REMARKS OF

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE STUDENT FORUM

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania September 9, 1968

WARD & PAUL

OFFICIAL REPORTERS 25 K STREET, N. E. Washington, D. C. 20002

(202) 628-4266

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE STUDENT FORUM

Burgundy Room
Bellevue-Stratford Hotel
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Monday, September 9, 1968
1:50 p.m.

Thank you very much. I wasn't sure whether we were buying this time or whether it was free.

(Laughter)

If we were buying it, I wanted you to sit down a little sooner. If it was free, why, stand up again.

(Laughter) (Applause)

It is a rare privilege to meet with you and it is a high honor to be introduced by a very distinguished, effective young Congressman like Congressman Bill Green. He has been very, very kind to me in his introduction.

Adlai Stevenson used to say that flattery was all right if you didn't inhale it. Did you notice how I was breathing?

(Laughter)

And what a joy it is to have alongside of me a man with whom I have worked in the Senate and when he was Mayor of this great city. Many, many years we worked together, and I believe in common cause and common purpose and the man that I hope is re-elected with an overwhelming majority to the United States Senate, Joe Clark.

(Applause)

And he sure looks like a winner. He waves like one, too.

(Laughter)

And thank you very much, Mr. Mayor, for once again welcoming me to Philadelphia. This city has been very kind to me. Of course, it has been very kind to, I think, all Americans and it certainly has a great reputation in our history, at least of the past, and I think it is going to have a better one in the future.

I am not going to take any time to talk about the past. I appreciated very much the comments, indeed the commentary, of Congressman Green about a record and I suppose that if you are going to hire somebody, sometimes you like to at least get their references. What do you know about them? What is the record? But there are times, and even despite a record, that you say, well, I don't buy it, and I want to take

a chance and I want to just look ahead without any regard to the yesterdays.

I am proud of the public record that has been mine. I don't say it is without blemish. I say in light of the public life, where one has to at least think in terms of a total nation and not just a small constituency, I believe that it is a record of forward progress. But what is most important is the future.

Somebody once said that America, if you spell it backwards in two or three other languages would spell future. I am not sure if that is true or not but it makes a good line. I do know that this nation has spent very little time thinking about the yesterdays. I know that Winston Churchill once said that those who use the present to stand in judgment of the past lose the future.

What is really important is the future because that is what most of us are going to live through. Most of us are going to spend our time in the future and I am talking to a roup of young Americans now that are all, with few exceptions, and I hope all of you will be alive in the year 2000. I am workingon it myself. I haven't found quite the right pill yet but I will keep trying until I do.

But what a fascinating future it is going to be if we can live. I didn't say just survive because there is a great deal of difference between survival which an animal can do and to live and all the meaning of that precious word "life" which a human being should have.

I would like to think of my political life as at least based upon what kind of an America will we have in 1976. We all know what kind of an America we had in 1776 and we note that much has happened since then and most of it to the good. I would like also to keep in mind and I want you to keep in mind that the majority of the people in America today will be alive in the year 2000. So when we look ahead, we are really looking to the 21st Century and isn't that an exciting prospect, to live in the 21st Century.

I think I have got some chance because my grandfather on my father's side lived to be 93 and my grandfather on my mother's side lived to be 89, and if I live to be 89 I will make it.

Now, if you have any remedies, you let me know.

What is the central issue of our times? I think it
is an issue that is both domestic and international. I just
jotted down very quickly here and I said it out in the
public square -- it is very difficult to speak in public
squares but I said we have to decide whether or not we are
really going to have one nation, one American community, in
which we share within the limits of our talents and our
abilities all of the privileges and all of the responsibilities

and all of the rights that belong to a citizen of the United States of America.

going to have to decide whether we are going to have one nation or whether we are going to have two. As the Kerner Commission

We cannot afford two kinds of citizenship. We are

report put it, two separate and unequal.

Now, we have been going through a long period of time in which we have literally had for many Americans a substandard citizenship. I think the greatest achievement of the past decade is the breakthrough in the field of human rights. Oh, I know the last decade has brought us material prosperity, unprecedented; in the last eight years tremendous increase in personal income and profits and wages, even despite the rise in the cost of living, a fantastic increase, three times better, 3-1/2 times better than in the preceding seven years or eight years. But while that is important, what is most important is that for the first time in the history of this country, the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation takes on some reality and there are literally today hundreds of thousands, millions of people for the first time that really feel that this country is theirs.

Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he shall have no love for it. That was the statement of a great English philosopher, John Stewart Mills. Many of you who are in the field of social sciences have studied his writings. Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he shall have no love for it. And there are literally hundreds of thousands of Americans today that have had nothing to do for their country. They have been cut out, they have been left out; well, they haven't been in on the action or on the benefits.

But they are coming in now. Ten million people have come out of poverty in the last eight years, ten million. Think of that. That is a remarkable record.

(Applause)

Time forbids that I should go through what is the statistical evidence of the breakthroughs. We passed all kinds of civil rights acts. We have a great bulwark, a framework of law but really civil rights and human rights depend on you, not so much on law -- your habits, your practices. It takes a lot longer to overcome a bad habit than it does to pass a good law and sometimes it takes a long time in the Senate with the filibuster to pass a good law. I have been there long enough to know.

(Applause)

So, we are going to have to have not only laws that

dictate open housing but we have to have open hearts and open minds. So the first issue is whether or not we will have one nation in which all people can really participate in the benefits as well as the decision-making of this country.

Now, the second one is what kind of a world are we going to live in? Wendell Wilkie back in 1940, I think a man ahead of his time, used the phrase "one world" and he wrote a book entitled: "One World" and you might want to get it. He talked about the fact that this world was no longer just principalities and sovereign nations but it had become in the very real sense one world, one kind of brotherhood. Now, brotherhood does not mean that you give up fraticidal warfare, in fact, many brotherhoods have had too much of it, but we are living in what we call the nuclear age and the space age and you are going to live in it but plenty.

I think the greatest achievement since World War II is the fact that we have been able to avoid a nuclear confrontation, a nuclear holocaust. I can tell you as a member of the National Security Council, as one who has worked diligently in the field of nuclear energy, trying to curb its powers of destruction, I can tell you that either the Soviet Union or the United States presently has enough weapons, nuclear weapons, to obliterate all of mankind and all of God's creation. You talk about over kill, I can assure you that if we should miss the first time or they should miss, there are plenty of times again, and when I hear people say, well, the Russians have fewer missiles than we have or we have more than they have, I say, yes, I guess that is right. We have a superiority in missilry but we all have enough to kill everybody.

Does that make you happy? It doesn't make me happy.

I think the greatest challenge of the coming decade
is to slow down the nuclear arms race and to call a halt to the
arms race before it calls a halt to humanity.

(Applause)

And I am not unaware of the difficulties. But because it is difficult does not mean that you must not try. It was difficult to get a nuclear test ban treaty but we got it. I fought for it for ten years. Joe Clark stood alongside of me, was one of our co-sponsors on that Senate resolution.

I see where Mr. Nixon said here the other day, just yesterday, that he had doubts about the nonproliferation treaty. Well, let me tell you, young Americans, that the one thing this world does not need is an expansion of nuclear weaponry. You don't need that.

(Applause)

Let me make it equally clear that the ratification of that treaty by the United States Senate is in our national interest. It is in our interest of national security. It is in the interest of world peace. That treaty is a landmark since

World War II in the building block	s of the cathedral of peace
and anyone that tells you that we	ought to hesitate or that he
has doubt about it is not a worker	for peace. He is one who
has doubt about what kind of world	
I draw the issue with Mr. Nixon or	this matter and I want
him to know it and I want his supp	porters to know it.

I happen to believe that the nuclear nonproliferation treaty is in the interest of the survival and the life of mankind. I think it is in the interest of our nation. I think it is in the interest of world peace. I think it is in the interest of national security and for anyone to say that we ought not to proceed with it is to show a confusion about the kind of a world we live in and a confusion as to whether or not he is capable of giving this country the sense of security.

(Applause)

Now, let me hear from you. Questions, please.

I don't want to be the picker and the chooser or some people will think I have a few people set out here. This is rawhide confrontation, now, unplanned, unorganized.

VOICE: Mr. Vice President, there have been some editorial allegations that as to the major issues confronting the candidates today, namely, the Vietnamese development, the urban crisis, the reconciliation between black and white, and rich and poor, labor and business, that the issues are mainly muddled between you and your adversary.

Would you care to comment on this?
VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I don't think they

are muddled. I think I can maybe make them quite clear. Let's first of all, start at the end of the line and come up to what I think is the climatic and the crisis issues.

First of all, on issues of labor and management I think you just have to study the record and I think the record is rather clear. Mr. Nixon was in an administration that had three recessions in eight years, in which there was growth in personal income of nine per cent.

I have been in an Administration that has had no recessions in eight years, a personal income increase of 32 per cent and adjusted for inflation and cost of living increases. So, these are true and what we call real percentages and real prices.

Mr. Nixon was in an Administration in which the increase in unemployment was two million. I have been in an Administration in which the increase in employment is two million, plus the increase in population which has been absorbed into the economy.

I happen to believe, for example, in the repeal of Section 14B in the Labor Relations Act. That happens to be my view. I think that national standards ought to govern

collective bargaining. I do not believe in what they call
the right to work laws. I do not intend to try to pass this
off lightly. I have worked hard all of my life for the
expansion of what we call the Fair Labor Standards Act to
include migrant farm workers which Mr. Nixon doesn't include.
I happen to believe -(Applause)
-- I want it quite clear I believe in the dynamism and the
dynamic viability of our free enterprise system. I think thi
is the greatest economic system this world has ever known

-- I want it quite clear I believe in the dynamism and the dynamic viability of our free enterprise system. I think this is the greatest economic system this world has ever known and the social dividends from that system depend upon its profit and depends upon its constant growth, the rate of growth in the previous eight years from 1953 to 1961 was approximately 2.5 per cent. The rate of growth in the last eight years has been 5.2 per cent. You just switch the figures around. It is sort of Geritol spelled backwards. (Laughter)

They have the Geritol.

We have some other differences, on the arms race, for example, and what we should do about it. I have explained that.

On Vietnam. Mr. Nixon in 1954 said that we should at that time send in massive forces of air, naval and ground units. His own President at that time had to disavow him. I think Mr. Nixon is more of a cold war lawyer than I am. I think he relies greater upon military power than he does upon diplomatic and economic and political persuasion.

I happen to believe that in the world in which we live a greater emphasis needs to be placed upon a balance between what we call the strength that comes from the military and the strength that comes from an economy and the third party the strength that comes from a moral purpose and the stature of a country, how we treat our own people, what kind of an image we give to the world.

And I am of the opinion that we will have very little success in this world convincing people that we believe in justice and that we believe in peace and that we believe in social progress unless we can demonstrate it here at home amongst the least of these that are in our own society.

The best foreign policy is a good domestic policy.

That happens to be my position. I don't think that is anything
(Applause)

This gentleman.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, you are quoted as saying you happen to believe we should stop the bombing if we have some reason to believe it will expedite the -- of power.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.
QUESTION: SInce Hanoi's position seems clear, that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the first and primarily necessary condition for successful negotiation is a complete halt in the bombing, wouldn't it be logically consistent on your part to support, therefore, a

halt in the bombing??

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I believe that there has been a great deal of overemphasis upon the differences that exist among some of us, for example, like my friend, Senator Clark here, and my self. No doubt but what we have had some disagreements on what some people think are rather basic and fundamental matters. I don't think they are fundamental at all. In Vietnam none of us recommend unilateral withdrawal, none of the men in contested candidacies in the Democratic Party. None of us have recommended that we have a military solution. All of us have said we needed a negotiated political settlement. None of us have said America should have permanent bases in South Vietna. All of us have said they should be withdrawn as soon as the violence has subsided. All of us have said that we should ask to seek to have more and more of the defense responsibilities in South Vietnam placed upon the Army of South Vietnam with a systematic phased withdrawal of American forces.

May I say at that point that I think this is very possible and it is possible in the short run that the Army of South Vietnam today is a much better Army, more capable of its own self-defense, and I think I can safely predict that unless there are unusual developments that no one can see at this time, that we will be able to start to remove some of our troops, I hope we will be able to do it very promptly if we can get these negotiations underway but I would think negotiations or no negotiations we can start to be able to remove someof the American forces in early 1969 or late 1968.

(Applause)

Let me present one more comment. Some of our very prominent Senators and spokesmen in this country have said as follows, that we should cease the bombing as soon as possible. I agree with that.

(Applause)

Others have said we should cease the bombing immediately. Others have said that we should cease the bombing because all of us want to cease all of the bombing of North Vietnam, cease the bombing when we have some indication of restraint or response from Hanoi.

Now, that has been my position, or as soon as possible.

I am sure of this, that you have to take calculated risks, for peace just as you take calculated risks on the battlefield and if I am permitted to be President of the United States, my young friend, I will scan that horizon of Vietnam with meticulous care and I will be prepared to take those necessary calculated steps that will lead to the

success of substantive negotiations in Paris. It is my view that those negotiations may very well start before I become a President of the United States but if they do not start, I want to give you and this audience my assurance that I will leave no matter untouched and no proposition unexplored that may lend itself to a more rapid success at the conference table in Paris.

No one wants peace in Vietnam more than the man that is looking at you. Every one of us want it. The only question is, how do we best get it and I do not want Hanoi to think between now and January that if they just keep up the killing, just keep up the killing between now and January, they are going to get abetter deal out of me than they will get out Mr. Harriman and Mr. Vance in Paris right now.

I want a cease fire. I want it now. I do not believe that it is good to have fight and talk. I think it is better to stop the fight and talk. And we are looking for that.

(Applause)

I don't mean just to take the front rows here.

We have a lady back here next.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, there have been many committees and commissions formed to investigate crime in the streets. If you are elected what do you intend to do about stopping the violence and crime that is waiving over the nation?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Crime in the streets is a very commonplace description of a rising crime rate in our country and a period of ferment and restlessness, some of which has burst out into violence, unorganized and organized.

Let me speak to you as sincerely and as knowingly as I can. I have been the mayor of a great city. I have had the responsibility for law enforcement and it is not easy. I never wanted my city, however, to be known only for its police department. I wanted it to be known for its schools and its hospitals and its jobs and its parks and its living conditions and the things that we did for people, but I happen to believe that the first duty of an elected public official is to protect life, to provide personal security, to see that neighborhoods are secure and safe. I think that is where you start.

I do not think that you can make social progress in lawlessness and violence. I do not believe so. I think in this country of ours you can make general social progress in order, that is, if there is reasonable order and that means of course, civil order and civil justice. They are one and inseparable.

Now, the differences in this campaign are again of

emphasis. I do not accuse my opposition of being uninterested in the welfare of people, but I do say that they are arousing the passions of people when they put all of the emphasis upon just law and order as if law and order could be obtained in a community by an increase in the police departments and an increase in repression without any regard to someof the conditions that fester in a community like an abscess or a sore that breaks out into a serious social condition.

So, I believe that we have to take two directions. On the one hand, assure law and order. On the other hand, assure with equal emphasis the respect for the laws of the right of a man to life in a decent neighborhood, the laws of building codes, of public health laws, the right of a man for a job, the right of a young person for an education. These are the new Bill of Rights of our times, by the way. They have never been written.

(Applause)

Might I just add quickly on the police state. Our police departents today need professionalization, they need upgrading, they need an increase in number. Law enforcement is not cheap but lawlessness is more expensive and crime is far more expensive.

For example, how many universities in the U.S. today have police training courses. The same neighborhoods where you want to have better police protection has a police officer that frequently does not have a high school education, but that same neighborhood has a social worker that has to have a college education. You insist that your librarian in the slum have a college education. You insist that the social worker in the slum at least have part of a college education. But you insist that your police officer be healthy, strong.

Now, many of them are much better, by far, don't misunderstand me. One city that I know of without mentioning names and it is not this city, one city that has approximately 4,500 police officers has approximately 800 who have less than an 8th grade education.

Now, I don't say that a man without an 8th grade education doesn't have judgment but I do think an education helps him and I think we need to upgrade the training and the quality of our police departments. We have to increase the numbers and we have to increase the pay. We have to professionalize our police services. We have to train them not only in how they enforce a law but we have to train them in community relations, in human relations, and we have to train them in a host of disciplines that relate to social order.

Now, when we start doing that we are going to start to get law enforcement but -- now, we used to have teachers that that could teach school with an 8th grade diploma and we found out that wasn't good enough. Then we had teachers who used

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let's give our mayors and our cities, let's give our police chiefs and police commissioners the kind of manpower that permits them not only to exercise law enforcement but to encourage law observance and there is a whole lot of difference between law enforcement and law observance.

(Applause)

I am trying to keep this balanced. A young lady here, please.

CONGRESSMAN GREEN: Before that question is asked, may I say just one thing. They tell me you are running very late.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, let's get this one. My long answers.

QUESTION: Thank you. Mr. Vice President, what do you think of the Fortas appointment and what do you think of Nixon's failure to take part in it?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I think that Justice Fortas is one of the most gifted and talented Americans of our time.

(Applause)

Now, Mr. Nixon has said about the same thing about him but there is one thing he hasn't said, which I am about to say. I think his nomination ought to be confirmed.

(Applause)

And from this platform I call upon Mr. Nixon to tell his coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats in the Senate to break up that filibuster and to confirm Justice Fortas.

(Applause and shouts)

You know, I have a suspicion that that little man you have that went down -- that was underway in Miami between Mr. Thurmond, who is the leader of the opposition against Mr. Fortas, that that little deal between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Thurmond has something to do with Mr. Fortas's problems of confirmation and I repeat I think if Mr. Nixon believes what he said, that Mr. Fortas is a fine, distinguished patriotic American, then I call upon Mr. Nixon to call upon his supporters in the Senate to call off the filibuster and confirm the nomination of Mr. Fortas.

One more question.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, Mr. Nixon has said that Israel should be sold jets to maintain at least a major balance of power against the Arab nations which are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

being given arms by Russia. How do you feel?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Nixon has

come around late. I am pleased that he has seen my point of view.

(Applause)

In early July of this year, at the request -- I believe Senator Clark and Senator Gruening and several Senators in the U.S. Senate, wrote to me and said, Mr. Vice President, we are people in the Congress that believe that the United States policy towards Israel needs to be strengthened and we would like to have your views.

Now, many people say, well, when are you going to be your own man? Well, if I wasn't my own man on that day my name is not Hubert Horatio Humphrey.

I submitted to several of the U.S. Senators in letter --

(Applause)

-- my views outlining what I consider to be the essential principles of foreign policy for the United States in the Middle East. For example, not only the recognition of the right of Israel to survive but to live, and there is a great deal of difference. The end of towards her. Free navigational rights in the Suez Canal and all interdational waters, and so forth.

Now, let's get on to the point of the military equipment. What we ought to be seeking everywhere is arms control, not arms escalation. That is where we ought to be. That is what we ought to have.

(Applause)

and I repeat, pour hundreds of millions of dollars, running into the billions of dollars of arms into the Middle East, arms which are directed against the safety and territorial integrity and sovereignty of Israel, I have said that it is not only right but it is the duty of this country to honor the requests of Israel and they are not requestsof gifts. They are requests of purchase, of the necessary military equipment to give her adequate defense and deter any aggression against her and that equipment must include not only conventional military equipment that is necessary for land forces and for naval forces but the supersonic, the most modern type of jet which is what we call the Phantom jet, and I made that clear a long time ago.

(Applause)

And as I say, I was happy to note last week that Mr. Nixon agreed with me. Thank you.

I will take one more question. The young man in the middle back there. This young man -- that young lady, if you will forgive me. We have got to balance this off some.

Yes, ma'am.

4 order to obtain peace in Vietnam? 5 6 7 8 is no problem here. 10 the NLF or the Viet Cong. That is the answer. 11 (Applause) 12 give us your views on the gun control bill? WARD & PAUL 13 VOICE: Yes. 14 15 16 of my hobbies. 17 18 I did get a marriage license. 19 (Laughter) And I have no objections to any of them. 20 K Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002 Thank you very much. (Standing ovation). 21 # # # 22 23 24 25 25

QUESTION: If you become President --2 VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Would you wait for the mike there? 3 QUESTION: If you become President, will you accept a coalition with the National Liberation Front in Paris in VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, may I make it quite clear that there has never been any problem on our part as to the representation of the different groups that are at war in Vietnam as to the conference in Paris. Never been any problem at all, and I am happy to tell you that the President of South Vietnam, Mr. Tsieu himself, has said that he is prepared to negotiate with the representatives of the NLF. So, there The problem that we have today is that North Vietnam is unwilling to sit down with the Government of South Vietnam, and when those governments are ready to sit down with each other, there will be no problem about the representation of QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, would you please VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The gun control bill? VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I will have to end up on I have supported strong legislation for gun control. I believe that it is necessary. I don't think that it impairs

anyone's legitimate rights. I, for example, like to go duck hunting, I like trap shooting and skeet shooting. This is one I don't think it is going to interfere with my right to have all of those hobbies and pleasures if I have to

register my gun. I have to get a fishing license, I have to get a hunting license, I have to get an automobile license and



Derry this post is

The Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Q & A With Students

I wasn't sure whether we were buying this time or whether it was free. And if we were buying it, I wanted you to sit down a little sooner. If it was free, stand up again.

It's a rare privilege to meet with you and a high honor to be introduced by a very distinguished and effective young Congressman, Ital Bill Green. He has been very, very kind to me in his introduction. Adlai Stevenson used to say that flattery was all right if you didn't inhale it. # Did you notice how I was breathing. And what a joy it is to have alongside of me a man with whom I've worked in the Senate and when he was Mayor of this great city. Many, many years we worked together, And I believe in common cause and common purpose, and a man that I hope is re-elected with an overwhelming majority to the United States Senate, Joe Clark. He sure looks like a winner; he waves like one too. And thank you very much Mr. Mayor for welcoming me once again to Philadelphia. This city has to wery kind to me. Of course it's been very kind to all Americans and it surely has a great reputation in our history. At least in the past - I think its going to have a better one in the future. I'm not going to take any time to talk about the past. I appreciate very much the commentary of Cong. Green about a record. And I suppose that if you're going to hire somebody sometimes you would like/to get their references. What do you know about them, what's their record. But there are times that even despite a record you say "I don't buy it". And I want to take a chance and I want to just look ahead without any regard to the yesterdays. I am proud of the public record that has been mine. I don't say with this without blemish. I say that in in light of public life one has to at least in terms of a total nation and not just a small constituency.

I believe it is a record of forward progress./ What's most important is the future. Somebody once said that America, if you spell it backwards in two or tree other languages, spelled future. I'm not sure if that's true or not, but it makes a good line. I do know that this nation has spent very little time thinking about yesterdays. I know that Winston Churchill once said that those who use the present to stand in judgment of the past lose the future. And what's really important is the future cause that's what most of us are going to live through. of us are going to spend our time in the future. And I'm talking to a group of young Americans now that are all with a few exceptions, and I hope all of you will be alive in the year 2000 . I'm working on it myself. I haven't found quite the right prill yet, but I'll keep taking them until I do. But what a fascinating future its going to be if we can live. I didn't say just survive. Cause there's a great deal of difference between survival which an anima1 can do and to live ... in all the meaning in that precious word life which a human being should do. I would like to think of my political life as at least based upon what kind of an America will we have in 1976. We all know what kind of an America we had in 1776, and we know that much has happened since then and most of it to the good. I would like also to keep in mind and I want you to keep in mind, the majority of the people alive today will be alive in the year 2000. So when we look ahead, we're really looking

to the 21st century and isn't that an exciting prospect to live to the 21st century. But I've got some chance because my grandfather on my father's side lived to be 93 and my grandfather on my mother's side lived to be 89. And if I live to be 89, I'll make it. Now if you have any remedies, you let me know.

What is the central issue of our time. I think it is an issue that is both domestic and international. I just jotted-it down very quickly here and I said it out in the public square. It's very difficult to speak in public squares but I said that we have to decisde whether or not we are really going to have one nation, one American community in which we

share within the limits of our talents and and tilles all of the privileges and all of the responsibilities, all of the rights that belong to a citizen of the United States of America. We cannot afford two kinds of citizenship. We are going to have to decide whether we wre going to have one nation or whether we are going to have two as the Kerner Report put it--two separate and unequal. Now we have been going through a long period of time in which we have literally had for many americans a substandard citizenship. I think the greatedst achievement of the past decade is the breakthrough in the field of human rights. Oh I know the last decade had brought us material prosperity unprecedented. The last eight years tremendous increase in personal income and profits and wages even despite the raise in the cost of living a fantastic increase. Three and a half times better than in the preceding seven years or eight years. While that is important, most important is that for the first time in the history of this country the promise of the emansipation proclamation takes on some reality and there are today literally hundreds, thousands, millions of peopley that for the first time fell that this country is theirs. Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he will have no love for it. That was the statement of a great English philosopher John infmany of you in the field of sociology have studied his "Let a man have nothing to do for his country and he shall have no love for it." And there are literally hundreds of thousands of Americans today who have had nothing to do for their country. They've been cut out, they've been left out, they've been well they haven't been in on the action or the benefits, but they're coming in now. Ten million people have come out of poverty in the past eight years. Ten million. Think of that. That's a remarkable record. Time forbids that I should go through what is the statistical evidence of the breakthroughs, how we passed all kinds of civil rights acts

We have a great bulwark a framework of law. But really civil rights and human rights depend on you and not so much on law. Your habits, your practices. It takes a lot longer to break a bad habit than it does to pass a good law. And sometimes it takes a long time in the Senate with a filibuster, to pass a good law. I've been there long enough to know. So we are going to have to have not only laws that dictate open housing but we have to have open hearts and open minds. So the first issue is whether or not we will have one nation in which all people can really participate in the benefits as well as the decision making of this country.

The second one is what kind of a world are we going to live in? Wendell Wilkie back in 1940, I think a man ahead of his time, used the phrase "one world" and he wrote a book entitled "One World" and you might want to get it. He talked about the fact that this world was no longer just principalities and soverign nations but it had become in a very real sense "one world." One world of brotherhood. New brother hood does not mean that you mean that you give up fratra idal warfare. In fact too many brotherhoods have had too much of it. But we are living in what we call the nuclear age and the space age. And you are going to live in it but pleaty. I think the greatest achievement since World War II is that we have been able to avoid a nuclear confrontation or a nuclear holocause. I can tell you as a member of the National Security Councel, as one who has worked diligently in the field of nuclear energy trying to curb it's powers of destruction, I can tell you that either the Soviet Union or the United States presently has enough weapons, nuclear weapons to obliterate all of God's creations, and all of civilization. You talk about overkill. I can assure you orthogo they should me that if we should miss the first time, that there are plenty of times again. But when I hear people say that the Russians have fewer missells than we have, I say "Yes, I guess that right. We have a superiority in

missellry but we all have enough to kill everybody. Does that make you happy? It didn't make me happy. I think the greatest challenge of the coming decade is to call a halt to the nuclear arms race before it calls a halt to humanity.

And I'm not unaware of the difficulties. But because it is difficult does not mean that you must not try. It was difficult to get a nuclear teat ban treaty, but *xxxxxxx we got it. I fought for it for 10 years. Joe Clark stood along side of me and was one of our sponsors on that Senate resolution. I see where Mr. Nixon said here the other day, just yesterday, that he doubts about the non-prolifieration treaty. EME Well let me tell you, young Americans, that the one thing this world does not keed is an expansion of nucleya weaponry. You don't need that. And let me make it equally clear that the ratification of that treaty Win the United States Senate is in our interest, it's in our interest of national security, it's in the interest of world peace. That treaty is a landmark since World War II in the building blocks of the cathredal of peace, and anyone that tells you that we ought to hesitate or whose he have in doubt about it is not a worker for peace. He's one who has doubt about what kind of a world we ought to live in. And I draw issue with Mr. Nixon on this matter and I want thim to know it and I want his supporters to know it. I happen to believe that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty is in the interest of the survival and life of mankind. I think it's in the interest of our nation and I think it's in the interest of world peace. I think it's in the interest of national security and for anyone to say that we ought not to procede with it is a confusion about the kind of world we live in and a kind of couffusion about whether or (ont he is capable of giving this country the kind of direction it needs.

Now let me kear from you. Questions please.

I don't want to be a picker or the chooser and let people think I have somebody set out there because this is rawhide confrontation you know.

Unplanned, unorganized.

O. m. V.P.

Well I don't think they are muddled and I think I can make them quite clear. Now let's first of all start at the end of the line and come up to what I think is the climatic and the crisis . First of all, on issues of labor and management, you just have to study the record and I think the record is pretty clear. Mr. Nixon was in an administration me till per skotter that had three recessions in which there was a growth in income of 9% I have been in an administration that has had no recession and there is a growth in personal income increase of 32% and look partial for inflation and cost of living increases. So these are ghat we call true and real prices! Mr. Nixon was in an administration in which the increase in unemployment was two million. I've been in an administration in which the increase in employment is two million. Plus the increase in population which was been absorbed into the economy, I happen to believe for example in the repleas of Section 14B of the Labor Relations That happens to be my view. I believe that National Standards ought to govern collective bargaining. I do not believe in what they call the "right to work laws." I don't intend to try to pass this off lightly. I have worked hard all of my life for expansion of what we call the fair labor standards act for migrant farm workers which Mr. Nixon doesn't include and I think the this is important.

I was in the synamism and the

I want it quite clear I believe in the dynamism and the dynamic viability of our free enterprise system. I think it's the greatest economic mar system our world has every known. And the grantmax soc ial dividends from that system depend maximu upon its profits, and upon its constant growth. The rate of that growth for the past eight years—from '53 to '61 was approx—imately 2.5%. The rate of growth in the past eight years has been 5.2%.

Just switch the figures around. It's sort of Geritol spelled backwards.

They had the Geritol.

We have some other differences. On the arms race for example and what we should do about it. I've explained that. On Vietnam. Mr. Nixon in 1954 said at that time that we should send in masses forces of air, naval and ground uits. His own President at that time had to disavow. I think Mr. Nixon is more of cold war warrier than I am. I think he relies more upon military power than he does upon diplomatic, economic, and political persuasion. I happen to believe that in the world in which we live a greater emphasis should be placed upon a balance on what the call the stringth that come from the military and the strength that comes from the economy and the third part, the strength that comes from a moral purposes and stature of a country. How we treat our own people, what kind of a image that we give to the world. But I am of the opinion that we will have very little success in this world convincing people that we believe in justice and that we believe in peace and that we believe in social progress unless we can demonstrate it here at home to the least of these The best that are in our own society. A good foreign policy is a good domestic policy. That happens to be my position. And I don't think Mr. Nixon agrees with that.

can be done.

A: I believe that there has been a great deal of emphasis put upon the differences that exist among some of us. for example, like my friend Sen. Clark here and myself. I don't doubt but what we've had some differences on what some people think is rather basic fundamental matters. I don't think they are fundamental at all .. It's essentially emphasis on rhetoric. For example, non of us recommend unilateral withdrawal. That is non of the men who contested for the candidacy in the Democratic party. Non of us recommended that we should have a military solution. All of us have siad that we needed a negotiated political settlement. Non of hs have siad that we should have permanent bases in Vietnam . All of us have said that they should be withdrawn as soon as possible and to her onee the violence has subsided. All of us have said that we should seek to have more and more of the defense responsibility of Youth Vietanm Jally Jak upon the Army of South Vietnam with a systematic phased withdrawal of American forces. And may I say at that point that I think this is very possible and it's possible in the short run. The Army of South Vietnam today is a much better Army and capable of its own self defense. And I can safely predit that unless there are unushal developments that no one can see at this time that we will be able to start to remove some of our troops. I hope that we will be able to do it very promptly if we can get negotiations underway. But I think negotiations or no negotiations that we would be able to start to be able to remove some of the American forces in late 1968 or early 1969

Now let me make just one more comment. Some of our very prominent Senators and spokesmen in this country have said as follows; that we should cease the bombing as soon as possible. I agree with that. Others have said that we should cease the bombing immediately. Others have siad that we should cease all of the bombing because all of us want to cease all of the bombing of North Vietnam, wehn we have some indication of restraint or response from Hanoi. Now that has been my position or as soon as possible. I'm sure of this that you have to take calculated risks for peace just as you take calculated risks in the battlefiedld. If I am permitted to be President of the United States my young friends, I will span that horizon of Vietnam with maticulous care and I will be prepared to take those necessary calculated steps that will lead to the success of substantive negotiations. It is my view that those negotiations may very well start before I become a President of the United States. But if they do not, I want to give you and this audience my assurance that I will leave no matter untouched and no proposition unexplored which may lend itself to a more rapid tht-may-lend-itself -- success at the conference table in Paris. No one wants peack in Vietnam more than the man that is looking at you. Everyone of us want it. The only difference is, how to best get it. And I do not Hanoi to think that between now and January that if they just keep up the killing, just keep up the killing between now and January, they are going a better deal out of me than they are getting out of Mr. Harriman and Mr. Vance in Paris right now. I want a cease fire. I want it now. I do not believe that it is good to have fight and talk. I think it is better to stop the fight, and talk. And we're looking for that.

I don't mean to just take the front rows here. We'll take a lady back there next,

there have been many and many to investigate crime in the streets.

Crime in the streets is a very commonplace description of a rising crime rate in our country and a period of ferment and restlessness some of which has burst out into violence -- unorganized and organized. Let me speak to you as sincerely and as knowingly as I can. I have been mayor of a great city and I have had the responsibilities for law enforcement and it's not easy. I never wanted my city however to be known only for its police department. I wanted it to be known for its hospitals, for its schools, its jobs and it s parks and its living conditions and the things that we did for people. But I happen to believe that it is the duty of an elected public official to protect life, to provide personal security, to see that neighborhoods are secure and safe. I think that is where you start. I do not think that you can make social progress in lawlessness and violence. I do not believe so. I think that you can in this great country of ours can make progress in order, that is if there is reasonable order and civil justice. They are one and inseparable. Now the difference in this campaign are again one of emphasis. I do not accuse my opposition of being uninterested in the welfare of people, but I do say they are arousing the passions of people when they put all the emphasis on law and order. And if law and order can be obtained in a community by an increase in the polide departments and in increase in office and without any regard to some of the conditions that the fester in a community like an abysses or a sore breaks out into a serious social condition, to I believe that we have to take two directions. On the one hand, assure law and order. On the other hand, assure with equal

emphasis the respect for the laws of a man to live in a decent neighborhood,

the laws of building codes an of public health codes, the right of a man for a job, the right of a young man for an education. These ar tie new bill of rights by the way. They have never been written. And may I just add quickly on the police side. Our police departments today need professionalization. They need upgrading and increase in number. Law enforcement is not cheap. But lawlessness is fer more expensive. And Create of far more expensive. For example, how many universities in the United States today have polide courses. The same neighborhood where you have better police protection has frequently has a police officer that does not have a high school education. But that same neighborhood has a social worker that had to have a colleg <__ education. You insist that a librarian in a slum has to have a college education. You insist that a social worker in the slum heve at least part of a college education, but you insist that your police officer be healthy, strong. Now many of them are much better by far. Jone city that I know of without mentioning names, mm not this city. One city that has approximately 4,500 police officers has approximately 800 who have less than a 8th greade education. Now I don't say that a man without an 8th grade education doesn't have judgment. But I do think that an education helps him. And I do think we should upgrade the training and the quality of the police departments, we have to increase the pay and we have to professionalize the police services. We have to train them not only on how they enforce a low, but we have to train them in how-theycommunity relations and we have to train them in a host of disiplines that relate to social order. And we start doing that we are going to start to get law enforcement. You know we used to have teachers that could teach school with an 8th grad diploma and we found out that wasn't good enough. Then we had teachers that used to teach school with a

highschool diploma. We found out that wasn't good enough. If you want a good education, you have to have a good teacher. If you want law enforcement, you have to have a highly professionalized, trained and well-paid police department. There is no other way to get it And instead of accusing polide departments of misdeeds, I think the American public should be accused. I think our mayors in our cities, let's give our police chiefs and our police commissioners the kind of manpower that permits them to not only exercise law enforcement but to encourage law observance. There is a whole lot of difference between law enforcement and law observance.

Now wait. Just a moment. I'm trying to keep this balanced. A young lady here please.

Mr. Vice President, before that question, may I say just one thing? They tell me that you are running axa very late.

MUmphrey: Well le'ts get this one

Q: Mr. Vice President what do you think of the Fortas appointment and what do you think of Mr. Nixon's

A: Well, I think that Justice Fortas is one of the most gifted and talented wixmax Americans of our time. One of the finest. Now Mr. Nixon has said about the same thing about him but he hasn't said what hasn't said what I am Ditte nie about to day. His nomination ought to be confirmed. And from this platform I call upon Mr. Nixon to tell his coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats to break up that filibuster and to confirm Mr. Fortas. You know I have a little suspicion that that littley, mineuver that Participations took place in Miami with Mr. Thurmond who is the leader of the opposition

against Mr. Fortas, that that little deal between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Thurmond

has something to do with Mr. Fortas' problems of confirmation.

and I repeat that I think Mr. Nixon believes what he said. That Mr. Fortas is a fine distinguished patriotic American. And I call upon Mr. Nixon to call upon his supporters to call off the filibuster and to confirm the nomination of Mr. Fortas.

One more question

Q:

A: While Mr. Nixon has come around late. I am pelased that he has seen my view.

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.

