

rshein
nash

Senator Humphrey
United Press International
Editors and Publishers
Statler Hilton Hotel
Washington, D. C.
October 7, 1964

Thank you very much, Mr. Burnham. A man gets launched here rather quickly.

(Laughter.)

My own hope is that the launching does put one in proper orbit.

This is a little different experience than I have been indulging in in the past few days, speaking from hastily constructed stands and podiums, in front of city halls before wildly cheering college audiences, but I do hope that I shall be able to at least this morning share some thoughts with the UPI Editors and Publishers on matters of American security and foreign policy that will be worthy of your consideration, and which may promote some questions which I am more than happy to entertain at the conclusion of my remarks.

The time has come in this period of national referendum, indeed it should have been all the time, to consider seriously the central questions of foreign policy which are at stake in this national election of November 3rd.

For nearly 20 years the Presidential candidates of both parties have agreed on our fundamental national goals of foreign policy and national security.

They have agreed on the necessity for a strong national defense to deter aggression, responsible managements of our powerful and awesome nuclear arsenal, unswerving support for the United Nations, the development of an Atlantic partnership, aid to developing countries, and effective arms control agreements along with sensible steps to reduce tensions with the Communist world.

Now, these are the basic guidelines of America's foreign policy for the past generation.

Republicans, leading Republicans, have played an important part in building a bipartisan consensus; men like Henry L. Stimson, Wendell Willkie, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, many members today of the Congress of the United States, General

Dwight D. Eisenhower, and then five Presidents since the time of Franklin Roosevelt, of both political parties.

The man that we elect as President this November must understand and I underscore the word, he must understand, the nature of this legacy, and he must be committed to its continuation.

In addition he must clearly perceive the nature of the world in which he seeks to apply this bipartisan policy. He must understand that although the United States is the world's most powerful nation, America is not omnipotent, and there cannot be an American solution to every world problem, and surely there cannot be an instant solution to long and lingering problems.

Now, the next President of the United States must be fully aware of the pernicious influence of world communism, and I doubt that there is anyone in America that isn't fully aware of that pernicious influence, at least anyone in responsible positions.

He must realize that many problems abroad would be with us today even if marks and Lenin had never been born, and even if communism were to vanish from the face of the earth.

He must perceive that the character of the cold war has changed, and that we are moving from a period of simple, bi-polar confrontation between two super powers into a period of greater diversity, and he must know that there are a myriad of international problems to which the use of force provides no answer.

He must understand that most nations, if pressed to the ultimate choice, will choose like our nation, like we Americans, to fight rather than surrender, and he must realize that diplomacy by nuclear ultimatum is a dangerous course, and could be the sure path to war.

Now, in the turbulent years since world war II, our nation has been blessed with men of such understanding in positions of national leadership. These men have hammered out the principles of a bipartisan consensus. Their achievements are everywhere, in America's strength, in the new resilience of free nations, in the triumph of diversity and in the disarray of communism.

Now, what are the fundamentals of this bipartisan consensus? What are its most recent achievements, and what guide-

lines does it offer for the years that lie ahead?

A first principle is the commitment by both parties, by all Americans, to maintain our nation's defenses. In recent years we have vastly increased the superiority of U.S. strategic power over that of the Soviet Union.

I trust that this is beyond debate. And may I digress for a moment to say that it does little good for Americans at home or for our policy abroad, to indicate by word or by innuendo from any responsible source that this nation is losing its strength or is being weakened or is casting off its strength.

We have responded with power and precision to each Communist probe of our intentions: In Cuba, in Berlin, in Viet Nam, in the Gulf of Tonkin.

We are today the strongest nation in the history of the world, and it goes without saying that we will take all necessary steps to remain so.

I say to the editors that are here, that the Congress of the United States, even further than the executives, and this Congress has in almost every instance of my 16 years in the Senate, we have added more strength, we have added more to the budget for national defense than was asked for by the Commander-in-Chief, so the American people support defense.

Yet military strength alone is never enough. The stuff of strength is a raw substance to be put to use for evil purpose or for good, with recklessness or with restraint, towards deepening chaos and war or towards order and peace.

The vital key to our national security is the responsibility in the use of strength, determination, wisdom, flexibility, restraint, and a clear sense of priorities.

Our power is relative, not absolute, and our every action must meet the supreme test of the responsible use of power.

Now, a second principle in our bipartisan consensus is that of partnership with the developed nations of the Atlantic and the Pacific communities. The new Europe and the new Japan are living proof of the success of America's post-war policy.

But history does not stand still. Success produces an entirely new spectrum of problems. The world has changed and

changed greatly since 1949 when NATO was created, and the time is coming for new solutions to these problems, and our European friends can and should be assured that within the great bipartisan tradition America is ready to share as a full partner in these efforts, and our allies need to be reassured time after time that our commitment to NATO in all of its application and meaning is unshakeable.

Now, in our relations with the new Europe, the problem of foreign trade or commerce is fundamental. In the past two years we have made a historic beginning in the trade expansion act, and if we can keep up our efforts to expand trade, to negotiate and break down trade barriers, a new Atlantic economic unity is inevitable, and a unity which will further strengthen our mutual security and enrich our lives.

I don't say that this is a goal easily attained. But it is one to which we must give our best efforts. It is not easy to break down old prejudices, old habits, old trade barriers, but at long last because of a bipartisan, bipartisan consensus, because of bipartisan support we have equipped the President of the United States with the tools to do the job of effective negotiation in trade expansion policy.

At the same time, we must also develop new ways to pool our Atlantic resources, along with those of Japan in an intensive effort to assist developing continents, for we have a vital common stake in the peaceful evolution of these societies, and I would place this matter of the pooling of our resources as a high priority in the next administration.

A third principle is that of communication with the Communist-ruled peoples of eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, of bridge-building in behalf of greater autonomy, greater independence, and ultimate freedom.

In the past four years the present Administration has witnessed and has treated with care and prudence one of the greatest changes of modern history, a change that aids the cause of freedom, the fragmentation of the sino-Soviet empire.

Everywhere the forces of national independence and autonomy are slowly but relentlessly eroding the old Communist monopolistic unity.

Everywhere the people living under Communist regimes have a new sense of hope and possibility.

Now, under the past three Presidents we have sought to encourage these hopes and this thrust towards national diversity. We have opened windows of light, air and hope to these people through cultural programs, educational exchanges, travel, and trade.

In Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union itself we must and will do more to encourage this evolution towards increasing national freedom.

At the same time we must understand that the new fragmentation of the Communist world presents us with dangers as well as opportunities, all the more reason for the responsible use of power, for flexibility and wisdom in the application of our foreign policy.

This danger is to be found especially in Asia. The sino-Soviet rift removes the restraints on Peking, and increases the possibility of recklessness, and of war.

Now, a fourth principle of bipartisanship relates to the priority placed on preserving unity, and promoting social and economic progress in our own hemisphere.

We have created the Alliance for Progress in cooperation with our neighbors to the South, an historic new partnership aimed at achieving economic and social justice for all people within the framework of constitutional government.

Through the Organization of American States we have isolated Castro's Cuba, and drastically curtailed his influence in this hemisphere.

A fifth principle of bipartisanship relates to the three-fifths of mankind who live in Asia and Africa, and our commitment to assist them in the difficult and complex tasks of nation-building, and I might add that this is no simple task that lends itself to immediate solutions or ultimatums. This will require the patience of a parent with a teen-age child, and it will require the patience of a mature, responsible people, the American people.

Now, of all the revolutions of our time, none has altered the shape of the map more fundamentally than the march towards full nationhood in Asia and Africa. The thrust towards expanding economic opportunities, social justice, individual dignity, in those vast continents inspires our hopes and commands our

sympathies.

One should understand that the birth of new nations is not necessarily painless. Ours wasn't, and theirs isn't. We must understand that these peoples do not come into the fullness of maturity and nation adulthood overnight. Surely a people as blessed as our people, and a nation as strong and responsible as America, ought to have some understanding of the evolutionary processes from colonialism to independence and nationhood.

Through deft American diplomacy we have gradually learned how to ease and assist the process of nation building in these vast areas, and we have simultaneously helped to prevent the inroads through Communist subversion.

Now, our instruments in this great struggle for peaceful development have been many. There has been a re-invigorated foreign service, infused with skilled and energetic men and women who speak foreign languages, respect foreign cultures and understand the vital importance of people in all walks of life, and a pat on the back to our foreign service occasionally might be of some help. It is a much abused area of our government.

We have a foreign aid program that stresses community development, and the essential ingredient of self-help; in creative use of our agricultural abundance through Food for Peace. Another one of our instrumentalities for the promotion of independence and nationhood is the excellence and compassion of America's youth, is that most successful of foreign policy initiatives, the Peace Corps, and I can't help but say it because I happen to be the author of this Act and I do say that anyone that would call the Peace Corps "a haven for beatniks" has no comprehension whatsoever of what is going on in this world, and in case you don't know who that was, see me after the meeting.

(Laughter.)

What a way to dismiss a thoughtful, effective proposal.

Now, those who view the developing nations as mere pawns in the cold war struggle or as mere images of America have no understanding of men and nations. We cannot and will not create obedient satellites amongst these peoples. But we can and will assist in the growth of well-rooted, viable nations seeking to their own identity and freedom, in their own way, in allegiance to their own values and traditions, and here again as in Europe,

the test of our success will be the strength of the independent that develops and that means independent of Washington as well as Moscow, hard as some may find it to accept such independent.

The test of our maturity will be our reaction to that independent.

Now, a sixth principle of bipartisanship is that of unswerving commitments and support for the United Nations. In a complex changing world the United Nations has time and again proven its unique value as an instrument for peace. It has become the primary forum for men and nations who can daily reason together to avert catastrophe. It is a unique peace-keeping mechanism that has helped to blunt more than 13 different threats to the peace over the past 19 years.

The survival of the U.N. is dependent upon the financial responsibility of its members as well as other factors. We must, therefore, press for payment from those who have failed to meet their obligations, and we will never permit those who default on their dues to cause the organization's collapse.

The United Nations is an international instrumentality that is in our interest as a peace-loving people, and having anyone as a candidate for President that can't make up his mind whether he is for it or against it, is incredible and unbelievable in this, the second half of the 20th Century.

And we must do, I say, all in our power to strengthen the U.N., particularly to strengthen the peacekeeping machinery, realizing that a stable professional United Nations peacekeeping force is the preferred instrument for restoring peace when explosive local disputes erupt.

Now, a final principle of bipartisanship is the commitment to the pursuit of effective multilateral safeguarded arms control.

Mankind lives today under the dark shadow of a spiraling arms race. One fact of our age is the proliferation of power and weapons, and in the past such arms races have ended in war. Our obligation, therefore, as never before is to break that ancient cycle. History runs against us, but we must change that pattern of history.

Under this Administration, as under its predecessors, we have relentlessly sought an answer to this human dilemma. We

have taken a first great step in the nuclear test ban treaty, and we must take further steps. We must patiently press forward in our search for new areas of mutual agreement amongst the great powers, the many nations under effective and safeguarded agreements to reduce the threat of war.

In recent years we have moved to attain such agreements. We have joined with the Soviets in the United Nations on a resolution to prohibit the orbiting of nuclear weapons in outer space, and we established following the Cuban crisis, a hot line between Washington and Moscow, to lessen the chances of miscalculation, which might lead to war.

Now, this is the record and the shape of bipartisanship in our nations foreign affairs, and frankly this record of bipartisanship is the clear manifestation of our maturity as a nation and as a people.

Yet where do we find the Republican candidate? I hesitate to say that, where do we find the candidate of at least a part of the Republican Party for President in relation to this record? He is totally at odds with it for in spirit and in action, he has drastically departed from the tradition of his Party. He has told us where he stands, he is a very candid man. He rejects foreign aid. He disdains negotiations. He dismisses the United Nations, he opposes our bridges to the people of the Communist nations. He terrifies our partners and our allies, and he condemns our efforts to end the armaments race.

Recall, for instance, the solid bipartisan backing for the nuclear test ban treaty -- as a matter of fact, that treaty was first offered by President Eisenhower -- the support of President Eisenhower and 25 of 33 Republicans in the Senate came when that treaty was for final ratification.

And recall as well the moving words of Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican Senate leader, "I want to take a first step, Mr. President," he said, "I am not a young man -- one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone 'He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step.'"

Senator Goldwater knew what happened at Hiroshima, too, but he said, "No," to the test ban treaty. He said "No," to President Eisenhower and the policy of President Eisenhower and, gentlemen and ladies, the recent get-together doesn't prove a thing. I know that a man in public life is judged not by whom

he puts his arm around most recently but by a record, a record that is in the Congressional Record, a record of votes, a record of statements, and a record of deeds, and that record, if anyone will examine it with any objectivity, is not a record of support of the Eisenhower policies during the period of Eisenhower's Presidency.

Mr. Goldwater refused to take that first step. Senator Goldwater blames his critics for making control of nuclear weapons the central issue of this campaign. He is wrong on two counts.

First, it was he himself who injected the issue by his own demand for the delegation of Presidential control. The injection of the issue has now been deplored by responsible men all over the nation and by General Eisenhower and I agree with General Eisenhower that detailed discussion of the specifics of nuclear command and control should not be injected into this campaign. There are some things, it seems to me, ought to be within the realm of national security classification.

And second, control of nuclear weapons is only a part of a far larger issue, namely, the qualities of mind and spirit required of a candidate for the Presidency if we are to protect our interest, advance the cause of freedom, and keep the peace.

Now, does Senator Goldwater have such qualities of mind and spirit? What value does he give to the rationality, wisdom and restraint of his predecessors on matters of war and peace?

Let us quote to you just a few of his most carefully considered ideas. They appear in the concluding chapter in his book, "The Conscience of a Conservative":

"A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective."

or "We must ourselves be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes."

Senator Goldwater declares that our main objective must not be peace but victory under his definition.

Or again hear these more casual words from a newspaper interview in May, 1961, and I am not going to take the time this morning to review the interview in Der Spiegel, but if that

doesn't make your hair stand on end, then I don't know what an interview will do to you.

1961, May: "Some day, I am convinced, there will be either a war or we will be subjugated without war, real nuclear war. I don't see how it can be avoided -- perhaps five or ten years from now."

Well, three of those years have already gone by.

Now, any man living in our nuclear age who can calmly say that "victory" and in quotes "as it is written in his publication, not peace, is our objective, who often implies that war is inevitable, does not possess a firm sense of reality, and such a man lives in a world, as my esteemed colleague, Senator McCarthy put it, in which the calendar has no years, in which the clock has no hands, and I might add a world in which the pale horse of death is indistinguishable from the white horse of victory.

Now, in his impatience with the world as it is, Senator Goldwater wishes to back the Soviet Union into a corner where its only alternatives would be retreat or nuclear war. Indeed one of Senator Goldwater's main goals seems to be, and I quote him exactly, "To invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat." End of quote.

Now, Senator Goldwater does not seem to realize that such dangerous games of nuclear "chicken" will inevitably result in the annihilation of both players. The Senator does not seem to realize that in our age of quick and total destruction, there is no such thing as a quick and total victory. No rational leadership can promise us speedy escape from the problems which demand prolonged and costly effort for solution.

All that can be honestly promised is what Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson have given us, unremitting, constructive work with hopeful advances, but with continued need for vigilance and dedication.

It is my view that the one thing that the Communist leaders are depending upon is a growth of national frustration in the United States, a weariness of the whole thing, and the one phrase that has characterized the statements of the Senator from Arizona more than anything else is the phrase "sick and tired."

Well, I want to say to the Senator and to the American people, this nation is not sick and this nation is not tired, and I think the Communists ought to know it, and if the leader of our political opposition here wants to peddle that kind of propaganda that is his responsibility.

But this person, this Senator, hasn't found America sick at all, and it isn't tired. In fact, it is bustling with vitality and energy. Possibly the Senator should attend some of our meetings.

(Laughter.)

Now, it is the Republican nominee's predilection for this quick and easy solution, his desire for diplomacy by ultimatum, that has impelled him long time Republican newspapers and leading Republicans themselves to repudiate him.

Typical of such repudiation were the words of two editorials from the New York Herald Tribune last week in announcing its support of President Johnson, I am not going to quote the words of the Saturday Evening Post, because I would be accused of being too tough on the Senator from Arizona, but the New York Herald Tribune said this:

"Senator Goldwater has shown himself in sum a poor risk for the most personal and the most awesome of a President's responsibilities, the conduct of foreign relations in an age when survival may, in crises, depend on his judgment and his judgment alone."

The second editorial:

"To entrust America's future on the negative-isms of the Goldwater campaign would truly be a leap in the dark. It is a leap thoughtful Americans could not contemplate without a sudder."

And this is a leap which Americans need not take.

I believe that the New York Herald Tribune has reached a conclusion shared by most Americans that Senator Goodwater is just not qualified to be the President of the United States.

Our country does have a President of prudence and compassion, a President fully conscious of his responsibility to use our awesome power with reason and restraint, and a man fully

aware of the world as it is, not just as he wants it.

A year ago this autumn shortly before his death, John F. Kennedy offered us all a prescription for responsible leadership in the years that lie ahead. He said, "In a world full of frustrations and irritations America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason."

Today more than ever this good counsel rings true.

America's challenge is indeed to make the world safe for diversity in freedom. And we must reject the voices of frustration and irritation. We must make shine the lights of learning and of reason. And it is my considered judgment that we can do so, and that we will do so, and I think we will continue to do so under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson,

Thank you.

(Applause.)

Mr. Burnham. I would like to remind those here once more that Senator Humphrey will receive questions from you, but from only delegates to the convention.

(At this time, a question and answer period followed, which has been previously transcribed.)



news release

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

FOR P.M.'S RELEASE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1964

B-3838

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY
SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY
UPI EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS CONVENTION
WASHINGTON, D.C.
OCTOBER 7, 1964

The time has come to pause in this period of national referendum and to consider seriously the central questions of foreign policy at stake on November 3rd.

For nearly twenty years now, the Presidential candidates of both political parties have agreed on our fundamental national goals in our relations with other nations. They have agreed on the necessity for a strong national defense to deter aggression, responsible management of our awesome nuclear arsenal, unswerving support for the United Nations, Atlantic partnership, aid to developing countries, effective arms control agreements, and sensible steps to reduce tensions with the Communist world.

Republicans played a leading part in building this bipartisan consensus -- Henry L. Stimson, Wendell Wilkie, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, and Dwight D. Eisenhower. So have five Presidents, of both political parties.

The man we elect as President this November must understand the nature of this legacy and be committed to its continuation. In addition, he must clearly perceive the nature of the world in which he seeks to apply this bipartisan policy.

A man fit to conduct our foreign policy must understand that, although the United States is the world's most powerful nation, America is not omnipotent -- and that there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

more

A man fit to conduct our foreign policy must realize that, although we are well aware of the pernicious influence of world Communism, we face many problems abroad which would be with us today even if Marx and Lenin had never been born -- even if Communism were to vanish from the face of the earth.

He must perceive that the character of the Cold War has changed -- that we are moving from a period of simple bipolar confrontation between two superpowers into a period of greater diversity.

He must know that there are a myriad of international problems to which the use of force provides no answer.

He must understand that most other nations are composed of men and women who, if pressed to the ultimate choice, will choose -- like Americans -- to fight rather than surrender.

And he must realize that diplomacy by nuclear ultimatum is one sure path to war.

In the turbulent years since World War II, our nation has been blessed with men of such understanding in positions of national leadership. These men have hammered out the principles of the bipartisan consensus. Their achievements are everywhere: in America's strength, in the new resilience of free nations, in the triumph of diversity, and in the disarray of Communism.

What are the fundamentals of this bipartisan consensus? What are its most recent achievements, and what guidelines does it offer for the years that lie ahead?

A first principle is commitment to maintaining our nation's defenses.

In the past four years, we have vastly increased the superiority of U.S. strategic power over that of the Soviet Union. And we have responded with power and precision to each Communist probe of our intentions -- in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam, and in the Gulf of Tonkin.

more

We are today the strongest nation in the history of the world. We will take all necessary steps to remain so.

Yet strength alone is never enough. The stuff of strength is a raw substance to be put to use -- for evil purposes or for good, with recklessness or with restraint, toward deepening chaos and war or toward order and peace.

The vital key to our national security is responsibility in the use of strength: determination, wisdom, flexibility, restraint, and a clear sense of priorities. Our power is relative, not absolute. Our every action must meet the supreme test of responsibility.

A second principle is that of partnership with the developed nations of the Atlantic and Pacific communities.

The new Europe of today -- and the new Japan -- are living proof of the success of America's postwar foreign policy. But history does not stand still: success produces an entirely new spectrum of problems. The world has changed since 1949, when NATO was created. The time is coming for new solutions to these problems; and our European friends can be assured that within the great bipartisan tradition, America is ready to share as a full partner in these efforts. Our commitment to NATO is unshakeable.

In our relations with the new Europe, the problem of trade is fundamental. In the past two years, we have made an historic beginning in the Trade Expansion Act. If we can keep up our efforts to expand trade, negotiate, and break down the barriers, a new Atlantic economic unity is inevitable -- a unity which will further strengthen our mutual security and enrich our lives.

At the same time, we must also develop new ways to pool our Atlantic resources -- and those of Japan -- in an intensive effort to assist the developing continents. For we have a vital common stake in the peaceful evolution of these societies.

more

A third principle is that of communication with the Communist-ruled peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union -- of bridge-building in behalf of freedom.

In the past four years, the present administration has witnessed -- and has treated with care and prudence -- one of the greatest changes of modern history, a change that aids the cause of freedom -- the fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet empire.

Everywhere the forces of national independence are slowly but relentlessly eroding the old Communist unity. Everywhere the people of Communist states have a new sense of hope and possibility.

Under the past three Presidents, we have sought to encourage this thrust toward national diversity. We have opened windows of light, air, and hope to these people -- through cultural programs, educational exchanges, travel and trade. In Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself, we must and will do more to encourage this evolution towards increasing national freedom.

At the same time, we must understand that the new fragmentation of the Communist world presents us with dangers as well as opportunities. Especially in Asia, the Sino-Soviet rift removes the restraints on Peiping -- and increases the possibility of recklessness.

A fourth principle of bipartisanship relates to the priority placed on preserving unity and promoting social and economic progress in our own hemisphere.

In the past four years we have created the Alliance for Progress, an historic new partnership aimed at achieving economic and social justice for all people within a framework of free democratic government. Through the Organization of American States we have isolated Castro's Cuba and drastically curtailed his influence in the hemisphere.

A fifth principle of bipartisanship relates to the three-fifths of mankind who live in Asia, and Africa: our commitment to assist them in the difficult and complex tasks of nation-building.

Of all the revolutions of our time, none has altered the shape of the map more fundamentally than the march towards full nationhood in Asia and Africa. The thrust towards expanding economic opportunities, social justice, and individual dignity in those vast continents inspires our hopes and commands our sympathies.

Through deft American diplomacy, we have gradually learned how to ease and assist the process of nation-building in these vast areas. And we have simultaneously helped to prevent inroads through Communist subversion.

In the past four years, our instruments in this great struggle for peaceful development have been many: a reinvigorated Foreign Service, infused with skilled and energetic men and women who speak foreign languages, respect foreign cultures, and understand the vital importance of people in all walks of life, an aid program that stresses community development and the essential ingredient of self-help; creative use of our agricultural abundance through Food for Peace; and the excellence and compassion of America's youth in that most successful of foreign policy initiatives, the Peace Corps.

Those who view the developing nations as mere pawns in the Cold War struggle or as mirror images of America have no understanding of men or nations. We cannot and will not create obedient satellites among these peoples. But we can and will assist in the growth of well-rooted, viable nations seeking their own destiny in freedom -- in their own way, in allegiance to their own values and traditions.

Here again -- as in Europe -- the test of our success will be the strength of the independence that develops; and that means independence of Washington as well as Moscow, hard as some may find it to accept such independence. The test of our maturity will be our reaction to that independence.

more

A sixth principle is that of unswerving commitment to support for the United Nations.

In a complex, changing world the United Nations has time and again proven its unique value as an instrument for peace. It has become the primary forum where men and nations can daily reason together to avert catastrophe, a unique peace-keeping mechanism that has helped to blunt more than 13 different threats to the peace over the past 19 years.

The survival of the U. N. is dependent upon the financial responsibility of its members. We must press for payment from those who have failed to meet their obligations. And we will never permit those who default on their dues to cause the organization's

- more -

collapse. And we must do all in our power to strengthen the peace-keeping machinery of the U.N. -- realizing that a stable professional U.N. peace-keeping force is the preferred instrument for restoring peace when explosive local disputes erupt.

A final principle of bipartisanship is commitment to the pursuit of effective safeguarded arms control.

Mankind lives today under the ^{dark} shadow of a spiralling armaments race. One ~~fact~~ of our age is the proliferation of power and weapons. In the past such races have ended in war. Our obligation, as never before, is to break the ancient cycle.

Under this administration, as under its predecessors, we have relentlessly sought an answer to this human dilemma.

We have taken a first great step in the Test-Ban Treaty -- a treaty that was possible because both sides clearly benefitted from a lessening of atmospheric poisoning. We must take further steps. We must patiently press forward in our search for new areas of mutual agreement to reduce the threat of war.

In recent years we have moved to attain such agreements. We have joined with the Soviets on a resolution to prohibit the orbiting of nuclear weapons in outer space. And we established a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to lessen the chances of miscalcualtions which might lead to war.

Now such, my friends, is the record and shape of bipartisanship in our nation's foreign affairs.

Yet where do we find the Republican candidate for President in relation to this record? He is totally at odds with it -- for in spirit and in action he has drastically departed from the tradition of his party.

He has told us where he stands: he rejects foreign aid; he disdains negotiation; he dismisses the United Nations, he opposes our bridges to the people of the Communist nations; he terrifies our allies; and he condemns our efforts to end the armaments race.

Recall, for instance, the solid bipartisan backing for the nuclear Test Ban Treaty -- the support of President Eisenhower and 25 of 36 Republicans in the Senate. And recall, as well, the moving words of Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican Senate leader. "I want to take a first step, Mr. President," he said. "I am not a young man -- one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, he knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

HUMPHREY/first step."

Senator Goldwater knew what happened at Hiroshima. But he said "no" to the Test Ban. He refused to take a first step.

Yet his seeming callousness to this treaty is hardly surprising. For, astonishing as it may be, Senator Goldwater seems to believe that the escalation of international conflicts will bring peace. And in so believing, he has talked the language of nuclear irresponsibility.

Senator Goldwater blames his critics for making the control of nuclear weapons the central issue of this campaign.

Yet he is wrong on two counts:

First, it was he himself who injected the issue by his own demands for delegation of Presidential control. The injection of the issue has now been deplored by General Eisenhower. I agree with General Eisenhower that detailed discussion of the specifics of nuclear command and control should not be injected into the campaign.

And second, control of nuclear weapons is only part of a far larger issue: the qualities of mind and spirit required of a candidate for the Presidency if we are to protect our interests, advance freedom, and keep the peace in our tradition of bipartisanship.

Does Senator Goldwater have such qualities of mind and spirit? What value does he give to the rationality, wisdom, and restraint of his predecessors on matters of war and peace?

Let us quote to you a few of his most carefully considered ideas. They appear in the concluding chapter of his book The Conscience of a Conservative:

"A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective."

Or, "We must--ourselves--be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes."

Throughout, Goldwater declares that our main objective must be "not 'peace' but victory."

Or again, hear these more casual words from a newspaper interview in May, 1961:

"Someday, I am convinced, there will either be a war or we'll be subjugated without war...real nuclear war.. I don't see how it can be avoided--perhaps five or ten years from now."

Now any man living in our nuclear age who calmly says that "victory" not peace is our objective, who often implies that war seems inevitable -- does not possess a firm sense of reality. In the words of my colleague, Senator Eugene McCarthy, such a man lives in a world in which the calendar has no years, in which the clock has no hands -- a world in which the pale horse of death is indistinguishable from the white horse of victory.

In his frantic impatience with the world as it is, Senator Goldwater wishes to back the Soviet Union into a corner where its only alternatives would be retreat or nuclear war. Indeed, one of Goldwater's main goals seems to be -- and again I quote him -- "to invite the Communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat." Senator Goldwater does not seem to realize that such juvenile games of nuclear "chicken" will eventually result in the annihilation of both players. Senator Goldwater does not yet realize that in our age of quick and total destruction, there is no such thing as quick and total victory.

No rational leadership can promise us speedy escape from problems which demand prolonged and costly effort for solution. All that can be honestly promised is what President Johnson has given us: unremitting, constructive work -- with hopeful advances but with the continued need for vigilance and dedication.

It is Republican nominee's predilection for the quick, easy solution, his penchant for diplomacy by ultimatum, that has impelled many long-time Republican newspapers to repudiate Senator Goldwater. Typical of such repudiation were the words of two editorials from the New York HERALD TRIBUNE last weekend, in announcing its support for President Johnson:

Senator Goldwater "has shown himself, in sum, a poor risk for the most personal and most awesome of a President's responsibilities, the conduct of foreign relations in an age when survival may, in crisis, depend on his judgment -- and his judgment alone."

".. To entrust America's future...to the vague negativisms of the Goldwater campaign would truly be a leap in the dark. It is a leap thoughtful Americans could not contemplate without a shudder."

My friends this is a leap which Americans need not take. Our country is led today by a man of prudence and compassion, a man fully conscious of his responsibility to use our awesome power with reason and restraint a man fully aware of the world as it is.

A year ago this autumn, shortly before his death, John F. Kennedy offered us all a prescription for responsible leadership in the years that lie ahead:

"In a world full of frustrations and irritations," he said, "America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason."

Today more than ever this good counsel rings true.

America's challenge is indeed to make the world safe for diversity in freedom. Let us reject the voices of frustration and irritation. Let us make shine the lights of learning and of reason. We can do so -- and we will do so -- under the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson.

2194
4744

Address by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

UPI Editors and Publishers Convention

Washington, D.C.

October 7, 1964

L The time has come ~~to come~~ in this period of national referendum ~~and~~ to consider seriously the central questions of foreign policy ^{which are} at stake on November 3rd.

L For nearly twenty years ~~now~~, the Presidential candidates of both political parties have agreed on our fundamental national goals in ^{Foreign Policy} ~~our relations with~~ ~~other nations~~. They have agreed on the necessity for a strong national defense to deter aggression, responsible management of our awesome nuclear arsenal, unswerving support for the United Nations, Atlantic partnership, aid to developing countries, effective

arms control agreements, and sensible steps to reduce tensions with the Communist world.

Republicans played a leading part in building this bipartisan consensus -- Henry L. Stimson, Wendell Wilkie, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, and Dwight D. Eisenhower. So have five Presidents, of both political parties.

The man we elect as President this November must understand the nature of this legacy and be committed to its continuation. In addition, he must clearly perceive the nature of the world in which he seeks to apply this bipartisan policy.

~~A man fit to conduct our foreign policy must understand that, although the United States is the~~
He must understand that although
world's most powerful nation, America is not omnipotent -- and that there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

The next President of the U.S. must
~~A man fit to conduct our foreign policy must~~
~~realize that, although we are well aware of the~~
being fully aware of
pernicious influence of world Communism, *he must realize*

that many problems abroad ~~which~~ would be with us today

even if Marx and Lenin had never been born -- even
if Communism were to vanish from the face of the
earth.

He must perceive that the character of the Cold
War has changed -- that we are moving from a period
of simple bipolar confrontation between two super-
powers into a period of greater diversity.

He must know that there are a myriad of inter-
national problems to which the use of force provides
no answer.

that
He must understand/most ~~other~~ nations ~~are~~
~~composed of men and women~~ who, if pressed to the

ultimate choice, will choose -- like Americans -- to fight rather than surrender.

And he must realize that diplomacy by nuclear ultimatum is *a dangerous course and could be* ~~the~~ path to war.

In the turbulent years since World War II, our nation has been blessed with men of such understanding in positions of national leadership. These men have hammered out the principles of the bipartisan consensus. Their achievements are everywhere; in America's strength, in the new resilience of free nations, in the triumph of diversity, and in the disarray of Communism.

What are the fundamentals of this bipartisan consensus? What are its most recent achievements, and what guidelines does it offer for the years that lie ahead?

A first principle is commitment to maintaining our nation's defenses.

In recent years ^{5 -}

~~In the past four years~~ we have vastly

increased the superiority of U.S. strategic power over that of the Soviet Union. And we have responded with power and precision to each Communist probe of our intentions -- in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam, and in the Gulf of Tonkin.

↳ We are today the strongest nation in the history of the world. We will take all necessary steps to remain so.

↳ ^{military} Yet [^] strength alone is never enough. The stuff of strength is a raw substance to be put to use -- for evil purposes or for good with recklessness or with restraint, towards deepening chaos and war or towards order and peace.

↳ The vital key to our national security is responsibility in the use of strength: determination, wisdom, flexibility, restraint, and a clear sense of

priorities. Our power is relative, not absolute. *and*

Our every action must meet the supreme test of responsibility,

A second principle is that of partnership with the developed nations of the Atlantic and Pacific communities.

The new Europe ~~country~~ -- and the new Japan -- are living proof of the success of America's postwar ~~foreign~~ policy. But history does not stand still; success produces an entirely new spectrum of problems.

The world has changed since 1949, when NATO was created.

The time is coming for new solutions to these problems and our European friends can be assured that within the great bipartisan tradition, America is ready to share as a full partner in these efforts. Our commitment to NATO is unshakeable.

and In our relations with the new Europe, the problem of trade is fundamental. In the past two

years, we have made an historic beginning in the

Trade Expansion Act. If we can keep up our efforts

to expand trade, negotiate, and break down the

barriers, a new Atlantic economic unity is inevitable --

✓ a unity which will further strengthen our mutual

security and enrich our lives.

This is our goal.

✓ At the same time, we must also develop new

ways to pool our Atlantic resources -- and those of

Japan -- in an intensive effort to assist the de-

veloping continents. For we have a vital common

stake in the peaceful evolution of these societies.

✓ A third principle is that of communication with

the Communist-ruled peoples of Eastern Europe and the

Soviet Union -- of bridge-building in behalf of

freedom.

✓ In the past four years, the present Administration

has witnessed -- and has treated with care and

prudence -- one of the greatest changes of modern

history, a change that aids the cause of freedom ~~---~~

the fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet empire.

↳ Everywhere the forces of national independence are slowly but relentlessly eroding the old Communist unity. Everywhere the people ^{living under} ~~in~~ Communist ^{regimes} ~~states~~ have a new sense of hope and possibility.

↳ Under the past three Presidents, we have sought to encourage this thrust toward national diversity.

↳ We have opened windows of light, air, and hope to these people -- through cultural programs, educational exchanges, travel and trade. In Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself, we must and will do more to encourage this evolution towards increasing national freedom.

↳ At the same time, we must understand that the new fragmentation of the Communist world presents us with dangers as well as opportunities. Especially

in Asia, the Sino-Soviet rift removes the restraints
on Peiping -- and increases the possibility of
recklessness *and war.*

↳ A fourth principle of bipartisanship relates to
the priority placed on preserving unity and promoting
social and economic progress in our own hemisphere.

~~In the past four years~~ *We* have created the Alliance
for Progress, an historic new partnership aimed at
achieving economic and social justice for all people
within a framework of *constitutional* ~~free democratic~~ government.

↳ Through the Organization of American States we have
isolated Castro's Cuba and drastically curtailed his
influence in the hemisphere.

↳ A fifth principle of bipartisanship relates to
the three-fifths of mankind who live in Asia, and
Africa: our commitment to assist them in the difficult
and complex tasks of nation-building.

Of all the revolutions of our time, none has altered the shape of the map more fundamentally than the march towards full nationhood in Asia and Africa.

The thrust towards expanding economic opportunities, social justice, and individual dignity in those vast continents inspires our hopes and commands our sympathies.

Through deft American diplomacy, we have gradually learned how to ease and assist the process of nation-building in these vast areas. And we have simultaneously helped to prevent inroads through Communist subversion.

~~In the past four years,~~ Our instruments in this great struggle for peaceful development have been many: a reinvigorated Foreign Service, infused with skilled and energetic men and women who speak foreign languages, respect foreign cultures, and understand the vital

importance of people in all walks of life; a Foreign Aid
program that stresses community development and the
essential ingredient of self-help; ^{the} creative use of our
agricultural abundance through Food for Peace; and the
excellence and compassion of America's youth in that
most successful of foreign policy initiatives, the
Peace Corps.

Those who view the developing nations as mere
pawns in the Cold War struggle or as mirror images of
America have no understanding of men or nations. We
cannot and will not create obedient satellites among
these peoples. But we can and will assist in the growth
of well-rooted, viable nations seeking their own destiny
in freedom -- in their own way, in allegiance to their
own values and traditions.

Here again -- as in Europe -- the test of our
success will be the strength of the independence that
develops; and that means independence of Washington

as well as Moscow, hard as some may find it to accept such independence. The test of our maturity will be our reaction to that independence.

A sixth principle is that of unswerving commitment ^{and} to support for the United Nations.

In a complex, changing world the United Nations has time and again proven its unique value as an instrument for peace. It has become the primary forum where men and nations can daily reason together to avert catastrophe ^{It is} an a unique peace-keeping mechanism that has helped to blunt more than 13 different threats to the peace over the past 19 years.

↳ The survival of the U.N. is dependent upon the financial responsibility of its members. We must press for payment from those who have failed to meet their obligations. And we will never permit those who default on their dues to cause the organization's

collapse. And we must do all in our power to
strengthen the peace-keeping machinery of the U.N. --
realizing that a stable professional U.N. peace-
keeping force is the preferred instrument for restoring
peace when explosive local disputes erupt.

✓ A final principle of bipartisanship is commitment
to the pursuit of effective, safeguarded arms control.

✓ Mankind lives today under the dark shadow of
a spiralling armaments race. One fact of our age is
the proliferation of power and weapons. In the past
such races have ended in war. Our obligation, as
never before, is to break the ancient cycle.

✓ Under this Administration, as under its prede-
cessors, we have relentlessly sought an answer to this
human dilemma.

✓ We have taken a first great step in the ^{Nuclear} Test Ban

Treaty. -- [a treaty that was possible because both sides clearly benefited from a lessening of atmospheric poisoning] We must take further steps. We must patiently press forward in our search for new areas of mutual agreement to reduce the threat of war.

↳ In recent years we have moved to attain such agreements. We have joined with the Soviets ^{in the U.N.} on a resolution to prohibit the orbiting of nuclear weapons in outer space. And we established a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to lessen the chances of miscalculation which might lead to war.

↳ ^{This} Now such, my friends, is the record and shape of bipartisanship in our nation's foreign affairs.

↳ Yet where do we find the Republican candidate for President in relation to this record? He is totally at odds with it -- for in spirit and in action he has drastically departed from the tradition of his

party.

 L He has told us where he stands: he rejects
foreign aid; he disdains negotiation; he dismisses
the United Nations; he opposes our bridges to the
people of the Communist nations; he terrifies our
partners and allies; and he condemns our efforts to
end the armaments race.

Recall, for instance, the solid bipartisan backing for the nuclear test ban treaty -- the support of President Eisenhower and 25 of 33 Republicans in the Senate. And recall, as well, the moving words of Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican Senate Leader. "I want to take a first step, Mr. President," he said. "I am not a young man -- One of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, he knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

Senator Goldwater knew what happened at Hiroshima. But he said "no" to the Test Ban. He refused to take a first step.

Yet his seeming callousness to this Treaty is hardly surprising. For, astonishing as it may be, Senator Goldwater seems to believe that the escalation

of international conflicts will bring peace. And in so believing, he has talked the language of nuclear irresponsibility.

↳ Senator Goldwater blames his critics for making the control of nuclear weapons the central issue of this campaign.

↳ Yet he is wrong on two counts:

First, it was he himself who injected the issue by his own demands for delegation of Presidential control. The injection of the issue has now been deplored by General Eisenhower. I agree with General Eisenhower that detailed discussion of the specifics of nuclear command and control should not be injected into the campaign.

↳ And second, control of nuclear weapons is only part of a far larger issue, *namely!* the qualities of mind and spirit required of a candidate for the Presidency if we are to protect our interests, advance freedom, and keep the peace.

in our tradition of bipartisanship.

Does Senator Goldwater have such qualities of mind and spirit? What value does he give to the rationality, wisdom, and restraint of his predecessors on matters of war and peace?

Let us quote to you a few of his most carefully considered ideas. They appear in the concluding chapter of his book The Conscience of a Conservative:

"A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective."

Or, "We must -- ourselves -- be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes."

Throughout, Goldwater declares that our main

objective must be "not 'peace' but victory."

Or again, hear these more casual words from
a newspaper interview in May 1961:

"Someday, I am convinced, there will
either be a war or we'll be subjugated without
war...real nuclear war... I don't see how it
can be avoided -- perhaps five or ten years
from now."

Now any man living in our nuclear age who calmly
says that "victory" not peace is our objective, who
often implies that war seems inevitable -- does not
possess a firm sense of reality. In the words of
my colleague, Senator Eugene McCarthy, **S**uch a man
lives in a world in which the calendar

has no years, in which the clock has no hands -- a
world in which the pale horse of death is indis-
tinguishable from the white horse of victory.

↳ In his ~~frantic~~ impatience with the world as it
is, Senator Goldwater wishes to back the Soviet
Union into a corner where its only alternatives would
be retreat or nuclear war. Indeed, one of ^{Sen} Goldwater's
main goals seems to be -- and again I quote him --
"to invite the Communist leaders to choose between
total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting a
local defeat." Senator Goldwater does not seem to
realize that such ^{dangerous} ~~jeopardy~~ games of nuclear "chicken"
will eventually result in the annihilation of both
players. ^{The Senator} ~~Senator Goldwater~~ does not ^{seem to} ~~yet~~ realize
that in our age of quick and total destruction, there
is no such thing as quick and total victory.

↳ No rational leadership can promise us speedy

escape from problems which demand prolonged and costly

effort for solution. All that can be honestly pro-

mised is what President ^{Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and} Johnson ~~has~~ given us:

unremitting, constructive work -- with hopeful advances
but with the continued need for vigilance and dedication.

↳ It is the Republican nominee's predilection for
the quick, easy solution, his penchant for diplomacy

by ultimatum, that has impelled many long-time ~~Repub~~

Republican newspapers to ^{repudiate him} ~~repudiate Senator Goldwater~~

↳ Typical of such repudiation were the words of two
editorials from the New York HERALD TRIBUNE last week-
end, in announcing its support for President Johnson:

↳ Senator Goldwater "has shown himself, in
sum, a poor risk for the most personal and most
awesome of a President's responsibilities, the conduct
of foreign relations in an age when survival may, in
crisis, depend on his judgment -- and his judgment
alone."

"...To entrust America's future ... to the vague negativisms of the Goldwater campaign would truly be a leap in the dark. It is a leap thoughtful Americans could not contemplate without a shudder."

L And
~~My friends,~~ this is a leap which Americans need not take. Our country *does have a President of* ~~is led today by a man of~~ prudence and compassion, a man fully conscious of his responsibility to use our awesome power with reason and restraint, a man fully aware of the world as it is.

A year ago this autumn, shortly before his death, John F. Kennedy offered us all a prescription for responsible leadership in the years that lie ahead.

L "In a world full of frustrations and irritations," he said, "America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason."

Today more than ever this good counsel rings true.

America's challenge is indeed to make the

Insert - p. 22

Gentlemen: I believe that the New York
HERALD TRIBUNE has reached a conclusion shared
by most Americans: that Senator Goldwater is
just not qualified to be President of the United
States.

world safe for diversity in freedom. ~~Let us~~ ^{*we must*} reject

the voices of frustration and irritation. ~~Let us~~ ^{*we must*}

make shine the lights of learning and of reason. We

can do so -- and we will do so -- under the leadership

of Lyndon B. Johnson.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOLLOWING ADDRESS
TO UPI EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS, 1964
CONFERENCE, STATLER HILTON HOTEL,
WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER 7, 1964

Q Senator Humphrey, we hear it said occasionally and we read occasionally that we are losing the war in Viet Nam, would you comment on this?

Senator Humphrey. There is no more serious problem facing our country today in terms of actual confrontation with Communist forces than in Southeast Asia. Surely the problem in Viet Nam is a very fundamental part of that whole Communist thrust in all of the Southeast Asian sector.

I would like to say first the policy that we are pursuing in Southeast Asia is one that was initiated in 1954. I reviewed this at some length here not long ago at a meeting in Los Angeles before the Town Hall. Our efforts were stepped up after 1959 because of the infiltration of Communist forces from Viet Minh. It is our view, the view not only of our country but of others, that the North Viet Nam economy was very shaky, was not doing well, that South Viet Nam was doing well, and, therefore, a program of terror and subversion and assassination and guerrilla warfare tactics was launched by the Viet Cong backed by the Viet Minh.

By 1961 this had reached rather staggering proportions, and the Government of South Viet Nam asked us for continued and expanded help, both economic and military, and we have placed in South Viet Nam to shorten this answer, about 18,000, I believe the present figure is, that may be 1,000 more or less, American forces that are essentially advisers and are working with the South Viet Namese military forces as well as their governmental structure to strengthen the South Viet Nam resistance, to the Communist forces.

I do not see any early victory, but I want to make it quite clear that I think to pull out under the conditions which presently exist would be a defeat. I think its repercussions would be unbelievably bad throughout all of Asia and Africa. I think we are being sorely tested in this far away place. We didn't select it, but we need to understand that the Communist force is an international force and it cannot be met just where we choose to meet it. We have to meet it every place, with different means, and different instrumentalities, under different conditions.

I don't think we are going to lose it. If we have the perseverance.

(more)

UPI 1964 CONFERENCE
Washington, D. C.
October 7, 1964

I believe that President Johnson has indicated the determination of our country in the two instances of the Gulf of Tonkin, where we have repelled attack, where we have taken defensive action against the nests of the P-T boats, and where we have made it crystal clear that we are going to maintain freedom of the seas and that is what this issue is about in the Gulf of Tonkin, the first time that the American government permits an enemy force to attack our shipping at will in the high seas is the day that a policy of America of 175 years has been repudiated and lost.

And we have no intention as a naval power to permit this issue of freedom of the seas and the use of international waters to be curtailed or to be destroyed by Communist forces or Communist aggression.

I am hopeful that this war will not have to be extended. There are no plans of this Administration to do so. But this Administration is committed to the firm resistance and the effective resistance of Communist infiltration, subversion and aggression in South Viet Nam. Once we have been able to restore some reasonable balance, where South Viet Nam is safe and where its independence and territorial integrity is protected, then and only then are negotiations such as have been suggested by others desirable or even, I would say, plausible or acceptable.

So, if people want an easy answer, they can pull out. If they want a frightening one they can extend the war. If they want one that deals with the realities of Communist power, which is not to blow the world to pieces but to pick it up piece by piece, they will resist, and resist as we are doing, in cooperation with the South Viet Namese. It is their struggle. We are backing them. It is not basically our struggle, it is theirs. But we are assisting them and we ought to make it crystal clear that when a people have the courage to fight for their independence, a duly-constituted government, that we are going to, if we have an agreement with them, and an alliance with them, and an understanding that we will back them. So, we may be at it a long time. I don't see an early solution.

Q Senator --

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir.

Q Yesterday Senator Goldwater said here as an illustra-

UPI 1964 CONFERENCE
Washington, D.C.
October 7, 1964

tion of administrative weakness that we sold wheat to Russia on Russia's terms and got nothing in return for it.

Would you care to comment?

Senator Humphrey. Well, of course, that just demonstrates that Mr. Goldwater hasn't been doing his homework.

(Laughter.)

We have sold some wheat to Russia and we have not had to use any credits. We have been paid for it. What is more is other people are selling wheat to Russia, and the world's wheat supply is one supply. The Canadians are selling wheat to Russia, the Australians are selling wheat to Russia, the Argentinians would have if they had had any surplus, the French have sold some wheat to Russia, the Germans transshipped some wheat to Russia that we sold to them. Apparently the Senator from Arizona doesn't think there is anything wrong in the United States selling wheat to Germany and then having Germany sell it to Russia.

Well, if you are going to have any middleman why not have a good American middleman, let him make some money.

Now, the truth is we are selling this wheat at world prices, and world prices are the only prices that you can get for wheat. We are not in a position of having the only market of wheat, and the only supply. Our Canadian friends, by the way, are going ahead and expanding their wheat production while we are asking our wheat farmers to limit our wheat production.

I would add also that Mr. Goldwater's statements fly in the face of the action of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the major farm organizations of our country, the leading spokesmen of American Commerce and industry, and I don't think they are all appeasers, in fact, I haven't found any of them; I know they are not soft on communism.

(Laughter.)

They may be a little soft on keeping the American economy thriving and I would say as one old South Dakota farmer put it that it is not too bad to sell Russians anything that they can't shoot back at you. In other words, if they are going to

UPI 1964 CONFERENCE
Washington, D. C.
October 7, 1964

use their hard currency, which they are using, their gold bullion which they are using, to purchase soft goods, such as wheat, a perishable edible commodity and we have that wheat which we are having to store, and we are having to ask our farmers to reduce their production, it seems to me that in light of the present trading conditions in the world with the Canadians and the French and the Germans and the Argentinians and the Australians and others that our position of sales behind the Iron Curtain of foodstuffs is a sensible position.

What is more is, the Russians are not going to -- the system is not going to fall apart because they didn't get some wheat from the United States, I think Mr. Goldwater had better re-examine what has happened in the Soviet Union. If they don't get it here they will get it some place else. I am not saying we should sell all of it but the whole matter of trade policy with eastern Europe is one which needs the careful analysis of American businessmen and American political leaders so that we get a sensible policy in cooperation with our allies.

Q Senator Humphrey, yesterday they had a lot of fun with me here because we were talking about computer operations and electronic devices, and I complained that on my small newspaper I found it impossible to buy just an ordinary cash register. Everything was too elaborate. Now, this is not an embarrassing question I am going to ask you, but it is fiscal.

Senator Goldwater didn't mention this and neither have you, and I haven't seen much about it anywhere through the campaign, but it is one that concerns me and that is this: the national debt is something in the neighborhood of \$300 billion, it is going up six, seven or eight billion a year, and nobody whom I have heard expresses any concern or has a solution to that.

I feel that cannot go on indefinitely, and, sincerely, what is the ultimate solution to balancing the Federal budget or is it necessary?

Senator Humphrey. I shall get to your question. May I just say first of all, that since World War II, the percentage increase in the national debt has been so -- has been very slight as compared to the debt of Iowa or Minnesota or South Dakota or New York.

It is state and local government that have really added

UPI 1964 CONFERENCE
Washington, D. C.
October 7, 1964

the expenditures; it is state and local government that have really added on the extra personnel. This is something, by the way, which for some reason or another you gentlemen don't write about or don't want to write about. It is a fact we ought to understand. I am not complaining about it but it is just a simple fact. You simply can't build more highways and have a simple increase of population, your school population just burgeoning, growing by leaps and bounds without more teachers and without more schools and you can't have more automobiles without more roads, and when you do this it costs more money.

Of course, in most instances in state and local government they put it off over in a bond issue and then they have a program of 20 or 15 or 35 years or so of amortization and they don't call it a debt.

But in the government of the United States we just put it all in one great big package and we call it a debt that apparently has to be paid off tomorrow.

Now, of course, that isn't the way you operate a business or a government.

Now, I do think that one should be concerned about the rise of national debt and I know of no responsible person that isn't. But there are many ways to meet it. As a matter of fact, I think we have demonstrated this year that by a reduction in the tax rates and by an acceleration of the economy we will possibly have less of a deficit this year than we would have had if we kept the tax rates up.

The answer, it seems to me, is frugality in government, to the best of our ability, and also to increase the gross national product, which means that you have a larger amount of money, not a larger share, but a larger amount of money coming into the Federal coffers, into the Federal Treasury. The debt today as related to per capita income is much less today than it was in 1940, much less today than it was in 1950, and everything is somewhat relative.

For example, a businessman has an income, let's say that he is a retailer, he has an income of, a gross income of \$250,000 a year. He has a debt of \$50,000. If he gets that income up to \$500,000 a year and has a debt of \$75,000, he is not worse off, he is better off. His debt has gone up, but he is a whole

UPI 1964 CONFERENCE
Washington, D. C.
October 7, 1964

lot better off.

Now, every major corporation that I know today that is really successful has a greater debt, that is in terms of its bonded indebtedness or of its borrowings than it had some time ago mainly because it has a higher velocity of trade. I was talking to one of the grain dealers in my city of Minneapolis not long ago, they are borrowing much more money than they used to but they are much richer than they were. They make money by borrowing it.

So, the Federal government's debt, I think must be considered relatively, sir, without trying to underestimate it and when one says this he is generally accused of being unconcerned about debt. Not at all. Let me be exceedingly frank with you. If you have got a mortgage of your house at \$10,000 and an income of fifteen you are in trouble. If you have got a mortgage on your house of \$15,000 and an income of \$35,000 you are not in very much trouble. Your mortgage is up, but so is your income, and the Government of the United States today has a much more viable productive economy from whence it draws its resources than it had ten years ago or twenty years ago or five years ago. In fact, our debt has gone up very little in the last four years, but our gross national product has gone up \$125 billion. Our debt hasn't gone up much more in the last two years than the increase in corporate profits in one year, ten billion dollars this last year. Not bad.

So, when you put it in terms of relativity or relationship, debt to income, debt to productivity, debt to investment, then I think we get a better focus on it. So, we have to keep it in hand and we hope that in the next two to three years we will be able to start to reduce that debt but then when we get to the problem of reducing it we have to be rather careful how rapidly because it would have some very deflationary effects.

Q: Senator, how can we explain to our readers that -- how can we explain to our readers that it is to our advantage to trade with Russia and yet it is not to our advantage to trade with Cuba or with China?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I think this is a matter of political policy, of political policy. The Soviet Union today is presently trading with a large number of the western European countries. I should start out by saying that you just have to face up to what is happening which frequently people do not want to face up to. West Germany, The Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, all of them are doing great big business with the Iron Curtain countries. In fact, while we are sitting over here arguing about it, they have trade missions in every one of these countries.

I have been to West Germany when they criticized us for even extending a little aid to Poland; and I am in Warsaw, and right out in front of the National Hotel in Warsaw are five cars from West Germany in there with a trade negotiation with the Polish government.

As long as they can keep us arguing about it and they do the business, they figure, "Well, isn't that great? That is good political grist for the American politician and public while we do the business." And the Deutschmark has very, very, very good convertibility.

Now, it is my view that the Soviet Union and the Eastern European States do not have the happiest of relationships and, therefore, for us to try to wean away some of the Eastern European States presently controlled by Communist regimes through a limited trade policy in non-strategic goods makes some sense. It is a calculated risk. I am not sure that it will work, but I am absolutely sure that to ignore the whole thing won't work because the rest of the world isn't going to ignore it.

Furthermore, I think that a few American businessmen going behind the Iron Curtain doing some dealing, making some trade arrangements might be the best advertisement we have for American capitalism. What are we so frightened about? Why do you permit to have American embassies and ministries behind the Iron Curtain with the foreign service that many people criticize us for being inept and not very practical, and yet being unwilling to let the most practical, successful, hard-hitting, thoroughly realistic people, according to our own definitions that we have, namely the American business communities,

go behind the Iron Curtain and do some business. I think it would be a sensible, reasonable arrangement if we could put it within guidelines that are agreed upon amongst our allies and ourselves.

Now, as to Cuba. Cuba represents a source of militant infiltration in Latin America. We have been able to curb much of that. Cuba also has a psychological impact in this country that other Communist regimes have not had, and Cuba is a threat to Venezuela, to Central America, it is a threat to each of these countries politically, not militarily as such because if it moves militarily it will be stopped cold. But politically, and ideologically. So we have sought by economic restraint and by the limitation of goods to Cuba, by working with our allies in the Organization of American States to strangle or at least to slow down the Cuban economy, and thereby hopefully to change the situation in Cuba and if we can't do that to isolate it.

Furthermore, to prevent the infiltration of Cuban infiltrators, Communist agents within the Latin American sphere.

I think our policy with Cuba has been rather successful. The OAS recent meeting has proven that.

As far as Communist China is concerned, they haven't sought to trade with us. They are aggressive, they are irresponsible, they are war-like, and I do not believe that they have demonstrated any fitness to be a dues-paying member of the family of nations, and I don't think that we ought to try to encourage them or strengthen them in any way.

Q: Senator Humphrey, --

Senator Humphrey. Yes?

Q: -- knowing your leadership in the Civil Rights fight, would you care to make any observations as to the extent of the so-called backlash among various ethnic groups in this country at this time?

Senator Humphrey: I am sure that there are many people in all walks of life from different ethnic origins that have mixed feelings about the relationships between the races. There are some people that frankly feel the Negro is going too fast, trying to gain too much in too short a time. There are others who feel he has been very patient, and had to wait for too long.

There are some people that just don't like colored people, and you have to face up to these realities. There are some people who just don't like their fellow white people.

(Laughter)

There are just some people who just don't like.

(Laughter)

Now, some places we run into people who just don't like people of other religions than their own.

I don't deny that there is some of what you would call the backlash in terms of the feeling, the emotional feeling, because of civil rights. I think it is more in the south, I might add, than any place else.

But to be specific, I think if you go into the areas of Gary, Indiana, and Milwaukee, or Buffalo, places that have been mentioned from time to time, or Chicago, that you will find that some of these groups that are known as ethnic groups while they may have some feelings about the civil rights issue they have other feelings that are overriding. In other words, they may not like what President Johnson did when he signed the Civil Rights Bill but they liked other things that he did a whole lot more, and they add it up, and they measure it off, and every indication that I have seen indicates that they are going to vote overwhelmingly for President Johnson in the traditionally democratic areas where the so-called backlash is supposed to prevail.

I don't think we ought to ignore it. I think it is a fact, and, therefore, it seems to me that what is needed today is both candidates for President, both of them saying that they are for law and order and saying it very loud, it seems to me they ought to indicate and promote respect for the law, because make no mistake about it, if Mr. Goldwater is elected President of the United States he is going to have to lift his hands and put his other hand on the Bible and say he is going to live up to the law. That he is going to enforce the law. That he is going to abide by the Constitution, that he is going to enforce the statutes, and he wouldn't be able to repeal the Civil Rights Act overnight. Congress never does anything that fast.

(Laughter)

So he has got a job, if that day should ever happen that

4 is indeed, to my way of thinking, a rather unlikely set of circumstances. But it might, it could.

I would, therefore, urge the two candidates for President, and I am sure that President Johnson has done this, I know I have, I know that Senator Ellender has, I know that Senator Russell has, these were men who fought against the Civil Rights Act -- they have asked that people abide by the law. They have asked people to work within the law, and they haven't gone out after the law was passed and said it stirs up bitterness and hostility and violence and tension, which is only a way of saying, "Sic em." I think we need today people who ask people to respect the law as they preach to us about law and order. That will help a little on the backlash, too.

Q: Senator Humphrey, talking about understanding reality, I suppose one of the most unrealistic things that confronts America today is our refusal to recognize the fact that today over 800 million people live behind the Bamboo Curtain. Why?

Senator Humphrey. This is a considered policy of our government around which there are many differences of view. The late John Foster Dulles, in one of his publications before he became Secretary of State, said that we ought to recognize the Communist regime of China, not because he thought Communism was good, but simply because it ought to be recognized just as the Mexicans and British generally recognize on the basis of the de facto regime.

It is my view that because of the large numbers of Chinese nationals in vast areas of southeast Asia, Malaysia, Vietnam, Indonesia, Thailand, and elsewhere, that if we, the United States of America, in light of their vicious attack that has been made upon us by the Chinese Communists both on the battlefield and through propaganda, if we were to recognize or in any way to condone or encourage recognition of Red China or acceptance of Red China into the UN as a member of the Security Council, for example, that we would be doing a great disservice to the cause for which we have given so much of our treasure and our efforts, the cause of freedom.

I know that there are 800 million behind the Iron Curtain. There are other contacts with Red China. The French, the British, and their contacts haven't been very fruitful. Therefore, I do not support realistically or not, I think I am being a realist. The realism, as I see it, is that to recognize Red China would be to encourage the Chinese in other countries to be more sympathetic to the Communist-oriented or socialist

oriented regimes, that it would only strengthen the hand of Communist China in its propaganda efforts, since we, the United States of America, are the major non-communist power, democratic power.

Also, I might add that at the present time with the fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet Bloc that it might be very wise and prudent diplomacy to have our relationships with the Soviet Union and to have them firm and reliable as we refuse to have open diplomatic relationships with Communist China.

I believe that there is some possibilities of a successful diplomacy in that posture.

Q: Senator, would you explain the background of the Americans for Democratic Action? I think some of these gentlemen would like to know the background as you have told it to me a time or two.

Senator Humphrey: Well, I have been reading a good deal about that little organization.

(Laughter)

It really has gotten out a lot of good publicity. I must say when I was active in it we tried to recruit members but we have never done as well as Senator Goldwater and Mr. Miller, they have given us more publicity and more interest in this organization than anybody ever, ever did.

Mr. Nixon came in a poor second on that.

The ADA was established, I believe, in 1947. It was established for one purpose primarily. Many of our -- you recall the election of 1946, you recall the Progressive Party, the candidate of that party was Mr. Wallace. I never did feel that Henry Wallace was a left-winger or a Communist, but I regret to say I think he was used. I know the kind of people that were in the Progressive Party manipulating it. Some of them were from my State.

I also know what happened to the Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota. I also know the leftist, the Communist infiltration from 1945 to 1948 in the Democratic Party, Democratic Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota, and anybody who lived in Minnesota knows what we had to do about it.

And I led the fight long before there were any others around that got this big fever about how we battled the Communists.

6 We had it out in my State. The labor movement was infiltrated. I went to see Mr. Philip Murray on the 11th day of May, 1947 in the William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh, and said to Mr. Murray, "I understand, sir, that you are a man of Roman Catholic faith." I had never met him. "I understand that you believe in good free trade unionism and I want to tell you something about your organization in Hennepin County, Minnesota, it is Communist-infiltrated. I am the Mayor of Minneapolis. I don't intend to have them run my city, any more than I intend to have the hoodlums or the gangsters run it. They are taking out after me, and I want you to know that I am going to take out after them. There can't be two people running Minneapolis, there can't be two groups in charge and what is more I don't like what they stand for, and it is about time that somebody called a halt to it. And I don't want to be branded anti-labor or a red-baiter because I am not. I am a friend of labor, honest labor unionism, and I think that I am a pretty good American, but I am going to wage war on these people."

Mr. Murray put his arms around me and said, "I have been waiting for a man like you for 10 years," and he said, "I am going to send two men to Minnesota, one of them Darrell Smith and the other Smiley Chatek," both of them living today, "and we are going to wage war right now on that organization," and we set to work to clean them up.

A little later the ADA came about. We had a meeting in Pittsburgh. There was a group known as the Union for Democratic Action first. What was its purpose? To work in liberal organizations to clean out the Communists, extreme leftwing influence, to bring in a number of people that were intellectuals, I maybe didn't qualify in that category, but to bring in people at least who were sound, progressive American liberals who could be for a housing program without being a Communist, who could be for fair employment practices without being a Communist, who could carry the liberal banner of American politics without being a Red, and we said we are going out and win, fight this war. And we went out in the labor movement, in the political parties, in many of the volunteer organizations in the country, and we cleaned them up. As a matter of fact, the ADA ought to be getting a medal, instead of the abuse that it has been getting.

Surely some members of the ADA are more liberal, more progressive than I am, many people in public life. I have disagreed with them many times. I disagree with them on the whole matter of Red China; they are more with Mr. Dulles. I disagreed with him on that. I don't think that makes

7 either Mr. Dulles or ADA Communists. I didn't think that made the man that asked the question one, either. It is a very thoughtful question.

ADA never believed in unilateral disarmament and those people who say so know it. It supports NATO, it supports SEATO, it supports our efforts in Cuba, it supports a strong military posture, it supports civil liberties, it supports civil rights, it supports Federal Government programs. It has a checklist of what programs it believes are good for America.

They generally add up being programs advocated by a Democratic President. I generally come out voting for most of those programs. I hope that I shall always have the privilege of not only voting for them but sponsoring some of them.

This organization represents an independent progressive group of people in American public life. Men like Reinhold Niebuhr, the great theologian, Bishop Scarlett, Wilson Wyatt, Leon Henderson was one of the early ones; men like George Meany, Walter Reuther, Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, Eugene McCarthy. I think these are all pretty decent responsible people.

You may not agree with some of their points of view. But to have an attack upon this organization as if it were a Marxist, Communist-oriented, socialistic organization is an insult to the intelligence of responsible, thoughtful Americans, and those who peddle that kind of trash have disqualified themselves, it seems to me, from public trust or public faith, and we intend to see that that happens.

(Applause)

stad

1s

1 fols
tad

Q Do you think the Democrats will carry all 50 states in this election?

Senator Humphrey. No, I don't. I doubt that we can do that. I think there are many very hard-fought battlegrounds yet in this election, and while I hope we will have a substantial victory, I sincerely doubt we would be able to fulfill the standard that you have just raised. I will bring that up to the President and may make him campaign a little harder. We may catch a couple of more.

Q Senator Humphrey --

Senator Humphrey. Yes.

Q -- it has been the policy of the Government that American newspapermen were not permitted to go to Red China because the United States would not accept an equal number of Chinese newspapermen coming over here.

Would you favor a change in that policy?

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir.

Q Thank you.

Senator Humphrey. I think it would be a good idea to have some good observations made and I am not afraid of anybody observing our country.

Q Senator Humphrey, maybe I am not updated, but why is President Johnson seemingly so reticent about jumping on Senator Goldwater for his inconsistency on the one hand of bemoaning violence in the streets in northern cities but not saying a thing about bombings and beatings and burnings in, for example, McComb, Mississippi?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I had the feeling that the President in his comments about Mr. Goldwater's statement was commenting about Mr. Goldwater's statement wherever they may apply. I think the question might be why is Mr. Goldwater more interested in talking about the violence in Harlem and a little less interested in talking about it in some other parts of the country.

The President comments upon the statement of the contender.

Frankly, the most reassuring thing I have seen is the tremendous acceptance and compliance with the law, with the Civil

Rights law. This is the first year in the history of America that every state in the Union has now made some effort towards desegregation of its schools. We have gone a long ways. I only wish that we can get people to understand that to break these patterns of habit, these long-established customs, is a major task and what we need today are people to inch along, so to speak, but keep moving along. We can't make a solid all at once breakthrough. I have learned in the Congress of the United States as one of the floor leaders that while you surely would like to go much further than you are apparently going to go, that the important thing is to get your foot off the brake and start making some progress.

Progress begets progress, paralysis begets paralysis, and retreat begets retreat.

So, Hubert Humphrey's point of view has been make some progress and come back for some more. It keeps you busy, too, and gives you something to do.

(Laughter.)

Not only that the other fellow sometimes doesn't feel so bad if he has to yield a little and you have time to condition him for the next jolt, do you see?

Q Senator Humphrey, yesterday Senator Goldwater said that President Johnson had been flying recently without his code clerk, his code clerk was in a plane 15 minutes behind him, and he implied this was a dangerous thing. Do you know anything about the alleged incident?

Senator Humphrey. I am sorry, I didn't quite get that.

Q Senator Goldwater yesterday said that President Johnson had made a flight recently but that his code clerk was not in the same plane with him -- this was a dangerous situation in case any message came through immediately.

Do you know anything about this?

Senator Humphrey. Gentlemen, I really don't. I am not trying to duck the issue. I guess I haven't had a chance to see the President enough lately. He has had me campaigning. You remember what he said in Atlantic City, he told all those good folks that everybody is going to go home and take a rest, but not Senator Humphrey, and believe me he has really given me the task. I don't know how I even got back to town today.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

RECEIVED



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