

*October 17 - Ventura County,
Calif.*

(Koch)

October 14, 1971

SUGGESTED REMARKS FOR TEAGUE FUNDRAISER

It is a great pleasure to be with you here in Ventura County today. I am having the opportunity to relax a little out here after a pretty hectic week that began with Columbus Day.

There is great controversy about whether Columbus discovered America, you know. The Scandinavians claim credit and, of course, now it looks like the Egyptians could have done it.

The American Indians never participate in these discussions, of course. They sit back and wonder what everybody's talking about.

I'm not sure if Columbus discovered America -- I know he's in the running. One thing seems pretty clear, however; according to the records, Columbus appears to have been the first Democrat. When he left Spain he didn't know where he was going. When he got here, he didn't know where he was. When he got back he didn't know where he'd been. And he did it all on government money.

Hubert Humphrey gets green with envy whenever he thinks about that record.

I don't know why, though.

He's got a pretty good record of his own.

If there is anybody here from the press, will you get those remarks on the wire right away? I promised Hubert I'd attack

-2-

him early enough to get him on the evening news, and I'm running a little late.

I don't know if you noticed, but the Democrats had their first battle last Wednesday. It was between the liberals and the party organization, and the commentator said it might cause a split in the party. All the liberals might leave.

If all the liberals left the Democrat party, the only people left would be John Sparkman and John Lindsay. Lindsay couldn't leave, of course -- he just got there.

Come to think of it, that's another good reason for the rest of them to leave.

But actually they're just warming up for a typical Democrat convention. That's a good clean fight with no survivors.

I saw the first delegation of supporters going into Democratic National Headquarters the other day. They were obviously firmly committed -- they had a big sign saying

"Let the Democrats lead me,
and welfare feed me."

The Democrats try to get their money from the rich and their votes from the poor, with a promise to protect each from the other. In the end the rich wind up with a dollar that isn't worth anything and everybody winds up with a vote that isn't worth anything.

- 3 -

I see the great Democrat city of Chicago last week ordered the churches to stop ringing their bells -- that's the kind of thinking that prohibits our children from praying in school. I want to see that tested before the Supreme Court again -- I think I can tell you that a Nixon court would not decide that prayer was bad for our young people. If we had judges interested in construing the law, instead of changing the law that would never have happened.

You know, the liberals are preparing for a battle over the Supreme Court nominations; anybody he is for, they are automatically against. But I think the President is going to outsmart them this time. There's a rumor out that he's going to nominate Jane Fonda and Abbie Hoffman. They have both had a lot of experience with the law.

But I expect the liberals will want to save most of their energy for the campaign. I heard Senator Proxmire on television last Wednesday. He said the Democrats have to hammer away at the problem of unemployment.

I wish they'd hammer away at some problem. They haven't done much of anything so far -- nothing of a positive nature. They have tried to sell us down the river in Viet Nam. They have tried to neutralize our bargaining power in an era of negotiation by trying to divide the American people, disarm the American defense forces, and disown the hard won objectives of a war they put our

-4-

boys in to begin with.

They've had a bill before them to clean up the welfare mess in America, and they have done nothing about it, except to shed a few more crocodile tears about the poor. They're all good at that, of course, but Teddy Kennedy would tear your heart out -- two years after all the old catch words, like "involved" and "meaningful," and "relevant" have gone out of style, Teddy has finally got them memorized. He goes around telling people they have to be "committed;" everyone is judged by the depth of his "commitment." Commitment to what, nobody knows. He'll memorize that later, if he has to.

But there is a basic difference in philosophy between the President and the Democrats. He would like to put those on welfare to work. He would like to help the poor by getting them to work. On the assumption that misery loves company the Democrats want to help the poor by creating a lot more of them. The way they want to spend the taxpayers money is clear evidence of this. As for actually moving to clean up welfare, however, they have done nothing.

They've had legislation for a much needed reorganization of your tax dollar -- putting it down where you can decide how it should be spent. You can be sure they haven't touched that. The

-5-

idea of the people spending their own money frightens them to death. Part of the problem is that they have never really understood the distinction between manipulating the masses, and presiding over the people.

There is legislation aimed at curbing drug abuse lying before the Congress -- and nothing is being done with it.

Well, there is a reason for all this, naturally. They want to sit on those bills; they want to let the country stagnate for four years, and then they'll want to go and tell the American people that President Nixon hasn't done anything.

What President Nixon has done, with little help and a good obstruction is to terminate, with our honor intact, a war that has claimed more than fifty thousand lives.

He has laid the groundwork for a generation of peace. He will shortly go to Peking in quest of a peace that can be maintained.

He will go to Moscow in further confirmation of this nation's willingness to go the last mile in search of a just peace.

The guns remain silent in the Middle East, and the effort to keep them silent goes forward.

The economy which two Democrat administrations destroyed is responding. The battle over inflation is being won. The battle

-6-

against unemployment, contrary to Mr. Proxmire's wishful thinking, is being won.

Since June, actual employment has gone up by 1.1 million. Of those unemployed, it is important to recognize that two and a half million of them are unemployed as a result of conversion to peacetime. Unemployment is a hard price to pay for peace -- particularly when it isn't paid equally by all. But it is a short-term consequence, and it is a price I think most Americans would be willing to pay if it meant that peace was coming at last. And we believe it is.

In addition, the 1.1 million increase in jobs is a phenomenal increase for a three month period. It has been largely absorbed by new people coming into the job market, and for that reason there has been little effect on the actual unemployment rate. But this increase reflects an economy which is responding very strongly to the bold steps which the President has taken, and in a matter of months I estimate a steep decline in unemployment, even with more veterans returning home.

So unemployment is not going to be much of an issue for the Democrat party next year. They'll have an unemployed candidate, but not much else.

-7-

At least, on precedent, we are assuming that they'll have a candidate.

Senator McGovern says he is running. Right now he's running on hot air trying to win the hearts and minds of the American bankers.

He told a group in Maryland he could negotiate an end to the Viet Nam war in one day. I don't mean to sound skeptical, but all I can say is where was George when we really needed him?

I don't think he could do it. For one thing, it takes more than a day for his mouth to wind down.

For another thing, I think he should keep in mind that it took his colleagues -- some of whom are self-annointed "peace" candidates now -- took them from 1962 to 1968 to really get that war going good -- I can't imagine him stopping it in one day. And, of course, from his standpoint, why waste a perfectly good war? When it's over, he'll have to find something else to be morally superior about.

Then Senator Harris is running, as you may know. He says he has to save America before it's too late.

I can think of a lot of things Fred Harris could do for America, but running for President isn't one of them. You shouldn't read too much into the Senator's statement though. It should like pre-

-8-

sumption, but it's really desperation.

You see, there is a small conflict between Fred's national ambitions and the more modest desires of his local constituency. Now that he is pretty sure he can't be re-elected to the Senate again, he has nothing to lose by going for the Presidency.

What he really wants is to save Fred Harris before it's too late. But the people in California, and Kansas, and Indiana and all the other great states in this nation are just as smart as the people from Oklahoma. And if the people from Oklahoma don't want Fred Harris, I doubt if anybody else will want him. I expect he'll shortly be looking for a job more in keeping with his abilities -- before it's too late.

(Note: I would stick with announced candidates for awhile -- partly just to keep from wasting good material. I don't know what the strategy is on Chisholm, but I think we shouldn't mention her, ever.)

Well, Presidential campaigns are always fun. With candidates like the Democrats are putting up, this one should be hilarious.

But on November 5, 1972, the laughing will be over and the people will vote with all the balloons and the campaign buttons, and the bustle of campaign politics behind them. And I think they will not weigh the individual issues -- who proposed what, who voted how, and who supported whom -- they won't go down a list,

- 9 -

item by item, measuring the men who want to preside over this great nation. They never do.

Instead, the judgment will come down to an assessment of those considerations that go right to the soul of this nation. Where has America gone under the stewardship of the Republican Party and President Nixon? Have we kept faith with America? Has America kept faith with her past? Is the road into the future clear, or is it dim with confusion and doubt? Do we still believe in ourselves -- or, perhaps, have we regained the ability to believe in ourselves? Has the hope of peace been realized, and is a better world within our grasp?

And what is a better world? It is many different dreams to many different dreamers -- but mostly it is a step closer to some ideal each of us keeps in our hearts. And so have we sustained a nation in which men can move towards the ideals that live in their hearts?

I think we know what the answers will be. President Nixon was elected by a very narrow margin in 1968. In 1972, his margin of victory will be overwhelming.

For the first time since the close of the fifties, Americans will go to the polls with confidence in themselves and in America; they will go in a celebration of the old meaning of America -- the

-10-

home of the free, the refuge of the wretched, the hope of the world.

One man has brought America back again to her high destiny;
one man has brought Americans out of despair and doubt and back
to a full share in the shaping of this destiny.

And so the American people will compare where we were in
1968 -- not only in war, not only in grave economic difficulty, not
only on the edge of domestic chaos at home and increasingly held
in contempt abroad -- but worse than all these, the American
people themselves were, for the first time in our long history,
in doubt. They will compare this with where we are today.

Today, peace is within our grasp, prosperity is within our
grasp -- but more than these, once again, greatness is within
our grasp. And Richard Nixon put it there.

This is what the people will remember when they go to the
polls on November 5, 1972.

#