

FOR RELEASE: 4:00 P.M.
April 21, 1960

That Bell
Good Honor Man

① Sta - JACK

Turner Catledge

A D D R E S S

by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, (D., Minn.)

American Society of Newspaper Editors
Washington, D. C.
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Shake hands

① Visitor from Canada
Internationalist

Shake hands w/ Russians
at church

Competitive

① Sta - JACK - Lyndon
in Senate
Can spare me !!

① Who was
that Kennedy
Nixon

① Sound effects !

✓ I trust this distinguished audience will permit me the opportunity to make a statement on a most vital issue before I address myself to the important subject upon which I have been asked to speak.

I impose upon your time because I believe that our national interest requires me to make this declaration - clearly, decisively, and unequivocally.

As you know, I am a candidate

for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. If the American people find me worthy, I hope to be nominated and elected.

There is no higher elective post in the world -- no greater honor -- no heavier responsibility.

I say this because leadership of the American people today carries with it great responsibilities to all of mankind.

Yet, great as this challenge and this honor may be, there

- 3 -

are circumstances under which I would not wish to be either candidate or President.

∟ I would not want to pursue this campaign if it were to create deep and dangerous divisions among Americans on the issue of religion.

∟ I would not want to be President if it meant that my own Party might be torn apart on this extraneous issue.

I would not want to receive the vote of any American because my opponent worships in

a particular church, whatever that church may be.

 Nor would I want to receive the vote of any American simply because he is of the same faith as I.

 It is alien to our American traditions for any man's qualification for public office to be judged on the basis of his religious affiliation.

 Indeed, Governor Al Smith was nominated by my Party for President without reference to his faith, either as an asset

or a handicap. He was nominated, as he deserved to be, on the basis of his record in public life.

One hundred and seventy years ago this country was founded on certain well-defined democratic principles.

One of these principles was that neither religious prejudice nor religious preference has any place in American politics.

My own record and deep convictions are clear evidence of my devotion to the basic principles

- 6 -

of American democracy.

Indeed, my dedication to equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race is frequently though ^{I think} erroneously cited as a reason why I cannot be nominated by my Party.

I am just as fully dedicated to equal rights for Americans of all creeds and national origins.

Keep I re-state these obvious truths because the issue of religion has been raised. Some people have raised it, I assume,

to help my opponent and to hurt me; others to hurt him and to help me.

Both these misuses of religion grievously offend Judaic-Christian and democratic principles.

The only tests that may properly be applied to any candidate are those relating to integrity, ability, experience, judgment, and dedication to democratic institutions and constitutional government.

No one should maintain, I believe, that any candidate be

nominated simply because he would obtain the support of voters of his own faith -- nor should he be denied the nomination because people of other faiths might vote against him. Both of these intrusions of denominational preference into politics threaten the very fabric which binds our nation together.

 < The issue must be faced squarely, for the sake of our national well-being. My statement has been made in that spirit.

Now let me turn to West Virginia - and, in justice to that state, speak of the wide and distressing gap between what is real^{in West Virginia} and what has been widely reported throughout the country.

The senior editor of a national news magazine wrote this week that "the same anti-Catholic prejudice that cost Alfred E. Smith the state in November 1928, was boiling up in West Virginia."

Actually, West Virginia had voted Republican in Presidential

elections ever since its origin as a state, and only went Democratic when the great depression hit it in the early 30's. If West Virginians were prejudiced, it was for Republicans and against Democrats. (*Showing the Danger of Prejudice*)

In the Democratic primary of 1928, Governor Smith, a declared opponent of prohibition, running in predominantly Protestant, bone-dry West Virginia, scored a comfortable victory in a vigorously contested election.

The nation should know this

through the nation's press. I suspect that there may be some Catholics in West Virginia who won't vote for me because I am a Protestant, and that there may be some Protestants who will not vote for my opponent because he is Catholic.

But, in 1960 as in 1928, these few irresponsible votes will not decide the election.

I am confident from my many conversations with people in West Virginia, that in the May 10th primary, the vast majority will again vote for the candidate they

consider best qualified to shoulder the responsibilities of the Presidency. They will not determine their political choice on the basis of where either of us attends church.

< I have always thought that good news is every bit as newsworthy as bad. Let me bring you some good news about West Virginia.

Its public schools have moved with much more than deliberate speed toward de-segregation in compliance with the

Supreme Court's decision.

West Virginia University was the first state university in the South to open its doors to qualified Negro graduate students after an earlier Supreme Court decision.

Its state-supported colleges, and most of the private ones as well, have students of all races. So also, I might add, has West Virginia State College, for years one of the nation's outstanding Negro colleges and now completely de-segregated.

- 14 -

I could go on. But I trust that I have made the point: West Virginia is contributing more than its share to solving this most urgent moral and social problem. Like the nation, it has a long way to go -- but it is well on the road and headed in the right direction.

∠ In this struggle, the West Virginia press has played a constructive role. It did not retreat behind that cold wall of objectivity which helps deaden

human compassion in our society. It avoided the sensationalism that too often fans the flames of bigotry. It spoke up calmly and courageously for the dignity of man.

Left Few newspapers in this country speak out as forthrightly on human equality as the Charleston GAZETTE, the ~~state~~'s largest daily.

Now pause a moment and ask yourself this question -- have you seen any of this good news in the recent reports of some of our syndicated political writers?

Pause →

Indeed, many thoughtful

observers are disturbed --
and deeply concerned -- about
the role the press has played
in the explosive issue of
politics and religion as it has
entered the campaign in West
Virginia and earlier in Wisconsin.

Let me cite two respected
journalists out of many who have
spoken out on this subject.

Theodore H. White, in the
April 13 issue of the SATURDAY
REVIEW, had this to say:

"Few, if any, out-of-state
journalists could have left

Milwaukee on the gray and overcast Wednesday morning following the Kennedy-Humphrey primary without concern over their own role in the dramatic last days of the contest.

"For, when they came to Wisconsin, it was a state of easy and decent tolerance; when they left, it was perplexed and divided. The divisions of origin and religion were, of course, always there. But how much we collectively did to exacerbate and amplify them is the heart of

a question that may be of central importance to the Presidential politics of 1960."

Chalmer Roberts of the Washington POST has written in much the same spirit this very week. Every member of the profession of journalism, indeed every person in public life, should give these observations sober, thoughtful consideration.

I know that, for you editors, choice is necessary and inevitable. You must choose what stories should be written,

and whether they should be played up or down.

I would suggest, in all humility, that fanning the flames of racial or religious prejudice -- however unwittingly -- is highly dangerous in a society based on the dignity of man. I would suggest that religious labelling is as undesirable as racial labelling.

< Let's talk program and quit exploring prejudices.

< One last brief note on politics. I have examined the West

Virginia primary law. I note that it provides for write-in candidates.

I would suggest to Senator Robert Byrd, and to all other residents of West Virginia who have stated they support other candidates than Senator Humphrey or Senator Kennedy, that they *can, if they so desire,* write in their choice on their ballots. *H*

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that all of us can get on with the discussion of the real and the important issues

of the 1960 campaign. That is precisely what I intend to do from this moment.

There is no subject so crucial to the future of mankind as the one you have assigned me today -- the wise and prudent handling of Soviet-American relations.

And of the many formidable problems of U. S. - Soviet relationships, none is of such magnitude as the arms race.

The arms race, draining

- 22 -

both the Free World and the Communist bloc of scores of billions of dollars -- and, far more important, posing the threat of incalculable disaster to all mankind 00 is the dominant fact of life in 1960.

Competition from the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc in THE production of goods, propaganda offensives, economic aid programs, diplomatic offensives -- all these threats from the Communist world are manageable, containable, well within our capability

if we but use the vast resources at our command.

But the arms race, unchecked, is a devouring monster -- heedless of ideology, heedless of race or creed or color. It is rapidly becoming unmanageable. It almost seems to take on a life and a will of its own. It can get to the point where military men -- yes, even machines such as electronic computers -- will be making the decisions of absolute life and death for civilization.

What a travesty! What a dead end for the flowering of man's creative intelligence to bear such

bitter fruit!

There is a great, unspoken yearning for peace among all the peoples of the earth. One only has to open the subject of peace in any group, however large or small, to find that he has struck a deep chord of emotion and feeling.

I have had this experience on street corners in Moscow, in drawing rooms in Paris, and in the high school auditoriums of Minnesota, California, Wisconsin and Florida.

This nation is ready, the people are willing, to support any

effort by our Government to make a breakthrough to genuine peace -- to replace the arms race with a new concept of international relationships in which nations and people can live free from the threat of aggression and free from the fear of instant obliteration.

Fundamentally, people all over the world are no different from us in this surging desire for peace. Even among the leadership of the Communist bloc, the desire for world domination may be tempered by the conviction that

one mistake can plunge them into catastrophe. With vigorous, persistent leadership from the Free World, even the men in the Kremlin may be prepared to swallow some bitter pills in order to find some way out of the monstrous arms competition.

The Soviet Union needs peace.

We have a better than fifty-fifty chance of making the last half of the 20th century a half century of peace. And if we can keep peace for fifty years there is at least some chance that the habit may take hold.

Above all, the arms race must be slowed down. The only way we can ever expect to accomplish this is by focussing on the possibility that armaments can be controlled, reduced, and eventually eliminated.

But there are those who think any talk or planning or studies of disarmament is dangerous. These people worry lest we be lulled into a false sense of peace and security. Such a view is without substance if we keep clearly in mind our goal, and the essential steps to it.

An armed world is not the necessary and natural state of mankind. Yet we must also realize that any control and reduction of armaments requires an enormous effort.

Any review of the field of arms control illustrates there is a barrenness in our past efforts.

1. We can count on one hand the number of qualified individuals who are competent negotiators in matters of arms control and in an understanding of Soviet and Communist psychology.

2. Government expenditures to conduct research in arms control systems are almost nonexistent except for research recently inaugurated on the detection and identification of nuclear weapons tests.

3. An analysis of our present arms control policy now being offered in the ten nation talks in Geneva shows that we are being limited in our disarmament proposals by the inadequacy of our technical and scientific preparations. We have preached the

- 30 -

concept of control and inspection. Now that we are again in serious negotiations we find that no firm plans exist on how various weapons and armed forces can be controlled and hence limited.

4. There is no centralized direction on the formulation of disarmament policy. There has been no strong leader who visualized that basically hostile powers might have sufficient mutual interest to provide the basis for agreement.

There was another spate of

fine words the other day from the White House -- the announcement of an upgrading of the Office of Disarmament within the Department of State. The objective is laudable. The worth will be determined by staffing and budget support. But what kind of a budget is this Office to have? Is it to have only the \$400,000 requested in the 1961 budget by the Administration? If we are going to have simply another slogan, another facade to cover inertia and indifference, then I want no

part of it.

Eight million dollars is needed for one project alone for one year -- research to improve seismic detection!

And what jurisdiction is this Office of Disarmament to have? I would hope that it will be given authority and resources along the lines of my National Peace Agency proposal, in order to be able to coordinate the many and diverse projects in the arms control field which now fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of

Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency or the Department of State.

I am not a believer in reorganization for reorganization's sake.

I do not believe that the basic lack of Presidential leadership can be overcome by changing the lines on organization charts.

But I am convinced that effective leadership in disarmament policy requires the creation of a disarmament office or agency within the Federal Government, personally

backed and given impetus by the President of the United States, well-financed and with high priority. It should have one comprehensive assignment: find a way! Find a way out of this terrible arms race -- one which safeguards the people of the United States from surprise attack and from nibbling aggression. Yes, find a way to transmute the energies of this great people into works of peace, works of life, rather than to spend them on the arms race which, at best, provides only limited security

- 35 -

for a limited period.

Nothing short of a Manhattan Project for peace is required -- a program that provides the necessary scientific and technical personnel, the facilities, the money and the priorities.

Some of our public officials are now beginning to see that a possibility for arms control exists. There is a new interest in disarmament. But neither the White House nor the Congress has provided the support necessary to do the job.

The Subcommittee on Disarmament has never, during its five years of

work, been granted an appropriation that would permit it to employ more than a handful of people. Its budget, by comparison with the Labor-Management Investigating Committee, is almost laughable.

Four times last year I tried to obtain a modest sum for arms control studies for the Department of State -- \$400,000. Even a token amount to initiate technical studies was denied. I sent a personal letter to every member of the Senate asking for support. Nine Democrats and two Republicans

responded.

Nor did the Department of State fight for its own appropriation. State Department officers said this had a low priority and other requests for funds were more important.

This year we have another opportunity. Again the State Department included in its budget the inadequate sum of \$400,000. The State Department has this time admitted that the lack of studies has delayed United States preparation for arms control negotiations.

000864

Deputy Under Secretary, Mr. Raymond Hare, said: "In reviewing our approach to disarmament, it was further found that the most serious deficiency in the U.S. approach has been the lack of adequate planning and studies in the field of disarmament . . . What is lacking is a sustained study effort concerning the effect of various possible arms control agreements on United States, allied, and Soviet capabilities together with future explorations of new possibilities of arms control which might enhance

U.S. security." But what a pitifully small effort even this Administration request would provide! It is nothing but the flimsiest of stop-gaps. If I did not believe that even a small crust of the loaf of arms control research is better than nothing, I would simply denounce the undertaking as too little, and perhaps too late.

In the meantime, I have introduced - early this February -- legislation which would establish by law a National Peace Agency.

It may eventually take the form of any one of a number of organizational structures -- what is important is that it be given high enough priority, enough powers and funds to do the job. It can be the framework within which the "Manhattan Project" for peace can be undertaken.

A National Peace Agency could become the strong right arm of the President and the Secretary of State -- a constantly active agency churning up new ideas, evaluating, researching, probing in one direction --

toward a more vital, meaningful and creative American foreign policy.

The President of the United States should -- must -- with or without such an Agency -- take immediate steps to determine precisely what can be done and what cannot be done in terms of arms control, and in terms of the possible creation of new international security mechanisms.

The President must ask -- and will, I am confident, receive -- emergency authorization and funds from the Congress for a project

which would put together from industry, the universities and from private professional life, men and women capable of finding the scientific underpinning for a way out of the arms race.

The President must urge the Congress to provide for long-term programming in the works of peace -- programs of economic development, of strengthening of the organizations of international cooperation, of the use of food and fiber, medical and health cooperation, international education and exchanges.

We have mobilized brains and capital before on such a basis -- and not just to fight wars, not just to create nuclear weapons.

There was a Marshall Plan. There was the need, there was a plan made, decisions were taken, and the job was done. It was that simple.

If the task of putting Europe back on its feet was staggering, how much more challenging and complex is the task of pulling the world back from the brink of nuclear war. Yet, the suggestion that we must both plan to achieve this, and plan to adjust our economy in the event we

succeed, is met with open opposition and ridicule.

I do not minimize the enormous difficulties that block the path to agreement on a new kind of world security system. But we must start somewhere. A beginning must be made. And it must be made with enough determination to keep the effort going through what may be years of exasperating, frustrating, agonizing and dangerous negotiations.

We must have the kind of national leadership that says "yes" to the future, that looks not for the obstacles,

but for the opportunities --
not for perfect solutions, but
for possible and safeguarded
agreements and progress.



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