I am so glad you are here. My gracious, this is wonderful. Now, you bring them up in the right way, bring them up to be good citizens, to vote the straight Democratic ticket.

Thank you.

SDX Luncheon, International Motel
Tampa, Fla.
October 18, 1964

PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

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

Mr. Brown and Mr. Scroggins and my esteemed colleague in the U.S. Senate, Senator Smathers, and I believe that we have a couple of good Congressmen here with us, Mr. Sam Gibbons and, let me see, who else do we have? And Mr. Haroldson is here, our candidate.

I am going to be very brief in my opening statement to you because I know that the great fun of these conferences is in the question period. It gives everyone a chance for a little workout.

May I first say that it is a joy once again to be in this beautiful State of Florida, one of the fastest growing States of the Nation, and a State that grows as rapidly as Florida and a State that is expanding both in terms of population and economy as fast as Florida is a State that ought to vote Democratic because it is the Democratic Party that seems to understand the processes of growth. [Applause.]

I have to be very careful in these comments as I travel around the country because every State that I go to seems to feel that it is the best State of all. And of course each of the States can claim a certain amount of that honor. But not long ago I was in a sister State called California, and I had to measure my words very carefully there. Now that I am in the other fast-growing State, Florida, I must be sure that I don't do any injustice to California.

So let me just put it this way, that both of these States have demonstrated the kind of vitality—economically, socially, culturally—in terms of population growth and industrial expansion that stands the Nation well in the days ahead.

This campaign is a hard-working campaign. This campaign is a hard-working campaign for both sides.

I recall President Johnson indicating to the Democratic National Committee out at Atlantic City something as to my duties.

Some of you may recall that in my acceptance address I used the phrase "but not Senator Goldwater," so that when President Johnson introduced me and presented me to the Democratic National Committee on the final day of the convention, he said "I want everyone here to take a little rest": he said, "I want everyone here to get themselves rested up well so that you can enter into this campaign. In other words, enjoy life for a little while. But not Senator Humphrey." [Laughter.]

And it was there I think he said something about that I was to go into 50 States. Well, I am not sure that we will make 50, but we will come mighty close to it, and I can say to you that the reception has been warm, friendly. We understand in campaigns that people have differences of view. I have been in politics a long time, and an honest disagreement, a difference of point of view, is the very spice and the life of political life, and of political activity. So that doesn't bother me at all. I do think that this campaign is a great deal different, however, than most of them that I have been in, and I think than any other that I have ever been in because it is my sincere conviction that for the first time in this century, there are people of both parties that find themselves unable to accept the candidate of one of the parties. There is a large number of people of sincere Republican

persuasion who are traditional Republicans, authentic Republicans, Republicans that have fought the battle for their party for a quarter of a century or more. These Republicans by the thousands, in fact, by the millions, are supporting the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson. And the reason they are doing it is because they have put what they believe to be the interests of their country in terms of national security, of foreign policy, and of sound economic policy, above partisan considerations. [Applause.]

Finally I would like to say that it is my view that the ultimate issue in this campaign is the choice between candidates and parties, but in reality the candidates who state the position of their respective organizations or parties, a choice based upon the quality, the qualifications, the experience, the temperament, the attitude, and the philosophy of these respective candidates that are the spokesmen for their respective parties in the campaign.

And on the basis of experience, on the basis of proven knowledge of government, on the basis of capacity and ability in the arts and sciences of government, and on the basis of the knowledge of this great Republic and the world of which it is a fundamental and large part, I sincerely believe, and not only partisanly, but believe that President Johnson stands head and shoulders above anyone else, and I am happy to support him. [Applause.]

Now, with that, let's have some questions. First question? Yes, sir.

QUESTION. Senator, in your opinion how will the Jenkins situation affect the campaign?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I believe, sir, that the President of the United States, first Mr. Johnson, made the statement relating to the tragic personal development relating to Mr. Jenkins, and I think that the American people respect that statement.

This is a great personal tragedy, and I think most of us feel it is almost one of those deep tragedies in the family, in the life of a man that leaves little to be said except sorrow and sympathy.

QUESTION. Senator, do you think the change of government in the Soviet Union will somehow redound to the advantage of the Democrats on election day?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Scherer, I am not at all sure that anyone can predict that. And I don't think that is the—of course, the basic issue, even though needless to say in a campaign year one can't help but ask that question and ponder it, I think we ought to clearly understand that the change in government in the Soviet Union does not ease the problems at all that we face and that our allies face internationally.

I think we ought to constantly remember that we are in a continuing struggle with the Communist forces. I think we also ought to remember that we have shown much more stability in this continuing struggle, much more strength, than the Communist forces.

If I could reflect for a moment I would say that the change in the Soviet Union exaggerates, or I should say, emphasizes the uncertainty of the world situation.

I can't see that it eases our problem at all. I would expect that these leaders, these newly appointed leaders, appointed by the Presidium, will make some statements, possibly take some actions, that could be interpreted as being provocative and troublesome.

I do not believe, however, that those actions will precipitate war because the Soviet Union knows the power of the United States of America and her allies.

I would offer this further observation, that the free countries, the democratic countries, have shown remarkable growth, increase in power, and stability, that if—in a sense this is a vindication of policies that we have pursued. And I want to make it quite clear that the policies that we have pursued have been bipartisan policies up until the recent attack upon those policies by the temporary spokesman of a small fraction of the Republican Party. [Applause.] And that is—I truly didn't intend that to be as partisan as it may have sounded because I am concerned, deeply concerned, as a citizen and as a Senator, and as a public official, over this reckless attack, this irresponsible attack upon the fundamental premises of American bipartisan foreign policy.

I think this is one of the more dangerous developments in the United States.

The only difference is here that it won't succeed.

In the Soviet Union, the instability and the irresponsibility has caused very grave difficulties. The Soviet Union is in a deep split with Communist China. This split is not only ideological, it is cultural, political, and racial.

It is in deep trouble economically. And sometimes I feel that the spokesmen for the radical right in the United States propagandize too well for the Soviet Union. They make the Soviet Union look like it is a success.

The Soviet Union's economic structure is at best mediocre and more factually, weak, and in agriculture, and in consumer goods, a grave disappointment to their own people.

Our economic structure is stronger than it has ever been. So is all of Western Europe. So it is not we that are weak. It is they. It is not we that are in grave trouble. It is the Soviet bloc with constant pressures in the Eastern European countries to withdraw from the tight grip of Soviet management.

I have a feeling that if we pursue carefully, patiently, and prudently the course of action that we have pursued and don't lose our sense of balance, our sense of perspective, that the struggle, as John Kennedy put it, the long hard struggle, with the Communist forces will be won by the free peoples. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Senator——

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir, Mr. Bailey.

QUESTION. Again on the Jenkins' matter but apart from the personal aspects of it, do you think the case has raised any questions about the adequacy of the security procedures employed by the Government?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, if it has, Mr. Bailey, that is a matter that will be carefully examined.

I was the author, may I say, in 1956 of the Commission to review all the security procedures of the Government of the United States, which commission bill passed the Congress.

I was joined in that by Senator Stennis of Mississippi. I felt that our security provisions then were inadequate, and they had been subject to a good deal of misunderstanding as well as misrepresentation. And yet there were loopholes.

That Commission was chaired by the former president of the American Bar Association, Lloyd Wright, of Los Angeles, Calif. That Commission's reports did a great deal to strengthen the overall security mechanism of the Government of the United States.

It may be that there needs to be further examination. However, I have heard nothing that indicated any security weakness or any security leak, and I have a feeling that if there had been some weakness or leak, we would have heard about it.

QUESTION. Senator, do you think the explosion of a nuclear device in Communist China will occasion a reconsideration of our nonrecognition policy of China?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, this surely was not unexpected, and I don't want to say that I have any prophetic vision but as one who has been long interested in the matter of nuclear policy and indeed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, one of its early advocates, I have said not once but at least 20 times in the Senate of the United States that there is all sorts of evidence, that indicated that China, Communist China, would, before—as I put it—before 1966, explode a nuclear device, and this last summer I said before 1965 because the physicists that I have talked to indicated that they had the capacity in terms of the knowledge of atomic molecules and the atomic structure to make this discovery and to perfect a device.

So we ought to have been prepared for that.

Secondly, there are those of us that believe that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty ought to cover Communist China. The President of the United States so said in January. John Kennedy stated so. Dwight Eisenhower stated so. Any responsible American that has been entrusted with the security of this country has advocated that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty be universal.

We have had difficulties with two countries, Communist China and the Republic of France. I would have a feeling now that the possibility of the inclusion of these two countries has improved primarily because with China getting the device, the French will undoubtedly be more interested in some limitation upon testing, and we ought to bring the pressure of the world community upon Communist China to become a member of that treaty structure.

That does not, however, require recognition. I want to make it clear that we can have treaties with nations or we are a part of a multilateral treaty organization with countries that do not have official recognition by the Government of the United States.

I am not prepared to advocate recognition of Communist China. In fact, I have been a stanch opponent of it, including its membership in the United Nations.

If the Chinese Communists were to show any sense of responsibility, if they were to adhere to treaties that were enforcible, they might be able to demonstrate the kind of responsibility that would merit reconsideration.

But as of now, I must say that they have indicated no willingness to be responsible members of the world community. And I don't believe in giving them any encouragement of respectability in the countries of Asia or Latin America.

QUESTION. Senator, it has been said in some quarters that you were selected as Mr. Johnson's running mate despite the fact that you would be a handicap to the party in the South. Would you comment, please, sir, on that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, that is a very complimentary reference. [Laughter.]

Well, I would like to—I wish somebody could answer that question for me because for me to state why I think the President selected me might seem a bit egocentric.

I think the President selected me because he knows me, because he knows of my work in the Congress of the United States, because he knows me as an individual, knows my family, knows Mrs. Humphrey, our children. I think I was selected because, as he said, he felt that I had the qualities that were needed for the vice-presidential candidate.

I know of no man that doesn't have some limitations, and I surely would be in the list of those that have those limitations.

I imagine in some areas of the country I am not a positive factor for the President. I would imagine in other areas I might be a very good positive factor.

May I say that I seldom carry all the counties in southern Minnesota. [Laughter.] But may I add that I win by better than 12,000 votes. [Applause.]

And I want to say that I have enjoyed campaigning in the South, and I will make a prediction for you. By the time that we have an opportunity to serve one term as Vice President, I have a feeling that the South and Hubert Humphrey may become country cousins. [Applause.]

Thank you.

Tampa, Fla.
Lowry Park Spaghetti Luncheon
October 18, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Now, my dear friends, my dear friends, don't you cheer so loud. You will make those Goldwaterites feel lonely. [Applause.] [Laughter.]

But then, on thinking it over, don't be too disturbed about that. They are unhappy anyhow, and I don't think we can do much for them. [Applause.]

Senator Smathers, I was awfully sorry that a moment ago, when I saw the signs of one of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate who will undoubtedly go back home after November, when I saw that—[applause]—when I saw that Goldwater sign way up there I was sorry that somebody took it down because that is as high as they are ever going to get. [Applause.]

And not only that, not only that. I just found out they were paying those kids only 50 cents an hour. That isn't enough. [Applause.]

I want you to know that we Democrats pay a dollar and a quarter an hour. [Applause.]

And now all of those young fellows that were carrying the signs that want a dollar and a quarter come up and see us right after the meeting. [Applause.]

Did you ever notice that they are always way over there on the far right? [Laughter.] [Applause.]

And my, am I ever glad to see so many wonderful Democrats right down the middle just as I see them here today. [Applause.]

Well, I am just honored beyond words to be here in Tampa, be in this great part of Florida where people have for years shown such wonderful good sense politically.

Oh, you do the right things down here. In 1960 you voted for John Kennedy and in 1964—[applause]—and in 1964 you are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States. [Applause.]

Viva the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

Thumbs down on Goldwater. [Applause.]

Well now, that took care of him. [Laughter.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, may I just say how pleased Mrs. Humphrey and I are to be welcomed by your community and to have been welcomed by your mayor and by your city officials, by your business and labor leaders, by your young people, and I want to take just a moment to say a word about my illustrious friend in the Senate, Senator Smathers, and his colleague, Senator Holland, who is up for reelection. And, believe me, one thing we know about our party—we know that to be a Democrat, you don't always have to do just as somebody tells you to do. We don't drive people from our party. We bring people into our party. [Applause.]

And we have a President at the head of our country and we have a President at the head of our party who speaks to unite our people, not divide them. [Applause.]

I know that the people in this State are going to reelect as their U.S. Senator a gentleman with whom I served in the Senate for many years, Senator Spessard Holland. I know you are going to do that. [Applause.]

And I know that there isn't any doubt but what you are going to send back to Congress your own Sam Gibbons because he is on the ball. [Applause.]

And my good friends, may I say that you have an opportunity here in Florida, you have an opportunity here in Florida to make all the pollsters and all the political prophets stand up and take notice because day after day I read that possibly Florida might go the wrong way. I don't believe it. I don't believe it. [Applause.] [Cries of "no."]

Let me ask you, is Florida going to vote for Johnson and the Democratic Party? [Cries of "yes."—applause.]

Does Florida want to go back, back, back with Goldwater? [Cries of "no."]

Does Florida want to go ahead with Lyndon? [Cries of "yes."]

OK. Here we go. [Laughter.]

Now, let me just thank the young people that are here. Every place that I go I find hundreds of young people. I am simply delighted. These young people represent the spirit of our party. They represent the vitality of the party, the youth of our administration and party.

I think many of these young people are going to perform a service on election day that is needed in this country as nothing else, and let me ask every boy and girl, every young man and woman in this audience for their attention for one moment.

On November 3 we have our election. Now, that is not election day only. That is citizenship day. It is on that day that Americans demonstrate whether or not they really believe in representative government, whether we believe in free government. It is on that day we demonstrate whether or not we are capable of making the right decisions. And I want every boy and girl here, I want you to go home and speak to your mother and your father. I want you to speak to your older sister, 21 years of age and older. And I ask you to ask them to be the guardians of our freedom.

I ask you to make them go to the voting box, the ballot box, on November 3 and to cast an intelligent vote.

You make it your business this time to advise dad and mom. You make it your business this time to advise your older brother and sister. And you get them to be good Americans. And a good American is a voting American. And a voting American is an American that loves his country. And make every one of them voting Americans. [Applause.]

I know you are going to do it, and we depend on you.

President Johnson has asked me to ask you to make this November 3 the greatest outpouring of votes that America has ever known. Let's do as good as they do other places. I know there are many people here of Italian descent. May I say that in the last election in Italy, 93 percent of the electorate voted—93 out of 100.

In America, in 1960, 53 out of every 100 voted.

In Venezuela, in Latin America, in the last election, 95 out of every 100 of the Spanish-American people in Venezuela voted. In America, the United States, 63 out of 100.

So, ladies and gentlemen, let's do as good as our friends in Italy. Let's do as good as our friends in Venezuela. Let's vote.

Let's have the biggest vote we ever had in the history of this country on November 3. [Applause.]

Senator Smathers, you sure keep it hot here. [Laughter.]

You know, for a fellow from Minnesota, where the ice is just coming into the lakes, to come down here to Tampa, this is good hot country. Good hot country. And with that hot spaghetti we have got here, we are really going to burn them up today. [Applause.]

George was just suggesting that I take off my coat. [Applause.]

The only reason I don't do this, all the Goldwaterites get scared when I take off my coat. [Laughter and applause.] They think we are going to go after them.

I want to tell you something. That is not true. That is not true. I want to let you in on a secret. Maybe you read about it in the paper because truly I sometimes think we get a little out of hand in these campaigns.

Two days ago I was in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The Senator from Arizona was there also. He was speaking at the Corn Picking Contest, and I was to speak there also. I said the Corn Picking Contest. [Laughter.] And while I was at the airport, at the Joe Foss International Field, the Senator from Arizona was coming back from his speech. And I thought it was about time that the American people noticed that we can compete in politics without being personal enemies.

This isn't a matter of being enemies. This is a matter of difference of points of view. This is just a matter of whether or not we can conduct ourselves politically in a manner that is befitting a free people.

So I went over and extended a hand of friendship and fellowship to the Senator from Arizona, and he did the same to me. And I think in every audience that is the way we ought to be.

Now, let me make it clear, crystal clear. I happen to believe that Senator Goldwater is a patriot. I happen to believe that he is a sociable, fine gentleman. I think he would make a wonderful neighbor, but I sure don't think he would make much of a President. [Applause.]

Now, I understand that you had a fellow down here in Miami not long ago. I saw him on the airplane steps there—looked like he was taking over. I saw a picture of that. He ran for President last time. [Laughter.] You heard about him. Well, he is still out, he is still running. [Laughter.]

Somebody said they thought he wouldn't make a bad President, but they wouldn't want him for a neighbor. [Laughter.]

I am not sure that I feel that way at all. All I know is that we have a man in the White House who will make a good neighbor for you, and he is a good President. So let's keep him. [Applause.]

Now, let's not underestimate the importance of this election. This election gets right down to the roots of American public life and public policy.

257 WBZ—LINO

For 30 years we have been developing in this country a new relationship between the Government and the people. Government is a partnership with the people. This is a Government designed to serve the people. This is a Government of the people and by the people and for the people.

We have developed great programs which have been mentioned here by my friend, Senator Smathers, programs of social security, programs to help the citrus grower with his marketing orders, programs that help the laboring man with collective bargaining, programs that help the businessman with programs of expanding commerce, the Small Business Administration, programs that help our young through education.

Right here at Tampa, Fla., hundreds of thousands of dollars of Federal funds come because this is a city with large amounts of Federal activities.

I am the author of an act that permits the Federal Government to send sizable sums of money here to help in the school districts of the State of Florida.

I say that this partnership between your Government—which is your Government—and these great communities is now in jeopardy. I say that these programs that we have talked about, social security, yes, children's school lunch programs, rural electrification, Small Business Administration, one after another, urban renewal, housing, public housing, middle-income housing, aid to our colleges and universities, every one of these programs today is on the block in this election.

A decision is going to be made. And people say to me, "Senator, do you really believe that the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party would repeal these programs?" And I say, "All I can do is take him at his word." And what did he say? He said, "I want to be elected not to pass laws but to repeal them." I want to know what laws he is talking about. Does he want to repeal social security? Oh, he says, no, no, no.

Well, he voted against its expansion. He said it ought to be made voluntary. He has expressed real doubt about it.

When we say that he may want to take away the housing programs, he says, "Oh, no." But he voted against them.

He voted against college aid. He voted against scholarships for you young people. He thinks apparently that only those that are well to do ought to have a chance to go to college.

He voted against higher education assistance. He voted against national defense education assistance. He hasn't voted for your flood control programs.

This man said the following things, and I quote him from his own words:

> The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs, from social welfare legislation, from education, power, agriculture, housing, urban renewal, and I do suggest that we establish a dateline, a timetable of withdrawal.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if Mr. Goldwater says that, I have reason to believe he means it, and I say to every mother and father here that wants her boy and girl to go to college, and you have a right to want them to go, you had better watch out how this election comes out because you can't build the colleges and the universities that we need in the days ahead without some help from a Federal Government that has a responsibility to the citizens of every State in this Union. You had better make up your mind—[applause]—you better make up your mind that programs like social security, programs like aid to dependent children, programs that we have worked for 30 years to build, under Republicans and Democats alike, that they are in jeopardy. That is why this election is a crucial one. This is a man who said—the man that seeks your votes on the Republican ticket—this man said, "Education is not the responsibility of Government. Education is only the responsibility of the parents."

And then he went on to say that some people would be better if they didn't have education.

Ladies and gentlemen, a man that makes a statement like that is no man to put in charge of this country. [Applause.]

Here is a man that can't make up his mind whether he is for the United Nations or against it. On one week he says, "I think we ought to get out of the U.N." The next week he says, "I think we ought to support it." Then he says, "I think the U.N. is inadequate." Then he says, "I think it is the best we can get."

Now, what kind of doubletalk is this?

I don't mind debating with a man that takes a position but to try to find one of these moving targets that is all over the lot—[laughter]—that is just a little bit too much. [Applause.]

You know, friends, remember when we used to worry about the flying saucers? Everybody thought they were seeing flying saucers.

Those weren't flying saucers. Those are just the recent statements of Barry Goldwater. [Applause.]

First you hear him and then you don't.

What America needs is a President that means what he says when he says it and says what he means when he says it. [Applause].

And America has that kind of a President. [Applause.]

And what America needs as a President is someone who will build and not destroy, someone who will create and not just criticize, someone who will lead us forward and not backward, someone who will seize the opportunities of the future rather than trying to distort the past. And we have got him and his name is President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.] Now, my friends, let me take just a brief moment of your time on the most important issue of all.

The most important issue facing the American people is the security of this country.

The most important issue facing humanity is peace in this world, not peace with appeasement but peace with honor, not security through making America a garrison state but security by building the great family of free nations into a mighty alliance. And this, my friends, was [applause] the goal of John Kennedy in his Atlantic partnership and this is the goal of Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

But security and peace is more than talk. We have built security through strength. America is stronger today than any nation on the face of the earth. America is more prosperous today than any nation on the face of the earth. America is much more prosperous today than it was 4 years ago. America is stronger today than it was 4 years ago.

While the Soviet Union has trouble, we have unprecedented prosperity. While the Soviet Union [applause] deposes and throws out Nikita Khrushchev, we march on to reelect Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

And, my fellow Americans, don't you let anybody kid you 1 minute. This country is growing fast. This country is more prosperous than ever.

We intend to build on that prosperity. This country is stronger than ever, and we intend to maintain and sustain and expand that strength. And we build this wealth and we build this power, not just for ourselves. We build it for purposes of a just order, a just world, and a peaceful world.

We have power and we need a President that knows how to use it and how to restrain its use. We don't want power for power's sake. We want power for justice, for freedom and peace. [Applause.]

And we don't want anybody in the White House who is playing war games. [Applause.] We want somebody in the White House that is prayerfully, day in and day out, searching for the paths of peace.

And ladies and gentlemen, we have been doing that. We have been building a better world and we Americans ought to be proud of it.

John Kennedy broke through the Iron Curtain. John Kennedy broke through the cold war. President John Kennedy, backed up by Lyndon Johnson, is winning the victory for freedom. Let's give him a chance. [Applause.]

And that Pan-American airliner reminds me of something. We built the Alliance for Progress while our critics criticized. Today there is a mighty friendship and partnership between the nations south of the Rio Grande and their big neighbors to the north. The Alliance for Progress is no longer a dream. The Alliance for Progress is no longer a speech. The Alliance for Progress is working and millions of people are living better today in the Western Hemisphere because of the Alliance for Progress. [Applause.]

We have put our food to work. We are using food for peace. We are feeding and helping to feed 40 million little children in Latin America, 100 million children throughout the world who are sharing in the abundance, the abundance of America's farms. And these 100 million children are being told every day that the people of America, the children of America care about you.

This is an act of friendship that will pay dividends for years to come.

We have sent our Peace Corps abroad. We have sent the flower of our land, the best that we have, to help other people help themselves—10,000 volunteers, American youth, many of them trained right here in Florida, many right from Florida.

And what does the Senator from Arizona say about the food for peace program. He says no. No food for the hungry. No farm program for the farmers. No food for peace for the world. No, no, no, says the man from Arizona. [Applause.]

And what should we say to the man that says no. [Cries of "No."]

No. And we will show him what a "No" means. We will show him how to spell "No." We will show him what "No" means on November 3d when we vote no against him millions of times. [Applause.]

And now, my friends, I have just got to cool off that throat.

The Peace Corps. Every mother and father in America that has a son or daughter in the Peace Corps is proud of it. What did the Senator from Arizona say about the Peace Corps, recommended by John Kennedy and, may I say with some humble pride, I introduced it in the U.S. Senate, backed by your Senators. [Applause.]

What did the man from Arizona say about it? Did he vote for it? No. But he called it a haven for beatniks.

Any man that will say that is not qualified to speak for the youth of America, and he ought to be repudiated. [Applause.]

So, my friends, we will go on and build. We will build our strength. We will build for peace. We will join the late and beloved, and great spokesman of a mighty church. We will join Pope Pius XXIII and we will join John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We will join these apostles of peace in working for an honorable peace through strength and through courage and through courage and through sacrifice. This is the work of a noble and a great people. [Applause.]

And I know that we are going to reject this voice of the past. We will reject these children of darkness. We, the American people, are the children of hope, the children of light. We are the hope of the future. We have a great responsibility to ourselves and mankind, and we don't intend to fail in that responsibility.

And therefore, we intend to keep at the helm of this Government someone who is tried and tested, someone who is experienced in the arts and sciences of government, someone who understands the world in which we live, someone who dreams of a better America and works for it, one who wants to lead us rather to push us back.

And I ask you to join with me today in showing our President that he will have 4 more years in the White House, Lyndon Baines Johnson as President of the United States. [Applause.]

St. Petersburg, Fla.
October 18, 1964.

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

In every sense of the phrase, St. Petersburg is an "all-American city." You have come from every State in the Union to make your home here in the warmth of the Florida sun. When I talk with you I hear the accents of New England, the Middle West, the Far West, and of the South.

By sharing diverse backgrounds you understand more than most Americans how big this country is and how complex its problems are.

You in St. Petersburg have succeeded in welding together in community life people of many viewpoints and people from many regions of America.

Unity has been the springboard of your success in creating a good life for many older citizens. It has given focus to your strenuous efforts to broaden the economic base of St. Petersburg beyond the tourist business into the industries of the aerospace age.

Your unity of purpose is helping you to preserve the beauty of the parks, the beaches, and the bays for which the city is so famous.

These facts—your local experiences—enable you to appreciate what the present administration has been trying to accomplish for America.

We believe that Government can succeed in serving America's needs only when it is a Government of all of the people—of people from all States and regions—of people of all ages, races, and creeds—of people of every occupation and business—of people who are liberals and people who are conservatives—of all majorities and minorities which accept the ground rules of a democracy.

I submit that the first choice which you face this fall is whether or not you want to elect a President of the United States who agrees with this philosophy.

Do you want a leader who possesses the qualities to create unity from division, a leader who invites those who disagree, "Come—let us reason together?"

Do you want a leader who believes that our domestic problems are best solved by a cooperative partnership and our foreign problems by bipartisanship?

If you do, you have the opportunity—and the duty—to vote on November 3 for a man who is this kind of leader—you have the opportunity to vote for President Lyndon Johnson.

There is another alternative open to you—you can reject a government of unity and moderation.

There are some extremists and radicals in our midst who would divide the country, setting group against group, State against State, section against section. These men long to tear down our institutions and to rebuild them to the specifications of their own weird whims and fancies.

A hero of these extremists, Senator Barry Goldwater, is a candidate for the highest office in the land. Only a month ago he came before you here in St. Petersburg with a sample of his divisive and disruptive viewpoint. His attack that day was on the Supreme Court; he demanded radical changes in our constitutional heritage.

If you choose Goldwater in November, you will be choosing a man who not only boasts about how he will radically alter our present institutions, but who brags about his past radicalism.

On some things of very great interest to you in St. Petersburg, Barry Goldwater has been consistent—consistently and radically negative.

He has opposed virtually every Federal program designed to improve life in our cities—programs developed by the Kennedy-Johnson administration for better housing, for mass transit systems, for urban renewal, for open spaces to be used as parks and recreational areas.

Senator Goldwater has opposed programs to help those many Americans who are not reached by our national prosperity—whether they are dependent children, the unemployed, the sick, or the disabled.

Yes, Senator Goldwater has sometimes been consistent. He has voted in the Senate against every program created during the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations to give more opportunities to older and younger citizens. The list is long:

Goldwater has opposed medicare through social security. When Senator Goldwater was asked in Atlanta where older citizens could find help in paying their sometimes staggering medical and hospital bills, his answer was a joke: "I've got my own medicare plan," he said. "I've got an intern for a son-in-law."

Goldwater has opposed housing programs for senior citizens.

Goldwater has opposed retraining and vocational training programs to help older workers find new jobs.

Goldwater, though he now offers a "pie in the sky" proposal for tax reduction, voted against the Kennedy-Johnson tax reduction which has already put millions of dollars into the pockets of Florida citizens.

And to top the list, Goldwater would like to do away with the social security system—or make it voluntary—or "stage a withdrawal" from it, whatever that may mean.

On November 3 you have the opportunity for an act of affirmation.

It is our conviction that no man is truly free unless he can live and work in dignity, fearing neither sickness nor old age—neither man nor machine.

It is our conviction that the business of Government will remain unfinished business so long as there is a hungry child, a lonely old man, a person "who never had a chance."

These convictions enable us to envision and work for what President Johnson has called the Great Society, an America in which each citizen can realize his capacities and in which he can enjoy the rewards of his labor and the sweetness of his leisure.

But more than charity and compassion, or opportunity and unity, are at stake this November. The Great Society is possible only if we live in a world at peace.

Since the world entered the nuclear era in 1945, we have lived constantly with the threat that atomic warfare might destroy our civilization either by calculation or error.

One year ago we succeeded in outlawing the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons as a first step in keeping the world at peace. But we have much more to do if we wish our grandchildren to enjoy the Great Society, in a world without war.

I say flatly that Senator Goldwater cannot deal responsibly with this most fearful crisis of our era—the problem of nuclear war.

This is the presidential candidate who came here to St. Petersburg 1 month ago and who—instead of discussing how we can live prosperously in a world at peace—chose to lecture you about crime and violence in the streets.

Lawlessness, crime, and moral decay are not problems in St. Petersburg because you have fulfilled your local responsibilities well. But you share with other Americans the responsibility to do what you can to build a better Nation and a peaceful world.

You can meet that responsibility by choosing as President the leader who has dedicated all of his talents and energies to working for freedom and justice in a peaceful world.

You can choose Lyndon B. Johnson.

St. Petersburg, Fla.
Williams Park
October 18, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

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

Mayor Goldner, ladies and gentlemen, I am singularly honored today as a visitor from Minnesota and as a candidate for the high office of Vice President to be welcomed here by one of the gifted, talented, and courageous mayors of any city in the United States. [Applause.]

I think I know a little bit about some of his problems as a mayor because it was my privilege at one time in my public life, it was my privilege to serve as a mayor of a city in the upper Midwest, the city of Minneapolis, Minn. [Applause.]

Mr. Mayor, I can think of no job that has more responsibility and at times more troubles but yet more satisfactions than to be the mayor of great city, and I am sure you feel that way in St. Peterburg. [Applause.] So thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Mayor, I think you would be interested to know that only 2 days ago it was my privilege to be in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., at which meeting I was also privileged to meet an old friend of the U.S. Senate. Senator Smathers and Senator Holland know that the U.S. Senate is a rather exclusive club, as it is called. While we have differences of points of view in that body, because we have an aisle that divides us, the Democrats on one side and the Republicans on the other, and even differences within our own party, while we have those differences, we have learned how to disagree without being disagreeable. [Applause.]

So in Sioux Falls I noticed a big jet, and I said to myself, I believe that is the airplane that carries the candidate of the Republican Party, and I was there for a little while at the airport, and I went on over there a little later and had an opportunity to say "hello" to the gentleman that represents the opposition.

I thought I would mention that because, believe it or not, Senator Goldwater and Hubert Humphrey didn't heckle each other. [Applause.]

Senator Goldwater and Hubert Humphrey are grown up enough to realize that in this country we have strong views and we have differences of views and we sort of felt it might be a good idea to set an example for our followers of how to be an opponent in an election and still be a gentleman. [Applause.] And how to debate the issues without mouthing just empty slogans. [Applause.] And I hope, my friends, today that the example that was set by the head of one ticket and the second man on another ticket will prevail in every audience throughout American because Americans deserve a frank and honest discussion of the issues and not a lot of immature, irresponsible chanting by people who don't know what they are talking about. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, may I say how privileged—what a privilege it is to be in this beautiful sunshine city. I have heard so much about it. It is my first visit here, and I am privileged today to be on the platform with a very dear aunt of mine, the aunt that I refer to as Mrs. John Humphrey, Aunt Jo, as we call her, and believe me, it is a wonderful opportunity and honor to be in this same city of her's. She and my Uncle John, who was my father's brother, they have been dear to us, to the Humphrey family, and to have her here at a political meeting like this is a pleasure that I hadn't expected.

And I want to say right now that I remember Uncle John so well, and he, too, was of some Republican persuasion, but I think he would have voted for Lyndon B. Johnson. [Applause.]

And then, too, may I say how pleased I am to see so many of your local candidates here, because this isn't just an election for President and Vice President. This is not only an election for the U.S. Senate here in your State. It isn't just an election for Governor. It is for school boards, and it is for county officers and local officers, and as one of the fine ladies here on the platform said to me, "Senator, we are talking about an election from the White House to the schoolhouse." So let's take good care of it. It is quite a responsibility. [Applause.]

I notice, too, that our candidate for Congress on the Democratic ticket is here today, and I want to say what a joy it is to travel with this brief time and to be with this gentleman, and I hope that all of you will give him very serious and thoughtful consideration in this election and I refer to Marion Harrelson who is here on the platform with me. Stand up, Marion. [Applause.]

Well, now, let's talk about a little matter that may be of some concern to us, about this Nation of ours and about this—[heckling from audience].

My dear friends, don't worry about that, there is always a little static on every good program. [Applause.]

Very frankly, a good night's sleep and a Democratic victory will take care of all of those problems. [Applause.]

Mayor Goldner, I come here to St. Petersburg to salute this "All America city." You have here in this wonderful, beautiful sunshine city of yours people from every part of America. There isn't a State in the Union that isn't represented here in this audience. I am sure. And if ever a Senator or a public official had an opportunity to speak to a totally American audience, an "all-American audience," Hubert Humphrey has been given that opportunity today, and I want to thank you, Mr. Mayor, for having such a blessed city, such a beautiful place, and one where you can give a Senator a chance to talk to people from every area of our Nation. [Applause.]

And you know what? Just a moment ago a man over here said, "and don't forget there are some here from Minnesota, too." [Applause.]

Now, I have examined into what has been the success of this great city beacuse I am sure you know that St. Petersburg has been selected out of all the great cities in America for high honors. Now, this is a tribute to your civic leadership. It is a tribute to the people, and it is a great honor to this State.

This city is not just an "All America" city in terms of a statement by a public official. It has been so designated by official bodies and that title, I think, comes from one particular accomplishment. You have here a unity, a unity of purpose and a unity of people, a high regard for people which builds a unity that has been the springboard of your success in creating a good life for your many citizens, and as we know, this great city of St. Petersburg is blessed by having citizens of rich maturity, people who have given so much of their lives to this blessed America of ours.

Many people say these are the older people. I don't say that at all. I just say these are the people that are richer in living and richer in experience and understanding. [Applause.]

Your unity of purpose here has helped you to preserve the beauty of your parks, your beaches, and the bays for which this city is so famous, but the real beauty of St. Petersburg is not even in these beaches and parks. The beauty of this city is in the spirit of its people, and it is in this great respect which this community exemplifies for humankind. What is it that differentiates, that divides the free people of the world from the totalitarians? What is it that is the difference between the Communist slave state and the free nation? The basic difference is that in the free nation there is a respect for humankind, a respect for human dignity. Actually may I say on this day of Sabbath that a free people and a democratic people know that basically our democracy has spiritual life and spiritual values. It was God who created man in his own image, and this, the finest creation of divine providence, is what we mean by human dignity, the soul and the spirit and the heart and the life of people. And a free society is not dedicated only to parks and playgrounds and jobs. It is not only dedicated to the rich life of material blessings. A democratic society, a free society, is dedicated to social justice, too, to constant concern over the well-being of the finest of all creation, not the creation of man, but the creation of providence, and that creation is none other than the heart and the flesh and the blood and the soul and the spirit of each and every one of us.

And the purpose of a free government is to see to it that the lives of these people, our people, we the people—that those lives are enriched, that they are emancipated, that they are made more blessed, and that they are permitted to fulfill their destiny.

That is what we are really talking about. [Applause.]

So here in St. Petersburg as in other cities, too, but so distinctly here, as I said, you have a people from all the States in the regions, people of all ages and of races and creeds, people of every occupation and of every business, people who are liberals and people who are conservatives, people who are of the majorities and of the minorities, but all of them have learned to accept the ground rules of democracy. I trust all have.

And those ground rules of democracy are respect and responsibility, respect for the rights of others and responsibility to one another. Not the unlicensed radicalism, not this business of just selfish pursuit, but respect for one another and responsibility to one another. And a government that is worthy of people of all races, creeds, and nationalities, of every religious faith, any government that is worthy of the respect of these people must be a government that cares. It must be a government with a heart.

This Government of ours has been designed to serve the people, not to be served by the people. This is what Abraham Lincoln called a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and those are not merely words. That is a description of a free government in a great republic, the United States of America. [Applause.]

Now, I say that the first choice which you face this fall is whether or not you wish to elect a President of the United States who sees that government has a responsibility to fulfill toward the communities, toward the individual citizens; in other words, do we want a President that accepts the responsibility of government to the people or do we

want a President that says that government is an enemy of the people? One candidate has said, regrettably, and I am sorry that he said it because I think it does him a disservice, one has said that the Government in Washington is a greater enemy of freedom than Moscow. This my friends, is not true, and it is a shameful statement. [Applause.]

And, may I add, that those who generally lack the logic of argument are those who generally engage in the noise of the tonsils. [Applause.]

Now, may I submit to this audience this question.

Do you want a leader who possesses the qualities in this country of ours to create unity out of division? I think so. A leader who invites those who disagree with him, in the phrase of the prophet Isaiah, "Come, let us reason together"?

Or do you want a leader that promotes disunity rather than creates unity, that drives away from him those who disagree with him rather than reaching out to ask them to come in and reason together?

Do you want a leader in America who believes that our domestic problems are best solved by a cooperative partnership and relationship between the people and their government and our foreign problems are best solved not as Democrats and not as Republicans but as Americans? If you do [applause]—if you do want that kind of leadership, you have the opportunity to maintain it and the duty. You have the opportunity and the duty on the day of November 3, election day, citizenship day, to select a man who is just the kind of leader that I have been speaking of, one who does create unity, one who seeks common goals for the American people, one who senses that a government can be a working partner with every citizen and every community, and one who believes that American security and foreign policy is not the special right of a Democrat or a Republican but belongs to the entire American people, Republicans and Democrats, independents alike, and that leader is the present President of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, there is, of course, another alternative open because we have been told that this election gives us a choice, and may I say frankly it does give us a choice.

The other alternative—you can reject a government of unity and of moderation. There are some extremists, and they are few in number, and there are some radicals in our midst who would divide this country, who would set up group against group, State against State, region against region, people against people. These men long to tear down the institutions that we have built carefully over two centuries and to rebuild these institutions according to their distorted specifications of their own weird whims and fancies.

I say to you that we are not going to let that happen.

I know that in this audience today as the mayor spoke there are maybe a substantial number, there even may well be a majority of people who traditionally have voted the Republican ticket. I must say to you, my friends, that today we find a substantial share of those voters doing as Mayor Goldner has said: because of love of country, because of concern for the future of America, that are putting their country above their party.

Now, let me say to these troubled Republicans, to these good souls, let me say, you haven't left your party. I recognize that in the days ahead many of them will return to support a Republican candidate 2 or 4 years from now. You have not left your party. Let me tell you who has left it.

In 1960 in the Republican Convention a platform was adopted as a result of 8 years of leadership on the part of Dwight Eisenhower. A platform that represents responsible actions of a political administration. It was a conservative platform, but it was an authentic Republican platform. It wasn't created out of thin air. It came from the experience of governing America. There were 25 basic commitments in that platform.

Now, in the Senate of the United States we elect leaders. The leader of the minority is the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, a Republican. The leader—the second man in charge in the Republican Party in the Senate is the Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel. The third man is the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Saltonstall. The fourth man is the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper, four of the most distinguished, gifted, able Republican leaders in the Government of the United States.

These men were selected and elected by their own colleagues just as the Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers, was elected by the Democratic majority to be the secretary of our—to be the secretary of the Democratic conference, just as I was elected to be the majority whip. We must be elected by our colleagues.

Now, what happened in 25 major specific proposals in the Republican platform of 1960? Senator Dirksen of Illinois—Senator Kuchel of California, Republican, elected only 2 years ago with a majority of 800,000 votes in his State, the largest majority any Senator ever received in the State of California, a smashing Republican victory, Senator Kuchel voted for his platform 25 times, thoroughly loyal to his party. Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts who has been in the Senate for over 20 years voted for his platform 20 times. Senator Dirksen of Illinois, surely he can't be called an extremist or an easterner, two phrases which Mr. Goldwater uses to dismiss those who disagree with him, but Mr. Dirksen voted for his platform 18 times. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper, conservative midwestern Republican, voted for his platform 17 times.

There were four of the Republican leaders that voted for their party. Senator Goldwater of Arizona voted against his platform 25 times.

Who is a Republican? [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, it wasn't the Republicans who left their party. It isn't the New York Herald Tribune that has never before supported a Democrat and this year is supporting President Johnson that has quit the Republican Party. It isn't the Saturday Evening Post published since 1797 and never endorsed a Democrat until now that left its party. It isn't Life magazine, the magazine, the magazine publications of Henry Luce and his wife, Clare Boothe Luce. It isn't Life magazine that left the Republican Party when it endorsed President Johnson.

These are Republicans. Mr. Whitney of the New York Herald Tribune is a Republican. He is a rich Republican. He is a strong Republican. He is an authentic Republican. And he endorsed Lyndon Johnson for President. [Applause.]

Now, why these millions of Republicans, and there are—why are the millions of them endorsing and helping Mr. Johnson, President of the United States? I will tell you why, because Senator Goldwater is not a conservative, he is not a Republican; he is a radical and people know it. [Applause.]

And why am I saying he is a radical? I am saying he is a radical because the definition of a radical is one who would tear down, who would destroy, who would repudiate, who would violate the traditions and the commitments of the past. And a presidential candidate that repudiates bipartisan foreign policy, repudiates the United Nations, repudiates his own party, drives from his own party people that have long been in it, a man, may I say, who was described by the Governor of Pennsylvania as out of the mainstream of the Republican Party, that sort of a man is a radical. And he ought to be so branded. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, we don't want any radicalism from the Communist left, and we don't want any radicalism from the Goldwaterite right. [Applause.]

What America wants America can have. America wants a political leader and a political party and a political performance that goes straight down the highway of social democratic progress for the American people, neither left nor right, but down the pathway of moderation and decency for the American people. [Applause.]

Now, why do I make these strong statements? I say that Mr. Goldwater is a radical because he has opposed every Federal program designed to improve the life of our communities, programs that are supported, every one of them, overwhelmingly by Republicans and Democrats alike. He has failed to support and opposes programs for better housing, programs for mass transit systems, programs for urban renewal, programs to help our cities, programs for open spaces, programs for recreation.

He voted against the extension and the expansion of social security in 1961. He has made it a practice to vote no on every program of the Kennedy-Johnson administration and the majority of the programs of the Eisenhower administration. [Applause.]

He has consistently opposed the programs to help those many Americans who are not reached by our national prosperity whether they are dependent children, the unemployed, the elderly, the sick or the disabled. He has voted in the Senate, and I repeat, against every program created during the Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson administrations to give more opportunities to our older people and to our younger citizens, and the list is long.

Let me read them. He has opposed medicare. When asked in Atlanta where the older citizens could find help in paying some of their staggering medical and hospital bills, his answer was this. Listen:

"I have got my own medicare plan," he said. "I have got an intern who is a son-in-law." [Applause.]

I must say, my friends, I must say that shows very little concern for those of us that don't have sons-in-law who are interns. [Applause.]

He has opposed the housing programs for senior citizens. He opposed and voted against retraining and vocational training programs for older workers that were displaced by automation. He voted against the tax reduction, a tax reduction bill recommended by two Presidents, supported by the chamber of commerce, supported by the AFL–CIO, supported by the National Association of Manufacturers, supported by every State and city in America.

This man voted no when there was a chance to reduce America's taxes by $11.5 billion. [Applause.]

And, ladies and gentlemen, that tax reduction bill which was passed despite Senator Goldwater's opposition and supported by over two-thirds of his own party, that tax reduction bill has created a prosperity in this country and an economic growth that exceeded the fondest dreams of any of us.

It has been a blessing to the consumer. It has been a blessing to industry. It has forwarded private enterprise, and this man who says that he champions private enterprise voted to put the dagger in its back when he voted against the tax bill that gave private enterprise some help. [Applause.]

Now, my friend from Arizona says that we misinterpret his remarks on social security. But, ladies and gentlemen, the Senator from Arizona said that he thought social security should be voluntary. He said that there ought to be a staged withdrawal on the part of the Federal Government from these social welfare programs. He said, "Ye shall know them by their votes and not by their words."

Well, Senator, I want to call to your attention the vote in May of 1961 when we extended and improved the benefits under social security. The Governor from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scranton, was then in the Congress. He voted then as a Republican, aye; the Senator from Arizona, who says he is not a Republican, voted no.

He voted against extra social security benefits. He recommends that it be tampered with.

Ladies and gentlemen, social security is supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. Social security belongs to the American people. It is just as much a part of our people today as the postal service, and it ought not to be a political football, and we ought to repudiate anyone that makes it a political football. [Applause.]

What America needs is a Government that cares.

Now, let me say to this fine audience today that those who say that compassion is weakness are wrong, and those who say that concern for the unfortunate, for the needy, for the lame and the halt and the maimed and the elderly, those who say that concern for these unfortunate ones is socialism, he, too, is wrong because compassion and charity and concern for people is good solid Americanism within the traditions of this country. [Applause.]

And as your mayor said, and I conclude on these notes, since the world entered the nuclear era in 1945, we have lived constantly and dangerously with the threat that atomic warfare might destroy everything. And a man that doesn't understand that is unworthy of public trust.

One year ago we succeeded in outlawing the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons as a first step in keeping the peace, and four out of five of the U.S. Senators, four out of five voted for that treaty. But may I say that one did not: 25 of the 33 Republicans voted yes, but the Senator from Arizona voted no.

I think that we have much more to be concerned with in the days ahead if we wish your grandchildren to enjoy a world without war. And I say flatly to this amazing and wonderful audience that Senator Goldwater cannot deal responsibly with this most fearful and dreadful crisis of our time, the problem of nuclear power, and this is the presidential candidate that I speak of who came here to St. Petersburg a little over a month ago and instead of discussing with you how we can live better, how we can live prosperously in a world at peace, he chose to lecture you about crime and violence in the streets.

Lawlessness and crime, lawlessness and crime and moral decay are not problems in St. Petersburg because you have fulfilled your local responsibilities and if every city in America would do as well—[applause]—if every city in America would do as well, then indeed this country would be the most law abiding and the most peaceful country in the world.

I am sure you share with me the concern over all of these problems, and I am sure that you share with other Americans the responsibility to do what you can to build a better nation and a peaceful world. You can meet that responsibility and that concern by choosing a President who works for peace and knows that the search for peace is not an act of weakness. It is written in the Scriptures, "blessed are the peacemakers." It is also written that a nation shall perish without vision. And ladies and gentlemen, let me say right now that to search for peace is the task of a giant because peace requires greater power, greater strength, greater moral purpose, than warfare. [Applause.] And the President of the United States who occupies 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is a man who knows that American power and American wealth is not here for luxury or for conquest, that American power and American wealth is here for God's most noble purpose, the search for peace, good will toward men, and that kind of a philosophy requires a nobility of character. It requires a sense of sacrifice. It requires the bravery of a man that is in combat himself.

And I am happy to say that I speak today in St. Petersburg, Fla., for a man who has that strength, who has that nobility of character, who has that wisdom, who has that understanding of the world in which we live. I speak for a man who knows that to search and seek peace is the work of God's children. I speak for a man who fulfills that duty relentlessly and fulfills it well, and his name is President Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Miami, Fla.
Florida Forum
October 18, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ANNOUNCER. WCKT News presents "Florida Forum," an examination of topics of interest to the people of south Florida.

Now here is your moderator, Tom Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Good evening.

Our guest tonight on Florida Forum is Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee, who arrived in our WCKT studios by helicopter from the Miami International Airport a few seconds ago.

Senator Humphrey brings his campaign to Florida today in an effort to return the State to the Democratic fold.

Questioning our guest tonight will be WCKT news commentator Wayne Fariss and Dr. Tom Wood, chairman of the department of government at the University of Miami.

We will also have questions from our studio audience.

Now we will begin with the panel and Wayne Fariss.

Mr. FARISS. Thank you, Tom.

Senator Humphrey, there have been reports late this afternoon that you are planning now to cancel your tomorrow's schedule here in the Miami area, that you plan to make a news conference here in this city shortly after the President addresses the Nation tonight.

Is there any truth to the report? If so, would you elaborate?

Senator HUMPHREY. The President will be addressing the Nation tonight, and I believe that following that address we will have to make a decision as to whether or not I can remain here for the projected schedule for tomorrow.

Frankly, I hope I can, but it is very probable that I will have to return to Washington.

Mr. FARISS. There is some doubt, then, that you will not be here tomorrow.

Senator HUMPHREY. There is as of the moment, but when the President has finished his report to the Nation, I will be in touch with him, and I will be able then to determine whether I can stay.

Mr. FARISS. Senator Humphrey, last week on this program Congressman William Miller mentioned that if elected, the Goldwater administration would support the Cuban refugees giving them ammunition and arms, et cetera. Do you foresee any change in this so far as if the Democratic administration is elected?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Fariss, I believe that the policy which we have been following relating to Cuba and to its ultimate freedom is a sound policy. It is not reckless, it is not irresponsible.

Today Castro is weaker. He is much weaker today than he was in 1960. And I would like to add that Castro didn't come to power in Cuba while there was a Democratic administration in Washington. He came to power in the late 1950's.

The policy that we have been pursuing as one of the diplomatic and political isolation and of economic pressure has for the first time brought the Organization of American States to censure the Castro regime, recommended cutting off of all diplomatic relations, and every country of Latin America save one has already done that.

Castro is weak. There has been a change of government in the Soviet Union. I doubt that the Soviets are going to want to pay a million dollars a day to keep this man in power in Cuba. And if we will pursue the course of responsibility, of effective diplomacy, every economic and diplomatic pressure, I do believe that there will be an uprising in Cuba and that the people in Cuba will be able to free themselves from this grip of a temporary dictator. And it is a temporary dictatorship.

Mr. FARISS. Then you don't foresee a change in the Democratic thinking of this.

Senator HUMPHREY. Not as I can see it now, sir.

However, we are committed to a policy of a free Cuba, and we are also committed to a policy of helping the Cuban people maintain or have a very good progressive and democratic government.

You know, as I recall, a few years ago, about 5 years ago, Cuba was the third—had the third highest per capita income in this hemisphere. Today it is third from the bottom.

The Cuban regime has been a colossal failure.

Mr. MILLER. Dr. Tom Wood.

Dr. WOOD. Senator Humphrey, you have gotten a good deal of political mileage out of your 18-hour interview with Khrushchev. Now that there has been a change in deadership in the Kremlin, do you think that your experience and knowledge in terms of our policy toward the U.S.S.R. is as valuable and pertinent as it was earlier this week?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Dr. Wood, the experience that I had in visiting with Mr. Khrushchev was part of a long period of study of Soviet affairs. I have attempted as a member of the Senate Committe on Foreign Relations to study Soviet political and economic development and problems.

I don't care to be a specialist in this. There are specialists in our great universities, in our centers of Russion studies, but that experience in talking with Mr. Khrushchev was one of many experiences that one has in studing a nation and a political party and a political program.

I think that experience was very valuable. As a matter of fact, I had met both of the men who are presently in the leadership roles in the Soviet Union. And I don't think that you get to know these men very well. They are very subtle and withdrawn.

But I think you can learn a great deal about careful study of Soviet developments.

Dr. WOOD. If I may turn to the domestic scene a minute, you are aware, I am sure, Senator, that the people of Dade County have been as much underrepresented in the State legislature as any people in the United States. And we are interested in securing fair apportionment.

What action will the Johnson-Humphrey administration take, if elected, if the Dirksen bill comes up again before the Congress providing for indefinite postponement of fair apportionment?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, it is my view that most of the legislature bodies will have complied with the Supreme Court decision before any action of any kind will be taken in Congress.

Of course, there could be a constitutional amendment, however. But that would then necessitate ratification by 38 States of the Union before it can become effective.

I think that the decision that has been taken by the Court will be effective and, as you know, the Dirksen amendment failed in Congress, failed because those of us that are in positions of leadership felt this amendment went too far, was far too complicated, brought more troubles than it brought relief.

I have no reason to believe that there will be any successful effort in the next Congress.

Dr. WOOD. Would the—excuse me. Would the administration work against it? That is what I am interested in. If it does come up?

You were aided by time at the end of this last session. If it comes up early in the next legislative session of Congress, would you believe that the administration would try to block it?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think the administration would ask if there was a reasonable time for legislatures to make their reapportionment decisions. We surely would not work against or would not support a proposal to repudiate the decision of the Court.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Fariss.

Mr. FARISS. Senator Humphrey, do you think the events of the past few days, the shake up in the Kremlin and the testing of an atomic device by Red China, will overshadow now in these last 2 weeks of the campaign the moral issues that will have come up in the campaign?

Do you think that these events I mention now will be in the forefront and be the major talking points, major campaign issues, during these last 2 weeks?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Fariss, the most important development that is facing the American people is on the national scene and most people realize that.

I sense as I travel around the United States an issue of—certain issues on the national scene—the possibility of war, the hopes of peace.

In other words, the security-peace issue. And surely the developments in the Soviet Union are reason for considerable concern on the part of the American people and the development in China of nuclear power, explosion of a nuclear device, brings a whole new dimension to the aspect of our national security.

In other words, China, Communist China, is on the threshold of being a nuclear power.

I want to make it crystal clear they are not yet a nuclear power because a nuclear device is not a nuclear weapon and the means of delivery are still far off as far as the Chinese are concerned.

But the real basic issues that affect the life of this Nation are the issues of our diplomacy, our foreign policy, of national security, and developments in the Soviet Union with the change in leadership must be watched very, very carefully and surely the development of nuclear power in the form of a nuclear device that can lead to a nuclear weapon must really affect the whole thinking of this country and the plans of this great Nation of ours in terms of our national security.

So I guess my answer is those are the big issues.

Mr. FARISS. And you will be talking mostly about those, then, in the next 2 weeks.

Senator HUMPHREY. I have been concerning myself about these issues as long as I have been in Congress. I was one of those that early predicted the Chinese would have a nuclear device very shortly. I have been watching the developments in the Soviet Union for a long time, and may I say one of the developments in the Soviet Union just recently indicates to me that our policy has been successful.

Mr. FARISS. Well, do you think that there will be a healing of the wounds now between the Kremlin and Peiping now that Mr. Khrushchev has been turned out to pasture?

Senator HUMPHREY. Not a bit. I do not. I think the split between the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Russian Communists is an irrepairable split.

The difference in ideology is basic. Both of them aspire to be leaders in the Communist areas of the world.

The Chinese feel very superior to the Russians. Those of you that have studied the history of China and the Soviet Union or Russia must realize that—and do realize that the Chinese have always felt themselves to be a superior people. The Russians have always been fearful of the Chinese. There is a basic racial prejudice—and I want to underscore this—a basic racial prejudice in the Soviet Union over the Chinese.

So I think that the split there is deep, and I think it will widen.

In the meantime there is a major battle going on in the Communist camp as to which of the Communist Parties, the Russian Communist Party or the Chinese Communist Party, will have the allegiance of the states in Eastern Europe, of the other Communist Parties around the world, and I think this struggle will continue for many, many years.

In the meantime we have to develop in our country mature understanding of the Communist programs and of the Communist political maneuvers, and this requires study.

You can't do this by just thinking off the top of your head. It requires a development of specialists. It requires patience. It requires above all a degree of forebearance in the use of power and in any statements that we make.

Mr. MILLER. Dr. Tom Wood.

Dr. WOOD. Senator Humphrey, the Warren Report and the recent Jenkins' incident reveal that our security measures are somewhat short of perfection. What recommendations do you have to insure that the necessary information about security problems gets to the proper officials?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Dr. Wood, I sensed a long time ago that there were some difficulties in any security mechanism in a country as large as this.

In 1956 I introduced into the Congress a resolution to establish a Commission on National Security. That resolution was adopted. And it was effected, or effectuated.

The head of that Commission was Dr.—was Mr. Loyd Wright, the former president of the American Bar Association.

It examined the entire security mechanism of the Government of the United States.

I am happy to say that many improvements were made there.

Now, we do have about as good a security system as one could really contemplate. There may be room for some improvements but I want to say that every single country in the world, Dr. Wood, has had problems with their security system.

The Russians have lots of problems, and they have the most vicious type of police state. The West Germans that are considered to be very methodical have had serious security problems.

The British have had a number of them. The French have had a number of them. The Dutch, the Norwegians, the Swedes.

I think you remember that Sweden only recently had one of its top officials that was a security problem.

Security is always a difficult matter. I think we have developed about as fair and yet as effective a security system as any country. It ought constantly to be examined.

But I don't see any security problem, may I say, as yet out of the recent developments. I don't believe this poses a security problem.

I think it has posed a tragic—personal tragedy. That is the sadness of this whole thing.

Dr. WOOD. But the trouble seems to be, Senator, that we have some information that may or may not be noteworthy and it fails to pass from one desk to another, from one office to another, is more proper.

What can be done to insure that this kind of breakdown of communications does not continue?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I guess we have to learn from our experience, Dr. Wood. That is the way most people learn. But I want to repeat against there has been no information that there was any breakdown in the matter of security. I mean, there has been no violation of security.

What has happened is a personal tragedy, a sad tragedy about which most of us are, well, are really grieved and very sad because a man's life is involved and his wife and his family, and yet nothing that we know is affecting the national security.

Mr. MILLER. Now we are going to our audience for questions.

Please wait for recognition. Then stand and give your name and organization, if any. Please do not make long statements but, rather ask questions.

The gentleman in the third row.

Mr. BROWN. Burton Brown, Carol City Citizens Organization.

With regard to the Interama project, I would like to know what the estimates are from the Government as to the potential tax revenues as opposed to the outlay of the Government funds?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I examined or looked over the proposals for the Interama project and actually took a helicopter flight over the whole area and met with some of the proponents and the officers of that project.

I regret to tell you that I have forgotten the exact figures but I do know that what we call the cost-benefit ratio was very high. In other words, the benefits were several times higher than any costs.

And while I was only a Senator from Minnesota, I was keenly interested in the Interama project because I thought it meant real good things for Florida and for this part of America, and frankly that means a great deal to the whole policy of the United States to Latin America.

I think the political benefits in terms of our international diplomacy are significant. The economic benefits would be several times beyond any cost, and I hope that we will be able to complete it.

You have my support, I want you to know, and I have spoken to the President about it. And I am confident that in our coming budget we will be able to do something about it.

Mr. MILLER. About four rows back, the lady in the red dress.

Miss DERMOTTI. Senator Humphrey, sir, I would like to know why——

Mr. MILLER. What is your name, please?

Miss DERMOTTI. Margaret Dermotti.

I would like to know why the President is so afraid to have a debate with Senator Goldwater?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, my dear lady—you always get good questions from the ladies.

May I say first of all that I recall Senator Goldwater said—I believe it was back in February of last year—that a President of the United States should not debate.

Now, we remember the debates between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kennedy, but neither of them were President. The President of the United States has responsibilities that go far beyond the Cabinet.

Also, I might add that Mr. Goldwater has a few invitations to debate still outstanding, and I have said, and I want to repeat it, and I say it seriously, not facetiously, that if Mr. Goldwater will finish that debate he was supposed to have had with Mr. Rockefeller [laughter] and applause]—there was a second invitation to debate with Mr. Romney of Michigan, and the most important debate of all I think was with Mr. Scranton, but—these were all, I admit, three Republicans that wanted to debate Mr. Goldwater, but those invitations are still outstanding.

And then I might add that since Mr. Goldwater seems to spend a good deal of time telling people of the United States that my middle name is Horatio, how glad I am that I am prepared to take him on for a sort of exhibition bout. [Applause.]

Then after that we may match him with the champ. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman in the first row.

Mr. STEVENSON. Ed Stevenson, president of the Dade County Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO.

Yesterday, Senator, Senator Goldwater campaigning in Mansfield, Ohio, said this: He made reference to one man's thumb being on everything, and he said if this thumb is on collective bargaining, this will be the end of collective bargaining, compulsory arbitration, and this will give you—he implied, rather, that strikes by labor unions would be out of order entirely.

What are your views on this subject? Do you think this is correct?

Senator HUMPHREY. My goodness. You know, I never thought I would get a lesson or a lecture from Mr. Goldwater on free collective bargaining. I mean, this is incredible. It is sort of like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop.

We believe in free collective bargaining. We believe in responsible unionism, I want you to know. And we believe in legitimate trade unions.

Fortunately in our country we have responsible unionism, with very few, if any, exceptions, and we have legitimate trade unions.

The Government can never substitute for a free election of the parties. The Government can encourage the parties to get together.

We have the Conciliation Service. We have interested parties. Occasionally the President will call in the disputants, the management and the union. But we want these labor disputes, these labor-management disputes, these industrial disputes, settled in the process of collective bargaining, and President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are committed to a program of solid constructive trade unionism and free collective bargaining.

We are opposed to undue interference by this Government in collective bargaining.

We believe that these economic decisions should be made by the parties involved and we obviously will encourage settlement.

The American people want us to. We don't want to encourage fights. We have encouraged settlement in the auto industry. We have encouraged settlement in the steel industry. And frankly, both management and labor have done very well, and this Senator speaks for the President of the United States, and this administration wants to say that we are proud of the fine record of labor-management relations in this country, and management and labor both are entitled to a good deal of praise and credit for conducting themselves in a manner that is—in a responsible manner.

Mr. MILLER. The gentlemen in the fourth row on the end.

Mr. MOORE. A. D. Moore, Miami core.

Senator Humphrey, you knew Barry Goldwater 11 years in the Senate. Do you know of any one single piece of legislation attached to his name or introduced by him during this period? [Laughter and applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to be very frank with you. I don't always mean that a man is ineffective if he doesn't have legislation in his name.

I have been in the Senate 16 years, but I do not recall any legislation that bears the name of the Senator from Arizona, even though he was there when the Republican President was there and when there was, I believe, a Republican majority in the Senate.

He was been very busy campaigning for several years. [Laughter.] And that doesn't lend itself to getting legislation passed, I will tell you that.

The only way I know to be an effective Senator is to be there. Someone asked me what does it take to make a good effective Senator. "Well," I said, "it helps if you are intelligent; it helps if you know what you are doing, but the most important, best way to be effective is just to be there."

If you are not there being a Senator, you can't do much, and I think that the Senator from Arizona has been there about 45 percent of the time, absent about 65 percent of the time.

Now, you simply can't make much of a record in the Senate when you are there 45 percent of the time because the other Senators are pretty busy, I will tell you.

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry. I will have to interrupt. Our time is up. Our guest tonight has been Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat vice-presidential nominee.

We thank Senator Humphrey for coming to Miami and making this his first order of business on his Dade County campaign.

Miami, Fla.
"Miami Press Conference"
October 18, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, TV PROGRAM

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Senator Humphrey, in view of Red China's explosion of a nuclear weapon, how much longer can the United States oppose Red China's enry into the United Nations?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Senator Humphrey, how serious a political defect do you feel the Walter Jenkins' case will be to the Johnson-Humphrey campaign?

Mr. BAYER. Well, these are two very timely, very topical, and very typical questions that will be asked tonight by our professional news panel of the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice President of these United States, currently serving as Senator from the great State of Minnesota.

Senator Humphrey, we appreciation your appearing on "Miami Press Conference" this evening, and we will get the answers to these questions from John McDermott, Miami Herald, and Jack Kassewitz, of the Miami News after this reminder. [Commercial.]

Mr. BAYER. We are back to the questions to Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice President of these United States from John McDermott, of the Miami Herald, Jack Kassewitz, of the Miami News. John do you want to go back to your original question?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. All right.

Senator Humphrey, how serious a political hazard do you feel the Walter Jenkins' case will be to the Johnson-Humphrey campaign?

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe it is rather difficult to really measure that. My only observation is that it is a personal tragedy. It is a family tragedy. It makes all of us that have known Mr. Jenkins very sad and sorrowful.

I believe that Mrs. Johnson and President Johnson express the thoughts of millions of Americans in their messages of understanding and of sympathy and of concern.

I don't think one can measure the political consequences.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Have you been able to determine whether there was a breakdown in security either on the part of the FBI or on the part of the Secret Service in the Jenkins' case?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, sir. As you know, the President did ask the Federal Bureau of Investigation to check into this thing immediately. But I doubt that there has been. However, we will have to await the full report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Back in 1956 I introduced a resolution in the Senate which was subsequently adopted by both the Senate and the House to establish a National Commission on Security, examining into our whole security structure.

Senator Stennis, of Mississippi, joined me in this. The Commission was established and the former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Loyd Wright, of Los Angeles, was the Chairman of that Commission.

We think we made some rather substantial improvements in the security structure. But I want to be frank with you, sir. I do not believe that any country has a totally perfect security structure. We try to improve it.

But even the Soviet Union, with its police state, has leaks in security. Germany, Britain, France, others have had—Sweden.

As yet, however, we have had no indication of any breach of security in the United States in this matter.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Senator Humphrey, last night in Fort Lauderdale former Vice President Nixon said that he felt that President Johnson should, when he speaks on nationwide television tonight, include also a background disclosure of what he knows about both the Jenkins' case and the Bobby Baker case. Do you feel that these cases should be part of the political campaign?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, sir, I would have expected Mr. Nixon to say that. This is within the pattern of his public conduct.

The respective cases that you have referred to are being carefully examined. Mr. Baker is under scrutiny and investigation by the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Senate. I imagine he is even being scrutinized by Mr. Nixon if that is any help to anybody.

And the Jenkins' matter is now under the investigation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And I hope I won't seem to be too unkind or partisan if I say that I would rather rely on J. Edgar Hoover than Richard Nixon.

Mr. BAYER. All right. Jack?

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Senator Humphrey, changing the subject, just for a moment, with the President speaking on television tonight, Red China having exploded a nuclear weapon this week and Mr. Khrushchev having been deposed, you made a statement in Tampa today that you expect the Soviet Union to make—take some action that could be considered provocative.

Now, is the President going to discuss some new phase in the world crisis that has not yet been disclosed to this Nation?

Senator HUMPHREY. What I tried to say—and, of course, this is always the danger of a sentence being taken from a larger statement, or possibly it is the danger of a man making any comments at all—I have tried to be a student of Soviet developments because I happen to believe that our relationships with the Soviet Union, now and in the years to come, are of crucial importance.

Too many people speak about the Soviet Union without knowing anything about its geography, its history, its background, its tradition, or the history of the Communist Party or the changes in the Communist Party.

There is new leadership now in the Soviet Union, and new leadership in a dictatorship generally starts to make a few—generally has a few new starts, so to speak.

I mean, they make statements that indicate that they are cleansing themselves of the past and being a little more tough relating to the potential enemies.

What I was trying to say is that you could expect, possibly for some weeks ahead statements that were irritating, actions that were of concern to us, but I said I did not expect the Soviet leaders to do anything that would trigger a major war or struggle or any hostilities.

I just happen to feel that these Soviet leaders, as they are now attacking Mr. Khrushchev, will most likely have some unkind words to say about the United States, and what we ought to do is just take this in stride.

It is the Soviet Union, Mr. Kassewitz, that is in trouble. It is the Soviet leadership that is in trouble. It is the Communist Party that is in trouble.

We are not in serious trouble. We are stronger than we have ever been. We are richer than we have ever been. Our policies are succeeding, their policies are failing.

Mr. BAYER. Senator, wouldn't this be a good time perhaps to try to encourage the Cuban exiles to take guns and go back and get their homeland back from Mr. Castro and his Red cohorts?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I may be too conservative for some peole. I don't believe that that type of radical adventure is the kind we ought to even consider.

I happen to believe that our policies relating to Cuba are very—are succeeding. The Organization of American States has taken unprecedented action of asking all of the nations of the Western Hemisphere to break diplomatic relations and economic relations with Cuba, and all but one have done so. This is historic.

Mr. Castro is in trouble. His benefactor, his sponsor, is out of power in the Soviet Union. The Russians are having plenty of trouble, and a million dollars a day for Cuba may be a little bit more of an expanse than they want to pay for that fellow Mr. Castro.

I think if we pursue the course we have been pursing of patience, perseverance, economic and diplomatic, upon Mr. Castro's regime, that within Cuba itself there will be an uprising, and I think that uprising will take place and that the Cuban people will be freed and they will be freed by the people within Cuba themselves.

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Senator, let me go back to this Red China for a couple of more moments. You have consistently opposed the entry of Red China into the United Nations as has been the policy of the U.S. Government.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Secretary Rusk said today that any treaty banning nuclear tests now may have to include Communist China.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Is this going to mean, in your opinion, that we are going to have a complete review of the China policy, and will we, perhaps, finally allow Red China to be admitted to the United Nations?

Senator HUMPHREY. It should be very clear to the American people that a treaty with Red China does not necessarily require diplomatic recognition.

Furthermore, it dos not require their entrance into the United Nations or their acceptance into the United Nations.

We already have been in discussion with China in Warsaw for many months, in fact, years, starting back in the Eisenhower administration. Those discussions have related to Korea; they haave related to Vietnam. They have related to all the areas of southeast Asia.

I hope that we will be able to—the pressure of the world community to bring Red China as a signatory to the nuclear test ban treaty—and I hope that our ally, France, will sign that treaty so that we can set a pattern here and break through, because these are the only two countries to date that have any nuclear capability that are not members of the—not participants in the nuclear test ban treaty.

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Suppose you put—they would put a condition of signing the treaty on the provision they get admitted to the United Nations. Would you go along with that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think those are matters thta would have to be reviewed more carefully than 2 minutes of a discussion on a television show, sir.

I think we have to be very, very responsible and careful in our foreign policy, and I don't believe that you can judge the matters quickly. We have to weigh off all of these things.

As I see it now, I would say that you cannot really ask, permit Red China to come into the United Nations because she has been an aggressive power, and she has been a very difficult nation in terms of our relationships to southeast Asia.

Mr. MCDERMONT. Senator, how did you feel that you could get the other nations of the world to bring the pressure which you had mention onto Red China to get them to sign the nuclear test ban?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, very frankly most of the nations of the world are very concerned over nuclear testing, and that is why over 100 nations have signed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Most of the nations of the world are worried about China's aggressive attitudes, and I would imagine that the best thing that we could do through the diplomatic channels that we have, we and the Russians and the British and the others, is to seek to have the foreign offices of these respective 100 countries to urge upon the Chinese government that they become a participant to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, a signatory to the treaty.

Now, whether that will be successful or not, sir, I can't predict. I would say, offhand, it would look like it wouldn't be, but a mobilization of world opinion is still a powerful factor in international relations. And I believe that the best thing that happened in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was the fact that 100 nations came to a common point of agreement as to the dangers involved in further nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Senator, at Fort Lauderdale last night your old friend, former Vice President, Mr. Nixon, said that he wanted, in all fairness to you, to say that Hubert is a loyal American, that he is for peace, that he is a sincere man, and that he is a dedicated radical.

Now, my thought was on this, Do you consider yourself to be a radical in politics?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, let me say that Mr. Nixon had a pretty good batting average there. He was right about three-fourths of the time. They fired Yogi Berra for much less than that, you know. [Laughter.]

I consider myself according to the description of Mr. Nixon to be a patriot and to be a loyal American, to be sincere, and I believe he said honest. I would like to feel that I am that.

As to the other part, he must have become a little confused because Mr. Goldwater is the radical. Mr. Goldwater is the man that has repudiated bipartisan foreign policy.

He is the man that has left the Republican Party. On 25 issues in the Republican platform of 1960 Mr. Goldwater voted against his platform 25 times.

He is the man that seems to have been out of the mainstream of American political life according to Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania. And any man that is so far out that he can't agree on foreign policy and domestic policy and can't agree with his own party, I would have to say is a radical.

Now, as far as Senator Humphrey is concerned, I am a Democrat. I agree with President Johnson. I believe in the free enterprise system. I support the bipartisan foreign policy.

I consider myself to be what Sam Rayburn once said, "a Democrat without prefix or suffix and without apology." And I hope a good citizen.

Mr. BAYER. Gentlemen, let's pause just a moment. Time out for this reminder, please. [Commercial.]

Mr. BAYER. We are back with the questions to the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice President of these United States, and the question is from Jack Kassewitz, Miami News. Jack, you were——

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Yes. I am going to say Senator Goldwater has charged that President Johnson and yourself and the administration are soft on communism. Do you have an answer to that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I remember when Mr. Goldwater made that charge, and I recall that he said that he had been advised to do that by Mr. Nixon.

I am sorry that he accepted that advice because that led Mr. Nixon to political oblivion.

Then he said also that he hadn't repeated it for a couple of days and somebody asked him, "Well, why don't you use that charge again, Mr. Goldwater?" He said, "I thought I would just wait and see what the reaction is."

Now, that seems rather cynical.

I would say this about President Johnson. Any man that has known the President knows that this is a patriot second to none. His work in the Congress as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, as majority leader, as Vice President—my goodness, I don't know anybody in the world in their right mind that would talk about President Johnson being soft on communism.

Now, he is a little soft on Republicans once in a while, but I kind of think that is all right. They are good Americans, and I think he ought to be. And some folks have even criticized him a little bit about that, but that is the only softness that I detected in the President.

Mr. KASSEWITZ. One more Republican charge that was made in this show, as it has been made elsewhere, Congressman Miller, your Vice-Presidential rival, said that this administration has a "no win" policy in Vietnam and says that the Republicans will have a "win" policy. What is the U.S. policy in Vietnam?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, sir, it is the policy that was established in 1954 under Dwight Eisenhower, reiterated in 1957, again in 1959, and again in 1960, and 1961.

I select these dates because in each of those years there were new developments in Vietnam where the United States at the request of the South Vietnamese Government came in to be of some help to that Government to preserve its territorial integrity and its independence.

Now, the gentleman from New York knows better than that but he needs to say something.

Mr. Lodge was our Ambassador there. And Mr. Lodge, I think, has made it quite clear to the American people that the policy that we pursue in Vietnam is not a Democratic policy. It is not a Republican policy. It is an American policy. And that policy is under constant review.

What we are trying to do is to see to it that South Vietnam remains independent and free without the involvement of the United States in a major war in southeast Asia.

Now, if Mr. Miller means that this "win" policy that he is talking about is to plunge this Nation into war with Red China, then let him explain that to the American people.

The President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, and Hubert Humphrey do not want to plunge this Nation into a major war with Red China or with anybody else. The task of statesmanship today is to preserve the peace and to secure the independence and freedom of peoples. And if we have the patience and the perserverance, sir, and I think we have as a people and a Nation, we will win with this policy.

There is no instant victory. There is only instant annihilation. And we are not for annihilation. We are for life. And we are for a program dedicated to peace and as President Johnson—as the late beloved President Kennedy said, "Peace is a process."

It isn't instantaneous. Peace requires great sacrifice, and it requires courage, and it requires great responsibility. And all these glib phrases about instant victory and no win and all that, doesn't represent statesmanship.

Mr. McDermott. Senator Humphrey, some of the real conservatives in Florida and other parts of the South talk about you as though you were a man with horns.

Could you explain what your political philosophy is and also include your connection with the ADA because that is very much a campaign issue down in these parts?

Senator Humphrey. Well, you know, I answered a question today about this, and I even indicated that in Minnesota I have had sometimes a little trouble in the southern counties of our State, but I get elected with about a 200,000 majority.

My political philosophy is one that this Government is designed to serve the people. It is not designed to dominate the people. It is designed to remove impediments to progress, to open pathways of opportunities. It is also a government that should care and have compassion. This is a government of the people and by the people and for the people.

I have never felt that compassion was weakness. And I have never felt that concern for the unfortunate was socialism. I think it is really very good Americanism.

There is a great history in this country of concern for people. I believe strongly in the free enterprise system. I am an advocate of it. I am a part of it. My family is a part of it.

I voted for the tax reduction bill to help free enterprise, for the investment tax credit to help free enterprise, for the Small Business Administration to help free enterprise. I have never believed that an organized, planned socialistic structure had any place in the American scene. I believe very strongly in the rights of people.

I guess my main trouble has been in the South that I have taken a strong position in reference to constitutional guarantees for all of our citizens. But you know what I find? I find that most people in America respect you if you have principle and while many people may not agree with you because of your point of view, they will respect you.

Might I say that my position, for example, on the issue of equal rights for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed, is one that has been traditional in the history of this country from Jefferson to Lincoln to Wilson to Roosevelt to Eisenhower to Kennedy. This is not unusual.

Now, we are making great social changes now, and it is difficult. I am sympathetic with people who have a time adjusting to this. But Hubert Humphrey's position in Minnesota is the same as it is in Florida, and it is the same in Texas as it is in New York. I don't have one pamphlet for the District of Columbia and another one for Georgia.

And I regret to say that the gentleman of the opposition has a pamphlet in the District of Columbia that says "Barry Goldwater, the Champion of Civil Rights." And then whistles "Dixie" when he gets below the Mason-Dixon line.

I am of the opinion that he is about as good for Dixie as Sherman was. [Laughter.]

I think these southerners are going to find that out. I can't recall yet what the Republican Party has ever done for the South. I can recall what they have done to it, but I don't know of any time they have been helpful, and I will put my record up as a friend of the South against the current Republican leadership.

Mr. BAYER. Senator, one thing that might be a little closer to home and some people might be interested in it is the space race, and, of course, Cape Kennedy is right in our backyard.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAYER. If the Johnson-Humphrey team wins, will you have some thoughts about speeding up our efforts to get up with our friends across the way?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir. President Johnson when he was in the Senate was the chief motivator and mover on the space program as you know. He was the chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Commission—Committee.

When he became Vice President under law he is the chairman of the board, so to speak, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. If I am elected Vice President, and President Johnson is elected President—that comes with it—I will be the chairman of that board.

I have vigorously supported the expansion of our space activities in the Committee on Appropriations and as the floor leader in the U.S. Senate, and may I say to the good people of Florida that they will have our unqualified support and development of this great program, not just for Florida but for America, because truly the frontiers are in the areas of outer space.

We must pioneer in this area. We must pioneer for our military security. We must pioneer in space for peaceful purposes.

And you can rest assured, sir, that this administration, the Johnson-Humphrey administration, will place priority, chief, main emphasis upon the expansion of our space and aeronautics activities.

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Senator, two questions in one, I hope. Will the Democrats carry Florida, and how many States in the South do you think you are going to lose because of your civil rights position?

Senator HUMPHREY. We surely expect to carry Florida because the——

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Well, they haven't done it the last three times.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, of course, but everybody is entitled to a few mistakes. It is time to redeem yourself, and we expect that this State will go for the Democratic team.

President Johnson is a southerner. I can't imagine the southerners turning their backs on the first President from the South in a hundred years.

We broke through the religious barrier in 1960 so that a man no longer is denied the opportunity to be President because of his religion. Now we have broken through the sectional barrier, the regional barrier, and I have a feeling that before this election campaign is through, the southerners will be the most vigorous supporters of President Johnson.

Whoever is President of the United States, sir, must enforce the civil rights law.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. But you have only 2 weeks, Senator. So what States would you consider are either lost or where you are trailing now?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I am such a positive thinker it is difficult for me to think of those.

Mr. KASSEWITZ. Mississippi for one.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would say there may be two States right now that look difficult, that would not be in the Democratic column, and they might not like me to say that. But Alabama—we do not have electors on the ballot, and Mississippi.

There may be some difficulty. Some people say in Louisiana, but I think we will carry Louisiana.

I feel that the South will again be a strong force for Democratic victory. Georgia has never voted Republican in a hundred years and neither has Arkansas. I have been in both States. They are going to go Democratic. And may I add that Minnesota will be right at the top of the list.

Mr. McDermott. What about Arizona?

Senator Humphrey. We expect to carry Arizona.

Mr. Kassewitz. South Carolina.

Senator Humphrey. Oh, of course.

Mr. Kassewitz. Senator Strom Thurmond's home State?

Senator Humphrey. Well, and also Governor Don Russell's and not only that—when the people of South Carolina find out what the Senator from Arizona has not done for them—they have to eat, too, you know. And they raise cotton. And they have industry. And the Senator from South Carolina—the Senator from Arizona is not going to get by with this double play of talking as if he is a great States righter south of the Mason-Dixon line and then going to Hershey, Pa., and meeting with Dwight Eisenhower and saying "Look, I am all for your program, General."

You have to come—you really have to take a stand, and the people of the South respect, I think, integrity. I think they respect intellectual integrity, and they know that the Federal Government has been more helpful to this area than almost any area in the United States, and it should be so.

The South is the new South. This is a whole new chapter in American life. And I think that the greatest development in America will come in the South, and if that is the case, they are going to need progressive leadership and prudent leadership.

We are going to offer it to them.

Mr. Bayer. Senator, you obviously are confident that you are going to win without any question. Then who would you say is going to emerge some 38 or 39 months away? You have always been a great "looker-aheader." That has been your record. Who do you look ahead and see as being the people in the Republican Party that you will be looking to, say about 39 or 40 months from now?

Senator Humphrey. Well, sir, it is my sincere view that the Goldwater crowd has more or less usurped control of the Republican Party. They did it through legal instruments. I don't want that to be misunderstood. They out-organized the rest of the Republicans.

But the Rockefeller Republicans and the Scranton Republicans and the Romney Republicans and the Dewey Republicans, and the Eisenhower Republicans, and others, they are not going to let this go by the boards.

What do you think Mr. Nixon is campaigning for? Mr. Goldwater? He is campaigning for Mr. Nixon. And so is Mr. Scranton. They are out just working the precincts left and rigl.t, and I bet you every time you find their coat pockets they have 40 names inside of new people they have just contacted.

They are planning on after the debacle, after the complete defeat of the Goldwater campaign, they are planning on coming back and trying to put the party together, and I hope they do.

Let me be very frank with you. I think America needs a responsible two-party system. I don't think America needs radicalism in the Democratic Party or the Republican Party.

There was once a time that there was some radical penetration tried in the Democratic Party. It was rebuked. It went off to the Progressive Party in 1946.

Now you have the radicalism of the extreme right penetrating the Republican Party. That must be rebuked.

We don't need the radicalism of the left and we don't need the radicalism of the right, and I do hope that some of these good responsible Republicans will reclaim their party.

I think they will. And it will be a real honest political contest the next election around.

Mr. Kassewitz. Are you going to accept any of these Democrats back into the party, those who have defected and announced their support of Mr. Goldwater?

Senator Humphrey. Oh, I have always believed in repentance if it is sincere, but I want to be sure they are sincere.

Mr. BAYER. Senator, when will you be able to know whether or not all your plans are canceled for tomorrow? Many of the people watching us tonight would like to know, do you know here now?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would presume I will have to go to Washington tomorrow, but I will know definitely tonight about 10 o'clock.

Mr. BAYER. Thank you.

I want to thank Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice President of these United States. This has been the only legitimate press panel program to invite him in Florida, and we appreciate your appearance. For Jack Kassewitz, of the Miami News, and John McDermott, of the Miami Herald, this is Bill Bayer saying good night and to you, sir, good luck.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, sir.

"OPINION IN THE CAPITAL" VIDEOTAPED IN ADVANCE FOR TELECAST OCTOBER 18, 1964

Guest: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey.

Questioned by:

Mark Evans, vice president for public affairs, Metromedia, Inc.

Marshall McNeil, Capitol Hill reporter, Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Mr. EVANS. This is Mark Evans welcoming you to another series of "Opinion in the Capitol," spotlighting the candidates and the issues of election year 1964.

The events leading up to the nomination of Senator Hubert Humphrey for Vice President of the United States had all the elements of a political whodunit. After 2 days of routine procedure, the Democratic Convention in Atlantic City came alive with drama, color, and excitement when the President of the United States presented to the delegates his choice for running mate.

Well, this element of drama and excitement has characterized the career of Hubert Humphrey from the time he exploded on the national scene as the zealous young champion of civil rights at the 1948 Democratic Convention, through his career as reform mayor of Minneapolis and in his 8 years from freshman Senator to skilled majority whip.

The contrast between his underdog fight for the presidential nomination in 1960 to his current efforts to win the Vice-Presidency of the United States has captured the imagination of the public and press alike.

Opinion in the Capital is fortunate to have been able to catch up with this whirlwind campaigner long enough to videotape this program in our Washington studio.

With me, along with Senator Humphrey, is the respected Marshall McNeil, Capitol Hill reporter, Scripps-Howard newspapers. In a minute, Marshall, I will ask you to fire the first question.

In the many years you have been in Washington facing the Senator, I am sure this isn't the first time you ever questioned him.

Mr. MCNEIL. Before we get serious, there is something I want to know about you. They don't call you Gabby in the gallery for nothing. How can a fellow who likes to talk as much as you do, Senator, how can you look forward to a role as Vice President when all you have got is silence?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, I wouldn't say it will be that way. I'll be able to talk to you, Marshall, and Mark. I'll have a chance to visit with my friends, and there are always some outlets, you know, for a man's energies. So you just bear with me. You maybe will have to suffer a little bit more than usual——

Mr. MCNEIL. I've been suffering.

Senator HUMPHREY. Through private contact this time.

Mr. EVANS. Will it be a difficult role, Senator, to assume a job that doesn't have the initiative with it that the Senator does?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I don't think so. Of course, it will be different. But it was very different to come from being a mayor of a city the size of Minneapolis to a freshman Senator.

I think many a Member of Congress that are Governors, for example, find it very difficult to make the adjustment the first year or so. I found that in my talks with some of my colleagues in the Senate.

But I have always liked, always enjoyed sitting down and consulting, advising, and discussing matters, and I know that with President Johnson I will have the opportunity to visit with him a great deal. We've always done so in the past; I imagine we will do so more in the future, and I will be a little closer to where the decisions are being made, at least at the executive level, and there are responsibilities for a Vice President, too. You are the head of the space program, you serve on the National Security Council, the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Employment. I think we will be busy. Knowing President Johnson I have a feeling I will be very busy, gentlemen.

Mr. McNeil. How do you look forward to your role as the Presiding Officer and your connection with the majority in the Senate?

Senator Humphrey. Well, as a presiding officer, of course, you must be a presiding officer with objectivity and with fairness and apply the Senate rules.

Mr. McNeil. But as the link between the White House and the Senate majority what is going to be your chore?

Senator Humphrey. Well, that will be something, Marshall, that we'll work out with the President, but as I would imagine in light of the President's activities on the legislative front, he will want me as Vice President to work closely with Senate leadership. He will want his Vice President to work with some of the prominent and more—well, let's say the senior Members of the Senate who have responsibility for legislation.

Mr. McNeil. Once you are on that dais, you are out of the club.

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir. That I know, and I think everybody that has ever come from the Senate to become Vice President soon finds that out as did President Johnson.

Mr. Evans. Senator, President Johnson has I think, to nobody's denial, changed his attitude on such things as civil rights and States rights since he became the President of the United States in contrast to being a southern Senator. As Vice President—as vice-presidential candidate have you changed? Are you perceptibly in your own mind changing your attitude on any particular thing?

Senator Humphrey. No. I don't think so. Maybe one of my weaknesses in the past was that I took a rather broad national attitude on a number of items such as civil rights questions and our foreign policy matters. I have occasionally taken a position on an item of legislation that did not have active support in my home State, but this is just the way a man is made up.

Now, I suppose there will be changes that one will make as the policy of an administration is designed. I have said, for example, that whatever this administration's policy is on fiscal matters or on taxation, that will be the policy that Hubert Humphrey will support.

Now, I will make my point of view clear in the privacy of our own discussions in the executive branch, but once that decision is made by the President, then it is my duty to be with him.

I remember once that Vice President—that when President Johnson was Vice President, he said if he were the only one that he would remain loyal to President John Kennedy, and I believe that it is the duty of a Vice President to be the loyal partner and ally and confidant of the President of the United States. I don't think he ought to be running around expressing views that are contrary to administration policy.

Mr. Evans. Well, you once made a comment, and at least correct me if I misquote you because I know how some of these things can be taken out of context. You had said one time that you felt that the atomic power, the atomic arsenal, should be turned over to the United Nations.

Now, last Saturday in South Bend you were quoted as saying the first and foremost task in pursuit of peace is to control nuclear weapons. Do you reconcile those two?

Senator Humphrey. Yes, very much so. The item that you referred to was a statement made at the time that we were advancing the Baruch plan which was the policy of this Government which was to try to internationalize atomic power. You may recall that the Soviet

Union resisted that very definitely but the administration of Harry S. Truman and the work of Bernard Baruch in the United Nations was to take this massive—this massive power called atomic power, and internationalize it, put it under international control. We were thinking of that primarily in terms of preventing other powers from gaining atomic weapons and at the same time being willing to make some sacrifice of our own monopoly of atomic power.

So my position that has been quoted now in 1964 was at a period of time of 1949 and 1950 when the whole subject of atomic energy was still a matter for international consideration.

Then in 1952 when the Soviet exploded their first nuclear weapon, then we knew why they had resisted the Baruch plan and why there was no opportunity at all for international control at that time over atomic weapons.

I now feel that the whole matter of nuclear power is at the center of foreign policy. It's the center of security policy because to put it bluntly, mankind has arrived at a point where he can destroy all of creation. He has it within his hands now, particularly if there is a proliferation of these weapons, without any responsible control over them, to just completely annihilate humanity. Now, with that situation facing us, war takes on a different color. War takes on different meaning, and therefore I do believe that the emphasis that has been placed upon responsible control over atomic and nuclear power is very appropriate, and we ought to be pursuing relentlessly ways and means of trying to better control this nuclear power to prevent proliferation of weapons and if we possible could, to prevent any further expansion of nuclear weaponry.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you.

Mr. MCNEIL. Without making a campaign speech, sir, what is the big issue, what is the issue as you see it after going all over this country that is going to make you the most votes?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think the issue that the people are most concerned about, Marshall, is the whole subject matter of our foreign policy and national security, and to put it in the personal manner, personal words, which of these two men, Senator Goldwater or President Johnson, can you trust? Which has the experience, the background, the temperament, the attitude, that you believe is necessary or required to be President of the United States?

Mr. MCNEIL. Is this the big issue or is this also the issue that is going to influence the most votes?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it is both.

Mr. MCNEIL. Both.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it is both. Actually in all candor, when we discuss the economic issues today, while it has some importance in certain areas, the truth is that most people are becoming quite accustomed to prosperity. The people that are most interested about the economic issue are those few here and there, those pockets or areas in which there hasn't been a general sharing of the economic blessings. So what are people concerned about? What has really happened in American politics? The concern over our very survival. People know that they are living in a dangerous world. People without being intimately acquainted with the facts of nuclear power or even world power; they know that this is a different world. They are a little bit smarter sometimes by their intuition than some of us are by our prepared statements, and they want to know that the man who is President of the United States, that has such tremendous authority under our system of government and under the world conditions that we face, that this man is responsible—I think that word is terribly important—that he is responsible, that he is calm, that he is deliberate, that he knows how to make a decision, that he recognizes the importance of power and the restraint of its use. I think this is what selfish to be quite blunt about it.

Mr. MCNEIL. Since you're the fellow who—we hope not—would be President within one heartbeat, are you responsible enough to handle this weapon? Have you got the restraint you were just speaking of?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Marshall, if I didn't think that I could measure up to that, I wouldn't want to be on this ticket. I don't think a man has a right to play with the destiny of his country. I'm not that selfish to be quite blunt about it.

A man never knows what really will develop under terrific tension and crisis. But I've faced a few moments of crisis in my life——

Mr. EVANS. Didn't Senator Mansfield——

Senator HUMPHREY (continuing). And I hope I've stood up fairly well.

Mr. EVANS. Didn't Senator Mansfield in a sense refute the statement that he thought Barry Goldwater to be slaphappy with the trigger?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think that any man that becomes President of the United States becomes a more responsible individual. I don't think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. EVANS. Does this include Barry Goldwater?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I think that is true. But I must say that the only way that one has an opportunity to judge a person is by his deeds, by his words, and by his actions, and this is particularly true of those of us in public life, and in public life I must say that Senator Goldwater's words and deeds and actions have been very disturbing to me. He is a little bit too impetuous and has a tendency to look upon power as an end in itself rather than a means to an end.

Mr. EVANS. Can we pause for just a moment here, Marshall.

Our guest on "Opinion in the Capital" is Senator Hubert Humphrey, candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States. My fellow reporter is Marshall McNeil, of Scrips-Howard papers. We will return momentarily. [Commercial.]

Our guest is Senator Hubert Humphrey, candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States on the Democratic ticket. Marshall McNeil, of Scripps-Howard, is my fellow reporter.

Senator, I have heard you say here in Washington, and that is the only thing we can judge by, is that you really want to get at the issues in this campaign, and yet when we read from the hustings where you're out pounding the pavements and shaking hands, that names, vituperative names and things come back. Are you satisfied with the press coverage? Are we getting the full story of what you're telling the people?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I certainly don't wage any struggle with the press. They are very good to Hubert Humphrey, and I mean that very sincerely. I have been treated, I think, maybe better at times than I should be.

But when you discuss a basic issue in a campaign like this, it's apt to get lost unless you get at an issue like the nuclear issue or the major issue of innovation on foreign policy. I was saying to some of my friends that—and to you, Mark—that we have tried to discuss the issue, like, for example, the concept of the Presidency. I think the American people need to know what was meant by this office of President. What kind of President do we want? Not as an individual, as such, but what is the makeup of the office? What did the Founding Fathers have in mind? Why do we have the Constitution that we have? What is this struggle for peace that John Kennedy talked about when he said that peace is a process? What do we mean by that? That is a phrase, and I think we need to discuss it.

What is a conservative? What is the conservative tradition in American life?

These issues I believe maybe come through a little bit, and they ought to, because it adds tone to a campaign. One of the great needs in any election is to remember that it is an education process as well as just an exercise in exhilaration. What I worry about is that we excite people rather than inspire them, and we exhilarate them rather than educate them. I believe that we ought to do a little educating.

Mr. MCNEIL. Well, we hope you will make some news, too. These fine esoteric subjects are good, too, but we're putting out newspapers.

Senator HUMPHREY. Marshall, I knew you would come through on that. And let me tell you there is no one better to know a good news story.

Mr. MCNEIL. Now, as you go around the country—well, first, Sam Lubell has had a poll in our Scripps-Howard newspapers about the image of Johnson as a wheeler-dealer. Does this come through as you campaign? Is his image—is this his image in many a place?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, the opposition would like to make it his image, but I'll tell you what I find to be his image. I go to a number of towns and have, of course, before this campaign. I think you really find out more about a man before you get into this political fisticuffs that we go through, this battling, and the image that I found of our President was that he is a man that gets things done, and the American people admire someone like that. They feel that he knows government, and people today understand that government is a complex operation. They feel that he is very sincere. They feel, of course, that he insists upon action.

Now, there are those that would like to have you believe that all of this is just wheeling and dealing but let me put it quite frankly to you. Politics is the art of the possible. It is not possible to get everything that you want, and, therefore, a degree of compromise without the sacrifice of principle is absolutely essential. The President taught me that. I had to learn that lesson in the Senate of the United States. I don't know why I had to learn it here because I was mayor of Minneapolis, and when I was the mayor I recognized you couldn't get everything that you wanted. But we have a tendency to become so interested in our own point of view that we forget that there may be another, and what President Johnson did and what I believe is his image is that he is a man of understanding, he knows government, he is a man of action, he is a man of responsibility, and he is a man of maturity. And people sense that. So I think the so-called wheeler-dealer propaganda job that is being carried on against our President isn't taking hold.

I think in the long run you will find that people feel they can trust President Johnson, and I think the most important factor in public life is whether or not you can trust him.

My dad told me once that smart people are 10 cents a dozen, but you grind them out of colleges and universities by the thousands, but a man of conscience, a man of integrity, a man of trust, is a priceless possession and a priceless asset. I think people supported General Eisenhower because they trusted him, and I believe they support President Johnson because they trust him.

Mr. EVANS. Senator, don't you think part of this amazement on the part of the American people—and I sit in humble admiration of you because I remember the blood that was pouring from your wounds in West Virginia. You had sacrificed, as the story is told, even money for your daughter's wedding. You were right down to the nub, and I don't suppose any politician ever got lower mentally and physically and spiritually than you were in the aftermath of West Virginia. And the team that had done the carving on you, part of which is now running for office. Now, can you really put your heart and soul into endorsing a man like that who was your bitterest enemy not more than 4 years ago? Now, the American people have seen this and they know what you have pulled yourself up from and have difficulty in seeing how you can really be converted to go for him now.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, let me just say this. I read in the past 2 months the speeches that John Kennedy gave in Wisconsin and West Virginia. I read my own speeches.

Mr. EVANS. I am not referring to John Kennedy.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am coming to that.

Mr. EVANS. Excuse me.

Senator HUMPHREY. And we didn't disagree on issues at all. As a matter of fact, one of my real problems was that I didn't have a real issue with him. He was a very attractive man, more attractive than Hubert Humphrey.

Mr. MCNEIL. You didn't have enough money, either.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, that was surely a—that was a very important factor, but I think that in the main he was better organized, he started earlier, he had a better operation, and his brother, Robert, was the campaign director, and he was out to win and they were pretty rough on me. There isn't any doubt about that. But I learned a long time ago that if you keep book on everybody that stepped on your toes, that you will have a book that would be bigger than the biggest library in the country, and one of the first lessons of political life is to try to remember not all the evils of the yesterdays but of the hopes of tomorrow. To look ahead and to try to forgive and forget some of the things that have happened.

Now, if I disagreed openly with a man on a public issue, I would say that on the basis of that I would have a difficult time coming to his support, but that he roughed me up a little bit, that is something you sort of have to expect in politics.

So I don't like it, don't misunderstand me. There are a lot of things that you don't like, but you get to expect them.

Mr. McNeil. I guess you love the pollsters, don't you?

Senator Humphrey. When they're working—when I read good news, yes.

Mr. McNeil. Do you believe them?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I think it would be wrong to downgrade what the pollsters attempt to do. The pollsters never tell you that their polls are definitive. They tell you that these are guidelines, these are trends, these are measurements of public opinion. And you never can really measure the intensity of public opinion either. You can measure the volume of it. I have seen some polls at times that were very pleasant, very optimistic for me when I was a candidate, and I liked them very much. I have also found a few polls that were against me, and it helped me because it aroused my supporters.

I think the greatest danger that the Democratic Party faces today and that President Johnson faces is that everybody thinks we are going to win and that the polls look good and people——

Mr. McNeil. So they won't vote.

Senator Humphrey. And so the organization doesn't work as hard as it should, and some people say it won't make too much difference if I go to see my grandmother or if I go fishing or if I go to see the neighbors and don't vote, but I want to tell you right now it is going to make a difference.

I come from Minnesota. We cast a million three hundred thousand votes in the last gubernatorial election, and it was settled by a majority of 91.

I know the importance of one vote.

Mr. McNeil. Well, your running mate knows the importance of 87 votes, too, remember?

Senator Humphrey. Well, you see, with that kind of background and rather cruel experience, we want to encourage everyone to exercise that priceless right of the American citizen to vote.

Mr. McNeil. Mark, as a guy who covers the Senate, I have got a question for this fellow.

Mr. Evans. I would be disappointed if you didn't.

Mr. McNeil. If you're Vice President in January and you're asked for a ruling by those who want to change the antifilibuster rule, are you going to say that the Senate is or is not a continuing body?

Senator Humphrey. I will discuss that matter when I have the opportunity to serve as Vice President. And I'll give it a good honest appraisal, Marshall, and I think I will come up with an answer that will make some news for you.

Mr. McNeil. I'll need it.

Mr. Evans. Senator, one of the areas of your interest has been the Americans for Democratic Action. It seems that you have had problems in defending them. I am not sure whether you think it is a defensive problem or not, but let me quote something that you had said one time regarding them. "So far"—this is evidently from the Congressional Record of June 20—"so far as ADA is concerned, I am one of its officers. I think it is no secret that on occasion this great organization has seen fit to chastise me and perhaps properly so. Perhaps I did not understand why at the moment, but their judgment was undoubtedly better than mine."

Do you live with that?

Senator Humphrey. Well, that's being a very kind fellow. There are differences between Hubert Humphrey and ADA on some issues, and on some issues I think they're wrong, on others I think possibly they've had reason to be somewhat critical of me.

I am a man in public life. I don't claim to have been perfect, and I surely don't run on the "sainthood" ticket. I have my limitations——

Mr. Evans. But do you think their judgment is better than yours?

Senator Humphrey. On some matters it might be, but on some others I think mine is much better. I would only say this for ADA: that it is a small organization and my goodness, it's getting a lot of free publicity. If the opposition doesn't stop talking about it, they

are going to be a bigger organization than the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party.

Mr. EVANS. They are big in the Democratic administration; aren't they fairly large in numbers of people involved——

Senator HUMPHREY. I think they've got about 20,000 people out of 190 million across the United States as members——

Mr. EVANS. But how many representatives in the official family are their members?

Senator HUMPHREY. Several of the members, yes. But this organization has had a splendid record of democracy, civil liberties, field of civil rights, supports the Marshall plan, NATO, vigorously anti-Communist. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that I affiliated with ADA was that it gave us an opportunity to clean up a very bad left-wing political situation in our State, and we did it, and ADA ought to be praised for leading the forces of decency rather than being chastised.

Mr. EVANS. We regret very much that Mrs. Humphrey wasn't able to be with us as we had planned but give her our best regards.

Senator HUMPHREY. I will indeed. She's going to regret that she wasn't with you.

Mr. EVANS. An American success story, a man known for his relentless energy, his boundless enthusiasm, and the common touch he has never lost, even though walking with the world's great. Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democratic candidate for Vice President. Much obliged to you, sir. Good luck in your difficult job.

Thank you, Marshall McNeil. Appreciate your joining us with your very pointed questions.

This is Mark Evans from Washington, D.C. Thank you for being with us.

Ardmore, Okla.
October 19, 1964

TEXT OF SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

My friends, I am here to urge you to vote on November 3 for your long-time friend and good neighbor, Lyndon B. Johnson, as President of the United States.

I emphasize this because I understand that the Republicans here—and particularly my fellow Minnesotan, Bud Wilkinson—have been doing all their campaigning against *me*.

So I'll let you in on the secret the Republicans have been trying to keep from the good people of Oklahoma—Lyndon Johnson is the Democratic candidate for President of the United States.

And Lyndon Johnson is superbly qualified for this high office—the most responsible office in America and, indeed, in the world. He is qualified by his wide experience and by his burning faith in America and its future.

First, let me emphasize that word *experience*.

If I decided to change my profession and applied for Gomer Jones' job as head coach at the University of Oklahoma, they'd laugh at me—and they'd be right.

Now I do have some experience in teaching. I was a pretty fair football player on the Doland, S. Dak. team. Maybe I'd have a chance at a high school coaching job. Then, when I'd had some experience, I might look for a better coaching assignment.

I happen to think that the higher levels of government are places for men of experience, not for amatures and beginners. I served two terms as mayor of Minneapolis before running for the Senate. Lyndon Johnson served 12 years in the House of Representatives and 12 years in the Senate before becoming Vice President.

Your fine candidate for the U.S. Senate, Fred R. Harris, has learned his job in your State senate and learned it well. You don't have to take him on faith—you *know* what he can do for you in Washington. I urge you to send him there.

287 WBZ—LINO

President Johnson is a man of unquestioned competence in the art and science of government. He has served the people of Texas and the people of America for more than 30 years. No American President has applied more sheer physical and mental energy to the job—worked harder at his tasks—labored more hours a day—more days a week. He is a 24-hour-a-day, full-time President.

Fred Harris has been called by the newsmen at your State capitol "the busiest and hardest working member of the legislature." And that puts him right in the Johnson tradition.

Now, let's look at Sentor Goldwater's record.

It's true he's been in the Senate for 12 years—but it's been off and on, now and then—when he could spare the time from his gadgets, his hobbies, and political speechmaking.

No significant piece of legislation carries his name. He has spoken little in the Senate. And he has said "no" far more often than he has said anything else.

Seven times, for example, he cast his vote against the development of the Arkansas River. And he's voted against every REA project, except two in his own State of Arizona.

Much of the time he hasn't even been on the job. Even before he became a candidate for the Presidency, he missed many rollcalls—more than 35 percent of the votes taken in the Senate from 1960 to 1963.

This year—1964—he missed 225 out of 312 rollcall votes—an absentee record of 72 percent. This year, for example, he wasn't on hand to cast his vote in support of protection for your cattlemen against excessive imports. But some of us were. We voted with your Senators to safeguard American cattlemen.

Experience and ability *are* important—but just as important are what a man does with them, what he wants for America and for its future.

President Johnson knows and loves and trusts the American people in all their infinite variety. He know the strength of America lies in the initiative and enterprise of its people and their ability to work together—not at the behest of some all-powerful government, but by their own free decisions, freely made.

In this spirit of free initiative and free enterprise you built this great state. In this spirit American worked themselves out of the depression. In this spirit we became the arsenal of democracy in the hot war and the leader of the free world in the cold war.

When Senator Goldwater looks at this, he sees only some hobgoblin of his own imagination which he calls "socialism."

He cannot deny times are good. He cannot deny we have enjoyed 44 months of sustained economic growth. He merely says we should not feel good about it. He cannot deny that profits are up—he merely thinks our spirits should be down.

I have been searching high and low to find whether there is anything—anything at all—that's happended in the past 30 years for which Senator Goldwater has a good word. I want to be fair about it. He has given his approval to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Securities and Exchange Commission. But that is about all.

Otherwise he has sought to pull everything up by the roots. He's not really a Republican. He called the last Republican administration a "Dime-store New Deal." He voted 25 times against the 1960 Republican platform. And he's not a conservative—a man who wants to preserve the best in the past and build upon it. He is a radical and an extremist.

In this campaign, he is the unhappy warrior—nothing about America seems to satisfy him and he views its future only with the direst forebodings.

The people who have rallied to his banner seem just as downhearted. I call them "sick and tired" Americans. They're always saying they are "sick and tired" of this and "sick and tired" of that.

A great poet and a good Democrat, Archibald MacLeish, has written that "America was promises." You have seen the great promise of the Oklahoma Territory fulfilled in this great State of Oklahoma.

You have seen the promises of America being fulfilled in the administration of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. And we believe this record of peace, prosperity, and progress will continue with the election of Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States.

On November 3, you will also be deciding something even more important. You will be deciding whether the peace of the world and the survival of mankind will continue in the hands of a man—President Johnson—who fully understands and accepts this responsibility.

There is no more fundamental question in this campaign. The dramatic changes in the Soviet Union—in Red China—in Great Britain—demonstrates the need for a President who understands the world as it really is—not as he imagines it to be.

Performance of duty can be the only criteria you exercise in choosing our President.

We must have a President who is neither erratic nor unpredictable, neither rash or impetuous, neither belligerent nor warlike.

Lyndon Johnson is a man of peace—but he is also a man who has defended freedom with courage and strength.

He is a man who possesses the capacity and understanding to lead America and the free world in these perilous times.

He is a man you can trust with the destiny of America.

Ardmore, Okla.,
Civic Auditorium,
October 19, 1964.

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very, very much. Thank you. Thank you very much, Congressman Albert, and I thank our enthusiastic young friends. I see that in Oklahoma you train the young early, you train them right. [Applause.]

What a wonderful privilege it is to be able to journey from our Nation's Capital here to Ardmore tonight and as your great Congressman has told you, only this afternoon we were closeted with our President, with the legislative leaders of the two parties, discussing the many matters of international crisis that face our country. But we were able to make a hurried trip from National Airport in Washington, D.C., to the airport here at Ardmore, Okla. And I am just delighted that things worked out so that we could be with you because I know I am in the land of Bob Kerr and of Sam Rayburn and of Carl Albert and of Mike Monroney and of Fred Harris, and when you are in that kind of democracy, believe me, you feel at home. [Applause.]

Permit me just a moment of thanks to the mayor of this community who was so kind as to meet us when we arrived, Mayor Woodrow Hulme, and may I also say how pleased I am with the reception that was accorded us by your county committee.

Time doesn't permit me to express my thanks to each and every one of your many party officers and officeholders, but I do know I just met a young man that is going to be Congressman here from your own sixth district, and that is Jed Johnson, Jr. [Applause.] I believe if I recall, Jed, you were a page in the Senate. So if you can start out being a page in Congress and end up running it, that is pretty good. [Laughter.]

And we want to wish you well, Jed.

And then might I hope to say a word or two in reference to a man that I think is so eminently qualified to serve in the U.S. Senate, and I know from the response of this audience that I heard earlier tonight that you agree with me that you need Fred Harris to represent you in the Senate. [Applause.]

When we arrived here this evening a bit tardy, my dear and good friends, one of the most illustrious, able, respected Members of the U.S. Senate was speaking to you, and I have always wanted to come to Oklahoma whenever the opportunity was afforded me if for no other reason than to be in the State that has in the U.S. Senate this wonderful man, Mike Monroney. [Applause.]

It appears to me that Oklahoma has a pretty good grip on this Government. You have that outstanding majority leader of the House of Representatives, this package of political dynamite. He has more power per square inch than any man in the U.S. Government. [Applause.]

Whenever we want anything done in the House, indeed, whenever we want anything done in the Congress, we know where to turn. We just take a look over at the House of Representatives. The President calls up Carl Albert. Carl Albert calls up the other folks, and that is it. [Applause.]

Well, I come to Ardmore, Okla., and I have been looking up a little bit about this wonderful city in this third district, Carter County, and I would say that this community of Ardmore is famous for several reasons.

First of all, it is famous because it is Carl Albert's hometown. That is enough for any town.

Second, this town didn't stop growing. They just pulled up their trousers, regrouped, started to grow on a steady but unspectacular basis.

And third, this community has done what so many enterprising communities have been able to do. It has been beating the swords into plowshares.

I understand that you have taken that fine military airport that was here and you are making it into an industrial park, new industry, about a hundred new industries.

And then finally you have made this the recreation capital for souththern Oklahoma and northern Texas. And believe me, I would like nothing better if Carl or Mike, when Fred gets to the Senate, if they would be just kind enough to extend Mrs. Humphrey and myself an invitation to come down to the Platt National Park, down to Lake Murray State Park—[applause]—or to come down to Lake Texoma and see if we can find any good fishing out there. [Applause.]

And if you do that, I will respond by bringing you up to Minnesota.

By the way, you know, I gather that there are a few Minnesotans that work down around these precincts. I want to have a word about this, too. Ever hear about that fellow, you know, I believe he was from Oklahoma or Texas, and he was talking to one of these men that had come to live in this area, and I believe the fellow was from Minnesota. He said, "You know, it is pretty dry down here, and it is pretty wet up there in Minnesota."

We have 22,000 lakes according to the chamber of commerce, 17,000 according to accurate count. [Laughter.]

This fellow was making quite a speech and somebody got up and said, "You know, if that fellow had as much suction as he has got blow, we would have all that water down here." [Applause and laughter.]

I came here tonight to Ardmore, Okla., for several purposes. First, I came here to urge you to vote on November 3, and I want you to vote for a longtime friend of this State, a longtime friend of your congressional delegation, and a longtime and a good friend and good neighbor, and his name is Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States. ([Applause.]

I made that statement early. You ordinarily would expect that to be held up for a little while, but I wanted to let you know why I was here because I understand that the Republicans down here, particularly my fellow Minnesotan that is having a little political exercise which will result in only exercise—[laughter]—I understand that he has been doing all of his campaigning against me.

I want to let you in on a secret. I am not the candidate for President. [Laughter.] No, I am not, folks. I am just the candidate for Vice President, and the secret that the Republicans are trying to keep from you is that the candidate for President is Lyndon Johnson who is going to be the next President of the United States. [Applause.]

My, they have been saying some juicy little morsels about me, and I have enjoyed reading it so much. If I was half as bad as they say or half as good as some say, I would be a terribly mixed-up fellow.

But let me tell you that I am here to talk to you about a man that is superbly qualified to be President of the United States, and believe me, it takes qualifications, high qualifications, for this, the most responsible office in the world, and the man that is President, the man that Carl Albert spent three and a half hours with or two and a half hours with today, that Hubert Humphrey spent four and a half hours with, that man is qualified by wide experience and by a burning faith in America and its future, and wherever I go I am proud to stand as the spokesman for Lyndon Johnson who deserves to be elected and will be elected. [Applause.]

Now, let me emphasize this word "experience." I want to underscore it. Experience.

If I decided to change my profession and applied for Gomer Jones' job as head coach of the University of Oklahoma, I doubt that the board of trustees or regents or the people of this State would want me. They would most likely say, "That fellow doesn't have enough experience. He wasn't even good football player in Doland, S. Dak. And I really wasn't. I made the team, but the competition wasn't much.

It is sort of like, you know, campaigning in the Republican Party. [Applause.]

The truth is that your legislators and others would just plain laugh me right out of the field, and they would be right.

Well, I happen to think if it takes experience to be a football coach, I think it also takes some experience at the higher levels of Government to be a Government official. And you need there men of experience, not amateurs, not beginners.

I served two terms as mayor of the great city of Minneapolis, a city of over a half million people, before running for the Senate and serving in Government employment. Lyndon Johnson, our President, served I believe 12 years in the House of Representatives, 12 years in the U.S. Senate, 4 years—2 years with the National Youth Administration, and he had all of this service before he became Vice President of the United States.

And your candidate for the U.S. Senate, your excellent candidate, Fred Harris, has learned his job at legislating in your State senate 8 years. Eight years of experience. And he has learned it well.

You don't have to take him on faith. You know what Fred Harris can do. You know what he has done in your own State, and you know what he can do for you in Washington.

So if you believe in experience and if you believe that a man ought to be tested before he is given a promotion, I suggest that you vote for Fred Harris. [Applause.]

Now, let me add this, that according to the reports that we hear in Washington, Fred Harris has been called by the newsmen at your State Capital the busiest and the hardest working member of the legislature, and I might say, Fred that sure qualifies you to serve in the Johnson administration because you have got to be a hard worker to get along there. And that is just the kind of a man that is in the Johnson tradition.

I mentioned our President a moment ago, and since there are so many that are mentioning things about him these days, let me just tell you a little bit about what I know of him.

He is a man of unquestioned competence in the arts and the sciences of Government. He served the people of America for 30 years. I think that it is fair to say, and I believe that I quote from Republicans and Democrats alike, that no man is more experienced and qualified. No man works harder.

This man works 7 days a week. He works 24 hours a day. He is a full-time President. In fact, my dear friends, if anything, he is an overtime President. [Applause.]

Now, let's take a look at that fellow that is the pretender, the Republican pretender to the Presidency, the temporary spokesman of a fraction of a faction of the old Republican Party. Let's see what he has done.

This is the man that calls our President a part-time President. I must say that people who live in glass houses not only shouldn't throw stones, they should pull the shades. [Applause.]

Well, let's take a look at the record of the Senator from Arizona. Now, it is true he has been enrolled in the Senate for 12 years. He hasn't been there, but he has been enrolled. [Laughter.] He has been an off-and-on, now-and-then, in-again, out-again U.S. Senator. That is when he can spare time from his gadgets, his hobbies, and his political speechmaking.

I wouldn't say this, but I don't believe in letting this fellow get by attacking our President for being a part-time President when he is working his heart out for the American people. [Applause.]

I was just checking here. He has introduced 144 bills since he has been in Congress. The most important bill that he ever passed was for the shipment in the mail of live scorpions. And that is generous—144 measures and the total accomplishment, 6 little teeny-weeny, itsy-bitsy little old bills that nobody ever heard of.

And yet this man says that President Lyndon Johnson is not attending to his duties.

No significant piece of legislation carries the trademark or the name of the Senator from Arizona. And se said "No" far more often than he said anything else.

Seven times, for example, my dear friends of Oklahoma and northern Texas, of Arkansas, this whole great Southwest, seven times he cast his vote against the development of the Arkansas River, and you wouldn't expect him to vote for the Red River, would you? [Applause and laughter.]

Oh, he would vote for the central Arizona project. Oh, yes—yes—$1 billion. But not one nickel, not one penny for the Mississippi, for the Missouri, for the Arkansas, or for the Red Rivers. Oh, no. Just let me get my hands on a little for the folks back in Arizona. [Applause.]

Well, let me be very frank about it. I think the central Arizona project merited support. The Senator from Minnesota, as your Senators, we don't go around just voting for our own projects. We happen to believe that this is one country. The United States of America, and Senator Hubert Humphrey and President Lyndon Johnson believe that what is good for Oklahoma is good for Texas and Minnesota, and what is good for Minnesota is good for California and Maine and Vermont and Florida. We believe in an America. [Applause.]

Well, the Senator from Arizona has had 35 opportunities to vote for REA. If there is any man in America that has fought the battle for the Rural Electrification Administration, for REA, for rural electric cooperatives, for electrification on the farms, that man is on this platform tonight, two of them, one a U.S. Senator and one a Congressman, U.S. Senator Mike Monroney, and when our late beloved Bob Kerr was there he fought the battle the same way, and then Carl Albert.

But how about the Senator from Arizona?

Now I want to qualify this. A man ought to be fair. They have got a few old kerosene lamps left out there in that department store and everybody has a right, I submit, to try to make the best out of their merchandise. But this man—[laughter]—has had 35 chances to vote for REA. He has voted against it 33 times. Two times for REA. Two projects in Arizona. [Applause.]

This isn't what I call seeing the Nation. This isn't what I call national vision. This is what I call trying to get rid of old merchandise and taking care of a few local constituents.

I want you to know that Humphrey's Drug Store used to have some kerosene lamps, too, but we sold ours in 1936. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, I speak again of the man that condemns our President for being, as he says, away from the job. Look who is talking. Most of the time the Senator from Arizona has been away. Ever since—even before he became an avowed candidate for the Presidency, he missed more rollcalls in the U.S. Senate than any man that was physically well; 35 percent of them from 1960 to 1963. And this year of 1964, while he is telling everybody how to run the Government, out of 225 rollcalls—out of 312 rollcalls, he was absent 225 times—[applause]—225 times.

Ladies and gentlemen, I generally find out that the people that criticize your Government most are the ones that know it the least or are never there. [Applause.]

Now, folks, I figure that anybody that is absent from Washington 72 percent of the time ought to be given the privilege of being absent all of the time. [Applause.]

And here is a man that comes out and goes into Southwest America or he goes into the Deep South and he goes into the West and he goes to the cattle country, and he tells you what he is going to do for America. And yet, when your Senators and your Congressmen were fighting their hearts out to protect the cattle industry, and the Senator from Montana, Mr. Mansfield, the majority leader, was working to help this cattle industry, and we passed legislation, legislation to safeguard the interests of the American cattlemen, where was this great friend of the West, this outdoor specialist, this man that loves the range, this man that speaks for the Southwest?

I will tell you where he was. He was in the Northeast campaigning up in New Hampshire or some place else. He wasn't attending to business.

I think we need a man that is on the job. We need experience.

Let's take a look at the record because the Senator from Arizona said, "We'll judge them by their votes, not by their words."

I think that is a fair standard. I want to be judged by my votes. I want to be judged by my votes for agriculture. I want to be judged by my votes for American free enterprise. I want to be judged by my votes for the Communist Control Act. I want to be judged by my votes for mutual security. That is the way I want to be judged.

The Senator from Arizona was eminently fair when he said judge them by their votes. Those are his own words.

Well, Senator, let's take a look at you.

VOICE. Pour it on.

Senator HUMPHREY. I plan on doing just that, neighbor. [Applause and laughter.]

Well, let's take a look. I already told you about the Arkansas River. I have already mentioned to you about REA. I thought everybody was for REA. I really did. Even the old lamp industries, they did come out for it. But not Senator Goldwater.

So what is the record? Let's take a look. No on REA. No to the cotton bill. No to the meat bill. No to the feed grains bill. No to the public works bill. No to the community facilities bill. No to the area redevelopment bill. No to aid to your universities and higher education.

No to the medical facilities bill to provide the training of more doctors and nurses and medical technicians. No to the National Defense Education Act. No to the antipoverty bill. No to a youth job training program. No to housing legislation. No to minimum wages. And no to a tax cut that provided $11.5 billion tax reduction, the greatest tax reduction in the Nation's history.

And this man says he is a friend of free enterprise. [Cries of "boo."]

Let me say right now, my dear friends, that anybody that can vote against that kind of a measure when American business, all of it, the chamber of commerce, manufacturers associations, labor, farmers, every group, the American Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, every one of them supported the tax cut. Why? To get America moving again. To help this great country progress. And what happened? The Senator from Arizona votes no. Votes no.

What else? Well, I want to give him credit for one thing. He votes "maybe" on soical security. Sometimes it is no, sometimes it is yes, but down the middle somewhere it is maybe.

No to the young, no to the elderly, no on every program that we had in Congress to be of help to our elderly.

No to the sick, no to the farmer, no to the worker, and no to the businessman.

And let me repeat once again that the man who today parades as a friend of free enterprise stuck the dagger into the back of American enterprise when he voted against the tax bill which was needed by American business and American consumers for a more prosperous America. [Applause.]

I am proud to come here in the presence of the majority leader of the House of Representatives who played such a great part in building thee record of the 87th and 88th Congresses of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Those two Congresses have gone down in the annals of American history as the two most productive Congresses of our time.

Conservation, agriculture, health, the first Congress to ever do anything about the problems of mental health and mental retardation. For the youth, for the elderly, for American enterprise, for people. Equal rights for our people to make American citizenship first class citizenship, to make its pledge of allegiance, one Nation, indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all. That is the kind of Congress we want. [Applause.]

And now, my good friends, our friendly competitor from Arizona doesn't want to talk about economics, he says. First of all, he said about a month and a half ago that all of this prosperity was just phony, it was an illusion until the president of General Motors got him and said, "Look, we have just paid more dividends this year than any time in our history, and it looks better than it has ever looked in our history and today investment is at the highest rate in history." And finally people came to the conclusion so overwhelmingly that the argument of the Senator from Arizona was wrong that he has quit talking about it.

But he can't deny that times are good. He cannot deny that America has enjoyed 44 consecutive months of uninterrupted economic progress and continuing prosperity. The longest period of uninterrupted economic progress in the history of the world. And that is the record of this administration. [Applause.]

Now, the Senator from Arizona says "I guess that is right." He now admits that there is prosperity. But he says, "I don't want you to feel good about it. Don't enjoy it." He cannot deny that profits are up, wages are up, dividends are up, employment is up. He can't deny it. He merely thinks that your spirits should be down.

In other words, when Senator Goldwater looks at all this, he sees only the hobgoblin of his own imagination.

You know what he calls it? Socialism.

My dear friends, why give a socialist that much credit. I will tell you what I call it: not Mr. Goldwater's creeping socialism, but President Johnson's leaping capitalism, and we like it. [Applause.]

Now let me just say a word or two for our Republican friends because most of them are our friends, and by the way, a substantial proportion of the Republicants are going to vote for Mr. Johnson, President Johnson. [Applause.]

And why do you think they are going to vote for him? They are putting their country above their party. They are putting their Nation's welfare above their partisanship.

The New York Herald Tribune, the Saturday Evening Post, Life magazine, today the Philadelphia Bulletin, one newspaper after another, traditionally Republican, former members of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, Republicans.

They say by the public opinion polls that one out of four or one out of every three Republicans is going to vote for President Lyndon Johnson.

Well, let me say in all fairness to these good Republicans, you are not leaving your party. Somebody just walked in and captured it. [Laughter.] The pirates boarded the ship. They kidnapped the crew, and they have taken it over. And I don't expect them to hold on to it long because after this Goldwater crowd gets through with this campaign, they are going to think that a hurricane is a soft breeze. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Goldwater is not a Republican. He called the last Republican administration—he is now trying to cosy over to President Eisenhower—they had a meeting up there at Hershey, Pa., not long ago. Both Republican Parties were there. A little splinter that Mr. Goldwater has, and then a large part of the Republican Party that Mr. Eisenhower has.

He is not a Republican. He called President Eisenhower's Republican administration—I quote him—"A dime store New Deal." Cute phrase, I must say. He voted fewer times for President Eisenhower's program than Hubert Humphrey or Lyndon Johnson. He is no Republican.

He voted 25 times against the 1960 Republican Platform on 25 specific issues listed in that platform. His batting average? He went to the plate 25 times and fanned out 25 times. And mind you, they fired Yogi Berra. [Laughter and applause.] And let me say to you that he is not a conservative.

Now, I want the candidates down here, these Republican candidates, to know what kind of association they have. Mr. Goldwater surely is not a Republican. Few think he is, ask Governor Scranton. Why, I never heard a more unbelievable blistering than Governor Scranton, Republican of Pennsylvania, gave to Mr. Goldwater. He said, "Mr. Goldwater is out of the mainstream of Republican thought." And he said, "He is not a Republican. He doesn't follow the Republican principles or Republican tradition." Ask Mr. Rockefeller. Ask Mr. Romney from Michigan. Mr. Goldwater goes to Michigan, Mr. Romney introduces him, and the reporters say, "Are you endorsing him?" And he says, "No, I am just presenting him." [Applause.]

Now, I say he is not a conservative because a conservative is a man who wants to preserve the best in the past and to build on it.

Then what is he? Well, let me give you the definition of a radical. A radical is a man that breaks with tradition. A radical is a man that repudiates his associations. A radical is a man that departs from the patterns that have been established. A radical is a man that seeks to destroy that which has been gained.

I charge on this platform tonight that Barry Goldwater is not a Republican, he is not a conservative, he is a radical. [Applause.] I would suggest to my Republican friends that are good, sincere, conscientious, middle-of-the-road conservative Republicans that as yet haven't seen the light that they ought to be as careful about associating with a leftwing radical.

We don't need any leftwingers, and wee don't need any right-wingers. We have got plenty of room down the roadway of American progress, right down the middle. [Applause.]

Now lest anybody have an doubts, any man that says we ought to get out of the United Nations, any man that repudiates the bipartisan foreign policy, any man that can't even make up his mind to be for REA, any man that has doubts about social security, any man that can join with the Birchers time after time, and I think we ought to make it clear that he has yet to fully disassociate himself, I say that that is radicalism, and the American people are going to repudiate radicalism in America in any of its forms. [Applause.]

Well, maybe I should just put it this way: he is just unhappy. [Laughter.] Did you ever notice those folks that carry those Goldwater signs? They look like they are just getting over the colic. [Laughter.]

He is an unhappy warrior. Nothing about America seems to satisfy him, and he views its future with the most unbelievable forebodings. The people who have rallied to his banner seem just as downhearted. They are always saying they are sick and tired of this and sick and tired of that. May I say they are sick and tired. [Applause.]

But may I be equally frank. We are not. We are not sick. We are as healthy, may I say, as can be. And we are not tired. We are as vital and as vigorous as can be. And we intend to demonstrate it between now and November 3, and on November 3 he can have all the sick and tired ones, and we will take all the healthy and vigorous ones. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, Carl Albert and Hubert Humphrey listened today to a President, to a Secretary of State, to a Secretary of Defense, to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency who talked to us about the changes in the Soviet Union, development of the nuclear device in Red China, and undoubtedly and not too long from now a further development, changes of government in Great Britain.

We reviewed for 2½ hours, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, because present there were the Republican leaders. We reviewed the world scene because America must not permit narrow gaged partisanship to in any way weaken its firm resolve to be a nation of strength, of high moral purpose, a nation that is dedicated to freedom.

We must make up our minds regardless of those who would lead us astray that we are going to maintain a national unity for the defense of this country and for the projection of our foreign policy.

On the election day of November 3, we are not only going to be deciding what happens to social security, even though that is very important, what happens to REA, what happens to the Arkansas River, what happens to Oklahoma's economy or Minnesota's.

This is all important. We are not developing this great America, prosperous and rich, just for luxury. We are not developing the power that we have in America, unbelievable power, uncontested power, my dear fellow Americans, for conquest.

We are developing all of this for one purpose, to maintain the standard of freedom and decency in this world, to protect our own country, to stand with our allies, to see to it that mankind does not destroy itself.

The spokesmen of the opposition peddle easy remedies to the American people. The spokesmen of the opposition come to us and say, "We must have a win policy now, instant win." Well, ladies and gentlemen, there isn't any such thing. The only thing that is instant in this world today is death, instant annihilation, and we are not going to pursue a policy, Lyndon Johnson, your President, is not going to pursue a policy, John Kennedy didn't, Dwight Eisenhower didn't, HarryTruman didn't, no responsible man pursues a policy of bluster, of bellicose statements of belligerency that can lead to nuclear war, to annihilation.

On November 3 we decide what kind of leadership America wants. There is no more fundamental question in this campaign, and performance of duty will be the only criteria you should exercise in choosing your President. Performance, responsibility, competence.

I say that we must have a President who is neither erratic or unpredictable, who is not rash or impetuous, and who is neither belligerent nor warlike.

We need a President that unites our people. We need a President that unites the free peoples of the world. We need a President that constantly gives to humanity hope, hope for a better day, hope for peace, hope for better living, hope for a better America. We need a leader in the White House that lifts us and doesn't depress us. And we need a man above all that understands the realities of the world in which we live, dear friends, that at least understands accurately the history of this country, and has some comprehension of its possibilities for the future.

Oh, my good fellow Americans, anybody can get this country into a war. The politics of war, the politics of ultimatums, the politics of playing war games, that is for another century, not the 20th.

We can't take those chances today. And those who come out and make these far-reaching statements that if you seek to accommodate, as somebody said, to the Communists you are wrong, well, let me say we don't seek to accommodate them at all. What we seek to do is to try to press forward relentlessly, to change the systems that oppose us, to build the power that protects us, to have that massive nuclear deterrent so that no one dare strike us.

Congressman Albert sat there this afternoon and heard this message, that in less than 1 hour, my dear friends, if all that we have in mind is destruction, we can destroy a hundred million people behind the Iron Curtain and 75 percent of their total productive capacity, but they can do the same to us.

We have unbelievable power for retaliation. Does it make America more noble? Does it make America more dear? Does it make it more moral? Does it make it more righteous to stand here and say we can destroy you?

Let me be very clear about it. The only brave person in the world is the peacemaker, the one who really pursues with honor, with integrity, the path of peace. [Applause.]

On the one hand we have our guard up. On the other hand we have our hand out, willing to work for peace, unwilling be blackmailed, unwilling to be threatened. But always willing to walk the extra mile.

And I have many a lecture on morality. Well, let me say that one of the great moral lessons of the Scriptures is to be a peacemaker. Blessed are the peacemakers. And great people who have been peacemakers have demonstrated the courage of a soldier at the battlefield and then some.

John Kennedy said that peace is a process. Great people of religious orders and organizations have reminded us that peace requires sacrifice. And in this election, ladies and gentlemen, you have a decision to make.

Do you want to have a man in the White House who is your Commander in Chief who practices foreign policy by ultimatums, who says what he would like to do is lob a bomb in the Kremlin's men's room? Is that what you want?

Do you want one in the White House who says that he admires the brinkmanship of Germany? Imperial Germany and Nazi Germany? [Cries of "no."] I think not. I think you want one in the White House who understands that power is not an end in itself. Power is to be used with restraint, that power is for the purposes of good.

Power we will use for our defense if we must, but the power that we build is for the—is to save the world, not to destroy it. The power which we have today and the wealth that we have today is to lift up the world, not to blast it to pieces. And I happy to say that Lyndon Johnson, big and strong man that he is, is a man of peace, but he is also a man who has defended freedom with courage and strength, and I know and I believe the American people know that he is a man who possesses the capacity and the understanding to lead America and the free world in these perilous times.

In other words, my friends, he is the one man in this campaign that you can trust, and America needs a man in the next four years in the White House in whom we can place our trust for peace and for prosperity.

Thank you very much.

Tulsa, Okla.
Airport
October 19, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Well, well, thank you very much, Senator Monroney, and thank you very much, my good friends of Tulsa, Okla.

It is great to be here with you. And by the way, I just want you to know that we had a marvelous meeting at Ardmore, Okla., tonight. A lot of good Democrats down there, people with a lot of good sense. They are going to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson.

I am simply delighted to be here not only in the presence [applause] of my good friend, your Senator, your Senator Mike Monroney, but also to be in the presence of the soon to be Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Fred Harris [Applause.]

And by the way, of all the signs that I have seen here that I really like, there is one up here that says "Go, go Horatio." [Applause.]

I think America is entitled to a Vice President with a middle name by the name of Horatio. [Applause.]

No other candidate can make that claim. [Applause.]

My dear friends, may I just add that we are having a very, very pleasant experience on these campaign trips. Once in awhile we find a poor misguided soul [laughter] that is carrying around a Goldwater banner. You know, I always look at them very carefully, and when I find one who is smiling, I know that deep down in his heart he is going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

And by the way, I noticed another sign here. It says here something about Tulsa being the Oil Capital of the World. [Applause.] Well, let me say that you have got a choice between a Senator that never is around to do anything for the oil industry and President that comes from Texas that knows the oil industry. Anybody with enough brains to come in out of the rain will vote for Lyndon Johnson.

I come here tonight just to say this, that the people of America that are interested in their country's prosperity, that are interested in their country's social justice, that are interested in their country's crusade for peace and strength, those people are going to put their confidence in and their trust in the man that can be trusted, the man that is being trusted, and the man that you can afford to trust, and that man is the man that I speak for and that I join, my good friend and your next President and our President, Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Listen, I want you to translate this enthusiasm into some good hard work. There is one thing that the opposition understands. They are slow to learn, but they do learn if you put the heat to them, and all I ask you is to give them an election spanking on November 3. Take them out to the political woodshed, administer the treatment to them and give them a whipping the likes of which they have never seen before. [Applause.]

I just want to thank many of our friends that are here, these young people in particular that have come out. We want you, and I want to thank these Tulsa University young folks that are out here, and I want to thank our friends from the labor movement that are out here. [Applause.]

Tulsa, Okla.
October 20, 1964

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

We live in perilous times.

We live in a world in transition—fraught with danger.

Within 24 hours Nikita Khrushchev tumbled from power in the Soviet Union—the Red Chinese detonated an atomic blast—and the Labor Party assumed control in Great Britain.

These 24 hours—these three historic events—illustrate the basic issue of this campaign.

Which candidate for President of the United States is better prepared to assume the fearful responsibility for the destiny of America—and mankind itself?

This one issue overshadows all other considerations. This one issue—and only this issue—relates to the survival of our people, and the cause of all mankind.

In choosing the next President of the United States, the people of America must base their decision on performance—not promises. Performance is the true test of a man. Performance separates great leaders from the second-raters. Performance is the one basis on which America can make the correct choice. And make no mistake about it—there is no room for error in electing the President of the United States. There is no second chance. There is no opportunity to repair the damage for at least 4 more years—and in today's world 4 years may be too late.

On the basis of performance, Lyndon Johnson is richly and fully qualified to assume the fearful burden of the Presidency for the next 4 years and to insure the national security of the United States, to preserve the peace of the world.

Think back to those ghastly days last November. Our great President was struck down. History stood still. The Nation and the world teetered on the brink of despair and collapse—one slip, one misstep, one rash judgment, one impetuous remark, one single error by the President of the United States could have produced international chaos. And Lyndon Johnson stepped forward. He grieved with us. He wept with us. But he calmed us—guided us—strengthened us—saved us. Never has a human being carried such responsibility upon his shoulders and responded with such courage, determination, wisdom, and leadership. Never has the Presidency known a finer hour. Performance—not promises—is the test of a man.

The American people understand this fact. They know that promises—allegations—distortions—radicalism—extremism cannot substitute for the hard currency of responsible performance in the Presidency.

The American people understand that the responsible Republican leaders have temporarily lost control of their party to the apostles of discord and radicalism. The outcome of the Goldwater convention in San Francisco was a flat refusal to repudiate extremism. By its refusal to condemn the lunatic fringe of American politics, the Goldwater party has permitted into its ranks those individuals and organizations whose stock in trade is the politics of hate, the politics of despair. For a generation these extremists and radicals have been pushing their accusations, their innuendoes, their attacks in the back alleys of American politics. Now they have captured the Grand Old Party and transformed it into Goldwater's own party.

I want to note at this point my personal conviction that Senator Goldwater in his private capacity is a pleasant and even charming man. What is at issue is not his private, but his public role in American politics. And the gist of my message is that though Senator Goldwater may be a charming guest at a social party, he is no fit spokesman for a great political party.

Our concern is only with Goldwaterism—the politics of radicalism. In San Francisco the Goldwater party deliberately refused to repudiate support from the John Birch Society.

The Goldwater party refused to repudiate a society that called President Eisenhower "a dedicated conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy."

The Goldwater party refused to repudiate the society that directed its members to "join your local PTA * * * and go to work to take it over." (Monthly Bulletin, April 1961).

What does Senator Goldwater think of the John Birch Society? Listen to his own words:

> * * * I am impressed by the type of people in it. They are the kind we need in politics * * * (Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 8, 1963).
>
> These (John Birch Society members) are intelligent people who are doing an effective job of calling attention to the dangers of communism (Milwaukee Journal, June 24, 1962).
>
> I don't consider the John Birch Society as a group to be extremists (New York Times, Apr. 17, 1964).

Well, President Johnson and I do consider John Birchers to be extremists and radicals.

The Democratic Party considers the Birchers to be radicals. And responsible Republicans consider the Birchers to be radicals.

We also repudiate such radicals as Gerald L. K. Smith, leader of the Christian Nationalist Crusade, who has built his career around the dissemination of hate.

Smith has written:

> Franklin D. Roosevelt in the mind of every mature, intelligent patriot was a complete fraud and a ruthless demagog surrounded by * * * corrupt politicians and international strategists who used the big lie as a fixed instrument of policy * * *.

Gerald L. K. Smith has written about Senator Goldwater in the current issue of The Cross and the Flag:

> He is a godsend for America * * *. For the first time since I have been a man, one of the old parties has nominated a candidate for whom I have complete respect.

Robert B. dePugh, national leader of the Minutemen, a wild right wing group which trains its members for guerilla warfare, has said:

> (President Johnson) is a political opportunist who would sell the United States out to the Communists or anyone else who would pay his price.

His minutemen, dePugh noted, "are as close to being 100 percent for Goldwater as it is possible for an organization to be."

American politics has often involved a good deal of rough play. But never on this scale—never with this venom and personal invective.

These are not merely attacks on a political figure—they are attacks on our basic American principles. They seek to destroy that atmosphere of trust which is essential for the very survival and development of a free society.

The United States is a great, diverse nation of almost 200 million people. The overwhelming majority—whether Democrats or Republicans or Independents—are loyal to the central values of our society. The overwhelming majority are committed to those priceless ideals we hold in common, faith in our future, mutual trust, and the spirit of liberty.

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

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

The overwhelming majority of Americans know that performance—not promises—is the true test of a man.

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

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

In President Lyndon Johnson we have the man superbly qualified to lead our Nation and the world away from the last great war toward the first Great Society.

Performance—not promises—is why the American people will elect President Lyndon Johnson to a full 4-year term November 3.

Tulsa, Okla.
Tulsa Civic Center
October 20, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much.

Well, Senator Monroney and my good fellow Americans, these wonderful happy people from Oklahoma—of course, whenever I see happy people, I know they are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson for President of the United States. [Applause.]

And whenever I see somebody that has a smile on their face and is carrying a Goldwater sign, I know that deep down in their heart they are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I am just delighted to be here. I see that as usual we have a few souls that are misguided, that come to these public gatherings for the purpose of confessing their political sins. [Applause.] And may I say we welcome them. We welcome them.

I generally notice that they are always off to the far right. And believe me, they do have some fancy sign painters. You will have to admit that. They really indulge in it no end.

Well, we are going to talk a little politics today. First of all, I want to thank the mayor of this city, Mayor Maxwell, for his gracious reception, for this typical Tulsa, Okla., hospitality, and, Mr. Mayor, I am going to give you credit for the weather. I am not going to let a Member of Congress take credit for this. But I haven't seen finer weather than this since the last time I was elected in Minnesota. [Applause.]

And I want to thank Major Kominsky, of the Oklahoma Military Academy for the band. We are very, very grateful to him, and he is indeed entitled to a little thank you from all of us.

It is a great privilege to be on this platform with one of the outstanding Members of the U.S. Senate, a gentleman that I have served with in that body for 12 years, and you get to know people there, and this fine man, your own Mike Monroney, is a tower of strength for American democracy for people all over this country. [Applause.]

And I am delighted to be in the presence of the "little giant" of the Congress, a man who has done more than any other single individual in the Congress to guide through the programs of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, your own Congressman Carl Albert. [Applause.]

Ed Edmondson is with us, and he has been noted already, but you folks when you send Democrats to Congress, you surely do a good job. You sent us a great Senator some years ago, a man who had his summer home in Minnesota and who was a personal friend of mine, and we literally weep at the thought that he is no longer with us to carry on as he did so ably and effectively, and I must say that we miss this fine man, Bob Kerr, that was such a tower of strength for all of us. [Applause.]

Well, now that you have done so well, you ought to do better. First of all, you ought to make sure that that seat in the United States Senate that was occupied by Senator Kerr and then Senator Edmondson, that good Democratic seat in the Senate, is occupied by another good Democrat, one who is experienced in legislation. I don't know how good he is in football, but he is a wonderful legislator. [Applause.] Your own Fred Harris. [Applause.]

And I want to be very frank about this. I always thought we could conduct political campaigns and still like the opposition, and I wouldn't want to come to Oklahoma without saying that I do think very highly of and like as a fine gentleman the man that is Mr. Harris' opponent. I believe that he is a fine man. I just think that he ought not to be in the United States Senate since he is for Mr. Goldwater and his program and that program isn't good for America. [Applause.]

And Doug Martin, Doug is here. Doug, did you stand up? If you didn't, they ought to get another look at you. Stand up once again. [Applause.]

Doug Martin of your own First District right here in Tulsa surely deserves your warm support and your help.

Father King, we are grateful to you for your invocation. Might I just say that it was my privilege in the Senate to have printed in the Congressional Record as official documents the great encyclicals of that wonderful man of peace, that wonderful man of God, the late Pope John XXIII. And when you read from his encyclicals, two great encyclicals, "Pacem in Terris" and "Mater et Magistra," I couldn't help but contemplate once again what a heavy burden all of us have in this campaign to be worthy, to be worthy of the respect of the American people and to be worthy of the faith and confidence of the people who look to us for some leadership.

Mike, you mentioned newspapers. Well, it is a wonderful experience for a Democrat this year. My goodness! I never knew there were so many newspapers that were for us. Why, all over America they are saying that they want to see President Johnson in the White House. The New York Herald Tribune that hadn't endorsed a Democrat since the time of Thomas Jefferson, and they weren't publishing then—[applause and laughter]—endorsed the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, for President.

The Saturday Evening Post, published since 1797, never ever endorsed a Democrat, but in the year 1964 it endorsed Lyndon Johnson for President of the United States and Hubert Humphrey for Vice President of the United States. [Applause.]



Minnesota
Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org