

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON
WASHINGTON, D.C.
JUNE 20, 1968

We are perhaps still too close to the tragic events of recent weeks to find in them the instruction they give the future.

One thing though is clear, and guides my remarks here today.

It would be the bitterest irony if the purposes that Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King pursued should be thwarted now -- not only by the fact of their death but even more by its violent circumstance.

These two men stood first of all for social justice. And in a strange, unreasoning way, that goal has been set off -- as though it were in opposition -- to the purpose of achieving "law and order".

The fact is that civil order and civil justice are twin imperatives...that they are interdependent...and that one without the other diminishes America.

* * * *

These facts of violence before this nation are not only the assassination of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King -- and John Kennedy and Medgar Evers before them.

What must be brought into evidence -- for trial by jury of the nation -- are the full facts of today's increasing commonplace of crime and violence in America:

*The fact of 8 thousand murders in this country every year now, and of more than 4 million major crimes.

*The fact reported in the headlines of every newspaper that many streets of our cities are no longer safe to walk on at night, or many of our neighborhoods safe to live in.

*The fact of an escalation of protest that has sometimes become an escalation of violence.

*The fact that there are guns today in seven of every ten American homes -- and television sets showing every youngster how they are used in an unreal underworld that becomes his vivid reality...his entertainment.

These acts, these statistics, these headlines, these television programs are not the story of America. They are America's nightmare. They belie the essential truth of America.

I reject casual or cynical talk about a "sick society."

It is too often an escape from social responsibility, or an attempt to reduce the costs of responsibility by someone who believes in the divine right of the fortunate.

It must be clear that violence, crime, looting, burning cannot be condoned and must be stopped.

It must be equally clear that the conditions that breed crime and violence have to be sought out -- and then rooted out.

This relationship between "law and order" on the one hand and "social justice" on the other hand should be made plain to every American.

Our generating idea as a nation was to secure the Right -- the unalienable right -- of Life -- along with Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But this means two things.

It means protecting Life -- the breath of Life itself.

It means equally, the fulfillment of Life -- giving it meaning...value...validity.

The Right to Life is today in jeopardy. Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King are dead. So are the victims found in the debris of April's riots.

And for millions of people in this country there is jeopardy to the Right to Life in the sense of Life that has meaning. There is violence to human dignity and self respect in the filth of our slums, the despair of unemployment, the crippling of illiteracy.

I propose that we draw up, in this year of national decision two agenda:

An Agenda for Civil Order.

And an Agenda for Social Justice.

and that we pursue both relentlessly.

I put these items at the top of the Agenda for Civil Order:

First. The rioting in American cities must stop. And if it breaks out again it must be put down promptly, firmly, and effectively.

Riots are wrong. Their toll of life and property is unconscionable. Their first and worst victims are the poor themselves.

The state laws regarding incitement to riot or to violation of the law in any respect should be strengthened and broadened.

If there is looting and burning in the course of a riot it must be treated and punished according to the laws against stealing and arson.

The prevention of crime and the enforcement of law against violence are essentially local and state responsibilities.

We do not want a federal police force.

But the states and local communities need and are entitled to help through federal funding of enlarged and better trained law enforcement agencies. Law and order costs money -- much more than we presently spend. It also requires public support for police and courts.

I have spent a great deal of my life defending civil liberties and civil rights -- not just recently when they have become popular, but back over a long time when they weren't.

I know that today, more than ever before, violence is the enemy of civil rights and civil liberties. It is the ally of reaction -- and can be used as an excuse for not doing the things that need to be done in this country.

Yes, crime and violence have got to be stopped. But I disagree with those who sneer at the Constitutional guarantees, and propose shortcuts to justice across the quicksand of contempt for due process of law.

Second. The sale and the possession of firearms has to be governed by the sole consideration of what is necessary and effective to stop their criminal use.

It demeans us as a civilized people to put any other consideration ahead of this one.

President Johnson has urged the present Congress to control the interstate shipment and the sale to minors of rifles and shotguns and ammunition as well as hand guns. This legislation must be passed -- now.

There is more to be done.

If the states don't adopt -- and right away -- legislation requiring the registration of all firearms, then the Congress must.

The laws against carrying concealed weapons must be greatly strengthened, and the penalties for violation increased.

Third. Federal, state and local agencies must be organized in a massive effort to stop the drug traffic in this country.

This means an increase in enforcement personnel.

It means stiffer penalties for violation of the laws prohibiting the unlicensed sale of drugs.

It means a large scale program for treating drug addiction, and for rehabilitating the victims of addiction once the habit is broken.

It means finding out -- instead of wondering -- about the effects of marijuana.

It means adopting the recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement regarding the sale and use of drugs.

The drug addict is the most pitiful person in the world -- and one of the most dangerous.

Fourth: Councils for Civil Peace should be organized at the state, and where possible the metropolitan, level.

Such a Council could include representation from all racial, religious and economic groups in the state...the state attorney general's office...the National Guard...law enforcement agencies and officials of local government.

It could provide a state community relations service designed to prevent violence and to gain community cooperation and hear the voices of those who have gone unheard. It could set up a coordinated early warning system so that coming disorders might be detected in advance and, perhaps, be stopped before they begin. It could establish a central communications network -- vital to effective law enforcement.

...Cont'd.

A Council of Civil Peace could provide a way and a means for those who would be the innocent victims of violence to have an opportunity to forestall that tragedy and to bring to bear their knowledge, their information and their sense of citizenship.

Fifth: We must take a hard look at the effects of television on our children. What happens when they are exposed to endless exercises in the casual infliction of injury and death on our television screens?

I do not propose censorship. I do propose effective consideration by the American public--and those responsible for television programming--of how to understand and deal with this pervasive influence on our children's lives.

These are some of the items on an Agenda for Civil Order. Others must be added. For it is the minimum demand on our society today that we protect the right to Life and property from violence and crime.

But the point of it all is that this must be done--and can only be done effectively--in conjunction with securing the Right to Life with meaning--Life that is worth living.

So there must be, too, an Agenda for Social Justice.

There is not time here today to set out all the detailed items on the Agenda for Social Justice. It is a longer agenda than the other. I outlined part of it last weekend in my letter to Reverend Abernathy. I will present it in detail during the next several weeks.

But its central elements--especially as they relate to civil order--must be made clear here and now.

Most important of all: Every individual must be able to play a meaningful role in his community--have a stake in what is going on...be "part of the action."

John Stuart Mill said it: "Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he will have no love for it."

The survival of democracy's community depends on every-
one having a sense of community--or being part of it.

This means participating in its decisions.

It means contributing to its progress.

And it means sharing in its benefits.

It means a man or a woman saying this is my neighborhood--
my home--my country--my job.

I submit that the recommendations of the President's Com-
mission on Civil Disorders are right--and that as they are car-
ried out civil order--as well as social justice--in America's
cities will be served.

I submit that those proposals of the Poor People's Cam-
paign relating to food, jobs and human dignity are reasonable...
that acting on them constructively will contribute greatly to
law and order, as well as to social justice.

If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right
of every citizen in this nation to have enough to eat.

There is no reason in America--with its unequalled wealth
and agricultural productivity--for any one to go hungry. It
is immoral to allow some babies to suffer from malnutrition
while others in our population are concerned about the dangers
of overeating.

If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right
of every American to earn a living.

The richest society man has ever known cannot afford to
permit the festering frustration of unemployment which can so
easily erupt into violence. Jobs bring dignity to the individ-
ual and resources to his family--and wealth to the Nation.

The idea of guaranteeing decent jobs to everybody who will
work at them makes sense--with private employers providing job
opportunities to the fullest extent possible, and with the
government making whatever back-up or financing arrangements
are necessary.

If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right to a full education--from age four on through college--and the civil right to grow up in a decent home and neighborhood.

We must act now to secure these rights.

It won't come free. It isn't cheap. It will not come without change.

It will require federal, state, local, and private resources--not just in dollars but in commitment.

But we know that every dollar we put into the full education of those who are now denied it...every dollar we put into the building of homes for those who now live in hovels...every dollar we put into the training of man or woman to perform a job will be repaid. And it will be repaid partly in the reduction of crime and violence.

* * *

Civil order and civil justice are not two goals. They are one.

And the future hinges on our realizing this oneness--not only as a moral principle but as a matter, possible, of our survival as a free society.

There is no choice today but to be tough-minded, hard-headed and fair-minded about stopping crime and violence in this country.

There is no alternative to being tough-minded, hard-headed--and warm-hearted too--about establishing social justice in this country.

We have to do both, and as rapidly as possible.

* * *

Finally, there is the whole context of the time we live in.

The next President of the United States will face new terms of reference--not just in America, but worldwide.

He will face a new period in history--a period in which all the old premises...the old policies...all the old ways of doing things are being brought into question.

He will face not only a new world map--a map containing dozens of countries and millions of people who have, until now, almost literally lived outside history.

He will face what modern communication and technology have wrought--namely, a highly sensitized, "in touch" and impatient family of people and nations who will no longer accept the status quo when it sustains hunger, injustice, lack of participation, or subjugation of one man by another.

No continent on earth will be immune from this rising tide. We see it now.

And no present day weapons system will suffice to maintain security in the context of these conditions.

Will we be able to cope with it?

We must, and we will, if we fully recognize now the nature of what lies ahead.

There is nothing less in this than the need to reexamine--and to change, where necessary--our national priorities...the allocation of our resources...the structures and framework in which we work.

If America has stood for anything in its relatively short history, it has stood for--and symbolized--the future.

Now it surely must.

All the doctrinaire arguments about the yesterdays...or the rightful pride in even-recent accomplishment mean very little against the challenge of the year 2000.

I've spent most of my life working and planning for the future. It has cost me some hard knocks and some hard names.

But I have no regret.

What I mean to do now is rally those people who feel the same...who are willing to accept and challenge this new world environment...who have the courage to do whatever is necessary to make this democratic system of ours bend and shape to new conditions--as it always has before.

And I mean to oppose those people who are already invoking nostalgia...escapism...and an inward outlook as the means by which this country can meet the future.

Now I'd like to hear from you.

#

Darius model
my women

President
✓ Mr Allen Crowley
John Hoffernan - V.P.
✓ John Jarrell
Ch. Speakers

← Reuters (Baltimore)

{ V.P. - A.B.C Bd -
V.P. not a principle } REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON

WASHINGTON, D.C.

JUNE 20, 1968

Escalation

V.P. to President

Valenti - Sleep better knowing
Jack will follow
the blunt.

NOT IN RELEASE

I have read so many different reports of what I am going to say here today that I can hardly wait to find out.

Frankly, what I've read is more interesting than what I've written.

It seems to me there has been more coverage of what I haven't said for two weeks ~~more~~ than there was of everything I did say during the preceding two months.

But such
as the life of a Vice President -
this is the kind of country where any poor
boy can grow up to be Vice President -
It's just a chance he has to take!

Progress!
move from
Balcony to
Head table!

John Jarrell
Amherst
Harvard

Rocky

START RELEASE

↳ We are perhaps still too close to the tragic events of recent weeks to find in them the instruction they give the future.

↳ One thing though is clear, and guides my remarks here today.

↳ It would be the bitterest irony if the purposes that Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King pursued should be thwarted now -- not only by the fact of their death but even more by its violent circumstance.

↳ These two men stood first of all for social justice. And in a strange, unreasoning way, that goal has been set off -- as though it were in opposition -- to the purpose of achieving "law and order".

↳ The fact is that civil order and civil justice are twin imperatives ... that they are interdependent ... and that one without the other diminishes America.

~~The~~ facts of violence before this nation are not only the assassination of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King -- and John Kennedy and Medgar Evers before them.

What must be brought into evidence -- for trial by jury of the nation -- are the full facts of today's increasing commonplace of crime and violence, ~~in America~~:

↳ *The fact of 8 thousand murders in this country every year now, and of more than 4 million major crimes.

↳ *The fact reported in the headlines of every newspaper that many streets of our cities are no longer safe to walk on at night, or many of our neighborhoods safe to live in.

↳ *The fact of an escalation of protest that has sometimes become an escalation of violence.

↳ *The fact that there are guns today in seven of every ten American homes -- and television sets showing every youngster how they are used in an unreal underworld that becomes his vivid reality ... his entertainment.

yet, These acts, these statistics, these headlines, these television programs are not the ^{True} story of America. They are America's nightmare. They belie the essential truth of America.

and I reject casual or cynical talk about a "sick society."

↳ It is too often an escape from social responsibility, or an attempt to reduce the costs of responsibility by someone who believes in the divine right of the fortunate.

↳ It must be clear that violence, crime, looting, burning cannot be condoned and must be stopped.

↳ It must be equally clear that the conditions that breed crime and violence have to be sought out -- and then rooted out.

↳ This relationship between "law and order" on the one hand and "social justice" on the other ~~hand~~ ^{must} be made plain to every American.

↳ Our generating idea as a nation was to secure the Right -- the inalienable right -- of Life -- along with Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

↳ But this means two things.

↳ It means protecting Life -- the breath of Life itself.

↳ It means equally, the fulfillment of Life -- giving it meaning ... value ... validity.

↳ The Right to Life is today in jeopardy. ^{by crime and violence} Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King are dead. So are the victims found in the debris of April's riots.

② ↳ And for millions of ^{our fellow americans} ~~people in this country~~ there is jeopardy to the Right to Life in the sense of Life that has meaning. There is a violence to human dignity and self respect in the filth of our slums, the despair of unemployment, the crippling of illiteracy.

↳ I propose that we draw up, in this year of national decision, two agenda:

An Agenda for Civil Order.

And an Agenda for Social Justice.

and that we pursue both relentlessly.

↳ I put these items at the top of the Agenda for Civil Order:

First. The rioting in American cities must stop. And if it breaks out again it must be put down promptly, firmly, and effectively.

Riots are ^{cruelly} wrong. Their toll of life and property is unconscionable.

Their first and worst victims are the poor themselves.

↳ The state laws regarding incitement to riot or to violation of the law in any respect should be strengthened and broadened.

↳ If there is looting and burning ~~in the course of a riot it~~ ^{it} must be treated and punished according to the laws against stealing and arson.

↳ The prevention of crime and the enforcement of law against violence are essentially local and state responsibilities.

We do not want a federal police force.

↳ But the states and local communities need and are entitled
to help through federal funding of enlarged and better trained law
enforcement agencies. ↳ Law and order costs money -- much more
than we presently spend. It also requires public support for ^{the} police
and ^{the} courts.

↳ I have spent a great deal of my life defending civil liberties
and civil rights -- not just recently when they have become popular,
but back over a long time when they weren't.

↳ ~~I know that today, more than ever before,~~ ^{But} violence is the
enemy of civil rights and civil liberties. ↳ It is the ally of reaction --
and can be used as an excuse for not doing the things that need to
be done in this country.

↳ ~~Yes,~~ crime and violence have got to be stopped. But I disagree
with those who sneer at the Constitutional guarantees, and propose
shortcuts to justice across the quicksand of contempt for due process
of law.

and ammunition

Second. The sale and the possession of firearms has to be governed by the sole consideration of what is necessary and effective to stop their criminal use.

It demeans us as a civilized people to put any other consideration ahead of this one.

President Johnson has urged the ~~present~~ Congress to control the interstate shipment and the sale to ~~all~~ of rifles, ~~and~~ shotguns, *hand guns* and ammunition ~~as well as hand guns~~. This legislation must be passed -- now. *Its many years late.*

There is more to be done. !

If the states don't adopt -- and right away -- legislation requiring the registration of all firearms, then the Congress must.

The laws against carrying concealed weapons must be greatly strengthened, and the penalties for violation increased.

Third. Federal, state and local agencies must be organized in a massive effort to stop the drug traffic in this country.

↳ This means an increase in enforcement personnel.

↳ It means stiffer penalties for violation of the laws prohibiting the unlicensed sale of drugs.

↳ It means a large scale program for treating drug addiction, and for rehabilitating the victims of addiction once the habit is broken.

↳ It means finding out -- instead of wondering -- about the effects of marijuana.

↳ It means adopting the recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement regarding the sale and use of drugs.

↳ The drug addict is the most pitiful person in the world -- and one of the most dangerous.

Fourth: Councils for Civil Peace should be organized at the state ~~and where possible the~~ ^{local and} metropolitan ^{level} level.

↳ Such a Council could include representation from all racial, religious and economic groups ~~in the state~~ ... the state attorney general's office ... the National Guard ... law enforcement agencies and ^{state} officials of local government.

↳ It could ^{should} provide a state community relations service designed to prevent violence and to gain community cooperation and hear the voices of those who have gone unheard. It could set up a coordinated early warning system so that coming disorders might be detected in advance ~~and, perhaps, be stopped before they begin.~~

↳ It ^{should} ~~could~~ establish a central communications network -- vital to effective law enforcement.

A Council of Civil Peace could provide a way and a means for those who would be the innocent victims of violence to have an opportunity to forestall that tragedy and to bring to bear their knowledge, their information and their sense of citizenship.

Fifth. We must take a hard look at the effects of television on our children. What happens when they are exposed to endless exercises in the casual infliction of injury and death on our television screens?

I do not propose censorship, I do propose effective consideration by the American public -- and those responsible for television programming -- of how to understand and deal with this pervasive influence on our children's lives.

These are some of the items on an Agenda for Civil Order. Others must be added. For it is the minimum demand on our society today that we protect the right to Life and property from violence and crime.

And go President I
shall organize the law enforcement

~~But~~ ^{But} the point of it all is that this must be done -- and can ~~only~~ be done effectively -- in conjunction with securing the Right to Life with meaning - Life that is worth living!

So there must be, too, an Agenda for Social Justice.

↳ There is not time here today to set out all the detailed items on the Agenda for Social Justice. It is a longer agenda than the other. I outlined part of it last weekend in my letter to Reverend ^{the} Abernathy. I will offer a comprehensive Program ~~I will present it in detail during the next several weeks.~~

But its central elements -- especially as they relate to civil order -- must be made clear here and now.

↳ Most important of all: Every individual must be able to play a meaningful role in his community -- have a stake in what is going on ... be "part of the action."

↳ John Stuart Mill said it: "Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he will have no love for it." ^{! And far too many Americans have had nothing to do for their Country - & yet they are desperately needed.}

This means devising innovative, new procedures and institutions to permit -- yes, to encourage -- Direct Citizenship citizen participation in the governmental process -- from the neighborhood level to the Councils of the national government. I will offer such proposals.

The survival of democracy's community depends on everyone having a sense of community -- or being part of it.

↳ This means participating in its decisions.

↳ It means contributing to its progress.

↳ And it means sharing in its benefits.

It means a man or a woman saying this is my neighborhood -- my home -- my country -- my job.

↳ I submit that the recommendations of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders are right -- and that as they are carried out civil order -- as well as social justice -- in America's cities will be served.

↳ I submit that those proposals of the Poor People's Campaign relating to food, jobs and human dignity are reasonable ... that acting on them constructively will contribute greatly to law and order, as well as to social justice.

We must take whatever administrative and legislative steps are required ~~to feed every~~ to provide every American with a wholesome and nutritious diet. And we must take these steps now. Food stamp and commodity distribution programs in every low-income County by July 1.

This means supporting the principal goals of the public service employment legislation now pending in Congress.

If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right of every citizen in this nation to have enough to eat.

There is no reason in America -- with its unequaled wealth and agricultural productivity -- for anyone to go hungry. It is immoral to allow some babies to suffer from malnutrition while others in our population are concerned about the dangers of overeating.

→ X
If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right of every American to earn a living — *to work and Earn!*

~~The richest society man has ever known cannot afford to permit the festering frustration of unemployment which can so easily erupt into violence. X Jobs bring dignity to the individual, and resources to his family -- and wealth to the Nation.~~

The idea of guaranteeing decent jobs to everybody who will work at them makes sense -- with private employers providing job opportunities to the fullest extent possible, and with the government making whatever back-up or financing arrangements are necessary. *and*

→ X

Resources Available after Vietnam
must be immediately directed
to a ~~massive~~ Marshall
Plan for our cities.
I shall offer such a Plan in
detail!

If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right
to a full education -- from age four on through college -- and
the civil right to grow up in a decent home and neighborhood.

We must act now to secure these rights.

It won't come free. It isn't cheap. It will not come without
change.

It will require federal, state, local, and private resources --
not just in dollars but in commitment. ~~but~~

But we know that every dollar we put into the full education
of those who are now denied it ... every dollar we put into the
building of homes for those who now live in hovels ... every dollar
we put into the training of a man or woman to perform a job will be
repaid. And it will be repaid partly in the reduction of crime and
violence.

Civil order and civil justice are not two goals. They are one. *Order + Progress -!*

And the future hinges on our realizing this oneness -- not only as a moral principle but as a matter, possibly, of our survival as a free society.

↳ There is no choice today but to be tough-minded, hard-headed and fair-minded about stopping crime and violence in this country.

There is no alternative to being tough-minded, hard-headed -- and warm-hearted too -- about establishing social justice in this country.

We have to do both, and as rapidly as possible.

* * *

Finally, there is the whole context of the time we live in.

The next President of the United States will face new terms of reference -- not just in America, but worldwide!

He will face a new period in history -- a period in which all the old premises ... the old policies ... all the old ways of doing things are being brought into question.

He will face not only a new world map -- ^{But a world} ~~a~~ containing dozens of countries and millions of people who have, until now, almost literally lived outside history.

He will face what modern communication and technology have wrought -- namely, a highly sensitized, "in touch" and impatient family of people and nations who will no longer accept the status quo when it sustains hunger, injustice, lack of participation, or subjugation of one man by another.

∟ No continent ^{or country} ~~on earth~~ will be immune from this rising tide. We see it now.

∟ And no present day weapons system will suffice to maintain security in the context of these conditions.

Will we be able to cope with it?

We must, and we will, if we fully recognize now the nature of what lies ahead.

There is nothing less in this than the need to reexamine -- and to change, where necessary -- our national priorities ... the allocation of our resources ... the structures and framework in which we work.

If America has stood for anything in its relatively short history, it has stood for -- and symbolized -- the future.

Now it surely must.

All the doctrinaire arguments about the yesterdays ...
or the rightful pride in even-recent accomplishment mean very
little against the challenge of the ~~year 2000~~ *next decade or the
year 2000*

I've spent most of my life working and planning for the
future. It has cost me some hard knocks and some hard names.

↳ But I have no regret.

What I mean to do now is rally those people who feel the
same ... who are willing to accept and challenge this new world
environment ... who have the courage to do whatever is necessary
to make this democratic system of ours bend and shape to new
conditions -- as it always has before.

And I mean to oppose those people who are already invoking
nostalgia ... escapism ... and an inward outlook as the means
by which this country can meet the future.

Now I'd like to hear from you.

#

NOT IN RELEASE

I have read so many different newspaper reports about what I'm going to say here today that I can hardly wait to find out.

Frankly, though, everything I've read is more interesting than anything I've written.

Gene McCarthy has been chiding me a little recently for not talking enough. That's a kind of new experience for me. But what bothers me is that there's been a lot more coverage of what I haven't said the past few days than there was of everything I did say when I was talking four or five times a day.

I knew you were watching this campaign instead of listening to it, but I just didn't realize how little it took to satisfy you.

You seem to be most concerned about my support or non-support of the policies of the President. In view of my experience I have decided to come out squarely now -- unequivocally -- and 100% -- in support of the policies -- of President Calvin -- Silent Cal -- Coolidge.

But more seriously ...

I guess it's all right ... even a good thing ... to laugh a little ... even a little self-consciously ... when we know the going is toughest.

Talking here today isn't easy.

START RELEASE

I know the smallness of words in the shadow of such events as we have recently been witness to ... and part of ... in this country.

It would be easier to try again to pay our respects, and then to press on to other matters.

We can't do that. It would be the worst disrespect ... the extreme of irresponsibility. We know we must face what has happened squarely.. try our hardest to be sure why it happened ... appraise all its implications ... and try to find its instruction for the future.

As I think through, to the best of my ability, the meaning ... yes, the instruction ... of the assassination of Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, Jr., before him -- I find two imperatives emerging.

They seem at first almost contrastingly different ... and then, on closer thinking, ironically inter-related.

One lies in the fact of these two men's extraordinary, in some ways unique, leadership. The other is in the impeaching, incriminating ordinariness of the violence that struck them down -- as it had John Kennedy and Medgar Evers before them.

I speak only briefly of the first of these matters.

Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King were magnificent leaders of the American people as a whole, exponents of its highest ideals. But they were more than that. They had particularly, and in extraordinary measure, the confidence and the loyalty of two groups in this society -- Americans who are young and Americans who are black.

These two groups have it in common that they feel -- with good reason -- that they are denied full membership in the democracy.

They have it in common that they question -- with good reason -- the capacity of democracy's established institutions and processes to deal with the facts of change, and to make change the agency for increasing both the quality and the equality of human life.

The feeling today among these two groups is that demanding participation, they have been denied now even their own leadership. Their feeling comes very close to being one of having lost any vestige of an effective franchise.

I am not going to press this point here, for my doing so would be misunderstood. But this election year will not serve its purpose unless the demands of these two groups for both leadership and the right to participate effectively are met. If they are not met, whatever officials -- of whatever Party -- are elected to public office in November will find themselves charged with responsibility, but with no effective constituency to carry it out.

The first imperative emerging from these tragic events is that the void in leadership which they created be filled. It is, beyond this, that the legitimate demands of the groups for whom these two men spoke -- the demands of young Americans and black Americans for effective authority in the democracy -- be met.

- Introduction

There is no issue in this election year that is more important than this -- for it goes to the very meaning and effectiveness of democracy itself.

The second imperative is no less stern. ^{We must} It is to recognize these murders not only as the (extraordinary) tragedies they are, but as part of a ^{growing} commonplace of (crime) ^{and violence} in this country that has got to be stopped.

Not two criminals alone must now be brought to trial -- but crime itself.

Not two acts of violence -- but violence itself -- must now be brought to judgment in America.

It is ^{not} trial by jury of the facts of two cases that is now most important. What is important is trial by the Nation of the facts of today's contagious commonplace of crime in America:

?
Too cute

* ^{There is:} The fact of _____ murders in this country every year now, and of _____ major crimes.

* The fact reported in the headlines of every newspaper that ^{so many of and neighborhoods} our streets are no longer safe to walk ~~on at night, or our neighborhoods safe to live in.~~

* The fact of an escalation of protest that becomes an escalation of violence, until the seasons are marked by whether the reporters are assigned to the slums or the campuses.

* The fact that there are guns today in seven of every ten American homes -- and television sets showing every youngster how they are used in an unreal underworld that becomes his most vivid reality.

It is imperative that ~~this trial~~ ^{in all their aspects,} of crime and violence ~~be stopped.~~

~~on trial~~
proceed.

~~But~~ ^{in doing so, we} It is equally imperative that ~~it~~ proceed according to the rules of ~~due process~~ of reason.

It must be made clear that these acts, these statistics, these headlines, these poisoned television programs are not the story of America. (They are America's nightmare.) They belie the essential truth of America ^{and distort this nation's image.}

^{And I believe talk}
~~It must be made clear that any testimony about a "sick society"~~
is a (sniveling) plea of guilty by somebody seeking immunity in turning ^{has been} loose and not addressed to the point.
(America is not sick. America is a nation trying to cope with several social, economic and technological revolutions all at once ... trying its

* The fact of an escalation of violence...
escalation of violence, until the schools are...
by which the reports are assigned to the...
of the country.

* The fact that there are today in every...
the American people -- and television sets showing...
every youngster how they are used in an...
backward that becomes his first vivid reality.

It is imperative that this trial -- of crime and violence --

proceed.

It is equally imperative that it proceed according to the rules

of the process of reason.

It must be made clear that these acts, these statistics, these

headlines, these poisoned television programs are not the story of

America. They are America's nightmares. They belie the essential truth

best to do it... sometimes falling short... but in the great majority
essentially holding still to the idea that it
can be done, peacefully and within the democratic
process.

is a shattering piece of guilt by somebody seeking humanity in killing

~~false evidence on his neighbor. (Or it is an attempt to reduce the costs of social responsibility by those who believe in the divine right of the fortunate.)~~

*> within this context,
[What is it we have to do now — and for what purpose?*

~~It must be clearest of all that it is the causes of crime and violence that have to be sought out -- and rooted out -- and that the purpose of achieving civil order is to achieve civil justice.~~

We have got to make it clear that in America law and order depend essentially, at their base, on a national sense of values . . . on a belief that there are things more meaningful than money or power . . . on the conviction that the rule of law, informed by the rule of reason and justice, is both necessary and desirable as a means for assuring everyone a fuller, freer, life.

~~The guide to this pursuit lies in the meaning we have given our generating idea as a Nation -- which was to assure life as our elemental guarantee to each other, along with liberty and the pursuit of happiness.~~

~~For~~ *T*his has meant protecting life.

~~But~~ It has meant, equally, nourishing life -- acting together to give life meaning and validity.

Before we do anything else, We have got to get this relationship between "law and order" ^{*the protection of life -- often expressed as*} and "social justice" ^{*the nourishment of life -- often expressed as*} ~~on the one hand and on the other~~ straightened out in our national thinking.

We have got to have both ~~and~~ and we won't have either without the other, ~~for they are essentially interdependent.~~

The ~~hard, pragmatic, working~~ [→] fact is that right now the people of this country are so concerned -- and rightly -- about violence and crime that adequate measures to protect life are an essential pre-condition of getting on with the things we want to do to nourish it.

Anybody who thinks that violence ^{*can be*} ~~is~~ an effective method today of bringing about social change is wrong. ~~This may have been less~~ ~~clearly true three or four years ago. The country was ashamed then.~~

~~Now it's afraid.~~ ¹ ~~And violence has become an ally of the status quo.~~

Violence is today the enemy of change in this country. It is the ally of the status quo -- the excuse those who oppose change will use, and use effectively, to prevent it.

And there are those who have already begun to do so in this election campaign.

between peaceful
The confusion of protest and violence . . . the blurring of the essential line between them . . . is part of the fever of ~~the~~ *those* times.

The glory of this nation is that you and I can stand up in the public square [^] or write in the public press [^] or argue in the public forum against injustice and discrimination or in favor of our own political and economic theories, however unconventional they may be. We can take unpopular stands . . . oppose the policies of our own government.

We can dissent, and protest bitterly if our dissent is ~~distorted~~ ^{represented} by *the narrow-minded as* ~~into~~ disloyalty.

We can oppose with words and ideas.

But we cannot oppose with force and lawlessness.

We cannot murder a civil rights worker, ~~we~~ cannot murder a

United States Senator, ^{change} and we cannot use the torch to alter society. For

the very promise on which this nation is built --
if we permit that to happen we and our dreams will be consumed in those flames. *that men can peacefully govern themselves -- will be consumed in the flames.*

The second imperative that emerges from the sacrifice of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King is that we re-establish the distinction in this country between protest and violence, and that we restore the national sense of safety from violence and crime.

Now, what about the protection of life?

Crime prevention and law enforcement are basically local and state responsibilities. ~~We~~ ^I don't want a Federal police force.

(?)

The Tenth Amendment makes it clear that the police power does not belong to the Federal Government, and the decisions of the courts give this fundamental principle its necessary and wise application. (CHECK)

(which?)

The protections of the Fourteenth Amendment [^] are equally important, and I question seriously the judgment of either members of Congress or candidates for the Presidency when they seem to sneer at those guarantees.

There is plenty of room within these Constitutional guarantees of due process of law and of ~~State~~ responsibilities to protect ourselves against the ravages of violence and crime.

Given this framework, what are the specifics of what can be done right now?

Leave - m

~~We must draw up in this year's national campaign an Agenda for Safety -- and then act on this agenda.~~

~~I will propose these items -- among others.~~

third, First, the taking of whatever additional measures are necessary to counteract the abuse of the privilege of owning firearms.

I reject the tired arguments about murder being committed by men rather than by their weapons. The fact is that those nations with stringent gun laws are far less plagued by crimes of violence than we are. The American people know that the easy availability of guns makes their widespread use more likely.

President Johnson has ~~acted wisely and effectively in pressing~~ ^{*urged*} the present Congress to the maximum of its willingness to control the interstate shipment and the sale to minors of rifles and shotguns as well as hand arms.

~~But there is more to be done.~~

I shall ~~urge in this campaign~~ ^{*urged*} the adoption, either by the States or by the next Congress, of legislation requiring the registration of all firearms, and the effective improvement of the laws against carrying concealed weapons.

Second. The availability and use of drugs in this country today is largely a consequence of our ignorance and our weakness.

I think the ~~Drug~~ ^{here} traffic ~~in this country~~ can be ~~substantially~~ stopped -- both by stronger attacks on it by our law enforcement agencies, and through demanding cooperative action by the governments of countries it comes from.

I support, also, strong penalties against sale and use of so-called "harmless" marijuana which,

I am frank to say that the present inclination to go easy on doing anything about marijuana because we aren't clear just how bad it is seems to me wrong. Any doubt here ought to be resolved the other way.

whatever its own effects, brings young people to the threshold of drug use.

I will propose the immediate adoption of the recommendations of

the President's Crime Commission regarding the steps necessary to control the sale and use of drugs. (CHECK and expand.)

Just Third. The rioting in American cities must be stopped.

The large majority of good will
~~I urge with all the force I can summon that the people who live~~
~~in America's slums and ghettos recognize that the efforts of all of us~~
~~who are pursuing most actively the effort to wipe out those slums and~~

their aspirations
ghettos will be dangerously hurt by any renewal of ~~the~~ rioting, ~~that has~~
Small minority who disregard the law.
~~taken place.~~

If there are riots, they must be dealt with firmly.

If there is looting or burning, it has to be punished.

The state laws regarding incitement to riot or to violate the law in any respect should, in my judgment, be broadened and strengthened to meet the plain fact that there is today a clear and present danger of civil disorder throughout the country.

Fourth. ~~I will develop further in the months ahead the proposal I made last year in Detroit for State Councils of Civil Peace.~~ *I renew* *spell out*

Fifth. ~~I will also~~ ask the people of this country to join with me in considering whether we are rightly exposing our children to endless *and needless* exercises in the casual infliction of injury and death on our television screens, in our motion picture theatres, and in our literature.

I do not propose censorship *or book-burning.* I do propose responsible consideration by men and women of how we meet the fact that our children's minds are being infected *every day* by a poison more virulent than any we would ever consider permitting to enter their bodies.

we must ~~I am determined to~~ put an end to fear wherever it exists in America ... whether in the streets of the city or the suburb, whether in black neighborhoods or white. *There must be no vacillation, no temporizing, with those few Americans among more than*

*Another point:
Incitement
Carmichael
Brown*

— especially those with responsibility in the media —

^{200 million}
~~one hundred and ninety million~~ who seek not the improvement of our society but its destruction.

^{But}
~~But~~ let me make this clear: The cloak of law and order must not be used to conceal repression or to diminish freedom. There are those who will call for repression, who will seek to exploit fear, for their own narrow purposes. They will seek to halt social progress under the guise of tranquilizing America. They will seek to divert us from those positive programs which alone ^{finally} can conquer unrest. They will not succeed.

Now of the other side of the guaranteeing of life -- the ~~enrichment~~ nourishment of it.

There are better reasons for making life mean something for every American than the fact that this will reduce materially the problems of "law and order." But this is nevertheless relevant.

Indeed if we are to have law and order -- except in the imperfect sense that a policeman's club can produce it -- we must build a society in which everyone will be able to ~~play a meaningful role~~ -- will have a stake in what is going on.

There is John Stuart Mill's putting of it: "Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he will have no love for it."

(Check quote. Add Lincoln quote on how we must teach respect for the law.)

It is imperative that every citizen feel he has a real role to play in this country.

What we need today is a major offensive against both crime and violence itself and against the root causes of crime and violence -- an Agenda for Justice to work on along with the Agenda for Safety.

What a great thing it would be if we could combine in our national decision-making this year the convictions of those who believe most strongly in "law and order" and those who press most vigorously for "social justice."

This is entirely possible -- if we can make clear ^{how much} ~~the essential~~ interdependence of the two. *they depend on each other* ?

There can be no compromise with crime or with criminals or with those who resort to violence and brutality. But it is a far different thing to respond constructively to the demands of those who seek in good faith a more meaningful role in the society and a fairer share of its benefits.

~~Let's do some bargaining -- with ourselves.~~

I submit that the recommendations of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders are right -- and that if they are carried out the civil disorders in America's cities will stop. ?

I submit that the recommendations of the President's Commission on (Military Service?) are right -- and that if they are put ?

into effect the protests on the college and university campuses will be greatly diminished.

I submit that the ~~demands~~ ^{requests} of the Poor People's Campaign are essentially reasonable ^{if not some of the methods of the misguided among it} that acting on them constructively would contribute ~~more in the long run to law and order than most of the measures that have been proposed~~ -- and that whatever cost was involved would be fully recovered within two or three years. ^{in social dividends.}

Nothing is more paradoxical in our affluent society than the spectre of hunger hovering over millions of American families. Every citizen in this nation must have enough to eat.

We have a vast capacity to produce food for the hungry people of this country and of the world. ^L It is immoral not to use that vast capacity to maintain a society in which some babies suffer from malnutrition while at the same time there is great concern among other segments of our population about the dangers of over-eating. Until those of our citizens who are hungry develop the skills to earn an adequate living with an adequate diet it is our obligation to insure that their families are fed properly.

This richest society man has ever known cannot afford to permit the festering frustration of unemployment which can so easily erupt into violence. Jobs bring dignity to the individual and resources to his family.

The idea of a guaranteed annual income does not ~~comport~~ ^{square} with the ideas we all grew up on and most of us still hold. But the idea of assuring a decent job to everybody who will work at it makes sense -- and the dividends would include the larger acceptance of law and of order.

*Altogether
letter
mention if
not
specify.*

Every dollar we put into the full education of those who are now denied it -- every dollar we put into the building of homes for those who now live in hovels -- will be repaid; and this will be partly in the reduction of crime and violence.

There is no choice today but to be tough-minded, hard-headed, about stopping crime and violence in this country. There will not be social justice until we do.

And there is no alternative to being tough-minded, hard-headed, about establishing social justice in this country. There will not be law and order until we do.

Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King -- and John Kennedy and Medgar Evers -- died in crimes of violence.


But the forces behind the bullets that killed them were the forces of hate and fear and despair -- of the unrest that feeds on these conditions and then degenerates into total intolerance and the ultimate obscenity of utter disregard for life itself.

They were champions of social justice.

They were victims of meanest crime.

The question today is whether we are more intent now -- because of their sacrifice -- on punishing crime or on preventing it.

Their answer would be the same as ours.

 Hurrah!

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY SPEECH
NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON - JUNE 20, 1968

We are perhaps still too close to the tragic events of recent weeks to find in them the instruction that **they should** give us for the **future**.

One thing is clear and it guides **my** remarks here **today**.

It would be the **bitterest irony** if the purposes that Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy pursued should be thwarted now -- **not only** by **the** fact of **their** death but even more its violent circumstance.

These two men, whatever may be your partisan or personal views, stood first of all and foremost for social justice. And in a strange and **unreasoning** way, that **goal** has been set off, as though it were in **opposition**, to the purpose of achieving what we term "law and order."

The fact is that civil order and civil justice are twin imperatives, that they are interdependent and that one without the other diminishes the meaning of America.

The facts of violence before this nation are not only the assassination of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. -- and John Kennedy and Medgar Evers before them.

What must be brought into evidence, for trial by the jury of the people of this nation, are the full facts of today's increasing commonplace, and I repeat commonplace of crime and violence:

* The fact for example of 8 thousand murders in this country every year, and more than 4 million major crimes.

* The fact reported in the headlines of every newspaper that many of the streets of our cities are no longer safe at least to walk on at night, or many of our neighborhoods **safe** to live in.

* The fact of an escalation of protest that has sometimes become a **dangerous** escalation of violence.

* The fact that there are guns today in seven of every ten American homes -- and television sets showing every youngster how they are used in the unreal

underworld that becomes his vivid daily reality and his entertainment.

Yet these acts, and these statistics, and these facts, and these headlines, and these television programs are not, and you know they're not, the true story of the America that is yours and mine. They are, however, America's nightmare and they belie the essential truth of this country.

Now let me make it clear, I reject the casual and cynical talk about America being a "sick society."

It is too often an escape from social responsibility, or it's an attempt to reduce the costs of responsibility by someone who believes in the divine right of the fortunate.

It must be clear that violence, crime, looting, burning cannot and will not be condoned and must be stopped.

It must be equally clear that the conditions that breed crime and violence have to be sought out -- rooted out with the same tenacity and the same courage.

This relationship between "law and order" on the one hand and "social justice" on the other must be made plain to every American. I know of no group of people that has a greater responsibility to make it plain than those who are responsible for informing the American public of the facts of our life -- the media -- press, radio, television, publication.

Our generating idea as a nation was to secure the right -- the inalienable right as it was said in our Declaration of Independence -- the inalienable right of life -- along with liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But this means to me two things.

It means first protecting life -- the breath of life itself, that precious gift of God almighty.

It means equally, the fulfillment of life -- giving life meaning and value and validity.

The right of life as a physical fact is in jeopardy today from crime and violence.

And for millions, millions of our fellow Americans, there is jeopardy to the right to life in the sense of life that is meaningful. And there is a different kind of violence. A violence to human dignity and self respect that haunts this land. A violence in the filth and the degradation of our slums, the despair and the hopelessness of unemployment, the crippling and the debilitating effects of illiteracy.

Violence to the human spirit. The walking dead are amongst us my fellow Americans. Men and women of despair and hopelessness.

I propose, therefore, that we draw up, in this national election, in this year of decision, two agenda:

First, the Agenda for Civil Order,

And an Agenda for Social Justice,

and that we pursue both simultaneously, relentlessly.

I put these items at the top of the Agenda for Civil Order:

First. The rioting in American cities cannot be condoned, cannot be tolerated and it must stop. And if it breaks out again, it must be put down promptly, effectively and firmly. And we know how to do it. And it is the first duty of government to do that.

Riots are cruelly wrong. Their toll of life and property is unconscionable. Their first and worst victims are the poor themselves -- the inhabitants of the ghetto, and if you please, the poorest of the poor, the most deprived of the deprived.

The facts are everywhere to justify that conclusion.

Our state laws regarding incitement to riot or to violation of law in any respect need to be strengthened and broadened. And you need to help get these state laws improved and modernized.

Law in this country is not all out of Congress, gentlemen and ladies. This is a government of the Federal government, the state and local governments.

If there is looting and burning it must be treated and punished according to the laws against stealing and arson. That's what it is.

The prevention of crime and the enforcement of law against violence are, as I said, essentially state and local responsibilities.

We do not want in a strong national government, stronger and bigger every day, a federal police force.

But the states and the local communities need and are entitled to generous help through federal funding of enlarged and better trained law enforcement agencies and personnel.

But let me level with you. Law and order cost money -- it's not cheap. I know, I served as the mayor of a great city. I expanded a police department, I modernized it and I enforced the law. I didn't theorize about it, I did it.

Law and order costs much more than we are presently spending. And it also requires public support for the police and it requires also respect and support for the courts.

I have spent a great deal of my life defending civil liberties and civil rights -- not just recently when they have become rather popular, but back over a long time when they weren't and when many people didn't think I was very popular doing it either.

But violence is the enemy of civil rights. It's the mortal enemy of civil liberty. It is the total antithesis and repudiation of it. It is the ally of reaction -- and it is frequently used as an excuse for not doing the things that need to be done in this country to make it a decent country.

Now we've said repeatedly and it cannot be said too often that crime and violence cannot be tolerated. It must be stopped.

But I disagree with those who sneer at Constitutional guarantees and propose shortcuts to justice across the quicksand of contempt for due process of law. Maybe, ladies and gentlemen, there but by the grace of God and good luck go you. The due process of law is made for the rich and the poor. It's

made for the black and the white, for urban and rural. Don't play with it. It's your one protection against powerful, omnipotent and at times almost dictatorial government.

Second. I propose that the sale and the possession of firearms and ammunition has to be governed by the sole consideration of what is necessary and effective to stop their criminal use. That's the simple rule.

Now the President has urged the Congress to control the interstate shipment and sale of rifles, shotguns, hand guns and ammunition. And this legislation must be passed now, today. It's years late, inexcusably late.

And there's more to be done. If the states don't adopt, right away, legislation requiring the registration of all firearms, then the Congress will be required to do so. The laws against carrying concealed weapons must be greatly strengthened, and the penalties for violation increased and the law enforced.

Third. The federal, state and local agencies must be organized in a massive, and I repeat, massive effort to stop drug traffic in this country.

This means an increase in enforcement personnel. Again, it costs a little money.

It means stiffer penalties for the violation of laws prohibiting the unlicensed sale of drugs.

It means a large scale program for treating drug addiction, and for rehabilitating the victims of addiction once the habit is broken.

It means finding out -- instead of wondering and arguing -- about the effects of marijuana.

It means adopting the recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement regarding the sale and the use of drugs.

The drug addict, often times a youngster in this day and age, is the most pitiful person in the world -- and can turn out to be one of the most dangerous.

Fourth. Councils for Civil Peace must be organized at the state and metropolitan level.

Such a Council should include representation from all racial, religious and economic groups, the state attorney general's office, the National Guard, the law enforcement agencies and officials of state and local government--at a state and local level such as we have here at the federal level in the Security Council.

It could and should provide a state community relations service designed to prevent violence and to gain community cooperation and to hear the voices of those who all too often have gone unheard. And it could set up a coordinated early warning system so that coming disorders that people in the ghetto and the slums know about might be detected in advance. And it could and it must set up a central communications system vital to effective law enforcement.

Finally, fifth. We must take a hard, frank look at the effects of television on our children. What happens when they are exposed to endless exercises in the casual infliction of injury and death on television screens? I ask your unbiased, parental, human judgment of this. I ask you to be your own monitor for one week.

I do not propose government censorship. I am unalterably opposed to it. But I do propose effective consideration by the American public--and those responsible for television programming--of how to understand and deal with this pervasive influence on the lives of our children. Something needs to be done.

Now, these are some of the items -- and only some -- on the Agenda of Civil Order. Others must be added. But it is a minimum requirement of our society today that government protect the right to life and property from violence and crime.

And if I am permitted to lead this nation, I will know how to fulfill that minimum requirement and will do so.

But more must be done. And it can be done in conjunction with securing the right to life with meaning and life that is worth living.

We're human beings, my friends, not animals. Life is more than survival. Life is God's greatest gift.

So there must be an Agenda for Social Justice.

Now, there isn't time here today to set out all the detailed items of that Agenda. It is a longer agenda than the other. I outlined part of it last week in my letter to the Reverend Abernathy. And I will, and have in the past and will continue in the future to outline a comprehensive program of action.

But its central elements -- especially as they relate to civil order -- must be made clear here and now.

Most important of all: Every individual must be able to play a meaningful role in his community -- he must have a stake in what's going on. He must have a "part of the action"

John Stuart Mill put it very well: "Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he will have no love for it." My fellow Americans, far too many of our fellow citizens have had nothing to do for themselves or for this country. And they're desperately needed today.

The survival of democracy's community depends on everyone having a sense of community, of belonging, of being a part of it.

And this means participating in its decisions.

It means contributing to its progress.

And it means sharing in its benefits.

It means a man or a woman saying this is my neighborhood -- this is my home -- this is my country -- my property, my job, my family.

And when they feel that way, they shall love America with all the passion and devotion of the greatest of the patriots.

This means devising new and creative procedures and institutions to permit, yes, to encourage direct citizen participation in their government processes. From the neighborhood level to the councils of national government. And I will and shall offer such proposals.

I submit that the recommendations of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders are right -- one of the members is here with us today, Senator Harris, on that Commission -- and that as they are carried out civil order, as well as social justice, in America will be served.

I submit that the proposals of the Poor People's Campaign relating to food, to jobs, to housing, to education and human dignity are reasonable. Say what you want -- if it's good for you, it's good for them. And I submit that acting on them constructively will contribute greatly to law and order, as well as to social justice.

If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right of every citizen in this nation to have enough to eat.

There is no reason, and you know it, in America with its unequalled wealth and agricultural productivity for any one to go hungry. What a travesty. What irony. What an incredible situation. It's immoral to allow some babies to suffer from malnutrition while others in our population are concerned about the dangers of overeating.

I submit to this audience and to this government and to this nation that we must take whatever administrative and legislative steps are required to provide every American with a wholesome and nutritious diet. And we must take these steps now -- not later on. Food stamps and commodity distribution programs in every low income county by July 1. Let's use this food. Let's not try to make ourselves the political squirrels of the twentieth century by storing it.

Not to be a relief client! To work and to earn a living! And to have jobs, you know, brings dignity to the individual and resources to his family and wealth to this nation.

The idea of guaranteeing decent jobs to everyone who will work at them makes sense. This is a free enterprise economy, with private employers providing job opportunities to the fullest extent possible -- and they are doing a tremendous job now -- and with the government making whatever back-up or financing arrangements are necessary. And this means, may I say, supporting the principal goals of the public service employment legislation now pending in Congress.

If we want civil order we must recognize the civil right to a full education -- from age four through college to adult education -- and the civil right to grow up in a decent home and a decent neighborhood.

And I submit we must act now to secure these rights.

It won't come free. I know it. It isn't cheap. I know it. It will not come without change.

But I submit that just as those who fought for the independence of this country, pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to those inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that if we do less in this as we approach the two hundredth anniversary of our independence, we will lose the meaning of our independence.

All that I've said will require federal, state, local, and private resources -- not just in dollars but in commitment. And there will be resources available, my fellow Americans, in a growing economy and after Vietnam. And those resources must be immediately directed to the needs of this nation, to a Marshall Plan for our cities. And I shall offer such a plan in detail that will work for America just as it did for Europe. I think we can do it.

Civil order and civil justice -- those are the twin goals of a free people. And they are not two goals, but they are one.

And the future hinges on our realizing this oneness -- not only as a moral principle but as a matter of our survival as a free society.

There is no choice today but to be tough-minded, hard-headed and fair-minded about stopping crime and violence in this country.

And there is no alternative to being tough-minded, hard-headed and warm-hearted about establishing social justice in this country.

That's what makes us Americans -- to be able to do both and to do that as rapidly as possible.

Now there is the whole context of the time that we live in.

The next President of the United States will face new terms of reference -- a whole new set of problems and conditions, not just in American but worldwide.

He will face a new period in human history -- a period in which the old premises, the old policies, the old ways of doing things are being brought into question.

He will face not only a new world map but a world containing dozens of countries and millions of people who have, until now, almost literally lived outside of history.

He will face what modern communication and technology have wrought -- namely, a highly sensitized, "in touch" and impatient family of people and nations who will no longer accept the status quo when that status quo sustains hunger, and injustice, and lack of participation, or the subjugation of one man by another.

No continent or country will be immune from this rising tide. Rising expectations do not belong to Africa and Asia alone. They belong here too.

And no present day weapons system will suffice to maintain security in the context of these conditions. War, like slums, is becoming obsolete, far too dangerous for modern man.

Will we be able to cope with all of this?

The answer, I think, is quite evident. We must, and we will, if we fully recognize now the nature of what lies ahead.

There is nothing less in this than the need to reexamine and to change, wherever necessary, our national priorities. And they must be constantly reexamined, the allocation of our resources and the structures and the framework in which we work.

If America has stood for anything in its relatively short history -- and it has stood for much -- it has symbolized the future. It's the other name for hope, the promise of a better day.

All the doctrinaire arguments about the yesterdays, all the rightful pride of our even-recent accomplishment mean very little against the challenge of the next decade or the year 2000.

I've spent most of my life working and planning for the future. Some of you know it has cost me some hard knocks and even some rather hard and rough names.

But I have no regret.

What I mean to do now and what I ask you to help me to do is to rally those people who feel the same, who are willing to accept and challenge this new world environment, who understand that we are in the last third of the twentieth century and that freedom itself is on trial.

I want to rally those who have the courage to do whatever is necessary -- pragmatic people, to make this democratic system of ours bend and shape to new conditions -- as it always has before.

And I mean to oppose those people who are already invoking the nostalgia of the past, escapism, and the inward look as the means by which this country can meet the future. I want our America to reach out and seize the future rather than to retreat from it. I want it to be the student of living conditions and not the historian of the past.

And I want its leadership to accept as an opportunity the challenges that are proposed to us and not to flee from the responsibility.

And I have a feeling that if we just settle down to the problem the best days of this Republic are yet to be lived and when we celebrate our two hundredth birthday on July 4, 1976, we shall be able to report to God and man that the inalienable rights of life, and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness have in a large measure been fulfilled.

Now I'd like to hear from you.

TRANSCRIPT OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S
QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS
CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 20, 1968

Allan W. Cromley, President, National Press Club:

Mr. Vice President, we have a table full of questions over here and I'll try to ask as many as I can.

The first question, Mr. Vice President: The other day Mr. Bill Moyers, former White House Press Secretary, predicted you soon will begin to spell out some rather important areas of disagreement with President Johnson on Vietnam policy and other policies. Could you comment?

Vice President Humphrey:

I don't think what this country needs is particularly disagreement -- what I think it needs is positive proposals. The objective of this nation and the objective of your government -- and it is your government -- has been a political settlement of the cruel, costly and ugly war in Vietnam -- to take conflict from the battlefield to the conference room and the negotiation table.

We are now at a point where that objective is in part being realized. We have a conference and a negotiation underway today in Paris. I am not so foolish as to believe that the search for peace at the conference table will be much easier than the price we have had to pay to resist aggression on the battlefield. But I do feel that we have to have the same persistence and the same patience -- the same willingness to be brave and courageous and tenacious at the negotiating table as we have on the battlefield.

We have sent there to Paris two of our most gifted diplomats -- a senior statesman Averell Harriman and a brilliant, competent partner in Cyrus Vance. This has been the objective of political settlement -- the negotiated settlement of the President. It has always been my objective. I have never felt that Vietnam was subject to a military solution. This is essentially a political struggle.

And the first thing that the American community must learn is how to fight the political battles in the world. How to wage the "political warfare" if you want to call it that -- or at least the "political struggle" -- which does not mean the sacrifice of life, but means the use of one's intelligence. I only wish that this nation was as willing to spend of its financial resources for the betterment of this world as it is to spend of its financial resources for the weapons of destruction.

I have been in government long enough, assuming some of its responsibilities, to know the importance of national security, to understand the importance of our national interest, to appreciate the interdependence of the areas of this world, and to also understand the danger of aggression unleashed and unchecked.

But my fellow Americans, we are now at that stage where there is reason for hope. And just as surely as I stand before this audience, that negotiation which is now underway offers the best hope that we have for the fulfillment of what has been the sole objective of this country -- to find a way to preserve the peace, peacefully -- to find a negotiated political settlement -- and to do so honorably in order to protect the right of people to design their own lives, to create their own institutions of government and social structure and to be able to live at peace with their neighbors.

This is what I stand for. I have devoted a good deal of my life to the causes of the works of peace. I have never changed in that thought. But I do not think that peace comes to the timid or the weak or to the cowardly.

I think it comes to those of great moral purpose -- people of strength. And people understand that just as you cannot permit violence in your streets and your cities with a handful of brigands running loose and hope to gain anything called social justice for

the great vast majority of your people, neither can you permit violence to run rampant throughout the world when outside forces seek to destroy the hopes of simple and plain people.

I advocate today councils of civil peace to prevent violence in our cities. I suggest that the strengthening of the United Nations -- its peacekeeping operations, the building of regional institutions of economic and political and social development must be the top agenda of the American people. I suggest the highest purpose of this country must be to reduce the tensions that exist in this world.

And we can put ourselves to it. This is 1968, not 1948. And we have to understand the gap of the 20 years. And anybody that's worth being trusted in the Republic must be thinking ahead at least 10 to 20 years, because whatever he says or the decisions that he makes now will affect the lives of children yet unborn and youngsters now who will have to bear the burdens of adult responsibility later on.

Mr. Cromley:

Someone sent this up, sir, -- Does your answer boil down to a denial or tacit acceptance of the Moyers' assertion?

Vice President Humphrey:

I've been reading that Hubert Humphrey ought to be his own man. That's exactly what I am. It boils down to what Humphrey thinks. I'll let the others think for themselves, write for themselves, speak for themselves. I've never been known to be inarticulate and on occasion I have a good idea. (applause)

Mr. Cromley:

Mr. Vice President, to what extent do you think you're committed to the policies you defended as Vice President?

Vice President Humphrey:

Well, I've been a member of the government and I'm very proud

that I've been the Vice President of the United States. I'm very proud to have had a hand in these last 20 some years at fashioning some of the laws of this country. I think John Heffernan can tell you how many real responsibilities the Vice President has -- even in the Press Club much less than the government of the United States.

But I have been a part of this Administration offering my advice and counsel when it was asked for and even occasionally when it wasn't.

I think that in the main we have made considerable progress for the good of this country.

Ladies and gentlemen, if I am permitted to be President of the United States, I intend to be President. I've noticed that most Presidents are just that. They really don't take orders from Vice Presidents or from anybody else.

And if I'm permitted to have the opportunity to lead this country, there will be my ideas as I glean them also from others, as I tap the wisdom of the people of this country and the experience of this country.

One does not repudiate his family in order to establish his own identity. My son is in this audience. I don't ask him to live his father's life. I ask him to live his life.

The President of the United States has not asked me to live his Administration when I am privileged to have the Humphrey Administration.

And there will be -- if I have anything to say about it and with the help of the American people -- a Humphrey Administration with its own program, its own nuances, its own sense of direction, its own perspective, its own objectives.

America is a continuity of the quest for an ever-expanding freedom. I intend to add to that expanding freedom in my own way.

Every conductor of an orchestra makes his own music even from the same score with the same musicians. But it's different music.

Hubert Humphrey as Vice President is a member of a team. Hubert Humphrey as President is a captain of a team. There's a lot of difference. (applause)

Mr. Cromley:

I don't know what we'll ask after that one Mr. Vice President. (laughter) But I'll try. Have you or any of your principal associates held any political discussions with Senator Edward Kennedy or his associates since the assassination? If not, are any such discussions in the offing? And a related question. How will you select your running mate?

Do you favor an open convention for Vice President?

Vice President Humphrey:

What are we doing for openers today? (laughter) Now I was wondering if this trip was really necessary.

I've had no opportunity to visit with Senator Ted Kennedy. It's quite obvious that it would have been quite improper on my part at this time to be talking anything about politics to Ted Kennedy. He's a man in great sorrow with many responsibilities.

I think you ought to know that my relationships with Ted Kennedy throughout the years have been most cordial and friendly. I admire him greatly and this is not just new. It is a fact that emanates from the time that he was a student at the University of Virginia. Both Ted and Joan are good friends.

And I have never talked to him about the possibilities of any other office. Quite frankly, I've been kind of interested as to whether or not I was going to get an office that I could talk to anybody about another office about. I said it was nice to have Muriel from the balcony down here but we still haven't made it

through Chicago.

No, I have not talked to Mr. Kennedy, nor have I offered the prize of the vice presidency to any person.

I did not think that this office was for purposes of bargaining or for sale or for political gymnastics at this time. I happen to believe that whoever is to be elected or nominated for that office, or selected, must be a man you feel has those qualities, as best as you can discover them, that would suit him for the highest office of this land.

It's very difficult for me to say this because it sounds rather immodest. But when President Johnson at Atlantic City some four years ago this August suggested to that convention that Hubert Humphrey would be his choice for Vice President, he said that he didn't select me because of geography or religion or race or age. He selected me because he thought that I had the qualities as best he could ascertain them that would best serve this Republic in case of need.

I think that's the high purpose. I think that's the standard that you ought to have. Our nation is much more closely tied together than before. The day of selecting a man because he's from one section of the country or another, or of one race or religion or another, is less significant than it was years past.

Now you ask the question do I believe in an open convention? Of course I believe in an open convention. I've been to a lot of conventions and they've always been very open. You know, you can set up all kinds of straw men.

I believe in an open convention. You can nominate as many as you want to for any office. Any delegate can get up and make any speech. If somebody wants to address the convention and he happens to be a delegate, he can get up and talk even longer than I can if he wishes to. I'll give him a good run for his money.

All of this talk about whether or not the convention should be open or not for any office or any position is just plain talk. If you are a delegate you can speak, you can testify, you can get those television cameras on you, you can go out and parade around and get signs and you can pack the galleries and bring your friends in. Oh I've been to some real wingdingers, and so have you.

But ultimately the delegates will make the choice. Now this might not be the best system, but it's like Winston Churchill once said about democracy. It's the worst possible form of government. Except all others that have ever been tried.

And I don't know what we're going to do to improve ~~te~~ the present system. There are many suggestions.

My answer to you is no commitments from the Vice President, no talks with this distinguished Senator, no conversations with any man about this office. Whoever is to receive it should be capable of handling it and handling even a higher office.

And an open convention absolutely, open testimony, open participation; nominate whoever you want to. If I'm privileged to be nominated for the office of President and if I am nominated I will make my suggestions. But even in my own home I have never been able to exercise dictatorial rule. (applause)

Mr. Cromley:

Mr. Vice President, the lesson of the primaries seems to be that the voters want a change. As an integral part of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, how can you offer the new leadership and new policies America demands? Related question: What is your reaction to the New York primary vote and to Mr. O'Dwyer's suggestion that it is time for you to withdraw?

Vice President Humphrey:

Well, I want to tell you, I like Mr. O'Dwyer. Just to show

you how wrong he can be, he said in 1960 it was time to elect Humphrey President. That's right. Yes, he served on my committee. I hope him every success. He's a Democrat.

I'm not in the business of repudiating Democrats. I want you to know that we've got enough trouble without driving people out of the party. And this party of ours has room for lots of agreement and disagreement and we'll have all kinds of hearings and testimony.

We'll develop a platform and it most likely will have some things in it that I didn't feel ought to be in. But I feel that a candidate of a political party has a responsibility to his constituency.

Now, you know about that primary in New York. I was at the Poor Peoples March for a few minutes yesterday and I sat there alongside of my old colleague and friend from Minnesota, Eugene McCarthy. And I said "Hi, Gene" and he had a nice smile on his face, why shouldn't he? Just to show the kind of a guy I am, I even had one on, and why should I? (laughter)

And I said, "Gene," I was about ready to congratulate him and he said, "Well, Hubert, we did a whole lot better up there in New York than you fellows thought we would, didn't we?" I said, "You sure did. I want to congratulate you." And I want to congratulate him. He did a fine job.

I'm not going to spend my time running down my colleague Senator McCarthy. He has his point of view. Mrs. Humphrey's had some point of views. I haven't run her down too much about it and some of your folks out here have had some points of views that I didn't agree with and I've been kind of careful about running you down. I've let you do that to me a little bit but I haven't tried to down you.

No, frankly, I think that this matter of change is one that deserves our immediate attention. I believe in a change. Strong change. I want to change from the Executive Office Building to the

White House.

And I don't only want to change residence. I've been a man of change. Some people talk it; other people live it. I'll spread before this audience or any other audience in America, twenty years of public service, every year marked with change.

Only a few months ago some people were saying Humphrey had more solutions than there were problems. And now I don't, apparently according to some, even though there are problems.

Some people said a little while ago this Humphrey is far too liberal for me. And now I keep reading that he may be taking Geritol. Why, I even read the other day that I've been looking out of drug store windows.

Well, let me tell you the windows I want to look out of. Drop by 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

I believe in change and I've talked to you about it today. And any man that's worthy of the consideration of the American people knows that there's a change all the time in this country. And what we want to do is not just change, but change for the good.

What you need is a person who knows how to govern.

What you need is someone who understands the ferment of change, the forces of change, and does not let those forces run wild but directs them, tries to bring them into some form of direction and consensus so that the change is for social progress and not for anarchy.

Change, not of destruction, but change of construction.

I do not think that you demonstrate qualities of political leadership by tearing down that which you have around you. I think you demonstrate qualities of political leadership by building that which is needed. I intend to be that kind of a builder, in change.

Mr. Cromley:

Mr. Vice President, in view of the new circumstances surrounding

the contest for the Democratic nomination, and the important issues involved, will you consent to debate with Senator McCarthy?

Vice President Humphrey:

I've always felt that I ought to save my best remarks for the Republican candidate, and that's about what I'm going to do. I do believe in the process of debate.

I think the great debate in this country is between the two political parties after these political parties have arrived at their platforms and after they have arrived at the decision of their candidates. There's never been any shortage of my words. I think most of you know that. And it isn't a question.

Debate isn't what this country needs. What it needs is reason. What it needs is an honest, responsible, constructive presentation of views and proposals.

I'm an old debator. I spent three years of it at a university, undefeated. Four years at a high school, only defeated once. I know a lot about debate.

Debate is what you call making points, not getting truths. What this country needs is a search for truth, through discussion and conversation and through dialogue, through the presentation of proposals.

I have travelled in 50 states of this land, my fellow Americans, since I've been your Vice President. I have been in over 600 of the cities and villages of this land.

I've been to 102 colleges and universities of this land. I have stood before those 102 colleges answering questions just like I have here -- sort of a cheap, Larry, Meet the Press; low budget. And I want to tell you, you ought to get some of the panelists that I've had of the students, answering their questions, just like we've done here.

I've travelled over 650,000 miles in the United States of America as your Vice President, going to the American people in questions and

answers, in discussions, in conversations, in backgrounders and what have you.

There is no lack of words and expression on the part of the Vice President.

I look forward to the opportunity of debating Mr. Nixon. I've already shaken more hands than Mr. Rockefeller and he's older than I am so I'd like to get a man somewhere near my age. Thank you very much.

Mr. Cromley:

Along that line, Sir, who do you expect to be the Republican opponent and would you prefer Nixon or Rockefeller?

Vice President Humphrey:

Well, I guess that question did come one question late. It isn't a matter of preference. I have -- my Republican friends have seldom taken my advice -- I've even had some trouble with my Democratic friends.

Whomever the Republicans nominate they'll have to live with the Republican record.

And all of the time up to now people have been looking at our record. I intend to have them examine theirs. I know it's going to be rather disconcerting to any decent type Republican, but when I have them examine what they have done on federal aid to education and what they've even done about such a simple little thing as rat control and rent supplements, how they voted on model cities, what they've done to every social program that's been advanced in this country, they'll have something to answer for.

I'm saving it up. I just wanted to touch you a little bit. (laughter) I, I (applause) okay.

Mr. Cromley:

Mr. Vice President, specifically do you favor a guaranteed annual income? Do you think such a program could replace present

welfare programs or whether it would just be superimposed on top of them?

Vice President Humphrey:

Many of these phrases are just that -- phrases. But the way people understand a guaranteed annual income, I would have to say that there hasn't been a real discussion as yet of its full meaning. But if it's what I think it is, I happen to be much more convinced that what we need is the guaranteed opportunity of a job.

I believe that people ought to earn their living. I believe that those who are helpless and handicapped, those that are sick, those who are incapable of providing for themselves, are deserving of a very generous and compassionate American people and country to provide them with what is needed for a decent living -- which the present welfare laws do not provide.

But I am not one who believes in a guaranteed annual income.

I prefer to put my stake in and my voice on the side of providing jobs. Six out of seven are in private employment. I would like to see even more of them in private employment.

But I also, as I said in my speech, feel that the government of the United States can help -- through training and through re-employment and through the JOBS program, the National Alliance of Businessmen and through the Public Service Employment type of program with State, municipal and local government.

Not make work -- needed work can do a whole lot more to provide for this country than just having the word go abroad in this land that we are going to provide everybody with a guaranteed income.

I want to guarantee their income through their work and I'll guarantee, as best I can to the helpless and the needy and the suffering, a decent standard of living through the generosity and the compassion of people in this country. I think that's the way to have it. (applause)

Mr. Cromley:

Can your Marshall Plan for the ghettos be accommodated within the limits of a \$6 billion spending cut?

Vice President Humphrey:

The beginnings of it can. Let me just say a word about the \$6 billion dollar spending cut. I have not been happy about it. I think everybody knows it.

We've had some choices that we were forced to make as to whether we were going to have any sense of fiscal responsibility in this country. And that's the choice the people need to make. You don't prove yourself to be much of a liberal or even much of a sensible citizen to ignore the realities of fiscal and monetary policy.

And we've been faced with a staggering deficit -- and inadequacy of public revenue -- and the very people who ought to be for the surtax were the ones who wanted to keep these programs going that help the needy and provide for a better sense of equity and social justice in this country.

Now I happen to believe that after the Congress is all through voting a \$6 billion cut that they'll start to pass laws that read as follows: That, as they pass a departmental budget, they'll have a little proviso at the end, Provided that none of the provisions of Public Law 00562 or whatever it is, the tax bill, and the \$6 billion mandatory cut applied to this appropriation.

I was there 16 years and I know a little bit about it. But I want to say that I would rather have that tax bill with the \$6 billion cut than to have no tax bill which forces a massive cut, and which may be a rather helter-skelter cut that could wreck a lot of the programs that we have.

And my Marshall Plan for cities is first of all one that you get a start on; the beginnings of it are in the Model Cities Program.

But what we really need in this country is to excite the imagination of our people. And I happen to believe that the word, the concept of "model cities" hasn't excited anybody.

Every American of your age and many of the younger ones who know little about foreign aid know one thing: the Marshall Plan worked.

And what was it? It was a preconceived plan between the giver, the donor and the recipient. It was a plan that was worked out relating to people and things, relating to investment and jobs, relating to the rationalization, that is the balancing, of an economy.

I think that the American people know that the Marshall Plan, as it was administered as foreign aid, was a success. I think they'd like to believe they could have a similar success at home. And why can't they?

The Marshall Plan was a success in Europe primarily because it was worked out in concert with the recipient and the donor, with industry and labor and the people in the area that needed the help.

Now if we could make that work in Europe we can make it work in America.

We have more management techniques and technology here, more management ability, as many or more skilled workers, more resources to do with than they had there.

And what I said to you was, this war in Viet Nam is going to be over. Pray the day that it may be over -- tomorrow, a week from now, a year from now. I can't predict when it's going to be over but it will come.

And the question before this house is what will you do when it is over?

After Korea I know what we did.

We just forgot our social needs.

We had more poor after Korea than we have now.

We had more illiterates after Korea than we have now. We had as many or more slums after Korea than we have now and we didn't do one thing.

What we did was reduce the taxes and forget our social responsibilities.

What Hubert Humphrey is saying to you today as Vice President, and what I will say to you if I am permitted to be your President, is the same courage that was required to wage war in Viet Nam must be required, it must be applied to wage war on the vestiges of deprivation and poverty

in this country.

And I think the American people would like to win a war in their own country. I think they would like to be able to do something for their own people and I think I can rally them to get them to do something for their own people.

I helped rebuild one city, not as a theoretician but as practicing Mayor with little authority and not much power.

Give me the chance to help rebuild this America as the President of the United States and I think we'll get the job done with your help. (applause)

Mr. Cromley:

You seem to be winning them all Mr. Vice President, so we'll give up. But first of all (laughter and applause), I would like to present you a Certificate of Appreciation awarded in recognition of service to correspondents, press, radio and television, from the National Press Club.

Vice President Humphrey:

Thank you very much.

Mr. Cromley:

Also, sir, our Press Club silk necktie which we hope you will wear.

Vice President Humphrey:

Well, I sure appreciate this. I'm a little short of them.

Mr. Cromley:

Finally the last question, sir, do you plan to make Bill Moyers your Press Secretary? (laughter)

Vice President Humphrey:

Well, I haven't cleared this with Mondale and Harris.

I want to say in the presence of many friends of Bill Moyers he is a fine gentleman and I deeply regret that there's been a kind of misunderstanding which has grown out of a statement which I don't think too many people read.

Last night I read to Mrs. Humphrey the transcript of what Bill had to say and I want you to read it and then I want you to take a look at what was said and what was said about it.

He didn't quite say what I thought he said and what some of you thought he said. He really didn't.

What he said was that Hubert Humphrey was never for a military solution of the problem of Viet Nam but he always worked for and argued for a political solution.

That was the sum and substance of his point, and he wanted Hubert Humphrey to say this more often.

I thought I did say it. But I just never knew that folks weren't listening. That's all, you know. But I guess they don't.

So I don't think Bill did me any great injustice. I may have done him some.

But he hasn't applied. I understand that Captain Guggenheim pays better than the White House; not only that they can leave the lights on up there and we can't down here. Thank you very, very much.



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