

OK

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

BAPTISTS LEADERS CONFERENCE

EDITED TRANSCRIPT

October 5, 1967

When I was a Professor of Political Science at Macalester College, I taught a course in American Government. One of the things I tried to teach my students was the meaning of democracy.

I'd ask the question: "What is democracy--what does it mean to you?" They'd say: "The right to vote--the right of free speech--the right to assemble--freedom of conscience." I'd say: "These are indeed symbols of democracy, but why should a man have a right to vote? Why should he have free speech? What is at the very heart of democracy?"

I think that the answer is spiritual, not political. It goes right back to the words of the Bible: "God created man in His own image." And man whom God created is more than mere flesh and blood and bones--he is created with a soul. If man comes from God, how can anyone govern him without his consent?

That is why our founding fathers said that man has certain "unalienable rights." These rights arise from the fact that man has been created by God in His own image. That's the basis of our democratic faith. That's the difference between the totalitarian state and the democratic state. The totalitarian state does not

recognize the divine origin of man. It holds that man exists to serve an all-powerful state.

Quite otherwise is the philosophy of freedom--the philosophy, in our own national history, of Thomas Jefferson. We say that the state exists to serve man, because it is the individual man who is important. He has unalienable rights that no one can take away from him on this earth, because no one gave them to him on this earth. They are his by birth, by the fact that he is human and not animal.

He has the right to live--not merely to survive. He has the right to live in liberty, and life and liberty make possible the pursuit of happiness, which gives meaning to life. It is indeed a magnificent trilogy that our founding fathers set forth.

I think one of the major reasons for our strength as a nation is that our beginnings were essentially spiritual. The real pioneers of this land, the people who founded lasting settlements, came here to practice their religion in freedom.

This is my religious philosophy--that the way you treat people is the way you treat God. If that be the case, then government has an inherent relationship to human welfare. There must be a moral and spiritual relationship between the government and the people. Therefore, the purpose of the policies we pursue in government is the improvement of man's life.

If I were asked: "What is the hallmark of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration--what would you like to be known for?" I would say that we have tried to open the gates of opportunity for as many people as possible--we have tried to give everyone his chance. I think that's the best kind of compassion and the best kind of welfare.

It is not a welfare state we are seeking to build here in America--it is an opportunity state. We want to make it possible for everyone who is capable of earning his own living to do so. There will always be those who are unable to do so, and I believe a prosperous society ought to be humane enough to help them. I do not think that compassion and charity are signs of weakness. I think they are proofs of strength.

But I do not believe compassion and charity are enough by themselves. I believe that human institutions, including churches, should help remove the obstacles to man's development, so that he can go forward on his own.

Education is the key that unlocks the door to opportunity. That door has been locked for many people in this country. What we've tried to do is to use the resources of government not to control men's lives but to liberate them. I think that the process of emancipation must be a continuing one.

Abraham Lincoln set the slaves free. But a man who is ignorant, illiterate, sick, the victim of discrimination, totally unadjusted to his environment, is not a fully free man. He is as much a slave as if he were in chains. Men can be enslaved by their fears, by ignorance, by prejudice, or by disease.

So we are engaged --not just the government, but all of us--in a continuing process of emancipation. We are opening our minds to new ideas, testing those ideas, training our young people for new vocations, trying to improve the quality of our judgments and not just the quantity of our information.

That is what we are trying to do in our new government programs, such as the war on poverty, federal aid to education, the Job Corps, the VISTA program, and others. If these programs were mere hand-outs, they wouldn't be worth a great deal. They are designed to improve the capacity of people to take care of themselves, to open doors that have hitherto been locked to them.

It does no good to have a law on the statute books banning discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color if a Negro job applicant has no education, and the only jobs that are open require education and training. It is not enough to clear away artificial barriers to a job, if people don't have the skills that equip them for it.

I think we've made some progress. Of course, I am an optimist--but I think history is on the side of optimism in our country.

With all our limitations (and the fact that we recognize them is a sign of our strength, because the weak are afraid to admit them), with all the mistakes that we've made, there has never been a society that has extended so many social benefits to its people as ours. We have done it under a system of free enterprise and of elected, representative government. We haven't taken the doctrinaire approach of a Marx or a Lenin. We have taken a pragmatic approach, within a basic philosophy of the dignity of the individual and the inherent value of human life.

The religious ethic of social justice and social action permeates American life. The church has had a tremendous impact upon it. Let me give you just one example--civil rights.

As Majority Whip, I was the floor leader in the Senate for the 1964 Civil Rights Bill. The debate in the Senate started in January and went on until June. Right at the beginning, I said that the decisive factor in the debate would be the churches--and I was right. Churchmen, ministers and laymen, dedicated themselves systematically to the task of persuading and convincing Congress--and, more important, the people in their own churches and communities.

I believe that most of the good work in the war on poverty is being done by people who, while they may not be churchmen, have a Judeo-Christian philosophy that makes them activists in seeking to eliminate social injustice.

One of the curses of America today is slumism--and I don't mean merely broken-down buildings and dirty streets. I mean broken-down people. I mean frustration, bitterness, and hatred. That is the worst poverty--the poverty of the spirit.

In a rich society like ours, the poverty of the purse is the easiest to remedy. Our Gross National Product is running at \$775 billion a year. Only a seventh of our people are living below the poverty level. The easiest thing for us to do in this rich society would be to write out checks and give them to everybody who is poor.

There are some people who raise their children that way--write them checks when they're unhappy or in trouble. I call that checkbook compassion. We need that--but we need something better, as well. The real poverty in America is not just the lack of money, but the feeling that you're not needed or wanted, you're shunted aside, you're not included. That's the poverty of bitterness and hatred which sometimes breaks out into violence. That's a kind that will take some time to cure.

This is where men of the church come in. That's what religious faith is all about. There are people today who are living in ignorance, illiteracy, and despair--whose eyes are blank. How do you put the spark back in their eyes? How do you get them to want to make something out of their lives? Handing out money is not enough.

We must see that they have food and clothing and medical care, but that is not enough. That is merely surviving, not living. That's not the pursuit of happiness, because happiness comes in self-fulfillment, in being a part of things. John Stuart Mill said that a man who has no stake in his country cannot and will not love it. What we are trying to do is to get these deprived people involved in America. We're trying to get the poor involved in their own salvation, so to speak. We're trying to get them to do something for themselves. They're going to stumble and make mistakes and waste money. And people with doubly-entry bookkeeping minds are going to say: "Look at all that boondoggling!"

The fact is that the poor are wasting their lives now. They are a burden to themselves, their communities, and the nation. When some little community action group doesn't do a good job of keeping its books--don't call it a great sin. It isn't the money men waste that is a sin--it's the lives they waste.

What we in the federal government are trying to do--in partnership with industry, with the churches, and with state and local governments--is to help people out of the quicksand of defeat. And it's working!

There are more young people in jobs today than ever before. Through the Youth Opportunity campaign, 1,400,000 needy youngsters

got jobs this past summer. Many summer camps were opened. We found that 20 percent of all the camping facilities in America went unused a year ago. We filled them this summer with youngsters who had never been to camp in their lives. For the first time, they saw trees. For the first time, they enjoyed good food. For the first time, they had physical examinations.

Right here in Washington, D. C., we had 1700 boys aged 10 to 16, coming out of slums to their first camping experience. They were youngsters from broken homes--some didn't even know who their father was. They got their first taste of a better life--and there wasn't a single incident. Good programs like that don't make the headlines. Of course, it would have made the headlines if one of those youngsters had gotten into trouble.

There's so much going on that's good that we oughtn't downgrade ourselves. It's a pretty good country, a pretty moral country, and you've helped to make it so.

Q. And I have heard there, and I've made it a point to listen here during these days, something that I've never heard before. I've heard a government agency refer so frequently to the need of the church. I've heard, actually, some of my fellow ministers flogging and condemning the church and I've heard government agencies talking about a need for the church. My simple and direct question to you is, is it just really a matter of policy in the OEO to organize in such a way as to utilize and to involve churches in this attemptive and reclamation ministry up there in the rural sections, in the little towns and in the cities?

A. It is the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity--and of the government generally--to involve people from the broadest possible base locally, not just local officials, but other constructive forces in the community. It may be the churches, it may be the trade unions, it may be the fraternal orders. We don't think it is enough to operate these programs only through the old, established channels.

We have included in the law that there should be maximum participation of the poor themselves in the poverty program. Some people say that we shouldn't bring them in, that they're poor because they're incompetent. But we found out that, when they're brought in and given the benefit of some time and patience--remembering that they come in with little or no experience and frequently with some pent-up bitterness--some of them turn out to be terrific. The director of

the community action center in Denver was, a year ago, one of the people who received training under the poverty program--and he's doing a great job now.

We need the church in the war on poverty because it can reach the people--and because it adds a dimension of personal concern and involvement that an impersonal government agency can't provide. That's the importance of voluntary effort. And I think it's good for the churches too, and good for church people. It helps you to get a little closer to the people who need help.

One thing I have found out about many kids who got into trouble. With the same energy that gets them into trouble, once you put them on the right path, they can do a lot of good. For example, gang leaders, once you put them on the right track, can lead other youngsters the right way too. They can lead their own gangs into education and training programs. They can go to the street corners, the pool halls, and the back alleys where the youngsters are likely to be sarcastic and cynical, and recruit them.

At an urban progress center in Chicago, the director told me: "We can't use a university-trained social worker here--they can't reach these people and recruit them. We have to get some of these same people, and train them. After we have half a dozen of them, they find the others we want and bring them in. Then we put them through an orientation course. We teach them good grooming, so they won't

scare off a prospective employer. Then we teach them how to use a map and locate the right bus to take them to where the jobs are."

In one city they ran a test program with one hundred people who had no training at all, with an industry that was willing to take them. They sent them to this plant, and all of them were going to get two dollars an hour or more to begin with. Something like 95 percent of them were gone before the first two weeks--many didn't even bother to collect their checks. They'd never even been inside a factory before--they didn't even know what it was to punch a time clock.

They took another hundred out of the same neighborhood to the same plant. But this time they gave them a six-week orientation course. They taught them about foreman, shop stewards, time clocks, how to get to the job, how to act on the job. Eighty-five out of that hundred stayed on the job and became good employees.

Q. Mr. Vice President, I come from the mountains of Kentucky, the heart of our poor--our poverty area. I appreciate deeply the ethics of the Poverty Program, and have subscribed to the optimistic programs. However, in Kentucky, in our particular region, there have been mixed successes. One county is very successful; another county, ^{bringing no} ~~2 (not clear)~~ to return. I am wondering if some of the pessimism that we have experienced, and cynicism is not due to the fact that when we talk about eliminating poverty, we are promising too much too soon. And many people are critical now because the miracle has not happened. Optimism is logical. There also be

? (inaudible) with realism.

A. I agree that it's wrong to promise too much. I don't think we'll eliminate poverty in my lifetime, and I expect to be around quite a while. I do think we can make progress, but it is a slow process. We are dealing with a cancer of the spirit as malignant as cancer of the body. The doctors have been seeking a cure for cancer for many years, and they haven't found the answer yet. But we don't condemn the doctors because they haven't found it yet.

There has been poverty as long as man has been on this earth. But perhaps we can help more and more people out of it. You are right--we shouldn't overseel the war on poverty. It is a long and arduous effort, but it is worth it.

Q. You've indicated that the poverty program is very important. How would you rate it in connection with the war in Vietnam if you had to set up a system of priorities?

A. I don't think you can set up a system of priorities of that kind. It's like an accident in the family--you have to take care of it, whatever your budget is. But I would remind you that more Federal funds are going to people in the poverty group this year is almost \$26 billion, whereas we are spending something like \$22 and a half billion on the war in Vietnam.

I want to make it quite clear that nothing would please me more than for the war to end this afternoon. We are constantly making efforts to bring that about.

But I want to be quite frank with you. I was here in Washington when the Korean War ended. We didn't do anything about poverty then--not one bit. We didn't put a nickel into education. We just cut the taxes and put the money we saved into our pockets.

When this war is over, I'm going to do some picketing. I'm going to carry signs like this: "Money for the War on Poverty"-- "Resources for Education"--"Build Better Hospitals"--"Clean Up the Slums"--"For Every Dollar Saved in Vietnam--A Dollar for Americans at Home."

I think that one of the things that is coming out of all this ferment in America is a new social awareness. I know that this country is rich enough and strong enough to meet its international commitments and still take care of the needs of our own people. Maybe we can't do it as fast as we want to, but we can do it.

Q. Mr. Vice President, when are we going to make it possible for a man who is not wealthy to run for a high public office without selling his soul or his last shirt? In other words--what has happened to legislation in Congress--and what is the plan of the Administration on our policies on legislation to aim at this preface?

A. That legislation has been reported out of the Senate Finance Committee, with strong bi-partisan support. It provides for appropriations out of the federal treasury to the two major parties (and to

other parties that get a certain percentage of the vote) for Presidential and some Congressional campaign expenditures.

If this goes through, it would be one of the finest things that has ever happened to government in America. There ought to be a firm limit on how much can be spent in campaigns, with effective enforcement provisions. Public financing, whether by tax deductions or directly from the federal treasury, would be far better than having to travel all around this country raising the vast sums that are required for a national campaign. As it is, most of us candidates are spending most of our time during campaigns raising funds--rather than educating the public, as we should be.

#

Baptist Leaders Conference

October 5, 1967

Washington, D. C.

HUBERT HUMPHREY

Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President of the United States! (Applause)

Want me to sit over here?

Yes, sir!

Alright, fine, sir!

Ladies and gentlemen, we've come to an exceptionally high time in our conference, one that we have all looked forward to with good anticipation. We have struggled, Mr. Vice President, with these various problems connected with the role of the Christian through church and state and we are extremely fortunate to be able to confer with the Vice President in a field where he is so eminently qualified, has such wealth of experience and such depth of concern. We are most happy that he was able to wedge into an extremely busy schedule this coming to meet with us. It has been my privilege to know him through a good many years. We were educators in Minnesota together, the schools being only about a mile apart. (Laughter)

The Vice President began his career, as you will recall, in a professional field, but his humanitarian bend turned him to education and then back in 1945 he was elected Mayor of the City of Minneapolis and performed outstanding service for the city in the areas of his special concern for education and related materials.

I don't know what our problem is. We've got music coming here that I'm sure is not ... I'm wondering if ...

It's kind of nice at this witchy hour. (Laughter)

Can someone get to that control? Thank you! I'll just stall a little while they find the controls.

It was back in 1948 that he was elected to the United States Senate, re-elected in '54 and '60 and then in 1964 was elected to the Vice Presidency of our country. We have followed his interests, his expressions, his work, with a great deal of appreciation and interest. The President of the United States has requested of him a great many services in this field and he is, as I said a moment ago, deeply involved in most of the activities that concern us as a conference. Just for your reminder, he does serve as Chairman of the Peace Corps' Advisory Council. He's Honorary Chairman of the National Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He's Chairman of the Special Cabinet Task Force on Travel U. S. A. and he's Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. Now, you notice I've selected out of a long list of obligations, responsibilities that he carries, I've selected those that relate to our special interests and concern. It's a privilege indeed for me to present the Vice President of the United States to confer with us. He will make a brief statement and then he will entertain some questions and discussion as he may see fit. Mr. Vice President!

Thank you very much. Thank you, Dr. Carlson. (Applause) Thank you, Dr. Carlson. Thank you for your introduction and the music, both. (Laughter) When I first received the communication from Mr. Sapp about this conference, this Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs holding its annual conference on the subject of the Christian's role through church and state in human welfare, I asked myself, "well, should I really attend this one or not?" I had a very busy day on the times that you gave to me and I was just looking through my notes here and my secretary had two or three hours that had been apparently indicated by your office that would be suitable for you and I agreed to the 5:00 o'clock hour, of course, never realizing that on this day

that I'd have two extra meetings that had to be piled in and a very busy day that I had never planned on. I had a meeting with representatives of the House of Representatives, members of the House, on subjects relating to our trade policy; a meeting with members of the Senate on subjects relating to our tax and trade and tariff policies; and I'll tell you, when you meet with House members and Senate members, they don't--those meetings do not conclude in three or four minutes. We all have something to say and I have as much to say as anyone. (Laughter) So it takes a little more time. So I hope you'll forgive me, but you're very kind and considerate to wait for me and to let me share some moments with you at this late hour of the afternoon.

Just a word of introduction of what I want to say to you in this opening statement and then, as you know, the questions come right from the floor, as I understand it, and we'll do our best to be responsive.

When I studied at Louisiana State University for my master's degree, I studied in the area of political philosophy, as well as in the field of American government. I've always enjoyed reading philosophy and philosophers and particularly in the political field because that's my bend, my interest. I wrote my thesis on the political philosophy of the new deal, but I wrote my interim or term paper, which was the--you really had to do two papers at that school. We had a tough prof. He was a hossier from out at Bloomington, Indiana, Dr. Heineman. And I wrote my interim or term paper on the subject of political philosophy of the New Testament. You see, I was always new; New Testament, new deal, (Laughter) what seemed to be forward looking. And I read a great deal about the early Christian leaders and the interpretation of the early Christian fathers, the great leaders of the church in the first few centuries; how they interpreted the meaning of the Christian doctrine and the

Christian faith and what its relationship was or could be to the problems of man in his life, to man's living conditions as well as his dying conditions, as one of my preacher friends once put it to me.

I later on, as a young married man and parent, taking an active interest in the church in my area was a Sunday school teacher. By the way, I went out to DePauw University not long ago in Indiana for the services in the--well, it was sort of a testimonial and a goodbye to the Bishop Richard Raines, who is the Methodist Bishop in Indiana. He was the Methodist Minister at the Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and his Youth Minister was Lawrence Nye, and I use to work with Larry Nye a great deal. I was brought up in the Methodist church and the Reverend Julian Hart, who is the Professor of Theology and Philosophy at Yale University, was my boyhood chum. We conjured up more pranks in the name of Methodism (laughter) than the most any Baptist could ever think of (laughter) in the name of the Baptist faith.

But a little later on, by the way, when I became Vice President I had Julian Hart come down in Washington and join Mrs. Humphrey and myself and others at the luncheon that the Vice President gave on the Inaugural Day and Julian gave the prayer and then went to tell a few stories about me to my sons and daughter, all of which added a little luster to the day.

So when I went on to teach in Sunday school I had two classes, one at night at Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church and the University of Life. And I talked to young people, I was a young man myself, about the social implications of the Christian faith. It was a course in social action. And then in the morning I'd be over at the First Congregational Church. If any of you are from Minneapolis around here you know that's over around the university. The First Church, we call it, and it's to that church that I transferred my church

affiliation and I taught the Old Testament Prophets and I'm just plumb full of Isaiah and Amos, particularly Amos, he's my kind of man, and Hosea, Jeremiah, I just loved them. I just read all about them and I have a whole library full of those books right up in my Vice President's Office right now. So when I have time and I really know that there's going to be a tough evening or an audience is going to be a little rough, I go and pick up those books and start to get a little of that Old Testament wisdom. I didn't have time today, so take it easy. (Laughter) I've just been up in Congress.

But I was always impressed by the--in the old--in the Prophets of the Old Testament in particular, of the great sense of social consciousness that was there and I can only paraphrase some of it. But I remember old Amos speaking about justice, you know, flowing like a mighty stream and he really had the spirit. That man was a--he was a real social actioner. He'd been a demonstrator in any man's society, (Laughter) and right out fighting for these great noble causes.

So I come to you today with that kind of a background. I'm not--I don't claim any, well, any life that's without blemish and I surely don't claim to be a man with a cloth. I'm a political man and I always am a little wary of men in politics that try to pretend they're preachers or sometimes, even, vice versa, but I just sort of (laughter) I just thought I'd share this little experience that I've had with you.

When I became Vice President, Dr. Carlson was telling you some of my duties and I appreciate the listing of them because I'm the only general practitioner in this government outside of the President and I'm just sort of the intern, see. You get to the main doctor after you get by me. I'm sort of a house doctor. I don't claim to be an expert in any of these particular

disciplines, but I have had some 18 years experience around this man's town now and that--you have to be pretty stupid if you don't learn something in 18 years. (Laughter) You don't have to be too smart to learn a little. But I am also a chairman of two other councils or committees that you'd be interested in.

One of those councils--I'm Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, commonly known as the Space Council, that's by Act of Congress. Space, that takes me close to the heavens (laughter) and that was by statute by Congress, not by Presidential appointment. And then I'm also Chairman of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Council, known as the Council on Oceanography, and that deals with the oceans and you'll note that every time the Congress gives the Vice President anything to do they put him either out of this world or on the bottom of the sea. (Laughter) The President's a lot kinder to me. He gives me something more ordinary to do, like working with young people, the Chairman to the Advisory Committee, our Council on the Peace Corps and I'm Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Office of Economic Opportunity and my public life, in all candor and seriousness to you, has been dedicated to what I call the injustices, trying to correct some of the, what I think are injustices or inequities. Or to put it more positively, to make the pledge of our Declaration of Independence, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," more than a pledge, a reality.

You see, the founding fathers didn't say you were going to have happiness. They said you could pursue it. It's just like truth. You have to search for it, but it can be found, as we know, in our faith.

When I use to teach government over in that other college, Macalester; I've been at Bethel, too, I want you to know, but they didn't hire me over

there. The standards are pretty high over at Bethel. (Laughter) But when I was teacher, Professor of Political Science, over at Macalester College, I had a course in American government and I would tell my--it was a freshman course. I sometimes feel, after having been in American government, I owe all those young people a refund for the tuition that they paid for taking my course (laughter) because I was a book teacher, in a sense. This was before I was Mayor of Minneapolis. And one of the things, though, that I tried to teach my young friends, my students, was the--what I called the essentials of democracy.

You know, I'd ask the question, "what's democracy, what does it mean to you, how do you identify it?" Because they'd say, you know, when you'd ask the question, "well, what kind of a government do you think we have?" And they'd say, "well, it's a democracy, or it's a democratic government," and they meant with a capital or small "d", not a capital "d". And I'd say, "alright, now what do you mean by that?" Well, they said, "you know, the right to vote, the right of free speech, the right to assemble, freedom of conscience." Well, I said, "those are identifying factors or symbols of democracy, but why should a man have the right to vote?" As a matter of fact, I've seen them vote very wrong according to my point of view, (laughter) on two or three elections that I can remember rather vividly. (Laughter) And they may do it again (laughter) which worries me some. Why should they have the right to free speech? Listen to what some people say. You know, it upsets you, doesn't it sometimes? It even upsets me sometimes what I say. So when you really look at it from a very subjective point of view, you say, free speech and free press, look what's printed, look what's said; freedom to assemble, look what some people do when they assemble. Well, of course, those are risks that you take in a free society. But what is it that's at the very

center of freedom, at the very heart of democracy, why democracy, why representative government, why the right to vote, why free speech, why the right to worship, why these things; and I think the answer is spiritual, not political at all and it's exactly what I've believed all my life and this is why, when I've written, as I have, an article in a little book on American liberalism, I've said liberalism is not political. Democracy is not political, it is essentially spiritual and it goes right back to the first words, "God created man in His own image." And it is my view that that which God created in His own image is something more than just flesh and blood and bones, that there is the quality of the spirit, of the soul. There is this priceless precious quality which makes the identity between God and man and I think, of course, as a Christian, that the life--the birth and the life--of Jesus Christ on this earth was to reveal to us that relationship, that identity between God and man. And, therefore, if man is in a sense from God, then how can anyone govern him without his consent? This is why the founding fathers said that there are certain inalienable rights. These were interpreted by a great churchman of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, Thomas Aquinas, as divine rights and he had the listing of the divine rights and the natural rights and the legal rights and so forth. It was called--that he was the Father of the Renaissance, as we call it, the rebirth of rationality and natural rights or inalienable rights are rights that come by the fact that man was born of God created in His own image. And that's the whole basic--that's the basis of democratic faith and democratic philosophy. That's the difference between the totalitarian state and the democratic state because the totalitarian does not recognize divine power or providence or even nature. It says the state is the creature of man and man is made to serve the state. The state is the

highest expression of man's capability, of his creativity, of his spirit; the state, that's what the Communist doctrine says to him. I've studied these doctrines. That's their religion. The state is the supreme all powerful, the omnipotent.

We, in our philosophy, and the men in the philosophy of freedom, the philosophy of a Thomas Jefferson to make it more parochial and more in terms of our own national experience in history. We say that the state is the servant of man because man is what is important, the individual. And then we say the individual is the all important one because that individual was endowed not by the government, not by the founding fathers, not by the AF of L, not even by the Baptists and not by the Methodists and not by the Catholics and not by President Johnson or the former President Eisenhower, but he was endowed by God, by nature, with certain inalienable rights that no one can take away on this earth cause no one gave them to him on this earth. They are his birth--possession of birth, the fact that he's called "human" and not "animal" and those rights are life, the right to live and not just to survive. There's a difference. The right to live and to live with liberty because living without liberty is not very much living and the purpose of life and liberty is the pursuit of happiness. In fact, life and liberty make possible the pursuit of happiness and the pursuit of happiness lends meaning to life. A beautiful trilogy that those founding fathers thought of and I think one of the reasons for the strength of this nation is that our birth was essentially spiritual. Who was it that came to found this nation, ladies and gentlemen? Were they people that were just fleeing the tax collectors? No! Were they people that were just fleeing the oppressors in Europe, that is, the political oppressors? No! The first people to come here were the people that were seeking religious

liberty. I think many people forget that; that the men and the women who really were the first pioneers of this land, that really made the basic settlement in America, that lasted, the Puritan fathers, not the exploiters, not those that came on over--the old Spanish men of the main that came over to get the silver and the gold, but the civilization that really lasted was the Puritan father, the French Huguenot, the Catholic that was driven out of his land or some other land, they came for religious freedom, the Roger Williams', for example. These were the men; the William Penn's and others. And now if you'll just take a look at our heritage, which most people forget to do these days, we're so busy with current events, can't keep up to the days--to the flow of news every 15 minutes on the transistor box, but if you'll take a look at our heritage you'll see that it is a great spiritual theological religious heritage which has been blended into a political life and into an economic and social life. "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism," by Max Weber, a famous book on the motivating force behind free enterprise in America that many a student of government ought to read.

So I get right down to it and I happen to believe, and this is why I act the way I do, some of you may not like it. I guess there are quite a few that don't. But here's my political, my religious philosophy and it's simply this; the way you treat people is the way you treat God. I'm unashamed in saying this and proud to say it. I didn't think that up. One of my spiritual counselors made that statement in a Sunday morning service and when I really needed it. You know, it's a funny thing that every once in awhile you just plain need to have somebody talk to you and it was one of those days when I was feeling pretty depressed, when things were going pretty badly, rather badly. And when you get very--well, almost cynical, you become, you know,

distraught, unhappy, distressed. And I'll never forget this minister standing there in the pulpit in the First Church and his sermon was the way you treat people is the way you treat God.

Well, now, if that's the case, then government has some relationship to human welfare because those of us that are in this government of the people, by the people and for the people, and that's what--Lincoln described it, and that's the best definition of this--the purpose of this government, that anybody ever made. A government of the people, by the people and for the people! If the way you treat people is the way you treat God then there is an ethical moral relationship, a spiritual relationship between the government and the people. And I think the whole justification that one ought to have today of many of the policies that we try to pursue, and we pursue them foolishly at times, we pursue them without the efficiency that you want and maybe without even the zeal and the integrity that you think is necessary, but at least the purpose behind many of these policies is the improvement of man's life.

Now, if I were to be asked by you, "what is it, Mr. Vice President, that you and the President of the United States are trying to do; what is it that the President and his administration are trying to do; what is it that President Johnson has in mind?" With all of the criticisms and everybody knowing better how to be President than he is, according to what I read, then we'd have a whole city full of new Secretaries of State. It's an amazing city. You know, there's all kinds of talents here untapped, unused. (Laughter) What is it, what would you, Mr. Vice President, if you two years from now you find yourself teaching in a college which is not beyond the possibilities. (laughter) I hope you remember what I said there, I may need that job. (Laughter) What would you say was the hallmark of the Johnson-Humphrey

administration? What would you like to be known for? And I would say that what we have tried to do is to open the gates of opportunity for as many people as we can possibly open those gates for; to maximize human opportunity; to do what that poet and author of the '30's, Thomas Wolfe, said, "Every man his chance," every man the right to life and to work; and to make something out of himself, whatever his vision or his manhood can combine to make him, every man his chance. That is the promise of America. That's what we're trying to do. Now, we may be fooly, we may not be doing it well and I gather from reading the polls that some people don't think we're doing it at all well, but what our objective is, and we may falter in its fulfillment and we may stumble along the way, but our objective is opportunity, opportunity. And that's the best kind of compassion and the best kind of welfare.

Now, I've said from many a platform that I wasn't one that tried to make America into a welfare state. I want to define what I mean. A welfare state; and where I'm just going to make sure that every day of your life that you have a check out of the government.

I'm one that believes that America ought to have as its objective a state of opportunity for everybody in this country so you can earn your own check and make your own life to the best of your ability. If, however, you are someone that is crippled, incapacitated, either by birth or by accident or by circumstances, then I think a rich and prosperous society ought to be humane enough and generous enough and considerate enough in the spirit of humanity and the spirit of Christian compassion to be a good samaritan, to help. I do not think that compassion reveals weakness. I do not think that charity reveals weakness. I think both compassion and charity reveal strength, moral strength, financial strength, intellectual strength. It indicates character. But I

believe that it is not enough to settle just for compassion and charity. My philosophy is that what the institutions of man, including church, should be directing their attention towards in part, at least, is to removing the obstacles from man's development, to remove the obstacles from the path of man so that he can walk to his own objective, not to carry him, but to clear the road, to equip him to make the march. Now, this is why I've said, and I was talking to my wife about this the other day. She's going to make a speech up there in Atlantic City. And she said, "You know, Daddy, what I want to talk about is education." She said, "You know, I mean not just education, but education for the handicapped, for the mentally retarded." You know of our interest in this area, for example. And I think it's nothing short of a capital crime that some of God's children who are mentally retarded are so totally ignored by the richest society on the face of the earth. How we can do this to the least of these and say yet that we're Christians; how we can forget them and institutionalize them and put them out of our way in bad institutions all too often. But, anyway, I didn't want to get off on that. It's just a little diversion.

I happen to think that the people that--that what we're trying to do here, and I'm speaking of education, where education is the key to unlock that door of opportunity and that door of opportunity has been padlocked for a lot of people in this country, not viciously, not--most people don't do things out of meanness. They just do things sometimes thoughtlessly. They do it out of habit. They just haven't stopped to think about it. Really and truly, I've been in public life a long time. Most people are not mean. They don't want to do the bad thing. Sometimes they don't even know and most of the times they don't even know that they are doing what is wrong or what proves to be

wrong or unjust. I think that most people can be appealed to. If I didn't, I wouldn't be in public life. I think they want to do what's right. I don't think there's ever been a President that wanted to do something wrong. As I've heard President Johnson say, "It's no problem for the President to do what's right. His problem is to find out what's right and then to do it." Because there are a lot of different points of view as to what's right, particularly in this political world, this international world, this domestic scene of ours. We don't know. I wish sometimes that I was assured that what we're doing is right as I am--as the critics are sure that what we're doing is wrong. Oh, I've just prayed to God that we could be so sure that we're doing what's right, but some people know that we're very wrong. They're sure of that. They've got a pipeline and I haven't been able to get through. (Laughter)

So what we've tried to do, dear friends, is to use the instruments and the resources of government not to control men's lives, but to liberate them. I happen to think that the process of emancipation is a continuing process.

Abraham Lincoln is known for his Proclamation Emancipation. He declared the Negro free. But a man that is ignorant, illiterate, discriminated against, sick, totally unadjusted to his environment, is not a free man. He's as much a slave as if he were in chains. One can be enslaved by his fears, as well as he can by a dictator. You can be enslaved by ignorance and prejudice. You can be enslaved by disease. A man that lies crippled is enslaved in many ways. So we are engaged in a constant process in this country, not just as a government, but all of us, I think, in emancipation, opening our minds to new ideas, testing those ideas, training our young people for new pursuits and new vocations, trying to improve our qualities of judgment and not just our quantity of information. And this is why the programs that we've tried to pursue here

and maybe I want to repeat again, I don't know how well we're doing it, you know, man is very poor judge of his own actions, but in the War on Poverty, in federal aid to education, in our great efforts that we're making, for example, in child nutrition, in the school lunch program, in the food stamp program, the primary in these programs of work study, job corps, adult education, higher education, national defense education and elementary and secondary education, the VISTA program. What are these programs for? Just to hand out the goodies? If that's the case, they're not worth it. They are really designed to try to sharpen the sensitivities of people, to improve their capacity to take care of themselves, to give them the key to the door that's been locked insofar as their life is concerned. It does no good to have a law on the statute books that says there shall be no discrimination in employment because of race, color or creed and stop there, if the man that is of a black color has never been trained for a job and never had an education and the only jobs that are open require training and education. You have to not only have equal employment opportunities, you will have to have training--well, let's put it this way; the skills and the tools that equip you for that job and then to remove any artificial barriers because of race or creed or national origin.

I think we've made some progress. Of course, I'm one of the few optimists in Washington, you'll find that, you know, and I'm going to tell you why. I'm accused every week or so by my friends over here, they're nice friends, I don't mean to be unkind, but some columnist will write and say, "Well," you write about the Vice President and say, "Of course, you will have to take this statement of the Vice President with a grain of salt because he is a perennial congenital optimist." I didn't know that was a sin until I got to Washington. (Laughter) I really didn't. (Laughter) My mother and

father said how wonderful it is to have a boy that has a smile on his face, you know, and I've always been known as sort of a happy fellow and I didn't know that in order to be really intelligent you had to look miserable.

(Laughter) Until I got down here! That's a fact. Then I found out that one of the symptoms of being an intellectual or being intelligent is if you look very unhappy most of the time, disturbed and concerned. Well, I'm not that way. I must say that some of the happiest people--Ben Franklin was always known as a very happy man, and I want to tell you he could teach blind, deaf and dumb most of the people today that consider themselves to be highly intelligent because he was a happy, he was a positive man. He was a thoughtful man. He had a great deal of wisdom and he was a happy man.

They used to accuse Abraham Lincoln, you know, of being sort of silly because he always was telling jokes. I remember the first time I ran for the-- when I ran for the Senate in 1948, one of the newspapers out home went after me and said that this is not the man to have in the Congress. Every time he makes a speech he seems to laugh, tell jokes. What kind of a man is this? And then I found out that we had several people like that in government. James Madison used to tell a lot of jokes. He was the Father of the Constitution. Benjamin Franklin told them--they were pretty raucous, too, some of his. (Laughter) And even Woodrow Wilson, who is a very keen intellect and a fine intellectual, use to be a jokster. So I didn't consider that necessarily a blemish on my record.

But to get back to why I'm an optimist. I'll tell you why. I'm going to let you in on a great Washington secret. There are so many people over here in this area of pessimism, it's crowded. (Laughter) In order to make a name as a pessimist in this town you have to be really pessimistic. (Laughter)

But you can get over here in the optimist area and there's hardly anybody over there, just Dr. Carlson and myself. That's all. (Laughter) So I staked out that optimism area. And I'll tell you what; I think history is on my side. I think history side of the optimism in this country because with all of our limitations, my dear friends, and we recognize them, which is a sign of our strength (it's only the weak that will never admit weakness, you know; the strong admit it and do something about it), but with all of our limitations and all the mistakes that we've made there's never been a society that has extended so many social benefits to humanity as this society of ours and its been done under a capitalistic free enterprise system and an elected representative government system. It didn't take a doctrine of Lenin or Marx, it took a pragmatic approach within a basic philosophy of the preciousness and the dignity of the individual and we have, of course, had many blemishes on our national record. But I submit that a nation that has the high standard of living that we have, that has as many voluntary agencies as we have that are trying to do good, and they do good, and that doesn't make it--I don't think it does a lot of good to be cynical about them--they do a tremendous amount of good and I know many people say the church has failed cause look at all the sinners. I say those are just new customers. (Laughter)

All I can say is that I watch the church at work. I watch religious people at work and I watched our other people at work in America and I have seen what is going on in this country and I think that much of the reason that our voluntary organizations are as effective as they are--your United Fund--many of the reasons that your corporate directors of big business are willing to contribute as much as they do is because they've had basic religious training, most of them. And what is more, because the religious ethic

of social action and social justice permeates the American environment. You just don't get by in this country being a scoundrel over a long period of time anyway, at least if they discover it. (Laughter) And I want to say to you right now that I believe that the church has had a tremendous impact--let me give you one example, civil rights.

Now, I managed the Civil Rights Bill in 1964 in the United States Senate. I was Majority Whip. I think some of you here have had some disagreement with my points of view on this at times, I mean, the methods. You didn't agree or disagree with the objective. I found that most people do not agree, disagree on objectives. We disagree on means. And that means that the other fellow is not a bad fellow at all. He just has a different point of view as to how to get to that goal that I had and I learned a long time ago that you don't get very far condemning the other fellow as being mean and nasty and evil cause he may find out that you're kind of that way, too, you know if you keep that up. And, anyway, you don't get any converse that way.

Well, I became the floor leader for the Civil Rights Bill. Now, every Civil Rights Bill--I've been introducing those bills since 1948 and some of you know that I was just about as popular as a polecat at a garden party around here. (Laughter) We didn't get many votes when I first came down here, but finally in 1964 we had a massive program, a comprehensive civil rights program, very controversial, breaking up established patterns and it wasn't easy and it wasn't easy for people to accept it, either, and it wasn't easy for people to pass it. How did it really get through Congress? Because of what we did? I happen to be the manager of the bill--floor leader. We had 250 some amendments; the debate started in February and ended in June, in June! I'll tell you how we got it; and I said in the beginning that the

deciding force and factor in this debate will not be the Senate or the House, it will be the churches and I was right. The church leaders, the church laymen who systematically put themselves to the task of convincing and persuading members of Congress, but more importantly, people in their own communities, their own churches, to take a stand. And I believe that most of the good work that we're doing today in the War on Poverty in the efforts to help people help themselves, in the efforts to help people really gain a life, you know, really, that's what we're talking about, is coming out of people who have not acted as church leaders have been the recipients of a social philosophy, of a spiritual philosophy, of a Christian philosophy, of a Judeo (?) Christian philosophy, that has made them activists in trying to eliminate social injustice.

Now, I've talked far too long to you, but I thought you'd like to know of my philosophy. I don't think you know much about a man by just coming up here and wheeling off a lot of figures and facts. Frankly, you can get that for a dollar in the World's Almanac. They've got it right out here. And I think that sometimes we confuse philosophy with information. But we want to talk about what makes you tick; why are you acting the way you're acting the way you're acting; why is it we're doing what we're doing, not that we're always doing it well, but what's our motivation; what are we really trying to do?

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I've said that one of the curses of America today is slumism and I don't mean just broken down buildings and I don't mean just ugly tenements and I don't mean just dirty streets. I mean broken people. I mean an attitude of mind, which is unkind, unChristian. I mean bitterness and hatred and frustration and indifference that is the real poverty of a man. That's the poverty of the spirit. The poverty of the purse is the easiest thing in the world to correct in a rich society. A society that's going to

produce \$800,000,000,000 in gross national product this year almost. Let's put it in round numbers. It would be around \$797-95; \$800,000,000,000 gross national product and in that society there's one seventh of our people that live in what we call levels below \$3,000 or the poverty level. The easiest thing for this rich society to do is just to write out a check and give it to everybody that's poor. That will cure him. That will cure this poverty, the poverty of the purse. Gee, I didn't know I had \$5--the poverty of the purse.

There are a lot of people that take care of their family that way and when they get very successful, very busy, when the boy or the girl gets in trouble, write them out a check; when they're crying because they're lonesome, get them a car; when they are--you don't know what's wrong with them, you call them in because you're busy, you've got to go someplace, what's wrong, dear, well, I don't know, well, maybe you need a new dress; and I happen to think that we've had a little bit too much of what I call checkbook diplomacy, checkbook family life and checkbook compassion. We need something better than that. We need that, too, don't misunderstand me. I--the old fellow said that money isn't the best thing in the world. He said, no, but it runs a good second best. It's helpful. (Laughter) I know that money is important and I don't want to act foolish here, but I want to tell you that the real poverty that afflicts America today is not just the poverty of income, but it is the poverty of frustration and not being needed or feeling that you're not needed, not being wanted, being shunted aside, not being included, the poverty of bitterness, the poverty of hatred which breaks out into violence, that's the poverty. That's the one that's going to take some time to cure. That's where the churchmen come in. That's what the religious faith that we have is all about. Man shall be born again. How? What do you mean? The new life! The poverty

of Paul, who became the great apostle. He was a poor man until he received the message of Jesus Christ. Then he became a rich man in spirit, fearless, strong. My goodness, what a wonderful story that is for anybody to know. Whether you're a Christian or not that's an amazing story of rebirth, a whole new life and that's really what we're talking about today. We're talking about people today that have been living in ignorance and illiteracy and hopelessness and despair, whose eyes are blank. I've seen them by the hundreds. How do you put that spark back in their eyes? How do you get motivation? How do you get them to want to do something; to lift themselves; to reach out; to want to make the most out of their lives? Every man his chance! How do you get that to him? By handing out money? That's not enough. We've got to see that they have food and clothing and health. But that's not enough. You can survive, but you don't live. That's not the pursuit of happiness. That's just hanging onto the skin thread of existence. Happiness comes in fulfillment. Happiness comes in being a part of things. John Stewart Mill said a man that has nothing to do for his country cannot and will not love it. Remember that! Idleness is not only an economic curse, but when you have nothing to do for your country, which means for your family, for your home, your state or your country, he will not love it. Those are real truths.

So what we're trying to do is to get people involved in America; getting the poor involved in their own salvation, so to speak; getting the poor involved in their own uplift; getting the ignorant involved in the program of education; doing something for themselves; and they're going to stumble and they're going to make mistakes and they're going to waste money and all the double entry bookkeepers are going to say, "Look at that--moondogging." They're wasting a life now; losing their lives and a drag on themselves and their

neighborhood and their community and their nation. And when we experiment to try to find a way for that life to be reborn, for the life to take on meaning, and the little group or the community action group that doesn't do a good job of keeping its books--don't call that the great sin. It isn't the money that man wastes that is his great sin. It's the lives that he wastes that's a sin. And we better remember that. And what we're trying to do in government, believe it or not, with your help, a partnership, not by government, but a partnership with private industry, with local government, with state government, with churches, with fraternal groups, a partnership; we're saying "get in the action, get there." The kids say, "get a piece of the action," you know. We're saying "join in." Let's see what we can do to help lift people out of this quicksand of their own defeat. And you know, it's working! It's working! There are more young people today on jobs than ever before. Thousands of them have been trained; a million of them--4,400,000 needy youngsters last summer got work because we tried in America. Camps opened. We found that 20% of all the camping facilities in America a year ago went unused--20% of them, that you'd already paid for! You had blankets for them--20%. We filled them this summer with kids that had never been to camp in their life. For the first time they saw a tree. For the first time they had good food. For the first time they had a physical examination. For the first time they heard about Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts or whatever else it was. Right here in Washington, D. C. we had 1,700 boys at Camp Roosevelt aged 10 to 16 from the slums that went on out and had their first camping experience. Not a single incident--kids from broken homes, kids that never even knew who their father was, many of them. But they got their first good taste of good life and group work, community action. Now, I think that's a pretty good program. Now, that

doesn't always make the headlines. I'll tell you what makes the headlines; the first time that one of those kids gets in trouble. And you know I'm telling you the truth.

But I venture to say, and I'm happy to say for our local press here in Washington, they did write up the camp and they did give us a good story. Not me, they gave the camp the good stories and the youngsters the good stories. They need that pat on the back.

Last Sunday in Minneapolis, Minnesota I should tell you the fraternity boys of the fraternities went out and all of them volunteered to go to community houses, settlement houses, elderly homes, homes for the elderly, hospitals, and they did work free. They had one day a week of community work. I asked them to do that a year ago. I said, "Listen, you kids. I've got some boys, you know, I know what they're up to." I said, "You have all these nice parties over here at the fraternity house. Why don't you fellows make--why don't you do something for somebody that doesn't have this kind of a life? Why don't you go out and volunteer to help somebody that needs some help?" And they took it up just like that, somebody asked them. And they went on out and last Sunday my boy, 19 years of age, spent all Sunday washing windows. I said, "How many did you wash, Doug." He said, "Sixty." All Sunday! Now, what I saw, however, on the TV and the press on that Sunday was a story about some hippies.

Now, I'm here to tell you, my dear friends, that for every hippie there's 1,000 good kids. (Applause) And I don't even want to stand in judgment of the hippies. I just simply say that they're so much that's going to go on that's good that we ought not to downgrade or bad-mouth ourselves. This is a pretty good country. It's a pretty moral country, too, and you've helped make it that way.

Well, now, those are those five or ten minutes of remarks. (laughter)

Thank you very much. (Applause)

I've got a little bad cold here. You'll have to bear with me, but we'll take some questions here for you. Yes?

Q: Mr. Vice President, I am in my community Chairman of the Community Action Committee.

A: Oh, my, hello there.

Q: And I have heard there, and I've made it a point to listen here during these days, something that I've never heard before. I've heard a government agency refer so frequently to the need of the church. I've heard, actually, some of my fellow ministers flogging and condemning the church and I've heard government agencies talking about a need for the church. My simple and direct question to you is, is it just really a matter of policy in the OEO to organize in such a way as to utilize and to involve churches in this attemptive and reclamation ministry up there in the rural sections, in the little towns and in the cities?

A: It, sir, is the policy of your government and, in this instance, the OEO being a part of this government, to involve people at the local level in the broadest possible base, not just the local government people, which should be involved, that is your mayor, your city council, your welfare board, or whatever group it may be, but to look to the other motivating energizing stabilizing constructive forces in that community and ask them to join. Now, in your community it may very well be that it's the church there--that some church or one or more churches that are very, that are so desperately needed. Also, it may be a trade union. It may very well be somebody in a fraternal order. What we're saying is that it isn't enough just to try to direct these

programs in the old established channels. We must broaden the base and we have included in the law that there should be maximum participation of the poor themselves. Now, this causes a lot of people trouble. Cause they say, "What do you mean, bringin them poor people in?" One of the reasons they're poor is that they don't own anything and because they're incompetent. You know, that's what people say. And because they have no capacity, no ability and here you want to put them on committees. Well, you know what we found out? That when they had been brought in and given some time with some patience, remembering that they come first with little or no experience and with lots of inhibitions, frequently with pent-up--well, I was going to say some hatred, but pent-up at least bitterness. It takes a little while for them to ease off. And then we find out that some of them are terrific. I was out here in Denver not long ago. One of the community--one of the great social action centers--that's where they coordinate a whole series of programs, health, jobs and everything, the director of that center was one year ago one of the people that was being a recipient of training in the Poverty Program. And just to show you how foolish the government is; his salary now is \$5,000 a year and his secretary's was \$6,000 and he's running the whole thing. And one of the people came to me and said, "Don't you think, Mr. Vice President, you ought to be able to do something about that?" I said, "Why," I said, "it's absolutely ludicrous. It's ridiculous." And they said, "Well, this man is a genius. He's really marvelous. He's doing a great job here." And I got ahold of him. I said, "Ben, why is it that your--what's this all about?" He said, "Well, there seems to be some rule or regulation that says that you can't have better than a 20% salary increase in any one year," and he said, "You know, I came off," this was two years. He'd been two years in the program, one year where he was a

trainee and the next year where he moved up to a supervisory position. And he said, "I'm still classified as one of those poverty clients and I'm under the rule." I said, "Well, we'll have to take a look at that." Cause I found out that these rules were not handed down in Holy Writ. They are generally written by some lawyer fresh out of college. (Laughter) And I thought maybe we ought to change that. Well, now, to get back to your question--we are changing it, by the way. Getting back to your question; we need the church in these activities simply because the church frequently has an entree to the people plus the fact we think that you can add a dimension of voluntarism of people to people, of personality, of individual attention, that an impersonalized, impersonal public agency like government can't do. This is what the whole voluntary effort's all about. I've said about our foreign aid program overseas that I think one of the best things about it is not the government people we send over, but the things that we can do through the voluntary agencies. What we've been able to do through CARE, for instance; through the different church organizations overseas. Fantastic, and why? Because it's individualized. It isn't Uncle Sam. It's Joe Smith. It's somebody that's personal and that's why we need the church plus, may I say, I just happen to think it's good for churches, too, and good for church people. You get a little closer to people. You know, gee, you know, we've all failed a lot, every one of us when we really get right down to it, you know, if all of our welfare programs had worked as good as they should have over the years, we wouldn't be in quite as much trouble. One of the--I'm interested in scouting, was a Scout and a Scout Master and I'm very active in the whole effort right now and, do you know, I've said many times about our Scout program, first of all, we can't get enough adult leaders, you know, that's one of our problems. But we've never reached

down, way down toward the kids that really need that scouting. Most of the little boy scouts we get come from pretty good families in the first place. But what we need to do is get down there and catch these kids that are the drop outs, the kids that are really about in trouble. I had about - I had six of those boys like that when I was Scout master; and you know what - they were the six best kids I had. One thing I found out about the kids that get in trouble -- they are so clever they can get into a lot of trouble and if you can get them on the right path they can do an awful lot too! We have taken into the Poverty Program, much to the chagrin of Congress and others, kids that are gang leaders. You know, they say -- Look at that crazy outfit up there in Washington. Here they are dealing with these gang leaders. -- Well, let me tell you something: anybody that can lead a gang in Chicago, if you can get that guy on the right track he can lead them the other way too. And we found out how to do it. Not enough, but we found a lot of them. And I sat down with some of the toughest characters I have ever seen in my life; I wanted to get out of that room. And I said: Who in the ... who do you got here? I thought I was in the wrong place! He said: Well, these are ... I forget what they call them now - they had a name for them - but he said these are fellows that have been recruited that have been with the gangs, and he said these are some toughies. But, frankly they are the ones that we are bleeding off, bringing around, and they are now leading kids out of the gangs into the Education programs, into the Training programs. You know what I found out? There isn't one of you in this audience, with a few exceptions maybe one, maybe two or three - I couldn't, I know that; I was told point blank I couldn't - do what? Go into the urban ghettos and get

down on the street corner and the pool hall, and the back alley where the unemployables are and where the kids are that are standing on the corner that have that sarcastic, cynical, blank look. I couldn't recruit them. As the director of that Urban Center in Chicago told me, and they had seven of these Progress Centers, and I had gone right .. I'd been right out in the bowels of our cities, my dear friends -- I haven't been much in the papers about it but I have been there. I have travelled this country more than any public official of the United States; and that's not to brag, its a fact: I've been in forty-nine States and I have travelled by air, in three years, five hundred thousand miles, and much of it has been on week-ends; there are very few Sundays or Saturdays that we have off! Well, I went into this Urban Progress Center and I saw these people and I said: What are you doing? They said: Look, Mr. Vice President, we can't use a highly trained Harvard - University of Minnesota social worker here; they can't recruit these people. We have to find somebody from them. We get a community agent out of the community. Its a long process. And after we get a half a dozen of them they find the others and they bring in the ones that we need to bring in. And then we put them through an orientation course. They teach them first how to clean their face and hands, my dear friends - grooming. And I've heard up here in Congress - they get up and they laugh about - What kind of business is this to teach people to groom themselves? Well, we teach them how to go about ... first of all we try to tell them: Look, if you're going to get a job and you are going to have an interview, you ought to know how to look. Don't scare off the prospective employer. And it takes a little time to teach them how to clean themselves. Then we teach them how to use a map; how to get on a bus. Let

me tell you what our experience was with some of these young people; I am speaking of practical experience where the hundred people recruited in the one city, with a test program with an industry that was willing to take them - we got one hundred that had no training at all; we finally got them, just like they swept them up and sent them off to this plant and all of them were going to get two dollars an hour or more; that's quite a little money for a start. Not a one of them ever had a job before in their lives. They are going to start out at two dollars an hour and time-and-a-half for overtime. Ninety-five percent of the hundred were gone after the first two weeks; in fact - never came back - didn't even collect their checks. They thought they were in a prison. They'd never been inside a factory. They had never known what it was. We buffed them there, took them there, and they just up and left. The first time they got a coffee break, about a third of them went out; they thought they were jumping jail! That's a fact. They didn't know what it was to punch time clocks.

Now, we took another one hundred of the same kind - out of the same neighborhood, to the same plant, but we gave them a six week orientation course. Now - what does it mean to have a shop steward, a foreman; what is a time-clock? What do you do when you come in there? When the coffee break comes, do you run, or do you take and drink coffee? Where do you collect your check? How do you get to the job? How do you act on the job? And we assigned with each - with every twelve - with every ten we put what we call a coach; one man per ten. And eighty-five out of that one hundred, stayed on the job, became good employees. Now - that's the difference - there is the difference; now that's a test case. All right? Next ...

Q. Mr. Vice President, I come from the mountains of Kentucky, the heart of our poor - our poverty area. I appreciate deeply the ethics of the Poverty Program, and have suscribed to the optimistic programs. However, in Kentucky, in our particular region, there have been mixed successes. One county is very successful; another county, ?(not clear) to return. I am wondering if some of the pessimism that we have experienced, and cynicism is not due to the fact that when we talk about eliminating poverty, we are promising too much too soon. And many people are critical now because the miracle has not happened. Optimism is logical. There also be ?(inaudible) with realism.

A. Yes, I couldn't agree with you more. I think there is a tendency for people to over-promise. I don't think any of us have ever over-promised. I don't think we'll eliminate poverty in my life-time; I expect to be around a little while. But, I do think that you can make progress. I think that every person has an obligation, when the Maker calls him to his final day, to be able to reflect, if he can, to say: Well, I think I helped somebody along the way. I think that I added a little something. I don't think that you have to add too much but a little something. Can you do something? I have said to some of us in public life, when we are sitting around alone you know, and we get pretty discouraged, some of us. I said - You know, if I can really feel, at the end of a year, that I have helped one person, just one person get out of trouble, make something up -- my golly, that's something. You know, we give people badges, make heroes out of them if they rescue somebody from a river and they're drowning - don't we? We even have the President, occasionally, pin on a badge for that. Well, what about a fellow that is

just drowning in his own problems, and you can do something to help him out of it? That's quite an accomplishment. Now, I think that we, in Government- we have a tendency you know- because we've got to sell it -- it's a hard job around here to convince people, and there is a tendency to overdo it. What I am trying to tell you is that it is a slow process. We're fighting the cancer of the spirit. And we've trying to get at this -- call it cancer of the body, this malignancy that we call cancer - for about fifty years, and we haven't discovered the answer yet. I have just lost a brother with it as you know. But I want to tell you something; you don't condemn the doctors because they don't find the answers. You say: Doctor - does it look like you're coming close? The doctor says - Well, the last five experiments I had failed. - Well, how much did you spend? - It cost about a hundred million dollars. - Well, Doctor, how about another half a billion dollars, will that help? And I'll tell you why - because out in this room, one out of five is going to have it, and one out of three is going to die with it. That's the statistics on cancer. So you're interested. I am - I'll tell you that! I saw a brother in complete and total agony for weeks, breaking him and breaking my heart. So, I'm for investing in health. I'm for investing in research.

Now, what about this kind of business called poverty? We've been having that for as long as man has been on this Earth, and we may be well continue to have it. But can you minimize it? Can we take more and more people out of it? And we ought not to oversell it. You are right; it is a long, costly, painful, arduous task, but it is worth it! Everytime we get a man off the relief rolls, instead of becoming a tax eater, he becomes a tax payer. And I want to tell you, my fellow taxpayers, and we're fellow taxpayers - that the

only Society that can afford poverty is a rich Society. And keep this in mind that for every dollar your Government spends on a training program to get somebody out of poverty, or whatever it is, whatever kind of treatment he has to have, we'll get it back. If we ever get him on a job, we've got a little machine over there called withholding! And when he gets on that payroll, you just give us enough time ... the Federal Treasury will get it all back. I'll take one more question, and then we're going to go home.

I've got to take two. All right. You start here ...

Q. You've indicated that the Poverty Program is very important. How would you rate it in connection with the war in Vietnam if you had to set up a system of priorities?

A. Well, I must say I don't think you can set up that system of priorities. Its sort of like a problem in the family. You've also got to have the basic essentials if your family, year in and year out, and once in awhile an accident takes place, and you've got to take care of that. I would say this - as far as the Federal Government expenditures are concerned, I am happy to tell you - very happy to tell you we are spending more on the War on Poverty totally throughout the Government than we are in the War in Vietnam. This budget, this year, includes for peoples that are dependent, or needy, or are getting aid in Education - that is Disadvantaged - the total picture of money - of persons receiving any kind of Federal Assistance in the Poverty Group runs to twenty-six billion dollars: Health, Education, Social Security, and all. We are spending about twenty-two and-a-half on the war in Vietnam. I want to make it quite clear to you -- nothing would please me more than that that War were over this afternoon. And even as I speak to you, efforts are made to bring that about. But I also have got to be very frank with you - I was here

in Washington when the War in Korea ended. They didn't do anything about Poverty; not one bit. And let me just tell you right now. I know why you are here; you wouldn't be here if you weren't concerned, if you weren't interested citizens in the well-being of the people of this Country. Be interested when that War is over, because I've been in Washington a long time - a long long time, and after we finished the War in Korea and we were spending far more there than we are here now, and we had eight hundred, nine hundred thousand men there, and we have about less than five hundred thousand in Vietnam -- when that War was over, we didn't put a nickel into education, or on the War on Poverty or anything else. We just put it in our pockets! And we cut the taxes, and we just said: "We're just not going to bother around with Health, or Education, or Welfare, and -- or anything else!"

Now, as I have said to my friends who like to picket - and I've been -- I've done a good bit of it in my lifetime too -- I am very tolerant about this - there have been very few movements I haven't joined, at some time or another -- But, I've said: Look now - when this thing is all over, and its my turn to picket, I put up the sign and say - Here's Humphrey, follow me. Money for the War on Poverty. Resources for Education. Build better hospitals, clean up the slums. For every dollar in Vietnam - a dollar for America at Home!

How many of you guys are going to be there? I've tried that once before and I want to tell you something -- They practically ran me out of Congress!

But I think it will be better next time. And I think that one of the things that is coming out of all this ferment in America, is a social awareness now. We're beginning to wake up. We don't like the War. We don't like the pain and the trouble of it. I was in a meeting the other day and a fellow

got up in the back row and said: Mr. Vice President, I want you and President Johnson to know that the War in Vietnam is unpopular. I said: Alleluia! I hope that I never live to see the day that a war is popular. Because when war gets to be popular around here, that's when you've got to worry. We know that the War is unpopular. We think we are doing what we have to do. We think what we are doing is right. We stand ready to be corrected. But we also know this and I believe this from the bottom of my heart, that this Country is rich enough, and strong enough to keep its international commitments and still to take care of the basic needs of the people back Home. We maybe can't do it as fast as we want to, but we can do it. I'm a family man. I've never been able to give my family as much as I wanted or as much as they wanted. I've got a house that's a series of patios enclosed. You know! And my gosh, I never know what my wife is doing to me. We get an open porch and pretty soon she's got it enclosed, you know. That's the way we built the Humphrey house. And why? That's the only way that we could afford it. We couldn't afford to design a mansion. I wasn't born with even -- I didn't even have a spoon in my mouth, much less a silver spoon when I was born. So we've had to put it together. We've tried to do it piece by piece, and that's what we are going to do here. Now, quickly your last question; and we're going to get out of here.

Q. Mr. Vice President, you've led up to my question beautifully. It is this: When are we going to make it possible for a man who is not wealthy to run for a high public office without selling his soul or his last shirt? In other words - what has happened to legislation in Congress - and what is the plan of the Administration on our policies on legislation to aim at this ?preface?

A. Sir, that legislation has been reported out of the Senate Finance Committee, I am happy to tell you that there was, I believe, almost - well not a unanimous report but a very large majority -- John, do you remember what the number ...? Pretty close to unanimous, a big bi-partisan support. And it provides for appropriations to the two parties and to other parties that get a certain percentage of the vote - out of the Federal Treasury for Presidential Campaign expenses, and for a certain amount of Congressional Campaign expenses. I know that that is going to be given an awful rough time around, but let me tell you --- you are right. In the long run, its good. If I never run for office again - no matter what happens - I know it wont be my good luck, I just know that - to have somebody to want to pay those campaign bills -- but this would be one of the finest things that ever happened to American Government. There ought to be a firm lid on how much can be spent and with effective police powers on it, number one. And it can be done. Number two, I think the public financing, either by tax deduction or by directly out of the Federal Treasury is far better than having to go around this Country looking for the vast amounts of money that are necessary for a National Campaign. Ladies and Gentlemen, the amount of money that is required for a National Campaign now is just incredible! And what is more - most of us are spending most of our time, instead of educating the public during a campaign as we should, trying to have fund raisers - fund raisers going around trying to raise enough money to pay off the bill. We just this last month - three years after the last election - finished paying off the bills for the last election. And I would hate to tell you how many places I had to go as Vice-President of the United States to speak to groups that raise a little money, put in the coffers to pay off old bills. Imagine what

its like if you get defeated! And I've had that happen too! Well I think I've given the invocation and the benediction here today. Thank you very very much!



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org