



# news release

FROM THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE PUBLICITY DIVISION 1730 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON 6, D.C. FEDERAL 3-8750

FOR P. M. RELEASE  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14

B- 3732

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY  
BY  
SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY  
DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14  
SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI

Sixteen years ago, and close by this city, President Harry S. Truman went to bed on election night--by the verdict of every public opinion poll and certain well-known commentators--a rejected and defeated man. He awoke the victor in the most dramatic upset in American political history.

It is well to recall the experience of 1948, because it should be both a warning and an example to us.

It should be a solemn warning never to let ourselves fall victim to complacency--or to be so confident of victory that we do not, in Harry Truman's good words, "do our damndest" to win.

It is a depressing thought, but the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party could be--despite himself--the President of the United States.

But only if we let him win.

His finger--or the finger of some field commander, as he has advocated--could be on the nuclear trigger.

But only if we let him win.

Voluntary social security and a regressive income tax could become the law of the land.

But only if we let him win.

TVA could be sold to private enterprise and farm supports abolished.

But only if we let him win.

Federal assistance in urban redevelopment and housing programs could be ended.

-----more-----

But only if we let him win.

In fact, the social and economic achievements of the past three decades could be in grave jeopardy.

But only if we let him win.

All this could happen, if we let it. And, if we do, history will not forgive us--if, indeed, there are people left with the ability and the heart to write it.

They say a great thing about George Washington as a general was that he never forgot--not for a single moment in seven long and hard years--that he was the one man who, by a single ill-judged action, could lose the war for independence.

Today the President of the United States is the one and only man in the free world who, by a single error in judgment, a momentary lapse in responsibility, can risk its annihilation.

Yes, it is that important who sits in the White House. As Harry Truman used to say--and it is even more profoundly true today: "The buck stops here."

As for myself, I promise you that I shall leave nothing undone, no mile untraveled, no word unspoken that will help keep responsibility and maturity--in the person of President Lyndon Johnson--in the White House.

Yes, 1948 is a solemn warning which all of us must keep in mind. But it is also an example and an inspiration.

President Truman won, as we Democrats have always won, by taking his case directly to the American people.

Up and down the land he denounced the "do-nothing" 80th Congress for defaulting in its duties to the people.

He certainly "gave 'em hell"--but he never hit below the belt. It would have been totally out of character--and he didn't need to, anyway.

He didn't need to stoop to personal abuse. You don't need to when your case is good. It is only when you have a weak case, or none at all, that the temptation may be--for some people--too strong to resist.

-----more-----

This Administration and this Congress have a magnificent record to bring before the American people. It is a record of pledges made and pledges kept, of promise and performance.

I commend that record to you for careful study and constant use. It is set forth in black and white, for everyone to read, in our 1964 Democratic platform, "One Nation, One People."

It is a detailed accounting of our stewardship.

It is a record of the accomplishments of President Kennedy in his 1000 days of office, and of President Johnson in his remarkable nine months. It is a record of the two Democratic Congresses of the past four years--the most fruitful in achievement since I first came to Washington in 1949.

Abroad, it is a record of peace through preparedness and power--and restraint in the use of our power.

At home, it is a record of economic thrust and vigor.

Gone but I hope not forgotten is the "stop-and-go" economy of the Eisenhower years--what I used to call the "cha-cha-cha" economy, forwards and backwards with a little shuffle in between.

Instead, we are now in our 43rd straight month of sustained economic growth--the longest unbroken peacetime expansion in our history.

Our economic growth rate has risen to over five percent a year--twice what it averaged in the years of 1953 through 1960.

Most Americans know that they are better off than they were four years ago.

Real wages are up. Unemployment is down. Profits are up. Farm incomes have risen.

Meanwhile, we have not forgotten those of our fellow citizens who need our help.

We have acted to give increased care and attention to the young and to the old, to the physically and mentally afflicted. We have demonstrated once again that progressive government is government with a warm heart as well as a sound head.

These are significant facts--known to all Americans, and not seriously disputed by our opponents.

But it is infinitely more significant, I believe, that in this affluent society--the most affluent the world has ever known--we have committed ourselves to an all-out war against the poverty that still persists in the midst of our plenty.

I sometimes wonder what would have happened if, at the Cow Palace in San Francisco two months ago, a speaker had mounted the rostrum and put the question: "Am I my brother's keeper."

Would the majority at that convention have nodded their heads, or would they have chorused "No!"

I don't venture to say. But I do say that there is little sign of an affirmative answer in the platform they adopted.

As for us, we have always believed--and have always acted on the belief--that we are indeed, all of us, our brothers' keepers.

We do not believe that, in order for some people to live well, others must go ill-fed, ill-housed, or ill-clothed. In this age of automation and accelerating technological progress, there is more than enough for everybody.

We have the resources, if we have the wit and the will, to purge the word "poverty" from our language. It is a big job--a job never before done or even attempted in any country in all the generations of man--but I am confident that we can do it.

We have made a solid start with the enactment of President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act last month. And, now that we have begun the job, we shall stick with it to the finish.

A great poet and a good Democrat, Archibald MacLeish, has written that "America was promises."

So it has always been, from the beginning, for everyone who came to our shores from the older world. And I say with all humility, but with deep satisfaction, that we Democrats have done much to redeem these promises. Given the mandate of the American people--independents and Republicans abandoned by their party leadership, as well as Democrats--we shall do more. We shall go forward in good heart and good conscience until we have created the Great Society--the "America the Beautiful" of which we have so often dreamed and sung.

-----more-----

This is our case, this is our cause. And if we profit from the example of Harry S. Truman and take it to all the people, wherever they live--North, South, East, and West--I am confident that they will respond to this call in November.

llllllll  
llllllll

Sp. Springfield, Mo.  
Sept. 14, 1964

Revised and used at Springfield  
~~KANSAS CITY SPEECH (TENTATIVE)~~

THE SPIRIT OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

Monday Evening, September 14, 1964

Sixteen years ago, and close by this city, President Harry S. Truman went to bed on election night--by the verdict of every public opinion poll and certain well-known commentators--a rejected and defeated man. He awoke the victor in the most dramatic upset in American political history.

It is well to recall the experience of 1948, because it should be both a warning and an example to us.

It should be a solemn warning never to let ourselves fall victim to complacency--or to be so confident of victory that we do not, in Harry Truman's good words, "do our damndest" to win.

It is a depressing thought, but the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party could be--despite himself--the

President of the United States.

But only if we let him win

His finger--or the finger of some field commander,  
as he has advocated--could be on the nuclear trigger.

But only if we let ~~him~~ win

Voluntary social security and a regressive income  
tax could become the law of the land.

But only if we let him ~~win~~

TVA could be sold to private enterprise and farm  
supports abolished.

But only if we let him win.

Federal assistance in urban redevelopment and housing  
programs could be ended.

But only if we let him win.

In fact, the social and economic achievements of the  
past three decades could be in grave jeopardy.

But only if we let him win.



All this could happen, if we let it. And, if we do, history will not forgive us--if, indeed, there are people left with the ability and the heart to write it.

They say a great thing about George Washington as a general was that he never forgot--not for a single moment in seven long and hard years--that he was the one man who, by a single ill-judged action, could lose the war for independence.

Today the President of the United States is the one and only man in the free world who, by a single error in judgment, a momentary lapse in responsibility, can risk its annihilation.

Yes, it is that important who sits in the White House. As Harry Truman used to say--and it is even more profoundly true today: "The buck stops here."

As for myself, I promise you that I shall leave nothing undone, no mile untraveled, no word unspoken that will help keep responsibility and maturity--in the person of President Lyndon Johnson--in the White House.

Yes, 1948 is a solemn warning which all of us must keep in mind. But it is also an example and an inspiration.

President Truman won, as we Democrats have always won, by taking his case directly to the American people.

Up and down the land he denounced the "do-nothing" 80th Congress for defaulting in its duties to the people.

He certainly "gave 'em hell"--but he never hit below the belt. It would have been totally out of character--and he didn't need to, anyway.

He didn't need to stoop to personal abuse. You don't need to when your case is good. It is only when you have a weak case, or none at all, that the temptation<sup>fs</sup> may be--for some people--too strong to resist.

This Administration and this Congress have a magnificent record to bring before the American people. It is a record of pledges made and pledges kept, of promise and performance.

I commend that record to you for careful study and constant use. It is set forth in black and white, for everyone to read, in our 1964 Democratic platform, "One Nation, One People."

It is a detailed accounting of our stewardship.

It is a record of the accomplishments of President Kennedy in his 1000 days of office, and of President Johnson in his remarkable nine months. It is a record

of the two Democratic Congresses of the past four years--  
the most fruitful in achievement since I first came to  
Washington in 1949.

Abroad, it is a record of peace through preparedness  
and power--and restraint in the use of our power.

At home, it is a record of economic thrust and  
vigor.

Gone but I hope not forgotten is the "stop-and-go"  
economy of the Eisenhower years--what I used to call  
the "cha-cha-cha" economy, forwards and backwards with  
a little shuffle in between.

Instead, we are now in our 43rd straight month of  
sustained economic growth--the longest unbroken peacetime  
expansion in our history.

Our economic growth rate has risen to over five percent  
a year--twice what it averaged in the years of 1953 ~~and~~  
through 1960.

Most Americans know that they are better off than they were four years ago. Real wages are up. Unemployment is down. Profits are up. Farm incomes have risen.

Meanwhile, we have not forgotten those of our fellow citizens who need our help. We have acted to give increased care and attention to the young and to the old, to the physically and mentally afflicted. We have demonstrated once again that progressive government is government with a warm heart as well as a sound head.

These are significant facts--known to all Americans, and not seriously disputed by our opponents.

But it is infinitely more significant, I believe, that in this affluent society--the most affluent the world has ever known--we have committed ourselves to an all-out war against the poverty that still persists in the midst of our plenty.

I sometimes wonder what would have happened if, at the Cow Palace in San Francisco two months ago, a speaker had mounted the rostrum and put the question: "Am I my brother's keeper."

Would the majority at that convention have nodded their heads, or would they have chorused "No!"

I don't venture to say. But I do say that there is little sign of an affirmative answer in the platform they adopted.

As for us, we have always believed--and have always acted on the belief--that we are indeed, all of us, our brothers' keepers.

We do not believe that, in order for some people to live well, others must go ill-fed, ill-housed, or ill-clothed. In this age of automation and accelerating technological progress, there is more than enough for everybody.

We have the resources, if we have the wit and the will, to purge the word "poverty" from our language.

It is a big job--a job never before done or even attempted in any country in all the generations of man--but I am confident that we can do it.

We have made a solid start with the enactment of President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act last month. And, now that we have begun the job, we shall stick with it to the finish.

A great poet and a good Democrat, Archibald MacLeish, has written that "America was <sup>?</sup>promises."

So it has always been, from the beginning, for everyone who came to our shores from the older world, And I say with all humility, but with deep satisfaction, that we Democrats have done much to redeem these promises. Given the mandate of the American people--independents

and Republicans abandoned by their party, <sup>leadership,</sup> as well as Democrats--we shall do more. We shall go forward in good heart and good conscience until we have created the Great Society--the "America the Beautiful" of which we have so often dreamed and sung.

This is our case, this is our cause. And if we profit from the example of Harry S. Truman and take it to all the people, wherever they live--North, South, East, and West--I am confident that they will respond to this call in November.



Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, at  
Press Conference  
Kansas City Airport  
Kansas City, Missouri  
Monday, September 14, 1964, 2:45 p.m.

Senator Humphrey. May we have your attention?

I am very proud to be in the attention of my good friend, the senior Senator from the State of Missouri, Senator Symington, and visit this great city of Kansas City.

I am also very pleased and proud to be present and in the company of the Democratic candidate for Governor, the gentleman that I trust that the people of Missouri will see fit to make the Governor of this State. I know that both the local and the national press may have some questions they would like to ask and without any further ado, I am available for questioning.

Question. Senator, do you think that Senator Goldwater has killed or at least badly wounded the bipartisan foreign policy?

Senator Humphrey. The question from Mr. Piers Anderton is, do I think that Senator Goldwater has seriously wounded or killed the bipartisan foreign policy.

I am going to address myself to this subject tonight at the Music Hall in Kansas City. It is my view that his speech in Seattle was most unfortunate, that it was an affrontal assault upon the great strides that have been made in the development of a bipartisan foreign policy ever since the period of World War II. The speech was not only an attack upon foreign policy that is now being conducted by President Johnson, but indeed, an attack upon some of the great Republicans of our time who have contributed so much to bipartisan foreign policy on national security -- men like Mr. Stimson, the late and beloved Arthur Vandenberg, men like Mr. Forrestal, President Eisenhower, and, of course, many others who have contributed so much to the national unity in terms of our security and foreign policy.

Question. Senator, in a sermon yesterday, one of Washington's respected clergymen, Dean Sayre, said that the people have what is quoted as "a sterile choice between Goldwater and Johnson." He called one man a man of dangerous ignorance and devastating uncertainty and the other a man whose public house is splendid in its every appearance, but his private lack of ethic must inevitably introduce termites at the very foundation. I wonder what comment you would have to that statement of Dean Sayre, sir.

Senator Humphrey. Well, I know the Dean and I surely respect him as one of the great spiritual leaders of our country. I seldom try to put myself in judgment on these matters when our clergy speaks out. I do feel that not only is the public house of America in good order, but knowing our President as I do and knowing his family as I do, and as I am sure many others do, the life and the works of President Johnson and his family have been dedicated to the well being of this country. In fact, a great sacrifice has been made in terms of personal life and personal happiness for the public good.

I find the President to be a man of good health politically, spiritually, and physically.

Question. Senator Humphrey, Senator Goldwater has made his Cuban policy, some fundamentals of his Cuban policy fairly clear. Can we expect if President Johnson gets the mandate of the people in November that there will be any stiffening of this policy or that we will carry along with it in the same respect

of the blockade and other aspects of it that were primarily set up by President Kennedy.

Senator Humphrey. Well, the policy of this government relating to any adversary or any trouble spot is not a partisan matter. The policy which is being pursued now on Cuba is one that has had its genesis first in the Eisenhower Administration and then in the period of President Kennedy's executive leadership, and now with President Johnson.

I don't really believe that much good will come out of a partisan discussion of Cuban policy, because once that starts, there are many charges and counter-charges that can be made. I could name some now, but I will not.

I will simply say that the policy which is being pursued is one that preserves peace in the hemisphere, that has seriously weakened Castro's regime in Cuba, and that has stopped Castro influence in the rest of Latin America.

Castro's influence was tried in Venezuela, in Mexico, in Chile, in Brazil, in the Argentine, and in every place, it was a failure, primarily because of the leadership of the United States and our partners in the Organization of American States.

Question. Senator, Congressman Tom Curtis of Missouri said in Kansas City today that the issue of morality in government would be the prime issue of the campaign, and he raised a charge that the Johnson Administration had been guilty of covering up rather than cleaning up. Do you have any comment on that, sir?

Senator Humphrey. My comment is that that is the kind of politics that one would expect at this season of the year. This is really not much news. I had expected this charge.

This Administration is going to ferret out any wrongdoing wherever it may be; in fact, I am sitting alongside of a distinguished Senator that ferreted out a good deal of wrongdoing in the previous Administration.

This Administration has directed the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is a totally nonpartisan, very effective instrument of investigation under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover, to examine into any charge or allegation of wrongdoing any place in this government. And when those investigations are made and completed, the responsible agencies of government can go before a grand jury and seek an indictment if there is wrongdoing.

I have a feeling that J. Edgar Hoover knows more about investigations than any Congressman and maybe will do a more honorable and a more objective and a more non-political job. So we will just trust the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Justice Department, and the Internal Revenue Service and the other agencies of government that are under civil service, and the courts of this land and the prosecuting attorneys of this land, to protect the so-called public morality. I think they will do a better job than a congressman or a senator in a campaign year.

Question. Senator Humphrey, I believe Senator Williams has said that he does not anticipate any report from the F.B.I. before the November election. Do you?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I hope that I heard you wrong. I understood that you said that Senator Williams -- this is of Delaware?

Question. He has been so quoted in the press.

Senator Humphrey. That he did not expect any report from the F.B.I. before the election ?

Question. This is the report I read on the news wire, sir.

Senator Humphrey. I simply do not believe that J. Edgar Hoover is going to pay any attention to the election date, and I never yet heard that anybody has accused Mr. Hoover of playing partisan politics. I think there is no evidence to that, and I doubt that Mr. Williams meant it seriously. He is occasionally a practical joker.

Question. Senator Humphrey, we have heard a lot of comment about the white backlash. How serious a threat do you consider this to the Democratic ticket in November?

Senator Humphrey. I don't consider it a very serious threat. I consider it a matter of concern, but I think that once the people understand the issues that are before us, once they fully understand that whoever is President of this Nation must take an oath to uphold the law and to enforce the law, including the Civil Rights Act, that people will then review the whole spectrum of the political issues of our day.

There has been much more talk about the so-called backlash than there has been fact. I noticed that in a number of areas that have been surveyed where people are distressed over what they consider to be some excesses in terms of violence and rioting, nevertheless, they support President Johnson. And I think that most Americans are fair if given the chance to be fair, Ma'am, and they want to do what is right.

I hope that the spokesman of the opposition will encourage us to do what is right as we of this party, the Democratic Party, should encourage people to do what is right.

In other words, what I am saying is that we ought to encourage observance of the law, respect for the law, and above all, respect for each other. And that means for everybody.

Question, Senator, he said in Minneapolis the other night that the Administration is encouraging racial violence through its attempts to legislate morality. What do you think of that correlation?

Senator Humphrey. Do I understand you to say -- who said that?

Question. Senator Goldwater said it in Minneapolis.

Senator Humphrey. Senator Goldwater said that the Administration is --

Question. Encouraging racial violence.

Senator Humphrey. As I recall, sir, so that the question may be known by our listeners and viewers, you are saying that Senator Goldwater indicated, or said that the administration is encouraging racial violence. Is that correct?

I doubt that is what Senator Goldwater said. I think what he said was that the Civil Rights Act has encouraged violence and bitterness.

And, of course, I disagree with him on that.

I regret that the Senator has seen fit to attempt to make political capital out of one of the great national problems and national challenges of our time. It is not easy for people to change their habits, nor is it easy for a country to change patterns of conduct such as in the field of civil rights, where we now have a law at the Federal level on public accommodations, fair employment practices. But we will make these changes if given time and given the opportunity to do so. And it ill behooves a candidate for President to indicate that a Federal statute, that was passed by an overwhelming majority of both Republicans and Democrats, after long debate, after serious consideration, after rallying the support of all the great religious organizations of this Nation -- everyone -- Catholic, Protestant and Jew -- that such law encourages bitterness and violence, I think, is -- well, it is a travesty upon decency and justice.

Mr. Goldwater knows better than that and he ought not to talk that way. He ought to join President Johnson in saying that the law needs to be respected and observed and ask people to do just that.

Question. Senator Humphrey, what is your reaction to the New York City groups that are boycotting schools today and presumably tomorrow because of the busing schedule they say, because it destroys the neighborhood school concept?

Senator Humphrey. I am not familiar with all the details of a particular local situation, but I can say, so that the record will be straight, that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not ask for busing of students; in fact, to the contrary.

There is a proviso in the Act saying that the Act shall not be applied for the purpose of busing students from one district to another. What we seek is the elimination of segregation, and we seek to provide for the development of better communities.

These matters that you refer to are problems of local nature to which the Federal law has no effect. In fact, the Federal law precludes any action on the part of the Federal Government in this area.

My own personal view is that we should improve the quality of our neighborhoods. I personally do not feel that we ought to be giving students long distance rides at the expense of families and students. But I do think we ought to build decent communities so that people have a chance to live a normal life, including a school life.

Question. Senator, Senator Goldwater's campaign manager said in Omaha recently that he thought the political battle or the election would be won in the Midwest. Do you think this is true?

Senator Humphrey. You have indicated by your question that Senator Goldwater's campaign manager thought the elections would be won or lost in the Midwest. If that is the case, I am happy that I am in Missouri. Because, may I say that in Missouri, men like Senator Symington, Governor John Dalton, and Warren Hearne and Bill Hull, and others that I can think of -- Senator Ed Long -- I would just like to make this the battleground if they want to. I think that Missouri will stand well in the final outcome, just as it did in 1960.

As I recall, Stuart, Minnesota and Missouri voted for John F. Kennedy, and in 1964, I can assure you that Minnesota, and I am sure Missouri, too, will vote for Lyndon B. Johnson.

I might add that I am of the opinion, too, that in Kansas City, this great district that I am visiting, that they will be voting for Dick Bolling, too, and sending him back to Congress.

Question. Can you tell us, Senator, whether on this campaign tour, you have been in contact with the President and what he might have said to you?

Senator Humphrey. I have not been in contact with the President. I will be as soon as I return on Tuesday morning. But during this tour, no.

Question. Thank you very much, Mr. Senator.



Conversation between former President Harry S. Truman and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, in the Muehlebach Hotel, Kansas City, Missouri, on September 14, 1964.

Senator Humphrey. We were afraid that this would be the only way they would get a chance to see you.

Mr. Truman. That is awfully nice of you to go to so much trouble.

Let me put on these other spectacles.

Senator Humphrey. Mr. Atkins said he wanted to be sure those are the ones that had lenses in them.

Mr. Truman. They wouldn't have any luck with me if they didn't have.

You see, the difference, those are made especially so they don't make a reflection for these birds that have to use cameras -- the "One More Club", I call them.

Senator Humphrey. I am beginning to find out a little bit more about that.

Mr. Truman. Do you know how the "One More Club" was organized?

Senator Humphrey. Well, Mr. President, I think this is a good time to start to ask you a few of the basic essentials that a candidate for Vice President ought to have. How was the One More Club organized?

Mr. Truman. You have all the qualifications; you don't need any more instructions from me.

Senator Humphrey. Yes, I do; yes, sir.

Mr. Truman. The only thing I know is just to be what you are and you won't need any help. That is the best selection that ever was made for Vice President.

Senator Humphrey. I thank you. That is a great compliment.

Mr. Truman. I have known Vice Presidents from the time of Grover Cleveland on down and we have never had a better candidate for Vice President of the United States than you are.

Senator Humphrey. I thank you, Mr. President.

How does it look in Missouri here for the ticket?

Mr. Truman. Well, I don't know. I don't think we are going to win by more than 250,000.

Senator Humphrey. About that?

Well, we will be willing to settle for that, Mr. President.

Mr. Truman. No, Missouri is all right. You needn't worry about the State of Missouri going the way it ought to. It will go overwhelmingly for the Democratic ticket as it always does when it has half a chance.

The thing that worries me, though, is what I hear about southeast Missouri. When Jim Reavis goes haywire, I don't know what we are going to do. I think I will have to throw him in the Mississippi River and pull him out and make him vote for the ticket.

Senator Humphrey. That will help him.

How do you think we are going to do, Mr. President, in the south? You are a good judge of politics.

Mr. Truman. I don't think you are going to have any serious trouble at all in the south. I can't see any place in the south, and I am rather familiar with the situation in most of the southern states -- they will do a lot of talking. And when it comes time to vote, they go into the polls and think, "Well, I can't afford to do that, my daddy will turn over in his grave," so they vote the Democratic ticket. That is what they will do this time.

Senator Humphrey. That is the best reassurance and I want to thank you for it.

Mr. Truman. It is true. That is what I believe, as sure as I sit here.

Senator Humphrey. I have felt that from a number of the southern leaders that have been up to Washington. They have their problems and are concerned about many things, but the Democratic Party has been good to the south and the south has been good to the Democratic Party.

Mr. Truman. And the south wouldn't have anything at all if it weren't for the fact that they belong to the Democratic Party. There is one thing about it. I don't think you have to worry about what they will do. I have had a lot of experience with them and they are all of the sort that remember things that they ought to remember. And that is that they can't afford to be Republican, because if the Republicans had their way, there wouldn't have been any south.

Senator Humphrey. Well, now, Mr. President, speaking about our friend in the Republican Party, one of the things that I have noticed on this trip is a goodly number of Republicans come up to me, or people say to me, "I am a Republican but I am going to vote for President Johnson."

Do you feel that we are going to get a sizable Republican vote because of the Goldwater nomination?

Mr. Truman. Oh, yes, I do. Goldwater's speech that he made for the acceptance of the nomination ought to be good for any Democrats.

Senator Humphrey. The acceptance thing?

Mr. Truman. Yes, it was terrible. I thought all those people of that viewpoint had passed away long ago, but he is trying to revive a situation that does not exist, that is all.

Senator Humphrey. You are familiar with his speech out in Seattle, when he attacked our foreign policy?

Mr. Truman. Yes, indeed. That is one of the things I can't understand. You know -- I don't know whether you remember it or not, but a young man from Minnesota, who was a Republican at that time and a congressman, and myself, went to every State in the middle of the Union and discussed a bipartisan foreign policy -- not non-partisan, bipartisan foreign policy. It was overwhelmingly passed by the Congress of the United States after that.

What he is trying to do is to put the foreign policy on the boards for a trouble during the election. It shouldn't be done. Foreign policy represents the United States as a whole and not

Senator Humphrey. And you, sir, in your Administration immediately following the war, established the line of bipartisan foreign policy with Arthur Vandenberg and some of the great Republican leaders at that time.

Mr. Truman. That is ~~exactly~~ right.

Senator Humphrey. That is what we are going to try to maintain.

Mr. Truman. It must be maintained and I think that is what you are for and you must do everything to see that it is maintained, because you are the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States.

Senator Humphrey. I look forward to that day.

How do you think our President is doing?

Mr. Truman. He is doing fine.

Senator Humphrey. He is, isn't he?

Mr. Truman. Yes, he couldn't do any better. He is a very able and brilliant man.

Senator Humphrey. Very well experienced.

Mr. Truman. I think so.

Senator Humphrey. Of course, you had the chance to know him real well, not only through your personal knowledge of him, but through your old friend, Sam Rayburn.

Mr. Truman. That is correct. I knew him when he was in the Congress of the United States and I was there, too, part of the time. I know him very well. He is a very able and efficient public servant. That is what you want.

Senator Humphrey. Well, Mr. President, I have not often had the opportunity to be in the role of some of these fine newspapermen and radio and TV commentators that we have before you, but I sort of enjoy just asking the questions, particularly when I am having a chance to ask the chairman some questions.

Mr. Truman. Well, you give me too much credit, but I appreciate it.

Senator Humphrey. Not at all.

How do you think we ought to be campaigning? Do you think we are doing the right thing or do you have some good advice for us?

Mr. Truman. I think you are campaigning in the right direction and that you ought to stand on the platform of the Democratic Party, which is an excellent one, and you can't go wrong.

Senator Humphrey. Carry on the battle?

Mr. Truman. That is right. Carry the battle to them. Don't let them bring it to you. Put them on the defensive. And don't ever apologize for anything. Don't let anybody put you on the defensive.

Senator Humphrey. Today at Springfield, I opened up my campaign speech before a wonderful crowd, by the way -- it was a magnificent group there -- and cited that 1948 experience when everybody, all the pundits and political commentators, thought you had had it, so to speak. But when you awakened the next morning, you had the prize -- you were the President of the United States. I warned all our good friends here that even with all these polls being good for us, not to become complacent.



- 4 -

Mr. Truman. Not at all. Just act like they don't exist. I never pay any attention to polls. If I had I wouldn't have been elected.

Senator Humphrey. You are so right. That is the advice I try to give all --

Mr. Truman. Look at these fellows grin.

Senator Humphrey. I don't think we ought to take any more of your time.

Mr. Truman. It is not my time, it is yours that you are wasting, because they are waiting upstairs to hear you speak.

Senator Humphrey. Oh, no, we are going to do a little speaking over at the Music Hall and I am going to tell them a little bit about how you constructed that great bipartisan foreign policy. I think the foreign policy and national security is your greatest achievement.

Mr. Truman. I do, too, and I don't want to see it thrown out the window by a fellow who knows nothing about it. And your opponent doesn't.

Senator Humphrey. I think so, too.

Thank you very much.

- - -

Mr President

Sp: Kansas City, Mo  
Sept. 14, 1964

Sen. Long  
Gov Dalton  
Gov Hearnes  
Sen Ed  
Sen Symington  
Cong Randall  
Cong Balling

Dick Balling  
Jackson County  
Democratic  
Back LBS  
with Denise  
from State House  
Court house

ADDRESS OF

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Kansas City, Missouri

Monday, September 14, 1964

Last Wednesday was a sad day for America.

On that day in Seattle the temporary spokesman  
of the Republican Party offered his countrymen the  
first full-dress speech of his campaign on the  
American  
subject of foreign policy.

Here was a chance for all of us -- and for  
our friends, allies, and adversaries abroad -- to  
take full measure of the man who aspires to the  
most powerful office in the world. Here was a  
chance to listen to his  
critique of four years of Democratic stewardship

in foreign affairs, his alternatives to past  
policies, and his specific proposals for action  
in the four years ahead. Here was a chance for  
him to reassure the nation and the Free World by  
showing the wisdom, prudence and responsibility  
so ~~very~~ essential to the American Presidency.

And what did we hear in Seattle?

We heard ~~an~~ intemperate intemperate assault

on the integrity of all those who have helped

to build our foreign policy in this infinitely

dangerous and promising world. We heard

slanderous charges of opportunism and cynicism,

~~so far-reaching as to be believable only of~~

~~monsters.~~ We heard a grotesque and unrecognizable

account of the past four years. And yet we heard

not a single word about what he would have done

= : = 2

in the past or what he would do in the future.

↳ Saddest of all, we ~~also~~ heard ~~in his words~~  
the ominous sound of a splitting rock -- words

indicating that if he had his way the mighty

fortress of American bipartisanship in foreign

affairs would develop a deep crack *and be shattered.*

↳ ~~the~~ the words of Barry Goldwater ~~were words~~

~~that~~ cut at the heart of American political

*they cut at*  
history -- nearly two decades of dynamic

partnership between the two great political

parties, a partnership that basically began at

the water's edge with an end to petty politics

as we united to face our tasks abroad.

↳ In Seattle Barry Goldwater did his best

to destroy that partnership. Yet I doubt that he

really succeeded -- or that he can succeed. *✓* The

American people know better. In his reckless-  
ness Barry Goldwater has taken on more than just  
the Democratic Party. He has flown in the face  
of history and reality. / And he has assaulted the work of  
the giants of his own great party, the architects  
of bipartisanship -- Henry L. Stimson, Wendell  
Willkie, Senator Arthur Vandenburg, John Foster  
Dulles, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Frankly, we had hoped for better things  
from the Republican candidate. Only a few  
weeks ago, you will remember, there was a  
Summit Meeting in Hershey, Pennsylvania, of  
both Republican parties -- the party of  
Eisenhower and the party of Goldwater. At this  
peace pow-wow Barry buried his hatchet -- and  
announced his conversion to the foreign policy

principles and record of the Eisenhower

administration, which he had opposed so often when President Eisenhower was in office.

↳ For one brief moment Republicans could hope that the sane and sensible policies that had commanded bipartisan support for so long might win the adherence of the Republican nominee in 1964. ↳

For one brief moment they could hope that Senator Goldwater would retract his impulsive threats, would turn from his crusade for extremism towards the sanity of moderation.

↳ But then came Seattle -- and out came the hatchet, all sharpened up for a wild bout of chopping at the U.S. ship of state.

↳ In vain, then, were the hopes of moderate Republicans that the Hershey Summit Meeting had

produced a new Goldwater. In vain, too, were the hopes millions of people -- Democrats as well as Republicans -- that Americans might be faced in this crucial election with a choice between two men of prudence and responsibility for the supreme office of President.

L The sad fact of Seattle is that no such choice exists. For there is no new Goldwater.

There is only that same old impulsive figure from a never-never-land of his own making -- a land, as my distinguished colleague, Senator *Eugene*

McCarthy, so eloquently put it, "in which the calendar has no years, in which the clock has no hands, and in which glasses have no lenses."

Let me tell you one thing: that Seattle speech was an amazing performance. The temporary Republican spokesman went peering

around the globe, seeing gloom and doom every-  
where. He rounded up every foreign policy  
problem of the past four years that he could  
lay his hands on; and he divided them up into  
two ~~little~~ groups. As for the crises that were  
hard to describe as defeats for the United  
States -- for instance, the Cuban missile  
confrontation of October 1962 and the Gulf of  
Tonkin crisis this summer -- these, he com-  
plained, had been somehow cooked up by the  
Administration for political purposes: timed,  
staged, and delivered just to make trouble  
for Republicans. As for all the others, he said,  
they simply added up to a "record of international  
disaster."

I ask just two questions: Where has Barry



been for the past four years? And who is his eye-doctor? Because -- heaven knows -- Barry needs help. He simply can't see very well.

Actually, Seattle showed that Barry knows he needs help, too. He told us that he was setting up a committee of advisers to help him understand the problems of foreign policy.

~~We can all be thankful. We wish these advisers well in their difficult assignment. These teachers have a real problem student; and they've got a problem teacher too. Who's the chief tutor of this cram course in foreign affairs?~~

Our old friend Dick Nixon!

Frankly, my friends, on the basis of his Seattle analysis, I submit that the Senator from

Arizona knows little about the world beyond  
our shores, knows less about the record of  
the past four years, and knows virtually  
nothing about the serious conduct of foreign  
policy in a nuclear age.

Furthermore, ~~I also submit that~~ he has  
exceeded all bounds of truth and decency in  
his Seattle diatribe. ~~For in the course of~~  
~~that speech~~ Senator Goldwater charged that  
President Kennedy deliberately manipulated the  
Cuban missile crisis for partisan political  
gain.

Here, in this charge, the Republican  
nominee has struck a new low in his campaign  
of slander and smear. I know that the charge  
is false. Senator Goldwater should know that  
the charge is false. Senator Goldwater may be

naive about many things, but he is not naive

about this. He has been in Washington for

years. He knows how the great processes of

government work in times of national crisis.

L Apart from his own recent proposals to

change the rules, he knows that the ultimate

responsibility for life-and-death decisions

belongs to the President. President Kennedy

exercised that responsibility for all of us in

October 1962.

L What can we think of a man now aspiring

to the Presidency of the United States who

deliberately attacks the patriotism, honesty,

and integrity of a recently martyred holder of

that office? What can we think of a Presidential

candidate who smears with the brush of partisan

politics the most fateful decision any President  
has made in this decade?

What can we think of a man who charges  
that a crisis involving the possible incineration  
of the northern hemisphere was handled on a political  
timetable? What can we think of a candidate who  
now slanders the reputation, after death, of a  
President whom he personally knew and hitherto  
respected?

This reckless attack would be deplorable  
enough if it came from sheer lack of information.

But in this case Senator Goldwater cannot be  
excused on grounds of ignorance and excessive  
political zeal. He is a member of the Senate  
Preparedness Subcommittee which held exhaustive  
top-secret hearings in the spring of 1963 on every  
aspect of the Cuban missile crisis. He attended

those hearings and questioned the witnesses.

*and* He did not dissent from the Committee report.

↳ Senator Goldwater knows the full story of  
the Cuban missile crisis at a privileged  
level of detail.

↳ A man sharing this platform tonight, the  
distinguished Senior Senator from Missouri,

Stuart Symington, who served with Senator

Goldwater on that same Senate Preparedness

Subcommittee, has assured me that the entire

record of the crisis was presented to the

Committee -- including all details on the

exact moment when the photographs of the

missiles were taken, who took them, where,

and when. All this Senator Goldwater knows *too*.

Senator Symington's conclusion -- which I

believe is shared by all members of the

Senate who have access to the facts -- is that

Senator Goldwater's charge is false.

I cannot believe that this ill-advised charge reflects the "conscience of a conservative."

It is the raving of a desperate office-seeker.

I believe that all Americans -- of any political party, of any section of the country --

will resent this slander on the memory of John F.

Kennedy and will reject the charge as false

*and reject the  
author of  
the charge.*

~~Yes, Seattle was a low point, but let us~~

~~hope that we may now hear wiser words from our~~

Republican opponent about the great issues of

foreign policy ~~that~~ do indeed confront us. These

are issues that need to be discussed. But they

deserve discussion on the basis of hard facts,

not distortions.

And among those hard facts is the clear and undeniable record of United States foreign policy under the leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

It is a record of which all Americans in both political parties can be enormously proud: a record of relentless dedication by gifted men of both parties in pursuit of a more peaceful world -- dedication in strength, dedication in faith, dedication in wisdom.

Look back for a moment at the distance we have come since January 1961. In these dynamic forty-four months...

...we have vastly widened the gap between U.S. and Soviet strategic military power.

↳ ...we have caught up with and surpassed  
the Soviets in space exploration.

↳ ...we have greatly increased the massive  
economic superiority of the U.S. and the Western  
world over the Communist world.

↳ ...we have taken the first step in  
history toward the control of nuclear weapons  
and the end of atmospheric poisoning through the  
conclusion of the Test Ban Treaty.

↳ ...we have diminished the danger of nuclear  
war through misunderstanding by the establishment  
of the Hot Line between Washington and Moscow.

↳ ...we have met the crucial test of Soviet  
threats to the freedom of West Berlin -- West  
Berlin today remains robust and free.

↳ ...we have opened windows of light and air



**to** the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and have given new hope to those who live under Communism.

↳ ...we have responded with power, restraint, and precision to each Communist probe of our will and intentions -- in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam, and in the Gulf of Tonkin.

↳ ...we have proven to our friends in Asia that our power remains pre-eminent and our devotion to freedom firm -- and to our foes that the U.S. is no paper tiger.

↳ ...we have assisted the 400 million people of India to survive an attack from Communist China, and ~~enter into with us a program to prevent further~~ Chinese aggression.

↳ ...we have aided the extraordinary growth ~~of~~ economic strength and maturity of Japan

and the Republic of China.

L...we have worked with our neighbors  
of this hemisphere in the creation of an  
historic new partnership, the Alliance for  
Progress -- and we have joined with them in  
the isolation, quarantine, and exclusion of  
Communist Cuba from the inter-American  
community.

L...we have broken new ground in trade  
legislation that can give even greater long-  
term strength and unity to the Atlantic  
Community.

*and* Most significant of all, we have  
witnessed in these months -- and we have  
treated with care and prudence -- one of the  
greatest cataclysmic changes of modern history,  
a change that immeasurably aids the cause of

freedom -- the fantastic disruption and frag-  
mentation of the Sino-Soviet empire.

↳ This, then, is our record of the past  
four years.

↳ Is this a "record of international disaster",  
as Senator Goldwater tells us? Far from it! It is  
a record of solid progress -- our allies know it,  
our adversaries know it, and the American people  
know it.

↳ Heaven knows we still have problems --  
we still have crises, and we will have them for  
a long time to come. For the path toward peace  
is long and slow, and dangerous and tortuous. To  
walk that path in a nuclear age we need all the  
brains and skill and wisdom, all the wit and  
courage and compassion that we can find within  
us. ~~↳ Yet instead of such qualities, the~~

could  
cut

~~temporary republican spokesman is offering us  
a substitute, a new instrument of foreign  
policy -- the free swinging meat axe.~~

could  
cut

⌞ The world we live in is a dangerous world --

a world darkened by nuclear weapons and a

spiralling ~~arms~~ race, a world darkened

by the sinister attempts of Communism to seize control

of nations and their destinies, and the minds

of men. ⌞ It is not a world for men of timid or impulsive

spirit. ~~It is a world where passions and~~

~~conflict and danger cause difficulty for men~~

~~and nations everywhere~~

⌞ But it is also a world of promise! We

are at the threshold, ~~as never before~~, of an

age when mankind can feed its hungry, clothe

and house its needy, bring care and cure to

the suffering and the sick, bring justice to

the oppressed, bring literacy and learning

and opportunity to those who

*long for a better life.*

*could cut*

And we are beginning -- slowly, carefully,  
painstakingly -- to reach for that promise, to  
move across that threshold. We are learning  
that individual burdens can be lifted if national  
burdens can be shared. We have begun, ~~however~~  
~~here~~ to work towards that Great Society for  
which all men yearn in their heart of hearts.

~~But the ideal and reality of the Great Society  
is not the private domain of Americans alone.~~

~~In the years ahead, we can begin to help create  
an expanding Great Society abroad -- in our  
Atlantic and Pacific Communities, and in the  
less developed continents.~~

How shall we do these things -- the great tasks that lie before us? Under the leadership of a man who vilifies the past, distorts the present, and shrinks from the future -- who lives to curse the darkness and never sees the light?


We Americans are children of light -- let us ~~reject~~ *reject* forever the children of darkness.

We have today in the highest office of our land a man who understands our world -- its dangers and its promise. We have a man of courage, prudence, and compassion -- 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.

It is especially appropriate that we  
should speak of such a man and such qualities  
here in Kansas City. For this is the home  
country of another great American of similar  
qualities who did so much to guide our land  
and the Free World through times of crisis  
and epoch-making decisions. Wherever creative  
statesmanship and dynamic bipartisanship in  
foreign affairs are honored, there will men  
honor the name of Harry S. Truman.

It is a depressing thought, but in the  
weeks ahead we must remember that the temporary  
spokesman for the Republican Party could

become -- ~~despite himself~~ -- the President  
of the United States.  He could be in a  
position to reverse the global gains of  
Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon  
B. Johnson.

 But only if we let him win.

He could be in a position to withdraw  
the United States from the United Nations --  
one of mankind's best hopes for freedom  
since its founding in the days of Harry S.  
Truman.

 But only if we let him.

He could have his finger -- or that of  
some field commander -- on the nuclear trigger.

 But only if we let him.

He could be in a position to destroy the



foreign aid program, one of the pillars of American security since the Marshall Plan of Harry S. Truman sparked the recovery of Europe.

L But only if we let him.

He could be in a position to destroy the nuclear test-ban treaty which has halted the pollution of the atmosphere.

L But only if we let him.

But I know and you know that we shall not let him win.

As for myself I promise you that I shall leave nothing undone, no mile untraveled, no word unspoken ~~that will help defeat Senator Goldwater~~, that will help keep responsibility and maturity in the White House.

L Few men have ever risen so rapidly to the challenge of history -- and with such success -- as Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson.

L No man today is more suberbly qualified to lead our nation and the world towards the noble goals of the Great Society than our President.

Z I ask you tonight to pledge your hearts -- and your votes in November -- to our President, Lyndon Baynes Johnson.



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)