



FOR RELEASE
SATURDAY PM's
August 18, 1968
Telephone 202/225-2961

REMARKS BY
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
LIBERAL PARTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
NEW YORK CITY
AUGUST 17, 1968

It is always a pleasure to meet with my good friends of the Liberal Party -- Alex Rose, Dave Dubinsky, Louis Stuhlberg, and all the rest.

As I said on September 24, 1964 -- in accepting your nomination for Vice President of the United States -- "We have come a long way together -- and you who know my strengths and my frailties must realize how deeply I am moved by your action."

That was a special day for me -- I had been campaigning with your nominee for the U. S. Senate, Robert F. Kennedy. And if you will recall, that was sometimes a rather lonely campaign.

That evening in 1964, I used these words to describe his qualifications to represent the people of New York in the Senate -- "Courageous, forthright, intelligent ... and a man with deep humanitarian instincts ..."

Looking back at the unspeakable tragedy of Los Angeles, we realize the depths of our loss -- the loss suffered by the people of New York -- the United States -- and, indeed, the world.

President Kennedy, Senator Kennedy and I were involved in many struggles -- sometimes on opposing sides, but more often on the same side -- fighting for the goals we shared -- fighting for the things which the Liberal Party is totally committed to achieve.

Robert Kennedy and I came to hold remarkably similar views on Vietnam. In his debate with Senator McCarthy, he said:

"I would be opposed ... to forcing a coalition government on the government of Saigon, a coalition with the Communists even before we begin the negotiations. I would make it quite clear that we are going to the

PAGE TWO

negotiating table, not with the idea that we want them to unconditionally surrender and that we expect that the National Liberation Front and the Viet Cong will play some role in the future political process of South Vietnam, but that should be determined by the negotiators and particularly by those people of South Vietnam."

Now that is what I believe. More than that, I subscribe -- with one modification -- to the eight point program of the National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam. Let me enumerate these eight points:

1. An immediate standstill cease-fire by all sides starting with an end of the bombing of North Vietnam -- and I add this one measure of elaboration -- the present limited bombing of military targets in the North should be terminated when restraint and reasonable response is obtained from North Vietnam.

2. International peace-keeping machinery.

3. Free elections so that the government of South Vietnam can be chosen democratically by the people and not imposed by Washington or Hanoi, with an agreement by all parties, including the U. S. and North Vietnam, to accept the results of the elections.

4. Full freedom for all political groups in South Vietnam, including neutralists, Communists, and anti-Communists, to organize, campaign and present their candidates and programs.

5. Economic and social reconstruction, including an extensive land reform program.

6. Assurance by the resulting government of protection of minorities against reprisals.

7. Arrangements for the withdrawal of all outside military forces from South Vietnam, both U. S. and North Vietnamese.

8. Neither unilateral withdrawal or military escalation by the United States.

This opening statement is very brief. I believe you know my record and my convictions about overcoming the deprivation and inequality which

PAGE THREE

still exist at home. We can explore these questions further in the question period.

Let me conclude on this slightly partisan note: We have all read about the emergence of a new Nixon

It seems I've heard this refrain before -- in 1956 - 1958 - 1960 - 1962 and now, once again, in 1968.

But this year, there is indeed a new Nixon -- for something truly new has been added to his political lexicon -- "Clear it with Strom."

When a candidate for the Presidency of the United States can give veto power over the choice of his Vice Presidential running mate to a man -- Senator Strom Thurmond -- whose public record is synonymous with reaction, and segregation, then I say we have a job to do this fall.

My basic plea to you is, therefore, to support the Democratic nominee for President whoever he is -- and not only support the nominee, but mount the most effective, hard-hitting campaign in the history of the Liberal Party -- for New York and for the Nation.

###

✓ Mr. Donald Harrington (not here)
✓ Mr. Timothy Costello (Deputy)
✓ Ben McLaurin

REMARKS BY
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
LIBERAL PARTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK
AUGUST 17, 1968

4 #
So many
good
friends-

nominee -
Dem. Party:
from minn -
on my native
state of S.D.

IT IS ALWAYS A PLEASURE TO MEET WITH MY GOOD

FRIENDS OF THE LIBERAL PARTY -- ALEX ROSE, DAVE DUBINSKY,

Ben McLaurin

AND ALL THE REST.

AS I SAID ON SEPTEMBER 24, 1964 -- IN ACCEPTING

YOUR NOMINATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES --

"WE HAVE COME A LONG WAY TOGETHER -- AND YOU WHO KNOW MY

STRENGTHS AND MY FRAILTIES MUST REALIZE HOW DEEPLY I AM

MOVED BY YOUR ACTION."

L THAT WAS A SPECIAL DAY FOR ME -- I HAD BEEN
CAMPAIGNING WITH YOUR NOMINEE FOR THE U. S. SENATE,
ROBERT F. KENNEDY. AND IF YOU WILL RECALL, THAT WAS
SOMETIMES A RATHER LONELY CAMPAIGN.

L THAT EVENING IN 1964, I USED THESE WORDS TO DESCRIBE
HIS QUALIFICATIONS TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK IN
THE SENATE -- "COURAGEOUS, FORTHRIGHT, INTELLIGENT . . .
AND A MAN WITH DEEP HUMANITARIAN INSTINCTS . . ."

L LOOKING BACK AT THE UNSPEAKABLE TRAGEDY OF LOS
ANGELES, WE REALIZE THE DEPTHS OF OUR LOSS --THE LOSS
SUFFERED BY THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK -- THE UNITED STATES --
AND, INDEED, THE WORLD.

L PRESIDENT KENNEDY, SENATOR KENNEDY AND I WERE
INVOLVED IN MANY STRUGGLES -- SOMETIMES ON OPPOSING SIDES,
BUT MORE OFTEN ON THE SAME SIDE -- FIGHTING FOR THE GOALS

WE SHARED -- FIGHTING FOR THE THINGS IN WHICH THE LIBERAL

PARTY IS TOTALLY COMMITTED TO ACHIEVE.

L ROBERT KENNEDY AND I CAME TO HOLD REMARKABLY
SIMILAR VIEWS ON VIETNAM. IN HIS DEBATE WITH SENATOR

McCARTHY, HE SAID: "I WOULD BE OPPOSED . . . TO FORCING A

COALITION GOVERNMENT ON THE GOVERNMENT OF SAIGON, A

COALITION WITH THE COMMUNISTS EVEN BEFORE WE BEGIN THE

NEGOTIATIONS. I WOULD MAKE IT QUITE CLEAR THAT WE ARE GOING

TO THE NEGOTIATING TABLE, NOT WITH THE IDEA THAT WE WANT

*Adler - Education
no need for
outburst of emotion,
but rather the steady
dedication
of a
lifetime.
Pursue the
cause of humanity -*

THEM TO UNCONDITIONALLY SURRENDER AND THAT WE EXPECT
THAT THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT AND THE VIET CONG
WILL PLAY SOME ROLE IN THE FUTURE POLITICAL PROCESS OF
SOUTH VIETNAM, BUT THAT SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY THE
NEGOTIATORS AND PARTICULARLY BY those PEOPLE OF SOUTH
VIETNAM."

NOW THAT IS WHAT I BELIEVE, MORE THAN THAT, I
SUBSCRIBE -- WITH ONE MODIFICATION -- TO THE EIGHT POINT
PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A POLITICAL
SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM. LET ME ENUMERATE THESE EIGHT POINTS:

1. AN IMMEDIATE STANDSTILL CEASE-FIRE BY ALL SIDES
(Including)
(STARTING WITH) AN END OF THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM ---

AND I ADD THIS ONE MEASURE OF ELABORATION -- THE PRESENT

LIMITED BOMBING OF MILITARY TARGETS IN THE NORTH SHOULD

BE TERMINATED WHEN RESTRAINT AND REASONABLE RESPONSE ^{as determined by our negotiators}

^{is} OBTAINED FROM NORTH VIETNAM

2. INTERNATIONAL PEACE-KEEPING MACHINERY.

3. FREE ELECTIONS SO THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH

VIETNAM CAN BE CHOSEN DEMOCRATICALLY BY THE PEOPLE AND

NOT IMPOSED BY WASHINGTON OR HANOI, WITH AN AGREEMENT BY

ALL PARTIES, INCLUDING THE U.S. AND NORTH VIETNAM, TO

ACCEPT THE RESULTS OF THE ELECTIONS.

4. FULL FREEDOM FOR ALL POLITICAL GROUPS IN SOUTH

VIETNAM, INCLUDING NEUTRALISTS, COMMUNISTS, AND ANTI-

COMMUNISTS, TO ORGANIZE CAMPAIGN AND PRESENT THEIR

CANDIDATES AND PROGRAMS.

5. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION, INCLUDING
AN EXTENSIVE LAND REFORM PROGRAM.

6. ASSURANCE BY THE RESULTING GOVERNMENT OF
PROTECTION OF MINORITIES AGAINST REPRISALS.

7. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF ALL OUTSIDE
MILITARY FORCES FROM SOUTH VIETNAM, BOTH U.S. AND NORTH
VIETNAMESE.

8. NEITHER UNILATERAL WITHDRAWAL OR MILITARY
ESCALATION BY THE UNITED STATES.

THIS OPENING STATEMENT IS VERY BRIEF. I BELIEVE

YOU KNOW MY RECORD AND MY CONVICTIONS ABOUT OVERCOMING

THE DEPRIVATION AND INEQUALITY WHICH STILL EXIST AT HOME

WE CAN EXPLORE THESE QUESTIONS FURTHER IN THE QUESTION

PERIOD..

Human RTS. - Edel, Jade, urban crisis,

*Adler - Patricism is not a frozen authentic
generation*

LET ME CONCLUDE ON THIS SLIGHTLY PARTISAN NOTE:

WE HAVE ALL READ ABOUT THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW NIXON.

IT SEEMS I'VE HEARD THIS REFRAIN BEFORE -- IN 1956 -

IN 1958 - 1960 - 1962 AND NOW, ONCE AGAIN, IN 1968.

BUT THIS YEAR THERE IS INDEED A NEW NIXON -- FOR

SOMETHING NEW HAS BEEN ADDED TO HIS POLITICAL LEXICON --

"CLEAR IT WITH STROM."

WHEN A CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED
STATES CAN GIVE VETO POWER OVER THE CHOICE OF HIS VICE
PRESIDENTIAL RUNNING MATE TO ~~A MAN~~ SENATOR STROM THURMOND --
WHOSE PUBLIC RECORD IS SYNONYMOUS WITH REACTION, AND
SEGREGATION, THEN I SAY WE HAVE A JOB TO DO THIS FALL.

MY BASIC PLEA TO YOU IS, THEREFORE, TO SUPPORT THE
DEMOCRATIC NOMINEE FOR PRESIDENT WHO^{*Subscribes to the Platform*}~~EVER HE~~^{*& Liberal Principles.*} IS -- AND NOT
ONLY SUPPORT THE NOMINEE, BUT MOUNT THE MOST EFFECTIVE,
HARD-HITTING CAMPAIGN IN THE HISTORY OF THE LIBERAL PARTY --
FOR NEW YORK AND FOR THE NATION.

#

Hubert H. Humphrey

Speech Before the Executive Committee
of the New York State Liberal Party,
at the Hotel Roosevelt,
New York City, Saturday, August 17, 1968



Transcribed by
Dict-A-Matic Corporation
565-0350

JOEL I. BERSON

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

VOICE: ...the next President of the United States,
now the Vice President... (APPLAUSE)...now the Vice President,
my friend and yours, Hubert H. Humphrey. *Thank you.*

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY: ^{Thank you for your introduction, Mr. [unclear]} They always tell me that if ^{Then} ^{there} you're going to be introduced to an audience that may have some serious doubts as to the credentials of the speaker, you should get yourself someone that is an unabashed...unabashed supporter, that just lets it go, no matter what the truth may be. And Ben, I want to thank you for this introduction. It just reminded me again quickly of what I've said on other occasions, that Adlai Stevenson used to say flattery is all right if you don't inhale it, and I sat up here alongside of Dave, and he said, "What are you breathing so deeply for?" I said, "I'm inhaling." I want to thank Ben McClellan (?) for his introduction. I want to thank him, more importantly, for his friendship, for the privilege that's been mine of working with him and alongside of him for many years.

I regret that Dr. Donald Harrington is not here with us today, and can I take just this moment to pay my personal respects to him, and to ask that you convey to him my very good wishes. But Dr. Timothy Costello, the Deputy Mayor, is here, and as a former mayor, no matter what anybody may say about any differences, Dr. Costello, I'm a Costello man. *[Laughter]* Mayors stick together. (APPLAUSE)

When the escort committee came upstairs to get me,

they...Dave Dubinsky, who is always telling me the truth, you know, even if it hurts, and Alex Rose, around here interpreting the truth, even if it hurts,...(LAUGHTER)... both of these men, they came in on me, and as I was shaking hands with M...Dr. Costello, and they said, "Of course, you know that he's a McCarthy man." "Yes," I said, "I do." I said, "My friend Senator McCarthy is just mighty lucky, and that's all I can say. He gets the best...does the very best."

Well, now, I come here today...come here today to talk to good friends. And I think I can say to you that in my visits with good friends I sometimes find my good friends in disagreement with me. I guess that's also a part of friendship. I've never thought that friendship required a sort of monolithic allegiance on everything that we said and everything that we did. I value my friends and I value this precious gift of friendship even when we have some disagreements. The advantage of a friendship in disagreement, or a disagreement in friendship, is that we can talk together, that we can reason together. There's been a great deal of shouting in American politics lately. I guess all of us...all of us that are candidates, at least, are somewhat guilty of it. From time to time, even as of today, I hear people chanting and shouting. I really don't believe that that's the way that we settle our differences,

and I don't believe that's the way we promote our democracy.

What we need is a reasoned approach to the most complex and difficult problems that ever confronted a nation, and we also need to recognize that this nation has a tremendous responsibility in the world and it also has an even greater responsibility to its own people here at home. So today I want to talk to you a little bit about that, and we're going to do it as you've asked, and as I surely have agreed to. I want to make a statement to you that will cover a very limited amount of the area of our concern, and then I should like for you to ask me whatever questions you wish, and hopefully I shall be able to give you some answers. At least, I shall try to respond to you honestly and frankly and fully.

Now one thing I might observe...at least until this morning I could say this...that the nominee of the Democratic Party will most likely come from Minnesota. I hope you New Yorkers won't be too disappointed with that. We've waited a long, long time, you know. You've had your day - many days, and more days to come. At least, I said the other day, that if/it...if he didn't come from Minnesota, he'd have been a neighbor of mine, and from my native state, when Mr. McGovern entered the race, because he is from South Dakota. For twelve years, he's been my very next door neighbor and one of the closest personal friends that I have, not had...have. And

Eugene McCarthy and Hubert Humphrey have worked together for twenty years in liberal politics. So I must say to you what I've said to our mutual friends that I have no intention of letting some differences, and they're not as big as some of our supporters would have you believe, I do not intend to have those differences destroy a friendship. I'm not going to permit partisanship to destroy a friendship of twenty years.

But this morning somebody else entered the race, and I guess I can't safely...well, I think I can safely predict, but I cannot say, you know, without any shadow of doubt, that the nominee of the Democratic Party will come from the Midwest. But I doubt that there is much support in this assemblage today for Mr. Maddox. I think most likely you would settle for McGovern, McCarthy or Humphrey before that. At least I hope so. (APPLAUSE)

No doubt...no doubt at all. Anyway it's all...you can always rely on the Democrats to add just a little extra something to something that goes on at the convention. I thought we had it mixed up already about as much as you could get. But there's still another week to go. You can expect anything.

Now let me say that I have...come to this meeting at your invitation and also at my request. I have been with the members of the Liberal Party before. The President said to

me just the other day when I told him that I was coming up here to see Alex and Dave and Timothy Costello and some of the rest of you that I mentioned by name, he said, "Well, this is maybe one of the real good things that you're doing." I guess he was remembering...I don't know why he said it that way, ^(laughter) but I...I guess he remembers that when he was here in 1963, when you and this party did something for him that he'll never forget. AND I know that you've done a lot of things for me that I'm not going to forget.

I said on September 24, 1964, in accepting your nomination for the Vice Presidency of the United States, these words: "We've come along way together and you know my strengths and you know my frailties, and you must realize how deeply I am moved by your action, because I remember your action of giving me your help, of giving me your support." Now that was a very special day for me, of course it would be. To be nominated for the second highest office and the gift (?) of the land of the people of this country, to have your support in this great state, and what you represent, that meant a great deal to me. I'd been campaigning on that day with your nominee for the United States Senate, Robert F. Kennedy, and if you will recall, that was sometimes a rather lowly campaign. That evening, in 1964, September, I used these words, and I have checked very carefully the record, to describe his qualifications to represent the people of

New York in the United States Senate: "Courageous, forthright, intelligent and a man with deep humanitarian instincts." Now looking back at that unspeakable tragedy of Los Angeles, I believe that we now more than ever realize the depths of our loss - the loss suffered by the people of New York, the people of the United States, and indeed, the people of the world.

President Kennedy, Senator Kennedy and I were involved in many struggles, most of which you know about. Sometimes on opposing sides, such as in Presidential primaries. And even in this most recent campaign. But more often, when it was on the issues, on the same side, fighting for the goals that we shared, and fighting for the things in which the Liberal Party is totally committed to achieve. Robert Kennedy and I came to hold remarkably similar views on many, many questions, and believe it or not, on an issue that seems to be in the forefront of people's thinking today, and our concern, on Vietnam.

In his debate, and I call this to your attention, and want you to check the actual transcript, prior to the California primary with Senator McCarthy, Senator Kennedy said these words, and I quote them accurately: "I would be opposed to forcing a coalition government on the government of Saigon, a coalition Commun.^{a coalition} with the Communists, even before we begin the negotiations. I would make it

quite clear that we ^{are} ~~re~~ going to the negotiating table not with the idea that we want them to unconditionally surrender, and that we expect that the National Liberation Front and the Viet Cong will play some role in the future political process of South Vietnam, but that should be determined by the negotiators and particularly by those the people of South Vietnam." End of the exact quote.

Now many people have tried to tip one against another, but the words that I've read is what I say and what I said ⁱⁿ on April 28, 1968, and what I believe. More than that, I subscribe, with one modification, to the eight point program of the National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam, and let me enumerate those eight points. First, an immediate standstill ceasefire by all sides, starting with the ending of the bombing of North Vietnam, and I add this one measure of modification and elaboration - the present limited bombing of military targets in North...in the north, should be terminated, when restraint and reasonable response, as determined by our negotiators, is obtained from North Vietnam.

Two, international peace-keeping machinery.

Three, free elections, so that the government of South Vietnam can be chosen democratically by the people, and not imposed by Washington or Hanoi, with an agreement by all parties, including the United States and North Vietnam,

to accept the results of the elections.

Four, full freedom for all political groups in South Vietnam, including Commu...neutralists, Communists, anti-Communists, to organize, campaign and present their candidates and their programs.

Five, economic and social reconstruction, including an extensive land reform program.

Six, assurance by the resulting government of protection of minorities against reprisals.

Seven, arrangements for the withdrawal of all outside forces from South Vietnam, both United States and North Vietnamese.

Eight, neither ^{neither} unilateral withdrawal or military escalation by the United States.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that's a program for peace. All of my life I have dedicated myself to the cause of peace. Nuclear test ban treaty; when John Kennedy signed that treaty, he reached over to me with the first pen and said, "Hubert, this is your treaty." The Peace Corps, the Food for Peace Program, the Non-Proliferation Treaty of recent date. I went to Europe this...a year ago this April, and you men and women know it, at the instructions of your government and your President, to obtain the cooperation of the European nations that were in doubt about that treaty, and work out the articles of inspection, a matter to which

I've given several years of my life as a Senator, as chairman of the Disarmament Committee. I was the first to propose that the United States seek a treaty that would prohibit the orbiting of weapons of mass destruction in outer space, and Arthur Goldberg, as our Ambassador to the United Nations, was the man that was able to guide those provisions through the United Nations to make it a treaty which today has been signed and accepted.

Insert, p. 9

All of my life I have given of the best that is in me to work for conditions that are conducive to an enduring and just peace, supporting the United Nations, urging the strengthening of its peacekeeping operations, advocating the expansion of the Security Council, to be more representative of the world in which we live, advocating an improvement of the emergency machinery of the United Nations so that we can help areas of the world that are in deep distress and trouble.

of a statement that my old friend Adlai made when he was describing patriotism, and I think patriotism and liberalism are synonymous: "Patriotism," said Adlai, "is not the frenzied, emotional outburst of the moment, but the steady dedication of a lifetime." Permit me to at least substitute one word - liberalism. Liberalism is not a frenzied,

emotional outburst of the moment, but a steady dedication of a lifetime. That's what you represent, not something that's recent or sudden or a flash for the moment, but something that has been developed over the years. This Liberal Party has stood for liberal policies and programs. It has been a conscience to the major political parties. It is compelled by its incisiveness of decency and conscience; the great political parties of this country at least have come face to face with the realities. This is why I'm here, and this is why I've been here before. I didn't wait to come to the Liberal Party executive council or committee until I was a candidate for President. I've been with you on other days - days that weren't quite as good for you, on even days that were better for you. My life has been one of dedication to great liberal principles, of human rights and civil rights, of human betterment, of trying to improve the institutions of this democracy so there could be broader participation by everybody, and so that those who were the participants and those who were not the participants could share in the benefits of this society.

When others were afraid to stand up and be counted on civil rights, we were there, unafraid - you and I was there, too. When others were afraid to stand up when the labor movement needed its friends, I was there. You were always there. But for better than 25 years of my public life, I've had the rare privilege of being a candidate supported by the

organized labor movement of America, and why? Because I've worked for working people, and I've worked for the unorganized as well as the organized.

And all during these years, some of us, with our disagreements as we're bound to have as men and women that are truly liberals, because a liberal is ~~a~~man that is emancipated in his thinking, at least. He's not a dogmatist. He doesn't accept some ironclad, monolithic doctrine. He thinks. And in that process, there are times that we have our disagreements, but we have learned how to try to find some way to reconcile disagreement as long as we did not abandon principle.

Well, let me conclude, then, on this slightly partisan note, because I wouldn't want you to think I was oblivious to the fact that there was a campaign on - we've all read about what our friend Ben mentioned a moment ago, the emergence of a new Nixon. It seems I've heard this refrain before. I think I heard about a new polishing job in 1956, even in 1958, and then, indeed, in 1960, and in 1962, and now, once again, in 1968. Really, so much newness almost makes newness look old and slightly frazzled, but this year there is indeed a new Nixon, for something has been added to his political jargon and lexicon, and you know what it is. "Clear it with Strom. Clear it with Strom." I never thought I'd live to see that day. I remember when

Strom, and I refer to the Senator from South Carolina, led the walkout in 1948. I've had a lot of people walk out on me, since, by the way, but for different reasons. But he started it, in 1948, when I asked the Democratic Party to walk forthrightly out of the shadow of state's rights into the bright sunshine of human rights. Well, when a candidate for the Presidency of the United States is willing to give a veto power over the choice of his Vice Presidential running mate to Senator Thurmond, whose public record is synonymous with reaction and segregation, then I say you've got some thinking to do and we have a job to do in this fall. Senator Thurmond looked to the South...or Mr. Nixon, I say, looked to the South. He didn't see in the South some of the things that I've seen - the rise of the labor movement, great new universities, a tripling in the enrollment of the higher education, vast new investments in education, new industry, leaders like a Terry Sanford (?) and others, he saw what I call the South of the dark, darkness of midnight. I found some people in the South who represent the dawn of a new day. He made his choice late at night, and to the midnight. I hope that we'll make our choice on whatever we do, with the feeling that a new day is at hand, with new challenges and new opportunities.

So my basic plea to you, therefore, is to support the Democratic nominee for President, providing that he subscribes

to the platform and the liberal principles that I know will be embodied in that platform, and not only support the nominee, but mount the most effective, hard-hitting campaign in the history of the Liberal Party, because we're going to have to do it. A liberal campaign, a hard-hitting campaign for New York, which is vital, and for the nation, and I come here today to ask for your help, to ask, above all, for your help to help clear the atmosphere, to get the American people to think in terms of a better day. I do not believe that the mood of this country is one of reaction, unless we let it be that way through our own dissension. I believe that the mood of this country can be one of steady social progress and great social progress to meet great issues in our cities, the great issues of deprivation, of unemployment, of filth in slums, of the deep concern that many people have today over the...over the well-being of our people. I ask you to help me launch a campaign not only to insure the social security of our people but to insure the social opportunity of people who have had no opportunity, of people that have been denied, been left out. I intend to see to it that the left-outs are brought in. I intend to see to it that those who have been denied at long last are given their chance. I intend to see to it that the institutions of this government and this economy are shaped in such a way that any man, any woman,

any child, that wants a chance, that wants to work, that wants to participate in the peaceful processes of our democracy, shall have that chance, and if you'll give me your help, I think we can get it done. Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Vice President. We have attentively listened to you and the presentation of your program. I want you to know that on this platform sit some of the most distinguished Americans, concerned with the basic policies and problems of America. I did not take time to present them, because there will be other opportunities for them to be presented to you.

I also want you to know that sitting in the audience are some of the most distinguished leaders in American politics, and while we are regulated more or less, or relegated to the New York State, our influence can be felt in many places because many of us are constantly drifting. Now we are aware that we have a lot of people who are seeking this high office, and two or three of them have one point of view, one platform. Now we all are for peace. But we're also for a lot of other things that you talked about, and we're very grateful for the opportunity of having you explain, as results of the questions that will be presented here, in order to minimize some of the misgivings and alleviate some of the confusion that may be in the ranks, in order that we might

be able to cohesively put together the kind of machinery
that will bring success to this coming campaign. [PAUSE IN TAPE] I know
there are a lot of questions, and I want to say from the
outset there will be no statements; only those of you who
are members of the State Executive Committee will be per-
mitted to ask questions because of the limitation of time.
And I would ask you to identify yourself before presenting
the question, and after the question has been presented,
the Vice President will answer. Who has the first...

VOICE: Mr. Chairman.

VOICE: You have the first question.

HHH: Can I just stand up here, Ben?

VOICE: Please do.

VOICE: Mr. Vice President. Could you state...

(INDISTINCT)...You state that you agreed with the eight
positions (?) that were included in the National Committee
for Peace in Vietnam's (INDISTINCT). *The way it stands* With the exception of
one modification that you made in number one.

HHH: Yes, sir.

VOICE: The original number one read, "an immediate
standstill ceasefire by all sides, starting with an end of
the bombing of North Vietnam." And then you added an expla-
nation to that, and stated, "And I add this one measure of
elaboration...the present limited bombing of military targets
in North...in the North, should be terminated when restraint

and reasonable response is obtained from North Vietnam."
Again, a conditional...^aposition. May I ask you, Mr. Vice
President, if the ^{original} number one had read, "an immediate
standstill ceasefire by all sides, including an end of the
bombing of North Vietnam..." period, would you have accepted
that without modification?

HHH: Of course, of course. That is exactly what
I tried to propose in this city, I recall, a little over
six weeks ago, when I called upon the...when I stated that
my objective was, and what I believe is a sensible, reasonable
objective to stop the killing, to get the negotiations under-
way towards a political settlement, was a total ceasefire,
including...not starting, but including the bombing of
North Vietnam. Period.

VOICE: Thank you. That includes...(APPLAUSE)

VOICE: Mr. Humphrey...

VOICE: Will you state your name?

VOICE: My name is Dr. Robert Cunningham. I'm
from Rochester, New York. Many of us in the Liberal Party
are deeply disturbed by the direction in which our country
seems to have been drifting in the last four years. Now
you have stated that while it is one thing to be a member
of the team, it is something else to be a captain of the
team. If you, sir, had been captain of our team for the
past four years, how would you have acted differently in

regard to the Vietnam situation, and how would you have acted differently in regard to the Dominican Republic affair?

HHH: Well, my good friend, I don't think it's going to do a lot of good for me to try to recapture, in the last four years, every incident that's happened. I've had a goodly number of people that are my critics, who have said "You know, it would be better if Mr. Humphrey would
Insert, p. 17

And for me to sit... stand here and say what would I have done, that would have depended a great deal on what kind of advice that I had received, because if I am permitted to be the President, my friends, I would be calling upon advisors that President Johnson had, possibly, but maybe some others that he didn't have, and a man's judgment is no better than his information and his advice, and it is almost impossible for a man to say what he would have done under a set of particular circumstances, unless he was in the position to make the decision because that position qualifies a great deal of what you will do and what you will not do. It is very difficult to say.

make it. [^] NOW ON THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Bosch, Juan Bosch, about as well as any man in this audience. I was there with him when he took office, and no one in this audience has a greater desire to see democratic institutions in Latin America than I have. From what I heard...from what I heard, and I didn't hear everything, but from what I heard,

I thought that what President Johnson did, from what I heard as to the information that he had that I was able to hear, I didn't hear it all, I thought that the decision that he made was proper, was the right decision. But my good friend, I've seen many a man in trade unions and political parties, in government, make decisions on the basis only of the information that they have, and somebody else may have made an entirely different decision, because of the information that he or she may have had.

And so I don't want to relive the yesterdays. I've had so many people come to me and try to polarize my differences with the President. Quite frankly, I just don't buy that argument, and I don't think I can answer it to the satisfaction of anybody, including myself, because I was one of the advisers. I did not sit in on every conference. I sat in when I was asked. I heard the information that was presented when I was there. I read (?) the intelligence reports, the same intelligence reports that your President reads, but when you are the man that makes the decision, or is compelled to, you...you dig in just a little more deeply into what your advisers are saying than when you are just a... sort of a member of the audience or the advisory team. This is in no way to try to pretend that...that I have no responsibility for differences that may exist between you, sir, and the administration. I have to...I've been a member of the

administration. In fact, I'm very proud to have been Vice President and I think that President Johnson's done many remarkably great and good things, and I think that only history will be able to properly, objectively judge his administration because of the tremendous emotion that exists in this country and the deep concern over the war in Vietnam. And I am not one that...that feels that that concern is wrong. I have on occasion been wrong when I've scolded some of the people, but I am a human being. I get tired. I get a little frenzied once in awhile, you know, like anybody else does, ^{you know,} a little frazzled, I guess that's a better word...and once in awhile you say something that you wish you did not say. In fact, if I could relive my life, the speeches would have been shorter, I would have kept some of the same friends that I had here, and I imagine that some of my decisions and some of my actions would have been a little different, but I have to live with what happened, and then I've got to think about what I've learned and what could happen tomorrow. And that's what I'm trying to do, as your Vice President, I want to say to you in all candor, I have tried to learn how to make the decisions that would come to a President, to learn the decision-making process.

I'm going to share another intimate thought with you. I have thought so much of late, if anything happened to the President, what would I do? I've thought so much of late,

if I'm elected, whom will I appoint? Where will I turn for counsel? Who will be my advisers? In fact, I can tell you that...that I sat up last night for four hours, thinking just about that, putting down some notes, 'cause it could happen, and I hope it does happen that I get elected. I hope it doesn't happen that I take over because of any tragedy to the President, but I have to think in terms of what kind of counsel would I take? What would be my direction? Who...to whom would I look? And I can honestly say, and I surely wouldn't mention names, but I think you pretty well know there'd be some people in this room to whom I'd look, both on the international and the domestic side. And there surely would be other people. And I don't happen to think that the Democrats have a monopoly on wisdom. I'd maybe look to even a few people that weren't in our party.

But that's the only way I can answer your question. I have...I must stand before you, in honesty and integrity, to tell you that I have supported the administration. I will not run away from that, because to do so makes me a hypocrite, and I do not want to be nor am I a hypocrite. But I do say that there's a new dimension today in the Vietnamese situation which we've alluded to here, and which was alluded to just a moment ago. Six months ago, Vietnam was nothing but a battlefield, and it looked like a very difficult, long, continuing, ugly, painful, costly battlefield.

By June and late May that situation had changed. The situation had changed that there was a new front in Paris, a ~~pace~~ front, and that is something that we have hoped for for a long time, and the President, in his March 31st statement, made it possible, by his personal action and a unilateral limiting of the bombing of North Vietnam, and I'm sure that you would know that that decision was not made lightly, and I'm sure you know that there must have been some probing ahead of time, as to whether or not if that decision was made a certain conference would take place in Paris. And a conference is underway.

Now I'm one of the people in this country that says that just as war has, in its own...has built in with it its own momentum or escalation, and it does. Once you get a war started it's hard to stop them, you know. So does the peace process have built within it its own continuity, its own life line. We're not going to break off those negotiations, and what I'm pleading for, in and out of the government, is that we continue those negotiations, no matter how long, what harrassment we take, what kind of propaganda is leveled against us. I happen to believe that if you can ask a nation to pay the cost of war for over four years in men and treasure, you ought to be willing to pay any costs that it requires at a peace table, for a continu...for a rather long period of time, and I don't believe

in the escalation of this war. I do not believe that we should get frustrated. I think we must find a way and pursue every conceivable diplomatic course that we have to gain a political settlement, which means that you cannot ask for unconditional surrender. It means that you do not get what you call an unconditional military victory. It means that you get the victory of peace and the div...the dividends of peace, and that's the victory I'm after, not the victory on the battlefield, but the victory ^{of} at the negotiating table and the political settlement. The victory of peace. (APPLAUSE)

VOICE: The chair will entertain a question from the side.

mayor VOICE: *Your name* (INDISTINCT) Mr. Vice President, *as far as* (INDISTINCT) you had mentioned ^a the Marshall (?) Plan for the cities.

HHH: Yes, sir.

VOICE: Do you reaffirm such a program and would you spell out some details particularly in regard to direct aid to cities, rather than giving experimental tests (INDISTINCT)...

HHH: *Yes, yes* About a year and a half ago, at the National Association of County Officials Convention in Detroit, I think it was February '67, as I recollect, I proposed there a Marshall Plan for the cities of America, and I

tried to spell it out in modest, general form at the time. Since then, when I became an avowed candidate for this office of the Presidency, I've tried to spell it out both in an address at Cleveland and in a position paper, which I would be more than happy to make available to you. We have a very fine urban task force, that consists of some of the best urbanologists or urban specialists in the country, including mayors and people that have worked with the associations, like the Conference of Mayors, the National Association...the National Association of Cities and some of our professors and others.

My Marshall Plan for cities is based upon the following principles: first of all, that there must be a long term national commitment. It cannot be a hit and miss proposition. Why do I say that? I use the word Marshall Plan for one simple reason, because the Marshall Plan was a pledge by the United States of America over a period of five years of a certain sum of money, so that the recipients of the aid, the loans and the grants, would know that they had a continuity, that it wasn't in and out, that it wasn't lean and fat, that it wasn't dry and wet, so to speak, that they had a constant flow. Secondly, that ^{there would be} ~~they had~~ a plan at this end of the line and one on the recipient end that was integrated, that was synchronized, that the recipients would have to plan the use of these resources, that the plan would have to be

acceptable to them, and that their...that our part of it would only be a matter of certain basic standards. And that there had to be involvement of the participa...of the people that were to be benefitted. Now those were the essentials of the Marshall Plan. A sum of massive...sum of money, a large sum. Secondly, a long term commitment. Thirdly, local planning and local direction and local operation, which is exactly what happened in the Marshall Plan.

Now we apply that to the modern city today. First of all, the modern city by itself cannot...be...cannot have remedies. It's got to be a metropolitan, it has to be a larger area that we're talking about. We have to find new forms of management for that larger area. You can't just clean up an area here and there. You have to...you have to have a program and a plan that is big enough to stem the tide of infection call^{ed} the ~~slum~~ and the growth of slums. And I have proposed a National Urban Development Bank. Now, why? Because the banks^{ed} represent continuity of financing, and I have proposed it on the basis of our experience both with domestic banks and international banks. The Federal Land Bank, for example, which made possible the growth of American agriculture in this nation fifty to sixty years ago, in which the federal government bought a large block of stock and provided the beginning capital. But the bank in turn reached out into the private community to solicit stock sales,

in other words, and raise capital from the private community.

We do this same thing with the Inter-American Development Bank today, for example, wherein we are a subscriber of a certain amount of capital, but that bank only recently, right in this New York market and in European markets, has sold large issues of its stock to give it a larger body of capital with which to work. I want to get the financing, much of the financing of our urban redevelopment and our urban...and of our Marshall Plan for ^{our} cities away from the willy-nilly hit and miss appropriations process of the Congress. I want us to make a massive, large commitment in the beginning, which may be very large. After all, we put in how many...several hundred millions of dollars into the ^{into} the Asian Bank, and we've put in, I've forgotten the amount, billions of dollars into the World Bank. We ought to make a large sum amount of capital stock and then we should guarantee the other stocks that are purchased by the public or by the pension funds of unions or by corporate wealth, or whatever it is. And we should then permit the financing of those less than profitable items in urban renewal, that is, the infrastructure, the great things that are needed that a city itself ~~can~~ ^{can} no longer pay for, we should get that financing out of that Urban National. ^{out} of that National Urban Development Bank. It'll have regional banks that are chartered around the country to raise its own money and to get public subscription

as well as private subscription. Now I've outlined this in a 44 page document. I think it can work, and who says it can work? I've met with hundreds of mayors and talked to them about this. I've met with the top financial experts on municipal financing in the United States of America, in Europe and Asia. I've had them into my office. This is not a little gimmick. This is the result of two and one half years' study by a task force within the government and a task force that I appointed as Vice President in my role as liaison with the mayors of the United States. And the mayors now know that this is about the only way that they're going to get enough capital in their cities to be able to do the job.

Finally, let me say, if we can bind up the wounds and stop this war, we can have some extra resources to do *all* lots of things that need to be done in this country, not immediately. I had a post-war, a post-Vietnam budget proposal here that was presented to ^{the press} this last week. Dr. Walter Heller, Dr. Charles Schultz (?), Dr. Otto Eckstein, just to mention a few. We have ten of the most eminent economists in America that have studied the post-Vietnam possibilities and what we would have. In fiscal ^{year} 1970, the next year, we'd have from \$2 to \$4 billions of dollars extra money over and above what we have now even if we took off the 10% surtax. And the next year would go up appreciably. By 1972, even with the built-in increase in government costs,

new salary increases, all kinds, new social security benefits, we'd have between \$28 and \$30 billion dollars in 1972 in one year to ^{flow}~~plot~~ into our cities for urban renewal under our proposal and our program. That's without any increase in the taxes.

I'll give you one other thought. I happen to think that ^{the}~~this~~ surtax, which will come off in a year if the war is over, and that's what it was based on. It was based on the period of the war, and it'll have to be renewed

Insert, p. 27

I am going . . . INDISTINCT . . . a question from the platform, and then I go to my right.

RICHARD THORPE: I am the youngest of the /State/ vice chairmen of /the Liberal Party/, Mr. Vice President. Your comments made, Sir, are presumably designed to set our fears about your present and future position on Viet Nam to rest, because you have do do it.

However, sir, would you choose to comment on the statement carried by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and recorded in the New Republic, that you are, and I quote, "equally responsible with President Johnson for having gone to the American people

in 1964 on a peace platform, and then immediately after the election, plunging them into a war which was being planned at the very moment that promises of peace were being made."

HHH: Well, that's a two-barbed question, and I think I framed my response earlier rather accurately. First of all, may I say that the priorities that you mention, we put plenty of priority in this administration, more than any in the history of this country, ^{upon} ~~on~~ the great social needs of this country, and I do not think it either fair or accurate to interpret it otherwise. I came to the Congress of the United States and fought for federal aid to education for a long time and we never got any of it. It was either killed on race or religion or so-called states' rights. We have increased the investment of this country in the last four years in federal aid to education by 300%, from \$4 billion up to \$13 billion. Now that's quite a priority. We've increased the investment of the federal government in health by over 300%. There was no War on Poverty until 1964 and I helped design the legislation and fashion it, and I helped get it through the Congress of the United States. In ^{they} fact, I couldn't even get a sponsor in the House of Representatives until I helped get one for them. We passed the act on guaranteeing rights to vote, the open housing act, which very few people even in this audience thought was possible. We've done more in the field of civil rights since

1964 than any time since Abraham Lincoln and even more than he did. It's been nothing short of fantastic. And I am not about ready to have people say that we have had no priorities. Look what we've done in the field of consumer legislation. We've ~~done~~ more in the field of consumer legislation in the last four years than the preceding 150. Truth in packaging, truth in lending, a dozen other measures. We've done more in the field of pollution control. There was no pollution control legislation until 1965. For our streams and our water supply and our air. We've done a lot of things. Project Head Start, Project Upward Bound, VISTA. I think these are pretty important things, and I've had my hand to them. I've been on the inside of this kind of work. So if I'm going to have to take responsibility for what people feel was a tragic mistake in Vietnam, would you mind giving me a little credit for what I think is a very noble program of social and liberal progress on the domestic front? I think we've done a lot of things. (APPLAUSE)

Now, Let me...let me be crystal clear. It didn't help any to get the thing complicated by losing 47 seats in the House of Representatives in 1966. *But,* We've had a remarkable legislative record. We've increase d the social budget of this country in four years by \$41 billion. That's/what the reactionaries and the conservatives are complaining about. We've had the largest single increase in social security in...social

security payments in the last year that we've had in thirteen years, and we did all of it without a single tax increase. We have reduced the taxes three times, until we had the surtax of this last year. Now these things are something I think that we ought not to sh...that we ought not to look down on with shame or with some sort of downgrading attitude. I have told a few of my liberal Congressman friends, I said, "You better be careful when you go home and you buy all this propaganda that we've done nothing, 'cause there's going to be a Republica opponent that says that's exactly right, you've done nothing."

Now we've done a lot. I sat in the Senate one day when I found over 75% of the Republicans voting against a 25% increase in Head Start...\$25 million, I should say, increase in Project Head Start. As Vice President I broke that tie. I sat in the Congress of the United States to protect our farm migrant workers, as the ^{Vice} President of the United States, so that they would not be the victims of a constant flow of people into the United States ^{who demand} to deny our own workers a chance. I support collective bargaining for our farm workers, under the National Labor Relations Act. I've taken the liberal position. Now I had no way of knowing, at all, in September, October, 1964, that the North Vietnamese were going to be sending two and three divisions of troops into South Vietnam. My name is Humphrey, not Jeremiah or Isaiah. I am not in the Old Testament or the New. I am

not a prophet. I am a political man. I could not foresee that, nor could President Johnson. ^{But} /We had to make a decision. In February of 1965. And not an easy decision. A decision that had been earlier by President Eisenhower and subsequently reaffirmed by President John Kennedy, because when Lyndon Johnson became President of the United States, there were 25,000 Americans already in Vietnam, and 1,000 of them had been killed. There was a conflict underway. He wanted, and I wanted to bring this conflict to a peaceful resolution, just exactly as we wanted to do it in Laos, and we signed an agreement about Laos in 1962, and all the parties were supposed to keep that agreement. But there hasn't been a single day since that agreement was signed but what the ^{North} Pathet Lao and the forces of/Vietnam have been attacking in Laos, and Souvanna Phouma is no hawk, and he is no warrior. He was a neutralist that was frowned upon by the late Foster Dulles as being a Communist sympathizer, and Laos today is a battlefield, and it was before we ever sent a plane to North Vietnam. Now we sent our planes into North Vietnam in 1965 with the thought in mind that it was the only thing that we could do that could leave any possibility of self-determination ^{for} of South Vietnam, rather than to have it overrun totally by forces of aggression and the Viet Cong. That was our judgment. Now maybe we were wrong. I think you can't determine that nor can I. I had to do what I thought was right, and the President did what he thought was right. And then in

July of 1965 there was a need, at least it was felt that in our government, from the best advice that we had, from the same advisers that advised John Kennedy, and there wasn't a single cabinet change, they were all the same ones...there was Mr. Rusk and Mr. Mac Namara and Mr. Taylor, Mr. McGeorge Bundy, the Kennedy Cabinet was right there. And they made the same recommendations that I heard to the President of the United States. They were the men that made the recommendations, and the President of the United States had to make his decision based on those recommendations. And I think they're pretty good men, and he decided that we had to send some ground forces in, and he decided it very reluctantly, very much so.

No one could have predicted the degree of escalation, but I want to make it crystal clear there's been no lack of desire on the part of my government and your government to get to the conference table. We've tried eighteen times that I recall, and eighteen other efforts were made by international bodies and several more were made by the Pope, to try to get this conflict to the conference table. And we agreed to proposals of the UN and we agreed to proposals of the non-aligned nations and we agreed to proposals of His Holiness the Pope, but we never were able to get anybody else to come.

Now I'll tell you you cannot settle a fight if the other party won't come. You cannot settle a collective bargaining agreement if management won't come to the table.

unless
And you cannot settle a war / the other participant in that war is willing to come and negotiate, and that's what I said was the new dimension. Today that participant at long last has come to the conference table, and the discussions are serious and the discussions are genuine. And I happen to believe that I can't fight over the war days of yesterday. If I am held responsible, then I am held responsible. But let me make it crystal clear. For those today who are advocating what they are advocating, I think you better take a look at the record. There's one way for us to show our disapproval of this war. You can vote no money. Ladies and gentlemen, some people did do that, but I happen to think that if you will examine the record you'll find that most of those who are today asking for the office of Presidency voted every supplemental bill, voted to put the money there, and voted for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Now that resolution has been kicked around a lot. I don't know whether it's as important as some people make it, but I know I was there in 1964, August, and I want it crystal clear in this assembly, you read the Congressional Record, I was asked as the Majority Whip of the United States Senate, the second-ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, having served on it twelve years, I was asked this question: Will the...will the ^{leader, ... will the majority ... will the} Majority Whip answer this? Does this resolution contain within it the possibility that American ground forces

may be sent into Southeast Asia? And I stood there and answered that question, to the Senator from Idaho, Mr. Church, and I said that the resolution speaks for itself. It...it empowers the President to take whatever measures are necessary, including the use of armed forces of the United States of America to repel aggression. Now that's *what* it said. Now maybe some Senator signed a bad contract. I've signed a few of them myself that I didn't like, and most everybody has had a deal or two that he put his name to that he didn't like, but that doesn't relieve you from the obligation that you put your name to it.

Now I didn't put my name to any more of these things than anybody else. I haven't voted for a single appropriation. I haven't had a chance, and there hasn't been a tie. *[Change of record machine]* So if I really wanted to welsh out on this argument, I could say, "Don't blame me. What does a Vice President have to say about this country? I got a lot of responsibility and no authority. I can only vote when there's a tie. But Senators have a lot to say about this country. I served in the Senate for sixteen *[For help on tape]* years, and I know that a vote in the Senate is a very important vote. Take a look at the record. I think my record ^{for peace} and for a political settlement in Vietnam is just as good as anybody else's and I think the fact that we've stood there to permit these people to have some right of self-determination is not something that the Liberal Party should be ashamed of, and it's

surely not something I'm ashamed of, because I believe in self-determination. (APPLAUSE)

VOICE: I know this could go on for hours.

HHH: ...a little while, Ben.

VOICE: I am anxious that we get as many questions as possible. I will now take one from ^{this} side. Mike?

VOICE: My name is Michael Donovan (?). I'm from the Bronx and I'm a little embarrassed to ask you this question, because it seems to be academic after your performance here today. But I ~~planned~~ to ask it, so I'm going to. You...there are some differences in this party, but I'm sure there's unanimity that we must defeat the Nixon-Agnew ticket this year, and why do you think that you would be the best candidate of the Democratic Party to spare this country four years of Nixon and Agnew, and in answering ^{to} ~~ing~~ that question, I wonder if you would address yourself to what you think would be the principal issues that you would campaign on, bearing in mind that Mr. Nixon appears to have a simplistic campaign issue known as law and order, whatever the devil that means.

HHH: Well, I think that the reason that I can come to you to ask your help...by the way, I don't feel that I should expect it, I want to earn it. I want to merit your support. I want to make that quite clear. I have gone from state to state, not assuming that I had any support at all, but that I had to earn it, and I believe that the reason that I can carry this fight, can carry it successfully to a successful conclusion,

is because I do have a record of performance, of progressivism, of liberalism, and may I say of some common sense also in the field of national security. I also have a record, may I say, in another area that I haven't touched on today, and that's in arms control. I happen to believe that the greatest single threat to the peace of the world is not Vietnam. I think that's going to be settled, and I will give you my word, as others would too, that I will make it the top priority of my administration, to get a quick and a reasonable and an honorable settlement in Vietnam. I'll do everything that I possibly can within the bounds of national security and honor to get that done. But there is something else over and beyond that. We are today at a stage at our country and in the Soviet Union, the two super-powers, where a great arms race is under way. Now fortunately, the Non-Proliferation Treaty is a good omen, that indicates that we can come to some agreements with the Soviet Union. I think that the next President of the United States must be one who can command the respect of the Soviet leaders and talk to them, and can make them understand that there is a mutual benefit in slowing down the arms race and putting a halt to it and de-escalating it. Because these new weapons systems, the fractional orbital bomb, the new offensive and defensive missile systems are ghastly in their significance of destruction and costly beyond anything that you and I ever dreamed of. And we've got a

job to do. We have grave difficulties in the Middle East. That's one of the most dangerous areas in the world today. And I believe that my record speaks for itself of liberal performance. I've been a mayor of a city. When you want to talk about law and order, I gave my city law enforcement second to none. ^{But} I also gave it a good dose of social justice. Long before there was a War on Poverty, I went into the relief rolls of the city of Minneapolis in the year 1946 and '47 and 90% of the relief clients in that city went off the relief rolls, were in a vocational rehabilitation program in cooperation of the labor movement and Minnesota industry. We put them to work and got them jobs. We started the first alcoholism institute of any major city, the first human relations commission, the first fair employment practices ordinance. We did things, and I'll let my record in the Senate speak for itself.

Let me tell you, in the past ^{they} I used to say Humphrey had more solutions than there were problems. Now my critics say that he's out of solutions and he doesn't recognize the problems. Well, let me tell you that if I didn't have any new solutions I had enough of them built up so I can take care of the next four years. (APPLAUSE)

There will be differences. There are differences between Mr. Nixon and myself - basic differences. He's a cold war warrior. I'm a man of peaceful engagement. I'm a

man that recognizes that this world has changed, greatly changed, and I recognize that we're going to have to reassess all the priorities of our foreign policy and domestic policy, and I recognize also that the government does have a distinct role to play if we're going to try to get this as a better country, if we're going to really help our deprived and our impoverished and our unemployed and our unemployable. We cannot just leave it to chance. WE have to have a sense of direction and a mobilization of resources of this country, public and private.

I think I know how to do it. That's why I want to be President. [APPLAUSE] I've got to leave.

VOICE: Basil Kirikakis (?), Rochester, Foreign

The gentleman in the rear. Anybody who had the floor once will not be given it again. There are too many hands up.

tration view the fascist military junta that was established and maintained by the CIA in the birthplace of democracy, namely Greece?

HHH: Well, we look upon the...upon Greece as a very troubled area, and we want to see constitutional government there. We shall do everything we can, within peaceful means, to encourage constitutional, representative government. But I must say that there are lots of countries that do not have it and I do not believe that we should use force to try to establish it. But we ought to aid the people of Greece in any way that we can, through our good offices, through our words, through our...through our policies, to

encourage and promote every possible way the return to constitutional government in that country. I'm not at all happy with what's happened in Greece, and I pledge to you that I... just as I have said this many times before, it's nothing new, that I deplore what's happened, and I look forward to the time that ~~our~~ government can be helpful in assuring and helping the people of Greece, I should say assure themselves of the full freedoms that they deserve ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ a constitutional government. Yes, sir.

VOICE: We will accept the...one or two more, but we have not a feminine voice, and I think ^{that} we ought to carry the theme through, and I will have Miss... ^{Bene, Sylvia Blue} (?)...

VOICE: Many of us are gravely concerned about the problems in the Middle East. How would you propose to handle this problem? What would your program be when you are elected President of the United States?

HHH: Well, Sylvia, first of all, there are always some changes that take place, and one can't predict everything, but let me say what I understand to be the situation now and what...what my reaction is to the current situation. I'm sure you appreciate that things do change in the days ahead. First of all, I think the President's proposal and his statement of June 19, following the Six Day War, is a solid base on which we operate. It is...it ~~is~~ considered a...I believe, a responsible, reasonable position for this country, and it

fulfills our...our requirements of territorial integrity, of peaceful settlement, and of doing away with the status of belligerency, which has plagued Israel all of its years as an independent sovereign state.

Secondly, I would hope that we could find some way between the super-powers to stop this mad arms race in the Middle East. I think this is a deadening and terribly difficult thing.

Thirdly, if that is not possible, then I think it is the duty of the United States of America to see that Israel has the instruments to defend herself, and I have said so, and I have been a proponent of it a long time, since the days of Israel's birth. On her first birthday. And that includes the necessary sophisticated weapons so that she can defend herself, including Phantom Jets, and that's just all I can tell you. (APPLAUSE)

VOICE: I recognize the hand in the rear. Is there somebody in the rear? Otherwise, you have the floor.

HHH: So I hope we get... (OVERTALK)...Humphrey buttons around here.

VOICE: There's a few. *[Laughter]*

HHH: Go ahead, sir.

VOICE: The State Committee of the Liberal Party, out of their dedication to justice...

HHH: Sir...

VOICE: ...to freedom...

HHH: Would you please repeat? I'm sorry, I didn't hear.

VOICE: I said the State Committee of the Liberal Party, out of that concern for justice, freedom, peace, to which you alluded, has seen fit to pass overwhelmingly a resolution condemning the War in Vietnam, because of the destruction of lives, because it is impeding economic and social progress of our nation, and because the world community is opposed, and records its unyielding opposition to any policy that will continue the war, and opposes any policy that would engage us in similar wars elsewhere, and favors an immediate ceasefire while the negotiations continue in Paris. And finally, resolves that we seek to support a candidate for President of the United States in 1968 who adheres to the principles hereunto. I have two questions, Mr. Humphrey. Can you, in good conscience, here and now state that you agree with this analysis of the war and its consequences, and that you adhere to the principles stated in the resolution, and secondly of all, if the Saigon regime refuses to participate in, or permit any political process which would involve the National Liberation Front, as signalled by its constant statements of its leaders and the political persecution and incarceration of political opponents in South Vietnam, would you then continue to favor American participation in the war?

HHH: Well, my good friend, those are rather general statements and they're subject to a lot of interpretation. Let's get down to the central point. Do I favor an immediate ceasefire, and that's what you said. The answer's yes. Let me tell you, if you can get an immediate ceasefire, if we can get that, these other problems will fade into insignificance. Do I think this war is costly and ugly? The answer is yes. Do I like war? The answer is no. Do I think that it has been a very serious and dangerous thing? Yes. The question was, is something else or something else more dangerous? That's what it really boils down to. Now an immediate ceasefire is what this man has proposed time in and time out. And believe me, that's what we need. And to have these negotiations find a political settlement. Now as to the question about what the regime in Saigon would do. Really, that is an iffy question. I say that respectfully. I can only say that the regime in Saigon now is a much broader based regime than it was six months ago, with the new Prime Minister and the group that's come in. I believe that there is growth in that...in the...in the representative character of that government. And I've also told you that I favored, in the political settlement of the war, free elections, that would permit all parties who believe in peaceful processes and are willing to accept the outcome of the election, to permit them to participate. I think I've gone about as far as an honorable man should and

could go. Not appeasement, not a sellout, but frankly, a legitimate, honorable, prompt cessation of hostilities that can lend themselves to working out the political needs and social needs of that beleaguered part of the world. Now that's what I...what I believe in. Now I've issued a statement on what I thought were the post-war lessons from Vietnam, and I shall be doing that again, the many lessons that we've learned from this, and hopefully, that we'll apply them in the future of our foreign policy. (APPLAUSE)

VOICE: We...we started the questioning with the gentlemen. We're going to have the final question from a lady. I will now ask the lady on the platform, a member of our Executive Committee, to make the last question...

VOICE: Mr. Vice President, I would like to know... my question is very simple, I would like to know what do you think about the problem of Cuba? (INDISTINCT)...all the Spanish Americans and that we are troubled so much, and we feel (INDISTINCT)...Spanish-speaking people...(INDISTINCT)...

HHH: You've asked me about the...what I think about the problem of Cuba. Can I be very candid with you? I'm afraid I'm somewhat the same...the victim of some of the same sickness or problem that has afflicted many other Americans. My mind has been so fully occupied with this war in Vietnam, not only because of its consequences, but because of all the dissent and discussion over it, that I'm

Indistinct

afraid we've failed to take proper attention of many other areas that we ought to have been giving some attention to. This has been one of the liabilities of this constant argument over Vietnam. I don't think any of us can ignore the fact that...that Castro's Cuba has been at least temporarily isolated as far as a force is concerned of...of ideological expansion in this hemisphere. That has been done primarily not by us, even though we've been a partner in it. It has been the accomplishment of the...of the nation states of Latin America themselves, as they have met and conquered, under the auspices of the Organization of American States and otherwise. Countries like Venezuela have suffered from infiltration of guerrilla warriors that have come in from Cuba, and they have brought this to the appropriate attention of peoples of the Organization of American States. I think that we have to be...we have to cooperate with the OAS, in light of what the needs are of the peoples of Latin America, and of the responsible governments of Latin America. I don't think this is solely an American, a U.S.A. decision. I think we must act as a good neighbor in this, and not to try to make a prescription for Cuba strictly on our own.

Finally, I would say to you that it may be very well now that we ought to take another great big look at the re...at what's happening in Cuba, and what its relationships seem to be to the rest of the hemisphere. More than

that, I can't be more precise. I wish I could. But you want honesty from me, and I'd be less than honest if I told you that I had any quick and sudden solutions.

Thank you. (APPLAUSE) *[The END] Liberal Party Undersecretary follows.*

VOICE: Mr. Vice President, on behalf of the officers and members of the Executive Committee of the Liberal Party, we are indeed indebted to you for your forthright, honest and consistent relationship to the questions asked here today, and I can only say to you as the campaign proceeds all of the questions unanswered will be answered, and in the final days I think you will find real support here in the Liberal Party. Thank you and good night. (APPLAUSE)

(END OF TAPE)



Transcribed by
DICT-A-MATIC Corporation
565-0350



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