

INTERVIEW

with

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

and

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MAINE

Sunday

October 20, 1968

Arlington, Virginia

#####

Q Mr. Vice President, I know in the past you have come out for electoral reform, reform of the Electoral College. A lot of people in America, a lot of young people in America, feel that the way the Democratic Convention was handled, regardless of who was at fault, they feel that that is not the way to elect a President or nominate a President.

Do you agree or disagree with the electoral reform that would replace the nominating conventions with a national primary, which I feel would give the candidates something to run on, the mandate of the people, support to him personally, and not necessarily as a party member, but to him from people who disagree with him, and not because he was a Democrat or because he was a Republican.

Would you agree? You have come out for reform of the Electoral College. Do you agree with reform of the nominating conventions?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: First, I want to say that the conventions over the long period of history have done pretty well. They have given you an Andrew Jackson, an Abraham Lincoln, a Woodrow Wilson, a Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman and John Kennedy. And they have done pretty well.

I don't think that you ought to condemn the convention system because of some feeling of disappointment in a particular convention.

Secondly, this convention did more to reorganize and, I think, to modernize the processes of the convention system than any we have had, ever had, in 100 years. I think it was very wholesome and very healthy.

But I would support a national primary. I would say with it you better have some way of financing it, unless you want the Presidency to go to the person who has the most money. The problem of campaign financing today is a very, very serious problem.

Q Well, along this line, could you make, or will you make, a personal statement on the way things happened at the convention, the way the police had to control disorder, the way disorder developed in the first place?

I feel that I have never really had a convincing stand made by anyone on the way it was handled or the way it turned out. Many people are just disenchanted and feel lost for a candidate because they feel that in a way they were cheated, because of maybe the way the press handled it or the way the whole thing was covered, or something like that.

But anyway, the fact is, people feel lost. The Democrats feel lost in a way.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I think it is fair to say that we had the delegate votes before we went to the convention. I think even Mr. McCarthy knew that.

There were two things that happened in Chicago. One

was the convention, and then there were the things that happened outside of the convention.

Now, the convention was a hotly contested affair, and that was to the good. The platform was debated, the platform hearings were open.

I called for the abolition of the unit rule, and had my people vote for the abolition of the unit rule. I had no need of doing it. I lost convention delegate votes because of it. But I thought it was the fair way to do things.

Inside the convention, as such, I believe that that was a good, strong, active convention, much better than the other.

As to how the media conducted itself inside that convention, I will have to let a more impartial jury decide that. But I think there was something there that needs to be looked into by a good school of journalism, or a high level group of public-spirited citizens, to see whether or not this is the way that you ought to cover a convention.

Now, outside of the convention there was a determined effort made by a handful of militants, and I repeat, a handful, who have exposed themselves since the convention as to what their purpose was -- an effort made to provoke the police and have a confrontation.

There were thousands of young people who had no part of that at all. They wanted no part of it and they were there

in support of different candidates, and I had many of them in support of myself. There were many there for Senator McCarthy and many there for Senator McGovern. They wanted no part of this trouble, but they got involved, and when you have people who are determined to disrupt a convention and said so ahead of time, and threatened everything from physical violence to total confrontation with the police, you get into trouble.

Now, as to whether or not the police conducted themselves well or not, I think that is for a Grand Jury, and I think it is for objective sources. I think, myself, that some of the police over-reacted and I don't think that there is any doubt about that.

I believe a police department ought to be highly disciplined. But I think you have to keep in mind what was their effort, what was the effort of the militants and really a very anarchistic group. What was their effort? To break up the convention, to march on the convention, and destroy the convention.

Now, none of the networks permit you to do that even on the Johnny Carson Show or Joey Bishop Show. They give you tickets and say "If you want to come into the show, you are going to come in and behave."

These were people who were not part of the convention process, but they were determined to break it up, and then they got into a fight.

Well, no one is pleased by violence. In fact, I abhor it, and that is why I have said that one of the things we need for our police is a much more highly professionalized training program, very much so.

~~Every~~ One of the things we need to understand is, if you want better police, you have to pay for them, you have to train them, and you have to have a higher standard of recruitment.

But I think we ought not kid ourselves. The leaders of the militants have said since then that they would provoke 200 or 300 more Chicagos, and they have said that they would go to the voting booths and they would lie down in the booths and they would prevent people from voting, and they would insist on the police hauling them away, to confront the police. They have said that they would disrupt meetings, and have tried to. Now that is not democratic. That is not a wholesome thing.

MORE

Q How do you feel you can cope with this if you are elected?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: With that particular group, I think that is outright violation of the law of civil peace, of that handful, and you cope with them that way.

That is, if they break the law.

For the rest of them, I think you have to have great understanding and forbearance. I am happy to tell you that during the campaign I have had very little trouble. Most of the young people are showing great enthusiasm for our campaign. The student coalition, which is to me one of the most gratifying developments in this campaign, has been hard at work in my behalf.

Any young man or woman that wants to parade and to demonstrate, to picket and to carry a sign, to show either approval or disapproval, is entitled to do that. That is part of what I call the active dissents of a democracy.

Dissents in a democracy is as important as yeast for making good biscuits. You have to have the right to disagree. But there is a difference between dissents and disorder. And those who provoke disorder and deliberately do so have violated the law.

It is the job of the police, by the way, to be selective, not to wade on in and hit anybody, but to find the provokers and the provocateurs, to find those that

hm-1

Rey B

are really at the root of it. And then apprehend those and bring them to justice, rather than just to wade on in as if everybody were equally guilty.

Somebody asked me, "What would you do if there was a riot?"

I said, "I would get away."

I think that is good advice.

Q Mr. Vice President, there was a plea by the editor of Parade Magazine calling for a hot line to be established between Peking and Washington. I would like to know your opinion on the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

Also, would you be in favor of establishing, in case of an emergency, the type of hot line we have now with Moscow?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I read that article and I think it may be slightly premature at this time because of the very nature of the instability and the uncertainty of anything that is going on in Peking, China.

I happen to believe that China must be included in the family of nations. We can't ignore the fact of 800 million Chinese on the Mainland of China.

But having said that, let me make it equally clear, that when you become a member of the United Nations, you have to abide by certain rules, the Charter of the

United Nations. The fact is that Communist China has refused to abide by that Charter. It isn't a matter -- she has never asked to be a member, you know. There are always others promoting her membership. I think when the time comes that she is willing to accept the responsibility of the Charter of the United Nations, she should be a member of the United Nations.

Whether we like her form of government or not, she should be brought in. But until she is willing to openly state that she is willing to accept the responsibilities of the Charter of the United Nations, then I don't think she has qualified as a member.

To date, she has not done so. But I want to make it clear that when she says she is willing to abide by those responsibilities, then she should be admitted.

Q Also, quite a few of the United Nations people say they are losing, so to speak, the respectability of trying to make peace. Do you see any way in which the five major powers of the Security Council could, in some way, in the next four years, perhaps in your Administration, with, perhaps, I guess, your courage to kind of give them the incentive to move on and become again the peace-making body that they were supposed to be established for, for making a peace?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The conception of the

Security Council in the beginning of the United Nations was that it would be the instrument for peace-keeping, the major powers. Two things have happened. One is that one of the major powers had a revolution and a civil war in which Communist China, the Communist regime took over Mainland China, and China today is represented by Nationalist China, which, at best, is a very small segment of the Chinese population.

So that part of the Security Council apparatus is strictly out of focus, and out of reality.

The second point was that it was assumed that the United States and the Soviet Union would be able to cooperate as they did during the war in sustaining and maintaining the peace after the war.

The cold war changed that, and we didn't start the cold war. It is a fact that the cold war did change the whole working operation of the Security Council.

Now, it is also my view, though, that -- two things: Number one, the size of the Security Council should be increased to take into consideration the fact of nations like Japan, like India, just to mention two, and possibly some others, because the whole United Nations structure today is entirely different than it was at the beginning.

At the beginning, there were around 50 nations. Today there are over 115 or 120 nations.

So, we need to update the United Nations and the Security Council. I have been for this, by the way, for a long time. I handled this proposition for our government in 1956. I spoke many times as a Senator on the necessity of at least having two more Asian powers in the United Nations Security Council as permanent members, India and Japan.

I believe that those two -- but there might be others. That was just my personal opinion.

Now, the peace-keeping machinery of the U.N. can be strengthened. This is, I think, one of the prime responsibilities of the next President of the United States, to work with the United Nations, both with the Security Council and the General Assembly, to find ways and means of having ready forces for peace-keeping operations.

Those ready forces are generally from smaller nations, so that there is no confrontation between the super powers, the nuclear powers. And also have readily available the kind of diplomacy and diplomats that can be the eyes and the ears, the conciliators for the many disputes that appear on the scene even before they become hard reality.

I think the best thing that the U.N. can do is not always to settle a dispute, but to move in before the dispute becomes crystalized, before it becomes hardened.

I have addressed myself to this subject matter in what I call the new strategy for peace, when I spoke to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco. As a President, I will give primary emphasis to our role in the United Nations and to the regional organizations that spin off from the United Nations, because I happen to believe that the smaller nations and the less than super powers, like the United States and the Soviet Union, have a great responsibility for world order and world peace. We ought to help them. We ought not to take on the role of trying to supervise the world. We ought to take on the role of trying to encourage regional compacts, regional cooperation for peace-keeping operations on a regional basis and if necessary, at the U.N. level itself.

Ald C Q With all these problems in the country, I am wondering what plans you have for really solving the problems of the depressed peoples of the United States, the large majority of whom are Negro.

We know there are many programs on foot which seem to hit at the various symptoms, but we are wondering, I am wondering what your plan is for hitting the underlying problems for giving people some security or something for which to hope, something to fight for, and something to work for.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, most

people that are poor are not black. They are white. That is number one. That is something people need to understand, and I say that for a purpose.

Many people feel that all the programs that we have today are designed just for one group. They are not. Poor people are spread across the board and we need to understand that. We need to understand there are more poor people in the rural areas than there are in the city.

But when you read the papers you would think they are either in New York or Los Angeles, or Chicago. But they are not. They are in the hills and valleys, and they are spread out through the countryside, abject poverty, must dispairing poverty among many rural people.

I think that these two facts are important. More whites are poor than black, and more rural poverty than urban.

Now, having said that, let us talk about what we do for poor people, black or white.

Q All right.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I think this is terribly important because there is a racism that goes through our society where some people have said, and I have heard them say about me -- they say this fellow Humphrey, all he wants to do is just help the black man.

I want to help the black person, that is true, but

I want to help people, just people. I don't need to put a prefix or affix. It is just people, people that are citizens of the United States, people who find themselves generally through no fault of their own in circumstances that are anything but encouraging or anything but pleasing.

So what do we try to do? Well, the very first thing, I think, at the base of it, is that we have an acceptance of each other, a trust in each other. This is psychological. This is human relations. We start to accept people for what they are, not how they look, or what their last name is, or their racial origin, or whatever you call it, their ethnic origin, but that we accept people on the basis that they are American citizens, they are entitled to every right and protection, and responsibility of the Constitution of the United States.

Now, once we get that acceptance clear in our minds, that is a personal acceptance as well as the legal requirements of non-discrimination, then I think we start to make some progress.

The second thing I would emphasize is the imperative necessity of the best in education for our people. We have to keep in mind that the poor people, poor people as such, and particularly in the black community, have been discriminated against. They have had separate and unequal education, and not separate and equal.

Therefore, the kind of education effort that must be made in the areas of world poverty and in the urban slums or ghettos, is more than an equal opportunity. It must be a special effort that is made. You actually have to give a little bit more than you would call equal opportunity.

I will give you an example: If a child is the victim of malnutrition, you take that child to a hospital, and you don't say, "Well, everybody in my family eats hamburger, so let's get the child hamburger."

That is equal opportunity. On the contrary, the doctor says, "Wait a minute. That child is not ready for hamburgers. That child has to have particular chemicals and vitamins and rest."

We have a whole period of time in which we bring this child back to where the system is, the ability of the physical system to absorb food normally.

We have many people today who are, in terms of their education, intellectually starved, the victims of what I call "educational malnutrition". They need to be brought up. That requires better teachers, specialized education, counseling, and education that is relevant to their life and to their needs.

Therefore, I have emphasized as a candidate for President, and I have emphasized this all my life just as a human being, that you need the best schools in the worst areas, and you need the best teachers. Where you have the poorest teachers, that seems to be the poorest students.

You need the best parks where you have the highest density of population. You need the finest municipal services where you have people who have the least means of providing for their personal services.

The whole business is upside down. What you have today are, generally speaking, the poorest schools where the poorest people are; the poorest police protection where the poorest people are, the poorest parks, the least adequate parks.

You know, Harlem is a case in point. I wish everybody would just remember what it is like there. If the same density of population were to be applied in all five boroughs of New York City as there is in Harlem, all 200 million Americans, all 200 million Americans, could be jammed into three of the five boroughs in New York. People are living on top of each other.

Just to say that you are going to have garbage

r2

collection once a week -- that is what you do in a neighborhood where you have fine-groomed lawns and where you have lots of space, where one family to one dwelling. Just to say that you are going to have a little park with a little asphalt base and a few swings is totally inadequate.

So we start on the educational level. Then what is the next thing that we try to do? We try to work on the proposition of jobs, training, skills, relevant to the industrial economy in which these people live.

Remember that many of these people have never had any work background. They have never been employed. They have no concept at all, or conception, of industrial discipline or industrial requirements. It is going to take time.

We have been doing this. What I am trying to tell you is that some of the things that I have talked about we are proving will work. The Teacher Corps, for example, and VISTA, the National Alliance of Businessmen, the Jobs Program. They do work.

The problem is that we haven't done enough of it. They have been experimental. What I want to do is to take and build on these experiments. Some of them didn't work, you know, and there is always somebody pointing out that you had a Community Action Program under the Poverty Program that was a failure. That is true.

Let me tell you that there are many a doctor that

r3 has made an experiment that didn't work. Many of the heart transplant patients die. But we don't go around throwing the doctors out and expelling them from the country, saying that they are fakes and failures. We say, "Well, now, maybe one will work."

There is a whole new school of surgery on what we call organ transplants. We are trying to see if we can't make it so that we can have life out of this kind of surgery and this kind of medicine.

That is what we have to do in the poverty program. We have had poverty longer than we have had cancer. We keep working on cancer and we have to keep working on poverty. We are beginning to get some breakthroughs on cancer treatments. We are beginning to get some breakthroughs in the poverty treatment: First of all respect; secondly, education; thirdly, jobs.

What has happened? In the last seven years, 12 million people have walked out of poverty into productive jobs. Just think of what that means to those people and think of what it means to the rest of us. They are tax-paying people.

Now we know we can do some things, and we know it has to be done with Government leadership, with Government determination, Presidential leadership, working with industry, working with the life insurance companies, the banks, working with the labor movement, working with the churches; a whole mix _

r4

ture of things. I know that it can be done. I will finish on this note: Of course, housing --

Q I was going to say housing.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. You have to have a decent place in which to live. That is why we must give people a choice of where they want to live. You can't lock people up in areas and say, "Here is where you are going to live." Open housing simply means one thing: If you can afford to buy a house in another neighborhood, you have a right to do it. That is all it boils down to. It is freedom of choice, freedom of movement.

People of a particular income group tend pretty much to live together in certain types of dwellings. But if they break out of that income group, and if they are an American, they ought to be able to move where they want to move.

We are going to have to have a massive housing program in our cities, in our center cities. But I want to say I don't think it is good enough just to pile them one on top of another, because the density of the population relates to the problem of the poor itself. You have to have living space, working space. You have to have creation space, education space.

Actually, in many of these ghetto areas, we are going to have to have open spaces, green areas. That means that people are going to have to find new places to live. We are going to have to be willing to accept those new places to live for people.

We must have social services available, jobs available.

Why should you have a man that has to run, get in his car if he has a car -- and by the way, most of the poor people do not; do not have a good one, at least -- why should he have to drive 25 miles to go to work? This is why public transportation becomes important.

Do you realize that in many cities today public transportation over a week end is almost impossible? People are locked almost into a prison because there is no way for them to get out. That is why I think that we have to have systems of mass transportation that may take Government help. I believe we can do it. Not only that, we can pay for it.

The most expensive thing that we have going for us today is poverty itself. When I hear people say, as my opponent says, "Humphrey will be an expensive President," I want to say the most expensive administration this country has had in the last 18 years, or the last 15 years, was from 1953 to 1960, when through unemployment alone \$175 billion was lost in potential earned income. \$50 billion worth of plant capacity went unused every single year.

That is expensive. If you get people on jobs, and you get them in schools, they become productive. Don't worry, the Government will get its money back. We have what we call withholding, you know.

Q Mr. Humphrey, it is very true that these programs

are desirable and, indeed, necessary, but our inflation is increasing already at 4.3 percent a year and it is going to go up. What happens in the meantime, while these billions of dollars have to be poured by the public sector into the economy, to finance these programs? Who pays for it?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: First of all, the public sector doesn't pour in all of the money. I call to your attention, Number 1, my plan for what I call a National Urban Development Bank. Now, we have an Inter-American Development Bank for Latin America. That has done very well, and it even makes money. We have a World Bank that has done very well, and it even makes money. We have an Asian Development Bank, and the American Government has contributed to every one of these banks. We have bought stock in them. We don't own the banks. But other countries have come in and they have put their funds in, and there has been public sale of the stock of these banks, to the private money market.

Now, what I have said, if you are willing to help everybody else in the world with a bank, why don't we have a National Urban Development Bank so when we go to build some of these things in the cities, a Mayor and a City Council, or the governing body, or whoever else it is, can have long-term money at reasonable rates of interest that doesn't all come out of an appropriation of Congress.

We did this with the Federal Land Bank. That is the

way we developed the American economy. We did this with what we called the Production Credit Administration. We did this with the Bank for Cooperatives that helped develop the farmer cooperatives. Today the Bank for Cooperatives is a privately financed institution. So are most all of the others I have spoken of.

Now, that is one of the ways that we can get the private capital involved. Now, some of this will call for Government guarantees, but you have a Government guarantee on your bank deposits. You could have a Government guarantee on these purchases of stock in this bank.

One other thing I mentioned is that our economy is growing. It is growing in real terms. If it grows at the present rate, it will be a trillion dollar economy by 1972 -- a trillion dollars. That will produce vast new amounts of Federal revenues. At the existing tax base, even with the surtax off, it will produce revenues at over \$120 billion a year, with no new taxes.

Q Do you propose to eliminate the 10 percent surcharge if elected President?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes, if the war is either de-escalated or over, I think that tax ought to come off. It is my view that you ought to judge the tax even if the war is on as to what is happening to the economy. If the economy is in a dip, then that tax ought to come off anyway, because it

wouldn't yield you the revenues that you want with an economy that is in recession.

Fiscal policy ought to be flexible, adjustable, because tax policy affects what ultimately happens to jobs and investment.

Now let me say a word about inflation. Of course, we want to stop inflation.

MORE

This country has had the least inflation of any industrialized country in the world. I know people talk a lot about it and they like to scare you, it is getting close to Halloween and they will scare you a little bit more.

"F"

The fact of the matter is on the wholesale price index, which relates to goods produced, not to services, but to goods produced, that this Administration, the last eight years, has had a better record than the previous eight years when you had three recessions, and you had as high as seven percent unemployment.

Our record is about 7.8 percent increase. The previous years was 9.2, from 1953 to 1960. The Consumer Price Index, which includes laundry, which includes hospital services, which includes medical services, hotel services, has gone up. That is true.

Your TV repair and so forth, that has gone up. But I want to warn you that we paid hotel workers, before the Minimum Wage Law, slave wages, and we paid laundry workers incredibly low wages, and we paid farm migrant workers disastrously low wages.

If you feel that to pay them \$1.60 an hour is unfair, I mean if you think that is too much, if you think that adds to what some people call inflation, that is your privilege.

I think a person is worth \$1.60 an hour and then some, much more than that. Really, that has been added. That is what has happened since 1965.

Up until 1965, we had price stability. Then the Minimum Wage Law went into effect that increased the wages of a certain number of nine million workers across this country, many of whom do not produce goods, but produce services.

Your hospital bill has gone up, your doctor's bill has gone up, your drug bill has gone up, your hotel bills have gone up.

But, actually, for the goods that are produced, the wholesale price index today is less than it was eight years ago. It is a better rate.

Now, I also think that the next President must be willing to sit down with management and labor and talk very frankly about price stability. I might add one other thing is added to the Consumer Price Index: interest rates.

Interest rates have gone up heavily. That is just like rent. That all adds on to what you call the Consumer Price Index. But with all of it, my dear friend, this has been the least price increase of any industrialized nation in the world.

The family of four in America today, under these

past few years, since 1961, has had a 32 percent increase in real income after taxes, after you take out what we call the inflation factor, as compared to nine percent for the preceding eight years.

I think that is a pretty good bargain. You can go around and make pumpkins on Halloween and say, "Inflation, inflation." But if you can show that you have had a 32 percent increase in real income, which is about a \$3,000 a year increase for a family of four, I think that is a pretty good record.

Q Mr. Humphrey, concerning the draft, Mr. Nixon has advocated a volunteer Army. Do you advocate abolishment of the Selective Service as it now stands and replacing it with something else, such as a lottery or volunteer Army, something to that effect?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: First of all, I think the present draft law is filled with a mass of inequities. I have been for what we call the random selection system, or the lottery system. That is number one.

I think we start right with that.

Secondly, the volunteer Army will increase the cost of the national security by about \$16 billion. Mr. Nixon doesn't tell you that. But that is the most conservative estimate that we have from the Department of Defense.

Thirdly, you have to ask yourself whether you really want a large standing professional Army in this country that is professionalized and is not a citizens Army. I mean, I have had little concern about Prussianized types of militarism in the United States. I am not so sure that this is exactly what we ought to have.

I do think if we can get to a point where we have less international commitments, then we might very well be able to satisfy ourselves and our national security requirements with a volunteer Army.

But Mr. Nixon can't have it both ways. He can't say that we have to strengthen NATO and he can't say that if need be you have to get tougher in Vietnam, and he can't say that you have to watch out for those Communists, and then switch gears all at once and say, "Well, you know, what we would like to do, we would like to do all of this with less of an Army."

If you are going to have a volunteer Army of 3-1/2 million men, you are going to have to compete with workers who are getting \$3, \$3.50, \$4 and \$5 an hour. Then Mr. Nixon says we are going to do all this with less money?

If you can pull that one off, I want to tell you you are the miracle of all times.

Let's face up to it. A volunteer Army, yes, if you are willing to pay for it. Number two, you have to ask

yourselves if you think that a volunteer Army over the long period of time, a highly professionalized American armed forces, standing here with power in the power structure, in the military-industrial complex, is the best thing for this country, or whether a citizens Army has some democratic traits to it that make it a little more safe for the country.

Thirdly, I think you have to ask yourself how are you going to fulfill all of your commitments today that we have that are very serious commitments.

Mr. Nixon hasn't said that he is going to change any of those commitments. Mr. Nixon, you know, he feels very strongly about nationalist China. He feels very strongly about being tough in Vietnam. He says that if things don't end there, we will have to consider even the bomb on the fire -- whatever that means. I don't know what he means by that.

He feels that we ought to be very strong in NATO. I happen to think we have to keep our NATO commitments also. I think we have commitments around the world that we have made. I think we have to re-assess some of those commitments to see whether they are still necessary.

But we have made them. If you have made them and you are going to keep them, you can't go around playing numbers games and say that you are going to do the cheaper,

you are going to have more men, you are going to be tougher on the Communists, you are going to fulfill every commitment and all at once you shuffle the deck and say, "Hocus pocus, here it is," and it all comes out all right.

I don't buy that and I don't think the American people buy it.

Q A lot of my friends, as a result of the Democratic Convention and other things, are saying now that they aren't going to vote in this election for the Presidency. They will vote for Senators, Representatives, local people, but they will not vote for a Presidential candidate.

This, they feel, will be tabulated and be the only way that they can make their protests known. These are all Democrats, by the way. If this results in the destruction of the Democratic Party, so much the better, because they feel that the Democratic Party is unresponsive to its constituency this year.

I would like to know what you are going to say to these people, how you are going to bring them back.

"G"

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, first I am going to put it right up to them. If they want George Wallace for President, that is their business. If they want Richard Nixon for President, that is their business. They have to think about the consequences of that decision.

There are times that people have to do their own thinking and other people can't do it for them. Also, the right to vote in this country is a precious right and the selection of a President in this country is the most important decision that people make and for those that want to opt out, all I can say to you is that it is an act of cowardice and not an act of courage, because there are many other ways to protest.

We have ways to protest in the election of Congressmen and Senators through the legislative process. Many of the protests that people had in our Party were resolved in the Convention, maybe not to everybody's satisfaction, but life doesn't always come out the way you want it.

You know we have had to learn that there are times that you will take temporary defeat only to go on to win the great victories. I spent 16 years in the Senate fighting for civil rights legislation and was defeated every year. But, the sixteenth year we won.

I spent 16 years in the Senate fighting for Medicare, was called a Socialist, and was called a Communist, and laughed at. And I was in a little minority, but we finally won.

I spent years fighting for what we called the wilderness areas of this country, to protect them, and I had

the mining interests and the lumber interests go after me with hook and tongue, and I could have opted out and said, "It is hopeless, they are all angry and they are ^{mean} ~~men~~."

But we didn't. We kept at it. I say we have spent a lot of time in this country, some of us, fighting for these programs that mean so much, federal aid to education, the first vote I ever cast in the Senate was on federal aid to education. Every year it was killed, either on the basis of race or religion, one or the other. We kept at it and finally we got it.

Now, my message to young people is that if you are just a sunshine patriot, that is your business. I mean if all you think you have to do is ask for something and it is going to come, you are wrong.

You have to fight for it, and you have to work for it, and the place to work for it is within the system, because remember, the history of Western Europe. Those that opted out of the system, opted out of the system only to see a worse system come in. That is the message that needs to be gotten out here.

I really appeal to young people, and I don't think that there are very many, and I think they are very ^{loud} ~~proud~~ and they get more newspaper publicity than the vast majority. I find thousands of young people today who are with us, by the thousands. We feel that with our student coalition we

have a million young people working for us.

Sure, some people were discouraged at the Convention. There isn't any doubt about that. I imagine my friend George McGovern was very discouraged, but what is he doing? He is working like a soldier, and he is working day and night to get re-elected and I am helping him.

I know that there are some others that didn't get all that they wanted. I ran for President in 1960 and I was defeated, but I didn't opt out. I helped elect John Kennedy, and I worked with Adlai Stevenson two times in 1952 and 1956 when we were defeated. We didn't quit. We rebuilt the Democratic Party and when you talk about the Democratic Party not being responsive, this has been the most responsive instrument that we have been able to perfect in America thus far.

Sure, it hasn't responded to everybody's needs, there aren't that many resources to do it at once. Persevering patience, constantly at it, sticking with it -- I had very little time for the man who comes in and says this is my demand and if you don't do it, I quit. I consider him a coward, I consider him unworthy of very much respect.

I think the man that really counts is the person who comes in and says, "I am going to fight for this thing if it takes 10 years, 15 years." Those people that say with it, they make it.

H
russ

Q Mr. Humphrey --

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Can we just get one of the others here? Yes, sir?

Q In 1948 we had four parties, two of them out of the Democrats. Mr. Truman was the low man on the totem pole, according to the polls, yet in the end he won a victory. Do you see any kind of a repetition this year?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, there are some similarities, but there are some differences. Mr. Truman was an incumbent President. I think we ought to keep that in mind. That makes a great deal of difference. The power of the Presidency is a tremendous influence in an election.

I am not an incumbent President. As a Vice President, you have many responsibilities, but very little, or no authority. You have generally loaded on your back all the animosities that people have toward an administration, and you very seldom receive credit for any of its achievements. So that is one difference.

There are some similarities. In 1948 you had the Dixiecrats. That is the Wallace crowd of this time. Mr. Thurmond was the head, Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, was the head of the Dixiecrats. He walked out of that convention after I called for my Democratic Party to take a firm stand on the issue of human rights and civil rights legislation. He walked out.

r2

I noticed he walked into the Republican Convention, and I think that is the difference. They are 20 years behind the times. I think Senator Strom Thurmond is going to play a very unique role in this election, and if this election goes to the House of Representatives, he may be in a very strategic position. It will be interesting to see what kind of deals are made.

There was another party in 1948. It was called the Progressive Party, headed by Henry Wallace. I think you know that Henry Wallace became a very disillusioned man because of that experience, not because he lost but because of how some people used him. Those were some of the people that were going to opt out then, if they didn't get their way. He didn't get too many votes when the election was all over, but he looked for a while as if he would get quite a few, and so did Mr. Thurmond. He looked like he would carry a substantial number of States.

But when the American people ultimately made their choice, and my, how it reads today. I remember the columnists in 1948. They had Thomas Dewey elected President. In fact, he was elected President so early that by the time the election came around, people thought it was time for a change and they elected Mr. Truman. That is almost a fact.

The pattern today is very similar. Mr. Dewey, a man that I respect -- I know him as a personal friend -- Mr. Dewey took his vacation and he was cool, confident. The crowds

r3

were big, the polls were good. Harry Truman was 5 percent or so behind in the poll just before Election Day. He was 5 percent ahead when the election was over in the next two days, that great switch taking place.

I think the American people do not like to be taken for granted. I think the American people finally, when they come into that voting booth, where they are there with themselves, their conscience and their God, they make a decision that relates to what they think is the well being of their country. I believe that is what is going to happen in 1968.

I think you will see a large amount of the so-called Wallace vote fade off into the never-never land of spent frustrations, and we are going to come out ahead.

Yes, sir?

Q In Latin America, many of the countries are being taken over by the military, especially in the last couple of weeks, Peru and Panama. Does this show a failure in the development of democracy in Latin America, when the military starts taking over many of the governments?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, it shows the restlessness of the troublesome world we live in, the restless world and the uncertain world. I don't believe we can assume the blame for all the things that happen everywhere in the world, but I do think that our failure to keep faith with the Alliance for Progress, and this is particular true in terms of the Congress

r4

and its appropriations, has lent to the frustration of the people -- I also believe that the Alliance for Progress needs a great deal more emphasis upon the political development of the country than it has had, and not just the economic development.

I also believe that the expanded military assistance to these Latin American countries is unnecessary and sometimes dangerous, particularly of sophisticated weapons for which they have no need and which drains their resources.

Up until the last two coups here, there has been a period of relative stability in Latin America. The President went to the conference, the recent conference, a year or so ago, at Punta del Este, and there were great efforts made, great pledges made, in terms of education, of economic integration, and of a kind of a common market, a Western Hemisphere Common Market.

I was there when the President called in the leaders of the Congress and asked for their support. He thought he had that support. When the bill finally came up here to the Congress, they cut the heart out of all foreign aid as a so-called economy measure.

One of the areas that took an awful cut, a very serious cut, was in the Alliance for Progress area. I think it was unfortunate from our part. I believe that we have simply got to put the checkrein on this military assistance program to Latin America. I think that that is money that is expended that

doesn't need to be expended.

I believe that we have to have a greater emphasis upon political development.

Thirdly, I think we have to keep our commitment under the Alliance for Progress to help countries that are really trying to make their democracy work. One of those, for example, is Chile, where I believe they have made a tremendous effort. I regret what has happened in Peru, because there was some hope there. It has happened before, I must say. Peru has had a military clique that has taken over far too many times.

Q Mr. Vice President, I wish you would talk for a moment about the rightward swing that seems to be taking place today in this country. It frightens me very much when the whole issue of poverty at home is categorized under the sub-heading "Law and Order."

You, yourself, bought television time to talk about law and order. It frightens me when 20 percent of the American populace can jump onto the band wagon of a Southern demagogue. Just what are some of your thoughts about this rightward swing and where is it going to lead, do you think?

I THE VICE PRESIDENT: You call it a rightward swing, and maybe that is as good a way to describe it. I call it a frustration swing. There are a lot of people that are just angry with lots of things. Let me see if I can help on this one.

It is a very complicated problem that you are talking about. We have had more changes take place in the United States economically and socially in the last 10 years than in the preceding 100 -- surely within the last 25 years -- from a relatively rural economy to a highly industrialized urban economy, with hundreds of thousands and millions of poorly equipped, illiterate, unskilled rural people moving into the vast, big cities, losing themselves totally, and losing their family relations and becoming just like wandering tribes in a distant land.

There is the impact of science and technology -- the automobile itself with its mobility, everything has compounded for bigness on the one hand and for a kind of lack of humanness on the other, the intimacy of life that many people knew has been lost.

There isn't any doubt but what this has promoted many frustrations. Then there is the living in the nuclear age, when who knows, what Churchill called this balance of terror -- it bears down on you. Maybe you don't quite realize it, but it is there all the time. Every time there is an explosion in the Middle East, and every time things seem to be getting out of hand anyplace, people wonder if this is it.

Then there are race relations. We have broken the pattern in America by dramatic legislative achievements on race relations. The laws have been passed and there are some of

them rigidly and firmly enforced. This changes the pattern of people's lives and it is hard to change a man's mind. You may get him to change his shirt, you may even get him to change some of his utterances, but to change his mind, and to change his habits, it takes a good deal of doing, and sometimes it takes time.

I have compared what we are going through to a flight in a plane through two weather systems. I do a lot of flying and I used to do it in small planes. I would be very concerned when I would hear that we are going through a weather system, out of a low into what they call a high. I always wanted to get into the high because that meant blue skies and clear sailing. But every time you would call the Weather Bureau, they would remind you that you are going to go through a front and "When you go through that front, Mr. Humphrey, it is going to be rough. It is turbulent and you have to watch out. There are going to be some thunderheads there and if you run into one, you may be wishing you hadn't."

What you hope for, if you are in one of those planes, big or little, is that you have a good pilot and a good co-pilot that had some experience and that the ship that you are riding in, the plane that you are in, is strong and sufficiently flexible and sturdy to take the storms. You try to vector around and veer around a few of them, but sometimes you have to go through and when you are going through that period of

turbulence, you wonder if you are going to make it, and you even have a few people that panic. Some people tie on their seat belts practically to the point of choking themselves, and others are running around asking for the stewardesses and the steward, and this is about what is happening in society.

But if you have a good plane, and I think we have a good Ship of State, and our structure, I think, is sufficiently resilient to take it, and if you have somebody that knows not to run head-on into a thunderhead, which can destroy you, but rather, to vector around it and deflect your flight a moment, and if you have some experience at this, you make it through and you come out into a better day.

I think that is what we are going through. That is why I say that Mr. Wallace is the kind of a pilot that says "Hit the thunderhead head on," and that means catastrophe.

Mr. Nixon is the kind of a pilot who says "Maybe we ought not to take off."

I am the kind of a pilot who says, "Look, we have the storm signals and we know what they are. The Weather Bureau has told us where we are and we have had our hands on these controls before and we have taken many a test flight, and we have tried it before. It is not going to be easy. It is going to be a little hazardous, but get in and put on your seat belts now and we have good radar, and we are going to try to move around and we are going to work our way through it. It is going

to be a little bumpy and all of you faint-hearted souls, you had better turn in your ticket, but those of you want to make the journey and come with me to that new day, you get in the plane and we are going to make it."

Now, we are seeing this today. We are seeing bitterness, and we are seeing the effects of bitterness and frustration, and anger, over a lot of things, and then we have people preaching it, preaching hate, preaching fear, and preaching suspicion, and preaching doubt -- doubt about your Government, and doubt about each other, suspicion, fear, hate, and I have watched it work in many areas.

I have seen blue-collar workers, for example, white, who think that when a Negro or black man gets a job, it is a threat to his job. Well, it is only a threat to his job if the country has leadership that permits the country to get into a recession.

The fact, is, if the economy continues to grow, the blue-collar man gets more seniority, and he goes up in the job, and the black man comes up and he gets a little more seniority, and the whole country is better off.

I told a group the other day, I said, "When you get a bigger family, if you want everybody to have the same size piece of pie, you have to get a bigger pie tin, and you have to have somebody that understands that. You can't cut up the same size pie for six children in the same size pieces that you did

for three."

We are getting a bigger family and we are getting more people who are coming into this American family as participants, so you have what I think is a sort of an angry mood in some parts of the country. I think maybe it is conservative. There was a group in France that were called the Peugatus -- is that right? They represented people in the low-income groups, many of them, and blue-collar workers, and they represented small shopkeepers, and some rural people.

They were just angry, and they were just against everything. They didn't have a program, and they didn't have an economic program or they didn't have a political program, but they had some votes. and they voted them. But they didn't have enough. It sort of faded away.

I think that you are going to see some of that right now, because as we move ahead, if we stick with what we are doing, what do I mean by "what we are doing"? Desegregation. What else do I mean? Acceptance of Americans because they are Americans. Training. Jobs. Education. Trying to build new cities, rehabilitate old cities and rehabilitate human beings, and have a government that really cares, and not only a government, but look what we have done with industry and what industry has done, and what banking has done, and insurance companies.

I sat in the Cabinet Room here a little over a year ago and saw the head of the Life Insurance Institute of

America come in and tell the President, "Here is a billion dollars of private capital from insurance companies for low-cost, low-income housing, Mr. President."

MORE

This had never happened before. Look at the urban coalition in America, headed by John Gardner, one of the great Americans.

It never happened before.

"J"

Mr. Nixon said the other day that as the government strains to do more, the private sector is constrained to do more.

That is sheer nonsense. The fact is that as the government has sought to do more, more people have come in from the private sector to do more than they have ever done before. Churches today are helping build homes. Unions are putting their health and welfare funds into low income, low-rent projects. Private industry is moving into the ghetto areas and putting up new factories.

We have, today, over 200,000 hard core unemployed that have been hired by private industry that no one would have ever hired before.

Tremendous great things are happening. So that the mood of the country may temporarily seem angry and very conservative, and right. And if it is, then it is my duty, as a leader, to try to show them a better way. That is what I am trying to do. I do not want to cater to the mood. Any man who goes around feeling his pulse and taking his temperature all day according to the polls is not ready to be President of the United States.

A President ought to be a leader and a teacher.

He ought not to be just on what I call a poll diet, swallowing each one that comes out and hoping that somehow or other the swallowing thereof, in digesting thereof, his reactions will meet with what the polls require.

What a poll give you is a measure of temporary public opinion. If you think that that public opinion is wrong, then you go on out and do something about it. That is what I am doing. I know the polls show that for me to talk, as I have talked to you, on the basis of equal treatment and equal opportunity, and, in fact, a better opportunity, that this is not politically popular.

I know that. But I know that it is right. I said earlier, and you heard me say it, I am sure, that I will make no compact with extremism. I will have nothing to do with it, because I think it is disastrous, I think it is wrong.

Law and order, I guess, I kind of left you on that one. I didn't talk about just law and order. I talked about civil order and civil justice. I talked about how you get a better law enforcement instrumentality in this country, not by a federal police, but by improving your local police, upgrading their quality, their training, their pay, having police institutes, not just on how to use a club, but how to use your mind, in human relations.

By the way, let's get another thing straight. The

black and white, are crying out for more police protection. They don't want police brutality, they want police protection. And they need it more than anybody else, because more crime is committed in the areas of the poor than any place else. More crime is committed against the poor than any other group. And more crime is committed by the poor against the poor than any other group.

We have to be thinking in terms not only of equal opportunity under the law, but equal protection under the law. That is what I mean by law and order. And I don't mean, by law and order, that all the problems are due to the black man, which is exactly what some people are preaching.

To them, law and order is another way of saying it is the black man who is causing you the trouble.

Let's be perfectly clear, that most of the black people, like most of the white people, want to live in peace and harmony. They want protection. They are the ones who are set upon by the crook. They are the first victims of violence.

It is my duty, as President and as a candidate for President, to say these things, whether people like it or not. And I am going to say it.

Who didn't get in on this? I believe you didn't yet.

Q What do you intend to do as to the repeal of

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley that hasn't been done in the last eight years?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Try to get it done. I do not believe in state right to work laws. I do not think they add to the economy of the state, to labor-management peace. I believe that when the Federal Government moves in, as it has with the National Labor Relations Act, to have jurisdiction in terms of labor-management relations of an interstate quality, that the Federal Government should have that area for federal jurisdiction.

And I shall recommend its repeal. I voted for it, worked for it. Whether we can get a Congress that will do it, I don't know. But I know this, that as President, I have some feelings about it and I have made a pledge a long time ago, long before I ever thought about running for President -- I voted that way and I shall continue to act that way.

Q Do you feel we would be able to get it to the floor?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes. I surely do. I think that one of the first things that the Senate needs to do is to amend its rules. I have always thought so, so that this miserable thing called the filibuster is not with us. The filibuster was used recently. The right of unlimited debate in the Senate, the threat of unlimited debate in

the Senate, was used to prevent debate on the part of the candidates before the American people on national television. In other words, it is perfectly all right for a few Senators to monopolize the floor, using the right of debate to prevent decision.

But it wasn't all right, according to those few Senators who threatened a filibuster and would have had one, it wasn't all right for them for the three candidates for President to stand before these microphones and to discuss the issues side by side, and cross examine each other.

You see, I believe that is good for this country. That is my personal view. That is the way I ran for the Senate. That is the way I did when I ran against John Kennedy in the 1960 primaries. We debated. When I ran for the Senate in my home state, I always debated my opponents. I felt that this was the fairest way to do it, and I had some pretty good opponents. I wasn't sure we always won the debates, but at least I knew that people had a chance to hear us.

Q Mr. Humphrey, our household includes an 80-year old grandfather and I looked around and thought really there is no body very elderly here today.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: You are very kind.

Q He is an admirer of Mr. Muskie, but is so solidly Republican that even this wouldn't woo him.

We have suggested it was to his best advantage to vote Democratic. I wonder if you would speak to that point a bit.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Is it your grandfather?

Q My father.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: You are such a young girl, I thought it was your grandfather.

Q Thank you.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I would like to speak to him. I am sure that he is a man that wants a country, what he would call a safe country. He would like to see less violence, he would like to see greater cooperation. I think I can offer that. I think that I can work with the groups in this country who want to heal and who are willing to sit down and work in the spirit of reconciliation.

I believe that I can work with blacks and whites. I believe that both trust me, because I have trusted them throughout my public life. I believe that the President of the United States must be a person who has tremendous forbearance, and yet, at the same time, is willing to make tough decisions if they have to be made.

Your father is a man who is eligible for all the benefits of social security, and he has earned them, he is entitled to them. One of those benefits is Medicare, which is a Godsend to you, by the way, and your family, as well as to your father.

For younger people, it means that they do not have to feel that they have to draw on what sometimes are meager resources, for most people have meager resources. Some times in Washington, we forget that. They are pretty well in debt.

If your mother and father are elderly and they become critically ill or have long-term illness, somebody has to take care of them. Most of the elderly people in America do not have large savings, most of them. By far, the largest group of poor people in America are the elderly, by far.

With Medicare, your father can go to the hospital of his choice, not a government hospital, but a hospital of his choice, to the doctor of his choice, and he can have hospital care and medical care. And he can also have nursing home care.

I think that that is one thing that he might keep in mind. That didn't come because Republicans helped us, us. I introduced the first Medicare bill in the Congress. And may I say that I was called every name in the book. I introduced that in May of 1949. I saw it signed in July of 1965. I was there for the signing ceremony.

It took a long time to get it, but we have it. And we are going to improve it so that we can include prescription drugs under it. We can do this. That is one

reason why I think your father ought to give us a vote. I think he ought to do it for you, I really do. I think he ought to do it for your family, because there are things we are trying to do and want to do that will be helpful to your family.

Pre-school, I don't know how many children you have, whether you have any young enough for pre-school, but the learning period from 4 to 7 is the most wonderful period of a child's life. We learn more at that time than any other comparable period in our life.

Yet, we have very little pre-school in America. How ridiculous. We know through project Head Start how much this means to the lives of little children and what it means to their intellectual development.

So, he ought to help us on that one. His vote will help get that.

Mr. Nixon has never talked about these things at all.

I think there are a few other things that he might be interested in; that he might very well want to make sure that more and more Americans have a chance to earn their own way. We have been doing something about that, rather than be on relief.

If I could talk to him, I think we could get him to be for both Humphrey and Muskie.

Q Mr. Humphrey, it has been noted in recent magazine and newspaper articles that many people feel that for you to have any major support in the country on the Vietnam policy, it must be something away from the present Administration's policy.

However, Mr. Nixon seems to be in the forefront with a policy that looks very much like Mr. Johnson's.

Would you care to comment on this?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, sometimes I am perplexed by what people write and what people do. For a long period of time, I was subjected to all kinds of picketing because of my attitudes on Vietnam.

r-1

Mr. Nixon never had a picket. His attitudes were much stronger than mine. After all, Mr. Nixon was the man who, in 1954, or 1953 -- 1954 -- when the French were the colonial power and had lost at Dienbienphu, he had advocated that we go in then, charge in then with armed forces, into Vietnam.

Right at this particular moment, the most sensitive negotiations that we have ever had are underway. I have felt that it would be a bit hazardous on my part, and I think anything but helpful, to go beyond what I said in my address at Salt Lake City. I outlined there my views on Vietnam.

As a Vice President, I sat in on Cabinet meetings, and National Security Council meetings, and when I was asked as to my opinion, I would give it. But the decisions were the President's decisions. He has many advisers. I was one of several. Sometimes my views were different than some others.

But as the Vice President, because there must be only one voice in this country speaking for national policy, and particularly in my role as Vice President, I supported the Administration's program on Vietnam. I have always said, though, that the Administration's program on Vietnam was not a military solution but a political settlement.

Many people didn't believe that, but I knew that that was the case, because we did not invade North Vietnam. We did not seek a military solution. We sought to find some way to get a political solution.

r2

Some people have forgotten that recently things have changed. In May of this year, conferences opened negotiations in Paris. There were no conferences a year ago May. There were none in January. There were none in March. But in May, a whole new dimension to the Vietnam thing came about, namely, that the North Vietnamese and the United States negotiators were sitting at a conference table, regular conferences on negotiations in Paris.

That was, it seemed to me, a dimension that ought to be given some new understanding. As a Vice President, I was a member of the team, and I had to do a little downfield blocking, to use the vernacular of this season. Once in a while I would get scarred up a bit, but as a candidate for President, I seek to be captain and quarterback of the team. I will be calling the signals when elected President, and they will be my policies and my decisions.

I am talking now about after January 20, 1969. Between now and then, President Johnson calls the signals. He can have all kinds of advisers, and he has. But he makes the decisions. After January 20th a new President will make the decisions, make the policies, call the signals. I hope to be that President.

I gave you some indication in my Salt Lake City speech of what I would do. I said, of course, any President would want to protect the security of our troops, no matter who he is. He would be unworthy of the office if he didn't want to do that.

K turn
1

But I said that I would stop the bombing, that I considered it an acceptable risk for peace in that it would promote the success of the negotiations, and shorten the war. And if it did that, it would therefore protect the troops.

I also said that before taking that decision, or in taking that decision that I would want to take into consideration evidence, direct or indirect, by deed or word, that the Communists would restore the demilitarized status of the Demilitarized Zone. In other words, that area which was an international zone would revert back to what it was.

I thought that that was the easiest thing for the Northvietnamese to do, because it did not refer to their territory. IBIreferred to an area that had not been violated for a considerable period of time. I went on to point out further that if the North Vietnmmese did not negotiate in good faith, that I would resume the bombing.

Now, I lid out plus other things, the de-American-ization of the war by a systematic withdrawal of American forces, as the Arvn was more able to do its own fighting and its own self-defense, which it can do, and which we must insist that it do, and also free elections with certain protections to make certain one man, one vote, including in all of the different facets and all of the different factions in South Vietnam, so that all peoples that are willing to accept the election process are included in that ele ction, and be willing

k2

to accept the government that came out of that election. So I have given a very detailed outline of my position on Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon has been a little fuzzy, I would say, except to say that it was too sensitive to talk about. He finds himself in the kind of enviable position. On many things he says it is beyond his jurisdiction, and on other things he said "negotiations are underway, so I shall not speak."

On other things he said that this is a little too sensitive, and he has been able to find so many different sets of circumstances that he thought he ought not to involve himself in that he is kind of above the battle.

I think what you want to know is how I would act as President, not how I would act as Vice President. As Vice President I am an advisor, and as President I am a man in authority. As Vice President I have responsibility, but no authority. As President I have both responsibility and authority.

I would ask you to take a good look at what I had to say, because it was very carefully worked out by me, and not by somebody else.

Q. I think it is so sad, it is really so sad, and I would like to ask you a question in behalf of the disillusioned disenchanted Democrats like me who will vote for

3

you. We will vote for you because we can't vote for fascism and we can't vote, for you know, the more rapid decline of America and of soul and all of the rest.

But why is it, are we so far gone in this country that you can't really lead in a more strong way, and in a more rapid way, a rapid reform of stopping the war, and of human rights? Everything that you said is good, but you know it is sad that there are so many people not voting for you because they feel that there isn't much difference between the three.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, it is sad for me to hear that, because I think that you are a very intelligent lady. I think that you know there are no quick and sudden answers to problems that are centuries in the making, and if you do think so you are not as intelligent as I think you are.

You just do not cure things overnight. What is important in a democracy are the beginniungs, the steadfastness.

Let us take a look at some of the things that we have been talking about here. I mentioned here to a lady a while ago, I know that Medicare does not seem very important to some young people, but when you are aged 65 and over and you are flat broke, and you have to go to the relief office, it is the difference between dignity and being demeaned. It

4 is very important. It took sixteen years. Now, I know some people say, "Why didn't you do it in a year?"

Why don't people grow up in a year? It takes time. Overnight -- there is a whole library, and why don't you read all of the books? It takes time.

What is important is the spirit, the determination to do some things. Mankind has been looking for peace for hundreds of years. People have been preaching religion. There are different kinds of religion and they have a tough time holding present membership much less getting converts. It takes a tremendous amount of time. But more than that, it takes spirit and courage and determination and perseverance.

Now, take for example the nuclear test ban treaty, my dear lady. I started on that in 1956 with Adlai Stevenson. I had a lot of young enthusiasts who said, "This is really great, Humphrey, it is marvelous and he has courage and fine", and of course we did not win the election, and Mr. Nixon said that it was a cruel hoax and catastrophic nonsense.

But I stayed with it, and I set up a committee in the Congress, and there were seven years of interrogation and investigation, of hearings, seven years of being called an appeaser and every dirty name that people could think of. But in 1963 we got the test ban treaty, and when Mr. Kennedy,

5 President Kennedy, signed it, he turned to me and he said, "Hubert, this is your treaty." It took time.

Look at the so-called Non-Proliferation Treaty that we now have to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. I have been working on this all during my ^{VICE} Presidency. I went to Europe to see the leaders of six countries on one little section of it, and now there it is, and Mr. Nixon says, "It is a good treaty, but don't ratify it."

You are frustrated? You ought to see how I feel after you work for these things, and work your heart out. It took us from 1948 to 1964 to get the comprehensive Civil Rights Act, and I was in every civil rights movement that this country had, and I was beat upon, as you know. I had to fight for my political life, even in my home State, but I lived to be the Floor Leader for the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

What I am trying to say is: It is what you stand for, and what you work for, and it is not that you make a speech, and say "Well, I am for peace." That doesn't make you a peace man. It means that you made a speech. Peace is not for the timid, and not for the weak. It is for the strong, and the persevering.

Kennedy put it once that peace and freedom are not cheap, and he also said that we will live out the rest of our lives in a period of danger, peril and change, and we will. There just isn't any simple solution.

I think that my duty as a leader is not to kid people. I am not going to tell them that it is going to be easy, because it is not. I can't tolerate the conditions that I see in these slums. They make me sick to my stomach. But I know that they are not going to be corrected overnight. I know that even if I had total power, it couldn't be done.

First of all, we don't even have enough engineers and architects. We don't even have the means, the intellectual means to do it all yet. But what is important is that we are determined to do it, and that we keep people wanting to do it.

May I say that if there is any weakness in America, it is that some people have maybe had it so easy that they don't realize how hard it is to get some things. Some young people today, even in America, have been able to go through college because their parents sent them, and it wasn't too hard. It is hard to study. I think the course work is more difficult, and I think they are more intelligent and I think they are better trained.

But some of us went through college working three and four jobs. I used to get about four hours a night sleep. I never even had books during my sophomore year. I used to go to the library. I couldn't afford them. I learned the hard way.

That is what I am trying to tell people. But we can change things and we are changing things in this world, and

we are making lots of changes, and we have done many things in America that nobody ever believed were possible a few years ago.

Why, when I go down South, and see integrated meetings, I remember 10 years ago it was impossible. When I see people today that are in colleges on Project Upwardbound, nobody ever would have dreamed of it. I see Job Corps centers taking kids out of the bowels of the slums, and we are training them to be productive workers. This was never done in the 1950's.

And you know the war was all over -- and the Korean War was as dirty a war as the Vietnam war -- and it was ended in an armistice. At least there was relative peace. What did the Republican leadership do with the dividends of that peace? Nothing. Even with the war in Vietnam, look what we have been doing in education and in health, and I will give you a little example.

Rey L-1

I will give you a little example because you care, I can see that. One out of every 400 babies born in this country is mentally retarded. We have known that for a long time. The Federal Government never did a single thing about it until the last three years. Now we are doing something about the care of those children, facilities and training, medical research.

We are doing something about it. We have 400 clinics across this country for the mentally ill. We have had mentally ill people in America as long as this country has been here. We are doing things.

The problem that you face up to me is you want it done all at once.

Q No, just faster, not all at once.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Lady, if you think you are impatient, you have met one that will be five lengths ahead of you. I have been impatient all my life. As a matter of fact, one of my major political problems in life has been, up until some of the more recent critics, is that "Humphrey is ahead of his time."

I am, and I still am. If we accomplished what I have been trying to talk about for the last ten years, we would still have plenty of work to do. I want to move this country. But, I tell you something, give me a Congress to work with. You don't have a dictatorship, and you don't want one.

You have to educate your public. You have to train

that public. You have to bring them up with you. I have gone the length and breadth of this land talking about, to give you a simple thing, teen age employment, the Negro teen ager, the black teen ager, 18, 20, 30 percent of them being unemployed.

I helped get 1,250,000 jobs for poor kids who were teen agers. How did I do it? Going plant to plant, state to state, mayor to mayor, city to city. You didn't read much about it because I didn't have many newsmen following me. The news isn't that you get somebody a job; the news is that you failed to get him a job.

So I am impatient, just as you are. And we will get it done, too.

Yes, sir, you have been waiting a long time.

Q Sir, if, as you said in Salt Lake City, as President you did, in fact, stop the bombing in Vietnam, in return for restraint by North Vietnam and the widening of the demilitarized zone --

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The restoration of it.

Q Restoration, or whatever. -- what I would like to know is what checks would we use to make sure that this restraint was carried out, and I think whatever mother and father of people in Vietnam would like to know is how many American soldiers would we have to lose before we determined that North Vietnam was not standing up to that restraint.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, we have very good ways of being able to determine whether or not there is any

L3 infiltration. We have sensor devices that are able to determine the movement of any body, any person. We have reconnaissance satellites that can take photographic evidence. We have electronic and magnetic devices that surely can record movement of infiltrators. We even have what we call check points.

So there are ways and means of protection. That is why I say any President that made that decision must keep in mind how would he best protect his own troops.

This does not mean, of course, that you could couldn't bomb south of the demilitarized zone. Ultimately, the protection of forces, ultimately, is the cease fire. That is really what we have to work for. Again, may I say stopping the bombing or not has become such a symbol in this country that I think sometimes it is overplayed.

What we are really talking about is if you stop the bombing, would it lend itself to the success of the negotiations, would it lead to a cease fire.

If it didn't, then it really would not be a very meaningful exercise.

Q But we do know that if you stop the bombing, it will increase the production in North Vietnam; it will allow them to produce more to fight with in the south. We also know, and I know through personal experience, that drawing our cease fires, our Tet cease fires, and so on, we have had, A, fighting during that time, and, B, increased activity after these

L4

those times. Now, this may not be documented as to being a very widespread thing, but I know it has happened.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I agree with that.

Q I think, therefore, that you, as President, would have to be very, very cautious with that increase in the rate of killing of American soldiers or the levelling off of the rate of killing of American soldiers, when they are producing arms in North Vietnam because we aren't bombing them.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I hope that you will talk to a lot of people about that, because this puts the proper balance into this equation that we are talking about. That is what I said, that a President must first take into concern the safety of his own troops. Then I said that before taking that decision on stopping the bombing, that I would want -- I would look for evidence, direct or indirect, by deed or word, that the North Vietnamese would restore the demilitarized status of the DMZ. That means that would not be an area of infiltration.

We have ways and means of determining whether or not there is infiltration.

I also said that you must be willing to take some acceptable risk for peace. It is a risk. You are right, what you are talking about. It is a risk. But it is a risk that, if it works, would shorten the war, would promote successful negotiations, and would really save lives.

If it did not work, as President I would assume the

L5

right to resume the bombing, and how. I believe that that is exactly what we have to face up to.

Again, the whole question is does this promote peace. That is why Presidents lose sleep. That is why the President has, we say, the awesome responsibility. He has to make that decision. I, alone, after listening to all the evidence. And he has to listen to a young man like you who comes in with sensible comment, possibly from some experience. Then he has to listen to somebody else over here who says, "Listen, we have taken all kinds of risks on the battle fields. Let's take a few risks at the conference table. Let's take another risk."

You see, we have stopped the bombing of 90 percent of the population and 78 percent of the land area. In all the productive area of Vietnam there is no bombing -- in Hanoi, Haiphong, the industrialized area.

The area where the bombing is is south of the 19th parallel. Most of that is jungle land, very little population. But there is a way of putting a blanket of protection against infiltrators. The fact is, however, it doesn't prevent infiltration. It slows it down but it doesn't prevent it.

END

(AT 3:30 PM EDT)

Q. Mr. Nixon has emphasized in his list of differences with the Democrats that he would rely more on private enterprise and less on the federal government to provide the know-how and funds needed to rebuild our cities and win the war on poverty. What is your comment on this?

A. The trouble with Mr. Nixon's good ideas is that they are second-hand. Democrats, over considerable Republican opposition, have managed to enlist the help of private enterprise in solving our social problems to a degree which the old Nixon Republican Administration never conceived possible. From the very beginning of the Poverty Program in 1964, the federal government relied heavily on business and the voluntary efforts of citizens across the country. That's what my Marshall Plan for the Cities is all about. It is conceived of as a massive national effort by government, business, labor -- by every segment of our society -- to correct problems which, if left unsolved, represent distinct threats to our national interests, and to the welfare of each of us as individuals.

Today, giants of American corporate life are involved in the running of Job Corps centers, in on-the-job training and in the development of sophisticated programs for social rehabilitation. Volunteers man community action posts across the country. Doctors and lawyers are giving their time free of charge to provide health and legal aid to the indigent. Neighborhood groups are being formed to work out solutions to common problems through self-help.

In the last eight months alone, the National Alliance of Businessmen, a partnership between government and industry led by the top business leaders of America, -- and a pioneering venture which I was in on and supported from its inception -- has obtained pledges from American industry to provide 310,000 new jobs for the hard-core unemployed and disadvantaged youth; nearly 190,000 of these out-of-work Americans have already been placed on the job, including more than 60,000 of the hard-core unemployed.

Think of it -- 190,000 people put to work in less than nine months . . . with firms planning to find jobs for half a million Americans within three years. These programs of the National Alliance of Businessmen -- programs that we shall expand to cover the entire country -- have established a pattern for a great partnership between American business and government: a partnership that sees the problems . . . tackles them . . . and solves them.

I say this to Mr. Nixon: Before you speak again on the role businessmen play in helping to correct our society's problems, why don't you talk to some of America's leading businessmen, to discover what, together, we have already done?

Q. Yesterday's paper quotes Governor Agnew as stating that "If you've seen one slum you've seen them all." Do you agree with the Governor's observation?

A. Certainly not. Apparently, what Governor Agnew has forgotten is that people live in slums. And people are not like grains of rice. I, for one, will continue to go to the people wherever they are -- in slums, in suburbs or in rural communities. Frankly, I don't understand how you can hope to represent people unless you are willing to meet with them on their home grounds. I learn from people; I draw strength from being with them. Furthermore, I spend time in slums so that those who are still forced by circumstances to lead lives of quiet desperation will know that I go to them because I care about them, and want to know from them what I can do to help them to help themselves.

OPENING MUSKIE STATEMENT

SUNDAY TV SHOW

Muskie: Serious, quiet, concerned, walks on to set with three podiums,
as much like 1960 as possible.

Who can the American people trust to lead the country for the
next four years?

That's the issue in this campaign -- that's the one we had hoped to
settle tonight in honest debate.

Honest debate -- that's how you learned in 1960 that John J. Kennedy
had leadership qualities that Richard Nixon lacked.

This year, with three candidates, there's an even greater need for
these debates.

With the help of your contributions, Vice President Humphrey bought
this hour of television for such a debate.

He invited Richard Nixon and George Wallace to participate.

Mr. Wallace said he would come only if Mr. Nixon was also present.

Mr. Nixon didn't have the courtesy to reply to Vice President Humphrey's telegram.

Don't the other candidates trust you?⁷ Or is it that they don't trust themselves under pressure?

You decide.

Hubert Humphrey didn't turn you down. He trusts you and you can trust him.

That's why he's here tonight.

My fellow Americans: Hubert H. Humphrey

David

Opening Muskie Statement

Draft: TV Hour

Muskie: Serious, quiet, concerned, walks on to set with three podiums, as much like 1960 as possible.

Who can the American people trust to lead the country for the next four years.

That's the issue in this campaign - that's the one we had hoped to settle tonight in honest debate.

Honest debate - that's how you learned in 1960 that John F. Kennedy had leadership qualities that Richard Nixon lacked.

This year, with three candidates, there's an even greater need for these debates.

But Mr. Nixon turned you down. So did Mr. Wallace.

Don't ~~they~~ trust you. Or is it that they don't trust themselves under pressure. You decide.

And keep in mind. Hubert Humphrey didn't turn you down. He trusts you and you can trust him. That's why he's here tonight.

My fellow Americans. Hubert Humphrey

OPENING REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

SUNDAY TV SHOW

In two weeks you will vote for President of the United States.

This year -- as in all Presidential elections -- this decision
will have direct impact on your lives . . . the lives of your family . . .
the lives of people everywhere.

You must judge among the three candidates for this office.

You have a right to see the candidates . . . to listen to them . . .
to judge them . . . as their personalities and ideas are tested in direct,
face-to-face debate.

The candidates have an obligation to test themselves in open debate.

During the primaries I repeatedly said I would debate the Republican
nominee -- Mr. Nixon said the same thing when challenged to debate by
Governor Rockefeller.

Since the conventions, I have proposed debates among the candidates. This evening -- with the help of many thousands of contributions -- I purchased this hour of prime television time. For I believed that out of this direct give-and-take would come some answers to Senator Muskie's question: Who can you trust to lead America for the next four years?

The principal reason for a debate among Presidential candidates has never been stated more convincingly than by Richard Nixon himself. He wrote about the 1960 debates -- and I quote -- " . . . I felt it was absolutely essential that I not only agree to debate but enthusiastically welcome the opportunity. Had I refused the challenge . . . I would be declining to participate in a program which the majority of the American people, regardless of party, wanted to see. "

A majority of Americans want this opportunity in 1968.

We can only deeply regret that Mr. Nixon chooses not to live by his own words.

In two weeks the campaign will end. You will step into the voting booth to choose your next President.

And as the President takes his oath of office on January 20, 1969, it will then be only a question of his principles, his ideals, his courage, and his vision. The confetti and the balloons will be gone. The advertising budgets will have been spent.

Our next President will stand alone -- on his own feet -- and begin making life or death decisions for each and every one of us.

That is why the issue of trust is so crucial to your decision.

PAUSE . . .

For the past generation the American people have turned to the Democrats to tackle -- and to solve -- the toughest and most urgent problems before this nation.

The Democrats -- supported by millions of Republicans and Independents -- have built this nation.

Tonight -- on film -- Senator Muskie and I want to capture this Democratic heritage . . . this compact of trust between the people and their leaders.

Then Senator Muskie and I want to tell you how we will extend this heritage into the 1970's -- as your President and Vice President.

Concept of Humphrey-Muskie Moderator Conversation

The conversation would build on the closing line of the Democratic film--". . . because it is right . . ." This necessarily establishes a conversation that is primarily, although not exclusively, constructive, forward-looking, affirmative. "Because it is right . . ." the Humphrey-Muskie Administration will move forward to tackle the critical issues of our time--just as Democratic Presidents and the Democratic Party have always done. The advertising theme of "America is the greatest country in the world" could easily be woven throughout the affirmative message.

Supportive of the ". . . because it is right . . ." theme would be the concept of trusting Humphrey-Muskie to get the job done which, in turn, would be buttressed by specific evidences of why Nixon-Agnew and Wallace-LeMay cannot be trusted.

Stressed within the affirmative presentation would be two principal areas (1) opportunities for turning the arms race around and the grave dangers of not turning it around, (2) economic and social progress under the Democrats and how this would be jeopardized by either of the other tickets.

The social and economic message would be translated into individual, family terms--not gross data like the GNP, rate of unemployment, etc.

Although some anti-Nixon and anti-Wallace material would be used--indeed, it is essential in making the case--it would be factual, specific, tied to issues--not personalities, and delivered in a low-key, balanced, and reserved tone. Stridency, name-calling, etc. must be avoided at all costs.

We should be shooting for a serious tone, similar to the previous two stand-up speeches, but more spontaneous and revealing of the candidates' abilities to think sensibly about difficult subjects, with vision, understanding, and strength of purpose.

Several additional points: Humphrey should listen a good deal to Muskie talk on subjects within his expertise, particularly cities and his line of the people trusting one another. Humphrey might want specifically to state his intentions of giving Muskie major substantive responsibility in the domestic field, especially in implementing the Marshall Plan for the Cities. This might even turn into the news lead of the show.

Finally, we should decide whether the show is to be used for re-issuing challenges to debate separately with Nixon and Wallace. This might be the closer--it would wind things up on a note of strength--and it would surely boost the contributions.

The fund raising pitch, in my opinion, should not be made by O'Brien--but someone like E. G. Marshall.

Following the Democratic film:

Humphrey:

"Because it is right . . ." That sums up the message of the Democratic Party and the men who have led the party.

"Because it is right . . ." we have built schools, cared for the elderly, kept our economy booming, defended this country, and brought unprecedented prosperity to America.

And, "because it is right . . ." we must press forward now until every American enjoys his full share of this prosperity . . . these opportunities. Not at anyone else's expense--it must never be taking from one man to give to another.

It must be--and it will be-- a matter of moving this country forward so that all will be full participants in this remarkable society. . . so that all of us may live in peace.

This is the message Ed Muskie and I have taken to the people in this campaign.

This will be the overriding objective of the Humphrey-Muskie Administration--this is the message of the Democratic Party in 1968,-- just as it was in 1932 when Franklin Roosevelt rallied America in the depths of the great depression.

This is what Ed Muskie and I want to talk with you about this evening. . .

Joining us in this discussion is the distinguished TV commentator and journalist, Howard K. Smith.

Smith:

Mr. Vice President, Senator Muskie, you have been campaigning for six weeks. You have criss-crossed the country several times. What are your impressions of this election? What are the American people looking for in this election? What's going to decide the election?

Muskie:

1. The election is definitely un-decided at this point--many undecided voters--Nixon off to early lead--but as polls have lately revealed, Democrats are on the strong up-swing--Nixon has stabilized--Wallace losing strength.

2. People know the country is faced with serious problems-- Vietnam, here at home. But people not assuming this year that simple change will solve these problems. People want to know how each ticket will deal with problems. That's a major factor in our favor: Democrats have given specific plans--others have talked in generalities if they have talked at all.

3. It all boils down to this: Who can the people trust to lead America in the next four years? How this question is answered will decide the election.

Humphrey:

1. That's why the debates are so important. Even if it means taking risks.

2. All candidates put concern for country ahead of personal fortunes--that's why I find it so hard to understand why Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace haven't been willing to debate the issues.

3. That's why I believe in the end, the Democrats will win--because we haven't taken the people for granted--because we tried to give specific answers--even if it had cost us votes from time to time.

Smith:

Gentlemen, some people say the war in Vietnam is the central issue of the campaign; others say it is a growing concern for law and order in our society. What do you believe the central substantive issue to be?

Humphrey:

1. Without a doubt, great concern for Vietnam and law and order. And I have spoken specifically on both these issues on national television. I have laid down my plans for ending the war in Vietnam and for building a society where every family can be safe from violence and lawlessness. Not slogans, but specifics, etc.

2. These issues are, in my opinion, only the top of the iceberg. Basic concerns of the people go much deeper--and you must look to these deeper concerns to find the real issues.

3. There are two deeper issues: (a) How can we build a more peaceful world--for my children and grandchildren? This brings us directly to the nuclear threat and the urgent necessity of turning the arms race around. (b) How can we build a more peaceful society here at home--and this includes more than just reducing crime and violence. Education for my children. . . elementary school through college or advanced training. Jobs . . . will I have a secure and challenging job . . . can we avoid recessions that will limit my opportunities and the opportunities for my children. Cities . . . can we make our cities pleasant and safe places to live--for everyone, not just the rich and well-to-do. Farms . . . can we build on the progress of the past eight years, really bring the farmers into the economic mainstream of this country, and also bring economic vitality to our non-farm rural areas.

4. When people focus on these deeper issues, the Democrats are going to benefit greatly--because the Democrats have always been the party that moved America ahead on these fronts.

Muskie:

1. When you talk in specifics, the people understand. Education, for example.

-- I doubt there is a local school system in America not now receiving substantial Federal assistance. We have tripled our Federal investment in education over the past eight Democratic years. And I can't think of a better way to spend our Federal tax dollars . . . it helps all our children get a better education . . . it helps keep local property taxes down.

-- Over 1 million college students now receiving Federal financial help. Your sons and daughters are going to college because of this Democratic help.

-- One of Mr. Nixon's last acts as Vice President in 1960 was to break a tie vote against \$1.5 billion Federal education bill--and the Republicans have never stopped fighting this legislation in Congress.

Humphrey:

1. Mr. Nixon has yet to say anything about education in this campaign.

2. Ed Muskie and I have laid out a detailed program of action--from pre-school Headstart classes for every child--right through college or advanced training.

3. And I've proposed that we ear-mark the Federal revenues coming from Federally-owned oil shale deposits--a source of many billions of dollars--for educational purposes. Take our natural resources and transform them into human resources--that's the objective of the Humphrey-Muskie Administration.

Muskie:

1. We've set forth similar plans for helping our older citizens.

2. Social Security--50 percent across the board increase over the next four years. This will bring the minimum monthly payment for a couple up from \$82.50 to \$150. And we propose making benefits inflation proof.

3. Medicare--put the doctor bill part of Medicare on the same social insurance pre-payment basis as the hospital part. Pay for drug prescriptions.

4. Again, the Republican record is alarming.

-- Mr. Nixon said Medicare would probably do more harm than good--

93 percent of the Republicans in the House voted against Medicare when the Democrats passed it in 1965.

-- And this year the Republican platform doesn't even mention Medicare.

Smith:

Doesn't all of this depend upon securing peace in the world?

Humphrey:

1. Absolutely. We are going to end the war in Vietnam--
honorably and sensibly. But we will end it.

2. Then we are going to push ahead with the most urgent
business of our time--finding ways to end the arms race. We must halt
the arms race before the arms race halts humanity.

3. The next urgent step is to ratify the treaty to stop the spread
of nuclear weapons. Mr. Nixon has recommended delay--this is a most
dangerous and irresponsible recommendation.

4. Then, of course, we have General LeMay--the man who proposed
bombing North Vietnam back into the Stone Age. This kind of loose
talk could literally ignite the kind of nuclear holocaust from which there
would be no survival for anyone.

Muskie:

Let me mention one other factor on which all these plans for the future ultimately depend--a growing and expanding economy.

1. The Republicans produced three recessions during their eight years in power in the 1950's. Most people forget how serious this had become by 1960--even the Soviets were boasting they would bury us--the United States had one of the slowest growth rates of any industrialized country.

2. Today the American economy is the marvel of the world--it has climbed steadily upward for 92 straight months--the longest sustained period of economic growth in our history.

3. The average American family of four can live as well in 1968 as it did in 1960 and still have enough left over to buy a new car out of its 1968 income--or pay for a year in college--without dipping into savings. And that's after inflation has been taken into account.

4. Mr. Nixon's economic advisor recently said a little more unemployment would be good for the economy. A little more unemployment . . . does he mean your job? Whose job is he willing to sacrifice?

Smith:

The problems we see in the country have been with us for a long time/... Why do you think the Humphrey-Muskie team will be able to solve them?

Humphrey:

1. No responsible candidate can state categorically that he and his administration will "solve" all the problems faced by the United States. And the American people would never believe him if he did.

2. We can, however, make real progress toward solving them . . . and that has been the story of the Democratic Party through the years.

3. But if you look at the two most urgent questions before the American people today, I think the Humphrey-Muskie team can do the best job--turning the arms race around--bringing peace and security to our people here at home.

4. I want to emphasize this: the Humphrey-Muskie team. When I am president, I will ask Ed Muskie to assume principal responsibility for all Federal activities dealing with our cities. This will be his domain and his major job. And there is no more qualified man in America to tackle this problem.

5. I selected Ed Muskie for Vice President because he was, in my opinion, the man most qualified to succeed to the Presidency if that became necessary. Here, again, the element of the people's trust is relevant: both Mr. Nixon and I have said that our most important decision in the campaign was our choice of Vice Presidential running mates.

The people understand this--they know how frequently Vice Presidents have been called upon to assume the Presidency. In these! perilous times, there could be no more crucial decision than picking a Vice Presidential running mate.

Mr. Nixon--after consulting with Strom Thurmond--picked Governor Spiro Agnew.

I selected Ed Muskie.

And I think that says alot to the American people about who they can trust to lead America forward in the next four years.

Humphrey closing:

"Because it is right . . ." That will be our guiding principle in the years ahead--just as it has guided the work of Democratic Presidents in past years.

America is the greatest country in the world--it is a nation we all love--we are a people of great compassion, great ability, great potential for future greatness.

Ed Muskie and I have unbounded faith in the decency and courage of the American people.

Our Administration will be devoted to calling forth that greatness and realizing the full potential of this nation.

Appeal for funds--

Sunday TV show

A Note on the Roles:

HHH kicks off and finishes. He is the populist. He is low-key, modest.

Muskie is secondary, but has a chance to speak at length while HHH listens attentively. He should not be a straight-man -- rather, a competent aide who knows his stuff.

Smith should express some of the most common of Nixon's generalities (very important) so that HHH and Muskie can knock them down.

We don't want to look as if we've slyly loaded the deck against Nixon. We're telling it like it is.

TV BROADCAST

(Picks up after Democratic film)

HHH: ...Yes, because it is right.

And because the Democratic party has always served the people and drawn its strength from them, Ed Muskie and I feel it is particularly important that you know where we stand this year.

We have asked Howard K. Smith (?) to join us today for an informal talk about the issues as we see them...about the campaign...about the nation and where we go from here.

I think the decision you have to make as you step in to the voting booth boils down to this:

Whom can you trust?

Whom can you trust to find peace in Vietnam without any unnecessary danger or loss of life?

Whom can you trust to give America peace at home? And I don't mean the peace of an armed camp...but real harmony and unity.

Two weeks ago I spoke to the nation about my plans to end the war in Vietnam...about how I would stop the bombing and how I would hope to bring our troops home. If the American people are voting on anything in this election, it is that crucial issue. I felt an obligation to make my position perfectly clear.

We know that in Vietnam, Mr. Wallace is willing to risk a major war and thousands more Americans being killed. And he selected as his running-mate a man who said he would "bomb the North Vietnamese back to the stone age." But Mr. Nixon won't even tell us that much. He refuses to trust the American people -- as I have done -- and he talks about having a "secret plan" for peace.

I think it is urgently important that we find out that "secret plan."

At the Miami Convention, Mr. Nixon told a secret meeting of his supporters that in order to make negotiations work, "We could put the Middle East on the fire. And you could put Eastern Europe on the fire. And you could put trade on the fire. And you could put the power bombs on the fire."

The power bombs. That means nuclear weapons. It would almost surely mean nuclear war.

I wonder whether we can trust a man who will talk peace . . . a vague, unspecified peace . . in public, and who will talk war in private.

Mr. Nixon's whole record on foreign policy shows a kind of recklessness about the use of military power . . . a preference for a weapon instead of a word.

Then there is arms control.

I have believed in this for years. And I think that I've been proved right. I supported the banning of nuclear tests in the air years before a treaty was signed to do just that.

I knew we had to take the radioactive poisons out of the air -- poisons that have crippled more than 80,000 children born since testing began.

Mr. Nixon called the proposal for a test-ban a cruel hoax and catastrophic nonsense.

This year, every thoughtful American is supporting the treaty that will keep nuclear weapons from spreading around the world. And more than 80 nations have already signed it.

But Mr. Nixon asked that ratification of the treaty be delayed, and saw to it that the Senate wouldn't act on it until next year . . . even though by then it may be too late.

I think he is dangerously short-sighted.

He says he is worried about Castro and Nasser. But he won't act to keep them from getting nuclear weapons.

It is even harder to understand Mr. Nixon's attitude on stopping the strategic arms race. He has laid down conditions for negotiating on this vital matter that cannot be met, and would only take us into a new ... and more deadly...round in the arms race.

The line is narrow, today, between life and nuclear death. I think that before we trust a man to be President, we need to know that he understands this. And Mr. Nixon doesn't seem to.

As for peace here at home, I have addressed you on television about crime and law enforcement. I laid out an action plan -- Muriel said it was so detailed it almost put her to sleep -- to deal with the very real problem of crime and safety in our neighborhoods.

That is a problem we can handle if we are willing to use the resources to bring our police forces out of the 1930's and equip them for the 1970's.

Here again, Mr. Nixon has been talking law and order and quoting ~~crime statistics~~, but he hasn't offered a program to deal with the problem. He said, "we want law and order, and I'm going to give it to you." But I just don't think that's good enough . . . when he doesn't say how.

He and Mr. Wallace aren't trying to solve the problem of order. They are trying to frighten you into voting for them. I don't think they're going to fool you.

Now peace here at home is going to require more than better police. There is a lot to it that we don't ordinarily think about.

Take pollution, for example. Air pollution costs us about \$230 a year per family a year in everything from extra cleaning bills to sickness, and yet we've only begun to do something about it.

Or take the question of local and state governments, and their relationship to Washington. Those are the governments that have most to do with our daily lives -- that collect the garbage, provide the police, rebuild the cities and keep up the highways. And yet many of them aren't able to meet their responsibilities adequately. They need to be reformed.

This is one of the reasons why I asked Ed Muskie to run as my Vice Presidential candidate. He has a lot of practical experience in both these areas -- and many others. He can be a leader -- not just a fifth wheel, waiting around in case something happens to me.

MUSKIE: Of course there's the whole question of the economy, too. (Economic growth. What it means to a family. Republican record not good. Greenspan on more unemployment. I think this is about the worst and most dangerous thing that could happen to our cities right now. Job training.)

HHH: And it need not happen. We can have a job for everybody, etc., without inflation, etc.

SMITH: Nevertheless, gentlemen, Mr. Nixon keeps telling his audiences that it's time for new leadership. How do you deal with that?

HHH: Well, the leadership will be new, no matter who is elected. It is the quality of the new leadership . . . what they intend to do . . . whether the people can trust them that counts. There's an awful lot of talent in this country . . . not just in the Democratic Party. And I'm going to call on the very best people in America. We can't get along with any ^{thing less} ~~rightists~~. That's another reason why I asked Ed Muskie to run. He can supply leadership -- as Vice president . . . and as President if he must. I feel pretty hale and hearty today, but the fact remains that a lot of Vice Presidents have become ^{in this century} ~~in this century~~ President because a President died ~~in this century~~.

And when I look at the man Mr. Nixon chose to be his running mate, I feel more than ever that I've done very well by the American people with my choice of Ed Muskie.

SMITH: To go back for just a moment to the question of Vietnam. Mr. Nixon points out that General Eisenhower said he "would go to Korea" ... and not much else in 1952, and that therefore he, Nixon, is not obligated to tip his hand. Do you think that is a legitimate position?

MUSKIE: I don't. You have to remember that Dwight Eisenhower was an experienced general. ~~We~~ He had had a great deal of diplomatic experience in Europe after the war. He was a man whose credentials as a peace-maker were proven. And Mr. Nixon doesn't have any of those qualities.

I don't say Mr. Nixon can't bring peace. All I say is that he ought to let the American people know how he plans to do it before he gets us in any deeper.

SMITH: I understand a lot of people who normally vote Democratic may vote for Mr. Wallace this year. What do you have to say to those people?

HHH: Yes, there is some dissatisfaction in the country among traditionally Democratic voters. (populist remarks) But there is a big difference between being dissatisfied, and voting for Republican recession (etc.).

Mr. Wallace is not offering answers. He is offering a crying towel. And that is just not good enough at a time like this. We need leadership.

MUSKIE: Let me put in a plug here for education. I know it is something you've been concerned about all your life (looks at HHH), and I think that if I had to pick the one area of domestic policy where the decision will matter most this year, it is in education.

(Statistics in Nixon, Alabama)

(Muskie then makes the case in some detail, compares records. HHH listens attentively to reveal that he can listen, absorb, as well as talk. Muskie reveals self to be knowledgeable in a new area.)

HHH: And there's health, too. This is something we've put a lot of effort into over the last few years, and it is paying off.

I read just the other day that we expect to have a chemical control for most kinds of cancer within five years. Anybody who has had cancer in their family knows what that means. And it is almost entirely because of public programs.

Medicare, of course, has already helped millions and millions of older people -- not to mention their children who are now relieved of their parents' medical bills. The Republicans fought Medicare tooth and nail, and as far as I know, Mr. Nixon is still against it.

And before Mr. Wallace starts throwing briefcases into the Potomac, he had better ask the American people whether they want their programs stopped in these areas.

As you point out Ed, we mean to give every American child a chance to a full education. I think the same must apply in health, especially in the pre-school years.

There are children growing up in the United States today permanently disfigured or retarded because of poor diets or inadequate medical care. That doesn't need to happen, and I mean to see that it doesn't happen any longer.

SMITH: (this is the last few minutes).

Before we close off, I would just like to ask you about the campaign itself. Mr. Nixon is running a highly organized and very well financed campaign. He speaks of a saturation campaign from here on out, and he's bought a lot of television time. Do you think you can win it on the issues despite that?

HHH: Yes, absolutely. There are a lot more voters in America than there are dollars in Mr. Nixon's advertising budget. And they're pretty careful shoppers. They won't buy a car without looking under the hood, and I don't think they will buy a candidate until they know where he stands and what kind of a man he is.

That business of trust is awfully important in an election. People don't demand that their Presidents be kings of gods. They don't even expect them to be right all the time. But they do want to know that they can trust their leadership to act in their interest.

I've always trusted the judgment of the American people, and also their decency. And I think they know they can trust the Democrats ... that they can trust me and Ed Muskie. They can trust us not only to do what we think is in the best interests of the nation ... but to work with them ... to listen to them ... to let them know what's going on and why.

That's what I mean by an Open Presidency.

Suggest: Add peroration on choice --- U.S. greatness, then end, cut to O'Brien

Now let me just add this. We may not have much money, but we're getting a lot of help.

The student coalition is going to mobilize a million students to ring doorbells, ~~and~~ etc. in this last two weeks of the campaign.

(Mention Cater's project "WE Care")

And let me just read you a passage from a little girl in Maryland. This is her press release. She wrote it: (Excerpts from Wattenburg release.)

And you know, she's already collected over \$200 for our campaign. Here are some of the things they've been ~~making~~ (holds up posters, bumper stickers, etc.)

With that kind of support at the grass roots, I do think we can win this one. It shows that people care a great deal about their country and who leads it.

SMITH: I see that our time is up ...

HHH: Let me only add that that offer to the Republican candidate is still open. I think the American people have a right to know who he is and what he stands for before they vote. And if he doesn't give them that chance, I think he has no chance of winning.

###

In two weeks you will vote for President of the United States.

This year -- as in all Presidential elections -- this decision can have the most direct effect on your lives ... the lives of your family ... the lives of people everywhere.

You must judge among the three candidates for this office.

have a right to see the candidates to
You ~~can do this best if you see them~~ ... listen to them ...

to judge them

^ ... as their personalities and ideas are tested in direct,

fact-to-face debate.

The candidates have an obligation to test themselves in open debate.

Your vote for President is too important to you... too important to others ... to rely upon impressions conveyed by the stage-managed speech, or the contrived and rehearsed question and answer session, before a hand-picked studio audience.

You should not have to settle for that kind of campaigning.

That is why the issue of trust is so crucial to your decision.

PAUSE. . .

For the past generation the American people have turned to the Democrats to tackle -- and to solve -- the toughest and most urgent problems before this nation.

The Democrats -- supported by millions of Republicans and Independents -- have built this nation.

Tonight -- on film -- Senator Muskie and I want to
Capture this Democratic heritage... this Compact of Trust between
~~recall this proud Democratic heritage.~~
the people and their leaders.

Then Senator Muskie and I want to tell you how we will extend this heritage into the 1970's -- as your President and Vice President.

In two weeks you will vote for President of the United States.

This year--as in all Presidential elections--this decision can have the most direct effect on your lives. . . the lives of your family . . . the lives of people everywhere.

You must judge among the three ~~xxx~~ candidates for this office.

You can do this best if you ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ see them. . . listen to them . . . as their personalities and ideas are tested in direct, face-to-face debate.

Your vote for President is too important to you. . . too important to others. . . to rely upon impressions conveyed by the stage-managed speech, or the contrived and rehearsed question and answer session, before a hand-picked studio audience.

You should not have to settle for that kind of campaigning.

You want a real debate among the candidates. . . on live TV . . . unrehearsed. . . with questions by the working press--not a carefully screened and pre-selected panel.

During the primaries I repeatedly said I would
debate
~~xxxx~~ the Republican nominee--Mr. Nixon said the same thing when challenged to debate by Governor Rockefeller.

3
4
27
making life or death decisions for each and every one of us.

the issue of trust is so
That is why ~~these debates are so crucial to this~~
~~campaign~~ *crucial to your decision.*
~~campaign -- that is why I have challenged Mr. Nixon to~~
~~appear with me next Sunday night.~~

Every American awaits his answer.

PAUSE.

For the past generation the American people have
turned to the Democrats to tackle -- and to solve -- the
toughest and most urgent problems before this nation.

The Democrats -- supported by millions of Republicans
and Independents -- have built this nation.

Tonight -- on film -- Senator Muskie and I want to
recall this proud Democratic heritage.

Then Senator Muskie and I want to tell you how we

41
-3-

we will extend this heritage into the 1970's -- as your
President and Vice President.

The advertising theme of "America is the greatest country in the world" could easily be woven throughout the affirmative message.

Concept of Humphrey-Muskie-Moderator Conversation

The conversation would build on the closing line of the Democratic film--". . . because it is right. . . ." This necessarily ~~xxxxxx~~ establishes a conversation that is primarily, although not exclusively, constructive, forward-looking, affirmative. "Because it is right. . . ." the Humphrey-Muskie Administration will move forward to tackle the critical issues of our time--just as Democratic ~~and the Democratic Party~~ Presidents have always done.

Supportive of the ". . . because it is right. . . ." theme would be the concept of trusting Humphrey-Muskie to get the job done, which, in turn, would be ~~xxxxxx~~ buttressed by specific evidences of why Nixon-Agnew and Wallace-LeMay cannot be trusted.

Stressed within the affirmative presentation would be two principal areas (1) opportunities for turning the arms race ~~xxxxxx~~ around and the grave dangers of not ~~mx~~ turning it around, (2) economic and social progress under the Democrats and how this would be jeopardized by either of the other tickets.

The social and economic message would be translated into individual, family terms--not gross data like the GNP, rate of unemployment, etc.

2/

Although some anti-Nixon and anti-Wallace material would be used--indeed, it is essential in making the case--it would be factual, specific, tied to issues--not personalities, and delivered in a low-key, balanced, and reserved tone. ~~xxxx~~ Stridency, name-calling, etc. must be avoided at all costs.

We should be shooting for a serious tone, similar to the previous two stand-up speeches, but more spontaneous and revealing of the candidates' abilities to think sensibly about difficult subjects, with vision, understanding, and strength of purpose.

Several ~~xxxxxx~~ additional points! Humphrey should listen a good deal to ~~Mr~~ Muskie talk on subjects within his expertise, particularly cities and his line of the people trusting one another. Humphrey might want ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ specifically to ~~say~~ state his intentions of giving Muskie major substantive responsibility in the domestic field, especially in implementing the Marshall Plan for the Cities. This might even turn into the news lead of the show.

Finally, we should decide whether the show is to be used for re-issuing challenges to debate separately with Nixon ~~xx~~ and Wallace. This might be the closer--it would wind things up on a note of strength--and it would surely boost the contributions.

The fund raising pitch, in my opinion, should be not be made by O'Brien -- but someone like E.G. Marshall. How about a woman?

Following the Democratic film:

Humphrey:

"Because ~~if~~ it is right. . ." That sums up the message of the Democratic Party and the men who have led the party.

"Because it is right. . ." we have built schools, cared for the elderly, kept our economy booming, and brought unprecedented prosperity to ~~this country~~ ^{defend this country, America}.

And, "because it is right. . ." we must press ^{now} forward until every American enjoys his full share of this prosperity. . . these opportunities. Not at anyone's ^{else's} expense--it must never ~~have~~ ^{be} be taking from one man to give to another. ^{be} It must--and it will-- ^{be} be a matter of ~~be~~ moving this country forward so that all will be full participants in this remarkable society ~~we~~ have built. . . so that all of us may live in peace.

^{This is} That's the message Ed Muskie and I have taken to the people in this campaign. ~~That's the issue we want to talk with you about this evening.~~

^{This} That will be the overriding objective of the Humphrey-Muskie Administration--~~that is~~ ^{this has been to} the message of the Democratic Party in 1968, ~~is~~ just as it was in 1932 when Franklin Roosevelt rallied America in the depths

4/

of the great depression.

This is
~~That's~~ what Ed Muskie and I want to talk with
you about this evening.

in this discussion
Joining us is the distinguished TV commentator and
journalist, Howard K. Smith.

Smith:

Mr. Vice President, Senator Muskie, you have been campaigning for six weeks. ~~Mx~~ You have criss-crossed the country several times. What are your impressions of this election? What are the American people looking for in this election? What's going to decide the election?

Muskie:

1. The election is definitely un-decided at this point--many ~~undecided~~ undecided voters--Nixon off to early lead--but as polls have lately revealed, Democrats are on the strong up-swing--Nixon has stabilized--Wallace losing strength.

2. People know ~~there's~~ country is faced with serious problems--Vietnam, here at home. But people not assuming this year that simple change will solve these problems. People want to know how each ticket will deal with problems. That's a major factor in our favor: Democrats have given specific plans--others have talked in generalities if they have talked at all.

5/

It all

3. ~~This~~ boils down to this: Who can the people trust to lead America in the next four years? How this question is answered will decide the election.

~~Smith:~~

Humphrey:

1. That's why the debates are so important. Even if it means taking risks.

2. All candidates put ~~their~~ concern for country ahead of personal fortunes--that's why I find it so hard to understand why ~~waxxxxxxxx~~ Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace haven't ~~any~~ been willing to debate the issues.

3. That's why I believe in the end, the Democrats will win--because we haven't taken the people for granted--because we tried to give specific answers--even if it ~~has~~ cost us votes *from time to time*.

Smith:

Gentleman, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ some people say the war in Vietnam is the central issue of the campaign; ~~the~~ others say it is a growing concern for law and order in our society. What do you believe the central substantive issue to be?

6/

Humphrey:

1. Without a doubt, great concern for Vietnam and law and order. And I have ~~xxxxxxxix~~ spoken specifically on both these issues on national television. I have laid down my plans for ending the ~~xxxxix~~ war in Vietnam and for building a society where every family can be safe from violence and lawlessness. Not slogans, but specifics, etc.

2. These issues are, in my opinion, only the top of the iceberg. Basic concerns of the people go much deeper--and ~~xxxxxxx~~ you must look to these deeper concerns to find the real issues.

3. There are two deeper issues: (a) How can we build a more peaceful world--for my children and grandchildren? This brings us directly to the nuclear threat and the ~~xxxxxxx~~ urgent necessity of turning the arms ~~xxxxx~~ race around. (b) How can we build a more peaceful society here at home--and this includes more than just reducing crime and violence. Education for my children. . . elementary school through college or advanced training. Jobs. . . will I have a secure and challenging job. . . can we avoid ~~xxxx~~ recessions that will limit my opportunities and the opportunities for my children/ Cities. . . can we make our cities pleasant and ~~xxxxx~~ safe places to live--for everyone, not just the rich

7/

and well-to-do. Farms. . . can we build on the progress of the past eight years, really bring the ~~farm~~ farmers into the economic mainstream of this country, and also bring economic vitality to our non-farm rural areas.

4. When people focus on these deeper issues, the Democrats are going to benefit ~~the~~ greatly--because the Democrats have always been the party ~~that~~ that moved America ahead on these fronts.

Muskie:

1. When you talk in specifics, the people understand. ~~the~~ Education, for example.

--I doubt there is a local school system in America not now receiving substantial Federal assistance. We have tripled our ^{Federal} investment in education over the past eight Democratic years. And I can't think of a better way to spend our ^{Federal} ~~tax~~ tax dollars. . . it helps all our children get a better education . . . it helps keep local property taxes down.

^{college}
--Over 1 million students now receiving Federal financial help. Your sons and daughters are going to college because of this Democratic help.

--One of Mr. Nixon's last ~~acts~~ acts as Vice President in 1960 was to break a tie vote against \$1.5 billion Federal education bill--and the Republicans have never stopped fighting this legislation in Congress.

Humphrey:

1. Mr. Nixon has yet to say anything about education in this campaign.

2. Ed Muskie and I have laid out a detailed program of action--from pre-school Headstart classes for every child--right through college or advanced training.

3. And I've proposed that we ear-mark the Federal revenues coming from Federally-owned oil ~~secrets~~ shale deposits--a source of many billions of dollars--for educational purposes. Take our natural resources and transform them into human resources--that's the objective of the Humphrey-Muskie Administration.

Muskie:

1. We've set forth similar ~~also~~ plans for helping our older citizens.

2. Social Security--50 percent across the board increase over the next four ~~year~~ years. This will bring monthly the minimum payment for a couple up from \$82.50 to \$150. ~~Ad~~ And we propose making benefits inflation proof.

3. ~~Medica~~ Medicare--put the doctor bill part of Medicare on the same social insurance pre-payment basis as the hospital part. Pay for drug prescriptions.

4. Again, the Republican record is alarming.

--Mr. Nixon said Medicare would probably do more harm than good--93 percent of the Republicans in the House voted against Medicare when the Democrats ~~finally~~ passed it in 1965.

--~~Smf~~ And this year the Republican platform doesn't even mention Medicare.

Smith:

Doesn't all of this depend upon ~~xxxxxx~~ securing peace in the world?

Humphrey

1. Absolutely. We are going to end the war in Vietnam--honorably and sensibly. But we will end it.

2. Then we are going to push ahead with the most urgent business of our time--finding ways to end the arms race. ~~xxxxxx~~ We must halt the arms race before the arms race halts humanity.

3. The next urgent step is to ratify the treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Mr. Nixon has recommended delay--this is a most dangerous and irresponsible recommendation.

4. Then, of course, we have General LeMay--the man who proposed bombing North Vietnam back into the Stone Age. This kind of loose talk could ~~xxxxxx~~ literally ignite the kind of nuclear holocaust from which there

10/

would be no survival for anyone.

Muskie:

Let me mention one other factor on which all these plans for the future ultimately depend--a growing and expanding economy.

1. The Republicans produced three recessions during their eight years in power in the 1950's.

~~Americans~~

Most people forget how serious this had become by 1960--even ~~xxxx~~ the Soviets were boasting they would bury us--the United States had one of the slowest growth rates of any ~~xxxx~~ industrialized country.

2. Today the American economy is the marvel of the world--it has climbed steadily upward for 92 straight months--the longest sustained period of economic growth in our history.

3. The average American family of four can live as well in 1968 as it did in 1960 and still have enough left over to ~~xxxxxx~~ buy a new car out of its 1968 income--or pay for a year in college--without dipping into savings. And that's after inflation has been taken into account.

4. Mr. Nixon's ~~xxxx~~ economic advisor ~~xxxxxxx~~ recently said a little more unemployment would be good for the economy. A little more unemployment. . . does he mean your job? Whose job is he willing to sacrifice?

11/

Smith:

The problems we see in country have been with us for a long time/... Why do you think the Humphrey-Muskie team will be able to solve them?

Humphrey:

1. No responsible candidate can state categorically that he and his administration will "solve" all the problems faced by the United States. And the American people ~~wix~~ would never believe him if he did.

2. We can, however, make real progress toward solving them. . . and that has been the story of the Democratic Party through the years.

3. But if you look at the two most urgent questions before the American people today, I think the Humphrey-Muskie team can do the best job--turning the arms race around--bringing peace and security to our people here at home.

4. I want to emphasize this: the Humphrey-Muskie team. When I am President, I will ask Ed Muskie to assume principal responsibility for all Federal activities dealing with our cities. This will be his domain~~x~~ and his major job. And there is no more qualified man in America to tackle this problem.

11-A/

5. I selected Ed Muskie for Vice President because he was, in my ~~ix~~ opinion, the man most qualified to succeed to the Presidency if that became necessary. Here, again, the element of the people's trust is relevant: both Mr, Nixon and I have said that our most important decision in the campaign was our choice ~~for~~ of Vice Presidential running mates.

~~xMrxxNixonxxxxxxNixonxx~~

The people understand ~~that~~ this--~~xxxxxx~~ they know how frequently Vice Presidents have been called upon to ~~xxxxxx~~ assume the Presidency. In these! perilous times, there could be no more crucial decision than picking a Vice Presidential running mate.

Mr. Nixon--after consulting with Strom Thurmond--picked ~~MrxxNixon~~ Gov. Spiro Agnew.

I selected Ed ~~Ex~~ Muskie.

And I think that says alot ~~about~~ to the American people about ~~whi~~ who they can trust to lead American forward in the next four years.

12/

Humphrey closing:

"Because it is right. . ." That will be our guiding principle in the years ahead--just as it has guided the work of Democratic Presidents in past years.

America~~x~~ is the greatest country in the world--
it is a nation we all love--^{we are}~~ixix~~ a people of great compassion, great ability, great potential for future greatness.

~~xixix~~ Ed Muskie and I have unbounded faith in the decency and courage of the American people.

Our Administration will be devoted to calling forth that greatness and realizing the full potential of this nation.

Appeal for funds-- ~~Could we get Joan Kennedy?~~

TV - SUNDAY, 10-20-68
Draft #1

The Vice President:

These are dangerous times ... both at home and abroad. We are faced now with decisions that will mean war ... or peace ... that will mean continued unrest here at home ... or a new reconciliation among our people ... that will mean social and economic stagnation ... or a renewed determination to move this nation forward.

Your vote for President on November 5 -- more than any other single act you can take -- will decide how America will deal with these challenges.

No one man can pretend to have all the answers.
No one man can act alone.

But there still rests with one man ... your President ... the awesome responsibility for our nation's course in time of peril.

Your decision for President will be crucial -- not only to you and your family but for all future generations of Americans.

You must judge among the three candidates for President.

But you can do this only if you see them ... listen to them ... as their personalities and ideas are tested in the direct confrontation of face-to-face debate.

Your decision for President is too important -- especially this year -- to rely upon the stage-managed speech ... or the contrived and rehearsed question and answer session ... clever gimmicks made possible by a gigantic advertising budget.

You -- the American people -- are too intelligent to settle for that kind of campaigning. You want a real debate ... among the candidates ... on live TV ... unrehearsed ... with questions asked by the working press ... not a carefully screened and pre-selected panel.

That is why I proposed a debate among the candidates for this evening. I believe that out of this direct confrontation would come the answer to Senator Muskie's question: "Who can you trust to lead this nation for the next four years?"

There is an even larger reason for these debates. It was one put by a candidate for President, who later wrote: "I believe the strongest argument for debates is that they make candidates put on a better campaign with the result that the man who wins becomes a better President."

Richard Nixon wrote these words ... words he does not choose to live by in this campaign.

Mr. Nixon has said he would not participate in a three-way debate. I therefore challenge Mr. Nixon tonight -- before the American people -- to meet me next Sunday evening for a two-way debate.

Again, as this week, I stand ready to purchase the hour of TV time that is required ~~p-~~ with money from the thousands of Americans who have sent contributions to make these debates possible.

If Mr. Nixon refuses this invitation -- one offered on precisely his terms ... the American people can draw their own conclusions about his capacity to shoulder the awesome burden of the Presidency itself.

In two weeks the campaign will end. The American people will have to step into the voting booth to choose the man to lead them for the next four years.

And as he takes the oath of office on January 20, 1969, it will ~~then~~ be only a question of his principles, his ideals, his courage, and his vision. The confetti and the balloons will be gone. The advertising budgets will have been spent.

He will stand alone -- on his own two feet -- and begin

making life or death decisions for each and every one of us.

That is why these debates are so crucial to this campaign -- that is why I have challenged Mr. Nixon to appear with me next Sunday night.

Every American awaits his answer.

PAUSE.

For the past generation the American people have turned to the Democrats to tackle -- and to solve -- the toughest and most urgent problems before this nation.

The Democrats -- supported by millions of Republicans and Independents -- have built this nation.

Tonight -- on film -- Senator Muskie and I want to recall this proud Democratic heritage.

Then Senator Muskie and I want to tell you how we

-6-

we will extend this heritage into the 1970's -- as your
President and Vice President.

Humphrey:

(When I accepted the nomination of the Democratic Party for President of the United States, I knew this would not be an easy campaign. ~~It is a very~~

~~are difficult and challenging times~~

(These are dangerous times . . . both at home and abroad. ~~It is~~ We are faced now with decisions that will mean war . . . or peace . . . that will mean continued unrest here at home . . . or a new reconciliation ^{among our people} . . . that will mean social and economic stagnation. . . or a renewed determination to move this nation forward.

Your vote for President on November 5 ~~will~~--more than any other single act you can take --will decide ~~Your vote will decide~~ how America will deal with these challenges . . . ~~xxxx whether America has the purpose and courage to~~ ~~seize these opportunities.~~

^{pretend to} No one man can ^{pretend to} have all the answers. ~~xxxxxxx~~ . . . ~~and~~ no one man can act alone.

But there still rests with one man . . . your President. . . the awesome responsibility for our nation's course in time of peril . . . ~~whether threat of nuclear war . . .~~ ~~or unrest here at home.~~

^{will be} ~~by~~ your decision for President ~~is~~ crucial--not only to you and ~~for~~ your family but for all future generations

of Americans.

You must judge among the ~~many candidates~~ three candidates for ~~President~~ President.

But you can do this only if you see them. . . listen to them . . . as their personalities and ideas are tested in ~~the~~ the direct confrontation of face-to-face debate.

Your decision for President is too important--especially this year--to rely upon the stage-managed speech. . . or the contrived and rehearsed question and answer session. . . clever gimmicks made possible by a gigantic advertising budget.

~~The~~ You--the American people--are too intelligent to settle for that kind of campaigning. You want a real debate. . . among the candidates. . . on live TV. . . unrehearsed. . . with questions asked by the working press. . . not a carefully screened and pre-selected panel.

That is ^{why} ~~what~~ I proposed ^{a debate among the candidates} ~~to the American people~~ ^{I believe that} for this evening--~~for~~ out of this ^{direct} ~~kind of~~ confrontation would come the answer to Senator Muskie's question?

" Who can you trust to lead this nation for ~~the~~ the next four years? "

^{But} ~~There~~ there is an even larger reason for these debates. ^{and} It was put by a candidate for President, who later wrote:

3/

"I believe the strongest argument for debates is that they make candidates put on a better campaign with the result that the man who wins becomes a better President."

Richard Nixon wrote those words. . . words he does not choose to live by in this campaign.

Mr. Nixon has said he would not participate in a three-way debate. I therefore challenge Mr. Nixon tonight--before the American people--to meet me next Sunday evening ~~xxxxx~~ for a two-way debate.

Again, as this ~~xxxxx~~ week, I stand ready to purchase the hour of TV time ~~xxxxxx~~ that is required--with ^{money} ~~considerable~~ help from ^{the} thousands of Americans who have sent contributions to make these debates possible.

If Mr. Nixon refuses ^{this invitation, . . . one offered on precisely his terms . . .} ~~again~~ the ~~xx~~ American people can draw their own conclusions about his capacity to shoulder the awesome burden of the Presidency itself.

In two weeks the campaign will end. The confetti and the balloons will be gone. The advertising budgets will have been spent. ~~and~~ The American people will have

^{to step into the voting booth to choose}
chosen the man to lead them for the next four years--
and as he takes the oath of office on January 20, 1969,
^{then} it will be only a question of his principles, his ideals, his courage, and his vision.

~~xxxxxxwillxxxxxxplacextoxixidxxxxx~~ He will have to stand alone--on his own two feet--and ^{begin making} ~~xxxxxx make~~ ~~xxxxxx that will xxxxxx~~ life or death decisions of for

(Every American awaits his answer.

each and every one of us.

That is why these debates are so crucial to this campaign.

that is why I have ~~again~~ challenged Mr. Nixon to appear with me next Sunday night.

(Pause)

(Pause)

(For the past generation the American people have turned to the Democrats to tackle--and to solve-- the toughest ~~xxx~~ and most urgent problems before ~~at~~ this nation.

~~Roosevelt. . . Truman . . . Kennedy. . . Johnson. . . that is our Democratic heritage.~~

The Democrats--supported by millions of Republicans and Independents--have built this nation.

Tonight--on film--Senator Muskie and I want to recall this proud ~~xxx~~ Democratic heritage.

Then Senator Muskie and I want to tell you how --
~~we as President and Vice President~~ we will ~~maintain~~
extend this heritage into the 1970's --as ^{you} President and Vice President.

Draft: TV Hour 10/20/68

Hunter 10/15/68

Muskie: serious, quiet, outraged, walks onto set with three podiums, as much like 1960 as possible.

There is one issue in this election that is more important than all the others: whom can you trust to be President of the United States?²

That is the story of this campaign; and that is the story of our efforts to have debates on television among all the candidates: whom can you trust?

Last week, Vice-President Humphrey invited Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace to join him, tonight, in this studio, for the first of three television debates on the crucial questions facing America now. . .and in the years ahead.

But Hubert Humphrey came alone, tonight.~~xxxx~~
Neither of the other candidates thought it worth his while to subject his views . . .and his programs. . .to the scrutiny of the television cameras. . .to face independent questioning by leading American newsmen. . .and to stand up before you, the American people.

Eight years ago, John Kennedy and Richard Nixon met here before our entire nation. But tonight, Richard Nixon and George Wallace would not come. So Hubert Humphrey will talk with you. . .and with me. . .about the issues. . .and about the future.

--a man whom I trust --

I am proud to join with him/for this hour-long Report to the American People.

Humphrey: enters and stands behind podium marked "HHH", pauses, then looks up and into camera.

~~the~~

When I accepted the nomination of the Democratic Party for President of the United States, I knew this would not be an easy campaign.

I knew that there would be hecklers. . .and extremists of the left and of the right. . .men who are committed, if they can, to destroy our freedoms and take away our rights.

But I accepted the nomination. . .because of my faith in the fundamental decency of the American people . . .your sober judgment in times of great decision. . . and because I know the gravity of the issues now facing American.

These are dangerous times. . .both at home and abroad. We, the people of the United States. . .must make decisions that will mean war. . .or peace. . .that will mean continued divisions here at home. . .or a new reconciliation . . .and ~~continued human~~ ^{and economic} social progress.

For these reasons I believe. . .and have always believed . . .in the people's right to know. . .to know the issues. . .to know the men ~~would~~ ^{would} presume to ~~exceed~~ lead them. . .and to know what must be done to keep our nation great.

one
No/man can have all the answers. . .no one man can act alone.

But there still rests with one man. . .the President . . .the awesome responsibility for our nation's course in time of peril. . .~~with~~ ^{the} threat of nuclear war. . .or unrest right here at home.

You must judge among the men who would be President.

And to do so, you have a right to see them ~~here~~. . .to listen to them. . .and to form your own opinions.

The only ^{way} ~~that~~ that this can be effective. . .free of the big advertising budget. . .~~the~~ stage-managed speech. . .or the faked question and answer session. . . is to see all the candidates ^{... together} here ~~here~~. . .with no props. . . no gimmicks. . .between ourselves. . .and you.

No American should be required to vote the way Madison Avenue would have him vote. . .no American should be deprived of the free exercise of his judgment by the timidity of any candidate.

But there is a larger reason for these debates. It was put by a candidate for President, who later ~~was~~ ~~was~~ wrote: "I believe the strongest argument for debates is that they make candidates put on a better campaign with the result that the man who wins becomes a better President."

Those are the ~~words~~ words of Richard Nixon. But I would add that his year, only a man who will stand before the American people. . .present his ideas. . .and talk about the issues. . .can govern ^{after} ~~when~~ he is elected. ~~Re-elected~~ ~~President~~. ^{And} only such a man will merit our trust.

I hope that you agree with me. And after this evening's broadcast, I hope you will make yourselves heard. . .to demand that there be debates. . .that you . . .have a right to know.

*Jul Sunday
TV*

Ladies and gentlemen.

I'd like to read you a telegram we've just received from
Pat Paulson.

"Dear Ed:

Yes, I'd love to debate HHH but only on the condition
that Alfred E. Newman doesn't get equal time."

Let's see, I've got another telegram here.

"Dear Ed:

I'd like to debate HHH but only on the condition that Pat
Paulson doesn't get equal time.

Signed,

Alfred E. Newman"

And one more.

"Dear Ed:

I'd be glad to debate Alfred E. Newman.

Signed,

Richard Nixon"

Seriously, ladies and gentlemen, when Vice President Humphrey
arranged to take the time set aside for "Mission: Impossible" this
evening, we didn't realize that only one candidate would be willing
to face the American people in open debate.

It seemed obvious to us that Richard Nixon, who ^{had} ~~had~~ always
not
considered debating to be his strong suit, would/turn the American
people down.

^{But}
~~And~~, we might have gotten a hint from something he said not so
long ago. He explained that he lost the 1960 election because he
flunked debating.

~~But~~ I think he should repeat the course until he passes.

We only chose our presidents once every four years. The
problems of obtaining peace abroad and public safety at home make
this election particularly crucial. Being president in the next
four years is no job for a softie; it's going to take a man who faces
the hard problems and not one who ducks them.

Lots of us still have honest doubts as to/George Wallace, Richard
Nixon or Hubert Humphrey would be the best leader. ^{whether}

The 1960 debates persuaded us that John Kennedy had leadership
qualities that Richard Nixon lacked. If Richard Nixon and George Wallace
were here tonight, you could see for yourself which man demonstrated the
most strength of character, the best capacity to lead.

But they turned ~~you~~ down. They turned ~~you~~ down without any
satisfactory explanation. They may lead you to believe, as I do, that
either they don't trust you or that they don't trust themselves when the
chips are down.

In either case, that ^{means they} ~~makes them~~ have no business in the White House.

*Sunday TV
show*

October 18, 1968

(1) Sign and Spoken Announcement

THE GREAT DEBATE OF '68

HUMPHREY

vs.

NIXON

vs.

WALLACE

(2) Opening by news commentator type:

Good evening, I am . No contest in the world is more important than that for the Presidency of the United States. The people of the United States choose the winner -- the man whom they trust to lead this great nation for the next four years.

Tonight was to be the night of the great debate. The three candidates, Hubert H. Humphrey, Richard M. Nixon, and George C. Wallace, meeting each other face to face to debate the issues of 1968, and giving you, the people, the chance to look, to listen, and then on Election Day to pass judgment, by your vote.

One candidate either did not trust you the people, or did not trust himself. Richard M. Nixon, defeated in

debate with John F. Kennedy in 1960, apparently does not have the courage to stand up to Hubert Humphrey.

In a book called "Six Crises" (flash picture of book) Richard Nixon wrote:

". . . joint TV appearances of candidates at the presidential level are here to stay, mainly because the people want them and the candidates have a responsibility to inform the public on their views before the widest possible audience."

The Republicans in Congress, clearly at Mr. Nixon's request, prevented legislation allowing the television networks to provide free television time for such debates. But the Federal Communication Commission has ruled that the candidates can purchase TV time for that purpose. Tonight's hour was purchased by Vice President Humphrey out of his very limited campaign funds so that Mr. Nixon would have no excuse for evading the direct confrontation and debate which he himself has admitted is a candidate's duty to the people.

Telegrams were sent to Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace on October , inviting them to be here tonight for the debate (show telegrams with close up). Mr.

Wallace accepted, provided Mr. Nixon also accepted. Mr. Nixon was not even courteous enough to reply.

This is the result (camera shows three rostrums, Humphrey, Nixon, Wallace, with HHH in place at his and the other two empty): Hubert H. Humphrey, Democratic nominee for President here and prepared to face his opponents, and both Nixon and Wallace as no-shows.

Senator Edmund Muskie, Democratic nominee for Vice President of the United States, is here with Mr. Humphrey tonight to tell you why Richard Nixon was afraid to debate (Muskie joins HHH).

(3) Muskie (pointing to Nixon empty rostrum)

Fear has been dominating this campaign. First Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace have been peddling fear from one end of this nation to the other; tonight Mr. Nixon himself gave way to his own fears -- fear he might lose the debate, fear he would be confronted with facts and realities which would expose the real Nixon. The man who, together with the great majority of the Republican Party in the Congress, has a long history of opposing all of the great modern measures of economic and social progress -- medicare, extending and increasing social security benefits, federal aid to education, the minimum wage.

(4) HHH joins in

Ed, you and I know the tough battles we fought in the Congress to bring these programs into being. Today, we have as a reality programs to care for the aged and the sick and to provide the opportunity for education to every child. We have added million people to our work force and reduced unemployment by millions since the time in 1961 when we took over from the Republicans and Mr. Nixon. In almost eight years there has been no economic recession.

But it is not just saying to America "You never had it so good." We can do better and will -- but the Nixons, the Strom Thurmonds, the Wallaces -- they ~~are committed to our yesterday, not to our ~~tomorrow~~ tomorrow, don't believe in the programs.~~ We know what they would do if elected. For eight years, 1953-1960, they did it -- three recessions, no progress, as many as eight million unemployed.

But we will not let Nixon escape a debate -- escape facing his record. I would like the people to see a little bit about where we Democrats have been and where we are going, and then talk with you and them about how all of us, you, I, and the people, are going to compel Mr. Nixon to confront me and confront the people so they can judge.

Secretary Freeman
Larry O'Brien
Memo to Ira K.

From John Stewart

This is very rough. It represents only the first submission from the writers and I have not had an opportunity to ~~xi~~ edit, condense, or sharpen.

At best it can serve as a check list--to note the issues which should be brought up in the post-film discussion.

Also, I have not had an opportunity to highlight the theme "America is the greatest country in the world--Don't let them destroy it."

I intend to do so in the next draft and also think through what visuals would be appropriate--because I think some could be used effectively if kept simple, e.g., charts of economic growth, etc.

The opening statements are in better shape--but still we're talking about a hurried first draft.

Opening Vice Presidential Statement

TV - SUNDAY, 10-20-68
Draft #1

The Vice President:

These are dangerous times ... both at home and abroad. We are faced now with decisions that will mean war ... or peace ... that will mean continued unrest here at home ... or a new reconciliation among our people ... that will mean social and economic stagnation ... or a renewed determination to move this nation forward.

Your vote for President on November 5 -- more than any other single act you can take -- will decide how America will deal with these challenges.

No one man can pretend to have all the answers.
No one man can act alone.

But there still rests with one man ... your President ... the awesome responsibility for our nation's course in time of peril.

~~Your decision for President will be crucial -- not only to you and your family but for all future generations of Americans.~~

You must judge among the three candidates for President.

But you can do this only if you see them ... listen to them ... as their personalities and ideas are tested in the direct confrontation of face-to-face debate.

Your decision for President is too important -- especially this year -- to rely upon the stage-managed speech ... or the contrived and rehearsed question and answer session ... clever gimmicks made possible by a gigantic advertising budget.

You -- the American people -- are too intelligent to settle for that kind of campaigning. You want a real debate ... among the candidates ... on live TV ... unrehearsed ... with questions asked by the working press ... not a carefully screened and pre-selected panel.

-3-

That is why I proposed a debate among the candidates for this evening. I believe that out of this direct confrontation would come the answer to Senator Muskie's question: "Who can you trust to lead this nation for the next four years?"

Again, as this week, I stand ready to purchase the hour of TV time that is required -- with money from the thousands of Americans who have sent contributions to make these debates possible.

If Mr. Nixon refuses this invitation -- one offered on precisely his terms ... the American people can draw their own conclusions about his capacity to shoulder the awesome burden of the Presidency itself.

A Note on the Roles:

HHH kicks off and finishes. He is the populist. He is low-key, modest.

Muskie is secondary, but has a chance to speak at length while HHH listens attentively. He should not be a straight-man -- rather, a competent aide who knows his stuff.

Smith should express some of the most common of Nixon's generalities (very important) so that HHH and Muskie can knock them down.

We don't want to look as if we've slyly loaded the deck against Nixon. We're telling it like it is.

TV BROADCAST

(Picks up after Democratic film)

HHH: ...Yes, because it is right.

And because the Democratic party has always served the people and drawn its strength from them, Ed Muskie and I feel it is particularly important that you know where we stand this year.

We have asked Howard K. Smith (?) to join us today for an informal talk about the issues as we see them...about the campaign...about the nation and where we go from here.

I think the decision you have to make as you step in to the voting booth boils down to this:

Whom can you trust?

Whom can you trust to find peace in Vietnam without any unnecessary danger or loss of life?

Whom can you trust to give America peace at home? And I don't mean the peace of an armed camp...but real harmony and unity.

Two weeks ago I spoke to the nation about my plans to end the war in Vietnam...about how I would stop the bombing and how I would hope to bring our troops home. If the American people are voting on anything in this election, it is that crucial issue. I felt an obligation to make my position perfectly clear.

We know that in Vietnam, Mr. Wallace is willing to risk a major war and thousands more Americans being killed. And he selected as his running-mate a man who said he would "bomb the North Vietnamese back to the stone age." But Mr. Nixon won't even tell us that much. He refuses to trust the American people -- as I have done -- and he talks about having a "secret plan" for peace.

I think it is urgently important that we find out that "secret plan."

At the Miami Convention, Mr. Nixon told a secret meeting of his supporters that in order to make negotiations work, "We could put the Middle East on the fire. And you could put Eastern Europe on the fire. And you could put trade on the fire. And you could put the power bombs on the fire."

The power bombs. That means nuclear weapons. It would almost surely mean nuclear war.

I wonder whether we can trust a man who will talk peace . . . a vague, unspecified peace . . in public, and who will talk war in private.

Mr. Nixon's whole record on foreign policy shows a kind of recklessness about the use of military power . . . a preference for a weapon instead of a word.

Then there is arms control.

I have believed in this for years. And I think that I've been proved right. I supported the banning of nuclear tests in the air years before a treaty was signed to do just that.

I knew we had to take the radioactive poisons out of the air -- poisons that have crippled more than 80,000 children born since testing began.

Mr. Nixon called the proposal for a test-ban a cruel hoax and catastrophic nonsense.

This year, every thoughtful American is supporting the treaty that will keep nuclear weapons from spreading around the world.

And more than 80 nations have already signed it.

But Mr. Nixon asked that ratification of the treaty be delayed, and saw to it that the Senate wouldn't act on it until next year . . . even though by then it may be too late.

I think he is dangerously short-sighted.

He says he is worried about Castro and Nasser. But he won't act to keep them from getting nuclear weapons.

It is even harder to understand Mr. Nixon's attitude on stopping the strategic arms race. He has laid down conditions for negotiating on this vital matter that cannot be met, and would only take us into a new ... and more deadly...round in the arms race.

The line is narrow, today, between life and nuclear death. I think that before we trust a man to be President, we need to know that he understands this. And Mr. Nixon doesn't seem to.

As for peace here at home, I have addressed you on television about crime and law enforcement. I laid out an action plan -- ~~Muriel~~ ~~said it was so detailed it almost put her to sleep~~ -- to deal with the very real problem of crime and safety in our neighborhoods.

That is a problem we can handle if we are willing to use the resources to bring our police forces out of the 1930's and equip them for the 1970's.

Here again, Mr. Nixon has been talking law and order ~~and quoting~~ ~~crime statistics~~, but he hasn't offered a program to deal with the problem. **L**He said, "we want law and order, and I'm going to give it to you." But I just don't think that's good enough . . . when he doesn't say how.

He and Mr. Wallace aren't trying to solve the problem of order. They are trying to frighten you into voting for them. I don't think they're going to fool you.

Now peace here at home is going to require more than better police. There is a lot to it that we don't ordinarily think about.

Take pollution, for example. Air pollution costs us about \$230 a year per family a year in everything from extra cleaning bills to sickness, and yet we've only begun to do something about it.

Or take the question of local and state governments, and their relationship to Washington. Those are the governments that have most to do with our daily lives -- that collect the garbage, provide the police, rebuild the cities and keep up the highways. And yet many of them aren't able to meet their responsibilities adequately. They need to be reformed.

This is one of the reasons why I asked Ed Muskie to run as my Vice Presidential candidate. He has a lot of practical experience in both these areas -- and many others. He can be a leader -- not just a fifth wheel, waiting around in case something happens to me.

SKIE:

Of course there's the whole question of the economy, too. (Economic growth. What it means to a family. Republican record not good. Greenspan on more unemployment. I think this is about the worst and most dangerous thing that could happen to our cities right now. Job training.)

HHH:

And it need not happen. We can have a job for everybody, etc., without inflation, etc.

SMITH:

Nevertheless, gentlemen, Mr. Nixon keeps telling his audiences that it's time for new leadership. How do you deal with that?

HHH:

Well, the leadership will be new, no matter who is elected. It is the quality of the new leadership . . . what they intend to do . . . whether the people can trust them that counts. There's an awful lot of talent in this country . . . not just in the Democratic Party. And I'm going to call on the very best people in America. We can't get along with any ~~thing less~~ ^{rightists}. That's another reason why I asked Ed Muskie to run. He can supply leadership -- as Vice president . . . and as President if he must. I feel pretty hale and hearty today, but the fact remains that a lot of Vice Presidents have become ^{in this century} President because a President died ~~in this century~~.

And when I look at the man Mr. Nixon chose to be his running mate, I feel more than ever that I've done very well by the American people with my choice of Ed Muskie.

SMITH: To go back for just a moment to the question of Vietnam. Mr. Nixon points out that General Eisenhower said he "would go to Korea" ... and not much else in 1952, and that therefore he, Nixon, is not obligated to tip his hand. Do you think that is a legitimate position?

MUSKIE: I don't. You have to remember that Dwight Eisenhower was an experienced general. ~~He~~ We had had a great deal of diplomatic experience in Europe after the war. He was a man whose credentials as a peace-maker were proven. And Mr. Nixon doesn't have any of those qualities.

I don't say Mr. Nixon can't bring peace. All I say is that he ought to let the American people know how he plans to do it before he gets us in any deeper.

SMITH: I understand a lot of people who normally vote Democratic may vote for Mr. Wallace this year. What do you have to say to those people?

HHH: Yes, there is some dissatisfaction in the country among traditionally Democratic voters. (populist remarks) But there is a big difference between being dissatisfied, and voting for Republican recession (etc.).

Mr. Wallace is not offering answers. He is offering a crying towel. And that is just not good enough at a time like this. We need leadership.

MUSKIE: Let me put in a plug here for education. I know it is something you've been concerned about all your life (looks at HHH), and I think that if I had to pick the one area of domestic policy where the decision will matter most this year, it is in education.

(Statistics on Nixon, Alabama)

(Muskie then makes the case in some detail, compares records. HHH listens attentively to reveal that he can listen, absorb, as well as talk. Muskie reveals self to be knowledgeable in a new area.)

HHH: And there's health, too. This is something we've put a lot of effort into over the last few years, and it is paying off.

I read just the other day that we ~~expect to~~ have a chemical control for most kinds of cancer within five years. Anybody who has had cancer in their family knows what that means. And it is almost entirely because of public programs.

Medicare, of course, has already helped millions and millions of older people -- not to mention their children who are now relieved of their parents' medical bills. The Republicans fought Medicare tooth and nail, and as far as I know, Mr. Nixon is still against it.

And before Mr. Wallace starts throwing briefcases into the Potomac, he had better ask the American people whether they want their programs stopped in these areas.

As you point out Ed, we mean to give every American child a chance to a full education. I think the same must apply in health, especially in the pre-school years.

There are children growing up in the United States today permanently disfigured or retarded because of poor diets or inadequate medical care. That doesn't need to happen, and I mean to see that it doesn't happen any longer.

SMITH: (this is the last few minutes).

Before we close off, I would just like to ask you about the campaign itself. Mr. Nixon is running a highly organized and very well financed campaign. He speaks of a saturation campaign from here on out, and he's bought a lot of television time. Do you think you can win it on the issues despite that?

HHH: Yes, absolutely. There are a lot more voters in America than there are dollars in Mr. Nixon's advertising budget. And they're pretty careful shoppers. They won't buy a car without looking under the hood, and I don't think they will buy a candidate until they know where he stands and what kind of a man he is.

That business of trust is awfully important in an election. People don't demand that their Presidents be kings or gods. They don't even expect them to be right all the time. But they do want to know that they can trust their leadership to act in their interest.

I've always trusted the judgment of the American people, and also their decency. And I think they know they can trust the Democrats ... that they can trust me and Ed Muskie. They can trust us not only to do what we think is in the best interests of the nation ... but to work with them ... to listen to them ... to let them know what's going on and why.

That's what I mean by an Open Presidency.

[Suggest: Add peroration on choice --- U.S. greatness, then end, cut to O'Brien]

Now let me just add this. We may not have much money, but we're getting a lot of help.

The student coalition is going to mobilize a million students to ring doorbells, ~~and~~ etc. in this last two weeks of the campaign.

(Mention Cater's project "WE Care")

And let me just read you a passage from a little girl in Maryland.

This is her press release. She wrote it: (Excerpts from Wattenburg release.)

* And you know, she's already collected over \$200 for our campaign. Here are some of the things they've been ~~making~~ (holds up posters, bumper stickers, etc.)

With that kind of support at the grass roots, I do think we can win this one. It shows that people care a great deal about their country and who leads it.

SMITH: I see that our time is up ...

HHH: Let me only add that that offer to the Republican candidate is still open. I think the American people have a right to know who he is and what he stands for before they vote. And if he doesn't give them that chance, I think he has no chance of winning.

###

Talking Lines for Humphrey-Muskie Conversation

1. What has this campaign been about? What have the American people been saying to the candidates? What have the candidates been saying to the American people?

What have we failed to do?

What issues have we failed to get across?

The issue of trust -- including both men and party.

Which party can you trust in this critical period of American history?

Which candidates can you trust to lead America for the next four years?

Many of the issues are complicated -- many people have other things to do than listen carefully to each candidate, etc. But a Presidential campaign, despite its faults and limitations, does eventually expose the respective candidates on such basic questions as trust.

And that is what has been happening in this campaign.

1. Mr. Nixon selected Governor Agnew as his running mate.
2. Mr. Nixon has refused to debate.
3. Mr. Nixon has stayed away from a detailed discussion of the issues.

4. Where he has discussed the issues, he has attempted to take both sides at the same time, e.g., the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

5. When he has proposed programs, most -- if not all -- either were first proposed by the Democrats or are already in operation. E.g., having fought Medicare, social security, Federal aid to education, etc., for years, Mr. Nixon has in the past 10 days issued statements which advocate such programs.

Who, then, can you trust to improve these programs?

The candidate and the party which has consistently opposed them -- or the candidate and the party which were the authors of the proposals in the first place -- fought for their passage -- and have now proposed many specific ways they can be improved.

Note: This opening segment devoted to trust and an attack on Nixon should not run much more than 5 - 7 minutes, if that long. Body of the program should be a give-and-take between the candidates over their administration, their vision of the future, their grasp of present difficulties and their ideas for overcoming them.

Overriding tone of discussion of future: frankness about our present difficulties, recognition that conquering these difficulties will not be easy, but confidence that America will make it safe. (Note: Since the Vice President used the airplane analogy last week, it might be wise not to use it again this week.)

Within this framework:

1. A Humphrey-Muskie Administration will be a new administration -- new people, new ideas, new style, etc.

-- massive talent search already underway.

-- over 30 task forces already at work; some, but not all, of their ideas have been set forth in the campaign.

-- unparalleled experience of candidates to run for Executive Branch.

-- major responsibilities envisioned for Vice President Muskie, including man charged with running Marshall Plan for the Cities, Chairman of the Domestic Policy Council, priority assignment to promote civil order, etc.

2. Change -- Change is the law of life -- of growth -- of hope. But what kind of change?

-- not change back to smugness and stuffed-shirts;

-- not change to racial antagonisms and setting group against group;

-- rather, constructive, improving change -- change which understands and takes into account the challenge of the future.

Challenge of the Future

1. Decisions made by the next Administration will have enormous impact on the future of America. This can be seen most clearly by examining the long-range influence of decisions made during the New Deal on American life.

2. As a people, we today have greater power to shape our future than any nation in history.

The economy is growing at such a pace that by the year 2000 economists forecast an average annual family income in 1968 prices of more than \$20,000.

Advances in science and technology will give us unparalleled ability to control our destiny, e.g., in genetics, application of nuclear energy, medicine, etc.

The avalanche of new inventions and technological advances we have been experiencing in the last few decades will undoubtedly continue and accelerate in the future. The development of the laser for multiple uses from industry to medicine -- the creation of new materials and fabrics, the operation of new kinds of transportation vehicles and systems, new sources of cheap power for all of society's needs, new medical techniques including mechanical aids and substitutes for human organs, the continued improvement in and new applications for the computer -- all these developments, and many more, will undoubtedly take place before the year 2000.

This theme -- human power -- contrasts sharply with contemporary alienation and feelings of inconsequence.

3. But the corollary of power to control our future is responsibility for what happens -- far greater than ever before. Poverty in an affluent society is more than an economic issue; it becomes a moral matter -- a question of choice and responsibility.

By the year 2000, leisure time for the average worker will be greatly increased. He will work shorter hours and have longer vacations. But, this does not say whether the quality of his life will be improved. It does not say whether his job will be interesting, or intellectually challenging -- and it does not reveal whether the added leisure will add meaning to his life, or will be a burden.

By the year 2000, our cities will have expanded until large urban concentrations will spread from Boston to Washington, Chicago to Pittsburgh, and San Diego to San Francisco, and these will likely contain over half of the country's population. We will have the technological knowledge and resources to insure that movement within these areas will be comfortable and swift, the air is clean, the water pure. We must make certain that the development of the land is planned so that there are open spaces remaining for recreation and esthetic values -- and cultural and entertainment opportunities must be widespread.

Having focused the issue in terms of choice and responsibility, the Failure of Nerve theme becomes appropriate.

-- At one point in its history, Athens stood on the verge of true greatness, an enormous breakthrough.

But, for reasons not fully understood, Athenians became pre-occupied with cults and, ultimately, the society deteriorated. This episode is referred to by classical scholars as the Failure of Nerve.

The analogy to the present situation is obvious. Fear is the cult. Wallace would lead back, Nixon would stand still; Humphrey would seize the opportunity and lead forward.

Future challenges call for significant re-structuring of institutions and traditions -- in a sense we live in a time of revolution -- a time where many fundamental assumptions which have controlled society are no longer accepted as assumptions, but actively challenged.

This is true in many countries -- in many social institutions and situations.

Our task is to work out new assumptions -- new institutions -- new traditions which meet the radically changed nature of our society -- or relationships among people.

This calls for vision, courage, relevance to the nature of our times, etc. These are qualities which have distinguished Democrats from Republicans and these are qualities which would be abundantly evident in a Humphrey-Muskie Administration.

Additional talking point for Humphrey-Muskie discussion.

1. Participation. In talking about the Humphrey-Muskie Administration, the themes of openess and popular participation in the processes of government ought to be stressed.

These are capulized in the concept of the Open Presidency.

--special emphasis ought to be given to seeking out and involving youth in the Humphrey-Muskie Administration--in the departments and agencies, in the White House, in the Executive Office of the President, on public boards and commissions--the criterion of youth will be stressed--also the criterion of women.

--you might want to say that after the election, you will ask the Student Coalition to serve as the principal recruiting mechanism to bring young people into the activities of the Humphrey-Muskie Administration.

2. Popular Participation in the Election--a strong plea for every person who supports the Humphrey-Muskie Administration to take personal responsibility for getting an extra two people to the polls on the election day.

--in the remaining week, there are many things that can be done--organize get-togethers in your neighborhood--canvass your black--telephone friends--call in on radio talk programs--write to your friends--write letters to the editors--paint signs and bumper stickers.

--Don't wait to be asked--just get to work--show the Republicans with 25 million dollars that the Democrats have 25 million people ready to work from now to election day.

--The Republicans can have their 25 million dollars--I'm putting my bets on the 25 million people who will respond to this appeal.



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