



news release

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

FOR A.M.'S RELEASE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 5

B-3820

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY
SENATOR HUMBERT HUMPHREY
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
OCTOBER 4, 1964

I am here tonight in a dual capacity -- as an old friend who has met with you many times and as a candidate for Vice-President of the United States.

These circumstances remind me of the time President Lincoln visited his Secretary of War and left his stovepipe hat on a chair in the reception room. When Lincoln returned he discovered that a rather large woman had sat down on the chair -- and his hat. The woman rose from the chair, bowed to the President, who paused briefly to bow in return. Then Lincoln picked up the remnants of his stovepipe and, said, shaking his head sadly, "Madam, I could have told you my hat wouldn't fit before you tried it on."

But I believe I do fit with my many friends from the National Association of Retail Druggists and I am overjoyed to be with you this evening.

You are all independent retailers. But you are also small business men. So I would like to make some observations tonight relating to the concerns of retailer and small businessmen in general.

Today you are doing business under some of the most favorable economic conditions in our history.

-- Our economy is growing and has produced an unprecedented Gross National Product of \$625 billion per year.

-- Corporate profits after taxes are up \$10 billion since 1961.

-- Federal taxes have been reduced by \$11.5 billion.

-- New schedules of depreciation have been developed for the business community.

-- Tax credits for capital investments have been enacted.

-- Weekly wages for the average factory worker have risen from \$89 in 1961 to \$103 today.

-- Unemployment has fallen from almost 7% in 1961 to an average of 5% in recent months.

(more)

--Wholesale prices are slightly below the 1961 average. These developments can only produce the following results: more jobs, more customers, better products, greater demand, and -- at the end of the month -- more profits.

As the overall economy goes, so goes small business. Your collective share in the prosperity of the past 43 months has been enormous. And I hope and trust this has been true for each of you individually.

And -- for the first time in recent history -- the success of small business achieved top priority in our agenda of national goals. President Kennedy proclaimed this policy in 1961:

"This Administration is determined to insure a strong, diversified foundation of healthy small firms; to expand the markets for American enterprise; to preserve a system of free and open competition; and to develop constructive policies and programs in behalf of the small business community."

What a contrast to the attitude which prevailed in the previous Administration. Do you remember the famous letter sent in August 1959 from the Small Business Administrator to all regional directors? I quote: "...do what we can to moderate demands for credit from the government... We should phase off any activity that tends to attract applicants or encourage program expansion."

And this directive was followed. In the midst of a recession, small business loans dropped by 50% within a short time.

President Kennedy changed this approach to the problems of small business. He established a White House Committee on Small Business with one sole purpose: to help small business men compete successfully in the American economy.

He charged the Small Business Administration to work actively in behalf of small businessmen. And SBA has done a remarkable job:

-- Loans under SBA's loan program have risen to \$1.1 billions during the last $3\frac{1}{2}$ years. The previous Administration granted only \$727 million in the comparable period.

--SBIC's have made available \$500 million in loans to 10,000 small businesses.

-- Management training programs, so vital to the small businessmen, have tripled in enrollment in the last $3\frac{1}{2}$ years.

-- Small business set-aside contracts have more than doubled in the last $3\frac{1}{2}$ years. In fact, President Kennedy in one of his first actions as President, directed that the share of defense contracts set aside for small business should be increased by 10 percent.

(more)

--Antitrust enforcement has been used as an instrument to encourage healthy competition between large and small firms.

--The new SCORE (Service Corps of Retired Executives) program enlists retired executives to provide management assistance to small businesses without charge.

--The 1964 tax cut reduced tax liabilities for corporations earning \$25,000 or less by an estimated 27 percent.

And I believe the results demonstrate clearly the wisdom of these policies.

Business failures for example, have decreased from 17,000 in 1961 to 14,000 in 1963.

This reduction is encouraging. But the 14,000 business failures last year also demonstrate that small businessmen and the American economy face a time of unparalleled challenge:

Will we be able to maintain a rising level of prosperity -- and a stable level of prices?

Will we be able to maintain record profits for our businesses -- and record wages for our workers?

(more)

Page 4/ our workers.

Will we be able to reduce the level of unemployment to more acceptable levels -- and find work for the millions of young men and women entering the labor market every year?

Will we be able to compete successfully with the challenges of automation in our plants, technological changes in our economy, and increasing competition from the nations beyond our shores?

You know, and I know, that your own problems are not over. The 1960's and the 1970's will test your ability to respond to the changing pattern of our economy as you have never been tested before.

You face the threat of the shopping center -- or its opportunity; the hazards of urban renewal -- or its promise. You must wrestle with the intricacies of the Robinson-Patman Act, and walk the slippery tightrope of joint and cooperative advertising.

But it is a law of nature that challenge produces opportunity: opportunity to grow, to expand, to capitalize on the continuing rise in our national prosperity, to carve out of an ever changing economy the niche which is ever reserved for the enterprising man.

That opportunity is what the Democratic Party offers you in 1964. What do we promise you in this election year?

What we do not, and I will not promise, is the quick and simple solution -- for history teaches that those who offer the easy answers are likely to be those who do not understand the questions.

What we do not promise is contrived remedies -- like an inflexible five year program of tax cuts, which takes into account neither the facts of today nor the unknowns of tomorrow -- for we know that the wrong medicine is worse than none at all.

What we do not promise is guaranteed success -- for we know that the taking of a risk is inherent in a free enterprise economy.

And, finally, what we do not promise is a society in which the decisions are made for the people, rather than by the people -- for we know that, as President Johnson recently told a group of small businessmen meeting with him at the White House:

"Today -- in this land of yours and mine -- the future of our system and our society is being determined not here in this city,

- more -

not in this House, not on Capitol Hill. The quality of the America your children and mine will know is being determined in the communities where Americans live and where you lead."

What we do offer you is opportunity -- that priceless gift which no totalitarian state can afford to grant to its citizens -- that right without which all our other liberties are as nought -- the opportunity "to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield"-- to build for yourselves and your families a secure today and a promising tomorrow.

What we do offer you is our record -- a consistent record of support for the goals and objectives of small business.

Lyndon Johnson has always fought for stronger antitrust laws and for their vigorous enforcement. He supported the formation of the Small Business Administration in 1953, he backed legislation which made SBA a permanent agency, he sponsored the Small Business Investment Act, and he insisted on the special provisions of the recent tax cut according especially favorable treatment to small firms.

Compare that to the record of Senator Goldwater, who has consistently voted against legislation vital to the small business community and to the economy -- and who vigorously asserts that a man making \$5,000 a year should pay taxes at the same rate as a man making \$5 million a year.

And, finally, we offer you our hands, our heart, and our ears. In a society where so many voices are raised so insistently on their own behalf, the lonely, sometimes inarticulate voice of the small businessman is in danger of being stifled. I give you my solemn pledge that we will hear your voice.

I have offered a resolution in the Senate calling upon the President to convene a White House Conference on Small Business shortly after the inauguration in early 1965, called for the purpose of making a special, top-level study of the problems of small business. If the Senate adopts it -- and if a receptive President is in the White House at the time -- I am confident that you industry, and your views will be given prominent and careful consideration.

(more)

President Johnson recently welcomed a group of small businessmen to the White House with these words: "This is your house."

I know of no more eloquent way to express the attitude and beliefs of Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Thank you.

$\frac{H}{I}$ $\frac{H}{I}$ $\frac{H}{I}$

President Donald Perkins
Willard Simmons

sp file: Oct. 4
- Geo Wilhelm San Francisco
- Henry Moon Calif.

HUBERT HUMPHREY SPEECH

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS

~~National~~ San Francisco, October 4

many members, Committee of Pharmacists
for Johnson & Humphrey

I am here tonight in a dual capacity—as an old
friend who has met with you many times, and as a candidate
for vice president of the United States.

These circumstances remind me of the time President
Lincoln visited his Secretary of War and left his
stovepipe hat on a chair in the reception room. When
Lincoln returned he discovered that a rather large woman
had sat down on the chair—and his hat. The woman rose
from the chair, bowed to the President, who paused
briefly to bow in return. Then Lincoln picked up the remnants
of his stovepipe and, shaking his head sadly, said
"Madam, I could have told you my hat wouldn't fit before
you tried it on."

But I believe I do fit with my many friends from the National Association of Retail Druggists and I am overjoyed to be with you this evening.

You are all independent retailers. But you are also small businessmen. So I would like to make some observations tonight relating to the concerns of retailer and small businessmen, in general.

Today you are doing business under some of the most favorable economic conditions in our history.

—Our economy is growing and has produced an unprecedented gross national product of \$625 billion per year.

—Corporate profits after taxes are up \$10 billion since 1961.

—Federal taxes have been reduced by \$11.5 billion.

└─New schedules of depreciation have been developed for the business community.

└─Tax credits for capital investments have been enacted.

└─Weekly wages for the average factory worker have risen from \$89 in 1961 to \$103 today.

└─Unemployment has fallen from almost seven percent in 1961 to an average of five percent in recent months.——

└─Wholesale prices are slightly below the 1961 average.

└─These developments can only produce the following results: more jobs, more customers, better products, greater demand, and—at the end of the month—more profits.

As the overall economy goes, so goes small business.

Your collective share in the prosperity of the past 43
months has been enormous. And I hope and trust this
has been true for each of you individually.

And—for the first time in recent history—the
success of small business achieved top priority in our
agenda of national goals. President Kennedy proclaimed
this policy in 1961:

“This administration is determined to insure a
strong, diversified foundation of healthy small firms;
to expand the markets for American enterprise; to
preserve a system of free and open competition; and
to develop constructive policies and programs in behalf
of the small business community.”

*this
policy
continues*

What a contrast to the attitude which prevailed in the previous administration. Do you remember the famous letter sent in August 1959 from the Small Business Administrator to all regional directors? I quote "... Do what we can to moderate demands for credit from the government ... We should phase off any activity that tends to attract applicants or encourage program expansion."

And this directive was followed. In the midst of a recession, small business loans dropped by 50% within a short time.

President Kennedy changed this approach to the problems of small business. He established a White House Committee on Small Business with one sole purpose: to help small businessmen compete successfully in the American economy.

Pres Kennedy + Johnson have

~~He~~ charged the Small Business Administration to work actively in behalf of small businessmen. And SBA has done a remarkable job:

↳ —Loans under SBA's loan program have risen to \$1.1 billion during the last 3-1/2 years. The previous administration granted only \$727 million in the comparable period.

↳ —SBIC's have made available \$500 million in loans to 10,000 small businesses.

↳ —Management training programs, so vital to the small businessmen, have tripled in enrollment in the last 3-1/2 years.

—Small business set-aside contracts have more than doubled in the last 3-1/2 years. In fact, President

Kennedy, in one of his first actions as President, directed that the share of defense contracts set aside for small business should be increased by 10 percent.

—Antitrust enforcement has been used as an instrument to encourage healthy competition between large and small firms.

—The new SCORE (Service Corps of Retired Executives) program enlists retired executives to provide management assistance to small businesses without charge.

—The 1964 tax cut reduced tax liabilities for corporations earning \$25,000 or less by an estimated 27 percent.

And I believe the results demonstrate clearly the wisdom of these policies.

Business failures, for example, have decreased, — But *there are still too many*
~~from 17,000 in 1961 to 14,000 in 1963.~~

∠ This reduction is encouraging. But the ~~14,000~~
business failures last year also demonstrate that
small businessmen and the American economy face a time
of *unequalled* ~~unparalleled~~ challenge:

∠ Will we be able to maintain a ~~rising~~ level of
prosperity—and a stable level of prices?

∠ Will we be able to maintain record profits for
our businesses—and record wages for our workers?

∠ Will we be able to reduce the level of unemployment
to more acceptable levels—and find work for the millions

of young men and women entering the labor market every

year? *300,000 new Jobs Per month*

Will we be able to compete successfully with the challenges of automation in our plants, technological changes in our economy, and increasing competition from the nations beyond our shores?

You know, and I know, that your own problems are not over. The 1960's and 1970's will test your ability to respond to the changing pattern of our economy as you have never been tested before.

You face the threat of the shopping center—or its opportunity; the hazards of urban renewal—or its promise. You must wrestle with the intricacies of the Robinson-Patman act, and walk the slippery tightrope of joint and cooperative advertising.

But it is a law of nature that challenge produces
opportunity: opportunity to grow, to expand, to
capitalize on the continuing rise in our national
prosperity, to carve out of an everchanging economy
the niche which is ever reserved for the enterprising
man.

That opportunity is what *Pres. Johnson + Hubert H.* ~~the Democratic Party~~
offers you in 1964. What do we promise you in this
election year?

What we do not, and will not promise, is the quick
and simple solution—for history teaches that those who
offer the easy answers are likely to be those who do
not understand the questions.

What we do not promise is contrived remedies—
like an inflexible five year program of tax cuts, which
takes into account neither the facts of today nor the
unknowns of tomorrow—for we know that the wrong
medicine is worse than none at all.

What we do not promise is guaranteed success—
for we know that the taking of a risk is inherent
in a free enterprise economy.

And, finally, what we do not promise is a
society in which the decisions are made for the
people, rather than by the people—for we know that,
as President Johnson recently told a group of small
businessmen meeting with him at the White House:

"Today—in this land of yours and mine—the future
of our system and our society is being determined not
here in this city, not in this house, not on Capitol
Hill. The quality of the America your children and
mine will know is being determined in the communities
where Americans live and where you lead."

What we do offer you is opportunity—that
priceless gift which no totalitarian state can
afford to grant to its citizens—that right without
which all our other liberties are as ^{nothing} ~~naught~~—the opportunity
"to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield"—
to build for yourselves and your families a secure
today and a promising tomorrow.

*we offer a friendly govt-
encouragement, not
harassment!*

What we do offer you is our record—a consistent record of support for the goals and objectives of small business.

✓ Lyndon Johnson has always fought for stronger antitrust laws and for their vigorous enforcement. He supported the formation of the Small Business Administration in 1953, he backed legislation which made SBA a permanent agency, he sponsored the Small Business Investment Act, and he insisted on the special provisions of the recent tax cut according especially favorable treatment to small firms.

(over)

Compare that to the record of Senator Goldwater, who has consistently voted against legislation vital to the small business community and to the economy— and who vigorously asserts that a man making \$5,000 a year should pay taxes at the same rate as a man making \$5 million a year. *Out*

~~And finally~~, we offer you our hands, our heart, *attention + concern* and our ~~care~~. In a society where so many voices are raised so insistently in their own behalf, the lonely, sometimes inarticulate voice of the small businessman is in danger of being stifled. I give you my solemn pledge that we will hear your voice.

Walter

I have offered a resolution in the Senate calling upon the President to convene a White House conference on small business shortly after the inauguration in early 1965, called for the purpose of making a special, top-level study of the problems of small business.

If the Senate adopts it—and if a receptive President is in the White House at the time—I am confident that your industry, and your views, will be given prominent and careful consideration.

President Johnson recently welcomed a group of small businessmen to the White House with these words:

"This is your House."

I know of no more eloquent way to express the attitude and beliefs of Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Thank you.

firshein
nash

Senator Humphrey
National Association of
Registered Druggists
San Francisco, California
Hilton Hotel
October 4, 1964

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, President Perkins. You launched me with such rapidity that I am not at all sure I can stay in orbit.

(Laughter.)

I am deeply grateful to the President of this great association for his introduction, and for the honor that has been accorded me of just coming by to say a few words to very dear and good friends and to at least once again before I can get back to Minnesota to shake hands with some of my fellow Minnesotans who are here, fortunately if not in the largest numbers, at least in the best of quality.

And I am delighted to see my old friend and your very able Executive Director and Secretary, Willard Simmons on hand. Willard is doing a great job for you.

(Applause.)

He always has a smile on his face. I guess that is one of the reasons he makes me feel so good most of the time. I sure thank you, Willard, for all of your kindness. And I want to also take this moment to thank my young friend in Washington who is so diligent and so attentive to his duties for this association that he ought to be getting a gold star or something and that is Phil Jehle.

I gather most of you know there is a little event taking place known as a national election, and if perchance during the moment's, the evening's proceeding, I shall occasionally make a partisan reference it is because I intended to, it isn't by accident.

I also want to thank at this time the many members of the National Committee of Pharmacists that have been so willing and generous, willing to serve and generous in their efforts, the Committee for Johnson and Humphrey. I hope you are very, very successful. It would mean a great deal to all of us.

(Applause.)

I am here to night in a dual capacity. I am here as an old friend who has attended so many NARD conventions that I hesitate to keep tabs on them any more, it keeps revealing how long I have been in political life and how long I have been in pharmacy, but it is good to see those old friends.

And I am also here tonight in another role, the first time I have been able to appear before you as a candidate. Of course, in Minnesota I appear before the boys and girls out there, the men and the ladies, as a candidate and they take me in stride, some are for me and some aren't, and I gather that is the way it generally adds up.

But tonight as an old friend and as a candidate for Vice President of the United States, these circumstances reminded me of a story which I jotted down so that I can portray it to you somewhat accurately about the time President Lincoln visited with the Secretary of War and left his stovepipe hat on a chair in the reception room, and when Lincoln returned he discovered that a rather large woman had sat down on the chair and on his hat. The woman rose from the chair, she bowed to the President who paused briefly to bow in return. Then Lincoln picked up the remnants of his stovepipe, and shaking his head sadly said, "Madam, I could have told you my hat wouldn't fit before you tried it on."

(Laughter.)

Well, if I may use that story as a point of departure, I believe that I do fit with my friends of the National Association of Retail Druggists and I am overjoyed to try you on and I am overjoyed to be here with you this evening.

(Applause.)

Many times in my visits with you, either as a group, an organization or individually, I have encouraged this organization and its members to take an even greater interest in the affairs of government. It is quite commonplace for us in America to be critical of government, and in a sense that is part of the responsibility of citizenship and of Democracy.

But it is even more important that we understand government and not merely be critical, because to be critical may be to criticize without knowledge, but to understand it and to understand government, I think gives you the kind of power, the kind of influence, that a great organization such as the NARD

ought to have, and I know many of you have interested yourselves in your respective communities in government policy, in your local government, in your state governments, in your state legislatures. I know my friend Henry Moen who is here tonight from my home state has been very active in my state government and very actively successful in promoting the best interests of the healing arts and of pharmacy, and at the same time protecting the public welfare and the general welfare.

Therefore, I talk to you tonight as people who ought to have a continuing interest in every aspect of government. That includes our national security, our foreign policy, our fiscal policies, the many domestic policies of government, and let's lay it right on the line, there isn't ever going to be a time in your lifetime that there will be less government.

People that tell you that deceive either you or themselves, and if they deceive themselves that is pardonable, but to deceive others knowingly is not.

This is a growing country, and it is going to get bigger, it is going to have more problems, and it is going to have more demands, and there isn't any way that a country that grows as rapidly as this one, that has as many problems as this one will have in the future, and now has, that you can actually substantially reduce what we call the total government of the country.

That doesn't necessarily mean only Washington. I had hoped tonight if I had the time to share with you some very interesting statistics. Most people are of the view that our government at the Federal level has grown by leaps and bounds. The simple truth is that since 1946 local government has grown four times as fast in revenues expended, in personnel, as the Federal Government, despite the Federal Government has had to be in charge of our national defense and national security.

Today over 70 per cent of all of the money collected by the Federal Government is spent on security either for wars that have been fought or for defense in the hope that we do not have to fight, and another ten per cent is expended upon the care of those who were in those wars.

So, I think it is fair to say that government is here to stay, and it doesn't do very much good to abuse it. It does a whole lot better to understand it and try to improve it.

So, starting with that as a base, and I think this base

is needed, because I occasionally hear noises that indicate to me that somehow or another there are those that believe that you can more or less just dissolve the government, you can't, and you won't and you know it and you ought not to fool yourself any more than you can quit operating your own business if you really want to stay in business.

It just doesn't make sense.

Now, you are independent retailers with few exceptions in this group. You are businessmen, independent businessmen, some people say small businessmen. It is rather difficult to know where you draw that line. So, I would like to make a few observations tonight relating to the concerns of the retailer and the businessman and his government.

Now, let me make it crystal clear, government does have a direct bearing upon what you do and what you do not do, and the task, it seems, of a man in government is to try to be of some help to see that the government does not do more than it ought to do and does not do less than the public interest requires it to do.

Today you are doing business under some of the most favorable economic conditions in our history, and also under some of the most challenging and changing conditions in our history. Our economy is growing, and it is growing rapidly. As a matter of fact, the American economy is growing more rapidly now than any other country in the world, which was not the case a few years ago.

It has produced an unprecedented gross national product, which is the sum total of all the goods and services, public and private, and it is running at the rate of over 625 billion dollars a year.

May I digress to say that this is only a beginning. When I come back to speak to you four years from now you are going to say to me, "Why, I can remember when you were talking about an economy that was creeping along at 625 billion," because I predict that before the year 1975 we will be doing a trillion dollars a year, and maybe more.

The trouble with many people is they can't ever seem to understand that things change, they can't seem to understand that people still have children, they can't seem to understand that people still want to buy cars and homes.

May I just drive a point home. This country is going to double itself in the next thirty years, double its population.

Now, that is a minimum that will happen, and according to some of the youngsters I see nowadays and the size of their family they may set new records.

(Laughter.)

And I am not against it. There is a lot of room in this country. As a matter of fact, the population increase is good for the baby talcum business and a few other items.

(Laughter.)

Now, corporate profits after taxes are up over ten billion dollars net since 1961. We have the highest corporate profit level in the history of this Republic. We have the highest rate of dividend rates. The stock market is at an all-time high. We are moving, and there isn't any reason to believe that it won't get better. Federal taxes this past year have been reduced by 11-1/2 billion dollars. Next year that tax reduction will maybe be from 12 to 13 billion, just on the basis of the percentage reduction, and by the way next year we intend to repeal as a commitment of this Administration, the excise taxes on retail items.

(Applause.)

Some of you were a little disappointed in me that I didn't vote for it this past year. I was a little unhappy myself. But my task was to get through the 11-1/2 billion dollar tax bill, and I want to tell you one thing I have learned, don't overload the elevator. It gets caught in between floors, and don't overload a tax bill in Congress, it gets caught between committees, and you would be surprised how big the crack is in the floor sometimes and it can fall right down in the middle, and the job of a responsible leader in the Congress is to know how far you can go, and not go further than that. That is what we call responsibility.

You can pretend that you want to go much further and if you are lucky enough you may get somebody to go much further but the other fellow in the other House decides you have gone too far and the whole thing falls out, no progress. That is one of the lessons Hubert Humphrey learned. You have to pace yourself, you have to know how far you can go and still bring people

along with you, otherwise you will be running out in front so far that you will be unable to find those that you were supposed to lead. It is a lonesome existence. I tried that a couple of times.

(Laughter.)

One other thing we have done, new schedules of depreciation have been developed for the business communities. This Senator speaking to you helped develop those. I worked with the Treasury Department on that; tax credits for capital investments have been enacted and some of you have shared in those tax credits. It has been very helpful, that bill. I supported it.

Weekly wages for the average factory worker have risen from \$89.00 in 1961 to \$103 today and that doesn't hurt any retailer. I always go back to what my father taught me. He said, "Son, we are not a bit more prosperous when the customer comes through the door. When they are doing well and if we have got any salesmanship we are doing well. When they are not doing well, it doesn't make any difference how much salesmanship you have got, you are not doing very well."

Very simple lesson, basic economics.

Unemployment has fallen, and it has dropped from 7 per cent now to below 5 per cent, in this age of automation and the change of, employment of, people it is not too bad but it needs to be better. Wholesale prices are slightly below the 1961 average.

Now, these are good indices, these are good signs of the economy. These signs show health, progress, growth, expansion, and it is on this base that we build. There isn't any use of spending much time telling you how good it is because this is like trying to tell your youngsters about the depression. They are not really interested. What really we need to talk about is how good is it going to be, because it has to be even better than it is.

But I say that these developments can only produce the following results: more jobs, more customers, better products, greater demands, and at the end of the month, with careful management and it takes a lot of that, better profits.

Now, as the over-all economy goes, so goes small business.

Your collective share in the prosperity of this nation for the last 43 months of continuous growth, continuous expansion, has been enormous, and by the way, my fellow Americans, never in the history of this Republic have we had 43 consecutive months wherein each month the figures of production and of profit and business were better than the month before, never before. This is the first time we have ever had it.

I hope and trust that this prosperity that has been enjoyed by the whole economy has been shared in somewhat individually by you. For the first time in our history the success of small business achieved a priority in our agenda of national goals which was stated in 1961 by the late and beloved President Kennedy and I want to make it clear, very clear, that the statement that I am about to read continues to be the policy of the Johnson Administration, and will be the policy of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration if that develops, and I am kind of hopeful that it will.

Now, this Administration, and I read the statement, this Administration is determined to insure a strong diversified foundation of healthy small firms, to expand markets for American enterprise, to preserve a system of free and open competition, and to develop constructive policies and programs in behalf of the small business community.

That is the policy statement of this government, and it is exactly what we are going to adhere to.

By the way, I digress to say I wish people would call what is happening in America -- would quit calling what is presently happening in America socialism. I have been to some of these socialistic countries and they have never had anything like this in their lives and I don't think we ought to go around advertising to the world that if you want to see what socialism is, look at the United States.

This is really doing the enemy a great service and doing ourselves an injustice, and yet I hear constantly even responsible business people talking about as if this country was going socialistic.

Now, that is a lot of bunk, and everybody knows it. There are more free enterprises in America tonight than ever before in our history, many more.

(Applause.)

And may I add that there are more individual bank accounts tonight than ever before in our history; there are more stock ownerships tonight than ever before in our history; there are more dividend checks tonight by individuals than ever before in our history; there are more profits than ever before in our history.

Why do people talk about socialism? What kind of nonsense is this?

It is one thing, I repeat, to deceive yourselves, but to deceive others is unpardonable, and yet I found people, I regret to say, who go around believing this. Our drugstore still operates and it has not been socialized one bit. As a matter of fact, it has been so individualized my brother won't even let me claim any ownership in it.

(Applause and laughter.)

Now for some poor misguided politician to talk about socialism that is all right. You can forgive him because you can get rid of him. But for any businessman that is enjoying the fruits of this economy, that is enjoying the prosperity that this country has, to say that this country has gone socialistic that either shows he is a fool or he is deliberately indulging in falsehood and I don't think that either one is the kind of a standard that American business ought to embrace.

Thank goodness, most business people don't believe that. But every once in a while while I am out in the campaign route I will hear, "Do you want socialism?" as if who does. I am the biggest capitalist of them all.

As a matter of fact, I want more of it. My only complaint is that it took me too long to get what I have got and I think that is the way most of us feel.

Now President Kennedy and President Johnson have charged the Small Business Administration to work actively and to work in behalf of the small businessmen, and I want to say that a man from my home state is in charge of that organization now, Mr. Eugene Foley, and he is as filled up with private enterprise of the American system as you can possibly get, and he is a good man and he is working hard, and I think SBA is doing a remarkable job.

Loans under SBA are repayable loans, there are no gifts. All this nonsense about how much the government is dishing out

for nothing, I have been around in Washington 16 years and I never found anybody getting anything for nothing yet. You generally pay for it, one way or another, and SBA loans at going rates.

The SBA loan program has risen to one billion 100 million dollars, during the last three and a half years. The previous Administration granted only 727 million dollars in a comparable period, and may I say that the purpose of the bank is to loan money. That is the way you make money. You don't make it by sitting on it, and the SBA is a bank.

(Applause.)

And may I further add that the SBA doesn't make loans unless they are participating loans. They are working in cooperation between the American Bankers Association, the Independent Bankers Association, and the SBA is one of the most heartening things in our country. So, we are working together, not government doing it, but government and the private institutions hand in hand, building and helping make a better America.

Loans under SBA's loan program also include the Small Business Investment Corporation which has made available over \$500 million of loans to 10,000 small businesses.

Then there are management training programs, and the enrollment has tripled in the last three and a half years, and in the areas of manufacturing, small business set-aside contracts have more than doubled in the last three and a half years, and anti-trust enforcement has been used as an instrument to encourage healthy competition between large and small firms. I wrote an article here some months ago for Look Magazine and I said the government is not anti-big business because you need big business and we know that.

It is kind of foolish for people running around the country talking about big business as if it was a mortal enemy. What we need, however, is a policy on the part of government that is pro-competition, not merely that of being the policeman or trying to push somebody down, but of trying to establish standards so that people who have something on the ball, people who want to work, who have management skill, who have the capacity to do something, that those people can live in a competitive society under fair standards of competition, and this is what this organization has fought for all the way down the line, fair

competitive practices, and that is what this Administration is committed to.

(Applause.)

Some of you are familiar with what we call SCORE -- or the Service Corps of Retired Executives. This is a program that enlists men of real competence, retired now, to provide management assistance to small businesses without charge.

In 1964, the tax cut bill reduced tax liabilities for small-sized corporations earning \$25,000 or less by an estimated 27 per cent so that those businesses could plow back into their business more of the capital, retain their capital, re-invest the capital that they earned.

Now, I believe the results demonstrate clearly the wisdom of these policies. Business failures, for example, are decreasing substantially. The reduction is encouraging but business failures last year also demonstrate that the independent or small businessmen in the American economy face a time of unequalled challenge.

Here are some of the challenges as I see them. Will we be able to maintain a rising level of prosperity, and at the same time a stable level of prices? We have done very well so far. As a matter of fact, my fellow Americans, not one country on the face of the earth in these post-war years has been able to curb inflation as well as the United States of America, and none of them in the last five years have even come close to equalling us.

So, when I hear about the wonders of Germany or of Belgium or of France or something else, that is storybook philosophy. The truth is that your country and your economy has provided the most solid base of security on investment and return on investment of any country in the world. We ought to be proud of it.

(Applause.)

Will we be able to maintain the record profits for our businesses, the record wages for our workers? Will we be able to reduce the level of unemployment to more acceptable levels, and at the same time, my friends, to meet the problem that I now mentioned?

For the foreseeable future this economy must provide not less than 300,000 new jobs every month, the equivalent of the manufacturing division of General Motors every single month.

That means over three million new jobs every year. That is just to take care of population increase and some of the effects of automation, 80,000 new jobs every week. I think this is something that ought to be talked about in this campaign.

One of the things that has bothered me about this whole election period is there has been an awful lot of shouting, a lot of name-calling, but when are we going to get down to talking about what we do about some of the basic problems, the growth of our cities, when 400 million people will be living in America in the year 2000 or 1990 or 280 million people will be here in the year 1980, when there will be one solid city from Boston to Washington of 90 million people?

No countryside, just one city inevitable. When are we going to get down to talking about how you are going to meet the impact of automation which is just taking its first bite. 300,000 or more jobs every month for the next ten years, this is no small task, and that is why you have to have fiscal policies and tax policies and investment policies, encouragement by government in cooperation with industry so that we can meet these needs and you don't get it by looking back to the good old days.

I am so fed up with that and it is running out of my ears. What was so good about those good old days?

(Applause.)

I wish some of us when we would go home tonight would just ask ourselves, what was so good about them? What I remember about the good old days, nobody could pay their taxes, I lived through the depression, at least I want to say since 1930 and that gives us 34 years, I don't think there have ever been better days than you are looking at right now, none at all.

(Applause.)

Then when I heard my grandfather tell about it, he was a country man, a good honest man, very, very honest, he wouldn't even buy coffee. They used to grind up barley, back in those cold country days in the Dakota plains.

What was so good about those? Ask your relatives and

your grandfathers and grandmothers and ask how good it was.

My gracious, it is plenty good now. When I went to the university hardly anybody had a car. Now, you have got to build parking lots before you build university buildings.

(Applause.) (Laughter.)

So, I can't quite get as excited about those good old days as some folks talk about. If they were so good why did they have to work so hard, I have often wondered?

He wanted his son to go to college and he used to tell me, "The reason I want you to go, son, is to have it better than I did," and his father before him encouraged him to become a druggist so he would have it better than grandpa had it.

Grandpa left the East so he could come West and have it better in the West than the East. The folks who came over on the Mayflower came over here so they could have it better here. What was so good about the good old days? Even Christopher Columbus didn't like it where he was.

(Applause.)

I think we have to ask ourselves will we be able to compete successfully with the challenges of automation in our plants, technological changes in our economy, and the increasing competition from nations beyond our shores. Now, these are some of our problems.

But every one of them I might add poses a great challenge to us. The 1960's and the '70's will test our ability to respond to changing patterns of our economy as it has never been tested before, but I happen to believe that it is the law of nature that challenge produces opportunity.

When you really are put up against it, you find out whether you have got anything to really offer. Most people do better when they are challenged, and we are going to have plenty of challenges. I hear people say that life is getting soft, for whom? I never worked harder in my life. When is it getting soft?

My son says he studies harder at college than I ever did. He sure does, either that or he must be an awful slow learner. Take a look at your children when they come home from school with those books. Did you ever bring home that many? It isn't

any easier, let's quit kidding ourselves. Maybe in some areas but there are many challenges and your son and your daughter are going to have to have more education than you ever dreamed of needing. Everything is stepped up, and where we used to get by by just being average, now we have got to be better and in the years ahead we are going to have to be much better.

Challenge produces opportunity, opportunity to grow, opportunity to expand, to capitalize on the continuing rise in our national prosperity, to carve out an ever-changing economy, to carve out a niche which is ever reserved for the enterprising man, and that opportunity is what President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey have been talking about and what we offer because we are committed to it.

I have gone out around this country and said, "Look, there is just one thing I want to get to the people. I want to see this America of ours be a land of genuine opportunity." The duty of government is not to guarantee quick solutions. The duty of government isn't to guarantee that everything will be wonderful. The responsibility of government is not to make sure that everybody is a success. The responsibility of a government of the people and by the people and for the people is to at least see to it that the standards and the rules of conduct in this society are such that if you really work, if you have got something to offer, that there will be an opportunity for you to use what you have and that is why we emphasize education.

(Applause.)

Now, what do we promise you then in this election year, because you expect promises out of people who run for office? What we do not and will not promise is the quick and simple solution, for history teaches us that those who offer easy answers are likely to be those who do not understand the questions, and what we do not promise is contrived remedies like, for example, a five-year program of tax cuts which takes into account neither the fact of today nor the unknown facts of tomorrow for we know that the wrong medicine is worse than no medicine at all and what we do not promise is guaranteed success for we know that the taking of a risk is inherent in a free enterprise economy, and finally what we do not promise is a society in which decisions are made for the people rather than by the people for we know that as President Johnson recently told a group of you businessmen meeting at the White House and some of you were there and I quote him, "Today in this land of

yours and mine the future of our system and our society is being determined not here in this city, not in this House, and not on Capitol Hill. The quality of America, your children and mine will know, is being determined in the communities where Americans live and where you breathe."

What we offer, therefore, is just opportunity, that priceless gift which no totalitarian state can afford to grant to its citizens, that right without which all of our liberties are as of nothing, the opportunity to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield, the opportunity to build for yourselves and your family a secure today and a promising tomorrow.

We offer a friendly government, a government that has as its legal and constitutional duty as well as its moral duty to serve the people. We offer you in that friendly government, my fellow Americans, encouragement and not harassment.

This government will not harass the American businessman, and I think this message is getting through to business. There may have been a time when government seemed to be picking at you, when there was constant harassment, but I say to you that President Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey that I know a little something about your problems are going to see to it and we have seen to it, that this government doesn't act as an agent of harassment upon a legitimate enterprise and we can pledge that to you here today.

(Applause.)

Might I add that when I had that privilege of being in the Soviet Union one time, you read about it and heard about it, I was on a Soviet TV show, the first Westerner ever to appear on a Soviet TV show, and I told them about our enterprise system. I told them about small business, about my drug store, about our farm groups and our laboring people and our cities and villages, and I have one word that they could find no word for in Russian, the word was "opportunity,"-opportunity and when we were trying to translate that word, when they were trying to translate it, they couldn't find a word, they not only can't find the word in their society, they can't even find the system, at least they refused to find the system that offers that opportunity.

Now, this Senator believes in our system. I think we have got the most marvelous political, social, economic system the world has ever known. You can't really describe it in a book. You have to live it. It is like trying to describe what happens

in your family. Why do you love one another so much? What does it mean to you to be in a particular community?

I have watched people grope for words as they tried to explain their heart-felt feelings about a set of circumstances.

All I can say is we have got the finest political, social and economic structure that man has ever created and it works well.

(Applause.)

What do we seek to do with it? We seek it to be a system, we seek this system of ours to provide more justice, not less, more freedom of choice, not less, more opportunity, not less, more concern for the afflicted and the unfortunate, not less.

May I add to my friends of the drug profession that compassion is not weakness, and concern for the afflicted and the unfortunate is not socialism, not one bit.

(Applause.)

I happen to think it is Americanism. I think this is what distinguishes this America of ours from any other country, that we are concerned about the littlest guy, the poorest one, the least fortunate, the man with the least opportunities, this is what has characterized us. This is the humanitarian part of our country, and I deeply resent attacks upon our government and our country that say we are being too concerned. I would rather be guilty of the sin of commission of too much humanitarianism than the sin of omission of not doing anything about humanitarianism.

(Applause.)

So as I leave you tonight, I want you to know that our President, the man that I am privileged to stand with in this election, that we offer you our hands and our hearts and we offer you our attention and our concern in a society where so many voices are raised so insistently in their own behalf, the lonely, sometimes inarticulate, voice of the small businessman is in danger of being stifled.

Well, I give you my solemn pledge that we will hear your voice and listen with concern and with understanding.

President Johnson recently welcomed a group of businessmen to the White House with these words, "This is your House."

I know of no more eloquent or more profound way to express the attitude and the beliefs of Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey than to say, "This is your House."

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

#####

Gov Brown
Pierre Salinger

16 term - George Miller
4 - Jeff Coahlan
Don Edwards

Oct 3
Phil Burton
Oakland
Calif.
Co Haylen

Justice
Earl Warren

HUBERT HUMPHREY SPEECH

Oakland Auditorium, October 3

Alameda County

Assemblyman

Bryon Rumford

Mill in Berkeley

Allan
Sherman

Barbara
McNair

Allan
Crampton

It is wonderful to be with you in Oakland tonight.

I come to the Golden West and everywhere find this

Democratic enthusiasm ^{of Happiness} and then I think about that gathering

of republicans here in the bay area earlier this summer

and I understand.

Three months ago thousands of Republicans rushed to
San Francisco looking for political gold. And what did
they get?

They got Senator Goldwater!

Three months ago the Republicans came to their
convention in San Francisco in search of a political
platform. And what did they get?

They got Senator Goldwater!

Three months ago the Republicans came to San Francisco to try to pick a winning presidential candidate. And what did they get?

They got Senator Goldwater!

And we have all seen what has happened since.

*GOP has become
Goldwater's
over
Problem!*

Republicans who have always voted a straight party ticket have bolted Goldwater. ^{many} Newspapers which have always been

and satisfied.

Republican now spurn him. Republican Governors and Senators

and other office holders ^{like the Gov of Michigan} ~~are so embarrassed by~~ *introduce* him, *but don't endorse him*. *Some Republicans* ~~that they deny~~ they are even running on the same ticket.

*Like Sen
Heating*

After watching his recent performances—in which the temporary Republican spokesman misses his cues, muffs his

lines, and plays to a rapidly emptying Republican House—

I think I have discovered a new principle of American politics.

That principle is: Goldwater seeks its own level;
it only runs downhill.

∠ And that is no wonder. For the Senator is a backward-
looking man. He wants to retreat. He forsakes the
present and favors a mythical past. He wants to build
the America which he thinks existed before the gold rush.

And that—in a word—is why there is no rush for

Goldwater.!

∠ It is a tradition in campaigns to look ahead to the

next four years. But in 1964 this would be shortsighted.

∠ The problems which beset us in 1964—and our
responses to them—will shape America not just for the
next four years, but for the entire next half century.

And few problems in America are more critical than
the challenge of the urban frontier—the "vertical frontier."

America is becoming urbanized

President Johnson and the Democratic Party bring a record of achievement and initiative in meeting the challenge of urban America. The leader of the Goldwater faction brings only his usual record of retreat, reaction and regression. His answer is always the same: "No, no, a thousand times no!"

but maybe we shouldn't be too critical - was calendar no months his watch no hands his glasses no lenses

In this election, Americans have a right—and a responsibility—to ask the following questions:

Will our next president understand the mammoth task we face in rebuilding our cities as part of the great society?

By 1980 - a pop of 275 million 80% in metropolitan areas

Will our next president understand that between 1960 and 2000 we must build the equivalent of 3,000 cities with a population of 50,000 each just to absorb our population growth? - *and*

Will our next president comprehend the urgency of preparing America for the problems of the year 2000 when four-fifths of our 400 million citizens will reside in urban areas?

Will our next president know that we can only solve the problems associated with this population expansion and this population shift to the cities ~~through~~ the active cooperation and participation of the Federal government with state, county, and local authorities? #

How our next president answers these questions will determine in large measure the shape of America for the next fifty years. No problem is more challenging—and none more frustrating—than seeking to transform our great urban areas into pleasant and rewarding communities of

work, recreation and family living. And this task

requires government action +
Cooperation - Leadership + planning!

Just to shut Socialism, "Soft on Communism"
ADA — to Freedom — Gives no answers

The modern American is the metropolitan man, blessed
and cursed by complex conditions of life wholly unknown
to the pioneering architects of the American Republic.

Our capacity to meet this new challenge of the
metropolis will decide whether we can deal successfully
with the problems of race relations, employment
opportunities, air and water pollution, policing and crime
detection, crowded schools and hospitals, degrading slums,
absence of open spaces for recreation, and even the
ordinary logistics of everyday living—how to get back and
forth to work.

These problems alone would be enough.

↳ But even as we try to adapt our private and governmental organizations to serving metropolitan man, we confront antiquated local tax structures, wasteful and overlapping agencies of local and state governments, rivalries and jealousies between suburbs and central cities, and too often the tradition of inertia.

↳ These problems are critical and these complexities are urgent because most of us today live in the metropolis.

↳ We must, in short, plan for a renaissance of the metropolis.

↳ In recent years we have made a determined effort to begin this renaissance of the cities.

✓ In 1958 most senators voted to increase funds for federal loans to communities for planning and public facilities.

—But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1959 most senators voted to increase federal assistance for sewer plant construction and urban renewal.

—But not Senator Goldwater.

✓ In 1959 most senators voted against a cut in the housing authority bill and in another roll call, voted for increasing the total for public housing units.

—But not Senator Goldwater.

✓ In 1961 most senators voted for President Kennedy's comprehensive landmark ~~omnibus~~ housing act.

—But not Senator Goldwater.

✓ In 1963 most senators supported the urban mass transit program.

—But not Senator Goldwater.

And finally, in 1964, most senators voted on the expanded housing program and on final passage of the urban mass transportation act.

—But not Senator Goldwater. He never even showed up.

✓ This is the record of retreat and reaction in the area of urban problems and housing the leader of the

Goldwaterites brings to the American people in this election.

*The Simple life of Early America
is no more - and you can't
meet the Problems of big, fast moving
modern America with
Covered Wagon answers.*

✓ This is the record the American people must evaluate
in relation to the one established by the Kennedy-Johnson
administration and a Democratic Congress: ✓ enactment of
programs for mass transportation and open spaces in urban
areas; expanded low rent public housing;
increased federal assistance for local urban planning;
expanded housing for the elderly; a humanized urban
renewal program; moderate income rental housing; increased
housing starts; and a comprehensive anti-poverty program
stressing local community action. *Hospital construction;*

✓ But much more remains to be ~~accomplished~~ *done*.

It is obvious that we need a Cabinet level Department
of Urban Affairs. The cities of the future will not
neatly conform to present city lines. Regional planning
is essential.

Those cities of the future must offer education of the highest quality. Life in interdependent proximity calls for knowledge, wisdom, and tolerance.

Those cities of the future must provide access to an abundant cultural life. — opportunity

yes, L Those cities of the future must provide employment opportunities which challenge every man's hands and brain and satisfy the human need for constructive effort.

L Those cities of the future must remove not only the ugliness of the slums, but the ugliness of intolerance—
create not only the beauty of design, but the beauty of spirit.

Those cities of the future must provide an environment for the enrichment of life. This mammoth task challenges whatever creativity and courage we can muster. We must begin now—and we must use every resource at our command.

I am convinced that on November 3rd you will return Lyndon ~~Baines~~ Johnson to the White House, not merely because he has demonstrated responsibility in the conduct of our foreign policy, not merely because he has shown the capacity to translate abstract ideals into concrete legislative programs, but also because he will lead us in the ^{Herculean} ~~Herculean~~ task of mastering the challenges of the American metropolis.

JFK - Tribute!
this election

*Sp file: Oct. 3
Oakland, Calif.*

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Oakland, California

October 3, 1964

It is wonderful to be with you in Oakland tonight.

I come to the Golden West and everywhere find this Democratic enthusiasm -- and then I think about that gathering of Republicans here in the Bay Area earlier this summer and I understand.

Three months ago thousands of Republicans rushed to San Francisco looking for political gold. And what did they get?

They got Senator Goldwater.

Three months ago the Republicans came to their convention in San Francisco in search of a political platform. And what did they get?

They got Senator Goldwater.

Three months ago the Republicans came to San Francisco to try to pick a winning Presidential Candidate. And what did they get

They got Senator Goldwater.

And we have all seen what has happened since. Republicans who have always voted a straight ticket have bolted Goldwater. Newspapers which have always been Republican now spurn him. Republican governors and Senators and other office holders are so embarrassed by Goldwater that they deny they are even running on the same ticket.

After watching his recent performances -- in which the temporary Republican spokesman misses his cues, muffs his lines, and plays to a rapidly emptying Republican house, I think I have discovered a new principle of American politics.

That principle is Goldwater seeks its own level. It only runs downhill.

And that is no wonder. For the Senator is a backward-looking man. He wants to retreat. He forsakes the present and favors a mythical past. He wants to build the America which he thinks existed before the Gold Rush. And that -- in a word -- is why there is no rush for Goldwater.

It is traditional in campaigns to look ahead to the next four years. But in 1964 this would be shortsighted.

The problems which beset us in 1964 -- and our responses to them -- will shape America not just for the next four years, but for the entire next half century.

And few problems in America are more critical than the challenge of the urban frontier -- the "Vertical Frontier."

President Johnson and the Democratic Party bring a record of achievement and initiative in meeting the challenge of urban America. The leader of the Goldwater faction brings only his usual record of retreat, reaction, and regression. His answer is always the same. "No, no, a thousand times no."

In this election, Americans have a right -- and a responsibility -- to ask the following questions.

Will our next President understand the mammoth task we face in rebuilding our cities as part of the Great Society.

Will our next President understand that between 1960 and 2000 we must build the equivalent of 3,000 cities with a population of 50,000 each just to absorb our population growth.

Will our next President comprehend the urgency of preparing America for the problems of the year 2000 when four-fifths of our 400 million citizens will reside in urban areas.

Will our next President know that we can only solve the problems associated with this population expansion and this population shift to the cities through the active cooperation and participation of the Federal government with state, county, and local authorities.

How our next President answers these questions will determine in large measure the shape of America for the next fifty years. No problem is more challenging -- and none more frustrating -- than seeking to transform our great urban areas into pleasant and rewarding communities of work, recreation and family living.

The modern American is the metropolitan man, blessed and cursed by complex conditions of life wholly unknown to the pioneering architects of the American republic.

Our capacity to meet this new challenge of the metropolis whether we can deal successfully with the problems of race relations, employment opportunities, air and water pollution, policing and crime detection, crowded schools and hospitals, degrading slums, absence of open spaces for recreation, and even the ordinary logistics of everyday living -- how to get back and forth to work.

These problems alone would be enough.

But even as we try to adapt our private and governmental organizations to serving metropolitan man, we confront antiquated local tax structures, wasteful and overlapping agencies of local and state governments, rivalries and jealousies between suburbs and central cities, and too often the tradition of inertia.

These problems are critical and these complexities are urgent because most of us today live in the metropolis.

We must, in short, plan for a renaissance of the metropolis.

In recent years we have made a determined effort to begin this renaissance of the cities.

In 1958 most Senators voted to increase funds for Federal loans to communities for planning and public facilities.

-- But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1959 most Senators voted to increase Federal assistance for sewer plant construction and urban renewal.

--But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1959 most Senators voted against a cut in the housing authority bill and in another roll call voted for increasing the total for public housing units.

-- But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1961 most Senators voted for President Kennedy's landmark omnibus housing act.

-- But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1963 most Senators supported the urban mass transit.

-- But not Senator Goldwater.

And finally, in 1964 most Senators voted on the expanded housing program and on final passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

-- But not Senator Goldwater. He never even showed up.

This is the record of retreat and reaction in the area of urban problems and housing the leader of the Goldwaterites brings to the American people in this election.

This is the record the American people must evaluate in relation to the one established by the Kennedy-Johnson Administration and a Democratic Congress: Enactment of programs for mass transportation and open spaces in urban areas, expanded low rent public housing, increased federal assistance for local urban planning, expanded housing for the elderly, a humanized urban renewal program, moderate income rental housing, increased housing starts, and a comprehensive anti-poverty program stressing local community action.

But much more remains to be accomplished.

It is obvious that we need a cabinet level department of urban affairs. The cities of the future will not neatly conform to present city lines. Regional planning is essential.

Those cities of the future must offer education of the highest quality. Life in interdependent proximity calls for knowledge, wisdom and tolerance.

Those cities of the future must provide access to an abundant cultural life.

Those cities of the future must provide employment opportunities which challenge every man's hands and train and satisfy the human need for constructive effort.

Those cities of the future must remove not only the ugliness of the slums, but the ugliness of intolerance -- create not only the beauty of design, but the beauty of spirit.

Those cities of the future must provide an environment for the enrichment of life. This mammoth task challenges whatever creativity and courage we can muster. We must begin now -- and we must use every resource at our command.

I am convinced that on November 3rd you will return Lyndon Baines Johnson to the White House, not merely because he has demonstrated responsibility in the conduct of our foreign policy, not merely because he has shown the capacity to translate abstract ideals into concrete legislative programs, but also because he will lead us in the herculean task of mastering the challenges of the American metropolis.

###

VIVA LBJ

Sp file. Oct. 5
San Jose, Calif.

San Jose State College

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

San Jose, California

October 5, 1964

Alan Cranston Don Edwards
Pierre Salinger

✓ The tremendous growth of the city of San Jose and the San Jose

State College represents what we're so proud of in this country and

what we want and must continue. Growth stems from opportunity, and I

believe that one of the basic issues in this election campaign is

whether the United States will remain the land of ever increasing

opportunity by rejecting the apostles of opposition.

✓ Those who use the gospel of opposition as their political

creed -- and I refer mainly to the Goldwater minority fraction of the

Republican Party -- should visit and study this beautiful and great

Santa Clara Valley.

✓ Here in this home of higher learning and advanced technology,

you know that government working as a partner of labor and industry

and agriculture has helped create an unprecedented rate of growth

with prosperity to match.

Calendar
no months
✓
Watch
no hands
Glasses
no lenses

Aerospace

✓ N.Y. Tail
hike
- 1 -

Study Ancient
Best
Don't vote

Barry up the

✓ Gol

✓ Turn off that bridge
when an com to it

The apostles of opposition scoff at government ^{cooperation} ~~help~~ and participation in providing opportunity. They call it waste ^{spending -} But most of us know it is investment, an investment of the highest kind, and investment in human beings.

How inspiring it is here in San Jose that such an investment is now being used to help others take advantage of opportunities opening up throughout the world. San Jose State College, I am told, has the highest per capita enrollment in the Peace Corps.

Peace Corps

~~I am first~~ I introduced the Peace Corps bill in the Senate in 1960. There were apostles of opposition to the Peace Corps then -- including the well-known leader of the faction that has captured control of the Republican Party.

But the Peace Corps is only one of the programs that gave our nation new hope and promise under the Administrations of the late and beloved John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Our country was founded on the basis of popular government and equal opportunity and we Americans know that education is one vital means of providing them.

Peace Corps!

We must continue our new energy, new faith, new dedication which
men must have to preserve freedom. We need an America with the wisdom
of experience. We must not let America grow old in spirit, deaf to
new ideas, opposed to investments in a peaceful and prosperous future.

###

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

University of California

Berkeley, California

October 5, 1964

Chancellor Strong

*Byron Rumford
R. H. Crayton*

*President Clark Kerr
Pierre Salinger
Alan Cranston
X George Miller
X Jeff Co. Hildan* *my
P.O.
for
U.P.* *cong*

"No man is an Island," reads the well-known line of the poet

John Donne. In the history of men and nations this judgment rings

true. Yet our opponents in this campaign have failed to perceive this

truth.

I believe as strongly as any man in the necessity for protecting

individual liberties and rights. But what some exponents of "Rugged

Individualism" fail to understand is that men and nations must live

together -- must strive together, must reason together -- to obtain and preserve

the benefits of civilization.

L In touring this great western empire named California and in visiting this vibrant San Francisco Bay Area, I am again impressed by what men can accomplish if they will but work together. You who study here at this splendid university -- a shining star in a state educational galaxy unsurpassed in the nation -- must perceive what men can achieve together. For this institution is a living tribute to cooperation in the pursuit of truth.

L This message of interdependence -- as old as the prophets -- ~~is~~ ~~one of which you are well aware, but it~~ seems to need repeating in every generation. Today, more than ever, it requires repetition. For we are now hearing preached in our land a philosophy which threatens to license individual selfishness ~~and greed~~ at home, and to isolate America from the family of nations.

L Whether in California or in the country as a whole, no American can afford an ostrich-like isolation from his fellow men. Nor in this world, can Americans afford leadership that is isolationist either in practice or in spirit.

"I don't give a tinker's damn what the rest of the world thinks about the U.S., as long as we keep militarily strong" Sept 22, 1963. U.S. Sen.

Such isolationism can be bred by illusion, impatience, frustration, or just plain ignorance. But whatever its source, it must be repudiated.

It is the danger of isolationism in relation to the United Nations that I wish to discuss with you briefly today.

Up until this year, our country has maintained a bipartisanship that rejected the counsels of withdrawal from the community of nations.

Just as many distinguished republicans like Arther Vandenberg, James Forrestal, and John McCloy supported the policies of President Truman in our relations with other nations, so did Democrats like Lyndon Johnson, John F. Kennedy, William Fulbright and myself support the policies of President Eisenhower. A consensus prevailed that these matters were too important to our nation to permit them to become pawns for partisan political gain.

What is tragic and ironic today is the drastic departure of the temporary leader of the opposition from the great highway of bipartisanship.

Bipartisan

His views are now well-known on a wide range of issues -- from foreign aid to negotiation, from the test ban treaty to the control of nuclear weapons. This is the man who greeted the Peace Corps not as an opportunity for service but as a "haven for beatniks."

But among the most striking in his breaks with bipartisanship have been his views on the vital issues of United States support for the United Nations.

Within the bipartisan tradition, no one issue has united leaders more solidly than that of support for the United Nations. Since those fateful days in San Francisco nineteen years ago when Arthur Vandenberg joined the U.S. Delegation in the establishment of the U.N., leaders of both parties have supported the U.N. as one of man's best hopes for peace and stability in a turbulent world.

Yet hear what the temporary spokesman of the opposition has said on the subject of the United Nations -- and judge where he stands today if you can.

✓ In Arizona, in December 1961, he announced that "The United States
no longer has a place in the United Nations." ✓ On CBS television in
March 1962, he reiterated, "I just can't see any sense in keeping ~~on~~ it
in it." ✓ On May 12 of last year, on New York's WOR - TV, he repeated, "...
Frankly, I think the fact that it's proven to be unworkable is grounds
enough for us to quit wasting our money on it." Asked whether as President,
he would favor getting out of the UN, he said again, "...I would,
~~at this point~~, having seen what the United Nations cannot do. I would have
to suggest it."

But ✓ More recently, we have heard some hedging from the spokesman. He
thinks perhaps we should stay in, but the UN should "do more" --
and somehow do it better.

(*Ides Statement*)

✓ These are his confused views on a vital institution that for two
decades has commanded the overwhelming endorsement of the American people
and their leaders. ^{*these*} ~~They~~ are views that should be dismissed by millions of
Americans who understand the deep truth that "no man is an island" -- and
that no nation can be isolated from the world at large.

u.n.

*confused
views!*

L For the past four years the Kennedy-Johnson Administration has supported the UN as our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace. We have consistently sought "to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak" and to "enlarge the area in which its writ may run." And we have been wise to do so.

Consider the UN's record: In the last 19 years, it has played a major part in dealing with 13 different threats to the peace of the world. Through border patrols in the Middle East, through supervision of truces between India and Pakistan, through its present mediation in Cyprus, the UN has played a uniquely constructive role. In an age where a great power war could breed unparalleled nuclear destruction, we should never belittle the record of the UN in preventing the escalation of brush-fire conflicts.

L And what of the future?

Congo

Under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy our government has supported -- and is supporting -- the expansion of the UN's activities in a number of significant areas. Last Friday, President Johnson proclaimed 1965 as International Cooperation Year in recognition of the UN's 20th anniversary. The President has indicated that his administration will use this commemorative year to press for measures which would strengthen the UN.

What are specific measures that would increase the UN's effectiveness? Among the steps which should be taken, I would attach special importance to better resources for fact-finding and observation; the development of an effective mediation and conciliation service; the streamlining and expansion of its economic development programs.

Most important of all is progress in the vital area of peacekeeping. We need to achieve agreement on improved procedures for the initiation and financing of peacekeeping proposals.

*Peace
Keep*

↙ The United Nations cannot fulfill its peacekeeping responsibilities if it can be frustrated by a Soviet Veto. We must therefore preserve the authority of the general assembly to launch peacekeeping operations if the security council is unable to act, and we must preserve the assembly's power to assess payment for such operations.

↙ To improve peacekeeping procedures, we must achieve the adoption of our proposals that the general assembly initiate a major peacekeeping operation involving military forces only after it has been discussed in the security council and the council has been unable to act. In assessments for peacekeeping, our proposals also require recommendation by a special committee in which the large and middle powers would have a greater representation than they have in the assembly as a whole.

Needless to say, our efforts to reach agreement on these procedures must be accompanied by efforts to deal with the UN's present financial crisis. Certainly we cannot be satisfied with any agreement unless past obligations -- including those of the Soviet Union -- are discharged in accordance with the charter. But if we can agree on improved procedures for the future, we should be able to settle out disputes about the past.

Another essential step for the strengthening of peacekeeping is the establishment of a flexible troop call-up system for future emergencies.

The UN cannot do its peacekeeping job if there are long delays in getting its forces to world trouble spots.

I strongly support the Secretary-General's request that members maintain special UN peacekeeping contingents, and I rejoice that some nations have already responded -- Canada, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Iran.

etc

↳ We ourselves should assist in this strengthening of the peacekeeping
capacity by helping to train and equip contingents of other nations
earmarked for UN use -- by transporting these units when necessary --
and by paying our fair share of the cost of peacekeeping operations.

Training
- Transport
- Pay

↳ Let us never forget that one of the best investments we can make is
investment in UN peacekeeping -- an investment which will save American
lives.

↳ We do not aspire to any pay Americana -- we could not if we would.

We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme -- we could not if

we would. And we have no desire to interject American troops into
explosive local disputes -- whether in Africa, Asia or the Middle East.

↳ But disputes do occur; and if hostilities are to be ended and the peace
preserved, there must be some outside force available to intervene. A
stable professional UN force can best play that role.

I make you here a pledge: That this administration will continue
to provide the leadership to strengthen the UN, to extend the area where
its writ may run. I have only contempt for those who would: Get the U.S.
out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S. ⁴ They are blind to the realities
of our world. Nor can I understand those who wish to scrap an imperfect
institution for preserving world peace because of their impatience with
an imperfect world. Nor do I agree with those who will salute the UN on
the one hand -- and on the other hand condemn it because it does not bow
to our wishes within 24 hours.

✓ The United Nations has proven its value as an instrument for world
peace. Our faith in it is strong -- and our hope is firm that it will
one day become what it was intended to be -- a world society of nations
under law, not merely law backed by force, but law backed by justice and
by popular consent. The answer to world war can only be world law. And
the best hope of achieving world law is through the United Nations.

Khrushchev

L This was President John F. Kennedy's great dream. Again and again he held up the idea of world law as the most essential goal of mankind in our time. He said that we must end the arms race or the arms race will end the human race. He called for the establishment of workable world law as the best way to accomplish that purpose.

L World law doesn't come into being just because ^{many} ~~a~~ people want it. It can grow only as there are institutions behind it -- institutions to enact it and enforce it. I believe the UN will develop such institutions. I believe the world's people will settle for no less.

L In today's world, no man, no nation, can remain isolated from the affairs of others. My message to you is this: Choose concern for your fellow men -- choose to treat others as you would be treated. Choose to commit yourself to that ultimate political goal: A world "where the strong are just, the weak secure and the peace preserved."

###

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Thank you very much, Congressman Edwards, thank you for welcoming me to your home town, to this great campus of San Jose State College.

First, I want to thank the local officials and the Chamber of Commerce for giving me something that is in gold that I can really enjoy -- (applause) -- I want you to know that this gold key will get into the White House and Goldwater will not.

(Applause.) (Booing.)

My friends, you have to forgive those who are the subject of, you know, that are afflicted by all of the vagaries of high altitude.

(Applause.)

You know that is as high as they are ever going to get. And my fellow Americans, be of good cheer, be for Barry, forgive them, they will come home to the land of the their fathers -- (applause) -- every young person is entitled to be wrong a little while, and they are just going to be wrong again now and November 3rd, and deep down in their heart they know that Lyndon Johnson is going to win. (Applause.)

Well, you know after that fracas up in the Cow Palace -- (laughter) -- somebody came around to one of the Goldwater leaders and said, "Now, that you have got him nominated, what do you intend to do when he is elected?"

The fellow said, "We will jump off that bridge when we come to it."

(Applause.)

I just say that as a word of warning. We don't want anybody to jump. We would just like to have them up there and listen.

Well, friends, it is a joy to be here and I hope you will forgive me if I tell you that after having been out in the beautiful Bay yesterday, first enjoying the sun, and then getting a little of that brisk breeze, I found myself with a little bit of a cold this morning but what I have to say, I think can be said even with the static to the extreme right.

Did you ever notice that/--did you ever notice, you just look up and see, they are always off up there far out, way out -- (laughter and applause.) -- well, friends, I am singularly honored by this massive turnout of the interested citizens in what is happening in our country and what can and is going to happen. I want to talk to you this morning seriously about your politics, about your government, and your country, and I want to say a word or two in reference to some of the men that are on this platform.

First of all, may I thank Dr. Clark, the President of this great college, for the hospitality that has been extended to me and for the privilege of speaking to members of this student body and indeed, the citizens of this community, and I am honored to have on this platform some of the great scientists, some of the truly great professional leaders of our country, Dr. Russell Lee, and Dr. Robert Hofstadter, Dr. Kornbert cannot be with us, they are men who have carved out for them through their own brilliance a record that is respected not only in America, but throughout the world.

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Page 2

I am particularly pleased also to be joined in this platform with a Congressman, a Congressman from the 9th District who in one term in the Congress of the United States, has demonstrated those qualities of leadership, those qualities of personal integrity, those qualities of ability and intelligence which should endear him in the hearts of every young man and woman, and which indeed should assure him of re-election in this coming campaign. We need Don Edwards in the House of Representatives, and I ask for your help.

(Applause.)

I want Day Carman of the 10th District who is running against a gentleman, I can't remember his name because his record was hardly such as would make one remember him, I want to ask you to give your help and your support to Day Carman, the Democratic nominee for Congress in the 10th District.

Now, Day has many wonderful assets the first of which was that he was born in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and he had the good judgment to come to California and now he has the ambition to go to Washington. All three may serve to mark him as a man of distinction, and I think you ought to elect him from the 10th District.

(Applause.) (Drinking water.)

They are going to see that I stay fit through this speech. It is not Goldwater. You are so right. Say that reminds me, the young lady, she says, "Not Goldwater," you are right. I have a little newspaper clipping here that I hadn't intended to refer to but you just refreshed my memory, and it is from Grand Rapids, Michigan, and of course, you know this is Exhibit A, and it shows an -- shows Associated Press, datelined Grand Rapids, Michigan, and it appeared in the New York Times but it appeared also in every other newspaper in America dated September 24, and it reads as follows and the young lady that saw me take a sip of that water is responsible for what is about to happen now.

(Applause and laughter.)

It says: "State officials have outlawed the sale of Goldwater." I didn't think anybody was going to buy him anyway but that is all right. Then it goes on, there is a comma, "a new soft drink promoted by the backers of Senator Barry Goldwater" -- I appreciate that initiative and that energy, then it goes on to say, "some 350 cases of the beverage have been ordered withheld from distribution on the grounds that the pop is 'grossly misbranded' and because it lists as ingredients only artificial coloring and preservative."

(Applause.)

Now, friends, as a political scientist, a former teacher, professor, may I say that that is the most concise, the most concise, definitive description of a candidate and a platform that I have ever heard.

This campaign deserves more than just good humor, even though I think this is a characteristic of the supporters of President Johnson that is very helpful and healthy. I have noticed all too often that there is an unusual amount of booing coming from one particular segment. I would hope that American politics could be conducted in good humor. I would hope this -- that it could be conducted with a bit of just the joy of living, and I would hope that we could talk about these problems as Americans recognize that you do not have to have an agreement in order to have understanding and

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Page 3

fellowship. There seems to be, however, a growing group in America over these past 25 or 30 years that have clear-cut simple answers to complex and difficult problems, and I have always felt you ought to beware of the person that seems to know the easy answer to the most difficult of all assignments. What we need to do in America today is to understand the role of our country, the role of our country in foreign affairs, the role of our nation as a leader in the world, and the role of our government in its relationship to the people of America.

Let me take the latter first. I am in an area now that represents one of the great aerospace complexes of America, and the aerospace industry today is the going, the growing industry of this nation, and that aerospace industry today is not only the produce of brilliant management, of heavy investment by individuals and corporations. It is not only the produce of scientists as a private initiative, but it is also the product of cooperation between a Federal government and the people, Federal government and industry Federal government and labor, Federal government and scientists, and may I say that if there ever was an example of where the government has demonstrated that it can serve the people, and that it is designed to serve the people, and that it has a role in serving the people, it is in this great area of research and development because your government today pours in some 15 billions of dollars into research and development in America.

In fact, it puts in over 80 per cent of all the research dollars that are expended today, and research leading developments, is the heart and the core of new industry, and new jobs.

Now, our friends of the opposition go through the land and spread doubt and suspicion about this government.

Not long ago I heard the leader of the temporary -- the temporary spokesman of the fraction of the faction of the Republican Party -- (laughter) -- I heard that man say that we were in more danger, we were in more danger, from our own government than we were from Russia. How bad can you get? How bad can you get?

(Applause.)

I have heard the leader of the opposition talk of the tyranny of the Federal Government.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the Government of this country isn't all in Washington. It is in Washington, it is in Sacramento it is in San Francisco, it is in San Jose, it is in the thousands of governmental jurisdictions. The simple truth is that since World War II, local government has grown much more rapidly than Federal government, far more rapidly, 400 per cent more rapidly. These are facts which apparently the opposition ignored, if they ever knew them.

I think there is a time when young people, intelligent people, when people of every age and group, have to face up to what are some of the facts of American life. Now, the first fact is that the duty of national security rests upon the national government, and many other programs that lend themselves to industrial growth, to better social and educational conditions are cooperative between federal, state and local government. We haven't lost our liberties, and when I hear the leader of the opposition telling us that we are on the road to socialism, he knows that is bunk, and those that talk about it know that it is bunk. And why do I say so? Because America today has more business institutions, more free enterprise, more bank deposits, higher dividends, greater profits, and greater gross national product than any time in its history, and if

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Page 4

Barry Goldwater doesn't know that he is unfit to be President.

(Applause.)

And yet my friends, far off, out on the far right somebody will holler "How about socialism?" Well, how about it? Who likes it? The only one who seems to talk about it is the leader of that temporary fraction of the Republican Party.

(Applause.)

So, my friends, the young people today have a greater choice than they have ever had, more of us can go to universities, more can attend schools. There are over 72 million people at work, there are more individual businesses, there are more schools, more homes, better communities, and anybody that doesn't know that America looks better today and is better today than it was ten years ago, five years ago, four years ago, or twenty years ago, that man, may I say, is either 'fooling himself or he is blind or possibly he is the kind of a man that has a calendar with no months -- (laughter) -- or maybe a watch with no hands, or a pair of glasses with no lenses (laughter and applause.)

The real question in America today is which of these leaders that seek our support, President Johnson or the Senator from Arizona, which has faith in the future of this country, which has the expression of hope, who talks of the future.

You know I notice Mr. Goldwater, he gives us some very inaccurate lessons but at least he tries, some inaccurate lessons, in ancient history. Now, I want to be very frank with you. I think everybody ought to know history, I think everybody ought to know ancient history but I don't think you ought to vote it.

(Laughter and applause.)

And I think that when you recite it, you ought to know what you are talking about, and I hear this man say to the young people of today, of 1964, "let's go back to the good old days." What were so good about them? Ask your folks.

(Laughter and applause.)

There were thousands upon thousands upon thousands of people that came to California back in those "good old days" from Arkansas, Oklahoma, from Nebraska, from the Dakotas, from the drought stricken areas, the depression area. Were they good? I don't think so. I think that America is much better today, physically, economically, politically, socially and spiritually, and I would suggest that the leader of the ... as he tells us how about our morals, that he would think about the morality, if you please, of some of the votes that have been cast in the United States Senate.

For example, the Peace Corps: The American young people have wanted to do something for this world of ours, there is still extensive idealism among us. Some of us said, "Let's put together a program and we will call it the Peace Corps to have young men and women who are trained and able and intelligent and healthy that want to give of themselves that they can go abroad and help."

You know what the leader of the opposition called them? Well, he called them, let's see it here, he said they would be nothing more or less than international beatniks, international beatniks. And yet this state college has the highest per capita enrolment in the Peace Corps of any college in the United States.

(Applause.)

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Page 5

When I offered the program of the Peace Corps and introduced it in the Senate, the leader of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party attacked it as wasteful, attacked it as another one of those Utopian idealistic socialistic schemes. And yet today, my friends, the Peace Corps is doing more for a better world than all of the speeches and efforts of Barry Goldwater put together.

(Applause.)

So, we try to do something to help our industry. Four years ago we found America with a high rate of unemployment. We found our industry lagging, we found our gross national product down, our rate of growth at about 2 per cent, and the Kennedy-Johnson Administration backed up by labor, by the Chamber of Commerce, by most Republicans and by most Democrats set out to do something with our tax policy and we reduced taxes 11-1/2 billion dollars, 9-1/2 billion dollars to individuals, two billion dollars to corporations, and the product of that reduction has been a tremendous intensive growth in the American economy. Private industry has flourished, new businesses have been established, expansion of plants, new purchasing power, but what about the Senator from Arizona that says he believes in private industry?

He voted "no" as did the Congressman from this district. He voted no faith in America, no faith in our industry, no faith in our bankers, no faith in our labor. I voted for it, and Lyndon Johnson asked us to pass it and he signed it and it is one of the great achievements of this Administration.

(Applause.)

Now, the Senator from Arizona knows full well that between now and the year 1990, in the next 30 years, that we will have to build more classroom space in America than all of the classroom space we have constructed in the last 300 years.

He knows that. If he doesn't he hasn't done his homework. Every prominent educator in America has warned us of the need for tremendous college expansion like you have had here in California, and it has been wonderful what has been done here. But let me say this: The College expansion in California, like other places, has benefitted from Federal funds, great amounts of Federal funds, six billion dollars of Federal funds in this wonderful state. Not bad, six billion, and here is the man, -- (applause) -- here is the man from Arizona that when an aid to higher education bill is before us, when a bill to build more medical colleges is before us, when a program to train nurses and medical technicians is before us, when there is a program offered to help America, to help itself, to invest in education, to make possible more trained manpower, because everybody knows that the future requires people well-educated, when that bill and other bills, the National Defense Education Act, the student loan program, the higher education bill, the library construction bill, every one of them when they are before the Congress for a vote to help America, to help train our manpower, to make us a better nation intellectually, to make us a better nation scientifically, to make us a better nation in terms of understanding, what does the Senator from Arizona do? He votes "no."

Yes, he votes "no." In fact, what he says is, "The Government has no right to educate children." That is his own statement. The Government has no right to educate children. The parents, you and I, have that responsibility. "The child has no right to an education. In most cases the children would get along very well without it."

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Page 6

Incredible, isn't it? A speech at Jacksonville, Florida, October 3, 1960, and I would have thought in the ensuing four years he would have changed. But no. Who has the opportunity and the obligation then to educate children? Are we unaware of the Northwest Ordinance; are we unaware of the Morrill Act? Are we unaware of the many acts that have been passed by Federal and State Governments?

The Government of the United States and the Government of the 50 States of this Union not only have an obligation to educate children but school attendance is compulsory, even if Mr. Goldwater doesn't seem to understand it.

(Applause.)

Now, I want to conclude on this issue, there are many that you could talk about. A Senator that asks to be President votes against the Trade Expansion Act, votes against education, votes against the UN bond issue, votes against library construction, votes against area redevelopment, public works, the poverty program, water control and pollution control, the tax cut; votes against an increase in our space program to keep us on top of this great advance in science and technology. But the one vote that I think tells more than any was when the Senator from Arizona decided that he would not help slow down the arms race in the nuclear field.

Our President, our late and beloved President, John Kennedy, after that memorable speech of June 10, 1963, at American University, proceeded carefully, methodically in cooperation with other countries to find if we could break through this Soviet intransigence and to move into the frontier of nuclear energy and see if we couldn't do something about preventing further pollution of the air and of the earth and of the seas, and we engaged in long negotiations.

Many of us in the Congress have been a part of this effort. I have given a good deal of my time and life to it. And President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy, all three Presidents tried desperately over the years, without regard to partisanship, to bring a halt to the nuclear expansion, to stop these tests before this nuclear arms race got completely out of control and before the atmosphere was polluted and the food and the milk that we drank and air was polluted and before there were serious genetic problems.

And we did negotiate a treaty. I was present at Geneva, Switzerland, when some of the preliminaries took place. I went to Moscow with a bipartisan group for the signing of that treaty, and I am happy to say that the overwhelming majority of Republicans, and the overwhelming majority of Senators in the United States Senate rallied as one to see to it that America, the land of decency, a nation committed to an honorable peace, a nation that wants to see atomic energy used to save lives not to destroy them, I am happy to say that regardless of partisanship, that the great members of the Senate rallied and we ratified that treaty, yes, my dear friends, over three-fourths of the members of the Senate ratified that treaty, but as the gentleman said just a moment ago, but not Senator Goldwater.

(Applause.)

And then to top it off, my friends, when the great opportunity came for America through the representatives elected in Congress to declare for once and for all that the emancipation proclamation was more than a promise, that it had to become a reality, when that great leader of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, had before the Congress a hundred years after his death, the very

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Page 7

promise that he had made for its fulfillment, and when leaders on both sides of the aisle, and let me say that men like Senator Dirksen and your own Senator Thomas Kuchel who was my co-floor leader in this fight, stood there like stalwarts and fought for that program, and we designed a good bill, we didn't say that it would cure all the problems but we did say it would provide a framework of law within which men of good will and reason could work out this problem of human relations, we saw to it at long last that the moral commitments of America were lived up to because the abuse of Civil Rights is not regional, it has become national, the need for this legislation was not sectional, it was both national and international, and I am happy to tell you that an overwhelming majority of the members of the United States Senate, Republicans like Senators Saltonstall, Dirksen, Kuchel, Aiken, men of distinction in public life, and Democrats that we stood together and we passed the most important piece of Civil Rights legislation that has ever been adopted by any country on the face of the earth, we did it because we knew it was right, not because it had any political benefits, in fact, maybe it has got some political liabilities, we knew it was right morally, we knew that the time had come that we had to do it, that America could no longer go before the world with a dirty face of bigotry and of segregation and intolerance, we had to cleanse ourselves, and we stood up like men and women, and we voted for the Civil Rights bill.

But the man that talks about morality and the man that talks about the spirit of America, and the man that says we have got to go back to those ancient virtues, he didn't vote for it. He not only voted against it, he denounced it as a police state measure which it surely is not, and on those two issues of nuclear power, and of human rights, I say that the gentleman from Arizona has disqualified himself to be President of the United States.

(Applause.)

Friends, I leave you with this hope and with this suggestion. It seems to me that a nation as young and as vital as ours would want to look to the future, that even though we have made great gains thus far, that we know that this is but a beginning.

We are in an age of discovery, we are in an age where mankind has literally proven we can perform miracles and do the impossible. We do not need leadership that calls us back to some never, never land, but we need leadership, if you please, that asks us to explore the universe, to look to the heavens, and to see, too, if we can't make it a little better on earth for God's creation, and I am convinced that the American people are not going to rally around the standards of a bygone past poorly described, and unfortunately inadequately articulated. I think the American people are going to want to lift their sights, they will not only want to accomplish the New Frontier and to see those new horizons, but I think they will want to look to a whole new age, a new age of promise, and of hope, not only for ourselves but for mankind everywhere. The cause of peace is at stake, for a just and an honorable peace, and the duty of this nation is indeed to remain strong, but to know that that strength is to be used with restraint and to know that that strength whenever used must be used for noble purposes.

And I ask the people of California who are really a blessed people because of the very conditions that exist in this state, I ask you to place your faith in the future, I ask you to make a commitment to it, I ask you to back candidates and programs that at least are willing to move and venture forth into new areas of discovery, and I think that if you do it there will be but one choice.

Senator Humphrey
San Jose State College Campus
San Jose, California
October 5, 1964

Page 8

You will find that you need a man in the White House today that not only can advocate but can educate, that not only can point ahead but also can inspire, and I am proud to stand alongside of the man today who is President, the man that was selected by John Kennedy as his Vice President, and I ask you to join with me to help us complete the unfinished work of our late and beloved President, John Kennedy, and to move forward with new programs for a better America in the days ahead.

(Applause

End

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
San Jose, California

For Release: Monday, October 5
P.M.'s

The tremendous growth of the city of San Jose and San Jose State College represents what we're so proud of in this country and what we want and must continue. Growth stems from opportunity, and I believe that one of the basic issues in this election campaign is whether the United States will remain the land of ever increasing opportunity by rejecting the apostles of opposition.

Those who use the gospel of opposition as their political creed -- and I refer mainly to the Goldwater minority fraction of the Republican Party -- should visit and study this beautiful and great Santa Clara Valley.

Here in this home of higher learning and advanced technology, you know that government working as a partner of labor and industry and agriculture has helped create an unprecedented rate of growth with prosperity to match.

The apostles of opposition scoff at government help and participation in providing opportunity. They call it waste. But most of us know it is investment, an investment of the highest kind, and investment in human beings.

How inspiring it is herein San Jose that such an investment is now being used to help others take advantage of opportunities opening up throughout the world. San Jose State College, I am told, has the highest per capita enrollment in the Peace Corps.

I am proud that I introduced the Peace Corps bill in the Senate in 1960. There were apostles of opposition to the Peace Corps then -- including the well known leader of the faction that has captured control of the Republican Party.

But the Peace Corps is only one of the programs that gave our nation new hope and promise under the administrations of the late and beloved John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Our country was founded on the basis of popular government and equal opportunity and we Americans know that education is one vital means of providing them.

We must continue our new energy, new faith, new dedication which men must have to preserve freedom. We need an America with the wisdom of experience. We must not let America grow old in spirit, deaf to new ideas, opposed to investments in a peaceful and prosperous future.

#####

Senator Humphrey
University of California
Berkeley, California
October 5, 1964

Thank you very much, Chancellor Strong. Thank you, you three or four misplaced Minnesotans here. I heard you respond with such courage.

(Applause.)

You won't live long but it will be a very exciting existence that you have.

I was going to read a telegram here of congratulations to me from the Senator from Arizona on that football game but I decided maybe I shouldn't be that unfair.

(Laughter and applause.)

This is a beautiful setting and to me it is a rare privilege and a wonderful opportunity to visit with students of one of the greatest universities in all the world in this great State of California.

(Applause.)

I regret that my friend President Clark Kerr is not here, he was my rival for the office of Presidency. You might have ended up with me being President of the University at Berkeley.

(Applause.)

I don't know how to interpret that applause.

(Dog barking.)

Let me say that I will -- will you get that Republican out of here.

(Laughter and applause.)

I think that is somebody left over from the football game here.

I am delighted to be on this platform today with one of the great public servants in this state, Mr. Alan Cranston, your state comptroller.

Just to show you what a grand fellow he is, he is out today working with me to campaign for the next U.S. Senator from California, Pierre Salinger.

(Applause.)

If you want to tune into something good why tune in tonight to that debate that is going to take place between Mr. Salinger and, I have forgotten the name of the other fellow. It is quite a debate.

The Congressmen from these two districts are not with us today, districts surrounding this area, but I would not want to come to the University of California without saluting Jeff Cohalan and without saluting George Miller.

(Applause.)

Much of the wonderful work that has -- that is being done here at this great campus is at least in some small part due

Senator Humphrey
University of California
Berkeley, California
October 5, 1964

Page 2

to the splendid cooperation of your Congressional delegation and the two Congressmen I have just mentioned, George Miller being the senior man on the Committee on Space and Aeronautics of the United States Government, and the Congress, and if there is any one university that today is in the forefront of the aerospace research and development, it is the University of California and its many very fine institutions.

(Applause.)

I am going to use this platform today not for frivolity or for some of the good political jokes I would like to tell. Of course, there are one or two that may slip in as I go along, but I want to talk to you seriously about our country, I want to talk to you about our foreign policy, I want to talk to you about where I believe we go from here.

It has been said by some of the columnists that this campaign has lacked what we might call the production of new ideas. Well, in any campaign there are those who are in office that try to point with what we call pride to our achievements, and there are those that seek office that try to point with dismay and sometimes with doom and gloom to what they think are the problems of our country.

I think both of those are to be expected, but I think we also have an obligation to restate our commitments so that there can be no doubt as to where our country stands or where a particular party or administration may stand, and I think we also ought to look a little bit to the future.

If there ever was a state or an area of America that typifies the future, I am in that state now, and you are students of a university that is molding that future.

I have become a little bit unhappy when I hear candidates for public office only recite the glories of yesterday. You would think that somehow or another that the yesterdays were the finest days of the Republic. But the people that lived through those days thought they were rather difficult. The further away you are from the day that you left the better it seems to be.

I am of the opinion that everyone, and every student, should, of course, study the humanities, and I want to underscore that. Even in areas of great science and technology, it is important to be acquainted with the humanities. I believe that students should study ancient history, I think even politicians should study it, but I want to advise you as citizens and as voters, don't vote it.

(Laughter and applause.)

It seems to me that what we ought to do is so see where we are and then make some plans about where we are going to go. I don't think you can guide this country by looking through a rear view mirror. I think somehow or another you need to chart a course, you need to feel that each generation or at least those of us in each decade make some gain, and from that gain it is like a launching platform, we probe to new areas of discovery, new achievements.

So, the first thing I should like to emphasize to any student body, to any audience, is that while we have made great gains economically and socially in America, our gross national

product today is unbelievably high, our employment is over 72 million, the profits of industry are ten billion dollars higher than they have ever been before, wages are higher than they have ever been before, more people at work than have ever been before, and all of this is good, but there are still new areas and new frontiers to conquer.

There are still, as we have said, some pockets of poverty. People have been left behind in the technological advance, people that are the victims of the change in our economy from a primarily rural to an urban society, and as a matter of fact one of the great needs today is for people to understand more fully the problems of the metropolis and to chart a course of action in government and in private life, so that our cities become more than places to work, they become places in which you can live, and live a good and wholesome and beautiful life.

We Americans ought to set our own standards, we ought not to try to judge ourselves by others and, above all, we ought to come to grips with the unbelievable change that is taking place at home and abroad, a whole world that was literally thrown into convulsions at the end of World War II.

And in these years since World War II, empires that had broken apart, peoples all over the world that are demanding their place in the sun and getting it, peoples that are no longer willing to be subservient, but prefer to have a national identity.

And, may I say to you in this audience, that we as Americans have had a great deal to do with stirring up this evolution and revolution that takes place in the world. We give the Communist far too much credit. We say that he is the one that stirs up the masses. Not at all. It is a philosophy of life and government that places important emphasis upon human dignity, a philosophy of life and government that places emphasis upon government as a servant of the people, a philosophy of life and government that tells us that change is in the pattern of life itself, and that we ought to come to grips with change, embrace it and direct it in constructive forces.

We are the real revolutionaries of the 20th Century, we the people.

(Applause.)

Who would have ever dreamed a hundred years ago of great universities like we see in California and throughout America. Why, in the year 1900, only one out of eight ever had an opportunity to attend a university or a college. Now, not only one out of eight, I should say, 7/8 of the young people had no chance.

Today one-third of all high school graduates are in universities, and in the years to come it will have to be much more.

This is why I take such exception in one area and many more, with the spokesman of the opposition... I happen to believe that it does us very little good to recite only the problems of today and then try to just glorify the virtues of yesterday. I think what we need to do is to face what is coming, and I think we need to talk about it.

(Applause.)

I think we need to plan how we are going to have living space, decent, wholesome living space for 400 million Americans by the year 1990 or 2000; how we are going to provide for people to live a good life in an area of America like on the West Coast or the East Coast where there will be one solid city of millions of people running for hundreds of miles. I think we need to ask ourselves how can we expand our university setup in the next 30 years so that we will build as many classrooms in 30 years as we did in 300, because that is what we are going to have to do.

How are we going to train the teachers and how are we going to afford the investment? All of these things we not only know we must do, we need to get on with the job of getting them done.

Let me turn to another area. The spokesman of the opposition apparently feels that somehow or another that the United States has such power that all it needs to do is to issue an ultimatum, and the problems fade away. I want to say to this distinguished gentleman that even if there had never been a Communist in the world we would have problems that wouldn't fade away because of the nuclear weapons being waved around and saying, "Be good. If you don't we will clobber you."

(Applause.)

I think the fact of our time is interdependence, not just independence, interdependence. If that interdependence has made this term of brotherhood mean a whole lot more than it has ever meant before, and it has also placed a great premium upon respect for human dignity or to put it in the simplest language, it has told us, this fact of interdependence, that a great power, a great people, a people or a nation that aspires to be the great society, can no longer indulge itself in any form of intolerance or bigotry or discrimination because of race, creed or color.

(Applause.)

Greatness does not permit parochialism, and greatness does not permit selfishness, and I am of the opinion that as we think of America's role in the world today we must remember that there has never been a military power that by military power alone was a great nation. It takes more than that.

We want military power, we want military strength, but we want it as only a part of, a much broader complex of, social forces, of areas of influence and impact. To rely entirely upon the mighty power of the military as a means for the conduct of foreign policy is to fool yourself and indeed to bring catastrophe to the world.

(Applause.)

The great poet, John Donne, said that "No man is an Island," and that is just another way of saying that we are of one another, and it is my view that every man that seeks the high office of President must understand that fact. I believe as strongly as any man could possibly believe in the protecting of our individual liberties and rights.

But what some exponents call rugged individualism turns out not to be individualism at all, but to be license. Those rugged individualists fail to understand is that men and nations must live together, and they must strive together, and they must

reason together, and they must do this in order to obtain and preserve and extend the benefits of civilization.

Now, I know what has been happening here in California. I shan't take the time to discuss it in any detail. I will only say that this splendid university is but one of the great stars in a state educational galaxy unsurpassed in the nation, and this university is the product of interdependence, the product of cooperation, the product of cooperation on the part of the state government with the people, and with the Federal government and indeed with the nation. We have a lesson right here in your own state of California of this great doctrine of interdependence.

Now, this doctrine is as old as the prophets, but it seems to need repeating. As sort of a refugee from a college classroom, I came to the conclusion a long time ago that education was essentially saturation and repetition and most people learn by osmosis.

(Laughter.)

So, maybe we just need to keep repeating some of the relevant facts of our time, and I think now that this concept of interdependence needs more repetition than ever before. For we are hearing preached in our land from false prophets a philosophy which threatens to license individual selfishness at home, and to isolate America from the family of nations.

I think this is a dangerous philosophy. It is a philosophy which, if you please, says that compassion is weakness, and that interest in or concern for the unfortunate is socialism. But this speaker and this Senator says to you that compassion is courage, and that interest in and concern for the unfortunate is not socialism at all, but it represents the full tradition of what I like to think of as our Americanism, a concern for the other fellow.

(Applause.)

Whether in California or in the country as a whole, no people and no American can afford an ostrich-like isolation from his fellowman, nor in this world can Americans afford leadership that is isolationist, either in practice or in spirit.

Let me tell you what I mean in specific details. The spokesman for the opposition in this campaign says as follows, just a year ago: "I don't give a tinker's dam what the rest of the world thinks about the United States as long as we keep militarily strong."

I say to you that that kind of thinking is disastrous and could be catastrophic and it must be repudiated by the American people.

(Applause.)

Ever since World War II we have had built a great national security and foreign policy on the principle of bipartisanism, and that foreign policy has had such architects as the late and beloved Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, James Forrestal, John McCloy, Dwight Eisenhower, and others, and it has been supported by Democratic Presidents as well as Republicans.

There were men that I have mentioned that supported the bipartisan foreign policy goals of Harry Truman -- (applause) --

yes, sir, I see you have somebody from Missouri here, too. That man has got the right idea. Recently we have heard the voices of men like Bill Fulbright, Lyndon Johnson, John F. Kennedy, --(applause.) -- and we supported the bipartisan foreignpolicy goals of President Eisenhower. A consensus prevailed that these matters were too important to our nation to permit them to become the political playthings or playthings of partisans or to be the pawns for partisan political gain, and what is tragic and ironic this hour is the drastic departure of the temporary leader of the Republican Party from this great highway of bipartisanship.

(Applause.)

I think his views are well known, they are well known on a wide range of issues. I surely compliment him for candor, and I also want to say that he is a very good explainer.

(Applause.)

His views are well known on issues from foreign aid to negotiation, from the test ban treaty to control of nuclear weapons. This is the man who greeted the Peace Corps not as an opportunity for service, but as he put it, "a haven for beatniks."

I submit that that kind of thinking does not qualify a man for the highest office of the gift of the people of the United States.

(Applause.)

But the most striking break in this consensus of bipartisanship are his views on the vital issues of United States support for the United Nations. Listen to this statement. "The United States should begin acting like a world power and quit groveling on its knees to inferior people who like to come to New York."

(Laughter.)

I submit to any intelligent audience that a statement like this disqualifies a man for the leadership of the American people -- (applause) -- and a statement that reads as follows: "Some day I am convinced there will either be a war or we will be subjugated without a war, real nuclear war -- I don't see how it can be avoided-- perhaps five to ten years from now."

That kind of a statement announces the inevitability of conflict, and may I say the task of American statesmanship is to move heaven and earth to see to it that this tragic possibility of nuclear conflict be avoided if it possibly can, be avoided with honor and be avoided in the sense of preserving our freedom and that is what President Lyndon Johnson is trying to do.

(Applause.)

I ask you to contrast that statement with the words of a great President who on June 10, 1963 standing before the commencement audience at American University in Washington told us that "Peace is a process, and that the pursuit of peace is the noblest of all aims."

That was President Kennedy who worked for the peace of the world.

As this man worked for peace, spoke for peace, planned for peace, he didn't weaken our defenses, he didn't insult our allies,

he didn't call people inferior. He didn't preach the doctrine of inevitable war. He preached the message that is written in scripture, "Let there be peace, let my people live in peace." I submit that this is the doctrine of a courageous man, not of an appeaser; of a brave man, not of a weakling.

(Applause.)

Former President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, said the other day, and I want to quote him accurately, when asked about some of the statements in the present campaign, General Eisenhower said, that he just was confused about what was being said -- (laughter) -- and I want to say I sympathize with him, and I am about to show you why -- (laughter) -- because he is trying to keep up with the latest editions, with the latest emphasis, with the newest statement of the spokesman of the opposition.

In Arizona in December, 1961, Mr. Goldwater announced "The United States has no longer, no longer has any place in the United Nations." And on CBA television in March, 1962, he reiterated "I just can't see any sense in keeping on in it."

On May 12 of last year on New York's WOR-TV he repeated, "Frankly, I think the fact that it's proven to be unworkable is grounds enough for us to quit wasting our money on it." And asked whether as President, he would favor getting out of the UN he said again, "I would, having seen what the United Nations cannot do. I would have to suggest it."

Well now, that is quite interesting that would leave one with a view that he really planned on getting out.
(Laughter.)

Even a slow learner would catch on.

(Laughter and applause.)

Mor recently, however, the Senator from Arizona has made some hedging remarks. He said that maybe we should stay in. But the UN should do more and somehow do it better. Let me read to you what he said in Der Spiegel, June 30, 1964 -- well, maybe I should say first of all from Phoenix, December 31, 1961, "I have come to the reluctant conclusion that the U.S. no longer has a place in the United Nations."

Los Angeles Times, October 20, 1963, "I have advocated withdrawal from the UN in the past. I would have to say at best I am lukewarm about it now."

On June 30, 1964, "I have never advocated withdrawing from the United Nations."

(Applause and laughter.)

Now, that maybe you can take, but listen to the next line, "I have given more support to the UN than some of my critics."

(Applause.)

This despite the fact that this Senator when the house came in the Senate of the United States to help with the financing of the UN's peacekeeping operations, for the bond issue that was recommended by two Presidents, this man voted "no." I must say that if one can't make up his mind where he stands on the United Nations, I don't

Senator Humphrey
University of California
Berkeley, California
October 5, 1964

Page 8

think he can make up his mind about the future course of American foreign policy.

Let me be crystal clear that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is committed to a program of support to the UN. We will follow the dictum that was laid down by the Kennedy-Johnson Administration when President Kennedy said of the UN, "It is our last peace hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace."

We have consistently sought to strengthen its shield, of the new or the weak, and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run and I think we have been wise to do so.. The UN has performed marvelous services for the world. To be sure it is not a perfect instrument because it is man-made but like other things in life it grows, and it matures, and it changes, and it also needs care and attention and encouragement, and I am happy to say that it has been receiving that from our government.

Under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson and John F. Kennedy our government has generously and vigorously supported and is supporting it, the expansion of the UN activities in a number of significant fields. Last Friday President Johnson proclaimed 1965 as the international cooperation year in recognition of the UN's 20th anniversary, and this government has worked through the UN in one program after another, in an effort to do what, to strengthen our own foreign policy, yes, but to use an international instrument in international problems so that the big and mighty power of one nation would not be called upon in every instance, so that it would appear that America was intending to impose a pax Americana over the entire world. We have done what was right. We have recognized the internationalism of our day. We have recognized the interdependence of nations and peoples and we have sought patiently, perseveringly and may I say at times with great, great sacrifice, we have sought to strengthen the many instrumentalities of the United Nations so that it can fulfill its functions of helping people to build a better society for themselves and of keeping the peace so that society can endure, as a means for mankind to improve his lot.

Now, let me just -- we know the problems of the UN, the Soviets' veto, but we have sought ways and means, my friends, to move around it. By using the peacekeeping machinery of the General Assembly, and by working with those in the General Assembly that are interested in peace, to provide for peacekeeping forces, and the next proposal of this government in the years ahead, in the United Nations will be to see to it that the United Nations has available on a moment's notice the peacekeeping forces that are necessary so that we don't have the long delays and the wait and the indecision, so that when we need them in the Middle East or in Africa or if you need them in Southeast Asia or any place else, that they will be there, and that those forces will have the complete support, financial, logistics support of the United States of America.

I believe the American people would prefer that to American involvements in every struggle in every area of the world.

(Applause.)

Let me just conclude my remarks with you today on this interesting subject of the UN by saying that I have only contempt for those who keep mouthing the very words that Mr. Khrushchev himself regrettably on many occasions has mouthed and some of these that

Senator Humphrey
University of California
Berkeley, California
October 5, 1964

Page 9

mouth the words are the ones who claim to be super patriots in our midst. They say, "Get the U.S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S." The Birchers and the Communists join hands. They are always in the same bed but they are fighting for the covers.

(Applause and laughter.)

Nor do I agree with those who will stand and salute the UN on one day and then the next condemn it because it doesn't obey our every wish within 24 hours. It seems to me that what we need is to see the United Nations help develop a body of world law, a world law if you please, that can be enforceable. This was the dream of President Kennedy.

Again and again he held up the idea of world law as the most essential goal of mankind in our time. He said and I say, we must end the arms race or the arms race will end the human race. He called -- (applause) -- he called for the establishment of a workable world law as the best way to accomplish that purpose. He was no idle dreamer and I trust that none of us are. They knew we needed our military power during this period of instability but he held out before mankind, not just before the Americans, but for the whole world he held out the dream of a world that can live under law in justice, under law in freedom, and I submit to you that a leader of a great nation like America must not be one that points to man's meanness, but he must be one that arouses in mankind their desire for goodness.

He must ask of us to do the impossible. He must seek from us to do new things. He must ask us to join in the age of discovery. He must be one who seeks to unite us for common goals and common purposes, and he must above all be a dreamer, and an educator. He must lift our sights, not only to the new frontiers, not only to the new horizons, but in a very real sense he must lift our sights to the stars because really we are living now not just in a world. We are living in a universe, and the next President of the United States by his every word and by his every deed, by his every pronouncement will be laying down guidelines for America and the world for another century, and I want that man who is President, to have a sense of vision because I know and you know the poet was right, a nation without vision shall perish, and I know and you know that a President that thinks in terms of one people, a brotherhood, and who thinks in terms of the old prophet, who said, "Come, let us reason together," is a President that can lift people to higher ground, can lead them to work within the framework of institutions, that are dedicated to the process and the pursuit of peace.

I leave you with this thought and this commitment. The President of the United States has said recently that he will go anywhere, any time, in the honorable pursuit of peace. He will meet with anybody at any place to talk about the conditions for a just and an honorable peace. This is not weakness or appeasement. It is courage and bravery like a soldier on the battlefield. If we can call upon our manpower to meet the enemy head on with weapons, I think we can call upon our leaders to meet our antagonists head on with better ideas and greater commitments for the love of humanity.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

#####

Humphrey Speech
Prepared for the University
of California at Berkeley

FOR RELEASE OCTOBER 5, 1964

"No man is an Island", reads the well-known line of the Poet John Donne. In the history of men and nations this judgement rings true. Yet our opponents in this campaign have failed to perceive this truth.

I believe as strongly as any man in the necessity for protecting individual liberties and rights. But what some exponents of "Rugged Individualism" fail to understand is that men and nations must live together -- must strive together, must reason together -- to obtain the benefits of civilization.

In touring this great western empire named California and in visiting this vibrant San Francisco Bay Area, I am again impressed by what men can accomplish if they will but work together. You who study here at this splendid university -- A shining star in a state educational galaxy unsurpassed in the nation -- Must perceive what men can achieve together. For this institution is a living tribute to cooperation in the pursuit of truth.

(more)

This message of interdependence -- As old as the prophets -- is one of which you are well aware; but it seems to need repeating in every generation. Today, more than ever, it requires repetition. For we are now hearing preached in our land a philosophy which threatens to license individual selfishness and greed at home, and to isolate America from the family of nations.

Whether in California or in the country as a whole, no American can afford an ostrich-like isolation from his fellow men. Nor in this world, can Americans afford leadership that is isolationist either in practice or in spirit.

Such isolationism can be bred by illusion, impatience, frustration, or just plain ignorance. But whatever its source, it must be repudiated.

It is the danger of isolationism in relation to the United Nations that I wish to discuss with you briefly today.

Up until this year, our country has maintained a bipartisanship that rejected the counsels of withdrawal from the community of nations.

Just as many distinguished republicans like Arthur Vandenberg, James Forrestal, and John McCloy supported the policies of President Truman in our relations with other nations, so did democrats like Lyndon Johnson, John F. Kennedy, William Fulbright and myself support the policies of President Eisenhower. A consensus prevailed that these matters were too important to our nation to

(more)

permit them to become pawns for partisan political gain.

What is tragic and ironic today is the drastic departure of the temporary leader of the opposition from the great highway of bipartisanship.

His views are now well known on a wide range of issues -- From foreign aid to negotiation, from the test ban treaty to the control of nuclear weapons. This is the man who greeted the Peace Corps not as an opportunity for service but as a "haven for beatniks".

But among the most striking in his breaks with bipartisanship have been his views on the vital issues of United States support for the United Nations.

Within the bipartisan tradition, no one issue has united leaders more solidly than that of support for the United Nations. Since those fateful days in San Francisco nineteen years ago when Arthur Vandenberg joined the U.S. Delegation in the establishment of the U.N., leaders of both parties have supported the U.N. as one of man's best hopes for peace and stability in a turbulent world.

Yet hear what the temporary spokesman of the opposition has said on the subject of the United Nations -- and judge where he stands today if you can.

In Arizona, in December 1961, he announced that "The United States no longer has a place in the United Nations". On CBS television in March 1962, he reiterated, "I just can't see any

(more)

sense in keeping on ~~it~~ in it". On May 12 of last year, on New York's WOR-TV, he repeated, "...Frankly, I think the fact that it's proven to be unworkable is grounds enough for us to quit wasting our money on it". Asked whether as President, he would favor getting out of the U.N., he said again, "... I would, at this bet, having seen what the United Nations cannot do. I would have to suggest it".

More recently, we have heard some hedging from the spokesman: He thinks perhaps we should stay in, but the U.N. should "do more" -- and somehow do it better.

These are his confused views on a vital institution that for two decades has commanded the overwhelming endorsement of the American people and their leaders. They are views that should be dismissed by millions of Americans who understand the deep truth that "no man is an island" -- and that no nation can be isolated from the world at large.

For the past four years the Kennedy - Johnson Administration has supported the U.N. as "our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace". We have consistently sought "to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak" and to "enlarge the area in which its writ may run". And we have been wise to do so.

Consider the U.N.'s record: In the last 19 years, it has played a major part in dealing with 13 different threats to the

(more)

peace of the world. Through border patrols in the middle east, through supervision of truces between India and Pakistan, through its present mediation in Cyprus, the U.N. has played a uniquely constructive role. In an age where a great power war could breed unparalleled nuclear destruction, we should never belittle the record of the U.N. in preventing the escalation of brush-fire conflicts.

And what of the future?

Under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy our government has supported -- and is supporting -- the expansion of the U.N.'s activities in a number of significant areas. Last Friday, President Johnson proclaimed 1965 as International Cooperation Year in recognition of the U.N.'s 20th anniversary. The President has indicated that his administration will use this commemorative year to press for measures which would strengthen the U.N.

What are specific measures that would increase the U.N.'s effectiveness? Among the steps which should be taken, I would attach special importance to better resources for fact-finding and observation; the development of an effective mediation and conciliation service; the streamlining and expansion of its economic development programs.

Most important of all is progress in the vital area of peacekeeping. We need to achieve agreement on improved procedures for the initiation and financing of peacekeeping

(more)

proporals.

The United Nations cannot fulfill its peacekeeping responsibilities if it can be frustrated by a Soviet Veto. We must therefor preserve the authority of the general assembly to launch peacekeeping operations if the security council is unable to act, and we must preserve the assembly's power to assess payment for such operations.

To improve peacekeeping procedures, we must achieve the adoption of our proposals that the general assembly initiate a major peacekeeping operation involving military forces only after it has been discussed in the security council and the council has been unable to act. In assessments for peacekeeping, our proposals also require recommendation by a special committee in which the large and middle powers would have a greater representation than they have in the assembly as a whole.

Needless to say, our efforts to reach agreement on these procedures must be accompanied by efforts to deal with the U.N.'s present financial crisis. Certainly we cannot be satisfied with any agreement unless past obligations -- including those of the Soviet Union -- are discharged in accordance with the charter. But if we can agree on improved procedures for the future, we should be able to settle out disputes about the past.

Another essential step for the strengthening of peacekeeping is the establishment of a flexible troop call-up system for future emergencies. The U.N. cannot do its

(more)

peacekeeping job if there are long delays in getting its forces to world trouble spots.

I strongly support the Secretary-General's request that members maintain special U.N. peacekeeping contingents, and I rejoice that some nations have already responded -- Canada, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Iran.

We ourselves should assist in this strengthening of the peacekeeping capacity by helping to train and equip contingents of other nations earmarked for U.N. use -- by transporting these units when necessary -- and by paying our fair share of the cost of peacekeeping operations.

Let us never forget that one of the best investments we can make is investment in U.N. peacekeeping -- an investment which will save American lives.

We do not aspire to any pax Americana -- We could not if we would. We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme -- We could not if we would. And we have no desire to interject American troops into explosive local disputes -- whether in Africa, Asia or the middle east.

But disputes do occur; and if hostilities are to be ended and the peace preserved, there must be some outside force available to intervene. A stable professional U.N. force can best play that role.

I make you here a pledge*: That this administration

(more)

will continue to provide the leadership to strengthen the U.N., to extend the area where its writ may run. I have only contempt for those who would: "Get the U.S. out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the U.S." They are blind to the realities of our world. Nor can I understand those who wish to scrap an imperfect institution for preserving world peace because of their impatience with an imperfect world. Nor do I agree with those who will salute the U.N. on the one hand -- and on the other hand condemn it because it does not bow to our wishes within 24 hours.

The United Nations has proven its value as an instrument for world peace. Our faith in it is strong -- and our hope is firm that it will one day become what it was intended to be -- A world society of nations under law, not merely law backed by force, but law backed by justice and by popular consent. The answer to world war can only be world law. And the best hope of achieving world law is through the United Nations.

This was President John F. Kennedy's great dream. Again and again he held up the idea of world law as the most essential goal of mankind in our time. He said that we must end the arms race or the arms race will end the human race. He called for the establishment of workable world law as the best way to accomplish that purpose.

World law doesn't come into being just because a lot of people want it. It can grow only as there are institutions behind it -- institutions to enact it and enforce it. I believe

(more)

the U.N. will develop such institutions. I believe the world's people will settle for no less.

In today's world, no man, no nation, can remain isolated from the affairs of others. My message to you is this: Choose concern for your fellow men -- Choose to treat others as you would be treated. Choose to commit yourself to that ultimate political goal: A world "where the strong are just, the weak secure and the peace preserved".

000



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