

## OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
YOUNG DEMOCRATS' NATIONAL CONVENTION
HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA
NOVEMBER 18, 1967

Next year will be an important year for America.

We, the people, are going to do more than elect a President and a new Congress.

We are going to have to decide some basic and fundamental issues of this last third of the twentieth century:

Does this country want a successful War on Poverty — or not?

Do we want the best in education for every American child — or not?

Do we want the 70 per cent of the American people who live in our cities to have a clean, safe, rewarding environment — or not?

Do we want to continue our path toward responsibility and peaceful development around the world — or not?

Do we have the patience and courage to use our power with restraint, and our wealth with compassion — or not?

There have been elections in the United States where issues were secondary.

Not in 1968. Not in the nuclear age.

The American people want to hear fundamental issues responsibly debated.

They want the facts.

And they want to measure one man and his policies against another, asking this basic question: Which man has the capacity, the experience, the prudence and the political philosophy best suited to leading this country through the demanding years immediately ahead?

I look forward to that kind of a campaign. I think it will be healthy for America, and healthy for the Democratic party.

I have seen the polls.

I have read a thousand pessimistic reports. And I am confident.

I am confident because I believe the hard cross-fire of 1968 will expose the doubters...the nay-sayers...the people who think this country can afford A Pause, for what they are — people unwilling to face up to the fundamental challenges of this time and place.

I believe, before November 1968, the American people will come to know that second-guessing...that nostalgia...that wishfulness...that a show-business smile are not substitutes for the clear, forward-looking commitments of a party and a President dedicated to freedom and human dignity — at home and in the world.

\* \* \* \* \*

The choice before the American voter on the home front is clear-cut — progress or retreat.

It is a choice between the party and the President that gave this country the Model Cities program, and the party that voted 80 per cent against it,

- between the President and the party that wanted a rat control program and the party that voted 87 per cent against it,
- -- between the President and the party that conceived rent supplements -- and the party that voted 93 per cent against it:
- between the President and the party that wanted a strong program of federal aid to elementary and secondary education and the party that voted 86 per cent against it.

Most of that legislation is now on the books, along with the great Civil Rights Act of 1964...the Voting Rights Act of 1965...Medicare...a minimum wage soon to reach a dollar and sixty cents.

Some look at that record of achievement and call for A Pause. "Enough for now."

To pause is to turn back. And let me tell you that there is a Coalition of Retreat in Congress today that <u>is</u> moving us back.

They cut President Johnson's Model Cities request by half: three-fourths off the rent supplements request.

The appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is three times what it was when President John F. Kennedy came into office in 1961, and twice what it was when Lyndon Johnson became President.

But here again the cold wind of retreat was blowing.

The Teachers Corps was cut from 36 million dollars to 13.5 million. President Johnson wanted to see 25 hundred young teachers serving poor children in urban and rural areas of this country next year, but the Coalition of Retreat thought three hundred and fifty would be enough.

We have all followed that hair-raising new serial — The Perils of the Poverty Program — over the last few weeks. Will the poverty authorization be cut by a third? Will your Community Action center be strangled by lack of funds?

Will 60 Job Corps camps be closed down, and 20 thousand jobless, untrained youths sent home to live on welfare?

Can American cities make it through another hot, explosive summer with no federally-funded programs for disadvantaged youngsters?

Our program has survived its passage through the Authorization Swamp, but will it make it through Appropriations Gulch?

If the War on Poverty has a chance this year, it is for one reason: People all over the country have spoken up for it — and not only the poor ones who are waiting to see how this rich country means to treat their new-found hopes.

Certainly progress costs something. But so does hard-core unemployment...preventable disease... inadequate education that prevents a young man from earning — or hoping.

I don't think the American public is "penny wise and people foolish," to use Adlai Stevenson's words.

I think this rich nation, with its liberal traditions, is ready to bring those now excluded into the mainstream of American society. I think we are ready to tackle the complex economic and social disabilities our legal progress in civil rights has exposed.

I think we are ready to complete Democracy's House.

And it is going to be the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Baines Johnson that does it.

\* \* \*

The Coalition of Retreat on foreign policy is non-partisan. It runs from far right to far left. And its objectives are not homogeneous.

The Retreaters will have trouble settling on one Presidential candidate who will suit all their divergent views of the world, but I think I can simplify their choice:

Those who think America is involved in the world for keeps, and who want this nation to play a role of firm and creative leadership will vote for President Lyndon Johnson.

Those who want to let the world settle the issues of war and peace, development and starvation, without American participation will find themselves another candidate.

I don't think a mojority of the American people are ready to scrap liberal trade and economic growth around the world and return to the days of Smoot-Hawley protectionism.

I doubt if they will be satisfied with a foreign aid authorization, passed last week, that amounts to less than a third of one per cent of our GNP...which, in the words of President Johnson, "reduces the margin of hope to the danger point." So I am confident of support on these issues.

Then there is the issue of America's role in Asia... and I mean all of Asia, not just Vietnam.

I recently returned from a visit to three Asian nations — South Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia.

Fach has its own character. But all share two vital common denominators:

- past and present resistance to Asian Communist subversion and aggression — covert or overt;
- urgent and priority efforts toward constructive nation-building.

These are the common denominators, in fact, among all the independent nations of that area.

Do we have any business there?

More American lives were lost in the Pacific than in Europe during World War II. Add to that our casualities in Korea and Vietnam.

Since 1946 we have committed more than 25 billion dollars worth of loans, grants, food and technical assistance to countries in the arc between West Pakistan and Japan.

That commitment to national security, and to national development, in Asia has been upheld by four American Presidents.

It has been upheld because they have seen it in our clear national interest that a continent at the strategic crossroads of the world...rich in resources... possessing more than half the world's people should not be nakedly exposed to Communist pressure.

It has been upheld because we as a nation have believed — or at least I thought we did — that peoples of all colors, races and religions deserved their chance to grow and develop free of coercion and tyranny.

What has our support for the efforts of free Asians achieved?

Japan is a prosperous, stable democracy.

South Korea is secure and on the verge of economic self-sufficiency.

Formosa has achieved economic self-sufficiency.

India and Pakistan have stable, progressive governments. They are making substantial progress in agriculture, population control and industrial development.

Indonesia, potentially the richest nation in Southeast Asia, gained time to throw off — for and by itself — a flagrant attempt at a Communist coup, and is now embarking on the long road to economic development.

All the nations of Asia have joined together in new regional cooperation.

Looking ahead, we can predict that economic development will be painfully slow...but that without it there will be chaos.

We can predict that mainland China will soon emerge as a nuclear power...still preaching and supporting the dogma of the cynically-misnamed "wars of national liberation."

We can predict that Asian communism will continue for the foreseeable future to retain its militancy.

We can predict that free Asian nations will continue to reach out to us for help.

That is the broad context in which the American people must decide what they want to do about the immediate issue of Vietnam.

Are we going to last it out until there is a just and peaceful settlement?

Or are we going to withdraw, short of such a settlement,...abandon the people of South Vietnam... and prove to the aggressors that might, after all, does make right?

Or — at the other extreme — are we going to impetuously reach for the weapons that would settle the issue in Vietnam by burying it in World War III?

Make no mistake about it. Vietnam is a test that is being closely watched by our friends and enemies alike.

They have no doubt about what is happening in the field.

They see the best-trained, best-equipped American soldiers in our history standing firm against aggression.

They have seen five successive elections, free and fair, take place when the critics said it couldn't be done.

They have seen the South Vietnamese Army steadily improving just as the South Korean Army did 15 years ago.

They have seen the tide of battle turning from a seemingly inevitable victory for the Communists in 1965 to a situation where Communist victory is today impossible.

But they are also watching the situation here at home...and they are wondering: Can we win the war on the American home front?

As a long-time dissenter myself, I defend the right of any American to dissent in good conscience.

But I ask all Americans, before they dissent, to search their hearts...to examine the facts...to know the effect of what they say on our civilians and soldiers in Vietnam — and on our adversaries.

I ask them to face, before they raise their voices, the hard fact of cynical Communist-initiated aggression and terror in Vietnam.

I ask them to recognize that we face in Vietnam no peaceful reformer seeking power through parliamentary means.

We face not handbills but hand grenades.

I ask them to realize the importance of our stake in Vietnam as part of our historic commitment to a free Asia.

I ask them to understand that an honorable peace through negotiation can come only when all parties agree to talk.

I am ready to hear those issues debated responsibly by the American people.

And I am ready to predict that they will stand behind the Administration which has had the courage to take the difficult middle path — to stand fast against appression, to insist on the development of democratic institutions even under the most adverse conditions, and to show restraint when it has the power to do otherwise.

For I believe that, under a few inches of American topsoil, there lies determination and strength of solid rock.

\* \* \*

My friends, our President and our party can stand before the people in 1968 with a proud record of accomplishment at home, and a record of patient, untiring building for a better tomorrow in the world at large.

But we can offer them even more — a Manifesto of Freedom consistent with the strength and vision of America in the last third of the twentieth century:

Freedom from poverty...for all; Freedom from ignorance...for all; Freedom from discrimination...for all; Freedom from fear...for all.

That is the Democratic Party's promise to America — and America's promise to the world.

And with that message — working for it and believing in it — we can make America stand for the best that is in it.

We can keep America strong and free — and the center of man's peaceful revolution toward a better chance...a fuller dignity...a life of freedom.

# # #

White Muse REMARKS VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY YOUNG DEMOCRATS' NATIONAL CONVENTION HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA W." ROM Next year win We, the people, are going to do more than elect a President and a new Congress. We are going to have to decide some basic and fundamental issues of this last third of the twentieth century: Does this country want a successful War on Poverty -or not? Do we want the best in education for every American child -- or not? L'Downwant Equal opp

we want the 70 per cent of the American people
who live in our cities to have a clean, safe, rewarding
environment or not?
Do we want to continue our path toward responsibility
and peaceful development around the world or not?
Do we have the patience and courage to use our
power with restraint, and our wealth with compassion
or not? (X) Ablai  There have been elections in the United States
There have been elections in the United States
where issues were secondary.
Not in 1968. Not in the nuclear age.
The American people want to hear fundamental
issues responsibly debated.
They want the facts.
And they want to measure one man and his policies
against another, asking this basic question: Which man

has the capacity, the experience, the prudence and the political philosophy best suited to leading this country through the demanding years immediately ahead? I look forward to that kind of a campaign. think it will be healthy for America, and healthy for the Democratic party. \_ I have seen the polls\_ Likemi I have read a thousand pessimistic reports. And I am confident. am confident because I believe the hard cross-fire 1968 will expose the doubters....the nay-sayers... the people who think this country can afford A Pause,

the people who think this country can afford A Pause for what they are -- people unwilling to face up to the fundamental challenges of this time and place.

I believe, before November 1968, the American

people will come to know that second-guessing....that ...that wishfulness....that a show-business smile are not substitutes for the clear, forward-looking commitments of a party and a President dedicated to freedom and human dignity -- at home and in the world. The choice before the American voter on the home front is clear-cut -- progress or retreat. -It is a choice between the party and the President that gave this country the Model Cities program, and the party that voted 80 per cent against it

a checker- between the President and the party that conceived rent supplements -- and the party that

voted 93 per cent against it;

a chave- between the President and the party that wanted a strong program of federal aid to elementary and secondary education -- and the party that voted 86 per cent against it. Most of that legislation is now on the books, along with the great Civil Rights Act of 1964....the Voting Rights Act of 1965..... Medicare....a minimum wage soon to reach a dollar and sixty cents. Some look at that record of achievement and "Enough for now." call for A Pause. that there is a Coalition of Retreat in Congress today that is moving us back-President Johnson's Model Cities

> House -Smale Deffere

half; three-fourths off the rent supplements request.

The appropriations bill for the Department of Health,
Education and Welfare is three times what it was when
President John F. Kennedy came into office in 1961, and
twice what it was when Lyndon Johnson became President.

But here again the cold wind of retreat was blowing.

The Teachers Corps was cut from 36 million dollars to 13.5 million. President Johnson wanted to see 25 hundred young teachers serving poor children in urban and rural areas of this country next year, but the Coalition of Retreat thought three hundred and fifty would be enough.

The Perils of the Poverty Program -- over the last few weeks. Will the poverty authorization be cut by a third? Will your Community Action center be strangled by lack of funds?

Poverts Program,

Will 60 Job Corps camps be closed down, and 20 thousand jobless, untrained youths sent home to live on welfare?

Can American cities make it through another hot, explosive summer with no federally-funded programs for disadvantaged youngsters?

Our program has survived its passage through the Authorization Swamp, but will it make it through Appropriations Gulch?

If the War on Poverty has a chance this year, it is for one reason: People all over the country have spoken up for it—and not only the poor ones who are waiting to see how this rich country means to treat their new-found hopes.

Certainly progress costs something. But so does



9909 COLLINS AVENUE BAL HARBOUR, MIAMI BEACH 54, FLORIDA

OUR Job is to Keep PeoPle in this PARTY, Not to drive they out.

The FIRST duty of a RESPONSIBLE POLITICAL LEADER is to LEARN to RESPECT the other Fellow's Point of VIEW,

If you don't believe in yourself, your PARTY OR YOUR PRESIDENT, how do you expect there to believe in you?

Never Put poison in the well from

which you will have to drink.

A RESPONSIBLE political party encourages debate, Accepts dissent, welcomes discussion and has the courage to Make decisions,

FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT REMINDED US there is are a MULTITUDE of WAYS to Move ahead.

hard-core unemployment....preventable disease.... inadequate education that prevents a young man from earning -- or hoping. / I don't think the American public is " penny wise and people foolish," to use Adlai Stevenson's words. I think this rich nation, with its liberal traditions, is ready to bring these now excluded into the mainstream of American society. 🖊 I think we are ready to tackle the complex economic and social disabilities our legal progress in civil rights has exposed. I think we are ready to complete Democracy's House.  $^\prime$  And it is going to be the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Baines Johnson that does it.

pur Hasalath

The Coalition of Retreat on foreign policy is non-partisan. It runs from far right to far left. And its objectives are not homogeneous.

The Retreaters will have trouble settling on one
Presidential candidate who will suit all their divergent
views of the world, but I think I can simplify their choice:

Those who think America is involved in the world for keeps, and who want this nation to play a role of firm and creative leadership will vote for President Lyndon Johnson.

Those who want to let the world settle the issues of war and peace, development and starvation, without American participation will find themselves another candidate.

I don't think a majority of the American people are ready to scrap liberal trade and economic growth

protectionism.

I doubt if they will be satisfied with a foreign aid authorization, passed last week, that amounts to less than a third of one per cent of our GNP....which, in the words of President Johnson, "reduces the margin of hope to the danger point." Se I am confident of support on these issues

Then there is the issue of America's role in Asia....

and I mean all of Asia, not just Vietnam.

nations -- South Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia.

Z Each has its own character. But all share two vital common denominators:

-- past and present resistance to Asian Communist subversion and aggression -- covert or overt;

-- urgent and priority efforts toward constructive nation-building.

These are the common denominators, in fact, among all the independent nations of that area.

Do we have any business there?

More American lives were lost in the Pacific than in Europe during World War II. Add to that our casualties in Korea and Vietnam

Since 1946 we have committed more than 25 billion dollars worth of loans, grants, food and technical assistance into countries in the arc between West Pakistan and Japan.

That commitment to national security, and to national development, in Asia has been upheld by four American Presidents

thas been upheld because they have seen it in our

clear national interest that a continent at the strategic

crossroads of the world.....rich in resources.... possessing more than half the world's people should not be nakedly exposed to Communist pressure. ( 5+K <del>pheld because</del> **W**e as a nation have believed -- or at least I thought we did -- that peoples of all colors, races and religions deserved their chance to grow and develop free of coercion and tyranny. What has our support for the efforts of free Asians achieved? Japan is a prosperous, stable democracy. South Korea is secure and on the verge of economic self-sufficiency. Formosa has achieved economic self-sufficiency. India and Pakistan have stable, progressive governments. They are making substantial progress in agriculture

population control and industrial development.

Indonesia, potentially the richest nation in Southeast Asia, gained time to throw off -- for and by itself -- a flagrant attempt at a Communist coup, and is now embarking on the long road to economic development.

All the nations of Asia have joined together in new regional cooperation.

Looking ahead, we can predict that economic development will be painfully slow....but that without it there will be chaos.

We can predict that mainland China will soon emerge as a nuclear power....still preaching and supporting the dogma of the cynically-misnamed 'wars of national liberation.'

We can predict that Asian communism will continue for the foreseeable future to retain its militancy.

We can predict that free Asian nations will
continue to reach out to us for help.
Inat is the broad context in which the American
people must decide what they want to do about the
immediate issue of Vietnam.
Are we going to last it out until there is a just
and peaceful settlement?
Or are we going to withdraw, short of such a
settlement,abandon the people of South Vietnam
and prove to the aggressors that might, after all,
does make right?
Or at the other extreme are we going to
impetuously reach for the weapons that would settle
the issue in Vietnam by burying it in World War III?
Make no mistake about it. Vietnam is a test
that is being closely watched by our friends and enemies
ali <del>ke</del> .

They have no doubt about what is happening in the field.

They see the best-trained, best-equipped American soldiers in our history standing firm against aggression. They have seen five successive elections, free and fair, take place when the critics said it couldn't be done. They have seen the South Vietnamese Army steadily improving just as the South Korean Army did 15 years ago. They have seen the tide of battle turning from a seemingly inevitable victory for the Communists in 1965 to a situation where Communist victory is today impossible.

But they are also watching the situation here at home....and they are wondering: Can we win the

war on the American home front?

ing-Down home front? - They are ing-Down have the Will, the investion, the necessary with

As a long-time dissenter myself, I defend the right of any American to dissent in good conscience. But I ask all Americans, before they dissent, to search their hearts....to examine the facts....to know the effect of what they say on our civilians and soldiers in Vietnam -- and on our adversaries. I ask them to face, before they raise their voices, the hard fact of cynical Communist-initiated aggression and terror in Vietnam. I ask them to recognize that we face in Vietnam no peaceful reformer seeking power through parliamentary means. We face not handbills but hand grenades. I ask them to realize the importance of our stake

in Vietnam as part of our historic commitment to a free

Asia.

I ask them to understand that an honorable peace through negotiation can come only when all parties agree to talk.

I am ready to hear those issues debated responsibly by the American people.

And I am ready to predict that they will stand behind the Administration which has had the courage to take the difficult middle path -- to stand fast against aggression, to insist on the development of democratic institutions even under the most adverse conditions, and to show restraint when it has the power to do otherwise.

Let For I believe that, under a few inches of American topsoil, there lies determination and strength of solid rock.

My friends, our President and our party can stand before the people in 1968 with a proud record of accomplishment at home, and a record of patient, untiring building for a better tomorrow in the world at large.

But we can offer them even more -- a Manifesto of Freedom consistent with the strength and vision of America in the last third of the twentieth century:

Freedom from poverty ....for all;

Freedom from ignorance....for all;

Freedom from discrimination....for all;

Freedom from fear....for all.

That is the Democratic Party's promise to America -- and America's promise to the world.

And with that message -- working for it and believing in it -- we can make America stand for the best that is in it.

We can keep America strong and free -- and the center of man's peaceful revolution toward a better chance....a fuller dignity.....a life of freedom.

# # #

YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA 35TH ANNUAL CONVENTION DIPLOMAT HOTEL HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA NOVEMBER 18, 1967 KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES 

MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, my obviously very good and dear friend, Claude Pepper; Virgil Musser, the distinguished president of the Young Democrats; the officers of this fine organization; our fellow Democratic friends and neighbors. You know how to make a Vice-President feel good.

You gave me such a good welcome, I am going to tell the President about it, and I will sure tell him that is the way it ought to be every day in Washington.

I said to Virgil when I arose to speak to you, I said, you know, if I had really good judgment, I think I would just say. "Amen."

I would ask you to adopt the resolution to say that everything that Congressman Pepper has said is true, spread it upon the record, put it in public print, and send it to all my doubting friends and say, "There you have it, right there."

Claude, I am very grateful to you, and you are overly kind and seemingly extremely generous and most gratifying.

You remember what our dear friend Adlai Stevenson used to say about flattery. He said, "It is all right if you don't inhale it."

But I gather that some of you have watched me up here, and I was breathing deeply all the time. I inhaled every last word of it, truth or fiction.

And sometimes these days it is hard to know just what you are getting.

Well, Claude, after listening to your introduction,

I was reminded of this rather corny story, but it does come to

mind, of the chap that passed away that had a rather, well, his

life hadn't been exactly an exemplary one. He would occasionally,

he would stop by the local tavern when he got his check, and

didn't bring the money home, and had forgotten his family on

occasion. And he had occasionally lost his job through being

absent from work.

But he passed away, and on the day of the funeral, the little family sat there in the front row, and the reverend got up to preach.

And the reverend started talking about this fine, wonderful, God-fearing, loving husband, faithful and true; this man that was a hard worker, that always took care of his family, that was diligent and prudent and ambitious to a point of almost physical exhaustion in his work, and he went on praising this departed soul. And finally, the mother said to the oldest son, "John, would you mind going up and looking in the coffin and see if it is your father."

It is an old story, but when you start to flatter these people in public life, sometimes there are those that wonder if it is true.

But I want to tell you today, true or not, it was nice - true or not.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be here with you,

R

and I want to just visit with you today.

I am particularly grateful to get invited to almost any kind of Democratic meeting these days.

I think I should tell our friends on the outside, however, what Will Rogers reminded us of. He said he didn't belong to any organized party, he was a Democrat. If we just sort of keep that in mind, maybe some of the trouble that we seem to have for the moment will be put in proper prospective.

But being invited and being grateful is like that industrialist, you know, who got very sick and went to the hospital and was there for two or three weeks with not a single message, not a telephone call, not a bouquet of flowers, not a card. And finally, the local union had a meeting, and they had a meeting of the Executive Board. And they had a vote. And they decided to send a get-well card to their boss.

And the card read like this, "The Executive Committee of Local 246 has met and deliberated, and we send you a message of greetings and get well by a vote of eight to seven."

I sometimes feel that that is about the way it is.

But since I did have a chance to interpret the majority, I shall proceed with my remarks.

I come to you today to talk to you about the most important business of this Nation, the business of its public service and of its politics.

Next year, when the people of this great republic

are going to do more than just select and elect a President and a Congress, we are going to have to make some decisions.

We are going to have to decide some of the basic and fundamental issues of this last third of the 20th century, and we are about now at the time where every one of us has that supreme obligation of talking sense to one another, a dialogue and not a monologue, a dialogue and not a diatribe.

I come to the Young Democrats to ask you to exemplify in your words, your conduct, your performance and your activity the highest quality of responsible leadership. The issues that we are going to talk about are right at the very heart of your lives, because they all deal with the tomorrows.

There isn't a single thing that you can do about the yesterdays except either to deplore them or to praise them.

They are gone. The hour that you now live is yours, and the tomorrows can be yours.

Now, here are some of the issues, as I see them.

Do we want to continue to pursue the goal of full equal opportunity for every American, or are we willing to settle back into a kind of second-class citizenship for a minority, while most of us enjoy the benefits and the profits of first-class citizenship.

Does this country really want to escalate and wage a renewed war on poverty, or does it not? Do you want the best education that is possible for every American, or not?

8 9

Do we want the 70 percent of the American people who live on that one percent of the land in our cities to have a clean, safe, rewarding environment, or are you going to leave it as it is?

Do we want to continue our task toward responsible leadership with all of its penalties, with all of its burdens, with all of its trials and disappointments? Do we want to continue that path of responsible and peaceful development around the world, or shall we forget it, give it up, relax, and withdraw?

Do we have the patience, do we have the patience and the courage, the will to use our unbelievable power with restraint, and our wealth with a sense of compassion and equity, or do we not?

Now, I think these are the fundamental issues, and there are more, of course, but I give you these few.

And let me give you a word of encouragement now.

You know, I think one of the great things that has happened to our country in the period of this party's defeat was the fact that we had as our titular head, as our leader, even in our hours of defeat, one of the truly great men of all times, a noble man in the best sense of the word, Adlai Stevenson.

Adlai Stevenson gave this country, of course, and this party of ours, character. I was honored by his friendship.

And when I speak of him, my heart is heavy.

8 9

Well, here is what he said, and I think the words are more relevant today than when he spoke them and more meaningful.

He said our objectives are not for the timid. They are not for those who look backwards, who are satisfied with things as they are, who think that this great Nation can ever sleep or stand still.

Let those words be seared into your minds and souls, because what he is saying to us is that everything that needs to be done requires an unusual quality of courage, of bravery, of confidence and faith.

And I speak to you today in that frame of mind and frame of reference, because while there is much joy in politics, and sometimes sadness, and while I sincerely believe that you ought to enjoy political life, it ought to be in the best sense of the word a wholesome experience. And it ought to be fun.

But let us never forget for a moment that it is the most serious business of a free people.

So let us talk about these elections that are going to come. Now, there have been elections in our country in other years in which issues were secondary, but not in 1968, not in this space age, the nuclear age, the age of danger, and yet the age of promise.

I think the American people want to hear fundamental issues reasonably debated. I think the American people understand

8 9

the importance of debate and discussion and dissent, and they also understand the absolute imperative of a responsible political party and political leader to make decisions.

Will you ponder it but a moment. It is so easy for us to debate, so easy for us to discuss, and so joyful and so interesting at times to dissent. But the moment of truth comes when you have to make a decision, and it is then when you are really tested. It is then when quality of faith and loyalty are put to the test.

I think the American people want the facts, and I believe it is our duty to present those facts. And they want to measure one man and his policies against another; one party and its policies against another; and they are going to be asking this basic question, and we have to be prepared to help find the answer: Which man has the capacity, which man has the experience, the prudent and the political philosophy best suited to leading this country through the demanding years immediately ahead. That is the question. That is what people are concerned with. That is the life and death issue.

I want us to formulate that issue and bring it to the attention of the people, because America deserves the best, and I look forward to that kind of a campaign, and I want this party, our party, to keep the level of the campaign high enough so that that issue is always obvious and paramount.

I think that that kind of a debate on that issue will

be healthy for America, and it will be healthy for the Democratic Party. And I have no fear as to the outcome. I welcome the day of decision, that first Tuesday in November, 1968. I know what is going to happen.

Now, I will let you in on a secret. I have seen the polls. And I will let you in on another secret. Some, I like. The ones that look good. Some, I don't like, the ones that aren't looking so good.

But I will tell you one other thing. I have also seen the people. And I have read a thousand pessimistic reports, and I have even heard words of pessimism coming from the lips of those who ought to be optimistic and who ought to have faith in their party, in their leader, and in their country.

And I am confident, of course. I know many people say, well, this fellow Humphrey is a perennial optimist, and I guess I am.

I will let you in on that secret, too.

You know, in Washington, there are so many well-developed pessimists, that whole area is so crowded, the competition is so sharp, that in order to really get known as a good pessimist in Washington, you almost must be unbelievably pessimistic.

I looked around, and because I do believe in freedom of choice, I looked it over and I saw pastures of optimism practically uninhabited, and I moved over there. Now, I found

two or three others, like Claude Pepper. He is over there most of the time.

And then I found another fellow that is always there when I am there, and that was the President. He was over there in the pasture of optimism.

But I will tell you really why I am confident and why I am optimistic, because I believe that the hard crossfire of debate, when we really get at the mighty debate of these politics, when we really find out who those Republicans are going to select from those less than chosen people that they have, when we really find out who their candidates will be, I have reason to be optimistic.

The crossfire of debate will expose the doubters.

It will expose the nay sayer. It will expose the people who think this country can afford to stop, take a pause, turn around and look back.

It will expose those who want to back away from our responsibility of leadership, the kind of people who have no faith either in themselves or in our destiny.

It will expose the people who are unwilling to face up to fundamental challenges and changes, and there is plenty of change in this time and place.

Now, I believe that before 1968 November, the American people will come to know that all of this second guessing, that this longing for the good old days, this nostalgia, this

1

3

4

-6

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

wishfulness, this show business smile are not substitutes for the clear, forward-looking commitment of a party and a President that are dedicated to freedom and human dignity at home and abroad. That is why I am confident.

You know, I heard somebody say the other day that the slogan of one of the potentials in the Republican Party who used to make a small compact car was to think small and shift for yourself.

You got it.

I don't necessarily believe that, but that is what I heard.

Now, the choice before the American voter, and you are going to be talking and working with that voter, on the homefront is clear-cut. It was referred to by Congressman Pepper. Progress or retreat. It is the same choice that Adlai gave us.

Are we going to be timid, or are we going to be brave?

It is a choice between the party and the President that gave
this country the concept of the Model Cities Program to help
rebuild our cities.

And it is a choice between that party and the party that voted, 80 percent of the membership, against it.

I want every Young Democrat to start to take a look at the alternatives.

It is like the fellow who had the question put to him,

"How is your wife?" He said, "Compared to who?"

When you start to think of a political party and its candidates, you had better ask yourself, "Compared to what and to whom?"

The party and the President, your party and your President that had the vision, that had the courage and had the political decisiveness to present to the people of the United States and the Congress a whole new concept of rebuilding the inner city, of helping to make our cities inhabitable and livable, and a decent place for humans to reside free and alive.

That party was the Democratic Party. The leader of that party that presented it was the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, and the opposition of the Republican Party.

No matter how they want to gloss over it, 80 percent of them said to the city dwellers, live as you are, there will be no change.

It is a choice between the President and a party that gave us Medicare, and a party that tried to kill it a hundred different ways. And don't you let the American public forget it.

A party and a President, your Party and your President, and your majority in Congress that said, we want peace and hospitalization and nursing homes and medical care for our senior citizens, and a Republican Party that said, they have it good

3

4

6

7

5

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

23

25

enough. There will be no change. And they voted against it.

Don't let the public forget it.

It is a choice between the President and the party that conceived of rent supplements so low income families could have a decent home rather than to live in rat-infested tenements, and a party that voted 93 percent against it.

It is a choice between the President and the party, your President and your party, that wanted a strong program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, and a party and its leadership that voted 86 percent of its membership against it.

A party that said every child should have the best education humanly possible, and a party that said, by 86 percent of its members, it is good enough now.

I want you to take that message.

You know, every once in a while, I hear one of my liberal friends say, "Whatever happened to the liberal program, Mr. Vice President?"

I will tell you what happened to it. We passed it.

Is there anything wrong with that?

The things that some of us have worked for for a generation are a fact, the law of the land and things we never dreamed possible have come into reality. Why? Because in 1964, in the election of that year, the people of the United States had the good sense and judgment to elect a President, a Democratic

4 5

President and a Democratic Congress. Lyndon Johnson and a Democratic Congress gave the American people new vision, new hope, new progress such as they never dreamed possible before.

Now, most of all this legislation that we talk about is on the books. The great Civil Rights Act of 1964 was mentioned here today. Well, I can remember when it wasn't very popular to introduce civil rights legislation.

You know, every once in a while I would go to a meeting where somebody gets up and walks out. And I really don't blame them. But I had to say to a group not long ago, to a few of them that walked out, you just joined that crowd in Philadelphia that walked out on me, Dixiecrats that walked out on Philadelphia. I remember that.

I remember the people that didn't want to move ahead.

But I am here to tell you that a man born in Texas, and a

Democratic Party representing all 50 states of this union

joined together and we were able to proceed to the Congress and

pass through the Congress the most comprehensive program of

civil rights legislation ever designed by the hand of man.

But there is a lot more and I shan't burden you with just a recitation of achievement, Voting Rights Act of 1965, Medicare, Minimum Wage, et cetera.

But some look at this record of achievement. Yes, some of our people look and say, well, really that is enough for now. Hold on. No more.

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

But let me tell you, that to pause, to stop, and to stop in this changing world is to lose ground.

Let me also tell you that there is a coalition of retreat at work in this country and in this Congress that would like to move us back and in all too many cases have retarded our progress.

That coalition of retreat came into being in the election of 1966 when the Democratic Party lost 47 seats in the House of Representatives, and from that day on we have had an upward-hill battle.

And you lose some more elections, my fellow Democrats. and you really have something to cry about and dissent about.

You will have something to mourn about, the likes of which you haven't dreamed possible, because there are forces at work in this country that do want to stop the clock of time and the clock of change, that do want to pause, and they have candidates. They have money. They have propaganda, and they have the will to win if they can.

I suggest that we buckle down to the task of giving them a good sound trouncing in the election of 1968.

The OEO program move that we have had comment about here today, the poverty program, the teacher corp, rent supplement and so forth; it has been authorized. It has survived its passage through what I call the authorization swamp.

But the next question is, will it make it through

appropriations gulch, to put it in the language of the Western?

If the war on poverty has a chance this year, it is for one reason. Well, for three reasons, because men like Claude Pepper had the courage to stand up and fight for it, and many more like him. That is where you start, And because the President of the United States was relentless in his efforts to get achievement and accomplishment, and because people all over this country spoke up for it.

They wanted the Job Corps. They wanted Project Headstart. They wanted Project Upward Bound. They wanted Community Action Agency.

And we are the ones that have defended that desire.

And I want you to take this message back into your precincts

and your communities and select the battleline.

Our Republican friends feel that the war on poverty is a failure. Let them stand up and fight it out on that issue. We will take them on, because we happen to believe that when you bring a little child into the Project Headstart, it is good for America.

When you give young men and women training for a job, it is good for America.

When you get young people through college education and high school, it is good for America.

When you destroy a system of welfarism and bring in the system of opportunity, it is good for America.

And that is what we are trying to do.

Oh, I know progress costs something. It costs a lot of money. It costs heartache. But so does hard core unemployment cost something, preventable disease, inadequate education that prevents a young man or woman from earning or even hoping.

I don't happen to believe that the American people or American public is penny wise and people foolish, to use Adlai's words.

I think that this rich nation with its liberal traditions is ready to bring those now included into the main stream of American society, and that is what we are trying to do.

We are not only trying to open up the gates of opportunity, we are extending the hand of fellowship, help people walk through those gates.

Might I remind you that many people who have been the victims for years of discrimination and of poverty, not only the poverty of the purse, but poverty of the spirit, the poverty of despair, of hopelessness, of frustration; that those people sometimes need more than just to be told that the law has been changed. Sometimes they need the helping hand of a good neighbor.

Sometimes they need the encouragement of a friend.

And above all, they need the acceptance, the acceptance of the people of the United States.

Civil rights and law is one thing, and human rights

and law is another thing. But civil rights and human rights in practice, in thought and deed is the only hope that the poor people of this land have to become a part of the first class citizens in this republic, and I ask you to help them again in that noble objective because, you see,I think we are ready to complete or move ahead with democracy's house, and it is going to be done by the party of Franklin Roosevelt, of Harry Truman, of John Kennedy and Lyndon Baines Johnson.

They know how to build this house of democracy, with your help.

Now, what is your job? I want to talk a little practical politics to you for a moment. Our job is to keep people in this party, not to drive them out. That is where you start.

The first duty of a responsible political leader is to learn to respect the other fellow's point of view, both points of view.

And here is a political axiom that you ought to remember. "If you don't believe in yourself, your party, your president; how do you expect to convince others to believe in your party, your president or yourself." Take your stand.

Or shall I put it more simply, and I have done it in one hundred and one places, "Don't put poison in the well from whence you are going to have to drink." I hope you understand this.

Leave it to the opposition. They have got bags full

of that kind of political poison. Take your stand for what we fight for and what we work for. This is our job as a party and as political leaders.

Now, this coalition of retreat that has threatened the homefront, but is not being successful, thank goodness, is also threatening the international front.

And may I make it crystal clear there is not the possibility of a successful foreign policy without a successful domestic policy.

Your foreign policy is a project of the vitality, the purpose, and the philosophy of a people and a nation. Now, the coalition of retreat on foreign policy is, in a very real sense, bipartisan and non-partisan. It runs from the far right to the far left. And its objectives are not at all homogeneous.

The retreaters will have trouble settling on any one Presidential candidate who will suit all the divisional feuds of the world. They are going to have some difficulty. But I think I can help them simplify their choice.

Now, those who think that America is involved in the world for keeps, and who want this nation to play a role of firm and creative leadership, they have a candidate. He is on the job. And his name is Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States.

By the way, how did you like the way he took care of things yesterday at that press conference?

Those who want to let the world settle the issues of war and peace, of development and starvation without full American participation will have to find themselves another candidate.

But I don't think the majority of the American people are ready to scrap liberal trade policies and economic growth around the world and return to the days of isolationism. I doubt if they will be satisfied, for example, with the foreign aid authorization passed last week that amounted to less than one-third of one percent of our gross national product which, in the words of President Johnson, reduces the margin of hope to a danger point.

No, I don't think the American people want that.

I think the American people agree with that late and beloved

Pope John XXIII who said, "Where there is constant want, there
is no peace." Or maybe with Pope Paul VI who said, "Development
is the new word for peace."

You see, the cry for peace is more than just a parade or a march or a placard. The scriptures say, "Blessed are the peacemakers," not the talkers, the walkers or the marchers, but blessed are the peacemakers and that comes through the hard work of developing an American society that is just, that is productive, that is based upon equity and equality.

That comes through the hard work of a Peace Corps, of a foreign aid program, of a technical assistance program, yes,

even of collective security.

You see, they are the issues of national security and national development which are one and inseparable.

Then there is the issue of America's role in Asia which, I know, is foremost in your thinking and concern. And I mean all of Asia, not just Vietnam.

I have been to that part of the world as your Vice-President four times.

Much of my background as a teacher, a student, and a man in public life was oriented, like most of us. It is from Europe that most of our families come. We are the children, in many instances, of Europe.

But there is also the reality of what a very famous Republican said, "One world," and we are a part of it.

Oh, I know there are those that would like to stop this world and get off, and I have a few that I would like to accommodate. But I regret to say it is not possible.

I recently returned from a visit to three of the Asian nations, South Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia.

I have been to sixteen of the free nations of Asia in my service as Vice-President. Now, some of these nations have their own character. There isn't any such thing as just Asia. They are the nations and the people and the cultures of Asia.

But all of these nations, and indeed, the three that I visited this time in particular, share two vital common

denominators.

First, there is past and present resistance to Asian communist subversion and aggression; covert and overt.

Might I say in all sincerity and in kindness, communist subversion and aggression to Asia is not a subject of academic discussion. It is a hard, cruel fact of their lives. They have been facing it for a quarter of a century, on the battlefields, in their villages, in their political apparatus, in every hour of their day. It is not an esoteric subject for intellectual distribe or dialogue alone. It is a cruel fact of their existence.

Maybe that is why, without exception, the leaders of free Asia hope and pray that America will not abandon them, will not forsake them; because I have talked to these men and women, and they recognize the importance, not only the importance, but the imperative necessity of American cooperation, American power, American science, terminology and resources in Asia if they are to regain freedom.

The second common denominator is the urgent and priority effort toward constructive nation building. First, they have the priority of resistance to the communist subversion and aggression to national security.

Secondly, the common denominator of constructive nation building.

Now, these are the common denominators among all of

3

4

5

6

8

10

9

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

the independent nations of Asia. The question comes, do we have any business there? Because I think it is a legitimate question. and it ought to be dealt with in a sensible responsible manner.

Most of us feel that we have business in Europe. have yet to hear a voice raised in this country that says we should not keep our commitment to Berlin, one hundred miles inside of the communist regime of East Germany, a commitment that was made by four Presidents of the United States, five Presidents starting with Franklin Roosevelt, a commitment that constantly tests the vitality and the strength and courage of this nation.

And three times within the last fifteen years it has required mobilization on the part of our country, partial mobilization three times, the possibility of nuclear war, and yet I have not heard one responsible voice raised in America that says we should abandon them. And I hope we don't.

But can I say to you in all candor, what is more precious about a life in Berlin than in Vietnam or Korea? What is it that makes it so much more precious? Do we have any business there in Asia?

Well, more American lives were lost in the Pacific than in Europe during World War II. So if it is on the basis of loss of blood and treasury, we have business in the Pacific and in Asia, and add to that our casualties in Korea, over 55,000 dead, 250,000 casualties. I guess we have some business, some interest in the Pacific and in Asia.

Since 1946 we have committed over twenty-five billion dollars in loans and grants, food and technical assistance in the country, in the arc between West Pakistan and Japan.

That commitment to national security and to national development in Asia has been upheld by four American Presidents, without doubt or without hesitation. And national security and national development are commitments that go hand in hand.

So many of my friends say, oh, I am all for foreign aid. I am all for technical assistance. I am all for the Peace Corps. I am all for this and that, but I am not for a commitment that may require power.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, unless you are willing to play both parts of this struggle, be involved in both parts, then there is success for neither part, because military security alone will not assure the independence and freedom of the nations of Asia.

And economic development alone will not assure the independence and freedom of the nations of Asia.

But military security, national security and national development together add up to independence and freedom.

You know, I found some words here the other day that I thought were rather reassuring. I don't necessarily agree with every line, but they were the words of a very great man, and a beloved man, and one that inspired every young American.

John Kennedy said in an interview with Mr. Brinkley in 1963 September, the following: "We cannot make the world over, but we can influence the world. The fact of the matter is that with the assistance of the United States, SEATO, Southeast Asia and indeed all of Asia has been maintained independent against a powerful force, the Chinese communists. What I am concerned about is that Americans will get impatient and say that because they don't like events in Southeast Asia, or they don't like the government in Saigon that we should withdraw. That only makes it easy for the communists. I think that we should stay."

And then he went on to say, in no uncertain words, his opposition to any form of withdrawal. He even went so far as to answer Mr. Brinkley in these words:

MR. BRINKLEY: Mr. President, have you had any reasons to doubt the so-called domino theory," -- No, I don't underwrite the domino theory, per se -- "that if South Vietnam falls, the rest of South Asia will go behind it?

PRESIDENT KENNEDY: No, I believe it. I believe it. I think that the struggle is close enough, China is so large, looms so high just beyond the frontier that if South Vietnam went, it would only give them improved geographic position for assault on Malaysia, also, I am impressed that the way of the future in Southeast Asia was communism, so I believe it."

A President can be wrong, but I think that Presidents

who have access to vast amounts of information and advice and counsel of hundreds of prominent and learned citizens may be right. And I happen to believe when our nation is deeply involved as it is all over this world in providing a shield for protection for people today who aspire to freedom and yet are weak that we might give the benefit of the doubt to a President Truman, to a President Eisenhower, to a President Kennedy, and to a President Johnson, because it may be that they are right. I think so.

So we made a great commitment in national security and national development, and that commitment has been upheld because four Presidents have seen it in our own national interests that a continent that is so strategic, that is at the crossroads of the world, rich in resources and possessing more than half of the world's people should not be nakedly exposed to communist pressure. That is what Mr. Kennedy spoke about.

And we as a nation have believed, or at least I thought we did, that peoples of all colors, races and religions, even though their names are not spelled like ours, even though their cultures and religions may be different than ours, deserve their chance to grow and develop free of coercion and tyranny.

You see, nation building, national security and national development has been our business, and it is an important business to know what our support of the efforts of

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

these free Asians has achieved because people do like to have an accounting.

Well, Japan is prosperous and is a stable democracy. South Korea is secure and on the verge of economic self-sufficiency, and yet I can refer your minds back to fifteen years ago when people said that Korea would never be anything.

In fact, the headlines of the press of this nation read in the year 1957, "Korea, America's mess."

And President Truman saw a popularity poll, a public opinion poll in June, 1951 where 66 percent of the American people demanded our withdrawal.

I ask this audience of brave young Americans, what kind of a world do you think it would be had we withdrawn from Berlin: had Mr. Truman not had the courage to stand firm in Greece and Turkey; had we not had the vision and courage to develop a NATO?

What kind of world do you think it would be if John Kennedy had not had the courage to face up to Mr. Khrushchev and tell him to get his missiles out of this hemisphere?

What kind of world do you think you would be living in if President Truman had not had the courage to face communist aggression in Korea?

What kind of world do you think this would be if the communists thought all they had to do was to threaten to subvert. and that the rule of brute force and law of the jungle would

prevail?

What kind of world do you think you would be living in? Answer your own question. I think you know. Our efforts have not been in naught. Europe stands proud and free today, prosperous and independent. Korea is on the verge of great economic breakthrough. Japan is strong and prosperous. Formosa, long a state receiving our aid, has achieved economic self-sufficiency. India and Pakistan have reasonably stable and very progressive governments. They are making substantial progress in agriculture and industrial development. Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines represent forward progress.

Australia and New Zealand definitely are friends and strong allies. They are better today than ever.

Why? Not only because of their great efforts, which were really great, but because they knew they had a partner.

They knew they had a friend. And they knew that that friend was present, near them, helping them, guarding them, strengthening them, and that friend was none other than the United States of America.

And if you don't know it, then you owe it to yourselves as citizens of this country and as leaders of this party to go there and find out. You will learn more in Asia than you will learn from reading a periodical printed on the East Coast or the West Coast or the Midwest. Go and learn. Seek, and ye shall find. It is there for you.

I just came back from Indonesia.

I saw they have suffered the ravages of self-indulgence of a leader, mismanagement, and have been victims of communist ideology and practice. And Indonesia is in poverty and in shambles.

But I also saw an Indonesia, potentially the richest nation in Southeast Asia gaining time, gaining time to throw off, and by itself, a flagrant attempt at a communist coup, and is now embarking on a long road to economic development.

I went into that country and into the heart of it.

I went into Central Java. I wonder how many of your critics have been there?

I went into Central Java where the Communist Party PKI have an interest.

In Demak, I was told that it was not safe, and I went there to see thousands of young men cleaning out irrigation ditches with shovels and hoes.

I saw them receiving pay, nothing more than cornmeal from the surplus stocks of America. They work for food.

I came in lightly, unannounced in the morning, for security reasons. There were thousands of people then, even then.

When the word spread along the road that I would be there, there were thousands even then.

When I left that area at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon,

GILBERT REPORTING SERVICE 401 COURT HOUSE SQUARE BUILDING FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

ladies and gentlemen, over one million and one-half Indonesians were on the highway shouting, "America; mordika (phonetic); freedom; America; without any organized demonstration, and no flags and no signs, but grateful to America.

General Suharto, the President of Indonesia, acting President, told me that Indonesians needed American help.

The Prime Minister of Malaysia, a country that has fought the communists for twelve years, twelve long years of communist subversion, communist aggression, said, "Mr. Vice President, if America is going to abandon us, there is no hope."

Every single leader said that their only hope was if we would stay and see it through.

Now, all of the nations of Asia, free nations are doing better these days. They have joined together in new enterprises and regional cooperation.

And I submit that looking ahead we can predict that economic development will come, even though painfully slow; but that without it, there will be chaos.

We can predict that Mainland China will soon emerge as a nuclear and space power still preaching, however, in supporting the dogma of the cynically misnamed war of national liberation.

We can predict that Asian communism will continue for the foreseeable future to retain its militancy and expansionist tendencies.

We can predict the free Asian nations will continue

4 5

21 22

to reach out to us for help, and I want you to be ready in mind and in spirit to understand it.

Now, that is the broad context in which the American people must decide what they want to do about the immediate issue of Vietnam.

Are we going to last it out until there is a just and peaceful settlement, or are we going to withdraw short of such a settlement, or settle on less than an honorable basis, abandon the people of South Vietnam and prove to the aggressors that might, after all, does make right, or to the other extreme?

Are we going to impetuously reach for the weapons that would settle the issue in Vietnam by burying the world in World War III? Make no mistake about it. Vietnam is a test that is being closely watched by friends and enemies alike.

They have no doubt, these friends and enemies, about what is happening out there. I have been there twice, so I have some basis of prospective.

They see the best trained, the best equipped American soldiers in our history standing firm against aggression. I saw those soldiers, my fellow Americans. I was there in Da Nang and Chu Lai. I was there with your marines and your soldiers and airmen. I saw the Koreans. I have seen the Australians, the Filippinoes, the Thais, and the New Zealanders. I have been with it.

Ladies and gentlemen, I heard not one single word

7 8

of complaint. But I did have the question asked of me one hundred times, "What is wrong at home? Why don't they understand?"

These are the daughters and sons. And already many of our young ladies are there working in their hospitals and offices. These are the young men and women who are on the firing line. If anyone had a right to complain, it is them, they above all others, because they are making the sacrifices.

Yet, the only question they asked is, "What is wrong at home?"

The enemies and the friends, they have seen five successive elections in Vietnam, free and fair, take place when the critics said it couldn't be done. And if you will bear with me, may I say that there has been a lot of criticism.

When I first went to Vietnam in February, 1966 there had been no elections. Your President had been at Honolulu with General Ky and General Thieu. They had just taken over in one of a series of coups, military takeovers in Vietnam that was on the precipice of disaster.

Our President asked those leaders to commit themselves to an election of constituent assembly to write a constitution for free and representative government. They promised they would.

My assignment from your President was to encourage them to fulfill that promise, which I tried to do. The critics and the cynics said it will never happen. And I guess they had good reason, in light of the past, to believe that it wouldn't,

4 5

but it did happen. A constitutional assembly was elected in a free election observed by the media and the press of the world. A constitution was written, a free constitution, in the light of public opinion.

Your Constitution was written in secret. There wasn't a camera, a pressman, or a photographer present. The doors were closed in Philadelphia, and even old Ben Franklin had two men assigned to him so he wouldn't talk after he had a glass of wine.

Village elections were held. Presidential elections, Senatorial elections, House of Representative elections. There were five elections in less than two years, under conditions of war, subversion and terrorism.

Oh, I know there were some abuses, my fellow

Americans, but who are we to cast the first stone. Those
who live in glass houses, you know.

Considering their experience and their background, constitutional development has been significant.

The enemies and the friends have seen a South Vietnamese army steadily improving. There is still much to be improved, but it is steadily improving; just as they saw a South Korean army fifteen years ago.

Have you forgotten what we said about the Koreans fifteen years ago? Have you forgotten what they were called? Have you forgotten that they were, well, that they were judged

4 5

as being not very good on the battlefield; and yet today, there are no better combat troops anywhere in the world than those that Korea has put in the fields of battle in its country and in South Vietnam.

Progress. Enemies and friends alike have seen the tide of battle turn from seemingly inevitable victory for communism in 1965 to a situation in which a communist victory today is impossible.

And they are also watching the situation here at home, and they are wondering, can we win the war on the American front? They are asking, do we have the will, the determination, the necessary units to persevere and to stay?

Let me be frank about it. I have been among the dissenters plenty of times in my life. I am a long-time dissenter, and I defend the right of any American to dissent, to debate, to discuss in good conscience. That is what the struggle is all about.

I was at the camp of the Revolutionary Development
Department in Vietnam asking Major Bhea (phonetic) of the
Revolutionary Development Program what he thought his problems
were.

By the way, that program years ago was but a thought.

Today, 30,000 of the Revolutionary Development Calvary have
been trained and sent in villages. 9,000 of them were in that
training program while I was there. The head of it is Major Bhea,

a man who fought the communist for sixteen years, and who was once himself a member of the Viet men fighting the French.

I said, "Major Bhea, what is your problem?" He said, "It is twofold; communist attack and subversion, and corruption." Corruption in his own government. He had the right to dissent.

And when I was asked by an American reporter,

"Mr. Vice President, what do you have to say about that, when

Major Bhea said he faces corruption at the province level?"

I said, "The fact that he can say it and still be the man in charge of this school proves that our mission here is a success."

Because we are there for the right of free speech, representative government, the right of an individual to have his say, and Major Bhea is still in charge. And since then, a province chief has been sentenced to execution for corruption. There is progress.

So I defend the right to dissent, but I ask all Americans before they dissent to do this. Search your heart, examine the facts, try to know the effect of what you say on your civilians and soldiers in Vietnam, and what you say on our adversaries because, make no mistake about it, Hanoi thinks that we will not persevere.

Hanoi believes that this country is torn apart over this issue.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

Hanoi won its last struggle from the French in Paris

8 9

It thinks it can win this struggle from the Americans in Washington. I think they are wrong. And I think you think they are wrong.

So I ask those who are our sharp critics, before they raise their voices, to face the hard fact that cynical communism-initiated aggression and terror in Vietnam is a reality. I ask them to recognize that we face in Vietnam no peaceful reformer seeking power through parliament, and I ask them to remember that Ho Chi Minh is no Robin Hood that seeks to take from the rich in order to help the poor.

We face in Vietnam not handmills, but hand grenades.

I ask them to realize the importance of our staying in Vietnam as a part of our historic commitment to a free Asia.

And I ask them to understand that an honorable, peaceful negotiation, which is our prayer, our hope and our commitment, can come only when all parties agree to talk.

And when the enemy refuses to talk to the Holy Father, to U Thant, to the British Prime Minister, to the Chairman of the Counsel of Ministers, refuses to meet with our President or any officer of our government, then I submit to this intelligent audience that the roadblock to peace is not in Washington, but it is in Hanoi, and you know it.

Thank you.

Let me conclude with these final words of respectful, I trust respectful and thoughtful comments.

I am ready to hear these issues debated responsibly by the American people, and I am ready to predict here and now that when they are debated, the people will stand behind the administration which has had the courage to take the difficult middle course, to stand fast against aggression, to insist on the development of democratic institutions even under most adverse conditions, and to show restraint when it has the power to do otherwise, for I believe that under a few inches of American soft top soil, which is what some people see, there lies determination and strength of solid rock.

My friends, our President and our party can stand before the people in 1968 with a proud record of accomplishment at home, a record of participation and untiring courageous building for a better tomorrow in the world at large.

But we can offer them even more, and we want to.

We offer them a manifesto of freedom consistent with the strength and the vision of America in the last third of this, the twentieth century, a manifesto of freedom, freedom from poverty for all, freedom from ignorance for all, freedom of discrimination, from discrimination for all, and freedom from fear for all.

Now, that is the Democratic Party's promise to America, and it is America's promise to the world.

And it is with that message and working for it and believing in it that we can make America stand for the best

that is in it, that we can keep this America strong and free, and the center of man's peaceful revolution toward a better chance, a fuller dignity and life of freedom.

I am reminded, as I leave you, of the words of Franklin Roosevelt as his last breath left his soul and spirit.

Recall for a moment, if you can, in your mind's eye, this man, the victim of war as much as any combat soldier, sitting in the bright sunlight in his little retreat in Georgia at Warm Springs, and writing what was his last message, a message to the American people for the Jefferson Day dinner of that year of 1945, a message that never was completed.

And the final words of that message as death took
him, and as the pen fell from his hand, were these--and I think
that these are the words that should be our guiding light from
here on out:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with a strong and enacting faith, my fellow Democrats, my fellow Americans."

If a man that was a cripple, if a man who was a casualty of the war, if a man who served this Nation faithfully, diligently and tirelessly could pen those words even as life left him, what less can you do?

It seems to me that if one who could not walk could tell us that we needed to move forward, it seems to me if one who had every reason to doubt could tell us that we must

erase our doubts, it seems to me that that kind of a man ought to be our inspiration.

So I ask you, in the memory of a Roosevelt, in the knowledge of a Truman, in the memory of a blessed one that was taken prematurely from us, of a Kennedy, and in the memory and in deed, may I say, in the living reality of the strong leadership of a Johnson, let us move this country forward under a Democratic banner.

Thank you.

## CERTIFICATE

I, JEANNE W. FOGAN, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report in shorthand the proceedings of the 35th Annual National Convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of America on November 16th, 17th and 18th, 1967; and that the foregoing, pages from 1 to and including 39, contains and is a true and correct transcription of excerpts of my shorthand report of said proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereto affixed my seal this 1st day of December, 1967.

Certified Shorthand Reporter

## 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.

