Edited Transcript

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY DEMOCRATIC PARTY WORKERS DENVER, COLORADO

September 9, 1967

I am talking today to the kind of people I like to visit with.

I'm talking to the people who make victory possible for our Democratic

Party -- and who could, if they should fail in their responsibilities,

contribute to our defeat.

We are a forward-looking party, an affirmative party -- that's why we are Democrats. I have never been the kind of Democrat who expected everyone to agree with me on everything 100 per cent of the time. If you want a party like that, I suggest the kind of headquarters you would need -- a telephone booth. That would be big enough to house all the supporters of the kind of a party that demanded unanimity on every issue.

The Democratic Party is a national political organization. This nation of ours has different cultural patterns, different levels of economic development, and different needs. A political party that has a national base must, on the one hand, have national commitments, national purposes, and national goals. But, on the other hand, it

must give its supporters the opportunity to express their own individualities and to hold their own points of view.

Therefore, I don't scold my fellow-Democrats because I may occasionally disagree with them or they with me. I am not always certain myself what is right -- rather, I try to find out what is right. I've heard the President of the United States say a number of times that to do what is right is not difficult -- what <u>is</u> difficult is to find out what is right. And that's what we seek to do in our party.

This morning, I want to talk to you about the record of the Administration and to tell you why I believe it merits your active, affirmative, and continued support.

I think I know what our problems are. I have been in politics a long time. I started out way back in the '30's as Chairman of the Young Democrats in my county. I'll never forget my first opportunity of meeting our late and beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I was the only young man in my town of 12,000 people who had the chance to shake his hand. It was the best thing that ever happened to Humphrey's Drug Store. I stood behind the soda fountain, and to get a handshake you had to buy a coke. It really did help business.

My father was a Democrat in a Republican community. Yet he was elected a councilman and a state legislator, and he was elected

mayor time after time. I was brought up in the philosophy of Woodrow Wilson, which is one great reason why, throughout my public life, I have felt very deeply about our international commitments. I think that, if this nation had heeded Wilson, mankind might have been spared the tragedy of World War II.

I was brought up as a young man working for Franklin D.

Roosevelt. I was a New Dealer, and I still am, because I consider
the movement that Franklin D. Roosevelt launched in 1933 part of the
unfinished American Revolution.

The Democratic Party has a record of sustained social progress. It has had leaders who have prevailed against the insults and acrimony of a powerful opposition. It has had leaders -- and it has a leader -- who merits the admiration, the confidence, and the support of the American people.

I have no doubt whatever that, when the choice has to be made, when it's a choice between two candidates, or three or four -- when it's a choice between two political parties -- the people of this nation are not going to cast aside the leadership that has brought this country to its highest pinnacle of prosperity, that has recognized the social problems of this country and launched an effective assault on them, that has done so much to build international understanding and peace

in the world community. I don't think that the American people are going to reject that kind of leadership, and that's why I'm confident about the months ahead and the election next year.

We Democrats like to take each other to task -- that's a

Democratic trait. This is in accord with our independence, with our

liberal and progressive spirit -- in fact, it's to be expected. For

most of the time, it's not only to be expected, it's to be desired.

Self-analysis and self-criticism <u>are</u> healthy things. But, after the debate and after the dissent, there comes ultimately a time for decision. And when that time comes, you have to make a choice -- not between the perfect and the totally imperfect, but between the available alternatives. I'm sure the American people would rather have a man who knows how to be President than a man who knows how to be an actor. They'd rather have a man who knows how to be President than one who's trying to describe a new kind of intellectual detergent.

In the words of Al Smith, let's look at the record. Let's take a look at what's happened in the past six years, because that's the record of the Kennedy-Johnson and the Johnson-Humphrey Administrations.

There is an over-riding theme in Democratic leadership. When Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, he found this nation in the

٠.,

depths of depression and despair, and he said that we had to get

America on the move once again. His parting words to the American

people, written for a speech that he did not live to deliver, were

these: "Let us move forward with a strong and an active faith." That

is the theme of the Democratic Party.

John F. Kennedy came to the White House as this nation was in its third recession in eight years. He had said all during the campaign: "Let's get this country moving again," and he said on Inaugural Day, "Let us begin." He moved this nation forward, he moved it in spirit and in fact -- and then he was taken from us by the assassin's bullet.

I sat in the home of the new President, President Johnson, as he was preparing his first speech to the joint session of the Congress. I was there all night as he was working on it. Remember those three words, "Let us continue," and the pledge he made to the American people at that joint session. He said that the platform of John Kennedy would be carried out -- it was a battle order, and we would fulfill it.

I sat there as deputy majority leader with the other Senate and the House leaders when President Johnson said: "We have a moral as well as a political commitment to see to it that the unfinished work of John Kennedy is completed."

So we set out to do it in the second session of the 88th Congress, and we did it -- a remarkable performance. Then came the elections

of 1964, with a fresh mandate from the people. We set to work in the 89th Congress, and it produced the most memorable and historic record of liberal and progressive legislation in American history.

If you think all this came easily, let me assure you that it didn't.

We Democrats have faced difficulties before, and overcame them. In 1948 President Truman won the election, despite all the predictions to the contrary. I'll tell you why he won that victory -- because he had courage, conviction, and confidence. He had the courage to say what he believed. He had the conviction to do what he thought was right. He had confidence in himself and in the judgment of the American people. He went out and won a great victory.

We Democrats face very much the same situation now as in 1948.

I hear that this group or that group that may put a candidate in the field. That's their right and privilege -- this is a free country.

But I believe, my fellow-Democrats, that you do want to win.

Every Democrats who holds public office ought to remember this -you're seldom much stronger than the head of your ticket. You don't
make progress when you break ranks. As Benjamin Franklin once said,
we must hang together or we will hang separately.

I'll put it quite frankly. I know that there is a temptation sometimes to point out the limitations of those who serve you. I know that many of us -- and I myself, on occasion -- have found fault with

* > 10 3

leaders and programs and policies. But I want to make this suggestion to you. It is just 14 months before the course of this nation will be decided. The American people are going to decide who is going to be President, and it isn't going to be a third party or a fourth party candidate. It's going to be a Democratic or a Republican candidate -- that is what the choice is ultimately going to be.

I think every Democrat ought to remember this -- that is isn't going to improve his political health to put poison in the Democratic well from which he is going to have to drink between now and next November.

Having stated the negative, let me state the positive. I have spent some eighteen years in Washington. I came there with a record of civil rights, at a time when our party had been split on that issue. I handled the comprehensive Civil Rights Act of 1964 from February 10th to June 27th, in debate and in filibuster, dealing with the 292 amendments that were offered. I was on the floor of the Senate every day but Sunday, since we met six days a week.

The President of the United States -- this President, the man from Texas -- sent to the Congress the boldest, the most far-reaching, the most comprehensive civil rights program that any President ever dreamed of, much less dared to send to the Congress. After months of debate, during which the President's purpose remained firm and

* * . . .

he brought every effort that he could to bear on it, we passed it.

Today the promise held forth by Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation

Proclamation has become a legal reality, because President Lyndon

Johnson proposed the program and a Democratic Congress enacted it.

There has been poverty in this country for a long time. But the Democratic Party believes, and the President of the United States believes, that every American is entitled to an equal opportunity in our society -- whether he is poor or not, whether he is white or black, whatever his name may be, whether he has a Scandinavian or a Spanish surname, whether he comes from the North or the South.

The war on poverty, and every piece of legislation that we've advanced in Congress during these years, have been designed for one single purpose -- to open up the gates of opportunity to every American.

We are <u>not</u> trying to make poverty more tolerable -- we're trying to get at its root causes. We're not trying merely to ease the pain of poverty. That could be done just be writing out a check -- and there are some people who believe that's the way to do it. They have what I call a checkbook mentality.

We think there's another way, a better way. It costs money -yes, but it costs more than that. It requires commitment, public
service, community action, personal dedication. It's the hard way,
it may be the slow way, but it's the sure way.

The President has recommended the expenditure of \$25.6 billion this year on the over-all attack on poverty. Yet there are people in our own ranks who ask: "What are you doing? What has happened to our liberal program?" I'll tell you what happened to it. I helped design it. I fought for it during 16 years in the Senate. I think I know something about it. I am one of its godfathers. I'm going to let you in on the secret of what happened to our liberal program -- we enacted it!

I don't think you prove yourself a liberal by your failures. I think that liberals do have to be willing to suffer reverses for a good cause. But I don't think you're any less a liberal when the programs you fought for, the programs that year after year were defeated, are finally enacted.

I introduced the Medicare bill on May 17, 1949. I couldn't even get a hearing on it. I introduced it every two years thereafter. I went to my good friend from New Mexico, Senator Clinton Anderson, a member of the Finance Committee, the Committee which had jurisdiction over the bill. I said: "Would you take this bill, and let me be its co-sponsor? If you take it, we can pass it." He took it, and so did Congressman King of California, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee. We kept at it. It was enacted in late 1965 and signed by the President at Independence, Missouri.

Medicare now assures hospital care to 19 million of our senior citizens. In its first full year of operation, four million persons received hospital care and 15 million bills for physicians' and other medical services were paid under Medicare.

I for one don't think this shows that the Johnson-Humphrey

Administration has lost its zeal for liberal legislation. I think that

it shows we know how to get liberal legislation enacted, and I'm proud

of our record.

Let's look at the whole galaxy of liberal programs. First, there is Federal Aid to Education. It had been before the Congress for many years. It would pass one branch of Congress and die in the other. It was like a tennis match in which every ball hit the net.

President Johnson, a former school teacher himself, said:
"We're going to try to get it through," and the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act was passed. Believe me, it wasn't easy.

This year the government of the United States will spend 12 billion dollars in all on education. Seven years ago it was only three billion.

I think we've really done something in this field.

Eight million children from poverty-stricken homes are receiving assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It was your President, your Administration, and your Democratic majority in Congress that made it possible for these eight million children to

have, for the first time in their lives, an equal chance in school.

It was your party, your Democratic majority in Congress, and your President that initiated Head Start for two million pre-school children, giving them for the first time in their lives the opportunity for educational experience in a wholesome environment.

It was your Congress, your party, and your President that saw to it that Medicare became an actual fact rather than just a mere promise.

It was your party, your Democratic majority in Congress, and your President that saw to it that, during this past academic year, almost a million college students received federal assistance in grants, loans, or scholarships so that they could continue their education.

It was your party, your Democratic majority in Congress, and your President that waged war upon the pollution of our air and water.

It is your party, your Democratic majority in Congress, and your President that has launched many of the programs that we hope to put to work to help our cities.

Let me just say a word about that. I have been a mayor myself.

And I serve as the President's liaison with city officials. There is a
coalition of conservatives at work in Congress. We lost 47 Democratic
seats in last year's election, and that has cost us precious time and
important programs. We still have a Democratic majority, but there

are all kinds of Democrats -- and some of them don't go along with the programs of the President and of the Democratic Party.

I think I've been in more American cities than anyone else.

Everywhere I've gone, I've done what I've been doing here. I've been working with our people, meeting with mayors and governors, with federal and local officials, with labor leaders and teachers, with business and professional people, seeking to get them to work together in partnership to deal with the social and economic problems of this country.

Yet I hear people say we've done far too little for our cities.

I know that we need to do more -- but may I remind you that the

President has recommended \$10.3 billion in aid to our cities this year.

Some \$6.8 billion of this has yet to be appropriated. Why is this?

It is because there were those who, after the 1966 election, said: "It's time to slow down, time to reassess, time to take another look -- we ought not to move too fast." It was they, not the White House, who started putting on the brakes, in Congress and throughout the country.

I predict that we are going to enact those bills and get those funds appropriated, but it isn't going to be easy. We need help from our Democratic precinct workers. We need help from the people who helped elect us. Here is help that America needs, help for the slum kid. We need the appropriation for the Elementary and Secondary

* - . . .

Education Act. We need the funds for the rat extermination program.

We enacted the Model Cities program, but we need the funds for it.

We need funds for urban renewal, urban research, amass transit,

the school lunch program.

We have put forward a program that adds up to social progress for America. There isn't any instant solution for our long-standing social and economic problems. There isn't any instant solution for our international problems. We have to do what we think best.

No one is more concerned about the value of life and the loss of life, about peace and war, than the President and the Vice President. My only argument with those who seem to feel differently about things is that they claim for themselves a sense of righteousness which they do not grant to others. Does anyone really believe that any President of the United States -- any President of any party -- actually wants a war? I don't really think so.

Yet there were people who made Abraham Lincoln's life miserable, because he sought to hold the Union together at the cost of the bloodiest war America ever fought. There were people who assailed Franklin D. Roosevelt because, in his 1937 speech at Chicago, he urged that we must quarantine the aggressors. There were good people who called him a warmonger.

I'll just make one statement to this audience. No man desires peace more, no man seeks it more diligently, no man seeks it with greater commitment and conviction that the man who has as his responsibility promoting the general welfare and providing for the common defense -- the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson.

President Johnson said in his State of the Union Message this year:

"This nation is mighty enough, its society is healthyenough, its people are strong enough, to pursue our goals in the world while building a great society here at home."

It is this philosophy which is being tested today. The easiest thing for any President to do is to walk away from his responsibilities.

The goals this nation pursues are well known.

There is the goal of ever-advancing economic, social, and political opportunity for every American -- and any American who doesn't know that doesn't understand the responsibilities of his citizenship.

This nation is also committed to the support of the United Nations, whose purposes, as set forth in its charter, are to resist aggression, to promote self-determination, and to help provide for the economic and social development of peoples who are in the process of nation-building.

John Kennedy, in his great Inaugural Address in 1961, said these words we all ought to remember:

"Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

These were the words of our late and beloved President. One month before his assassination, the well-known TV commentator David Brinkley asked him this question:

"Mr. President, have you had any reason to doubt the so-called domino theory, that if South Vietnam falls the rest of Southeast Asia will go?"

President Kennedy answered:

"No, sir, I believe it, I believe it. I think that the struggle is close enough, China is so large, looms so high, just beyond the frontiers, that if South Vietnam went, it would not only give them an improved geographic position for guerrilla assault on Malaya, but would also give the impression that the wave of the future in Southeast Asia was China and the Communists. So I believe it. I don't agree with those who say that we should withdraw. This would be a great mistake. We took all of this, made this same effort to defend Europe, now Europe is quite secure. We also have to participate, we also have to defend,

. .

we may not like it, in the defense of Asia. We can't make the world over, we can influence the world. The fact of the matter is that with the assistance of the United States, with SEATO, Southeast Asia, and indeed all of Asia, has been maintained independent against a powerful force, the Chinese Communists. What I am concerned about is that Americans will get impatient and say because they don't like events in Southeast Asia, or they don't like the government in Saigon, that we should withdraw. That only makes it easy for the Communists. I think that we should stay, we should use our power, our influence, in as effective a way as we can, but we should not withdraw."

Three Presidents have spoken to the same effect -- President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and now President Johnson.

When President Johnson took office, there were over 16,000 Americans in uniform in Vietnam. We had suffered several hundred casualties -- nothing like we have by now, but we were there. And the late President Kennedy had made it crystal clear that we would stay there.

We're not there just because of South Vietnam alone. For, as the late and beloved Adlai Stevenson (then our Ambassador to the United Nations) reminded critics of our presence in Vietnam, the most aggressive force in the world today is militant Asian Communism, and it must be checked if there would be no peace.

Half of the world's people live in Asia. It is far away, its cultures are foreign to us, and most Americans cannot even pronounce the names of its leaders or spell the names of its cities and towns and villages. Nevertheless, it is a part of this world, and an important part. The United States has had an involvement with this part of the world ever since the early years of our Republic.

Have you forgotten Korea? It was because President Truman wanted to fight a limited war there, because he did not want to run the risk of enlarging it to a nuclear conflict, that he dismissed General MacArthur -- and his public opinion poll rating on that day dropped to 26 per cent. Yet, as our civilian commander-in-chief, he stood his ground.

The war in Korea was unpopular, very unpopular. The same charges were made then that are being made now, and by some of the same voices. Indeed, some of the same voices that were heard then and now were heard as long ago as 1940, saying: "Hitler has won.

We must make our peace with him. Why try to resist the inevitable?"

Today Korea, with all its difficulties and limitations, is a success story. It has succeeded in making the greatest economic breakthrough of any country in Asia, save Japan. Ten years ago, many people wouldn't have given it one chance in a thousand. It was called an insoluble mess, a tragedy, an American mistake. Yet

today the people of South Korea are building a free society and a great economy, and making their full contribution to a free Asia.

Yes, we are in South Vietnam not just for the sake of South Vietnam alone. We are there because we believe that nations should have a chance to build in freedom, in Asia as well as in Europe and Latin America and Africa. We're there because we have made a solemn commitment.

It wasn't made by this President. The only treaties that Lyndon Johnson has signed are treaties of peace. I hear people say that our foreign relations are in desperate disarray, yet there have been more agreements signed with the Soviet Union in the past three years than in any comparable period in our history.

Let me tick them off for you. The President signed a treaty
with the Soviet Union to prevent the orbiting of weapons of mass
destruction in space -- highly significant. He signed the Civil Air
Agreement -- significant. He signed the Consular Treaty -significant. His Administration has drafted and presented to the
Disarmament Conference at Geneva a nuclear nonproliferation treaty -highly significant.

Those are the treaties and agreements that your President has signed. He hasn't signed a single treaty involving an additional military commitment. But, as President of the United States, he is

responsible for honoring our existing commitments. And the credibility of American commitments is the only shield for peace and freedom and independence that many nations have.

Only two years ago, the Prime Minister of Singapore was highly critical of America. Yet he is coming to see the President of the United States, at his invitation. And the Prime Minister has said that the American presence in Vietnam is essential if Asia is to have any hope for freedom.

I have been in 14 countries of Asia and the South Pacific, on three trips. I might say to those who feel that they are the self-appointed apostles of peace that I am one of the co-authors of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I stood beside Adlai Stevenson on this issue in the 1956 campaign. I held hearings before the Senate Disarmament Committee. I advanced the cause of general and universal disarmament. I am the author of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Food for Peace program, the Peace Corps. Indeed, I was accused of being the "peacenik" of the Senate.

But I want to say for the record that, long before I became Vice President of the United States, I felt that our commitment in Southeast Asia was absolutely essential if there was to be any hope of a free and independent Asia in the years ahead. Yes, we're in South Vietnam not just because of South Vietnam alone. We're there in our own national interest. We're there because of Indonesia, we're there because of Thailand, we're there because of India, we're there because of Ceylon, we're there because of the Philippines, we're there because of Burma and every other free country in Asia. If you think it is easy to live in peace with the Asian Communists, ask India. She was the victim of unprovoked aggression by China, even though Prime Minister Nehru had built his foreign policy upon peace and understanding with China.

Only two years ago Indonesia, the fifth most populous nation of the world, was in imminent danger of control by its Peking-oriented Communist Party. They launched a coup whose purpose was to complete their control, leaving President Sukarno as a figurehead. Yet today the leaders of Indonesia tell us that the success of their counter-coup, the freeing of their nation from Communist domination, was dependent upon the American commitment to Asia. The Communist-sponsored confrontation of Malaya by Indonesia -- and it wasn't all bluff, it cost several hundred lives -- is over, and peace reigns there.

Harmony among the nations of the area, once shattered, has been restored, in the form of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Regional cooperation is increasing. Japan is beginning to take her place as a great economic force in Asia -- and a force for

٠.,

good. The victories in this struggle are many -- and they are not military victories alone, even though military victories have been won. I list them for you -- the victory in Indonesia, the fact that Malaysia is no longer confronted by massive hostile forces, the emergence of regional cooperation in Southeast Asia.

Asian leaders may disagree with us about tactics, but they don't disagree about strategy or about ultimate objectives. Not a single leader of any free country in Asia thinks that we are wrong to be in Vietnam. All of them say our presence there is essential to their freedom and independence.

What are we there for? What John Kennedy said we should be there for, what Eisenhower said we should be there for, what Lyndon Johnson says we should be there for. We are there in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations as set forth in its Charter. I defy anyone to find that we have violated that Charter, because it sets forth as one of the major purposes of the United Nations resistance against aggression.

Is there anyone who has the unmitigated gall to stand up and say that there has been no aggression against South Vietnam by the forces of North Vietnam? He knows better, and he knows that they were there before we were there. Of course he knows it, because it is a fact.

As truly as the sun rises in the East and sets in the West, we're there to resist aggression, we're there to promote self-determination. Have we? Well, with all the limitations, and there are plenty, a constituent assembly was elected to write a constitution.

It is a fact, as you may know, that we in America did not actually elect a constituent assembly to write a constitution. The delegates were chosen by their state legislatures. They were invited to come to Philadelphia on May 14. But it was not until May 25 that enough delegates had arrived to start the meeting -- 29 in all. Finally, several weeks later, 55 delegates had arrived, representing 12 states (Rhode Island never did send anybody). Only 42 stayed to the end; only 39 actually signed the Constitution.

That's our record. The capital of the United States was moved ten times between 1776 and 1790. There was talk of secession in New England during the War of 1812. President James Madison was accused of leading this nation into an unprovoked war. They called for his impeachment. They even burned him in effigy.

So nation-building, even here, was not all that easy. And we had the assistance of a friendly nation, as well. There were more French troops at Yorktown than American, and it was a French fleet that bottled up General Cornwallis. We had help in gaining our

independence, just as the Vietnamese did. I think it's good to look at history now and then.

The constitutional process is under way in Vietnam. Some people have doubted it. They said the election would never be held last year, but it was -- and a higher proportion of the people voted than in our own elections that year.

Then the critics said that the constituent assembly would be nothing but a rubber stamp. They said it wouldn't last, that the Vietnamese government would send it home. But it did last and it did write a constitution. It debated -- and the debates were heated at times -- and it wrote a constitution.

Then the critics said: "The military directorate will never accept it -- they'll file it away and forget it." But the directorate did accept it.

Then they said, "The military directorate will draw up the election laws." But they didn't; the elected constituent assembly drew up the election laws.

Then they said: "The constituent assembly will never be able to set the election date." But they did.

Then they said: "They'll never have hamlet and village elections," but elections were in fact held, and 77 per cent of the registered

voters in these villages participated in them -- more than in any municipal election in America. (The average vote in a municipal election in America is 35 per cent.)

Then they said the Presidential elections would be a fraud, a farce, and a hoax. Archbishop Lucy was one of the official American observers there, and the President asked him:

"Archbishop, what was the main disappointment that you encountered in your visit to Vietnam?"

He said: "The one disappointment I encountered was that of the newspapermen who couldn't find anything really to complain about in the election."

And Mayor McKeldin of Baltimore, a Republican, stood up and said:

"Mr. President, I want you to know that I wasn't brainwashed."

The electoral process is taking place. I won't predict what the future may hold. It is difficult to build democracy in a country that's had a thousand years of mandarin rule, almost a century of colonial domination, and 26 years of war.

But I do know that we must be firm in our resolve. We must not let people drive us into a massive acceleration of this struggle. We must hew to the middle course -- and by that I mean the course between withdrawal and using all of our power.

*** **

We have a civilian commander-in-chief -- the President. He has as his prime objectives in this struggle the prevention both of aggression and of a military holocaust.

That is why your government has acted as it has. That is why we don't bring to bear all of the massive power of this nation. That is why we consult with Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Gromyko, that is why we have gone to everyone in the United Nations -- to seek ways and means of securing a just peace.

I want to say to our critics, speaking this morning in my capacity as a member of the President's Cabinet, that any time anybody can bring Ho Chi Minh or any of his appointed and responsible agents to the conference table, we are ready to sit down and talk peace.

We are ready to talk and to negotiate. We'll talk if the fighting stops, we'll talk even while it goes on. But I think our critics should know that Ho Chi Minh has written the President and said there would be no talks and no conference -- even with the good offices of Chairman Kosygin himself.

We've walked the extra mile. We're prepared to walk two miles or more. We're prepared to do anything that can be done, not only through the United Nations but through intermediaries.

We are anxious for peace, but we are not prepared to withdraw, to give up, to retreat.

#

Address of

VICE-PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

to the

Democratic National Committeemen And Committeewomen And Democratic Party Workers Of The State of Colorado

At The Grand Ballroom

DENVER HILTON HOTEL DENVER, COLORADO

September 9, 1967 9:00 A.M.

Address of

VICE-PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

to the

Democratic National Committeemen And Committeewomen And Democratic Party Workers Of The State of Colorado

At The Grand Ballroom

DENVER HILTON HOTEL DENVER, COLORADO

September 9, 1967 9:00 A.M.

PROCEEDINGS

MR. WILLIAM GRANT: Fellow Democrats, the Vice-President of the United States. (Applause.)

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I'm hardly awake. I'm afraid that somebody sounded my title, so I think that it's going to do for this occasion. I do appreciate, Mr. Chairman, this splendid early morning reception, and I'm happy to see a gathering around us here now, the leaders of the community.

Mr. Mayor, it's nice to see you, Tom. I think he deserves a good loud hand. (Applause.)

Mayor, I wasn't sure if you were any more awake than I happened to be at this moment. I just wanted to be sure we were both on the same wave length here. And, of course, from your own District here in the great City of Denver, I'm sure everyone here knows — and if he hasn't been introduced, I want to do it, I imagine he has, and if you've made a speech, you can make another if you wish, none other than Byron Rogers, Congressman Byron Rogers. (Applause.)

And then that sterling character of a man, that fine

Congressman that I worked with down in Pueblo, and yesterday at

Colorado Springs, that has suffered beyond the call of human

endurance, being with me yesterday, and listened to me speak five

times, none other than Frank Evans. (Applause.)

And you may have noticed that as we came into the room this morning, I was accompanied by a very distinguished gentleman

not only distinguished in his looks and appearance, but in his performance as a public official, I tried to get ahead of him a little bit, because when he walks alongside of me they always say, "Look at that good looking man," and I know it's not me, and it bothers me, and if I'm out alone, why, I get by fairly well.

But I want to introduce to you the man who is presently number two in Colorado, but any day, and I think it will be about, oh, a couple or three years from now, he'll be number one, Mark Hogan. (Applause.)

A wonderful Lieutenant Governor. Now, I don't know if any more have gathered but as they come in, why, we'll stop the proceedings. I've often said as I've come to a morning gathering like this, if the spirit moves any of you to do anything, make a speech or make a contribution, don't for a moment hesitate to get up and do it, particularly if it's a contribution.

(Laughter.)

Because I received a little note just as I came down
here -- by the way, I have a hand full of papers here, none of
which I have prepared, different leaders of the Democratic party
in Colorado said, "Would you mind mentioning this," and if it's
a little disjointed this morning, just remember they didn't
have a chance to get their material together, either. But I
have a note here that reminds me that the Chairman, Dale Tooley,
has told me about, it says something to the effect, "We surely
would appreciate emphasis on door to door solicitation, both votes

-3-

~

W.V.

and money." I added that part, I knew that's what he meant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And in fact, I do think it's very important for us to remember it, and I didn't want to forget it, Dale, and that's why I mention it now, for the Denver County Democratic Central Committee, precinct workers and all, to keep in mind, the drive that you're going to have here in this county for the 1967 Democratic Fund Drive. And I hope that you will get at it. starts September 15 to 25, and it's Support Your Party Week, and it's party time in Denver and Colorado. And I know what it means to have to try to carry on a political program without the resources that are necessary. I helped build a political party in my state. We built it literally from the ashes of ruin to the controlling party in the State of Minnesota. And we had to do it the hard way, with just people, faith, energy, dedication and competence. And we went out and molded a political structure, fielded political candidates, carried out our political assignments, went door to door for political solicitation, started a sustaining fund, Dollars for Democrats, parties, dances, meetings, we even had a barbeque before they had one in Texas. (Laughter and applause.)

So I'm not unmindful of the tremendous job that it is to keep a party organization alive, to keep it operating, to maintain a central headquarters, a county organization, and I know that I'm talking to the people this morning that are fully aware of these responsibilities and these duties and burdens.

I am talking to the people that I like to visit with. I'm talking to the people that make possible our victory, and could, if they failed in their responsibilities, contribute to defeat. But we are a forward-looking party, and we're an affirmative-looking people, that's why we're Democrats. And I want to clear the decks of certain things early. I've never been the kind of a Democrat that expected that every person that I met or that every one of my friends would always agree with me on everything one hundred percent of the time. If you are going to have a party like that, I suggest the kind of a headquarters you ought to have, a telephone booth. Because that'll be big enough to house all the supporters of that kind of a party that demands unanimity on every issue. The Democratic party represents a national political organization and structure, it represents an entire nation, and this nation of ours has different cultural patterns, this nation of ours has different levels of economic development, this nation of ours has different needs. And people in a political party that has a national base must on the one hand have some national commitments, national purposes, national goals. But on the other hand you must leave them an opportunity to be individualists, to have their point of view.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2I

22

24

So I do not come to scold my fellow Democrats because I may disagree with them or they may disagree with me. I'm not sure, I am not positive, what is right. What I try to do is to find out what is right. I've heard the President of the United

States say a number of times that to do what is right is not difficult, what is difficult is to find out what is right. And that's what we seek to do in the political party.

4.

Now, this morning I want to talk to you about the record of the administration and I want to tell you why I believe that it merits your active, affirmative, continued support. I think I know what our problems are, I've been in politics a long time. I started out way back in the 1930's as Chairman of the Young Democrats in my county. I'll never forget my first opportunity of meeting the late and beloved President, Franklin Roosevelt. I was the only young fellow in the town of 12,000 that had the chance to shake his hand, and I was one of those that really didn't wash that hand for at least a week. It was the best thing that ever happened to Humphrey's Drug Store, because I stood behind the soda fountain, and in order to get a handshake you had to buy a coke. It helped business.

My father was a Democrat in a Republican community. He was the mayor of his city time after time, a councilman, and then a state legislator, he was a businessman. I was brought up in the philosophy of Woodrow Wilson, which is one of the reasons that all of my public and private life I have felt very deeply about our international commitments. I think had the nation listened to the call of Wilson we might have been spared the tragedy of World War II. I was brought up as a young man working for Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I was in Denver, Colorado,

on March 4th, 1933, when Roosevelt was inaugurated for his first term. I was a New Dealer, and am, because I consider the movement that Franklin Delano Roosevelt launched in 1933 part of the unfinished American Revolution. (Applause.)

You're doing mighty good back there, you should take up sign painting. (Laughter and applause.)

You know, one of the joys of public life is to see the unbelievable undeveloped talent for artistry that's in the Democratic ranks. (Applause.)

This party has a record of sustained social progress, and
I repeat, sustained social progress. It has had leadership that
has endured the insults and the acrimony of a powerful opposition,
and it has had leaders, and has a leader, that merits the support
and the admiration and the confidence of the majority of the
American people. (Applause.)

And I haven't any doubt that when the choices have to be made, when it's a choice between two candidates, three or four, or when it's a choice between two political parties, the people of this nation are not going to cast aside leadership that has brought this country to the highest pinnacle of its prosperity, that has done more to recognize the social problems of this nation, and to launch a program, an effective program, of assault upon those social problems, that has done more to build a world community of international peace and understanding. I don't think the American people are going to reject that kind of

leadership, and that's why I'm confident (applause) -- that's why
I am confident about the months ahead and the election in November

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

But my fellow Democrats, let's get down to business. We like to take each other apart, that's one of the traits of being a Democrat, this is what we call our independence, this is what we call our liberal progressive spirit, and it is to be expected, and in fact it is most of the time and for most of the months of the year not only to be expected but to be desired.

Self-analysis, self-criticism, is a healthy thing. But there comes a time after the debate, after the dissent, there comes a time after the debate and dissent when you ultimately have to make a decision. And when that time of decision comes, you have to make choices, not between what you think is perfect and what you know to be totally imperfect, but between the available alternatives. And that's why when I read the polls, when I see what the American people seem to be sensing and thinking, I find that the administration, while it has many who wish we would do better, while it has many critics, that when they take the poll they'd rather have a man who knows how to be President than a man who knows how to be an actor, they'd rather have a man who knows how to be President -- (applause) they'd rather have a man who knows how to be President rather than one that's trying to describe a new intellectual detergent, and I think you know what I mean. (Laughter and applause.)

And I don't want anybody here to say that I said anything about brainwashing. Well, now, let's just go in the words of Al Smith, let's just take a look at the record. Let's take a look at what's happened the last six years, because that's the record of this administration, the record of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and the record of the Johnson-Humphrey administration. And I put myself in that, because I'll tell you why, one day in the Senate I was presiding up there, and there were folks up there giving the President all sorts of trouble, and they were condemning the President for this and condemning him for that, and lo and behold, up rose Everett Dirksen, and Everett Dirksen said in his melodious voice, he said, "Mr. President, I don't think we ought to put upon the weary shoulders of the President all of the responsibility for the mistakes of this administration, I want to include in our beloved friend, Hubert." (Laughter and applause.)

And he started then to denounce the Johnson-Humphrey administration. Well, I'll tell you, when you're Vice-President you're glad to have your name mentioned anywhere. (Applause.)

So it is the Johnson-Humphrey administration, and I am proud to be associated with it. There is a rhythm about Democratic leadership which I want to give you this morning. When Franklin Roosevelt became President of this country he found the nation in the depths of despair and depression, and he said that we had to get America on the move once again. And Franklin Roosevelt's departing words to the American people, as he was taken from us, and you remember the occasion, as he was writing the remarks for

his Jefferson Day speech, the last words in that speech, a speech that was never finished, never delivered, were these, "Let us move forward with a strong and an active faith." That is the theme of this party, let us move forward, but with a strong and active faith.

It's sort of like what Abraham Lincoln said, "With malice towards none," and there's folks that want to have that spirit only, "With charity for all," and someone has stopped there, but that isn't what Lincoln said, he said, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, but with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

And Franklin Roosevelt said, "Let us move forward," and then he told you how, "with a strong and an active faith." A strong conviction and an active faith in what you're doing and what you hope to do, what the promise is. John Kennedy found a nation that was in its third recession, and I can remember on that inaugural day because I was sitting on that platform as the majority whip of the United States Senate, and John Kennedy said, "Let's get this country moving again, let us begin" — the three words, "Let us begin" — and he did get the nation moving. He moved the nation forward, he moved it in spirit, he moved it in fact. And then he was taken by the assassin's bullet. And I sat in the home of the then Vice-President and just President by the tragedy of John Kennedy's death, I sat there as Lyndon Johnson was preparing his speech to the joint session of the Congress, I

was there all night as the President was working on that speech.

And I remember three words, "Let us continue," and the promise
that he made to the American people in that joint session, when

President Johnson said, "The platform of John Kennedy will be
carried out, it is a battle order, we will fulfill it."

I was called in as one of the two lieutenants of the United States Senate, with Senator Mansfield as majority leader and Hubert Humphrey as the deputy majority leader and the majority whip. And I sat there with the leaders of the House and of the Senate when President Johnson said, "We have a moral as well as a political commitment to see that the unfinished work of John Kennedy is completed." And we set out to do it in the second session of the 88th Congress, and we did it, a remarkable performance. And then came the elections of 1964, with a mandate from the people, and we set to work in the 89th Congress — and I'm talking now about the real facts of political life — and the 89th Congress produced the most memorable and historic record of liberal and progressive legislation in the annals of American history, there's never been anything like it. (Applause.)

But unless you think it came easily, let me assure you that it didn't. We passed a comprehensive Civil Rights Act, and my, you think we did nothing, to hear some people talk.

Listen, I went to the Democratic convention in 1948, and I'm used to people walking out on meetings, you know, and I saw then the bigots -- and there are all kinds of bigots -- I saw then

the people who said they were right and they knew how right they were, and they were far right. (Laughter.)

You know, you get on either side of the road too far and you're in the ditch. I saw then people who were not going to tolerate any, any change whatsoever. And they got up and walked out, the Dixiecrats. And Harry Truman was faced in that election of 1948 with a Progressive Party candidate, who was the late and beloved Henry Wallace, he was faced with the Dixiecrat Party candidate, Strom Thurmond --

A VOICE: What about your friend, Lester Maddox?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I'll come to him a little bit later. If he's one of your relatives we don't want to miss an opportunity to speak kindly of him. (Laughter and applause.)

You never know how I worry about these meetings, I pay these people to interrupt me at certain times, and they're always a little late. (Laughter and applause.)

Wait a minute, wait a minute, we don't want to throw people out of meetings, the purpose of the meeting is to keep people in. Just leave everybody alone, he's got a right to have his opinion, I've been wrong, why can't he be wrong. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, I'll give him the platform when I'm through, I think we ought to have equal time here -- but it'll be some time, I'm afraid, however. You did interrupt my train of thought. I said that I'd been in places where we'd had difficulties before. And

Mr. Truman went on in that election, despite all the predictions to the contrary, to win a tremendous victory. And I'll tell you why he won the victory, because he had courage, conviction and confidence. He had courage to state what he believed and to do what he thought was right, he had conviction, even though he had a Congress that opposed him, and he had confidence in himself and he had confidence in the judgment of the American people, and he went out and won a great victory.

We face very much the same situation in 1967 and '68. I hear that there may be this group or that group that fields a candidate, and all I can say is that's their right and that's their privilege, this is a free country, and the Democratic processes are to work.

But I know this, my fellow Democrats, that if you want to win, and I think you have a stake in it, and every man and every person that holds public office, every man and woman that's a Democrat that holds public office, ought to remember this, that you're seldom much stronger than the head of your ticket. You don't make progress when you break ranks and break away from the family.

Benjamin Franklin, a man who I've used in this state, his famous statement of the Constitutional Convention, was right, "You either hang together or you hang separately." (Applause.)

I'll put it quite frankly. I know that it is a joy on occasion to point out the limitations of those that serve you.

I know that it seems to tickle the fancy of many of us, and it has me, on occasion, to find fault with leaders and programs and policies. But I want to make this suggestion to you just a few months before the decision will be made in 1968 -- and this is September 1967 -- 14 months from now the American people are going to decide the course of this nation, they are going to decide who is going to be President, and it isn't going to be a third party candidate and it isn't going to be a fourth party candidate, it's going to be a Democratic candidate or a Republican candidate, that's what the choice is ultimately going to be.

Now, that choice can be affected by many factors, but that is the ultimate choice. And I think Democrats ought to remember this, that it isn't going to improve your political health to put poison in the Democratic well from whence you're going to have to drink between now and next November. (Applause.)

Now, having stated the negative, let me state the positive. What has been going on? Well, I've spent some 20 years in the City of Washington, I came there with a record of civil rights, a party that had been split, I believed in what I was standing for, and I handled the legislation of 1964, which I was referring to, from the 10th day of February to the 27th day of June, in debate and filibuster, the comprehensive Civil Rights Act of 1964. 292 amendments. I never had a chance to leave the floor of the Senate, save on Sunday, because we met six days a week.

And the President of the United States, this President, the man from Texas, sent to the Congress of the United States the most bold, far-reaching comprehensive Civil Rights program that any President ever dreamed of, much less dared to send to the Congress. And after months of debate, with never a lack of purpose on the part of the President, with every effort that he could bring to bear, we passed it.

And today, the promise of Abraham Lincoln in the Emancipation Proclamation became a legislative, legal, statutory reality, because Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, advanced the program and a Democratic Congress passed the program.

(Applause.)

Now, there's been poverty in this country for a long time. The Scriptures say the poor shall always be with us. That may be true. The Democratic party happens to believe, and the President of the United States happens to believe, however, that whether a person is poor or not, whether he is white or black, whether he is red, brown or yellow, whatever his name may be, whether he has a Scandinavian surname or a Spanish surname, whether he comes from the North or the South, that every American is entitled to an equal opportunity in the American society. And the war on poverty and every piece of legislation that we've advanced in Congress during these years has been designed for one purpose, to open the gates of opportunity to every American simply because he is an American, and we fought

25 /201

-15-

the good fight. (Applause.)

Now, we're not trying to make poverty more tolerable, we're trying to get at its root causes. We're not trying to ease just the pain of poverty, that could be done by writing out a check, and there are some people that think that's the way to do it, they have a checkbook mentality. We think that there is some other way, that there's a better way, that costs money, yes, but more than that it costs commitment, it costs public service, it means community action, personal dedication, it's the hard way, it may be the slow way, but it is the sure way. And we have today a galaxy of programs across the American scene that's taking from the Federal budget this year \$25,800,000,000 in total expenditures in the war on poverty. 25,800,000,000.

Now, my friends, some people think that's far too much, and I've been cautioned not to say that figure, because it arouses the concern of many of a conservative citizen, and indeed of the taxpayers who never like to see too big expenditures. But I mention it because there are people in our own ranks that say, "Well, what are you doing?" And they say, "What happened to the liberal program." I'll tell you what happened to it, I helped design it, I fought for it for 16 years in the United States Senate, I think I know something about it, I'm part of its daddy, I was there. (Applause.) And I'm going to let you in on a secret of what happened to the liberal program. We passed it, yes, we passed it. (Applause.)

-16-

Now, I don't think it makes you a liberal, I don't think you prove yourself a liberal by having failures, I think liberals have to be willing to stand failure, I think they have to be willing to suffer defeat, I think they have to be willing to suffer reverses for a cause. But I don't think you're any less a liberal when the program that you fought for, that year after year was defeated, is finally passed.

I introduced on May 17, 1949, Medicare. Hubert H. Humphrey And the title of the bill was an act to amend the Social Security Act, to provide hospital and nursing home care for persons aged 65 and over. We couldn't even get a hearing. I introduced it every two years.

I finally went to my good friend from New Mexico, Clinton Anderson, who was on the Finance Committee, knowing that this bill had to go through the Finance Committee, and having learned in Congress that if you want a bill really passed you try to get hold of somebody on the committee that's going to handle the bill. And I said, "Clint, would you take this bill and let me be co-sponsor. I believe in this bill. If you take it and you believe it, you've stated that you're for it, we can pass it." Dennis King of the State of California, on the House Ways and Means Committee, did the same. And we kept at it from 1949 to 1965.

And we went to Independence, Missouri, to sign Medicare.

Medicare, that provides medical, hospital and nursing home care

for 19 million of our senior citizens. Last year 4 1/2 million people received hospital services and 20 million hospital medical bills were paid under Medicare. Now, I don't think this proves that the Johnson-Humphrey administration has lost its love of liberal legislation. I think it only proves that we know how to get liberal legislation passed, and I'm proud of the record. (Applause.)

Let's take a look at the galaxy of programs. The first big item was the Federal Aid to Education. Federal Aid to Education passed the Senate in one session, was defeated in the House, it was sort of like a tennis match, there was always a net ball. It never got in the opposite court.

The Government of the United States, under a new President, the man who is now President of the United States, a former schoolteacher, said, "We're going to try to get those things through," and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed. It wasn't easy.

This year the Government of the United States for higher education, for research, for the National Science Foundation, in the field of medical research, elementary and secondary education, this year the Government of the United States will spend 12 billion dollars on aid to education. Six years ago we were spending 3 billion. Four years ago we were spending 4 billion. I think we've done something. (Applause.)

Eight million children, from needy homes or poverty homes,

8 million deprived children, are receiving assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It was your President, and your administration, and your Democratic majority, that made possible the fact that 8 million children deprived of the equal opportunities for education are today for the first time in their lives getting a chance. It was your Congress, your party, and your President, that initiated Project Head Start for 2 million little children, for the first time in their lives it is a chance for a wholesome environment and educational experience. (Applause) It was your party, your Democratic majority, and your Democratic President, that saw to it that Medicare became not a promise but a fact. (Applause.) It was your party, your Democratic majority, and your President, that saw to it that last year one million students in higher education were the recipients of federal assistance in grants, loans or scholarships, so they can continue their education. That's quite an achievement. (Applause.) And it was your party, and your Democratic majority, and

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And it was your party, and your Democratic majority, and your President, that waged war upon the pollution of the air and the pollution of the water. And it is your party and your Democratic majority that launched many of the programs today that we hope to see put to work to help our cities.

And let me just say a word about that. I have been a mayor of a city, and I worked as the President's liaison with the President of the United States. There is an old coalition at work in the Congress, and my friends here know what I'm

speaking of, the old coalition of conservatives. We lost 47 seats in the last election, and those 47 seats have cost us precious time and important programs. Oh, we have had a good working majority. We had many Democrats, but as I said, there are all kinds of Democrats. And some of them couldn't go along with your Presidential program and with your Democratic party program. Nobody knows it more than the Mayor of Denver, Mayor Currigan, and the former mayor of Minneapolis.

I think I've been in more American cities than anyone.

I've traveled 568 separate missions. I've been in 26 countries, four continents, 49 states, and traveled over 500,000 miles, doing what I'm doing here now, working with our people, meeting with mayors and governors, meeting with federal and local officials, meeting with labor and teachers, meeting with business and meeting with professional people, to get them to work together in a partnership to advance this cause of this great country and the social and economic programs of this country. And I hear people say that we have done far too little for our cities. We'll never have done enough, I'm aware of that, I know that we need to do more.

But ladies and gentlemen, President Lyndon Johnson has placed before the Congress bills that relate to the economic and social development of our cities that add up to the sum total of 10 billion, 300 million dollars. Here's a listing of 6 billion 800 million right here. 6 billion 800 million that

7 3 4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have yet to be funded, that have yet to be appropriated for. And why? Because there were those that said at the end of the 89th Congress and after the election in November 1966, "It's time to slow down, and it's time to reassess, it's time to take another look, we ought not to move too fast," and they started putting on the brakes, not out of the White House, but in many areas across the country, and some people in the Congress, some people.

Now, we're going to pass these bills, and I predict we'll pass every one of them, but it isn't going to be easy. And what we need from our Democratic precinct workers and what we need from the people that helped elect us is help. Here is the help that America needs, here is the help for the kid that's in the slum, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has yet to be appropriated for, we need that money. Rat extermination funds and program, we need that money. That's not a laughable subject. Model cities, we passed the legislation, but we need the funds. Urban renewal, urban research, mass transit, the child nutrition act, the school lunch act, we need these funds.

A VOICE: What's the use of educating them if we send them to Viet Nam to be killed. We're killing kids right out of high school. Stop the war.

> VOICES: Boo.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Just a minute, just a minute. We have people that are entitled to express their point of view. I respect that point of view, and I'm going to comment and answer the lady's question. I think the worst thing that can happen in the ranks of the Democratic party is when somebody is deeply moved on an issue and we try to shout them down. We're not going to do that, we're going to let people be heard.

(Applause.)

We have advanced a program for your people -- and for our people -- and that program adds up to social progress in America. There isn't any instant solution to any problem, there isn't any instant solution to the economic and social problems, and there isn't any instant solution that we have for international problems. We have to do what we think is best.

Now, the President of the United States, and the former President of the United States, made some statements that I think are very much to the point of what the lady just said. And no one is more concerned about life, loss of life, violence, war, than the President of the United States or the Vice-President of the United States.

My only argument with those who seem to feel differently about things is that they claim for themselves a sense of righteousness which they do not attach to others. Does anybody really believe that any President of the United States, any president of any party, wants a war? I don't think so, I don't think so. There were people that made Abraham Lincoln's life miserable, because he sought to hold a union together in the

bloodiest war that America has ever fought. There were people that assailed Franklin Roosevelt, and there were good people who went after him when he spoke at the great meeting at the Chicago Bridge in 1937 and said, "We must quarantine the aggressors," and they said, "This is a warmonger." And there were people that were opposed to every action that this nation has ever taken throughout its history, when it came in action that ended in hostilities.

I just make one statement to this audience. No man is more desirous of peace, no man seeks it more diligently, no person seeks it with greater commitment and conviction, at least he seeks it with as much as anyone else, as the man who has on his conscience and has as his burden the responsibilities for promoting the general welfare and providing for the common defense, and that man is the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson. (Standing applause.)

Let me just remind you of what I think are two rather pertinent and relevant statements this morning. I've been talking about what we've been trying to do on the domestic front. Obviously, we can't cover every issue, but we have a broad program, and we think it will lend itself to the public good.

Lyndon Johnson said in his State of the Union message,
"This nation is mighty enough, its society is healthy enough,
its people are strong enough to pursue our goals in the rest of

the world while building a great society here at home."

And it is this statement of philosophy, it is this statement of philosophy, which is being tested today. The easiest thing for any President to do is to walk away from his responsibilities. The goals that this nation pursues are well known, the goal of an ever-extending advancing economic social political opportunity to every American, and an American that doesn't know that doesn't understand the responsibilities of his citizenship. (Applause.)

And the commitment of this nation under the Charter of the United Nations is quite obvious and quite well understood by treaty, to resist aggression, to promote self-determination, and to help provide for the economic and social development of nations that are in the process of nation building. That's from the Charter of the United Nations.

And that's why John Kennedy, when he spoke in his great message to the American people in the inaugural of 1961 said these words that you ought to remember:

"Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Those were the words of the late and beloved former

President. Mr. Brinkley of the Huntley-Brinkley show, just a

month before President Kennedy's assassination, asked the then

President of the United States this question: "Mr. President, 1 have you had any reason to doubt the so-called dominal theory, that 2 if South Viet Nam falls the rest of Southeast Asia will go behind 3 it?" President Kennedy: "No, sir, I believe it, I believe it. I 4 5 think that the struggle is close enough, China is so large, looms 6 so high, just beyond the frontiers, that if South Viet Nam went, it would not only give them an improved geographic position for 8 guerilla assault on Malaya, but would also give the impression that the wave of the future in Southeast Asia was China and the Communists 10 So I believe it. I don't agree with those who say that we should 11 withdraw. This would be a great mistake. We took all of this, 12 made this same effort to defend Europe, now Europe is quite secure 13 We also have to participate, we also have to defend, we may not 14 like it, in the defense of Asia. We can't make the world over, we 15 can influence the world. The fact of the matter is that with the 16 assistance of the United States, with SEATO, Southeast Asia, and 17 indeed all of Asia, has been maintained independent against a 18 powerful force, the Chinese Communists. What I am concerned about 19 is that Americans will get impatient and say because they don't 20 like events in Southeast Asia, or they don't like the government 21 in Saigon, that we should withdraw. That only makes it easy for 22 the Communists. I think that we should stay, we should use our 23 power, our influence, in as effective a way as we can, but we 24 should not withdraw." (Applause.)

25

Now, ladies and gentlemen, three Presidents have said the same. One was President Eisenhower, one was President Kennedy, and now President Johnson.

When President Johnson became President of the United

States, we had over 25,000 American forces in Viet Nam, we had

suffered several hundred dead, and many casualties, nothing like

we have now. But we were there. And the President of the United

States, the former President, the late President, had made it

crystal clear that we would be there.

Now, we're not there just because of South Viet Nam. If
that were the case, then indeed, people might very well ask
with great validity, at least in their own sense of judgment
and values, is it worth it? No one likes war. It was Franklin
Roosevelt who said, "I hate war." Yet he was President at a
time that America fought the great war. It was President Franklin
Roosevelt who said, "We must quarantine the aggressor." And yet
he had to listen to a Congress and a public that said, "Keep away,"
and Hitler went on to his conquests.

The late and beloved Adlai Stevenson, as our Ambassador to the United Nations, reminded President Lyndon Johnson that the most militant aggressive threat in the whole world today was militant Asian Communism and it had to be checked or there could be no peace.

Half of the population of the world lives in Asia, it's far away, it's foreign to our culture, most people cannot pronounce

-26-

the names of the men who lead, most people don't even know how to spell the names of the cities and the towns and the villages. Nevertheless, it is a part of this world, a very important part of this world. And America has had an involvement in this part of the world since the beginning of this Republic. The wars in which this nation has been engaged since 1920 have started in that part of the world.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Harry Truman and Korea -- have you forgotten? -- his public opinion rating on the day that he dismissed General MacArthur was 26 percent in the poll. 26 percent. Because he wanted to fight a limited war, because he did not want to be guilty of extending a war to the possibilities of a nuclear conflict, and because he was civilian commander in chief. And he stood his ground. The war in Korea was unpopular, desperately unpopular. I served in the Senate in those days. The same charges were made that are being made now, and some of the same voices. Indeed, some of the same voices, may I say, were heard then and now that were heard back to 1940, when polit columns were written, when spokesmen in America said that, "Hitler has won, we must make our peace." The written word in the leading journals of America, from leading public opinion commentators, "Why try to resist the inevitable."

Today Korea, with all of its difficulties and limitations, represents a success story, the greatest economic breakthrough of any country in Asia today, save Japan itself.

Ten years ago, there isn't a person in this audience that would have given it one chance in a thousand. It was called the insoluble mess, the American mistake, the American tragedy, and yet today, the peoples of South Korea are building a free society with all of its problems, are building a great economy with all of the difficulties, and are making their contribution to free Asia.

We're in South Viet Nam not just because of South Viet
Nam, we are there because we happen to believe that nations
should have a chance to build in freedom, in Asia as well as
in Europe and Latin America and other parts of the world. We're
there because we made a commitment, whether we should have or we
should not have, the fact is it was made, and it wasn't made by
this President. This President has signed some treaties, and
the only treaties that Lyndon Johnson has signed are treaties of
peace. He signed a treaty with the Soviet Union to prevent
orbiting of weapons of mass destruction in space, and I hear
people say today that our foreign relations are in a desperate
disarray, and yet there have been more agreements signed with
the Soviet Union, the second largest power in the world, in the
last three years than in the preceding 30. (Applause.)

Just let me tick them off for you. The Spence Treaty,
a significant one. The Civil Air Treaty, significant. The
Consular Agreement, significant. The Culture Exchange Agreement
double what it was, highly significant. The exchange of scientists

and technologists, highly significant. The drafting of and the laying on the table of at Geneva, the disarmament conference, of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Those are the treaties that your President has signed.

He hasn't signed a treaty to commit the United States to one single more defense contract. He frankly didn't even vote for SEATO. That is not his record. But he is President of the United States. And don't forget it that the credibility of the American commitment is the only shield of the peace and freedom and independence that nations have.

The Prime Minister of Singapore, who only two years ago was highly critical of your America, very critical, to the point of even saying that he'd have been tempted to be bribed, today is coming to see the President of the United States at his invitation, at his request. And Prime Minister Li of Singapore said that American presence and stand in Viet Nam is essential if Asia is to have any hope for freedom.

I have been in 14 countries of Southeast Asia and the sub-continent, three times, and might I say to those who feel that they are the self-appointed apostles of peace that I am one of the co-authors of the nuclear test ban treaty. I fought for that when some of you ran for cover. I have stood alongside of Adlai Stevenson in the campaign of 1956 and started the hearings in the Congress of the United States for a disarmament committee. I advanced the cause of universal and general disarmament. I am

the author of the disarmament agency established in the government of the United States, the Food for Peace program, the Peace Corps. I was accused of being the "peacenik" of the United States Senate.

But I want to say for the record right here that long before I became Vice-President of the United States, and not because of loyalty to Lyndon Johnson, I felt that our commitment in Southeast Asia was absolutely essential if there was to be any hope of a free and independent Asia in the days ahead.

(Applause.)

We're in South Viet Nam not just because of South Viet
Nam, we're there because of ourselves, we're there, if you please,
because of Indonesia, we're there because of Thailand, we're there
because of India, we're there because of Ceylon, we're there because of the Phillipines, we're there because of every country
in the area, Burma included. And if making understandings with
the Communists, if that's the way that some people think that
you get peace, go talk to the President of India. Two times
India was the victim of unprovoked aggression by China. Two times
even though India fashioned its foreign policy as if it was the
twin brother of Communist China, it made no difference, none
whatsoever.

Two years ago, Indonesia, the fifth largest nation on the face of the earth, was a captive of the PKI, the Chinese Communist controlled party in Indonesia. The coup was to complete it.

Sukarno was to be nothing more or less than the titular head of a country that was completely controlled and operated under the Chinese Communist party influence.

Every student of government that's worthy of being called a teacher knows that that's the truth. And I've been a teacher, too. And a full professor, too. And yet today, the leaders of Indonesia openly say that the success of their counter-attack, of their revolution to free themselves from the grips of Chinese Communist control, and they've expended a half a million lives in doing it, -- a half a million -- that their success has been dependent upon our presence, upon our stand, upon our commitment in South Viet Nam.

The war between Malaya and Indonesia, which has taken thousands of lives, you know -- and if you're really interested as a God-fearing, God-loving person in saving life, a life is a life, whether it's an American life or somebody else's -- the war between Indonesia and Malasia, sponsored, supported, fashioned and spawned as a part of the Communist attack in Southeast Asia is over, that war has been settled, and peace reigns.

The Southeast Asia association, including Malasia and Indonesia, and the Phillipines, which was once broken and shattered, is today a fact. Regional cooperation is beginning to take place.

Japan is beginning to take her place as a great economic force for good in Asia. The victories that have been won in this struggle are many. Not the military victories alone, even though

they have been won. But I list them to you, the victory of an 1 Indonesia today, that by her own testimony is able to do what 2 she's been able to do because we were there, the victory of a 3 Malasia that was under attack two years ago, and confronted by 4 massive forces of the enemy, the peace has been signed, the 5 nations are at peace. The victory, if you please, of regional 6 7 cooperation in Southeast Asia, the likes of which the world has never known, the victory of Burma, who only a few months ago --9 yes, a year ago -- was in the grips of Chinese Communist influence 10 and Mai Win himself came to see the President of the United States 11 and Burma today stands as a proud, free and independent nation. And what did General Mai Win say to the President of the United 1213 States? Did he say that we should get out? He said, "If you do, we're lost." Does the President of India say we should get 14 15 out? To the contrary. Oh, they disagree about tactics, we've 16 got all kinds of tacticians, but they don't agree as to ultimate 17 objectives or strategy. Not one single leader of any free country 18 in Asia thinks that what we're doing in Viet Nam by our presence 19 is wrong. All of them say it is essential to their freedom and 20 independence, and I think they may know more about Asia than 21 some self-appointed artists that carry signs. (Applause.) 22 I'll conclude. What are we there for? What John Kennedy 23

said we should be there for, what Eisenhower said we should be there for, what Lyndon Johnson says we should be there for, what the Charter of the United Nations says we should be there for.

24

25

And I defy the students of international law and international relations, because I, too, have been to college and taught the courses. I defy them to find that we have violated the Charter, to the contrary, we are supporting it, because that Charter says, first, the duty of every nation state is to resist aggression.

And is there any man that has the unmitigated gall to stand and say that there is no aggression in South Viet Nam by the forces of North Viet Nam? He knows better, and he knew that they were there before we were there, and he knows that two divisions are in Laos, and he knows that there are thousands of them in North Thailand. Of course, he knows it, because it's a fact.

II

As the sun rises in the East and sets in the West, we're there to resist aggression, we're there to promote self-determination. Have we? Well, with all of the limitations, and there are plenty, a constituent assembly was elected to write a constitution. Your country never elected a constituent assembly to write a constitution. You're familiar with our history.

One hundred people were invited by special invitation by certain selected appointed leaders to come to Philadelphia to take a look at the Articles of Confederation and hopefully to discuss them and make modest revisions. They were appointed by the Legislatures, and there was not universal manhood suffrage, and they didn't vote at age 18, and the war was over, Cornwallis had been defeated, and a hundred were invited, 55 ultimately came, a quorum was present two and a half weeks after the date assigned

for their presence, 39 stayed, 38 signed, and little Rhode Island never signed.

That's our record. The capitol of the United States was moved 11 times from 1776 to 1790. There was secession in the War of 1812, so if you think we've got troubles now, why, up in the New England States, where Harvard and Yale and other places are, they had people there that got up and said, "Let's secede."

And James Madison was called a mad dog, and he was accused of leading this nation into unprovoked war. He was called upon to be impeached. He was burned in effigy. Just a few little things you might want to remember. (Laughter and applause.)

Well, we committed ourselves in Southeast Asia and in Viet Nam to try to promote nation-building, and nation-building is difficult, it is not an easy way to do it.

A VOICE: There's bombs.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: America's nation-building came with bombs, too. And might I say that it came with more French troops at your town than Americans, and there were more French dead buried at your town than Americans, and a French fleet that bottled up Cornwallis at your town, not an American fleet. We gained our independence because somebody else helped, we didn't even like them, but they helped. (Applause.)

I'm not asking you to live by history, but I think it's good to remember a bit of it. The power of constitutional process is under way, and everybody has doubted it, if not everybody,

certain loud voices have doubted it. They said they'd never have the election. More people voted in the election of '66 percentage-wise in Viet Nam than voted here. And I think the election results were better. (Applause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then those that were the observors and the critics said, well, the constituent assembly will be a rubber stamp. First of all, it won't last, they'll send it home. But it did last, it had an assignment for six months, it wrote a constitution, and it debated, an angry debate, it divided, and it wrote a constitution. And then the critics said, "But the military directorate will never accept it, they'll file it away and they'll throw them out." But the military directorate did accept it, and the ten man -- the 20 man directorate, ten civilians and ten military leaders, did accept it. And then they said, "But the military directorate will draw up the election laws," but they didn't, the constituent assembly elected drew up the election laws. And then they said, "The constituent assembly will never be able to set the election date. Ky and his boys will set it." But they didn't, the constituent assembly set it. And then they said, "They'll never have hamlet and village elections." But they have had, and 77 percent of the registered vote in Viet Nam participated in village and hamlet elections. Now, Tom, I'll bet you never got 77 percent of the registered vote. (Laughter.) You don't get 77 percent of the registered vote in any municipal election in America, and let me say to my political science friends, my intellectual friends, that if you really want to do something for good government, get people to take an interest in local elections. The average vote in a municipality in America is 35 percent. (Applause.)

And then they said the presidential elections would be a fraud, a farce, a hoax. Well, I admit that it wasn't an election like in Davenport, maybe it wasn't even like one in Denver. But if you really want to see some election irregularities go back to the time of John Adams -- or you can even go to Minneapolis. (Laughter.)

You know, I was almost mayor of Minneapolis the first time I tried. I'm not complaining, I think the people -- despite everything, it worked out right, maybe they knew exactly what they were doing, in fact I know they did -- but I was leading up until 3:00 a.m. in the morning, and then the river precincts came in. Now, there was a wonderful thing that happened. That precinct, that ward, had never voted at any time over 35 percent of its registered vote -- or its available vote, I should say, that was its high figure. But for some reason or other, on that election, when I was leading, and that ward was not yet in, the votes had been kept out, they had a 92 percent voter participation. I tell you, this civic spirit moved every one of them, some of them several times. (Applause.)

Archbishop Lucy of San Antonio was asked in the cabinet room here last week by the President of the United States, he

said, "Archbishop, what was the main disappointment that you encountered in your visit to Viet Nam." And the Archbishop, by the way, was not exactly what you would call a friend of the policy of this government in South Viet Nam. And do you know what his reply was? He said, "The one disappointment that I saw was the newspapermen that couldn't find anything really to complain about." That's what he said, I didn't say that. I don't want that put to me, that's what he said. (Laughter.)

And Theodore Francis McKeldin -- Theodore Roosevelt, I
guess it is, Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin of Baltimore, a Republican
mayor, got up and said, "Mr. President, I want you to know I was
not brainwashed." (Applause.)

The election process is taking place. What the future will offer, I can't predict. I know that a country that's had a thousand years of Mandarin rule, a hundred years of French Colonialism, and 26 years of war is not exactly what you'd call a healthy patient. I know that. But I know something else, my friends.

I know that if we have firm resolve, if we stand pat, and if we'll not let people drive us into massive acceleration of this struggle, if we'll hew to the middle course -- and I mean the middle course, the one between withdrawal and the one between using all of our power -- and that's the courses that are being advocated by many -- some say get out, at least that's an honest position, I think it would be unfortunate, it might be a catastrophe,

but I have respect for those that say, "Let's get out." I don't know whether I can agree with too many who think they know more about military tactics when they weren't even a Boy Scout leader. (Laughter.) And some of the people who are in charge of our military -- and let me tell you, if our military don't know anything at all, we've wasted one heck of a lot of money on West Point, that's all I can say. (Applause.)

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But our military are not in full charge, because we have a civilian commander in chief. And the President of the United States has as his prime objectives in this struggle on the military front to stop the aggression, and to prevent a nuclear holecaust. This is why your government has acted as it has, this is why we seek to use not all of the massive power of this nation, this is why we consult with Mr. Kosygin, and Mr. Gromyko, that is why your government has gone to everyone in the United Nations to seek ways and means of securing a just peace, and I want to say to our critics that as of this morning, speaking in my position as a member of the President's cabinet, that any time that anybody can bring Ho Chi Minh or any of his appointed responsible agents to a conference table to sit down and talk, we are ready to talk and to negotiate, we'll talk even as the fighting goes on, we'll talk if the fighting stops. We're prepared to walk the extra mile. But I think the critics of this policy ought to know that Mr. Ho Chi Minh wrote to the President of the United States and said there would be no talks or no conference. And this was

with the good offices of Chairman Kosygin himself. We've walked the extra mile. We're prepared to walk the two miles. We're prepared to do everything that can be done in not only the United Nations, with third party intermediaries. We are anxious for peace, but we are not prepared to withdraw, to give up, and to retreat. Let that be the record. (Applause.)

Thank you. Thank you very, very much.

MR. WILLIAM GRANT: Mr. Vice-President, we're grateful to you for what you have said, you have heard the applause, which states better than I can how proud we are to have you with us. (Applause.) We hope you will return very soon.

. . . Whereupon, at 10:15 a.m., the proceedings were concluded. . .

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1. In introduction, special attention to Lt. Governor Mark Hogan -- who also has to try harder, 'cause he's only No. 2, also ...

Easy on Steve McNichols. While he looks like the best for Senate race, a lot of active seekers of the Democratic nomination.

Some special attention to the three splendid

Congressmen -- Byron Rogers, Wayne Aspinall, and Frank Evans ...

- 2. Message: courage and confidence.
- 3. There is one reason to review the magnificent record the Democratic party these past seven years: we delivered on what we promised.

And those are our credentials for asking the people of the United States for a vote of confidence in our ability to deliver on what we say that we want to do for our country in the coming decades.

4. People sometimes ask me whatever happened to the liberal program of Roosevelt, Truman, and Stevenson?

We passed it. Medicare, aid to education, etc.

Now we must come to grips with the problems and challenges of a <u>new</u> day of incredible technological, economic, and sociological change.

The task of the party of the Democrats is to perceive those emerging problems, and to seek solutions.

We look back only to gain courgge and confidence for the task ahead.

Talua Prog.

80

5. Increasingly we are a <u>suburban</u> people -- the growth in our suburbs is five times the rate of that in the city or in the countryside.

Yet our worst <u>problems</u>, our worst poverty and lack of opportunity lie in the central cities and in our farming areas — where the golden promise of America is yet to be fulfilled.

Here in the Southwest the promise of America is not yet fulfilled for hundreds of thousands of our fellow Americans with Spanish surnames, who for generations have been patient and tireless and uncomplaining. We must make a special effort to see that educational economic opportunity of every kind is made equally available to them as it is to other Americans in the cities of the north and the west.

The massive immigration of millions of our fellowAmericans from the rural areas of the south to the great cities of the north and west has challenged our institutions and our capabilities as we have seldom been challenged in our history.

We have taken up the gauntlet that is represented by the bleak poverty of a fifth of our people, and we are making massive investments of dollars and manpower to enable our poor to move into the mainstream of American life and opportunity. But we are only beginning.

Same

6. We have succeeded in holding the rise in prices to a minimum, and our living standards, for most Americans, have continued to rise much faster than the prices we pay.

The American economy is the envy of the world, and the average American of today is living better than ever in our history.

The economy is so strong and thrusting that we have been able to undertake fundamental programs of improvement of our nation never before dreamed of -- and yet been able to maintain the security of our nation in an age of fantastic weapons costs.

- 7. Yet we are, as a party, deeply conscious of costs, and of the obligation of fairness to the consumer. And we have tried, therefore, not only through fiscal policy, but also through legislative efforts such as truth in lending and truth in packaging to see to it that those who live on modest incomes can get a square deal and a fair shake. So consumer protection is a new area of effort in which we can make great progress. (THIS IS ONE OF HOGAN'S BIG PITCHES.)
- 8. Now I am taking to the shock troops and the leaders of the Democratic Party of Colorado this morning, and I want to say this directly to you here and to those who may be watching on television: the next campaign year is going to be one of our typical hard struggles the kind we usually have. Fair weather friends have already begun to write the obituary notices they were writing before the campaign of 1948, xikk and the cries of doom and gloom are as thick as they were in the summer of 1962, when all the pundits were writing that John Kennedy had lost the young people, lost the intellectuals, and was surely headed for a great defeat at his next election.

Those are premature obituary notices.

We are going to win -- with your help and your dedication -but principally because the American people can ultimately be
trusted to weigh up the pros and the cons and make the basic
decisions that are required toxered ensure the safety and
security and well-being of the nation -- and our record commends
itself to the people.

Our task as a party is to make sure that the record and the platform of our party <u>is</u> put forward, with confidence and spirit.

As Ben Franklin said, "Gentlemen, we must all hang together, or we shall most assuredly all hang separately."

9. Now let me turn to the great question of peace and war.

Not Vietnam. Not Vietnam alone. For the commitment and the struggle in Vietnam is only fm the focus point of the struggle for our own ultimate national security.

This President is continuing the great tradition of three American presidents -- to keep this nation from suffering a nuclear holocaust.

And all the turns and twists of American foreign policy are designed to construct a world in which peace is built, in which small aggressions are not permitted to succeed and thereby set the world on the downward slide toward an ultimate nuclear confrontation.

10. In Vietnam we are seeking once again to turn back a strategic thrust of Asian communism.

And in that mighty effort, which has cost us so much in treasure and blood, we are succeeding.

Two years ago, the Republic of South Vietnam was teetering on the edge of collapse, and Asian Communism was the wave of the future. The wars of liberation concept was riding high, and its disciples were preaching that violent and bloody doctrine throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Musley

Our stand in Vietnam has turned back that tide.

Asian communism is no longer the wave of the future.

Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Burma, India, the

Philippines -- once trembling under the threat of the massive

threat from the north are no longer fearful of their independence.

And we are seeking, your president is seeking, to find a way to end the fighting now, to convince those who are conducting the aggression against South Vietnam that they cannot possibly win, and to negotiate a settlement.

We \boldsymbol{z} re once again seeking a solution through the United Nations.

We are seeking the assistance of every country.

We will persevere to the ends of the world to find a way to bring peace and stability to Southeast Asia, and to thereby ensure the safety and security of the American people.

The question is ${\bf n}$ ot whether we can be defeated in battle. We cannot.

The question is whether we shall have the courage and the perseverance and the vision to see how our own security and the peace of the world in is involved in the successful defense of Southeast Asia. Bo we have the staying power, do we have the patience, not to tire, not g to give up, not to turn our back from leadership, not to pass on to the next generation the terrible problems which are our responsibility to face and to solve.

Finally, let us remember that -- after the terrible events in our cities this year, especially, that we <u>are</u> one people. And that the <u>unity</u> of our people is the strength of the American nation.

The pledge of allegiance.

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.

