

SPEECH BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

TO THE DSG STAFF ROUNDTABLE LUNCHEON

JULY 22, 1966

Thank you. I suppose that all of you have heard your boss complain about you on occasion, and I've just given my friend Ted Van Dyke a going over as I came in here. I said, "This morning Bill Canell grabbed me out of my home and took me literally from the breakfast table; I never even got there and didn't have any breakfast." And I said, "Now you fix it up so I don't have any lunch. What are you doing for dinner?" But I think if I can spring away from the office tonight I'll maybe make it. But if that coffee comes, you put some sugar in it. I need some dextrose. My blood sugar is down and I'll sip on it.

I'm not at all sure just how it's best for us to proceed, but I've been told that I might take a few minutes of your time and we'll have whatever questions that you'd like to ask and from there on we'll just hope it comes out all right.

We're coming into a very vital period in the Congress of the United States, this, the Second Session. And I hope I need not tell you that the best thing to run on when you're up for re-election is your record. I know that I'm talking to people here today that helped make possible the good record for members of Congress. In fact, there isn't a single Senator or Congressman, President or Vice President or anyone else who can have that kind of a record unless he has good staff. And people that are deeply involved in the creation of that record as the principle. This leads me to say to

you that the programs that are before the respective houses of Congress are the platforms upon which we will have to stand and defend our case in the elections of 1966 in these coming months. And I hope that no one will feel any less enthusiasm for what we're trying to do now than what we did a year ago. This means we have to pass these programs.

Also it means that once we've passed them, we have to be proud of them. Not because they are the -----, the omega, not because they're perfection, but because they are better than we've had and better than the opposition has offered.

I've spent two and a half hours this morning, well, in fact I've spent the whole morning in consultation with different people in government and outside of our government. An hour and a half with a distinguished statesman of Japan, Mr. Takyo Mikki (?), former Foreign Minister, now Minister of Industry and Commerce, and old friend of mine who is here for the meeting of the OECD, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. This is an organization as you know of the more industrialized nations.

And then after I spent an hour and a half with Mr. Mikki, I spent a couple of hours with the representatives of our Office of Economic Opportunity, going over the whole program as it is now, as we hope it will be. I mention these two areas because one is domestic and one is foreign. In my visit with Mr. Nikki we talked about the things that have been happening that we don't read much about that are very very good.

We generally read about what the last battle in Vietnam is, and we sort of keep a running casualty list every morning on television. I've wondered whether or not a nation with our responsibilities can be an expert in current events and sort of keeping a morticians table and at the same time have any perspective on the world in which we live and the role of the United States in that world. Frankly, I doubt it. I doubt that you can develop a sense of constructive foreign policy if you are going to be in constant turmoil over the latest news flashes. It's sort of like checking on the health of your baby by taking the temperature, either orally or rectally, every hour. Pretty soon that child will be a wreck. I don't think that any mother who loved her child would ever do that. Also, a mother who knows anything about a child knows that temperatures do vary. Every one of them isn't necessarily a crisis. But we insist on every hour having the news. And the worse it is, the louder it comes through the radio or on the television. In fact, people hunt for the bad news.

Well, Mr. Mikki told me this morning about some of the good news. He told me, for example, that this November, in Tokyo they will have a meeting of all the agricultural ministers of the Southeast Asian countries. He said, "Mr. Vice President, since I've last seen you"--and I've been with him two times in Japan this year, I saw him last year when he was here with Prime Minister Sato--he said, "Since then we've had the economic conference in Tokyo of all the economic ministers of the Southeast Asian countries. We had the meeting in Seoul, Korea

of the nine Asian countries, Asian and Pacific countries, and organized the Asian and Pacific Council. We've had subcommittee meetings of these respective meetings. "We've made great progress," he said. "There's a new feeling of vitality in Asia. There's a reawakening." Then he went on to say how discouraged he was that in the meeting of DAC (?) or the OECD, that of all the countries that were there, only four delegates ever mentioned Asia. He said, "Why is that, Mr. Vice President, where half the population of the world lives, why is it that ministers from all over the developed areas of the world, primarily Europe and the western hemisphere, only four of them mentioned Asia. Two of those were from the United States, the Secretary of State and the Vice President."

And I said that this is one of the problems that we're having in the United States right now. We're a world power with a half-world commitment. We're a world power with about a third-world knowledge. Most everybody in the United States is sort of an expert on Europe, a few have some interest in Latin America, fewer in Africa, and fewer in Asia. This is part of our problem. This is why we have people that are today in America that will defend Berlin to the death, give every American all the resources of our country, pledge everything to it--and maybe we should, and we do, it is a commitment--but they can't quite see the relevance of a struggle in Asia.

And I said, "There's good news. You've brought me good news."

And he said, "the best news that Asia's had was the President's speech in West Virginia, at White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, when he pointed out that the United States was a member of the Pacific Community, and that the United States was involved in Asia, and that we looked upon Asia as a very vital part of the entire world order." He said, "This had more positive effect in Asia than anything that's happened in recent years."

Now I want to just tick off a few of the things--because I know all of you know all the bad news--I'll give you some of the good news:

Asians' initiatives by Asians.

Regional cooperation by Asians.

The Economic Conference in Tokyo.

The Political Conference in Soeul.

In Burma, Ne Win, the Prime Minister soon to be here in Washington. A year ago, Burma was a captive, for all practical purposes, of Communist China. The Prime Minister is now going to pay us a visit.

A year ago, war between India and Pakistan. Today, these two countries at least making a determined effort to settle their disputes amicably, to find their way to peaceful development.

A recognition in Asia at long last that the important thing is agricultural development, that industrial development will have to take a third priority and maybe a fourth: first agricultural development; second, infra-structure, which is ports, harbors, roads, etc.; third, light industry; and fourth, heavy industry. This is one of the best pieces of news, because this means there can be systematic development.

Indonesia, only a year ago literally a Communist Chinese satellite; today it's making its break for freedom. Yes, with violence, with bloodshed, but at least it is making a determined effort to stand on its own feet, soon to come back into the international community a member of the United Nations, hopefully, again and the International Monetary Fund.

It's making progress.

The new awakening in the Philippines under a new President, Ferdinand Marcos, an articulate, intelligent, strong voice in Asia.

The tremendous economic breakthrough in Korea and Thailand. Korea has had an economic growth in the last three years of over 8 per cent. It is on the verge of one of the most fantastic economic developments of any country in the world. And Taiwan is running 7 to 8 per cent and now extending foreign aid and no longer receiving it. These are a few of the developments.

Australia and New Zealand coming into the Pacific community and recognizing that they are no longer just members of the Commonwealth but are members of a larger order.

And the commitment of the United States to this area.

Now we could spend a lot of time on this, but I thought I'd just run through a few of them because there is some good news in the world. And if you have to look for it, the Scriptures say, "Seek ye the truth." You really have to look hard these days, you really have to seek it out. There's a lot of good news.

I heard some good news in the Poverty Program this morning. Let me tell you just a little that I heard.

Job Corps: The average income of 10 per cent of the enrollees in the Job Corps (had jobs before they came to the Job Corps some time in their life)--their average hourly wage was \$.80. Those same Job Corps graduates today that are coming out of the Job Corps have an hourly wage of \$1.71.

The retention rate of an enrollee in the Job Corps center is 71.7 per cent (____?). The retention rate of all students in high school is 68 per cent. So when you hear about Job Corps enrollees dropping out, remember that more of the middle income young people

drop out of high school than of the deprived young people dropping out of Job Corps. And every one that came into a Job Corps camp was a drop out before he got there.

Get the figures. 68% of all young people that enter high school as a sophomore from junior high school drop out. 68% remain, I should say. 32% drop out. 71.7% of the young people entering Job Corps remain, 28.3% drop out. Pretty good.

The rate now of employment of Job Corps enrollees is very high. Industry is picking up these young people. I wish that I could remember all of the facts that were just given to me just a little while ago and it isn't that everything is hunky-dory, it doesn't mean that everything is going beautifully. In some areas of America there are incidents that cause trouble. There are 106 some Job Corps camps around the country, both conservation and the camps near cities, and of those about 25 or 26 have had some troubles.

There have been over 75,000 enrollees come through Job Corps camps. (90 some thousand applicants that have been processed).

I think there's a good deal of good news, if you'll just look at it.

There are well over a hundred thousand people in the United States who had never before ever participated in a community decision that today are members of committees and advisory groups and decision groups deciding the future of their neighborhood and their community as a result of the War on Poverty. Literally hundreds of thousands, they say up to five million people's lives

have been affirmatively, constructively helped and touched in eighteen months of Job Corps activity -- not Job Corps but War on Poverty activity.

I mentioned to the officers that were over to brief me this morning--we went through the projections for five years ahead as well as what we're doing now--I said to them, I'm glad you're giving me some of this information because there's criticism in Congress that we haven't done well enough. But I want to tell you something. A friend of mine is a large stockholder in a large bank. He told me that in the first eighteen months of this huge bank they lost money, hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars. And at this nineteenth month they began to almost break even. They figure by the end of two years they can break even.

Now we haven't had two years of the Poverty Program yet, and we've made some progress. Now I tell you this because so many purists, so many perfectionists among us imperfect people these days--we have people who keep saying, well, we haven't done enough. I can only say this. We've done a whole lot more than anybody else has ever done. And if Einstein's Theory of Relativity is worthy of science, it is also worthy of social science. I saw the _____ budget figures today. As to what does your government put into the American economy to help poor people--farmers, workers, youth, Social Security payments, for elderly, for dependent children, etc., the total package this past year was \$24 billion. That's quite

a lot. Total amount, \$24 billion. That includes all the programs. Public housing programs, every kind of program that you can think of that goes to distressed areas, or to poor people, or to people of low incomes, or people under pensions or Social Security.

Now somebody's going to say, well, that isn't so much out of a \$740 billion economy, and it really isn't. But you know how much we put in two years ago? \$13 billion. So in the two years that the Congressmen that you have something to do with around here, you've almost doubled it. So when I hear somebody say we ought to do a lot more, I say, "Thank you, I agree." And we're going to, if you give us a chance. But in the mean time, I'd like to ask you what did you do, since you think we ought to do more, what did you do when you had your chance.

Or better yet, let's just take a positive look at it and say it is true that we ought to do better and we ought to have higher standards, we ought to want to do more, we ought to want to make this a bigger country, a better country, a more just country, a finer country, but we are making considerable progress. And I'll tell you something, my dear friends, you're here to work for your congressman and you're here to help us as Democrats (most of you, at least, I hope all of you). And you're here to help this administration. In doing so, we think you are going to help the country.

I don't think you're going to help your boss get re-elected by reminding everyone of the inadequacies of the Administration. The opposition will take care of that. They have that all mapped out. If you think you're proving yourself to be intelligent, and

objective, and noble and intellectual by trying to outdo them on criticism, then I must say I don't think you're working for the right person and you ought to resign.

The best thing that you can do is to try to point out what we're doing that is being done well. And then you go to your boss privately if you don't think things are being done too well, and tell him, look, I'd like to share a thought or two with you.

I'm Vice President of the United States. There may be sometimes that I might have a moment of disagreement with something that the Administration's doing. But if I had, or have, I'm surely not going to stand up here on the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial and say, "Gather ye, my friends around"...

I'm going to go talk to the people in the Administration that I ought to talk to inside the Administration and make my fight within there. Within the confines of the Administration.

And recognize that you never get everything you want, that after all, family life, community life, or national life is a series of adjustments and compromises and realignments. And once that a decision is made you have two choices, and only two: either to support it or have enough guts to go out and try to defeat it. Don't you go wobblin' around, you know, trying to straddle that old fence and pretend that you're really for it but you're not, and you ought to be but you aren't, and all of that nonsense. That doesn't prove that you're courageous--it proves you're confused.

There's another way of putting it: don't put poison in the Democratic well from which you are going to have to drink.

And finally, I would say that I don't think one proves himself to be courageous, progressive, or liberal by enjoying defeat.

Now let me explain that rather definitive statement. I know that I've heard many people say, "Well, I'd like to have gone along with that bill, but it didn't go far enough so I had to vote against it." Or, "I think the Administration has done pretty well, but they haven't done well enough, so I feel I simply have to criticize it." Now that doesn't make you an intellectual. And it doesn't make you a liberal. It doesn't even make you a conservative. Just as I said a moment ago, it just sort of makes everyone feel that somehow or another you don't really know what you want or what's going on. Or maybe that you want much more than anyone could possible do ever, and that you're setting yourself up as some sort of pinnacle of purity around which all folks should rally.

Really, there're others that qualify for that and don't try and crowd in on their jurisdiction.

I've been in Congress quite a while and I was one of those who would fight hard for what I thought was right. Real hard. And many, many times vote for what I knew was only half right. But half right was better than no right. And we'd inch along.

Franklin Roosevelt was considered to be the greatest liberal, progressive, radical President that we've ever had. And everything he did was just a beginning. Everything. His Social Security program would have been denounced today even by Barry Goldwater.

Franklin Roosevelt--all he did was just break through the inertia. He just barely got a little old start. Twenty cents an hour minimum wage. Coverage, practically nothing. Just a few, very few, workers. We've made fantastic progress. You've heard again and again. We've doubled the funds in aid to education in the last two years. We've more than doubled the amount of money in aid to health in the last two years. We've made real progress. And all I suggest to you is, if you'll stick with it, and if you'll remember this, that if your Congressman is a new Congressman, a first term Congressman, that what he needs more than anything else to do a real job for his constituency is re-election. That's what he really needs.

And I say that to you because it takes a little time, and a little experience and a little seniority around this place to be able to carry through some of the dreams and ideals that you have. And most of us have a lot of dreams and ideals. I've had many people say to me today, "well, where's the liberal program, Mr. Vice President. I can't understand what's happened to liberalism." I'll tell you what's happened to liberalism--it's in power. And that disturbs some liberals.

But it hasn't by any stretch of the imagination completed its assigned duty or its work. Medicare--a wonderful beginning. But you and I know we're going to have to improve hospitals and nursing homes and more doctors and medical technicians. There's a great job yet to be done. But we made the break.

Our programs about our cities--we're groping now. We're not quite sure what we're going to do. We're trying to get a demonstration

city bill out, and if you really want to dig your teeth into something, get that bill passed. Get our rent supplements passed, and our teacher corps passed. These are new liberal programs. This is a part of the new America. But much of what we've been fighting for for twenty-five years is now the law of the land. But like in the days of Franklin Roosevelt, it represents a beginning.

We're going to do much more in the field of education than we've done thus far. We're going to do much more in the field of medical research than we've done thus far. We've just begun to do something about the pollution of our lakes and our streams, just barely begun to do something about the pollution of our atmosphere. We're just now beginning to think in terms of metropolitan areas. We used to go around putting band-aids on cities, a little urban renewal here, a little public housing there. Now we know that we have to rebuild them. Not only physically, but in many other ways. An American city ought to be the finest manifestation of man's creativity. The city was the dream of primitive man to have his contact with culture. We ought to make these cities instead of cesspools, beautiful sparkling lakes of magnificence, and culture and education and commerce.

That's what the program's about in the future, and we're beginning to make it. We've got a Department of Housing and Urban Development. We've got some bills up here in Congress that we've been kicking around for months. And the task that we have is to pass those bills and frankly admit it's just the beginning.

It's just like my wife trapped me into building a house. Somebody said to me not long ago, "you know what a family house is?"

I said, "No."

He said, "Well, it's like yours. It's a series of patios enclosed."

You know how they do it fellows? They get you to get a house, then somebody says that we ought to screen the porch. And a little bit later, then we ought to enclose it. And after you have that they say, "Where is that screen porch we were going to have?" So then you have to go out and put some gravel in, take up a piece of the lawn, put a piece of screen around it, then Mom says, "You know, wouldn't it be nice if we could just have a vinyl floor there. We'll have to put in concrete or something, and then we'll put some vinyl in there or asphalt tile and then we could screen that in."

And the next thing you know, you've got a new room--several thousand dollars later. Now this is the way we build programs. A series of patios enclosed. So don't be depressed or in any way unhappy about the slowness of progress. I'm one of the most restless human beings in Washington but I see our country doing fantastic things. I don't think anyone else is doing a better job. All we need to do is have our own standards, our own ideas as to what we want to do, and then proceed directly to accomplish them.

All right--I just wanted to visit with you, now you must have some questions. You go ahead and toss them at me. Don't hesitate.

Speaker: Mr. Vice President, Perhaps in some cases it isn't too helpful when the Congressmen criticize the Administration, but what about the Administration criticizing Congress? This week, I think, the President called in some of the Appropriations Committee members and expressed concern that they were spending more money than the Administration had asked for. This created some difficulty back home for some of the Congressmen, so how would you suggest that a Congressman reply to this criticism from the Administration?

Humphrey: Just take it. (Laughter) I understand your concern. I think it can be said that what I was trying to refer to was that if we make it appear what we've done that is constructive to make it look like it was less than constructive, it doesn't help anybody. I could really show you that we ought to do a lot more in federal aid to education, but there's a limit to how much you can do at any one time out of a national economy as well as what the people can absorb, as what the school system can absorb, just merely what you can take and that's what I was trying to get at. I understand the concern that some Congressmen have had over the meeting there at the White House. The President feels very strongly that if five to six billions of dollars over his budget request are added to the Appropriations Bill, that it will have a very serious effect on the economy, inflationary-wise. And he is concerned about that. And he called in the Congressmen to ask them to see what they could do in both Houses of Congress to put some restraints on. He didn't say to do less than the Budget.

Now I've heard some of the boys around talking and I know a few of

them went out there and I can see them drooling saying "Well, now, we can go back and just raise the dickens with those Democrats and make them cut the budget." No. The President said, "Look, I want my budget, and I can take a little more." He didn't say less than the budget. So if your Republican friends say to you, "Well, now, we just ought to cut back. You heard what the President said." The President didn't say to cut the Poverty Program. He said, "I want at least what I asked for in the Poverty Program." The President didn't say to cut the school program. He said, "I want at least what I got in the school program." And he also said, look, he's been around Congress, he said, "I know that there are adjustments that can be made in the budget and will be made in the budget," but what he was saying to the Congress was, "Watch out. If you add an extra six billion dollars onto this budget, we are going to have to do one of two things: either have a massive deficit at the end of the next fiscal year, which has an inflationary impact of its own in a tight economy, or we're going to have to have a tax bill and do you want to have to vote on one of those before you go home?" (laughter) So that when you get off the train, they'll say, "Now what did you do for me?" And you say, "Well, I passed a tax bill." (laughter) I said train because I'm not sure that we'll be flying.

But your question is well put, sir, and I understand that there was some embarrassment, and I'm sure the President meant none. It was hopeful that that meeting would be looked upon as sort of an inside meeting, but it got a little outside, didn't it?

It's just like I noticed here. It said that everything is off the record. And I'm going to tell you that will be the first time that I've

ever experienced that....(laughter) All, right. Anybody else?

Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: What do you think of the move to transfer the Head Start Program from the Poverty Program over to the Office of Education? The Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare is voting to do that.

Humphrey: I think it ought to be in CAP. I think it has a good start there and that's also the Head Start program involves more than just the education area, it involves the whole community. I've said about the best thing about the Head Start Program -- amongst the better things -- is, number one, you've found the needy child. You're not only giving this child some educational attention, but some emotional attention, some health attention. And then the child. After you get that child into Head Start, the teachers finds out how poor a teacher he or she is and has to change teaching methods. And we've improved teaching techniques. Teachers at first they've recognized. They say that this is the greatest experience that they've had for improved teaching techniques and methods.

Then from there on, if you follow that child back from whence the child came, back to the neighborhood and the family, you get at the source of the problem. Because Project Head Start alone, even if you keep that child in school ten months or a year or eleven months, if that child has to return to the same abysmal surroundings with no change in that pattern of environment, Head Start will have limited effect.

So the best thing about the Head Start is that it ties in the social workers, the community. It ties in the social agency, the whole business of rehabilitation of individuals, adults and neighborhoods. That's why I think it properly -- at least it appears to me -- that it properly

belongs where it is presently located.

SPeaker: Mr. Vice President, apparently the long, hot summer is back in Chicago, Cleveland, Brooklyn, last night. The President, when he discussed the D.C. Home Rule Bill -- and many of us are concerned about that -- said that if we don't get such a bill this year, there may be long, hot summers here in Washington also. It's sort of a three-part question. What is the Administration going to do about home rule? Second, what are they going to do about the Morse amendment? And do you think that Home Rule has a chance this year in Washington?

Humphrey: I don't know that it has a chance, but it ought to have. And the Administration is solidly for the Home Rule and has supported and has passed the United States Senate, and it is my view that if Senator Morse adds his modified bill to the Higher Education Bill, that the Administration will be in full support of it.

I think we need Home Rule in the District of Columbia. I think it's a shame that we don't have Home Rule in the District of Columbia. I don't think you're going too -- people think you're going to have a better city without it. I believe they're wrong.

Now, may I add about the other cities. We have two or three developments here, as I see it, are very serious. The riots, the violence. These cannot be tolerated. We all know that. You have to use law enforcement agencies to stop that sort of pillaging, riot, violence and destruction of lives and property. You have to use police. You have to occasionally, even regrettably, call upon National Guard, because you cannot permit a social structure to be torn apart by lawlessness and violence. We just start there.

But, once having said that, you and I know that even though much of this violence may be created even by teenagers that get out of hand, some incident, and it is. And sometimes by plain hooligans. There are festering sores in these communities. Whorehouses, slums. I've been very outspoken about this and I'll continue to be, because I think that the greatest danger in America today is slumism. I think it's the "ism" that really is plaguing us right now. And by slumism, I don't mean just delapidated buildings, even though that's part of it, broken down neighborhoods, the physical structure. That certainly is a part of slumism.

I mean deprivation. I mean lack of education, lack of opportunity, lack of jobs, the vicious cycle of welfarism. You stay on, generation after generation. The feeling that you're not wanted, that there's no place for you, that you've been shoved around. And there's a growing hostility and bitterness. And all of this -- I put it in one word called slumism. And this can't all be corrected by just building new buildings, even though that would help. Or by opening up green areas, even though that would help. It's a whole process of rehabilitation, getting people to feel that they are something. The constant question: What am I? Who am I? And to be able to answer it in one's life, in his own heart and conscience.

We're seeing this in the sickness today. It's just broken out. As I said to a group not long ago: We cannot have, with modern communication, with television, radio and the press and publications and the mobility that we have today. You can't have a neighborhood over here that is affluent, and beautiful with parks, and the garbage collected, the houses nice, everything, the streets lighted, everything, and within a half a mile or less utter filth, broken down neighborhoods, you can't have two Americas -- you just

can't!

Now we broke down segregation in this country by law. We said that public law that required segregation was unconstitutional. We have said there is only one citizenship. Now I want to say to you we've got to say there's only one America. There can't be an America for the poor -- white or black. And by the way there are more poor whites than there are poor blacks. It isn't just racial -- unless you want to call it bi-racial and tri-racial; we have a lot of poor Indians and poor Mexican Americans and poor Puerto Ricans. You cannot have two Americas, the other America that President Johnson spoke about about a year ago at Howard University and my America where I live the good life.

And this is what's beginning to happen, just like in the world in which we live. I said here the other day that I was privileged to be your government spokesman before the OECE. This is a very important meeting and I'll be quite frank with you. I was very disappointed in the coverage of that meeting and disappointed with the coverage of my particular speech. Because I spoke for our government, not for Hubert Humphrey. The first thing that I said is the biggest threat to world peace is hunger and poverty and it is. More than any "ism." That's the greatest single threat to world peace, and as the gap widens between the rich nations and the poor, that threat continues. Thank goodness that Pope John XXIII said it so somebody will believe it. (laughter) He said that in a world of constant want there is not peace. And he went on to say that as this gap widens, the fabric of peace is torn more and more and it is!

Now it doesn't mean that all nations have slipped and haven't progressed. It means they haven't progressed as rapidly as other nations so that the

gap widens. The gap is widening in your America and my country -- your country. And it's widening in Chicago, and in Omaha, and in Minneapolis and in St. Paul and in New York and in Philadelphia and in Washington and in Pittsburgh and you name it -- every place -- Los Angeles. That gap widens. And we have to find some answers. Otherwise there'll be safety for no one.

So I have been receiving a little criticism of late for being rather outspoken on this subject. But I shall continue to be outspoken, because I think the very safety of this country's at stake. And I believe that it is very difficult for the United States to go preaching eternal verities around the world about what we ought to do about self help and how the poor ought to be helped and how we ought to help rebuild the world if you're not really going to prove you can do it here where we speak the same language and live in the same country. Most of the world is made up of colored people -- people that are non-Caucasian.

- 22 -

~~SECRET~~

Well, now, if the United States of America ~~with~~ the minority of non-Caucasians can't do something about them, what about the rest of the world that we're supposed to be helping? I have a very sincere feeling about the foreign policy and domestic policy are on e and inseparable. I think the greatest act of foreign policy in recent years was the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964. add that to the Peace Corps. These are the two greatest single foreign policy programs that we've had in recent years. Well, I don't want to get on ~~in~~ my favorite topic. I'm filled with this one. And I intend to keep at it until they throw me out of office. I want you to know that. (laughter and applause) Yes, sir.

Here on the Hill many of us are concerned about the plans to extend the West Front of the Capitol. Can you tell us why you support that effort?

H: Well, I think the West Front needs modernization and I think it is ~~a~~ seriously deteriorated. I know that if any other building in town were in this shape they would have had it closed up a long time ago. And that is a factual statement. It is a menace to life and limb the way it is right now and I don't know/~~if~~ ^{whether} they are letting anybody walkout there now these days or not, but if they are, they ought to be forewarned, because that building is off kilter as much as 6" and the Founding Fathers were delightful, wonderful men, but I've looked at some of the stuff that they poured in those walls. It must have been some conflict of interest back in those days (laughter) It will be modernized -- or I should say -- renovated -- and I must say that I haven't been quite as excited as some people have. I'm not at all sure that what the present plans are will be the final plans and I think it's surely ~~something~~ subject to some re-

evaluation and, most likely will have it. But I was around when we voted on the East Front. We argued long enough on the East Front, so we didn't get a garage, and if we were going to build that same garage we argued about in the Senate in the East Front it would cost twice as much now to build it as ^{it} ~~we~~ did then and we should have built it then, and I heard everybody say "Oh, don't. You'll do something to the Capitol. You'll ruin it if you put in the East Front." "The best thing that's happened to this Capitol since they built it was the East Front. (laughter). That's a fact; it's beautiful, marvelous. What's wrong with marble? It's better than limestone any day. Unless you're in the limestone business. (laughter). It's beautiful. Now I don't know. I'm not an architect. I don't know all about how far they ought to go and all that sort of business, but I know the architects are pretty much like Protestants, they don't much agree with each other. They really have a lot of different points of view. I do know that the ~~East~~ Front ought to be repaired. I don't think it would hurt if it had some nice marble. I don't think you'll destroy its historical significance. They repaired Westminster Abbey and didn't destroy it. It was ____; they had to repair it. I don't

believe that there's a need of more space and there will be a need. This is a growing country. And then I'll let you in on a secret. There has never been a public building in this town constructed that somebody wasn't against. You go around and take a look at the history. See what they said about the Supreme Court Building when they were building it? Why, I don't want to repeat it here. It's mixed ~~country~~ company. You remember what they said about Franklin Roosevelt and the Jefferson Memorial? It was unbelievable. "Why? How could they do that?" But they did it thank goodness. They were opposed to the Washington Monument. And what about Harry Truman's balcony? They went through two years of roaring about that. Now

I don't know whether this present one fits in that same category, but I do know that if there was any building in this town ~~that~~ ^{been} everybody agreed to, it's ~~the~~ ^{been} torn down long ago (laughter). When Mr. Hoover built all these buildings down Pennsylvania Avenue in his administration, they were opposed to those, too. This is a wonderful city for opposition. There are more fight promoters per square foot in this town (laughter). When I go out to Minnesota, everybody's kind of peaceful, nice, they like each other -- most of the time. And you can build a building out there and people really don't care too much. But I care about this Capitol. I love it. ~~xixix~~ It is our historical shrine. It is the people's government, and we don't want to alter it's basic design, nor do we want to change its basic plan, But I don't think you prove yourself a lover of history, just to let it fall down. I think you do have to make repairs and I think ^you ought to try to make it so that it's usable. And quite frankly, they ought to put some water ~~w~~ountains in. They didn't have water fountains back in John Adams' day, but I'm for them now and I think they're here to stay. (laughter, applause). And I've had a lot to say about this capital. I've thought about getting some flowers out around here for ^{us} ~~shilve~~. That was before Mrs. Johnson on beautification. Everett Dirkson took me out on that. I didn't know the difference between flowers and shrubs, but I knew there ought to be something outside besides dirt. I think there ought to be outside cafeterias, and cafes. Why should it only be in London and Paris? We ~~might~~ help build those all over the world, why not build one here? (laughter, applause). If you know where I stand on the West Front, you're better than I think you are. (applause, laughter). I'm for its improvement. Yes, sir.

- 25 -

Mr. Vice President: How do you best feel that the ^{traditional} ~~official~~ liberals, ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ can handle the ^{new} challenge of the left -- the third party challenge?

H: How do I feel that the ^{traditional} ~~original~~ liberal should handle the new challenge from the new left, I guess is what you're..

Speaker: / ⁱⁿ a third ^{firm} party..

H: A third party? Go right ahead and fight your battles out for what you believe, organize. One of the problems with most of us in politics is that when we see a new force coming up, we stand in amazement and wonder why it happened, instead of going out to ^e ~~d~~eat it. Get busy, organize. Stand your ground. Teach your programs. You're gonna have opposition. I'd just as soon have it from the new left as from the old right. We've always had it one way or another. I don't think it's really a very serious threat. Much of what's coming in from the so-called new left may very well find its way in modified, adjusted into the political, social, economic life of this nation.

~~And before I stand on the you're much better than I think you are. I'm for its improvement.~~

And it might very well find its way, modified, adjusted into the political, social, economic life of this nation and what many people call the new left is just a kind of a vitamized vitality of young people that are a little overly rambunctious according to a man of my age. I can remember when I was considered one of those of the new left of center. They said nice things about us then too. But truly I think that the real -- that there's very little real menace except in limited instances if you organize your progressive liberal forces to do battle and not run from it and try to get a guilt complex that some how or another you've done nothing. I'm not going to apologize to anybody for my record of public service, not on your life. When I hear some people coming up with so-called new ideas I say look-it I had that one fifty years ago and forgot it, now what do you want to talk about? We don't have to apologize. We've made a record in this country and you don't prove yourself to be a liberal by being ridiculous and you don't prove yourself to be a progressive by advocating something that is far beyond anything that anybody can possibly tolerate. Now ~~you're right~~ ^{it} *your right* to advocate/is there, but we don't necessarily have to accept it.

I happen to think that the Johnson-Humphrey administration is the most liberal political administration that this country has had for a long time and I'll take my stand on it and I think we've got a record that can prove it. We not only have talked liberal, we've delivered and when you deliver the groceries(applause)

that
Mr. Vice President: You mention/the riots are in place of~~in place of~~
~~were~~
they are meant to provide for Cleveland and Chicago/~~a~~ racial riots.
also especially
But ~~this~~ this sort of kills the chances for Home Rule/in D.C..~~which~~ But do you
~~have any other things to say on this subject?~~
actually thing these are racial-wide?

Humphrey: Partly, but ~~these~~ not totally, but I don't see the
relevance to Home Rule problem in D.C. unless it's simply that if
you don't give people a chance to have something to say about their
own lives that you have ^{pent}~~permed~~ up tension and frustration that can
explode. I think that's what the President was referring to. Now
I don't think that we should try to pass Home Rule on the basis of
frightening people one way or another. I think we ought to pass it
on the basis of democratic government. A city this size is
entitled to have representatives government. We believe in that
and the fact that they lack a representative government produces
many problems and tensions is a supplementary fact, but we ought
to do what we ought to do because it's right to do. I don't think
we ought to feel that we have to extend Food for Peace ~~if~~ just
because if we don't the Communists will get there. I think hungry
people ought to have an opportunity if there is food available to
be fed. I think it is morally right and I happen to think that in
the long term it is politically right so possibly we'd be better
off on occasion if we -- I think on all occasions -- if we contem=
and
plated a program that we believe is desirable ~~is~~ needed simply
because it is needed. You ~~have~~ can't always depend on the Communists
to frighten~~you~~. He may decide not to. And you can't always
depend on a riot or lawlessness to frighten you either. There are
some kinds of things that ought to be done just because they ought

to be done. For example, the right to vote. I know that the right to vote got an impetus out of the Selma demonstrations, but the right to vote and the protections of that right was a moral and political right for 100 years or more. We were just late. We shouldn't have needed Selma. It did trigger some action and I suppose this is the way a lot of things are done. I used to say that ^{we} ~~we~~ have two kinds of politics: physiological and psychological; empty stomach, full head; little stomach, empty head. I think that's a broad generalization that has an awful lot of relevance to certain things that have happened on occasion. But I hope that we don't always have to be in pain before we do what we ought to have done and I hope that once we start to feel good that we don't quit doing what we ought to be continuing to do.

Ques.: I read in the New York Times, I think it ~~was~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ 1965 . that some 96,000 South Vietnamese troops deserted their own army. i wondered ^{fact} if that/was valid and, if it is, if it indicates anything?

Humphrey: I think it's ~~supposed~~ most likely somewhat valid. I think it's true that a number of South Vietnamese forces have not deserted.

That would be -- the word desert means to go to the North -- but they ^{their} had left ~~these~~ ^{their little country farms.} military forces and gone back to ~~the South Vietnamese~~ ^{has}

But most of those are what we call popular forces. There ~~have~~ been little or no desertion from the South Vietnamese regular army or popular forces or militia. They have three groups -- little or none to the North. This is the most significant fact. What happens is ^{it's} that when the harvest season comes along -- like they did during the Civil War -- this is an old American habit -- and by the way/an ^{'s} ~~what~~ why they always talk about French leave. That's old french habit. That ^{is}

a fact. That's where that ~~xxxx~~ phrase came in when the French trained in the colonial days the Vietnamese. They expected every so often that most of the Vietnamese colonials would leave ~~xxxx~~ and go home in the harvest, if they had a celebration or a birthday or a funeral or a national holiday or a holy day or something, they left. And this is where the term French leave came in and when our boys were in the service -- World War I -- every once in a while someone would say "Well, he not only went AWOL he just took French leave," which sort of meant that there was something ~~xxx~~ more interesting in Paris than there was ^{up} on the Marne. He went back to see her, you know. That was French leave. And that is actually the cultural fact of the Vietnamese military life. Now these Vietnamese that you speak of. I think that number may be large, but I wouldn't argue over the numbers, because there are over 800,000 Vietnamese in the regular army and the popular forces. So let's say that 85 or 90,000 did. They neither defected or deserted. They just took leave for a while. They come and go. But many of them came back. What is most interesting is the rate of desertion from the North to the South. And more significantly, it seems to me, is what happens to the refugees. Now if you can use the argument as we have in America that the East Germans voted with their feet and that the East Berliners voted with their feet, namely that when they got a chance, they went West. They couldn't have a ~~heavy~~ vote and we went around for years in America saying ~~what~~ well if you really want to know what's it like in East Germany just remember the hundreds of thousands of East Germans that voted with their feet. They walked out of East Germany into West Berlin and from there into West Germany, and that is as valid point. A million South Vietnamese have voted with their feet. They have not gone to the North, to the ~~xxxxxx~~ "Worker's Paradise". They have come south even under the government that many people have criticized in the South. They have come into the Saigon area, into the Delta area where the

- 30 -

Government does exercise control. I wouldn't want you to think that we're always satisfied with everything that a government does, but again in this world there are alternatives and choices and you sell them a choice between God and the devil. It's generally a choice between degrees of imperfection. And in this instance the desertion rate from the North has grown rapidly. This is one of the most encouraging developments^{ments} in this present military situation. It runs now at about twice what it did six months ago. And six months ago it ran about three times as much as it did a year ago so that the desertion rate from the North Vietnamese regular units and the Viet Cong is going up. The French leave of the South Vietnamese forces depends on two things: when they have holidays and when they have harvest. And if they have a big harvest and a big holiday they have a lot on leave and they're gone for a few weeks and a few months some times, then they're regrouped and many of them fill them back in, about 30% of them return voluntarily. Another group is sort of picked up again, you know (laughter).

Mr. Vice President: One of the major criticism ~~was~~ made by liberals of the war on Vietnam is that it is draining money from the programs of poverty, housing, etc. which are probably, as you've described them,

as the causes of some of the riots. How do we answer these criticisms?

Humphrey: ~~It~~, you don't answer them. It's fact. I don't deny that. I don't deny

that if we didn't have the struggle in Vietnam we'd have had a balanced budget this year. The federal government had a surplus and we could have put another \$1 billion dollars into the poverty program ~~the~~ most likely.

Another half a billion dollars into education, if you've got the congress to vote for it. I've noticed around here at times that many times that we are all excited about what we could do if we didn't have to spend money on defense, but when that money is relieved, it's a little hard to get some of it put back into the proper channels. The same boys that are

going to relieve you of the defense expenditure don't get quite so enthusiastic to help grandma or the little grandchild. But I think that there is some validity to what you've said. Now having agreed with what critics say, namely that if we hadn't had the struggle in Vietnam we'd have been able to do more of this. I can say to you that if we didn't have the Soviet Union threatening us we'd have been able to do a lot more things too. And if we hadn't of had Berlin crises on two or three ~~times~~ occasions. I remember one day in the Senate ~~when~~ on one afternoon without any hearings we voted \$6 billion more just like that and I think my friend over here will remember, Chet, you remember just as well as I do when in 1961 in the Berlin Crisis we had to put billions of dollars on occasion. We surely could have done a whole lot more under Harry Truman if we hadn't ~~of~~ had the struggle. No doubt about it. We spent billions, billions. How much? About 90 billions of dollars totalling. and 160,000 casualties. There isn't any doubt in my mind but I want to say that I think we did right in Korea and I'll tell you something else. We could have had a whole lot money for a lot of other things if we hadn't had to fight Hitler, no doubt about it. War is expensive business. And if we didn't

t
have to have foreign aid, we'd have some more money, ~~have~~ save some other people. I happen to think that foreign aid is maybe made it possible so that ^{we had} ~~it~~ at least somewhat of a more peaceful world. We have thus far averted World War III and that's been no small task. There have been a number of singular foreign policy accomplishments and no one is happy about the struggle in Vietnam. As I said to Mr. Meekie this morning, distinguished diplomat, I said, "my dear friend, ~~we~~ we were talking on Vietnam -- I said I'll give you a promise right now. If you can get Ho Chi Minh -- and you're a bit closer to him than I do (laughter) -- If you can deliver Ho Chi Minh in Tokyo to talk about peace, I will promise you that I can deliver President Johnson or Dean Rusk or Arthur Goldberg. any

counterpart. The threat to peace -- and let's get it clear right now -- the roadblock to peace is not in Washington and it's about time that this country made that manifestly clear. What more can you expect ~~for~~ from a head of state than you've heard from your President (applause) who has said these words: I will go any place, anywhere, anytime, under any auspices to meet with anybody to bring about peace. Now that's your government's position. Now you can say that we ought not to be bombing. Some of you say that and some of you say that we ought not to escalate. We don't think we've escalated, we think we've met escalation, or whatever your view may be. You go ahead and say it. We are prepared as of this moment. This second. If you can get the North Vietnamese to get to stop infiltrating their forces, we're prepared to stop our bombing and we're prepared for a cessation of ~~hostilities~~ ^{hostilities} and we're prepared to negotiate. Can you get Ho Chi Minh to say that? I speak as Vice President of the United States. I don't speak up idly to you. I know what the position of this government is. And I must say to you what I've said to many. I believe in the right to dissent. I believe in the right to advocate. I believe in the right of protest. I've been a part of dissent. My life has been a part of protesting movements, but once in a while it would be nice if somebody would carry one of those cards to someone who needs to see it. (laughter) You've convinced us. (laughter) It isn't a matter now of say who made the mistakes. Let's just assume that both sides made mistakes. I said to Mr. Meekie: "You don't need to worry about that you've been critical of us in Japan on occasion. That was your privilege. Let's forget about that. Let's start as of this minute. ^{Can} ~~Then~~ you take my message and do anything with it? Can you.." He said, "well we've tried." I said "I know. So did the Canadians try, so did the Pope try, so did Harold Wilson try, so did the President of India try. I spent hours with the President of India and he's as peaceful as any man can be. (laughter)

- 33 -

And your government has literally ~~fin~~ pled, pleaded. As of this hour, we just had Arthur Goldberg on another mission doing the same thing, to get a chance to sit down and talk. And I hear a lot of this amongst our liberal community. Well, we ought to be. Every resolution that comes from a liberal, democratic group says, ~~well~~ you must ~~press~~ press for peace. The Administration must press for peace. Fine. How much more press do you want us to do? ~~Flat?~~ ^{Flat?} We are pressing for peace. But I think that it's about time that the social, democratic, liberal, progressive, humanitarian forces of America let the other side know that we expect them to do a little pressing for peace. That's what needs to be... I told the Swedish Prime Minister the very same thing I'm telling you now, and he's a dear friend of mine ~~xxxx~~ Cause most of the social democratic countries have been very critical of us. I said, fine, you be critical of us. That's your right. But would you mind taking a look at the other side of the coin? And maybe you can use your influence. You've convinced us. You've convinced us that ~~xxx~~ this war ~~year~~ ought to be stopped. You've convinced us that we ought to have peace. You've convinced us that we ought to have no military bases in South Vietnam. You've convinced us that we're perfectly willing ~~xxx~~ to take a Vietnam that designs ^s its own government. If they wish to unite North and South that's their business. ~~where~~ ^{we're} willing to accept a new Geneva Conference. We're willing to sit down with anybody, anywhere, anytime, anyplace and discuss anything. Now what more do you want to convince us to do except to give up, which we don't. And I think that young Democrats and leaders in the Congress ought to get on this tack and go with it. It ~~doesn't~~ isn't a matter of whether we've done everything that's right. War is not a summation of acts of kindness. War is a dirty business. And everybody knows it. And you don't fight a war without either side

making some mistakes. The question is how do you get one side that refuses to come to the conference table. What did Mr. Ho Chi Minh say the other day? Why did he say after we made another Viet --- we'll fight, ~~and fight~~ fight, and fight. Well, if that's what they want. As we have said a number of times. This nation is not weak, but we're patient, and we're ^Srestrained, but we're also resolute. And I think that the sooner that the world understands that we mean business, my dear friends, the sooner that everybody understands that this nation has no desire except for peace, but we mean business in the pursuit of it, even on the battle field, the sooner this war will come to a conclusion.

Well, I think that's about enough. Thank you. (applause)



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