



news release

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE • PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION • 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037 • 202/333-8750

For release Thursday PM's
October 24, 1968

For Further Information:
Ev Munsey, Ext. 201
DC-717

V.P. Humphrey Pledges End of "Balance of Terror"

Los Angeles, Calif., October 24, 1968 -- Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey pledged today to reduce the "balance of terror" in American and Soviet relations.

In remarks to members of the South California clergy, Humphrey said that our responsibility in this area is "above all a moral issue. We cannot live forever in a world where our safety and our security depend on a precarious balance of terror."

Pledging to work towards the reduction in the strategic arms race between the United States and the Soviet, he said that only in this way can our resources "be turned away from war toward the work of human development."

He cited America's "responsibility to the conscience of mankind," promising that as President he will "build a sense of common trust" and "strengthen the moral bonds among nations and peoples."

He noted that ratification of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty must be the first step towards achieving this goal, saying that failure to do so may result in losing the race to "keep the nuclear weapons out of the hands of the Nassers and Castros of the world."

The text of the Vice Presidents' remarks is attached.

. . . more

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
SOUTH CALIFORNIA CLERGY :
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
OCTOBER 24, 1968

For Release: Thursday PMs
October 24, 1968

I have come to talk with you about the paramount concern of all our people -- our desire for peace.

We must end the war in Vietnam.

I have spoken to the nation about what I would do to achieve peace in Vietnam. You know the content of that address in Salt Lake City.

And you can trust me to do as I said.

But even as we seek peace in Vietnam, we must look beyond to another urgent matter.

We must stop the deadly race in strategic arms before it halts humanity.

For twenty years, I have tried to place limits on the momentum of the arms race.

I led the fight to end testing of nuclear weapons in the air...while Mr. Nixon called the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty a "cruel hoax" and "catastrophic nonsense."

I led the effort to create the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

I have worked for years for the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons around the world -- the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

We now have that Treaty. But unless it is ratified, all our hopes for a world not dominated by the nuclear bomb may be lost forever.

Mr. Nixon says he is for the Treaty, but is against ratifying it this year. He says he is for the Treaty, but has reservations about it.

I say this: If we now lose this Treaty -- if we now lose the race to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of the Nassers and Castros of the world -- humanity may never have the same chance again.

I also support the early beginning of talks with the Soviet Union to end the race in offensive and defensive missile systems.

Unlimited additions to nuclear arsenals can make neither of us safer; on the contrary, each extra unneeded missile, each extra unneeded warhead only brings nearer the day when we will be unable to stop the plunge into nuclear war.

And, beyond that, I favor worldwide -- supervised and carefully safeguarded -- reductions in arms and military expenditures so that man's resources may be turned away from war toward the work of human development.

This is no idle dream. I believe it can be done.

This is, above all, a moral issue.

We cannot live forever in a world where our safety, and our security depend on a precarious balance of terror.

. . . more

PAGE TWO

This is a balance of insanity...an immoral balance, that undermines our very claim to be civilized.

"For what has a man profited, if he shall gain the world, and lose his own soul?" (Matthew 16:25-26)

There is another way to preserve our security and preserve the peace. I am dedicated to this cause. The nations of the world must find their way through the valley of the shadow of death. America must take the lead.

We have a responsibility to the conscience of mankind. It will not be easy.

It may take years...to build a sense of common trust...to strengthen the moral bonds among nations and peoples...to save our souls, even as we save the world.

I ask your help...your ideas...your prayers. Our goals must be moral ones... and the first of these goals is peace.

As the Prophet Isaiah said: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace."

That should we America's role in the world. When I am President, that will be America's role.

#

9-7-4-4
REMARKS OF HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
OCTOBER 24, 1968

10/24
Hubert H. Humphrey
California
Clergy

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Rabbi Nussbaum and my good friend, Reverend John Simmons, members of the clergy, ladies and gentlemen.

I have looked forward to this opportunity of visiting with you. I shall try to divide our time so that we shall have an opportunity for you to ask your questions and hopefully that I may be able to provide you with some answers.

This morning -- I will talk a little louder. I am trying to save this voice for the last 12 days. When we are out on the street rallies, it gets a little rugged. So I thought possibly in the quiet of a church that we might be able to preserve the strength.

This day is a most appropriate time for us to discuss reconciliation, peace, and the reduction of tensions at home and abroad.

This is U.N. Day. This is the 23rd anniversary of the United Nations. It is also a day in which we once again reaffirm human rights -- not only human rights here in America, which needs constant reaffirmation, but the whole body of human rights as conceived in the United Nations Charter and by those who have tried to implement it.

I might add very quickly that I have been one of those in the years that served -- in my years of service in the Congress -- that had diligently sought the ratification of the human rights conventions because I believe that those resolutions or conventions, whatever you wish to call them, would once again reaffirm America's moral leadership on the basic issue of our time, which is the issue of humanity and its survival and the enrichment of the lives of the people of this earth.

I have just left a breakfast, as Rabbi Nussbaum has said, with some of your fellow citizens. I will take just a moment to summarize what I tried to say there about this election because I am engaged in the business of trying to get elected, at the same time of trying to show people why this election is important.

We are really at a time -- living in a time of crisis in this country. That doesn't need to be documented to those of you who have to live with it every day. A crisis in race relations -- I think a very serious crisis in the moral values of our nation. We are living in a time of unprecedented change and ferment. I happen to be one of those that believes, however, that the nation is not sick beyond remedy. As I have said from many a platform, I do not think this nation has lost its way. I think it is trying to find its conscience.

This is not a new experience for America, because if you are a student of the history of this Republic, you know that we have gone through many, many times, many, many periods of violent change, of grave disorder, and of serious moral crisis. And we have been able to come out of each, I think, a little better.

As a matter of fact, there may be some truth to it that a great people must go through suffering -- possibly the anguish and the suffering of our time, the suffering and the anguish as we make decisions about how we want to live here at home, whether it is to be a community, one community of Americans, or whether it is to be divided on the basis of race, or economic status -- that anguish and that suffering I think can make us a better people, if we make the right decision.

And I am talking to men and women that have a great deal of influence in this country. I know that you are idealists, and so am I. I have been one all of my life. I find myself in a rather

ironical and paradoxical situation. Most of my critics for twenty years of my public life have said that I was too far out, too far ahead of my time. This has been my political liability, according to my best friends -- quote-end quote. And all at once the same man is supposed to be devoid of ideas, lacking in vision, and lacking in idealism.

I just don't think so.

I asked my mother about that not long ago, and she didn't think so either. (Applause)

We are facing a time of election decision. Every candidate feels I am sure when he stands for the highest office in this land that the time that he is up for election is the great moment. But I have said that I think we are at the end of an era, and we are approaching the dawn of a new day. I think that is true in matters of international relations as well as domestic policy. And it has led me to say that one of the first requirements of the next President of the United States, at least if I were President, will be to reassess our commitments abroad as well as to reassess our policies here at home.

I think we have made very great progress here at home in particular in recent years. I think the indicator of that progress is the fact that some people seem to be so upset by it. When people see possibility of hope, they become more restless. It is only the hopeless who are apathetic. It is the people who never see any chance for improvement who accept the intolerable conditions in which they live as being inevitable. It is people who see some chance for improvement that refuse to accept the incredibly bad conditions in which they live as being inevitable.

And so we see now, I think, all over the world a spirit of emancipation. I think we see it in Eastern Europe. I think we see it in the Soviet Union. I think we saw it in Czechoslovakia. I see repression being used to put it down. I think we are seeing this spirit of emancipation here at home, amongst our black Americans, amongst many other minorities -- the so-called Mexican-American, and the Puerto Rican and many of the poor.

And I see people today who say let's stamp it out, repression, Soviet mentality.

But the spirit, the longing for individual identification, the longing to be identified as an individual, to be needed, to be wanted, to be a man, to be accepted as a person, to be free -- that longing cannot be put down. You may temporarily subdue it, you may temporarily oppress it, but the spirit, the will of mankind to be free, or at least to have some hope of emancipation is one of the dominant facts of recorded history.

In this election we are going to determine, for example, what kind of a Supreme Court you are going to have, ladies and gentlemen. And no mistake about it.

In this election you are going to determine whether or not you are going to pursue policies that really will try to get at the root causes of poverty -- knowing how difficult it is, knowing the mistakes that we will make. But also knowing that we can have some achievement and some success.

In this election we are going to, I really believe, decide whether or not we are going to revert back to a cold war mentality, or whether we are going to try to rise above it. Not foolishly ignoring the dangers of our time, but rather trying to create a philosophy of peaceful engagement, where we are ever alert to danger, but equally alert to opportunity.

I believe that the arms race within itself is one of the fundamental issues. But before I touch on that, which I have in some prepared remarks, let me say once again -- the question before the American people in this election, which I believe is more fundamental than all the peripheral issues that most of us get to discussing -- bombing or not bombing -- is whether or not we

Americans can live together in a community, as neighbors, as fellow citizens, white and black, rich or poor, to be together in trust and in confidence, or whether we are to live in a society that is divided, a society of apartheid, a society of hate and suspicion and doubt and fear, that is aggravated by cheap demagoguery, or even high-class demagoguery. If you are going to be a demagogue, I think you ought to be a crude one.

(Applause.)

We are talking about human relations. And with all of our desire for peace abroad, my fellow Americans, let me suggest that we can set an example here at home. If we cannot find ways and means to settle our problems here at home without violence, without demagoguery, without pitting race against race, person against person, what makes you think that you are going to be able to help to settle it some place in the world where you can hardly spell the names of the persons involved, or identify the areas geographically?

I think the best foreign policy, or at least the underpinning of a great American foreign policy of moral leadership, is a position of moral strength here at home, right here in our own communities.

We are trying to make this great experiment that we call our democracy work. No people have ever been able to do it before -- under the complexities and the difficulties that we have. Here is the nation of every race, creed and color, as you know. Here we are with a mosaic of cultures, or should I say a variety of cultures. The question is, Can we make it a mosaic? Can we make it America the beautiful -- not just our hills and our valleys and her mountains which God Almighty put here, But what about we the people? What about our relationships? Divine Providence has done very well by us -- except where we have loused it up. But what are we doing to each other?

This the issue.

And when I hear political leaders, or alleged political leaders, or self-proclaimed political leaders, talk about our programs that we seek to develop to help the poor as if somehow or another they were a waste of effort and a waste of money, I wonder then what kind of moral leadership do we have in this country. And that is why we need to speak out.

No, government -- the government of the United States is not here to see that those who already have too much have more. We will get that without the help of the government. The government of the United States is here to be able to see that those who have too little may have a chance to earn for themselves enough. We are not only interested in social security. We are interested in social opportunity. I think we have some of us been the victims of such a fear of insecurity that we fail to understand that the young people of our time are primarily concerned about the visions and the horizons of opportunity. And I believe that the greatest challenge of tomorrow is not security, which I believe we can build into our structure, but how do we open the gates of opportunity, how do we give people a chance, how do we release them from the bondage of despair and hate and poverty and disease and illiteracy, fear That is really what we are talking about. And that is why there ought to be a common bond between clergy and political leader -- at least on these areas.

Now, the central issue that has concerned many of you, and on which you have spoken, and of course you have all spoken on what I have, and much more eloquently, and with great scholarly knowledge-- when you campaign, you don't have much time for scholarship, I want you to know. It is sort of like trying to give eight good sermons a day. Did you ever try that?

(Laughter.)

And then may I say in the meantime trying to take up a

collection to keep the church open.

(Applause.)

I want to say just a few words about a paramount concern of all of our people, and that is our desire for peace. And that is the desire of people.

We have many ways of seeking it. The first thing we know is that we have been -- we have suffered from the agony and the pain and the terrible cost of a war that has lingered on in Southeast Asia. So we must end that war. And as I speak to you now, there are determined efforts underway by your government in the most sensitive areas of diplomacy to find a way for a political solution, a negotiated settlement. And I have had to be extremely careful these recent days with the press. Any statement that a man makes from a public platform that seeks to be president can either encourage the enemy or discourage the negotiators, or cause misunderstanding or confusion. And if my reluctance to say some things costs me my election, but it can still bring peace, then maybe I will have served my country better than if I were president, because what I think is important is to find a way to end this war, and to do it in such a manner that the peoples that you have sought to protect are not victimized and not destroyed, and at the same time that our on security is adequately protected.

Now, I have spoken to the nation about this, from my own heart, my on mind -- I am somewhat knowledgeable in the area of foreign relations, having served for years in the Senate on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and having been vice president for four years, and serving on the National Security Council.

I spoke at Salt Lake City, gave my message on Vietnam. I noticed in the paper this morning that one of your columnists called Mr. Bill Henry said that "First of all, the major objective, the possibility of a halt of the bombing of the north, is not the objective, it is just one step towards our major objective, which as President Thieu of South Vietnam pointed out is to stop the war."

Well, of course the whole purpose of stopping the bombing is to produce fruitful negotiations that might lead to either shortening the war or de-escalating the war or stopping the war. Then he goes on to say, "Our secondary objective is in case of inability to stop the war, to do what Richard Nixon described as to de-Americanize the fighting. De-Americanization of the war seems to be a steadily-developing success."

Well, I might just suggest to you that the first man in public life to talk about de-Americanizing this war in this part of the campaign, since the two conventions have been held, was not Mr. Nixon. It was Hubert Humphrey. And when that happened, I was taken to task in many places. But I have made it quite clear that we can do it. I appreciate that Mr. Henry doesn't know how to spell my name. But I want it quite clear, from this platform, that it wasn't Mr. Nixon who said it. He was taking a very statesmanlike attitude of saying nothing -- period. And you know it and I know it. And I am here for straight talk.

But it was Hubert Humphrey, the man standing before you, I was the one that said that we should and we could reduce the force levels, that we could de-Americanize and should this struggle. I pointed out that the ARVN was being strengthened, it was being given equipment, that it should provide more for its self-defense, and that when I became president, one of my first steps, if there was no peace by that time in Vietnam, would be to meet with the leaders of South Vietnam and to work out a systematic program of reduction of forces, the de-Americanization.

If I haven't done anything else in this campaign, I have been able to get Mr. Nixon to come out with one positive constructive suggestion about Vietnam. And I think that is a substantial

contribution.

(Applause.)

I also said that we needed totally free elections, supervised, with all elements in South Vietnam. I said that we had to have -- that we had to have withdrawal of foreign troops. I have also pointed out to you that during these years as vice president I have been an adviser -- I have been a member of the team. The National Security Council doesn't take a vote, and even if it did, remember what Lincon once said about the Cabinet. "The vote is eight nays, one aye. The ayes have it."

(Laughter.)

There is one spokesman in this country in the field of foreign policy. There is one commander in chief. The Vice President of the United States has a lot of responsibility, but very little authority. I don't know if they put that seal there, but they generally do. And if they have or haven't, I will just tell you a little bit about it. The vice presidential seal has an eagle just like the presidential seal. The eagle doesn't look as strong and as healthy, and it is another way to keep the vice president humble.

(Laughter.)

The Constitution provides adequate ways of doing it, but this is just an extra effort. That vice presidential seal shows that eagle, that American eagle, with one little old sprig of olive branch, one little olive branch, just a kind of emaciated looking one. Looked like it didn't have very much growth. And over there is one little arrow, in the other set of claws. I told a group the other day that were hollering at me "Peace, peace," I said, "Well, you give me as many olive branches as you have got in the presidential seal, and I will get you peace."

(Applause.)

It is pretty hard to do it with one little sprig, just one little old twig hanging out there. And somebody asked me what that one arrow was for. And I told them that I hadn't made up my mind until only recently. Then I saw a billboard that said "Nixon's the one," and I thought maybe --

(Laughter.)

Well, I will come back to you on this. I merely want to say that you must understand that the highest priority of the Humphrey-Muskie Administration will be to secure peace in Southeast Asia. We know that we must do that.

(Applause.)

But even as we do this -- and this has become the symbol of peace -- let me tell you there is something even more fundamental going on, and more dangerous. If you had peace tomorrow morning in Southeast Asia and every American were brought home, you live in a dangerous world. And you live in a world in which the area of danger or the level of danger goes up every day. In the Middle East, one of the most dangerous areas of the world, where there is the possibility of confrontation of the super powers -- look what happened in Czechoslovakia. Look at what has been happening in Latin America. Plenty of areas of danger. And I know that we become fixed upon certain areas. But let me assure you that you need to have a broad vision, a vision of all of mankind. Therefore I think that one of the major objectives of the next president of the United States must be to stop the deadly race in strategic arms before it halts humanity. And let me level with you. The next president of the United States is going to have to make some basic decisions with armament, because for years plans have been on the drafting board in the Pentagon and in other pentagons around the world as to just what the new level of armament will be, the new kind of sophisticated weapons. And they will cost billions. And, more importantly, they raise the level of danger.

Now, for 20 years I have been a fighter trying to place limits on the momentum of the arms race. And with the exception of a few of you clergymen, I haven't had much help.

It has been pretty hard to get a lot of people steamed up about that. I led the fight for seven years in the United States Senate to end the testing of nuclear weapons. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. And I took all the boos that a man ought to take for leading a good fight. I remember the man that runs against me in this campaign, that called my efforts a cruel hoax, a catastrophic nonsense. But thank goodness President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson didn't listen to Mr. Nixon -- they listened to Adlai Stevenson and Hubert Humphrey. And when that treaty for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was signed, the President of the United States gave me the pen and said, "Hubert, this is your treaty." Now, that is one of the building blocks of peace.

You know, we say blessed are the peacemakers. It takes a long time to make peace. Some of you have been preaching religion a long time, and you still have got a lot of work to do. You haven't converted them all. You haven't even got the basic message through. And neither have I. We are working -- we have got an uphill struggle, not only politically but spiritually, I might add. But that doesn't mean that we don't keep at it.

I led the effort to create the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and it is a fact, and it was the first nation to get one. Today there several others that have followed our initiative. I have been the representative of this government in three conferences at Geneva on arms control, the representative of your government at the United Nations in the crucial years of 1956 and '57. And I might say to you, Rabbi, at that particular time I was a friend of the State of Israel. You know, it is plain talk. I didn't wait until I ran for president to find my new incentives. I have had these incentives when it was so unpopular that about the only people that I could come to and tell my story to were those of you that were used to listening to confession, or willing to at least give consolation.

(Applause.)

We have been working the last few years for another treaty; by the way, one of the treaties that we signed was the treaty to prevent the orbiting in space of weapons of mass destruction. Now, when did that -- what was its genesis? Its genesis was out of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the United States Senate led by the man speaking to you now. I went around this country. I spoke right out here at the University of Southern California on that matter in the year 1958. We kept at it a long time -- 1960, in the campaign of 1960. And the treaty is a fact. It was signed. Arthur Goldberg was our representative at the United Nations that did the work there, a good deal of work. It took us eight years to get it. Now we have a treaty now called the one to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Its technical name -- the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. All it means is stop the spread of the weapons, don't put them in the hands of anybody else. Stop the spread of nuclear technology. Remember, your government since the Baruch plan, since 1945, has been trying, because it knew the dangers of nuclear weaponry, to get some kind of international agreement to put a halt to this kind of arms race. Now, that treaty was consummated. I went to Europe in April last year, not this year -- a year ago, to six countries, to work on Article 3 of that treaty, because Article 3 is what we call the inspection article. And I am a knowledgeable man in this field having worked with the Berkner Committee and with others on it and knowing a little bit about it. And we came out of those discussions with Mr. William Foster, the head of our Arms Control Agency, with a treaty that is signed by 80 nations today.

It was our idea, it was a followup on the test ban, it was a followup on the treaty to prevent the orbiting of weapons of mass destruction. And that treaty came before the United States Senate and the leader of the opposition party in this campaign said he was for it but not now. And when I appealed for a joint statement, as my being the leader of the Democratic Party as a result of our convention, and he being the leader of the Republican Party as a result of his convention, I said let's the two political leaders call upon our partisans in the Congress to do something about it. But the answer was no, not now.

The works of peace. If we lose this treaty, which we may -- we lost the Versailles Treaty -- and we stand with a great sense of guilt for the failure of the League of Nations -- if we lose this treaty, we may lose the last chance we have to stop the spread of nuclear weaponry, because there are between six and ten nations now that within the next three years -- six of them within the next two years, another four within the next three to five years -- that are capable of nuclear weaponry development. And as that spreads, just imagine the peaceful world we would live in if Mr. Castro and Mr. Nasser had a fistful of nuclear weapons this morning. We almost went to war to prevent it.

I also believe that we need to, despite all the troubles in Eastern Europe, proceed with the beginning of talks with the Soviet Union to end the race in offensive and defensive missile systems. Now, the simple fact is that as you build your offensive capacity, the other man builds his defensive capacity; as he builds his defensive capacity, you build your offensive capacity, and the fact of the matter is you do not gain more defense or offense. What you do is it is a mad race. We have been trying to hold back on it.

Beyond that, I favor worldwide, carefully supervised safeguarded reductions in arms and military expenditures, so that man's resources may be turned away from war to the work of human development. I think the next president of the United States must have the courage -- I repeat -- have the courage to dare to seek worldwide reduction in armaments. This world of ours is today being bled by the cost of the armament race. Now, we cannot live forever in a world where our safety and our security depends on the precarious balance of terror. This is really the balance of insanity. And what we are really talking about now is trying to bring some moral purpose. And I think that America must take the lead. And I am dedicated to that course. The nations of the world must find their way through the valley of the shadow of death. And we have a responsibility for the conscience of mankind to try to find that way. And it will not be easy. It may even take years. But I ask your help. And I ask your ideas. I ask for your thoughts and your prayers. I know that our goals must be moral ones, and the first of these goals is to find a way to build the building blocks of peace.

Now, with that, I present you at least a synopsis of some of my thoughts. And I welcome your questions.

Thank you very much.

REVEREND SIMMONS: We will have about 15 minutes for questions. Will you please rise and identify yourself and ask your question. May we have the first question.

Are there questions from the audience, the clergy, that would like to be asked? Stand up and identify yourself and ask a question.

QUESTION: How do we answer the loudmouths who talk about law and order?

REVEREND SIMMONS: How do we answer the loudmouths that talk about law and order?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The first thing I want to make clear is that I have had some experience in the matter of law and order. My friend here, the Reverend John Simmons, was pastor of the church in North Minneapolis when I was mayor of Minneapolis. The mayor of a

a city has to deal with these problems. Law enforcement, the police power, is essentially under our constitutional system the responsibility of state and local government -- at least within the traditions of the Constitution. I think we have to be very careful now that in the frenzy that some have over the matter of violence and lawlessness that we do not precipitously move towards a national police force. The central government has plenty of power without having the president of the United States becoming a super sheriff and a super chief of police. Responsibility for the fight against crime, for enforcement of your laws, is essentially a local responsibility. The Federal Government has of course some areas in which it has responsibility against organized crime that is interstate in nature -- kidnaping, narcotics. There are certain areas in which the Federal Government can do a great deal. But the cry of law and order, my friend, is frequently used by some people in this country as another way of saying put the Negro down. I just as well lay it on the line. Now I want to make it clear about myself. I am not a man of violence. I don't believe that you settle problems by violence. And I don't think that any man that seeks to be president of the United States can for a single minute condone it. He must take a firm stand against all forms of violence. And he must use the prestige of his office, the moral stature of his office to seek observance of the laws by the people, and, if called upon, in dire emergency, to lend the resources of the Federal Government where they are required to suppress violence. Because, regrettably, the people who are the first victims of violence are the poor themselves. Those are the ones that suffer the most. So we just rule out -- just plain rule it out.

And guerrilla movements across this country, black or white, and we have got some of both, are despicable, and we cannot permit a nation to be terrorized by a handful of people who think that they can take the law into their own hands, whatever kind of group they may be, whether they are black or white. And we do have some extremists on both sides. We just have to understand that.

But in between those limited number of extremists is the great bulk of the American people that want to live together.

Now, I have laid down a program of assistance to our law enforcement officials. And that program includes not merely better salaries for police -- because you are going to get what you pay for. In the city of Washington, D. C., we increased the salaries of our police department where we had over 400 vacancies, and the 400 vacancies were filled like that.

But what we need also is better training. We need a higher quality of personnel. We need not only training in the techniques of how to subdue crime and how to detect a criminal in a criminal act, and how to -- how to use your tools or your weapons, whatever you may have, in case of need. But we need training in human relations. We need training in what are the rights of the policemen and the rights of the citizen.

We have got a lot of people today that say, you know, that there is too much concern over the rights of the citizen. Just remember, with a powerful government, federal state and local, the rights of a citizen are very important. And the police officer needs to be trained as to what his duties are and his rights are, and what the duties are and the rights are of that citizen. Just that very fine line. But that police officer has to make a spot decision. That is why you need better police.

Now, I say it costs money. And you don't get law and order by putting a bumper sticker on saying support your police. And you don't get law and order by talking about it as if some of this is some way to point out that most of the crime is committed by one particular group in this country, which is of course not

true because the crime is not committed by the blacks, my white bretheren. We have done ourselves up pretty well on this. We are quite far ahead. And may I also say that there is a relationship between violence, lawlessness, and poverty.

Mr. Nixon said not long ago that one of the countries in the world where there were a number of poor people is Ireland and they didn't have a very high rate of crime. That may be true. The Irish are a great people. I simply want to say this: that there isn't a sociologist or a statistician or a political scientist, or a man of any knowledge that knows anything about human behavior that doesn't know that the greatest amount of crime is committed in the areas of the poor, by the poor, against the poor. So there is some kind of a relationship between crime, lawlessness, and violence and poverty. some kind.

So my program is order, yes, but justice, yes. And I want people who are for law and order to remember that there are some other laws. For example, there is a law on our books that is called the Full Employment Act. We have building codes. We have health codes. We have all kinds of laws that are supposed to protect people and see that they have a decent home in which to live, see that it is not a rat-infested tenement, to see that there is sanitation. All kinds of it. I want those laws enforced, too. And as the president of the United States I am going to try to be an educator to the American people as well as their leader, to point out that we will settle nothing in violence, but we can settle a great deal in growth and understanding and forbearance, and we will enforce the law.

I want to make it clear. I enforced it as mayor of Minneapolis, and no one ever said I didn't. And, believe me, I cracked down on organized crime, street crime, and violence. There was no room for it in my town. But in the meantime I sent my police department to the university to take a course in human relations. And we organized -- (applause) -- we organized the first human relations commission in the United States. We passed the first FEPC in the United States. So we did something about it. And when I had a police officer that uttered a few racial or religious slurs, I found out about it, and I gave him 90 days without pay -- out. And you would be surprised how fast they catch on.

(Applause.)

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, you enumerated a number of trouble spots around the world, and amongst them you mentioned very briefly the Middle East as being one of the potentially most dangerous. Would you be kind enough to spell out briefly what your policies will be when you become president of the United States in regard to the Middle East?

REVEREND SIMMONS: Are there other questions in that same general vein, so that the Vice President can make one response?

QUESTION: The question of the selling of jet planes to Israel has been raised. And the Johnson Administration has said we must begin negotiations, which I believe now the Secretary of State has said, "Well, that doesn't mean that we should sell the planes, we should only talk about it." And there seems to be a slowdown in movement in that direction. How do you feel about it?

REVEREND SIMMONS: All right. One more in that general vein, if there is one, in that general area. If not, he will make a response. We will have time for one more question after this one.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I like to get a question like yours, because, you know, I started out being interested in this area of the world when I was still mayor of my city, and before that when I was a professor of political science and international relations at McCallister College. We know -- I said it is a trouble

spot, it is a danger spot, and it is. The reasons are quite obvious. The Soviet Union has been pouring arms into the Middle East for the past several years. In fact, it has been doing so since 1956, after the struggle then in 1956. The State of Israel has attempted to maintain a balance of force so that it was able to repel attack and to defend itself. During many of those years our government has been helpful in economic assistance and in the sale of some weaponry. Since the six-day war of June a year ago, the Soviet Union has re-equipped the United Arab Republic, has re-equipped other areas -- Syria -- has been helpful in Iraq. And I won't delineate them all. But a vast amount of armament has come in, plus technicians.

The State of Israel has been unable to obtain peace negotiations that would recognize some security of frontier and boundary. And I have listed out what I thought were the six main points, six or seven points that I wanted to see as a basis of settlement in the Middle East. I have asked my man here from my staff to give me just those six proposals, because again may I say that a definitive word is so important.

First, I think that a settlement could be made on the basis of the six points expressed in the story that I gave to the United Press International in an interview, namely, one, the recognition of the existence of the State of Israel. It must be accepted by all of its neighbors as a viable, sovereign state. That means the end of the state of belligerency.

Secondly, the boundaries of all these countries must be transformed into agreed and secure frontiers.

Thirdly, the State of Israel must have free navigational rights in all international waters, including the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Arabia.

Fourth, I happen to think it would be best if we could end the arms race in the Middle East so that we could have some chance for the utilization of the vast resources of that area for peaceful purposes.

Fifth, the international community must assist in solving the human tragedy posed by the Arab refugees.

Six, the resources of the Middle East must be used for human and economic development rather than war and destruction. Now the fact of the matter is that we have not been able to get an arms agreement in the Middle East. Your government, the government of the United States, has tried repeatedly. This is an area in which I worked for many years. I went to the Middle East three times as a senator in charge of the subcommittee on the Middle East to talk about this and since you haven't been able to get it, and since there is a growing imbalance of power with the modern sophisticated supersonic jets and the ships that have been made available to several of the Arab countries, I think one only way that the State of Israel is going to be able to have any hope of securing peace and being able to defend itself is to give up -- to sell it -- they are not asking for a gift, by the way: they are not asking for military assistance. They are asking for the right to buy what is known to me as a very qualified, high-class supersonic jet known as the Phantom jet.

Now, what has been my position? Well when I started to run for president. But this has been my position a long time in this government, in the arguments on this government. Last summer -- that the State of Israel should have the right to buy the kind of equipment, including the Phantom jet, by which it could defend itself. And I believe that it is in the interests of some stability in that area, because the minute that the enemy of Israel feels that they can attack quickly and devastatingly, without Israel's being able to properly defend herself with the most modern equipment, that day that war will start.

Now, we saw that before. And we ought to learn some lessons. In the meantime, we ought to encourage every way we can for these

states to come to some agreement, bilaterally, ultilaterally, the Jaring Commission, and as you notice, the State of Israel of late has been giving a great deal of cooperation in the U.N. trying to bring this about. And when I am your president, and I intend to be, I intend to lend my good offices to that.

(Applause.)

REVEREND SIMMONS: One more, and then we really -- otherwise we will get in trouble with other people.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: My fault.

REVEREND SIMMONS: Don't worry about that.

QUESTION: I would like to ask -- being alert to the dangers all over the world as you pointed out so very well, what would you as president do, for example, had the Czech invasion taken place, with Yugoslavia being invaded and so on, without necessarily getting us into a hot war?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, one of the things I did not talk about, which I should have, I would like to, if I might, commend to your attention my address to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on what I called the new strategy for peace. I wish that we could get a little more emphasis on the issues in the campaign rather than on the histrionics, all of which we are guilty of, I guess. We got lots of emphasis upon the mood of the electorate. But what we need to have is some emphasis on the issues.

I think our country did all that it could in the instance of the Czech crisis. I must say that while there are those jingoists that think that we ought to have moved in, we don't need another war. And we deplored it, we went to the United Nations, and I thought Ambassador Ball did an extraordinarily good job in that instance. I think we did as much as we could.

In the instance of Yugoslavia, I think it is prudent on my part, as a candidate for president, not to be answering too many "iffy" questions. I will say one thing about Yugoslavia. It is a strong nation, and they are stubborn and powerful people. I have a feeling that the Soviet Union has -- will take a second look before it would move on a sturdy little country like that. And some of the fears that we have had about other areas have not materialized.

It is to the eternal credit of this President -- I want to say I know that President Johnson has many people that are vitriolic critics. But let me say a word for the President. During all of these four years with which I have been associated with him, he has never once spoken in angry, in passion, demagogic terms of the Soviet Union. He has tried to ease the cold war. He has tried to find ways and means of reconciliation, of peaceful engagement.

By the same token, he has also understood the importance -- and I think for us right now -- the importance of seeing to it that our NATO alliance is a viable, effective instrument -- not merely of defense, but of political action as well, of peaceful engagement. And I have addressed myself to that.

I think, sir, if I may say rather immodestly but nevertheless truthfully, I have given very, very intricate and detailed attention to the Far East, to the whole matter of multilateral aid, development -- as the Pope said, the new name for peace is development.

The Middle East, Europe, Eastern Europe, the United Nations, and what we could do to strengthen it. And I wish that we could get a little more -- a little more currency, a little more knowledge of these positions. But I can assure you of one thing, that the greatest task of a president is not to accumulate

power, but how to restrain the use of it. That is his greatest task. The power is there. Sometimes it has to be used. But his moral qualities will be tested, not so much by the use of the power as by the restraint of its use. And I hope that I will be that kind of a man.

(Applause.)

- - -

NOTES

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CLERGY
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
October 24, 1968

U.N.
DAY
23rd Anniversary
@ People's Human Rights

I have come to talk with you about the paramount
concern of all our people -- our desire for peace.

We must end the war in Vietnam.

I have spoken to the nation about what I would do
to achieve peace in Vietnam. You know the content of
that address in Salt Lake City.

De Americanization
✓ Free Elections
✓ Withdrawal of For. Troops.

And you can trust me to do as I said.

But even as we seek peace in Vietnam, we must look beyond to another urgent matter.

↳ We must stop the deadly race in strategic arms before it halts humanity.

↳ For twenty years, I have tried to place limits on the momentum of the arms race.

↳ I led the fight to end testing of nuclear weapons in the air ... while Mr. Nixon called the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty a "cruel hoax" and "catastrophic nonsense."

↳ I led the effort to create the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

↳ I have worked for years for the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons around the world -- the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

↳ We now have that treaty. But unless it is ratified, all our hopes for a world not dominated by the nuclear bomb may be lost forever.

↳ Mr. Nixon says he is for the treaty, but is against ratifying it this year. ↳ He says he is for the treaty, but has reservations about it.

I say this: If we now lose this treaty -- if we now lose the race to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of the Nassers and Castros of the world -- humanity may never have the same chance again.

↳ I also support the early beginning talks with the Soviet Union to end the race in offensive and defensive missile systems.

∟ Unlimited additions to nuclear arsenals can make neither of us safer; on the contrary, each extra unneeded missile, each extra unneeded warhead only brings nearer the day when we will be unable to stop the plunge into nuclear war.

∟ And, beyond that, I favor worldwide -- supervised and carefully safeguarded -- reductions in arms and military expenditures so that man's resources may be turned away from war toward the work of human development.

This is no idle dream. I believe it can be done.

This is, above all, a moral issue.

∟ We cannot live forever in a world where our safety, and our security depend on a precarious balance of terror.

∟ This is a balance of insanity ... an immoral balance, that undermines our very claim to be civilized.

"For what has a man profited, if he shall gain the world, and lose his own soul?" (Matthew 16:25-26)

∠ There is another way to preserve our security and
preserve the peace.

∠ I am dedicated to this cause.

The nations of the world must find their way through
the valley of the shadow of death.

∠ America must take the lead.

Space Treaty
U.N. annual meeting
in the 1950s
- AID Development

We have a responsibility to the conscience of mankind.

∠ It will not be easy.

It may take years ... to build a sense of common
trust ... to strengthen the moral bonds among nations and
peoples ... to save our souls, even as we save the world.

I ask your help ... your ideas ... your prayers.

↳ Our goals must be moral ones ... and the first of these goals is peace.

As the prophet Isaiah said: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings,
that publisheth peace."

That should be America's role in the world. When I am President, that will be America's role.

#

Los Angeles

ATTENTION: SAM KEITH

FOLLOWING IS FOR TED VAN DYK'S ATTENTION

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

MEETING WITH SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CLERGY

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

OCTOBER 24, 1963

I HAVE COME TO TALK WITH YOU ABOUT THE PARAMOUNT CONCERN OF ALL
OUR PEOPLE ... OUR DESIRE FOR PEACE

WE SHALL END THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

I HAVE SPOKEN TO THE NATION ON MY PAKKA PLANS FOR PEACE IN
SOUTHEAST ASIA:

-- HOW I WOULD STOP THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM AS A NECESSARY
RISK FOR PEACE;

-- HOW I WOULD REDUCE THE ROLE OF AMERICAN FORCES IN THAT WAR;

-- AND HOW I WOULD CALL ONCE AGAIN FOR AN IMMEDIATE CEASE-FIRE,
WITH INTERNATIONAL SUPERVISION.

BUT WHEN WE HAVE THAT PEACE, WE MUST LOOK BEYOND TO PEACE IN THE
WORLD.

WE MUST STOP THE DEADLY RACE IN STRATEGIC ARMS BEFORE IT HALTS
MANKIND.

FOR TWENTY YEARS, I HAVE TRIED TO PLACE LIMITS ON THE BAD MOMENTUM
OF THE ARMS RACE.

I SUPPORTED AN END TO TESTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE AIR ...
WHILE MR. NIXON CALLED THIS STEP A "CRUEL HOAX" AND "CATASTROPHIC
NONSENSE."

I WORKED TO CREATE THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY.

I HAVE WORKED FOR YEARS FOR THE TREATY TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AROUND THE WORLD.

WE NOW HAVE SUCH A TREATY. BUT UNLESS IT IS RATIFIED, ALL OUR HOPES FOR A PEACEFUL WORLD -- OF A WORLD NOT DOMINATED BY THE NUCLEAR BOMB -- MAY BE LOST FOREVER.

MR. NIXON SAYS HE IS FOR THE TREATY, BUT IS AGAINST RATIFYING IT THIS YEAR. HE SAYS HE IS FOR THE TREATY, BUT HAS RESERVATIONS ABOUT IT.

I SAY TOXKX THIS: IF WE NOW LOSE THIS TREATY -- IF WE NOW LOSE THE RACE TO KEEP NUCLEAR WEAPONS OUT OF THE HANDS OF THE MASSERS AND CASTROS OF THE WORLD -- MR. NIXON MUST BEAR THE BLAME.

I ALSO SUPPORT THE EARLY BEGINNING OF TALKS WITH THE SOVIET UNION TOXKX UNION TO END THE RACE IN STRATEGIC ARMAMENTS. UNLIMITED ADDITIONS OF NUCLEAR ARSENALS CAN MAKE NEITHER OF US SAFER; ON THE CONTRARY, EACH EXTRA UNNEEDED MISSILE, EACH EXTRA UNNEEDED WARHEAD -- ONLY BRINGS NEARER THE DAY WHEN WE WILL BE UNABLE TO STOP THE PLUNGE INTO NUCLEAR WAR.

AND THIS IS, ABOVE ALL, A MORAL (ULINE MORAL) ISSUE. WE CANNOT LIVE FOREVER IN A WRLKXX WORLD WHERE OUR SAFETY, OUR SECURITY, DEPENDS ON A BALANCE OF TERROR -- THE THREAT TO END THE WORLD.

THIS IS A BALANCE OF INSANITY ... AN IMMORAL (ULINE IMMORAL) BALANCE, THAT UNDERMINES OUR VERY CLAIM TO BE CIVILIZED.

"FOR WHAT IS A MEN PROFITED, IF HE SHALL GAIN THE WHOLE WORLD, AND LOSE HIS OWN SOUL?" (MATTHEW 16:25-26)

THERE MUST BE ANOTHER WAY ... TO PRESERVE OUR SECURITY ... TO PRESERVE THE PEACE.

I AM DEDICATED TO THIS CAUSE OF PEACE.

THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD MUST FIND THEIR WAY THROUGH THE VALLEY
OF THE SHADOW OF DEATH.

AND AMERICA MUST TAKE THE LEAD ... WE MUST POINT THE WAY.

WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO THE CONSCIENCE OF MANKIND.

IT WILL NOT BE EASY. IT MAY TAKE YEARS ... TO BUILD A SENSE
OF COMMON TRUST ... TO STRENGTHEN THE MORAL BONDS AMONG NATIONS
AND PEOPLES ... TO SAVE OUR SOULS, EVEN AS WE SAVE THE WORLD.

I ASK YOUR HELP ... YOUR IDEAS ... YOUR PRAYERS.

OUR GOALS MUST BE MORAL ONES ... AND THE FIRST OF THESE GOALS IS
PEACE.

AS THE PROPHET ISAIAH SAID: "HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS ARE
THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."

THAT SHOULD BE (ULINE SHOULD BE) AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD.
THAT WILL BE (ULINE WILL BE) AMERICA'S ROLE WHEN I AM PRESIDENT.

#

END OF LOS ANGELES CLERGY TEXT

END OF THIS TRANSMITTAL

SAM KEITH: THIS SHOULD ALL BE GIVEN TO TED VAN DYK -- AS AN EXTRA
MEASURE, PLEASE GIVE THE OTHER TWX COPY TO ONE OF THE STAFF SECRETARY
SANDY JENNETT, GLORIA CANOTHERS, KITSY FRENCH, ETC. THE LOS ANGELES
TEXT IS FOR THURSDAYS P.M.'S RELEASE

DID YOU RECEIVE THIS OK?

HELLO " " " YES THANK YOU
THANKS A TEXAS MILLION OUT BYE



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