



ADDRESS OF

THE HONORABLE

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Vice President of the United States

to the

YOUNG DEMOCRATS

of

Arizona

Colorado

and

New Mexico

Hilton Hotel, Albuquerque, New Mexico

September 10, 1966

SENATOR ANDERSON: I know you'd all like to have a thirty or forty minute speech. I would like to take your thoughts further than that. Last night Senator Montoya introduced the chief speaker in a brilliant and lovely speech. You're going to hear him now. All I can do is say he is a grand person, this man whom I have been associated with sixteen years in the Senate, the man that I have watched day by day and his conscience grows and his contribution grows also. Hubert Humphrey.

VICE PRESIDENT: Thank you, my friend Senator Anderson, Miss Smith, my old partner over here Fabian Chavez. Fabian has been working the precincts. I asked where he was this morning and they said, "Well, he has all the votes in this room. There were two or three in the lobby that he had missed last night." I was a little worried that he might be campaigning in Colorado and Arizona, except in New Mexico, but I gather that he's rather selective.

I'm very pleased that Mrs. Humphrey and our son Douglas and myself have this privilege and opportunity to be in this beautiful State of New Mexico and to be at this occasion where young Democrats from three states, is that right, from New Mexico, Arizona and Colorado, have joined together for purposes of talking about the future and about our party which is synonomous, by the way. Democratic Party



in the future is just a different way of spelling it. Just keep that in mind.

We had a great evening last night. We are going to have a very full day today. After I leave you now we will do some television and then later on up to the Job Corps Center and then up to Los Alamos and back to Santa Fe. And then on Monday morning up into Utah where we'll spend the day in Salt Lake City in that immediate area and then Monday, late afternoon and night back to Washington and be quite busy next week.

Well, I am here to say, I guess, a few words to you. I ought to start out again doing what I did last night, but Mrs. Anderson, our dear friend Henrietta, said, "I don't want you to brag on Clinton anymore. He's getting out of hand." I'm just not going to praise this great man anymore. I said so much about Joe Montoya last night that Della came to my room afterwards and said, "He will be beyond control for at least a month." So I'm not going to say anything more that's complimentary about this industrious, this extremely able, this competent, this fighting United States Senator from New Mexico. And Connie Morris and Polly Walker have both protested that we were too kind and considerate to Tom and to John, and so I'm not going to say anything that's complimentary about two of the most able and competent and most progressive members of





the Congress of the United States than I said last night. But I can tell you that I'm here because I like it.

Yesterday was a wonderful day for us. We were in Iowa talking to our farm friends out there at the National Plowing Contest and I had the good fortune of speaking to a huge audience. There were 104,000 people on the grounds and about 40,000, they estimated, right where we were doing the speaking. And I didn't try to dramatize anything. All I told them was the truth. I just told them that we were thankful to American agriculture for its great achievements and we knew that American agriculture would not be unmindful of the friendship that had been extended and the helpfulness that had been extended by the Democratic administrations, the Kennedy-Johnson and the Johnson-Humphrey administrations, and the farmers, they applauded. I think that was a good idea they heard a truth.

Now, to you, to you I want to talk about the yesterdays, I want to talk about tomorrow. There really isn't anything we can do about the yesterdays. There isn't much that we can do about our inheritance. And as a country, we've inherited many wonderful and great achievements, accomplishments and we've also inherited some problems.

We've inherited, for example, in our cities the problems of the slum, the ghetto, and when I speak of the



slum, I do not speak only of the physical deterioration of the core of the city, the center, I speak also of the deprivation, of the denial of opportunity, yes, of the deterioration and the erosion of the human being in that broken down slum of the city.

I have called this "Slumism," and I want the young people of America, in particular, to become as worried and concerned and motivated about "slumism" as we have become about other "isms". Communism, totalitarianism, because all of these "isms" destroy character, destroy the meaning of individuality, deny human dignity.

People that are compelled to circumstances beyond their control to live in an environment that denies them the chance for a rich and full life, those people have been the victims of a tyranny. It may be the tyranny of poverty or of discrimination or of bigotry or intolerance of the tyranny of ill health or the bad habit of indolence, but it is a tyranny and it's just as tyrannical, just as despotic, just as destructive of freedom and human dignity as any form of totalitarianism.

This is not to say that one is more evil than another. It's to say that we have a job to face up to both challenges, at home and abroad. But the "ism" that gnaws at the heart of America at home, the malignancy in our body



politic, the rot of our Nation is "slumism" and that slum can be in a city or in rural America. It can be where people live in the hills and reservations or it can be in the steaming asphalt jungles of our great metropolitan areas.

There's just as much pain and poverty in rural America as there is in urban America and we are set on the course of doing something about it. That's the important thing.

I know that many of us become impatient and I know how easy it is to get up and say that we ought to put all of our resources into just this battle on the domestic front, but this is one world and it's a smaller world every day and every part of it is interrelated and inseparable. There are no neat compartments for foreign policy and domestic policy. There's no way you can have domestic tranquility without international security or vice versa and what we do at home will condition what we do abroad. And what we do abroad will also condition what we do at home.

This nation of which you are a leader and a member and a citizen is a world leader nation, and leadership, my young friends, is not a luxury. It is a burden. The cold responsibility is not the cloak of comfort. It calls upon you to exercise self discipline and leadership.

And it's a wonderful thing for us to go around and





speak of our great land as a leading country in the world, the leader of the free world, but once that you have proclaimed that and it is a fact, and we can't deny it, we maybe didn't plan it that way, we maybe didn't aspire to it, but it fell into our hands and we are the leader, the leading nation of the free world. And with that role comes the burdens and the duties of responsibility and this means that we have to take a big look at all of the world and not just parts of it. And fortunately we are big enough to do it and we're rich enough to do it and strong enough to do it.

I wonder how many in this room realize that last year the United States of America produced about forty-eight per cent of the total gross national product of the entire world. Of the whole world are less than two hundred million people. While we represent about five to six per cent of the world population, we have thirty-six per cent of the income.

Much has been given unto us and much is expected of us. I give you this little sermon, so to speak, because I don't want to see any new isolationism grow in our country. I don't want to see America just pull into itself and be inward. I want us to reach outward. This world needs us and we need the world in which we live. We cannot isolate ourselves from it.

But having said that, let me tell you that the strength





that we need for this world leadership responsibility must come from within and that's why we need everybody. We cannot afford to have one-sixth or one-fifth, whatever figure you may use, of our fellow Americans out of the main stream of American life. We cannot afford to have two Americas within one America. I want you to remember and it's sort of rhetorical and sometimes it may seem a bit sentimental, but remember every boy and girl and you yourselves were taught to repeat and you did, and you still do on most occasions, "One Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." It didn't say two nations. It said one. And it didn't say liberty and justice for some, but for all.

Now, you either mean it or you don't. And I would say that the most condemning words of Scripture are these, "Woe unto ye hypocrites" and hypocrisy is bad enough as a personal trait, but as a national characteristic is unforgiveable and it is corrosive and destructive.

But, thank goodness, we are not hypocrites. We recognize it in our midst that we have the needy, the deprived, those that have not been given a fair break in life, those that have not only not been given, but the opportunity has not been there for them. And at the time of our greatest wealth and greatest power, we have compassion for the needy and the weak and we are determined to open the gates





of opportunity to every single American, to every person without any regard to where he lives, his ethnic background, his race, his origin, his religion or how he spells his last name.

At long last, it is one citizenship. At long last, it is one America. And now we're trying to make sure that in our countryside, in our cities, that there's not another America, a different America for the poor than there is for the well-to-do, and the middle income and those of education. We're trying to upgrade the whole quality of American life and are we doing it? I think we are. Some people say not fast enough. We will be restless. That's your task and you will be, anyway. The Democratic Party is a party of ferment, of ideas adaptable to change, that's what distinguishes this party in the main from its opposition.

We do reach out, we do sometimes reach out even further than the public is willing to do, but that is the part of education that a political party ought to engage in. If you're going to try to second-guess everybody to stay more popular, you're going to miss most of the answers, and you can't forget it.

I wonder if you realize that one of the characteristics of the Johnson administration, President Johnson's first job when he left that little teacher's college was to become a

teacher. His first pay check was about \$55.00 and he gave it to the students to buy recreation equipment and books for the little Mexican-American students down in a little country school. It just so happens that the leadership of your Government are former teachers. The President of the United States, I'm a refugee from a classroom, having been a professor of political science and a teacher in history and political economy.

Mike Mansfield, a former professor in history and political science, University of Montana, Carl Albert, a Rhodes scholar, a former teacher and professor. I think I could go down through the line and show you that many of the people in this Government of yours today are dedicated to the whole idea of education, not just education in its formal sense, but education that opens up new vistas of opportunity, and what have we done? In three years, we have more than doubled the Federal investment in education in the United States from 4½ billion dollars to 10-3/10 billion dollars.

In three years, we have more than doubled the investment in health, in the United States, from 4.3 billion dollars to 10.5 billion dollars and when I hear, for example, as I have heard some say, that we ought to spend as much at least upon our poor and our cities as we do upon the war in Viet Nam, let me testify to you that we spend more, far more.



The total investment in programs relating to urban development and rent supplements, Social Security, Medicare, elementary and secondary education, higher education, these programs, Appalachia, the War on Poverty, the Office of Economic Opportunity, they total up to be far more than that which we are spending in what appears to be a far away place and what your Government believes to be a necessary act of national security and international responsibility. We have to allocate our resources and we are going to continue to allocate those resources to upgrade the quality of life in America, to strengthen this nation because this nation is only as strong as its people.

What we want you to do as young Democrats and men and women that will occupy positions of leadership at your local level, your State houses and in the Federal Government and your businesses and the professions and in religion and education, we want you to be thinking about what more should we be doing, not how much more money alone should be spent.

Many people start out, and I have listened to the testimony and they start out and say, "Well, what we need for our cities is fifty billion dollars." You may need fifty billion dollars, but for what? Money alone does not cure the problem of the city. What is the plan of action? What is the battle plan? What is the command structure, if you please?





Who is in on it? Where are the plans to be designed? I heard one man testify that what we needed was two hundred and fifty billion dollars for our cities. Well, any figure you can pick out, but maybe what you need to do is take a look at your own State Constitution, maybe your own State law, maybe your own State political institution. Are these institutions up where you live at the level where you live? Are they in tune with the realities of the economy? Are they in step with what's happening in America? Is your tax base adequate?

Because, remember this, that good government in the United States does not mean just a generous Federal Government. Most people are affected by local and State Government. I was a Mayor of a city of over a half million people and most everything that happened to those people in that city in terms of law was law of the City ordinance or the County Commissioners or the State legislature and its Statutes. The Federal Government, yes, has its prime responsibilities today in the field of foreign policy and National security and large grants and aids. To whom? To State and Local government. And our task is to make State and Local Government effective working partners that can carry their fair share of the load because no central government in Washington can design a plan for living for you in New Mexico, Arizona and Colorado, and no central Government should be permitted to do so. It's wrong.



What we want is what we call creative Federalism in which the Federal Government supplements, in which the Federal Government, yes, can help establish standards, in which the Federal Government can indeed inject new resources into the main, into the pipeline of the Governmental structure, but what we need are plans that are locally inspired, locally initiated, locally administered, locally motivated that fit the unique pattern of your State and your community.

Surely you don't think New Mexico is identical to New York. Surely you can't think that Arizona has the same identical problems and cultural patterns as Minnesota. The United States is a mosaic.

As John Kennedy once said, "We seek to make the world safe for diversity." We're not asking for unanimity. It's the beauty of America that comes from its cultural differences, that comes from its different rate of growth and from its heritage and its background. And that's what I mean when I say that we need young people in Government today that look ahead to their community.

Now, if you are going to build a better America, you are not going to build it far away. You are going to build it where you live. It's in your town that you're going to have good schools or bad schools. It's in your City and your County and your State that you're going to have good health programs or



bad health programs. It's in your town and your City that you are going to have good housing or bad housing. Your Federal Government with all of its tremendous powers, with all its great resources, cannot build all those houses and shouldn't, but your Federal Government can help you with your plans to get this country moving once again and we are moving.

And be of good cheer, I've been in this Congress business now sixteen years, as Clinton Anderson said, and I want you to know that many of the hopes and dreams that I had as a Senator, fought for and lost many a fight, have all come into being. I've heard people say, "What happened to the liberal program," because I'm a political liberal and many times my friends, in the cause of liberalism, will say, "Well, what's happened to liberalism?" I said, "Well, I'll tell you what's happened, we passed it, we enacted it.

Now, to be a liberal doesn't mean that you have to always enjoy defeat. To be a progressive doesn't mean that you always have to aspire to something that you can't attain. This is a progressive administration. It is a constructive, liberal, practical, progressive administration.

Just think of what's happened in the field of Civil Rights; think of what's happened in the field of health; think of what Senator Clinton Anderson single-handedly almost, in the Congress of the United States, did with Medicare.





Would you have believed, would you have believed, five years ago, any of you, that today you would have a Medicare Program that included hospitalization, nursing home care and medical care for those persons under Social Security? Why, my dear friends, some of us, why, we were literally run out of Congress for the thought of it. I remember what I was called. I don't want to repeat it here. The very first bill I ever voted on when I came to the Senate was Federal Aid to Education and you had to choose up sides. They tried to kill it either with Church or State.

Every other bill they used to try to kill with racism, anything that was going to do anything for the poor people, they'd say, "Well, we know what you are trying to do, integrate," and there would be a filibuster. More social legislation died on the cross of racism and Federal Aid to Education died on the issue of the cross of religion.

What have we done now? We've passed fantastic programs of aid to education for the student, no matter where you go to school, for books, for teachers, for facilities to improve the education. Over a billion dollars this year of new federal funds going into the school districts that are poor and deprived, for youngsters that are poor and deprived. And that's just the beginning. We have Job Corps Centers,



Project Head Start, Upward Bound. I was telling some of our friends here in an informal breakfast this morning, just think of one thing, we have 20,000 young people out of our great high schools of America this year that were potential school dropouts in their senior year, identified as such, were restless, were unruly students doing poorly. They have been lifted out and sent to the universities this summer. But what has happened is beyond human imagination.

Many of these students today that were problem students only four or five months ago, many of them that were considered to be failures four or five months ago are today getting scholarships at Harvard and Princeton and M.I.T., and University of California, and most likely the University of New Mexico and other places. Thousands of them, they turned out to be great.

Well, now, some people say, "Well, that's not much. There's a lot of people in the United States and you only took 20,000." I am here to tell you that's 20,000 more than anybody else ever touched. It's a beginning. And the critics offer you nothing except criticism. The Johnson-Humphrey administration is not trying to be popular. We're trying to be right.

I want to say to you good young friends to lend your active minds to how we can do the job better. Don't figure



the cost tag. Figure out the method, the formula. Then we'll work on the cost tag. We don't do everything overnight.

I always tease Mrs. Humphrey about this, you know. If she'd ever told me how much our house in Minnesota was going to cost the first time, I would never have let her dig the hole in the ground out there. But she trapped me into it. As one of my friends says, his house is a series of patios enclosed. It's the beginnings that count, the beginnings.

What do you think? Franklin Roosevelt, surely great, will be listed in our history as one of the truly great men of all times. Franklin Roosevelt, the great liberal, the great progressor, what do you think was his liberal program for minimum wage? We are going to have a dollar sixty an hour, you know, next year; 1968, a dollar forty, 1967. Twenty cents an hour, that's a great liberal program.

Twenty cents is where we started. Social Security. You think we had the coverage that we have today of almost a hundred million people when we started? We had twenty million. And what were the benefits? They were so small that I hate to tell you, unless somebody, the Republicans may say we were fooling the people. But we made the start and we made a lot of starts and we're going to make more. We're going to make the starts in our cities to get open spaces and to have living





space and we're going to have our educational system attuned to the needs of the time and we're going to make starts in water pollution control and air pollution control. We have made advance in the field of science and technology and all of this adds to the betterment of life.

Now, one final word. Don't run away from the tough ones. And I have a feeling that sometime we find it easier to protest than we do to find it possible to build and to create and to stick with it. Dissent, of course! This party has been built on it. Every man in the free society has a right to be heard, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you have to take his ideas seriously. It depends on what he offers.

Every person has the right to protest, the right of dissent is a precious right of free people, but also with that dissent comes an obligation to present an alternative and not to run away from reality. You can protest that we're not doing enough in our cities. You can protest that we haven't made a far enough advance in the field of Civil Rights, but what is your program? So we must come up with programs, and we are doing it, demonstration cities, open housing, fair juries, pollution control, rent supplements, metropolitan-wide planning.

We have many alternatives that are coming forth,





but the tough problems are international, international. And for every problem that your country faces, other countries have them ten-fold.

Oh, I know that we carry heavy burdens and we make mistakes, and I know that many people are weary of the fact that we have to do so much internationally and have to become so involved, but I ask you this morning to take a look at the problems that the Soviet Union has and take a look at ours. I ask you to take a look at the problems that they're having in Communist China and take a look at ours. And all I can say is I thank God that I live here and that I belong to the American society, because our problems are minimal, plus the fact we have resources with which to do something about the problems; and I want to remind you once again, for those that feel that somehow or another the enemy always seems to have the answers, and I've heard so many times, "Oh, look the way the Communists do it, look what they've done in Africa, look what they've done in Asia." What have they done in Africa? Failed! That's what they have done. Not one single African country gone Communist, not one. A billion people gained their freedom in the last twenty years and seventy new nations came into being, as I said to some of you last night, and not one Communist.

The wave of the future? Oh, no! The backwash of the

swamp, that's all. There's no wave of the future here. There's a yearning of people for freedom and independence that's just built in them, and we're aiding that yearning, but once in a while we have to face up to the hard facts of violence just as we have to face up to it in our cities and to put it down, and we have to face up to it internationally. And I think young Americans ought to understand this more than anybody else. There was another generation that didn't understand it. Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke in Chicago in 1937 and said to the American people when Hitler was riding high, "We must quarantine the aggressor," a famous speech. And the public in America said no, and the demagogues attacked him and they said, "He seeks to lead us into war. He's trying to intervene. He's an internationalist." And even brave Franklin Roosevelt retreated under that avalanche.

Only four months before Pearl Harbor, Selective Service was saved by one vote in the House of Representatives. The American people almost turned their back on political reality.

My fellow Americans, it's never been easy to stand up to the hard facts of international life, it's much easier to write a check from a rich country, it's much easier to send foreign aid from a rich country, it's much easier to give speeches from a rich country and a loquacious country.





But sooner or later there comes a time when banditry has to be met, when aggression has to be faced, and the facts of international aggression are here and the people that ought to recognize it are the young, because if aggression goes unchecked it goes unleashed; and if aggression becomes a pattern of international conduct, where does it stop? Where?

And if we can accomodate ourselves to aggression and let it go unchecked, what about weak nations, what do you think of the little nations? There are one hundred little nations in this world and their stake in international life is being tested right now, because if an outside aggressive force can chew up a little, weak nation any time it wants to, then there is no safety for any little weak nation; and just as you and I know that the true test of justice in a free society is not so much what you do for the majority but the protection of the rights of the minority and the weak. So, in the international scene the true test of international statesmanship is not so much what you do amongst the super powers but what is done to make life possible for the little ones, the weak ones, the fragile ones, those who are seeking to make their way as a new nation. So we face the terrible problem in South Viet Nam.

And I only want to conclude now by saying that your government pursues every hope of peace, you surely ought to



know, and you ought to carry the message to your fellow Americans that your President and your Vice President and your Senators and your ambassadors want peace as much or more as anybody in this world; and the roadblock to peace, my fellow Americans, is not in Washington, it's in Hanoi and Peking. It isn't we who've turned down an offer. The roadblock to peace is not in Arthur Goldberg or Lyndon Johnson or Dean Rusk, it happens to be in Mao and Ho Chi Minh and Lo-Jui, and I think you ought to know it.

This does not mean that we need to agree on every tactic and strategy that we use, but let us make it crystal clear that this nation has contributed more to the cause of peace than any nation on the face of the earth. We've contributed since World War Two, 169,000 casualties; since World War Two, we've contributed one hundred twenty billion dollars in grants and loans; we've contributed billions of dollars in food and health and education over and above what I've mentioned; we've kept the United Nations alive when others would kill it. We are prepared as of this morning to go any place, any where, any time, to meet with anybody to seek an honorable peace, but we are not prepared to let the aggressor satisfy his insatiable appetite with one country and then seek another in the name of peace, because to do so is a fraud, to do so would be immoral, to do so would be



irresponsible. Power and leadership impose responsibility and duty and if we're not up to it, who is? If we can't help the weak, who can? If we cannot resist the aggressor, who will? If we are unwilling to abide by standards of international conduct, who do you expect to do so?

And this is what young people must think about, not just the easy things, but the tough ones, and I am of the opinion that it is better for this nation to face up soon to the challenges that appear momentarily to be within our control than to have to face up to the possibility of a nuclear cataclysm and catastrophe later on down the road. And when the aggressor finds out that the price of aggression is too high, he may start to live peacefully.

It is our hope and prayer that the militant forces of Asian Communism may become as restrained and as reasonably responsible as some of the former militant forces of European Communism. This is not to say that Communism and Communists would not like to dominate this world. It is to say that the Soviet Union has learned to understand power and has learned to understand that it could be destroyed, and that its leaders at long last have come to understand that there is no victory in nuclear war.

Hopefully and prayerfully we seek that same understanding in China, and in other areas of the world, and if we stand our





ground now and at the same time if we relentlessly pursue the cause of a just peace through negotiation and through diplomacy, I think that we can have a world peace and a world that fits within the aims and the objectives and the ideals of the Charter of the United Nations.

Good luck to you, carry forth and do your good job.





# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)