

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY
TO 26TH U.I.U. BIENNIAL CONVENTION

PRESIDENT HOFFMANN: I am sure we have all enjoyed hearing Andy Biemiller. I know we learned a great deal from what he told us. We know that what we must do to defeat Taft-Hartley is to carry on the program he has laid down for us. That is the only way we can win!

In your behalf I want to thank Andy and present him with this badge as a guest of the Convention! (Applause)

Our next speaker is also very close to the U.I.U., its officers and members. We all know him. We have heard him speak. Just as we feel that Andy is "our" Congressman, we also feel that Senator Humphrey is "our" Senator. (Applause)

He has been closely associated with us--so has Andy Biemiller--in the A.D.A. and in all our political activities. When we go to him and talk to him we forget he is a Senator; that is how close we feel to him. We consider him one of our great leaders in the Senate, a man from whom we expect a great deal in the years to come, a man whom we know will go very far in defending the rights and the welfare of the people of our country.

I know you would rather hear him than listen to me. You will have your chance to listen to me next week! (Laughter) We asked Senator Humphrey to come here today and he has come. It wasn't any too convenient for him to come here but he has come because he feels close to our union. I knew you would like to hear from him.

I want to present to you now our Senator from the State of Minnesota! (Rising applause)

HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (United States Senator from Minnesota): Thank you very much! My very good friend, Sal Hoffmann, Officers and Members and Delegates of the Upholsterers' International Union, particularly my Friends and Delegates from the great sovereign State of Minnesota, Locals 1859 and 61: I want to pay special tribut

to these fine people who have graced your Convention! I want you to pay attention to them here! And I want them to not forget, when they get home, how good I was to them in Philadelphia! (Laughter and applause)

I was as thrilled as any member of the audience with the splendid address and forceful remarks of my friend and colleague in the Congress, Andy Biemiller; we have teamed up sort of like the Gold Dust Twins when it comes to speaking programs. I guess that is what you might call it. It is quite usual for me to find myself in my present position, when I have lost the argument as to which one of us will be the first to speak. I can tell you right now you have heard everything that needs to be said! (Laughter)

The only reason I still persist in speaking is that I find I have within myself, unfortunately, a sort of mean streak. So, since I am scheduled, I am going to make you sit through it. The mean streak, by the way, was inherited from someone on the other side of the family--I have never been able to identify which side that was! (Laughter)

Congressman Biemiller, my one and only friend Andy, I want to compliment you on the masterful presentation you made--of my speech! (Laughter) Now I know that when people call me up and say, "Humphrey, will you come and speak to our organization?" and I start to hem and haw a little bit, and they add, "We want you to know we asked Congressman Biemiller, also, because we thought possibly you would be willing to play second fiddle to him!" (laughter) I should take that as a compliment.

As a matter of fact, it is an honor to be associated with the Congressman from Milwaukee; it is a privilege. It is a privilege, a real privilege, to share a platform with him; but I can assure you there isn't much left to talk about.

Just in case you should go around later saying, "I wonder what Humphrey talked about--that was a good speech Biemiller made--" (laughter) I must let you in on a little secret. Yesterday I phoned him, and the day before, too. We were trying to make arrangements

to ride up here on the same train. However, since the House of Representatives works on a sort of half-time-at-double-pay basis, and we in the Senate, on the other side, work on overtime-at-half-pay (laughter), we found it would be impossible for me to get away from the great responsibilities and duties of public office to join with one of the younger members of the House of Representatives who was enjoying the good things of life in Philadelphia! (Laughter)

At last I said to him, "I will be perfectly frank with you. What I wanted to talk to you about was what you were going to say at the U.I.U."

Well, I didn't get much comment out of him. I checked his office. His office is a very dignified place, full of protocol, very respectful, as befits an "Honorable." But eventually I found one of his nice secretaries who said, "Why yes, Senator, you want to know what Mr. Biemiller is going to say at the U.I.U.?"

She proceeded to take out and read a very fine press release, a synopsis and analysis of the Congressman's speech. When she got through, I said: "It is obvious what my function as a representative of the Congress of the United States is: I shall go to Philadelphia and to Sal Hoffmann and I shall report on the conditions of the weather!" (Laughter)

That was all that was left. In case I fail in that function, let me hasten to say that whatever remains appears to be as foggy as the weather outside! (Laughter)

Andy, I have many grievances with you! I am looking for a good attorney right now. In view of the fact that we have to settle these jurisdictional disputes (laughter) under the Taft-Hartley law--which, of course, is the full-employment program for the legal profession (laughter), I am looking for an attorney.

This fellow Biemiller not only takes on the Senator from his own State--and he could have made a much longer speech on that subject than he did--but he has come carpetbagging, horning in and sneaking over into my own State, taking on one of its sons! (Laughter) I stopped there--I just said "one of its sons"! (Laughter)

And all this is done with such a fulsome display of oratorical eloquence that what I am left with is a fine analysis for a psychiatrist of the weaknesses and frustrations of the perennial speaker.

Andy, I am hurt! In fact, I am hurt to the quick! (Laughter) Because I came here with the desire to give you a first-hand informational report as to this newly adopted City of mine, Philadelphia! But since the Congressman--I am not going to call you "my friend" now--has seen fit to enter upon my territory and to go back and talk about something in his own State as well, I shall have to carry on with a few remarks about Wisconsin and Minnesota, as well as a few other parts of the country.

Andy, I was impressed with your analysis of good political procedure: Facts, Funds and Footwork. I guess maybe I have heard you make that remark in those terms before and possibly I should not have literally jumped out of my seat, as I did, when I heard it again. But you are right and I can go on and emphasize and fortify the comments of Andy Biemiller.

Too often liberal people, trade union organizations, liberal organizations, feel that the way that they can get their ends accomplished or obtain what they are after in politics or in the economic sphere, is to pass resolutions. We have more "resolutors" per square mile or per organization than any other area or organization in the ranks of the liberal movement. We pass resolutions by the hundreds. We send them to county commissioners, to the mayor, to the City Council. We send them to the Congressman, to the Senator, to the President and to everybody else!

But I want to tell you ladies and gentlemen that a resolution is nothing more or less than a declaration of good intentions. Just as it requires enforcement clauses to make a law, so it requires something beyond resolutions to get what you want. It requires a complete knowledge of the facts--because facts are devastating if you have the facts. It requires a reasonable degree of sacrifice to be able to produce the funds--and I am going to emphasize that later. It requires a little of that which every one of us

can give--footwork. Footwork is doorbell ringing, visitations, talking to our neighbors, being part of the community.

It is hard to get facts these days. You have to get them by digging them out. Labor's League for Political Education has been doing a good job of that. Andy was right that when you get up and enunciate a fact that is for the good of this country you are apt to find yourself back in the classified ads section of the newspaper.

If one of us, however, on the team, should give one vicious speech against the President, he would be a hero. He would have headlines in 75 per cent of the metropolitan press of this country. They would say: This Fair Dealer, this New Dealer, this radical, this liberal, or this Democrat, has seen the light! He has cleansed his mind and soul! He has come to an understanding of the truth! Well, it is a wonderful thing to be a hero--but not at those terms or those prices!

The facts we need are the facts available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The facts we need are available through your own research department, through the kind of work Art McDowell, along with Sal and others, is doing, that results in the sort of release I have before me now. Those are the facts we need to know.

But it is not enough for you to know the facts. You have to be a missionary. You have to have the same zeal as the others have. You have to talk these things up, use these facts on every occasion, to spread the information.

There is an old Biblical admonition that says: "Seek ye the truth and the truth shall make you free." I want to tell you now, ladies and gentlemen, if you want to find the truth these days you will really have to seek it, dig for it, look for it. But when you find the truth--which is another word for facts--it does make you free. It gives you the opportunity of devastating and demolishing a ruthless and falsifying opposition!

I want to call to your attention again the importance of knowing that there is much everyone can do and must do. So many people want to get into politics to be the front runners. They like to get

big, they like to make statements here and there, they like to join groups. Well, I have never found a master mind in politics! I never found a front runner that could get his own wife's vote, much less be sure of his own!

I prefer the ordinary people who are convinced on a program, who believe in an individual not because they like him personally but because of what he stands for. That is the kind of loyalty and the kind of determination we need in this year of 1950!

I will try to develop a little more what Andy Biemiller has said. Funds! You hit the nail on the head, Andy. We cannot match the funds of the opposition. If money controlled we would never win an election. It would be impossible.

Of course, that is really what they are angry about. That is what is causing all the furor. The men of high finance believe that financial power ought to be dominant, ought to have disproportionate influence, upon the political trends and development of this country. Why is it that these people--the same people who dislike Mr. Truman--condemned the New Deal and the Fair Deal and the liberal movement? Why did they hate Mr. Roosevelt as they hated him? Let's not forget how they hated him!

Did they hate and dislike him because he was unkind to them? Did he undermine their enterprises? That was the last thing he ever would have intended to do or ever did do! As a matter of fact, the very first people to be saved under the terms of the New Deal, the first people to benefit from the actions of his Congress, were the big boys of this country. The first loans made were not made to the poor and hungry but to the powerful financial institutions so that they made more money, under more secure terms during the days of the New Deal than they ever made under the so-called good old days.

Yet, they do not like it. And there is a very simple answer why. The answer is simply this: these people do not trust "the people." These people, these agents of special privilege, do not believe that our kind of people want the same things out of life

that they want. They do not believe we really believe in a good kind of society; or if they do think we believe in it, they do not want it at our terms. They want it on their terms or not at all.

What Mr. Roosevelt and Harry Truman and their associates did was to transfer political power from the hands of the privileged few to the hands of the majority. That is what we have done under the New Deal and the Fair Deal; we have given the privileges back to all the people.

For years this country was dominated politically by the privileged. For years legislators were governed by utilities and railroads. In 1920 we saw the vilest corruption in the high places of government.

Then came the period of 1930! I think Mr. Roosevelt's greatest contribution to America was the fact that he made everyone in this room, made us all, feel that we were partners in the great enterprise of American Government. He made us feel it was Government of the people, by the people, for the people--not government by some of the people for some of the people! He made all of us feel we had a stake in it and that this Government could and should be responsible to everybody in America.

That is what they cannot get used to, because they want to be agents of privilege; they want to be in the position that if somebody is going to get a little benefit it will be themselves who get and give as they choose. Remember, he who gives can take away!

They want to be the good neighbor if it is to their benefit to be the good neighbor. They want to be the bad neighbor if it is to their benefit to be the bad neighbor. The processes of American democracy are not based on that philosophy; the processes of American democracy are based on majority rule with full respect for minority rights. It demands that the resources of America be used for the general welfare of the great American people. That is a little dissertation on political philosophy we have to understand.

Why do the Gabrielsons talk the way they do? Why do the

Stassons talk the way they do? Why do we have this kind of opposition? Why do they say the country is insecure or going to the dogs? Andy Biemiller pointed out that it is not true.

Just subscribe to BUSINESS WEEK if you want documentation. Look at the financial pages of the newspapers, THE NEW YORK TIMES or your own Philadelphia papers. You will see that never in the history of civilized society have the great industries of America been in a more secure and profitable position than in this hour-- and they have been in this secure position since 1934. They have been making more money ever since 1934, more in proportion to investment, than ever before.

Yet, they are unhappy. They are unhappy because they are not in charge of the spigot of public welfare. They are not in charge of the switchboard of American democracy. They have all the democracy that anyone could hope for. They are enjoying all the good things of life. But they not only want to be a part of it; they want to control the switchboard of political power. When they cannot, they are unhappy.

I submit to you that that is a testimonial to their lack of faith in the processes of free government. I want to say that when Mr. Nelson of the Real Estate Board made his remark he was possibly one of the honest ones of privilege because in his anger and in his emotion he said, "Democracy stinks!" And unfortunately some people do oppose the only hope of the rich and the poor, of the privileged and the underprivileged: the relentless growing process of democratic government.

I started to talk about funds and I sure talked about the folks that have the funds. It is not good enough to hope we are going to win. The stakes are high. We have to win not only for ourselves but we have to win because of the kind of world in which we live.

You are asked on occasion to make a contribution of a dollar or two dollars. I hope you have the good sense to do that because you have to remember--you have got to remember--political freedom

and political action are not on the bargain table. They are not free prizes, door prizes, that you do not have to pay for. You are asked to pay, not in terms of millions and thousands but in terms of the sums you are financially able to give to your own organizations or to an organization for political action, which ultimately do the work at the local level where it needs to be done.

Elections are not won in Washington. Elections are lost in Washington. Elections are not won there. Elections are won in the voting precincts of the respective towns, villages, hamlets and cities. A liberal is not as strong as the individual liberal you have as a Congressman or Senator in Washington. A liberal is only as strong as the people back home at the precincts.

We know the people are there; we know how they think. We know whenever we get a big vote we have a better than fifty-fifty chance to win. Nobody was responsible for the tragedy of 1946 except the people, and the labor people had a big share in it. The labor people just did not turn out. They had some place else to go. They went fishing instead of voting.

Believe me, the kind of fish they caught is the legislation you have now on the statute books! And after two years the legislation-- or the fish, if you wish--that came out of it, doesn't smell too good! I hope we understand that. I hope we don't have to be taught too often in order to get the proper kind of action. The year 1946 ought to stand out in our memory. And we should review the results since 1948.

Let me say to you, this year of 1950 is crucial. We know down in Washington if we can get another half-dozen liberal Senators and twenty-five to thirty pledged liberal Democrat or liberal Republican--if you can find them!--Congressmen, we will be able to turn the tide in the legislative field.

You want Taft-Hartley repealed. You will not get it done by just hoping, by saying it ought to be undone, that it is an unfair and an unjust law. Taft-Hartley was passed by an overwhelming majority and it will be repealed only by a Congress

that is pledged to repeal it. That is the only way on God's green earth you are going to get it off the books!

You have to have more Congressmen like Andy. You have to have more Senators like Francis Myers from this State, who will fight for liberal legislation. Can the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee do it? Can my good friend, Joe Keenan, Director of Labor's League for Political Education, do it? Can Sal Hoffmann do it? They will help; they will do what they can. But ultimately the way to get the job done is by getting the voters registered.

An unregistered voter is no voter. Registration is basic and vital. If you get them registered, then the next step is to make sure they get the facts. We want people to know the issues. Your next job is to see that they get to the polls.

There are some business agents in this group. I gather your local unions mostly all have business agents. They do their jobs well. They negotiate contracts. They take care of grievances. I know of no one who is busier than a business agent and no one who has more problems.

But you can have the best business agent that the world has ever known, and if the Congress of the United States does something to strengthen Taft-Hartley instead of repealing it, you can have the best business agent in Kingdom come and he will never do any good for your people, because this legislation today is your life. This government is your Government. It is your Government for good or for bad, your partner for good or for bad.

You had better make up your mind that your first responsibility is your political responsibility because the economic life of this country, the social life of this country, is not only directed by what happens at the local level, by your own union, but is framed by the great policies of the Congress of the United States, of the state legislatures and of your city councils. Political action is a matter of life or death itself for people who wish to aspire to the good life and to their fair share in this good life.

I think you know enough about that now. I do not have to talk about it any more. I want to fortify what Andy said about the

opposition people feeling a little stronger today. They were stunned after 1948, but not for long. There is now what I call a polarization or centralization of political attitudes in this country. In other words, people are getting divided into two camps; there does not seem to be much in between ground.

There is the camp which is headed up by such forces as the committee for Constitutional Government, which is the old Liberty League--the N.A.M. crowd. Over here there are the liberal democratic forces that center around the great labor organizations, the farm cooperatives, and some liberal professional and business people of this country.

There is a real struggle going on and every time this reactionary group wins a victory they taste blood and like the so-called vampires of old they want more. They have quit the shotgun politics where they sprayed the whole atmosphere and have taken out their sharpshooting rifles, where they center upon people one by one. The most recent example was down in the State of Florida. That is how they will go about it.

It was as if during that period of time everything in the country was centered down in Florida. Every remark from the newspaper commentators was about Florida. For better than a month before the election every comment was centered upon that particular area, every effort directed there.

They removed from public life to my mind one of the great men of America. I think Claude Pepper served his country well. I think that, as Andy said, he was one of the great liberals at heart. We all make mistakes; he made mistakes. Everybody makes mistakes. The world is full of mistakes. You can get a lot of confessions when people really want to start confessing.

The opposition tasted blood. They have been figuring what kind of campaign they will follow now. What is their formula? To frighten you as a working person, to frighten you as a worker in a shop or a factory, into thinking if the present financial policies of this country are carried on you are going to be ruined, that the solvency of the United States of America is threatened, that we are

going bankrupt.

They continuously harp on economy, economy, economy-- as if those of us in Congress were not interested in it. They harp on economy without telling us the real problems. I have said to some of these people who talk economy, "Where do you suggest we reduce?"

And every once in a while the truth comes out! They suggest that we make reductions in housing programs-- which is a nice way of saying, "We don't care whether people are housed or not." They suggest reductions in the social security programs, another way of saying, "We do not believe in social welfare for the people of this country."

They seek reductions in foreign aid policies. The only way to fight communism, they say, is to have Joe McCarthy investigate!

I think it is about time we put them on the spot. My office gets about a thousand letters a day. Fifty to sixty percent of them are against everything you and I stand for: a concerted, well organized campaign to prove Mr. Truman is taking the country down the road to socialism, which is the next step before communism.

Of course, that cannot be based on historical fact, because the most inveterate enemy of the communist has been the socialist. It appeared to me from history-- not by revelation--that there is no historical foundation, no proof whatever for the statement that if Mr. Truman were taking us down the road to socialism, communism is the next step.

Those who say that are either politically ignorant or are capable of political falsehood because, believe me, communism is a philosophy which denies all human liberty, one that denies all equality, one which denies all individual opportunity, all individual freedom. If they want to talk that way it shows they are one of two things: political liars or political illiterates. We have no room in public office for political liars or political illiterates. There is no room for them!

We have to have people in public office with a modicum of integrity and a reasonable understanding of what goes on in this world.

The next slogan is economy. Economy at whose expense? I was talking to some of the publishers who were down in Washington before the Civil Service Commission. We were talking about postal rates, which bring about the biggest deficit of any department in our Government. The Post Office Department is the department that contributes a great portion of our deficit.

Now, mark my words! Two hundred million of that deficit is directly attributable to a subsidy to second and fourth class mail. That is a subsidy to TIME, LIFE, FORTUNE, and all the other big magazines and great newspapers of this country. Do they want that eliminated? They are down there by the hundreds saying, first of all, that the figures are not true. Secondly--after that first charge--they are saying: After all, the Post Office Department is not really a business, it is a service enterprise; it ought not to be regulated in terms of a business enterprise.

That is what we have been saying for years! But when it applies to individuals, when it applies to this side of the fence, they take a different point of view.

I said to one of those gentlemen, "All right, the Post Office is a service. Maybe its budget possibly should never be considered on a business basis. Maybe it has a deficit because of the cost of rural free delivery, and transporting books at a reasonable cost so that people can read and be educated. Maybe we ought never to think of postal rate for income. I agree with that. That is our philosophy. That is exactly the way we believe. You cannot expect those of us who feel that way to argue about high charges and low charges upon the shipment of books, magazines and so forth."

I said, "All right. Take it just another step. The Post Office Department is an aid to your business"--because this gentleman testified if the postal rates were increased he would go out of business. He needed that subsidy. They have testified if postal rates were increased 35 to 50 per cent on second and fourth class mail a large number of them would go bankrupt.

It is a direct subsidy, that you as a taxpayer, pay for. For every dollar of postal income the taxpayer pays \$4 out of the general

revenues of the treasury: four to one! That is a matter of testimony and a matter of record.

So I said to this gentleman, "How about the farmer? Do you know how he feels?"

He feels that without a price support for his agricultural products he will go bankrupt. About 25,000 publishers in this country receive a subsidy of \$200 million in second and fourth class mail rates in one year. The total cost of the Commodity Credit program for the farmers, for a farm population that totals about 26 million people in this country, is \$435 million. Twenty-six million people get \$435 million in help from the Government--you have heard a lot about that!--and 25,000 people, captains of an industry, get a subsidy of \$200 million! It seems to me the per capita subsidy is a little large!

How many people in America know what kind of subsidies are paid to magazine and newspaper publishers? What you hear about are the subsidies on unemployment insurance, on social security. We can't afford the Brannan Plan. The Government is supposed to say it cannot afford subsidies that go out to children and dependents and mothers. We cannot have so much of this health program to relieve the misery of poor health. That help is undermining the moral fiber of the people!

But, my God, what does it do ^{to} the moral fiber of your captains of industry to get \$200 million for a handful of people? It does not seem to undermine their character! It seems to me they have more darn character as the days go by! (Laughter)

I bring these things to your attention, my friends, because these are the matters that you need to know. I am emphasizing them as strongly as I am because when we leave the room we sometimes forget that the import, the purpose, of this Government is to help the people. Its purpose is to cooperate with the people, to constantly promote the general welfare of the people.

We have to keep the incorrigibles and the lawbreakers in line, of course, but the purpose of democratic government is a posi-

and affirmative purpose: to build a better society. This is not a dictatorship or a kingdom. We own it!

You hear a lot about taxes. You would think the only people who pay taxes are the big corporations and big multimillionaires. In 1939 people with an income of \$5,000 a year or less paid 10 per cent of the Federal income tax. In 1949, ten years later, people with a \$5000-a-year income or less paid 54 per cent of the Federal income tax. You're not getting any free rides! No one gets a free ride in any society.

You are paying your way but when you hear it over the radio or read it in the press you would think somehow the people in this room do not pay taxes, that just a few people at the top pay taxes. You folks are out on a lark or a vacation. You are ne'er-do-wells living out of the public trough.

You have heard about excise taxes, the tax on cigarets, the tax on luxuries, the tax on luggage. Who pays that tax? Ladies and gentlemen, the facts of the Internal Revenue Department disclose that in 1949, 85 per cent of all excise taxes were paid by people with incomes under \$5000 a year. We need to know these things!

I want to say that as one representative of the Congress of the United States I have not had fifteen letters in a year from the average working man or woman, from the kind of people I represent back in Minnesota, complaining about taxes. I have yet to hear them complain about their Government--the average rank and file worker, the ordinary taxpaying citizen, the ordinary mother who raises the children. Those people do not complain that this country is going to hell and we are going down the road to socialism!

(Applause)

What I hear are complaints from the other kind of people--and the more they get the more they complain. I think it is a very disconcerting and unhappy sign. We wish it were not that way but we know it is. That is the background.

What is really going on? What is this Fair Deal all about? This Fair Deal is merely an attempt on the part of the elected representatives of the people to translate into political action and

into public law the commitments which have been made to the people, which commitments were voted upon by the people in an election.

You know what the platform was. Harry Truman did not give you any gobbledygook. He talked plain and straight from the shoulder. As for what Mr. Dewey was saying--well, there is Ed Murrow on C.B.S., a great radio commentator, a good one. Ed Murrow put some records together: the important events of the last ten years--I don't know what he called it--maybe "The Eventful Ten Years"--the story about Roosevelt and the period of the war and since the war.

He is putting out a new album now, of fifteen-or-thirty-second transcriptions which give you the history of the present day. He said he was trying to find out how he could best demonstrate the difference between Truman and Dewey in the 1948 election. He included in the album a transcription of one speech in San Francisco by Truman and another by Dewey. Here is how they went, on the issue of the minimum wage.

Dewey, in flowery language, first of all--since the theme song was unity, unity, unity--sang unity, unity, unity. After that he said, "I want these good folks to know I stand unequivocally for a fair and adequate and reasonable minimum wage that will meet the standards of living of the great American people"...and on and on and on. A "fair and adequate" minimum wage! A generalized statement, a generalization!

Harry Truman, candidate for the presidency, speaking at San Francisco, got up on the platform and said, "I stand for a 75-cents-an-hour minimum wage!" Bang! That's all there was to it! (Applause)

That, my friends, is why Mr. Truman won the election. He won it because he talked straight from the shoulder to the people. He said, "You elect me President and we are going to have a grain storage program for farmers. We are going to give you grain storage!

He said, "We are going to put through a low-cost housing program." He talked in plain terms. He said to the worker, "You elect me President of the United States and I will stand four-square and unreservedly for repeal of Taft-Hartley!" And every human

effort was expended to get it repealed! He kept his word. The people know! They do not want any gobbledygook milk-toasty politicians trying to play on both sides of the fence!

You cannot possibly please, in America, the National Association of Manufacturers on the one hand and, on the other hand, the American Federation of Labor and the C.I.O. It is not in the political books to be able to please both sides on minimum wage, health insurance, repeal of Taft-Hartley--those things that are basic for our domestic economy.

Andy, you talked about McCarthy. I want to give you another little twist about McCarthy. I have not said much about this except once or twice before. All I can say is that what is happening in the Congress of the United States today is deplorable. If McCarthy can prove his charges he ought to go down in American history as one of our heroes. But if he cannot, if he cannot substantiate his charges, he ought to go down in American history as one of the greatest phonies!

The charges are yet before the Government. Yet even before the charges were submitted to the Senate, he started it all in a political after-dinner speech in Wheeling, West Virginia, in which he stated that there were 205 communists in the State Department, known to the Secretary of State! Before he went to the Senate he reduced the number to 81--and he denied, mind you, that he had ever said 205. It was proved that he was lying! He had said 205. I submit to you ladies and gentlemen, if the Senator lied once, how can you believe him on anything? Because if you start out lying you are going to lie all the way through in order to protect yourself! So he went from 205 to 81, the 81 that they had had up before the House Committee back in the Republican 80th Congress and who were fully investigated. The chairman of the House Committee then-- a Republican committee-- got up before the House and assured the House of Representatives that none of the people on the list were bad security risks. He wanted the House to know--I quote--"...the State Department has been cleaned out from top to bottom of communists..." In spite of that, McCarthy gets out the book, looks cock-

eyed at the label, dusts it off, and brings out his "new" evidence--its all over the papers--81 cases of communists in the State Department!

The people are frightened. They know what happened in Czechoslovakia. They know what nearly happened in France. They know what happened in every free country when, by such conspiracies as McCarthy attempts to prove here, communist infiltration has taken place. I submit, however, it is one thing to make the charge and another to prove it.

So 81 of the original supposed 205 cases were submitted to the committee; the balance have never been submitted to the committee. Then a little bit later he made another reduction. Apparently he had been looking at a Heinz ketchup bottle because he came up with 57 cases--57 different varieties! (Laughter) And then, after he got through being unable to prove anything about the 57 varieties, he said, "I will rest my case upon one case--one communist--who is a member of a super spy ring, the top figure in a super spy ring, who is in the State Department!"

He is referring to Mr. Lattimore, a fellow who teaches at Johns Hopkins. Let's get it straight, once and for all: Mr. Lattimore does not work for the Government of the United States!

If Mr. McCarthy wants to investigate individual communists I can find him a dozen of them. Earl Browder admits he's a communist. Why doesn't McCarthy investigate Browder instead of horsing around with people who swear they are not communists? What we're looking for are real communists!

I have a picture of Earl Browder taken at one time in the company of some distinguished United States Senators--one being Robert Taft! Now, wouldn't it be terrible if, because he once had his picture taken with Browder and some other prominent communists--at a time when we were allies, working together to get better production, to sell bonds and so forth--people began to believe Robert Taft was a communist?

By the doctrines of association, because a man is seen in a picture with another man, a communist, he is a communist, too!

It's getting so a man can hardly afford to have his picture taken with his wife these days! (Laughter) I want to submit to you that it is ridiculous--this kind of doctrine, the doctrine of guilt by accidental association.

Nevertheless, Mr. McCarthy rests his case, after all these charges, on one man! When you go back to your local unions you have got to make sure your people know these things because they are making headway with these charges. All this publicity, all these headlines, are having their effect. One public opinion poll showed 41 per cent of the people thought McCarthy was right; only 29 per cent thought he was wrong. You can see why I am disturbed. Nearly half the people don't know the actual proven facts.

That is what has happened after weeks and weeks of this headline business, with no evidence as yet except the evidence of a former communist--and the former commie said he wasn't sure himself, he didn't know, somebody told him that he had heard from somebody else who was high up at the top that so and so was the case! Now that is really strong evidence!

Be that as it may, let's assume for purposes of theory--and I surely do not want to be misunderstood or misquoted---let us assume for the immediate purpose of argument that this one Mr. Lattimore is a communist. Does he work for the Government? He does not. He has not given any more advice to the State Department, if you please than any other college professor. He has not given any more advice to the State Department than the President of the University of Pennsylvania--one Harold Stassen. In fact they were present at the same meeting, a discussion group, of people interested in foreign affairs who were asked questions and requested to state their opinions. Mr. Stassen by association system of McCarthy could be a communist too.

Whether Mr. Lattimore is a communist or not, it does not prove that the State Department, or the Government of this country, is infiltrated with communists. All it proves is that we have let ourselves be sucked into a trap whereby we have let somebody get on the brush and the red paint and smear everybody in sight--spatter a little red paint here and a little red paint there until--maybe!--

he hits on somebody and can say, "Ah-h-h! That's the guy I was looking for all the time!" (Applause)

It appears to me that if Mr. Lattimore was known to Mr. McCarthy as the head of a super-duper communist spy ring the least he could do, as an American, would be to report it to the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

When I mentioned that once to the Senator from Wisconsin he said, "The F.B.I. cannot prosecute anybody; all it can do is investigate and dig out the information. Mr. Hoover cannot prosecute anybody and if the Government, the Administration, did not want to prosecute somebody, they would tell Mr. Hoover not to do anything about it."

I think that is an insult to the integrity and the character of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I honestly believe if Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, regardless of the merits or demerits of Mr. McCarthy's charges, from his own investigations or from the investigations of the F.B.I.--and he has investigated every top person in this Government and the little and the lowly--if he knew one man who was a communist, or the head of a super spy ring, was working in our Government, not God Almighty himself could keep him from testifying to the American people, at the cost of his job, that that man ought to be run out of the Government! (Applause)

If the Senator from Wisconsin intimates Mr. Hoover would be so hungry for his job that he would not speak up against a communist in our Government, then I believe his regard for the integrity of a public servant of Mr. Hoover's caliber is at an all-time low. What do you think? (Applause)

Those are the charges that are being made. When you go home, get your fighting clothes on. This is no small matter. We are not holding hands, making love. We have a job to do: to be honest with ourselves, to uphold the standards of representative government.

You know what is happening in this country. People are losing faith in free government. People are beginning to believe everybody is corrupt. Apparently they feel where there is so much smoke there must be fire. People are beginning to believe nobody can be

trusted--not the Federal Bureau of Investigation, not the Attorney General, nobody! It is a principle of totalitarian philosophy, remember, to engender that feeling where everybody distrusts the other guy. Just tell enough lies, spread enough rumors, spread enough gossip, get everybody disbelieving, undermine respect for the government!

Just let that continue and, so help me, folks, you will have in this country a complete breakdown of the free processes of democracy!

It is the people who are supposed to be rooting out the super spy rings, the seeds of subversion, who are creating the conditions under which subversive activities and anarchy find a hold, who are making a laughing stock of this country. Here we are, 150 million strong, boasting that we can lick the Russians, we can lick this one and that one, we are proud of our productivity, proud of our economic strength, proud of our country and its development. Then all at once a Senator comes along with a lot of old half-baked charges, dusted-off charges, about communists in the State Department--and everybody starts quivering all over!

The newspapers start putting out headlines, though I'do want to say that on the whole the newspapers have been very sensible about this. The **editorial writers**--we should acknowledge this--of much of the major and metropolitan press of this country, have been very, very careful. They have been on the affirmative side and in defense of freedom.

But what do you think we look like to the people in Norway? The Norwegians are a pretty sensible people. They live a few miles from Joe Stalin. They have communists in their Parliament. I was talking last year to the mayor of Helsinki, the capital of Finland right on Russian border. There are 3-1/2 million Finns; there are 200 million Russians. The Communist Party is active in Finland. Are they quaking in their boots?

No! They go around doing something about it. They are busy doing their work and doing it so well that they paid 95 per cent of their reparations to Russia, almost double what the Germans were re-

quired to pay and the Germans never paid a dime. The Finns have paid back 95 per cent!

The Finns have resettled in their own country 500,000 of their people, 12 to 15 per cent of their population, in a country hardly bigger than the State of Minnesota. I think one of the great tributes to Finnish democracy was the fact that when the Russians took over the Karelian Isthmus, that connects Russia and Finland, as the price for victory during the war, and there were 500,000 Finns in the Province of Viipuri--400,000 farmers with their farms and cattle and homes, 100,000 workers with their homes and their shops, businessmen, doctors, dentists, lawyers--do you know what they did?

Five hundred thousand strong, from grandpa to the babe in arms they walked out, lock, stock and barrel, without even a suitcase! They walked across the line into Finland! Not one stayed to live under the oppression of totalitarianism! They left it! (Applause)

That is what I call courage and I hope America will exemplify that same courage. Ultimately, the answer to McCarthy is our regularly set up investigative machinery. We have the Loyalty Board, appointed by Mr. Truman long before Mr. McCarthy knew the difference between a Red and red underwear! If you let him, he will investigate the left-handed! He'll hang out a sign in Cincinnati:- "REDS UP FOR INVESTIGATION"! He'll tell on the redbirds, if there are any down there!

What is the answer to this? The answer to this is a vibrant, working, militant, progressive democracy. The answer to a threat to democracy is not to curtail freedom but to expand freedom. The answer to communism is not to let the American people know what it is like to be born in despair, to know sickness, unemployment, depression, without help or hope.

If you want to keep communist philosophy out of the United States you are going to have to do it with jobs at good wages--not investigations! You are going to have to do it with good houses--not investigations! You are going to have to do it with pensions and disability insurance and business and production. You are going to have to do it with education for our children and with the kind of

social organizations and society that makes people live in conditions which are conducive to happiness.

I submit for the record here that there has never been a people that has thrown off, by its own will, the opportunities of freedom, when its government has been solvent, prosperous, at work and on the job! The one example of the kind of infiltration that could be dangerous is that which we saw in Czechoslovakia and that was made possible, if you please, not because of communism but because the Red Army was there to dominate the people. We do not have that here in America!

The only way we can make sure we do not have it even close in America is by building up our friends and allies in other countries. Andy said that Senators always talk foreign policy and I shall conclude with foreign policy because it is important. Domestic policy is important, to be sure, but I submit to you that the major threat is not only what happens here but what happens somewhere else.

We are living in a sort of sick world: a world which has had depression, two world wars, two postwar periods of adjustment, millions of people killed and maimed and undernourished, shops and factories destroyed. Is it any wonder we are living in a kind of sick world?

We are one of the few nations that came out of these wars untouched in terms of industrial enterprise. Our shops and factories, thanks to Almighty God and Divine Providence, were spared to us for the leadership this world needs. We are capable of providing that leadership--but not if we are palsied by fear: fear of communism, fear of taxes, fear of depression. Remember, Franklin Roosevelt told you, "All we have to fear is fear itself!" Do you remember, on March 4, 1933, that that did more than anything else to take the people out of their depression and despair?

"Look," he said, "fellow citizens! Let's take a look at ourselves! The only thing we have to fear is fear itself!"

Let us recognize what kind of world we are living in. It may not be easy for us in the years to come. We may have to continue

what we are doing for our friends and allies, for the world, for the next twenty-five years. But what is your choice? You are either going to do what we have to do to aid in the rehabilitation of free countries, to help the underprivileged, the underfed of this world, or you are going to have war. There is no happy medium. Make up your minds: You will do it by dying or by sacrificing.

I have three boys out at my house. They are the ones, along with your boys at home, who are going to die if you are unwilling to make the sacrifice in terms of taxes, governmental expenditures, organizing our society for full production. We have to be willing either to meet these tremendous problems or to put uniforms back on the kids again. It is one or the other, because some people in this world would like to destroy us.

How are we going to win the cold war? Not by being frightened of the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb! We do not have to be frightened of them, but they should stand up there as warnings to us. What we should do is what has been done in the House and on the floor of the Senate: continue with the Marshall Plan. It is not perfect and there are criticisms of it that could be made. But it has done something to rehabilitate the hopes of the peoples of these lands, to rehabilitate their economies and their industries. They are making progress.

What else should we do? What we did yesterday! We took \$45 million to send competent trade unionists, if you please, and scientists and public health nurses and doctors-- where? To India, Indonesia, to Burma, to Siam, down to South and Central America. To do what? To help those people help themselves! To train them how to plant and conserve their soil, how to put in modern sanitary conditions, how to improve their social structure.

I want to tell you something. That \$45 million that we authorized yesterday in the Senate--the House authorized \$25 million and most likely it will end up about \$35 million--that amount of money will do more to build a better world, to build good will, than \$10 billion of armaments, because the armaments become outdated awfully fast.

It is interesting to me, however, to note that some of the boys in the Senate who will vote for the armaments will not vote for aid to the underprivileged sections of the globe. The Senator from Ohio, who could not see fit to vote for the Atlantic Pact and who offered an amendment to emasculate the Marshall Plan and E.C.A., is one of the first who wants to send the Navy to Formosa.

The Senator from Ohio is ready enough to rescue Formosa. But do not expect, if you send the Navy out there you are not going to have a fight. You had better be ready to fight. If you are ready to fight, remember, you are ready to die. It will not be just a little fight, either. It will be a knock-down, drag-out fight, in a part of the world where we are without support.

That is the foreign policy of the Republicans. That is the foreign policy of these people who would like to take over the Government of this country. They would like to run off to Formosa with the Navy but they do not want to spend a dime on public health assistance to the people of India so they can get rid of disease, and develop the agricultural economy and industrial economy of the 400 million Indians who are our potential allies so that they can make a stand against communism.

They are concerned about China, already two-thirds communist controlled, with the balance waiting to choose which side it will take, freedom or totalitarianism.

Well, I am going to stick with the foreign policy we have. I think we ought to go further. I think we ought to be relentless in our search for peace; the price of war, in proportion, is much too high! The Congress, in World War II, on one vote and without a dissenting voice, voted \$90 billion. They had to do it. Of course, we are glad they did it! But you have to fight like cat and dog, you have to have a knock-down, drag-out fight, if you please, to get even a few million dollars for DP's, or to get \$45 million for a program to aid the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

What do you think the communists do with this--the boys in the Politburo: Out in Kansas we have eggs rotting in caves, milk we

cannot sell, butter we cannot sell, food wasted-- with two-thirds of the population of the earth on a subsistence diet, starving to death? And here we are with all this kind of food rotting and going to waste!

We vote \$15 billion for the armed services, and let me make my position clear. I think we have to have a strong military establishment. This atomic age is no time in which to go around waving handkerchiefs at people! We have to remember the kind of war the next war will be.

But the people who vote that \$15 billion for military purposes cannot see the logic of voting for a few million to help somebody off in another part of the world make a better thing out of their own lives.

I accuse that kind of leadership of being politically illiterate. Their understanding of communism is the McCarthy definition. Their understanding of fighting communism is that of a "Hawkshaw" with a double-visor cap and his old magnifying glass, a "Fearless Fosdick," trying to find somebody who was associated with somebody who might have been a communist and put him in jail. You can bet your boots the society in which that doctrine can be created has begun to decay.

The answer at home is vigilance, not only through the kind of machinery set up such as the F.B.I., but through the kind of program Andy Biemiller talked about. The answer abroad is the kind of program we are trying to work out through the Marshall Plan; the Point IV Program; the foreign assistance that Mr. Kaiser talked to you about yesterday; the kind of program whereby the labor movement of this country can go over and help and reinforce the democratic trade union movements so they can overcome the subversive elements and give the free countries new strength; the kind of program, if you please, whereby we can take care of children through the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund; through the World Health Organization whereby we help develop the sanitary conditions in underprivileged areas of the world; through really developing the United Nations developing these instruments of peace.

I want to conclude by saying you had better make it your business to do this. I am sick and tired of John Foster Dulles being referred to as the expert on peace. I do not think he is and I don't care if he is Assistant Secretary of State or not.

I tell you, you had better be the experts on peace--the people who are going to do the dying. We have them, and I am looking at them right now! Our State Department is not going to be able to save the hopes of the world; but the will of the American people as expressed through their representatives, as expressed in trade union and churches and civic groups back home, is going to have something to do with saving the hopes of the world. The will of the emancipator, the elimination of racial discrimination, tolerance--those are the things which will have something to do with peace!

You cannot expect to get the love and affection and respect of the 60 per cent of the population of this earth that is colored--let's face up to that, us Gentiles, Semitics, Caucasians--60 per cent of the population of the world is colored. And as long as we deny equality to our own American Negroes--who are indigenous to this country, born and raised here for generations, as much a part of this country as the Statue of Liberty--we are not going to have the kind of respect and confidence we need from the people beyond the seas!

(Applause)

Well, I don't know why I do this. My wife says I don't have to be eternal in order to be immortal! (Laughter) But I almost forgot about the civil rights business. I want you to know we will have a fight on F.E.P.C. in the Congress starting Monday.

Let no one digress, let no one mislead you, let no one take you off the track. We are not talking about who your next-door neighbor shall be, or whom you have to marry, with whom you go to church. People have a right to make those choices for themselves. I choose my own friends; I am not going to let anybody choose them for me. Whether they be Mexican, or Indian, or Catholic, or Jew, or Protestant, or Chinese, it is my business and I will have them. This is the kind of life for which this country was founded and the kind of life for which we have fought.

But when it comes to economic opportunity we have certain obligations. We cannot afford in America to have second-class citizens. There are only 150 million people in this country. We are far outnumbered by those who look at us from afar as a juicy plum to be plucked.

We had better recruit people for their worth, not according to the contour of their faces or the color of their hair or the church they attend. We had better make up our minds the aristocracy we need is an aristocracy of skill, of talent, of ability, of what can you do? I am not interested in this: Who are you? Who were your ancestors? I am not interested in the ancestry business, in who are you, but what are you as an individual? What can you do? What will you do?

They would have you believe this is a terrible revolution. The Declaration of Independence says: "All men are created equal..." Jefferson said that was a "...truth we hold self-evident"--said it here in this town of Philadelphia-- "... a truth we hold self-evident..." that all men are created equal.

It is about time we put some meaning into those words because if we do not we are wide open to the propaganda attacks of our enemies. That is exactly what brought about the downfall of the nations that have long exploited the colored people of this world, like the Indians and the Burmese and the Siamose and the Africans. The British and French have historically taken out of the countries of those peoples the fruits of their labors. It has been estimated that Britain received \$6 billion annually in net revenues from India when it owned India as a colony. Those days are all over now. India has her freedom.

The communist says, "We treat you on the basis of equality; don't listen to this tripe of democracy." They on your side talk a good show; but you treat people on the basis of inequality. We should know better than to try to say, true as it is, that "It isn't what you are or do, it's your political attitude that Communists mistreat you for, and when you're 'daid' (dead) you're a long time 'daid!'"

People who are hungry and oppressed and miserable do not look for that kind of answer.

We hold ourselves up before the world as a paragon of virtue. Why, we just continuously sing our own praises and tell people how they ought to emulate our example. It is about time to produce the example! We have made great progress. The fact that we have as much as we have means we have done great things. But we ought to judge ourselves by our own standards, not by the standards of others.

Our standards are equality of opportunity, personal liberty, individual security and individual freedom. That is all that is embodied in Mr. Truman's civil rights program. That is what we were all together on, in introducing the resolution to the Democratic National Convention that did not mumble the words in the Democratic platform for a civil rights plank! (Applause)

I want to say here that the prophets of the Old and New Testaments teach, and we should believe, that if the Democratic and Republican Parties that have pledged action on civil rights do not deliver they will have no one else to blame if there arises on the American political scene another party, not democratic in terms of freedom, in aspects of freedom, that will try through demagoguery and through deceit to attack the minority groups in our country.

We have a moral obligation and a political obligation for a civil rights platform, and we have a great international obligation to come clean. This affects northern states as it does southern states; it affects Michigan as it affects Mississippi, South Carolina and Georgia. This is not a sectional problem--none whatsoever. This is a problem that confronts every home, every village, every town and every city in the United States of America.

Unless we come clean we are going to find ourselves in a bad situation, a bad internal situation, because we cannot produce. Just sit down for a while, if you do not believe either side of the fence and think this out for yourselves. Ask yourselves if we can afford to cast off 15 million people who want to do their share for our country. We cannot afford anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, anti-Negroism! There is even anti-Protestantism, you know!

That is social rubbish! We should accept people for what they are. We should accept them on the basis of character and standards and personality and ability and talent. The trade union movement has got to do something about it. And we expect you to do something about it!

It took two hours and fifteen minutes for me to come up here from Washington; that is a lot of time. You didn't expect me to let you get away with much less time than that, did you? (Laughter and rising applause)

PRESIDENT HOFFMANN: Andy Biemiller made the Senator's speech for him in the beginning! (Laughter)

I am quite sure you enjoyed it. Now you know why we say he is our Senator. He speaks our hopes and our views and he represents all the things we stand for.

In your behalf, I want to thank Senator Humphrey for coming here today, for taking a two-hour-and-fifteen-minute trip to Philadelphia, especially on a muggy day like today, and for coming here and talking to us. I know you wanted to hear him and you have heard him. I know that now you feel the same as we do--that he is a swell guy and a darn good leader for the American people! (Applause)

Of course, you want to make sure that you remember everything you heard here, when you go back home from this Convention, and act back home with the same spirit of determination with which you applauded.

All these battles cannot be won simply by applauding. They are won by tough, hard fighting. It is people like us who must do the fighting because it is people like us who will pay if we do not win.



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