

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE
7TH ANNUAL CONVENTION - UNION COUNTY YOUNG REPUBLICANS
SUMMIT, NEW JERSEY
Saturday, March 13, 1965

THE GREAT ANXIETY

It's good to be in a Congressional District which didn't go "all the way with LBJ" -- thanks to my friend and able colleague, Mrs. Dwyer.

I don't know how she did it, but a lot of midwest Republicans would like to have her recipe.

President Johnson, I have learned, swept Union County -- by two-to-one, with ~~the~~ a margin of 82,000 votes. Flo Dwyer not only made up this huge deficit but by a margin of 46,000 -- 60 per cent of the Vote, her best record in five campaigns for the House, I understand.

I don't know of any Republican Congressman who bucked the Johnson trend and still managed to increase his own previous margins of victory.

It is an immense tribute to Mrs. Dwyer and all of you who support her so diligently.

Republicans in the House -- think highly of your Congresswoman. We respect her political judgment and her analysis of the issues. No one, for example, did more to defeat the Administration's Area Redevelopment bill than Mrs. Dwyer, and on the other hand, no one does more for promoting passage of commuter transportation legislation.

MAR 13 1965

Page 2

She's sound, constructive and exceedingly able -- and I'm delighted to be in her District tonight.

It goes without saying those gathered together here tonight are ready and willing to help us make a "Republican" comeback.

Politics is generally a bitterly-serious business but I've often felt that, if we can't occasionally laugh at ourselves, it's time to quit.

Yes and to illustrate there are no hard feelings over the November election, I want to pay a tribute to our President.

Without any qualms whatsoever, I want to state publicly that we're all indebted because of his Administration -- even generations yet unborn.

Moreover, it looks like the Great Society is going to make this a land of plenty -- owe plenty, tax plenty, spend plenty, and waste plenty and perhaps in 1966, switch plenty seats in Congress.

MAR 13 1965

Page 3

There's spunk left in the Grank Old Party, as illustrated at a recent Democratic fund-raising dinner where an old farmer kept interrupting the Democrat orator to boldly announce that he was a Republican.

"And why are you a Republican, may I ask?" the orator finally asked.

"My father was a Republican, and his father before him," the farmer answered.

"Well," said the orator, finding the opening he'd been waiting for, "suppose your father were a fool and your grandfather were a fool. What, according to your reasoning, would you be?"

"I'd be a Democrat," replied the farmer.

In a more serious vein, Republicans all over the country are eager to go to work. The Republican Party has a real responsibility at a time when more than ever the world looks and waits and waits and looks again to the United States for guidance and inspiration in the fight to preserve and extend freedom.

The Republican Party has plenty to do as a party of responsible opposition. I personally feel we should continue with renewed energy **as** the "G.O.P." -- not become irresponsible and ultimately change to the G.A.P. (Great Alternative Party).

Our role should be opposition to all ill-advised schemes and programs that hurt the people -- now or hereafter. In addition, our

MAR 13 1965

Page 4

role should be equally strong in our advocacy and support of proposals which help the private enterprise systems to increase earnings of management and the share of the workers.

What this country needs -- and needs now -- is a political party truly representative of the needs of the people. Rather than imposing restraints on human progress, we ^{Must} invite the broadest implementation by the self-governed to meet the challenges of any age.

If Lincoln were alive today he would warn against complacency and drift -- he would caution that America cannot maintain its position as a symbol of hopes for all mankind if only lip service is paid to the grand design outlined by our Founding Fathers. In this spirit, Republicans humbly acknowledge a responsibility to serve the Nation in all things dedicated to the common good.

To paraphrase a famous political observer, recent reports about the death of the Republican Party have been greatly exaggerated. The very intensity of the debate among Republicans about our Party's future is convincing evidence that the Grand Old Party is alive and kicking -- sometimes each other.

The question preoccupying all of us is, Where do we go from here -- and how do we get there?

I suggest two steps: (1) to keep in mind that the differences between Republicans today are not one fraction as great as the common

MAR 13 1965

Page 5

interests which bind us together as a Party; and (2) to build a stronger Party on the basis of our common interests, not our differences.

It will not be easy. Nothing worthwhile ever is. But haven't we been seeking an easy solution to our problems? Haven't we tended to bask in the reflected glories of past victories, past leaders, past strategies?

This is not to say that we cannot learn from the past and from those who have gone before. The lesson is clear for the Republican Party in 1965. We lost an election last November, a battle certainly, but not the war. We must not become so preoccupied with the why of our last defeat that we neglect the how of our next victory. The lessons of history strongly suggest that we can expect victory for our Party in the 1966 elections as the large flock of Democratic chickens come home to roost, as the Great Society begins to shrink under the test of time and as Republicans begin to concentrate their fire on the mishaps and misjudgements of the Democrats.

Some of us, discouraged and frustrated may ask, "why worry about 1966." Because, in my opinion, the people of our Republic are entitled to a strong competitive 2 party system. Because, in my opinion, a majority of Americans do believe in sound constitutional government -- freedom of the individual -- individual rights and responsibilities provided in a Free Society -- just to mention a few -- Because, we must resist -- yes even for those who may presently disagree -- the concentra-
tion

MAR 13 1965

Page 6

tion of power in our federal government -- the continuing administration efforts to control the news and manipulate public opinion -- Administration efforts to "wink" at scandal in high places -- Vague Administration "promises" designed too often for political purposes -- Because of grave responsibilities to generations yet unborn to preserve basic freedom, and because of fundamental responsibility to Republicans (past - present and future) ; to strengthen our party.

It may ;be dubbed the "Great Society" by President Johnson, but for those who must pay -- I suggest more descriptive terminology might well be "The Great Anxiety". As proof their fear is not groundless think back to the evening of January 4 when American television viewers were subjected to the "longest uninterrupted commercial in history".

The Johnson State of the Union Advertisement outlined a plan for creation of the land of milk, honey and sunshine for all -- particularly urban dwellers. In his 47 minute "live" program he pledged his Administration to solve all problems, but failed to mention the cost. He didn't say how much the withholding taxes, the Social Security taxes, State and local taxes would have to rise to pay for Government programs which will be applied to everything from A to Z.

The message was a blueprint for further Federalizing nearly every aspect of American life. An invitation to all to find a seat at the public trough, and take what a beneficent father in Washington was ready to hand out.

MAR 13 1965

Page 7

The President prescribed a liberal dose of "Federal Elixir" for each and every American. No problem appears too difficult, that creation of another Federal agency -- and throwing a few millions of tax dollars at it -- ;will not solve. Since then we have had the Economic message, an Inaugural Address and at least a Presidential message after message to Congress proposing new or renewed programs.

Going back to January 25, 3 weeks after the State of the Union message, Johnson sent Congress his Budget for fiscal 1966.

To the extent any budget bears the imprint of a President, Johnson's proposals for fiscal 1966 spending etch his economic, sociological and international profile with discernible clarity.

Last year's budget was set at \$97.5 billion. This year's prediction is \$99.7 billion.

Last year's deficit will total about \$6.3 billion. This year's estimate is \$5.3 billion.

Last year's cash payments to the public totaled \$121.4 billion. This year's outlay calls for \$127.4 billion.

Expressed in terms of increases over last year's budget, the 1966 requests do not at first appear excessive. But there are other criteria.

Expressed in terms of what we're buying for the money, the President's new budget lends itself to closer inspection -- as does the original bookkeeping peculiar to Mr. Johnson's attempt to create a conservative image.

MAR 13 1965

Page 8

What are we buying?

Less military research and development, for one thing. Less military personnel, less new weapons and equipment, less military assistance and less military operation and maintenance for another.

Less help for farm income stabilization, less conservation this year, with reductions in land, water and power resources, less money for fish and wildlife, forests, and general resources surveys.

Less money is allocated for highways, commerce and transportation.

Less money is provided for veterans.

Where does the increased spending go.?

Largely for the downpayment on President Johnson's Great Society. More federal money for public housing, urban renewal and community facilities.

More federal money for welfare, public assistance, health services and research.

The thrust of the President's message -- more spending for welfare, for education, for health.

(His Budget gymnastics were appropriately described in the January 31st issue of the Washington Star:)

"The preparations of the 1965-66 budget had all the posturing of an Elizabethan morality play. Evil was personified as the \$100 billion dollar figure.

MAR 13 1965

Page 9

"The forces of Good -- the President, the Cabinet and other trusty aides -- armed with scissors and self-denial -- went out to do battle with the inevitable figures."

"The President dramatized the struggle by taking his army of aides down to the Texas ranch before the Christmas holidays. Reporters were given steady details of the battle in a series of soliloquies and confidential asides that then found their way into headlines.

"Soon the President had the press pondering would he or wouldn't he stay under \$100 billion. One day he was losing, one day winning.

"After Act one on the Texas ranch came a series of messages to Congress on health, defense and education.

"In morality plays, the forces of Good always win. And they won in the finale last week. The President submitted a \$99.7 billion budget."

The preceeding remarks should indicate my distaste for many Great Society programs. I know many of you who concur are wondering what can be done to stop or slow the trend, so let ^{me} ~~us~~ conclude with what, in my opinion, are the Republican challenges.

Although outnumbered in both Houses of Congress by two to one majorities, it will be our duty during the next two years to continue to function as a vocal, yet responsible, opposition. To do otherwise

MAR 13 1965

Page 10

would be to destroy the very fabric of our two-party system.

The tremendous task facing the Republican Party in rebuilding its political fortunes had a steadying influence on the meeting of the Republican National Committee in Chicago in January.

Republicans simply can't afford an intra-party struggle; nor can they escape the past.

The meeting ended in an atmosphere of harmony and rededication. It is idle, though, to talk about a "new policy" or a "new philosophy," as is being done in some of the comment.

It isn't so much that the Republican Party must change -- though all political parties as well as institutions must turn with the times -- but that the impressions regarding the party must be changed.

The issues which really brought about defeat were not the positions of the party nor of its candidates.

It is time, as all agreed, to stop blaming each other as to what happened. The central issue, as Richard M. Nixon said, is not whether there is to be a third party but whether there is to be a second party.

It is not a matter of political organization, or who is or is not national chairman, but whether an "out" political party can win a campaign in the face of the almost overwhelming communications facilities and vast sums of money available to those in public office.

In the last campaign the nation experienced the effect of an attack that so distorted the positions of its candidates and of the party

MAR 13 1965

Page 11

itself that they were made to seem entirely out of step with American life.

The impossibility of countering this attack, in the short time of a campaign, resulted in the alienation of independent voters and many Democrat conservatives who often are found voting with Republicans.

On the other hand, a President is in the news every day. His words and his thoughts influence our daily lives. Federal bureaucracies are entwined even in community life, and daily we are told how this and that agency has produced the necessities or benefits of individual existence.

The problem of an effective answer, and of a consistent and persistent presentation of alternatives, is the vital problem facing the Republican Party.

Its voice must match that of the party in power. One move at the conference was a resolution to organize a Republican coordinating council. The first meeting was held in Washington, D. C. on March 10, at which time a Declaration outlining the plans and purposes was unanimously adopted. Another Chicago decision was to take whatever means are necessary to reach a greater audience on a regular basis.

Whether it can be done remains in doubt. But it must be accomplished. The Democrat Party now has a registration advantage of two to one, and has crushing majorities in the Congress.

If it is not corrected, and quickly, there will be a continu-

MAR 13 1965

Page 12

ing rush toward a one-party government. Already there is a growing public awareness of this danger.

Republicans have before them the greatest and most important challenge in this generation.

And mark my words, there are those who would destroy our two-party system under the false label of what they euphemistically call a "great national consensus" or the "vast middle ground of American thought."

These are the same persons who are quick to label practically any opposition to the so-called Great Society as being either generated by extremists or smacking of disloyalty.

These are the people who have tried to create the national myth that the Great Society is, in actuality, equally attractive to Democrats and Republicans alike.

But, like the Pied Piper, their real purpose is to paint a false picture of something for everybody in order to lure Independents and Republicans into a permanent one-party structure of government. Just a quick glance at the history books will point to the decay and corruption that march in tandem with one-party rule.

The task that lies ahead won't be easy, but as Chairman elect Ray Bliss recently remarked, "When you begin pondering either the lateness of the hour or the length of the road ahead, you're all through in politics."

*Extra
copy
sent* →

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE
7TH ANNUAL CONVENTION - UNION COUNTY YOUNG REPUBLICANS
SUMMIT, NEW JERSEY
Saturday, March 13, 1965

THE GREAT ANXIETY

It's good to be in a Congressional District which didn't go "all the way with LBJ" -- thanks to my friend and able colleague, Mrs. Dwyer.

I don't know how she did it, but a lot of midwest Republicans would like to have her recipe.

President Johnson, I have learned, swept Union County -- by two-to-one, with a margin of 82,000 votes. Flo Dwyer not only made up this huge deficit but by a margin of 46,000 -- 60 per cent of the vote, her best record in five campaigns for the House, I understand.

I don't know of any Republican Congressman who bucked the Johnson trend and still managed to increase his own previous margins of victory.

It is an immense tribute to Mrs. Dwyer and all of you who support her so diligently.

Republicans in the House -- think highly of your Congresswoman. We respect her political judgment and her analysis of the issues. No one, for example, did more to defeat the Administration's Area Redevelopment bill than Mrs. Dwyer, and on the other hand, no one ~~did~~ ^{does} more for ~~promoting~~ ^{promoting} passage of commuter transportation legislation.

She's sound, constructive and exceedingly able -- and I'm delighted to be in her District tonight.

It goes without saying those gathered together here tonight are ready and willing to help us make a "Republican" comeback.

Politics is generally a bitterly-serious business but I've often felt that, if we can't occasionally laugh at ourselves, it's time to quit.

Yes and to illustrate there are no hard feelings over the November election, I want to pay a tribute= to our President.

Without any qualms whatsoever, I want to state publicly that we're all indebted because of his Administration -- even generations yet unborn.

Moreover, it looks like the Great Society is going to make this a land of plenty -- owe plenty, tax plenty, spend plenty, and waste plenty and perhaps in 1966, swithhhh plenty seats in Congress.

There's spunk left in the Grand Old Party, as illustrated at a recent Democratic fund-raising dinner where an old farmer kept interrupting the Democrat orator to boldly announce that he was a Republican.

"And why are you a Republican, may I ask?" the orator finally asked.

"My father was a Republican, and his father before him," the farmer answered.

"Well," said the orator, finding the opening he'd been waiting for, "suppose your father were a fool and your grandfather were a fool. What, according to your reasoning, would you be?"

"I'd be a Democrat." replied the farmer.

In a more serious vein, Republicans all over the country are eager to go to work. The Republican Party has a real responsibility at a time when more than ever the world looks and waits and waits and looks again to the United States for guidance and inspiration in the fight to preserve and extend freedom.

The Republican Party has plenty to do as a party of responsible opposition. I personally feel we should continue with renewed energy on the "G.O.P." -- not become irresponsible and ultimately change to the G.A.P. (Great Alternative Party).

Our role should be opposition to all ill-advised schemes and programs that hurt the people -- now or hereafter. In addition, our

role should be equally strong in our advocacy and support of proposals which help the private enterprise systems to increase earnings of management and the share of the workers.

What this country needs -- and needs now -- is a political party truly representative of the needs of the people. Rather than imposing restraints on human progress, we invite the broadest implementation by the self-governed to meet the challenges of any age.

If Lincoln were alive today he would warn against complacency and drift -- he would caution that America cannot maintain its position as a symbol of hopes for all mankind if only lip service is paid to the grand design outlined by our Founding Fathers. In this spirit, Republicans humbly acknowledge a responsibility to serve the Nation in all things dedicated to the common good.

To paraphrase a famous political observer, recent reports about the death of the Republican Party have been greatly exaggerated. The very intensity of the debate among Republicans about our Party's future is convincing evidence that the Grand Old Party is alive and kicking -- sometimes each other.

The question preoccupying all of us is, Where do we go from here -- and how do we get there?

I suggest two steps: (1) to keep in mind that the differences between Republicans today are not one fraction as great as the common

interests which bind us together as a Party; and (2) to build a stronger Party on the basis of our common interests, not our differences.

It will not be easy. Nothing worthwhile ever is. But haven't we been seeking an easy solution to our problems? Haven't we tended to bask in the reflected glories of past victories, past leaders, past strategies?

This is not to say that we cannot learn from the past and from those who have gone before. The lesson is clear for the Republican Party in 1965. We lost an election last November, a battle certainly, but not the war. We must not become so preoccupied with the why of our last defeat that we neglect the how of our next victory. The lessons of history strongly suggest that we can expect victory for our Party in the 1966 elections as the large flock of Democratic chickens come home to roost, as the Great Society begins to shrink under the test of time and as Republicans begin to concentrate their fire on the mishaps and misjudgements of the Democrats.

Some of us, discouraged and frustrated may ask, "why worry about 1966." Because, in my opinion, the people of our Republic are entitled to a strong competitive 2 party system. Because, in my opinion, a majority of Americans do believe in sound constitutional government -- freedom of the individual -- individual rights and responsibilities provided in a Free Society -- just to mention a few -- Because, we must resist -- yes even for those who may presently disagree @- the concentra-
gion

tion of power in our federal government -- the continuing administration efforts to control the news and manipulate public opinion -- Administration efforts to "wink" at scandal in high places -- Vague Administration "promises" designed too often for political purposes -- Because of grave responsibilities to generations yet unborn to preserve basic freedom, and because of fundamental responsibility to Republicans (past - present and future) ; to strengthen our party.

It may ;be dubbed the "Great Society" by President Johnson, but for those who must pay -- I suggest more descriptive terminology might well be "The Great Anxiety". As proof their fear is not groundless think back to the evening of January 4 when American television viewers were subjected to the "longest uninterrupted commercial in history".

The Johnson State of the Union Advertisement outlined a plan for creation of the land of milk, honey and sunshine for all -- particularly urban dwellers. In his 47 minute "live" program he pledged his Administration to solve all problems, but failed to mention the cost. He didn't say how much the withholding taxes, the Social Security taxes, State and local taxes would have to rise to pay for Government programs which will be applied to everything from A to Z.

The message was a blueprint for further Federalizing nearly every aspect of American life. An invitation to all to find a seat at the public trough, and take what a beneficent father in Washington was ready to hand out.

The President prescribed a liberal dose of "Federal Elixir" for each and every American. No problem appears too difficult, that creation of another Federal agency -- and throwing a few millions of tax dollars at it -- will not solve. Since then we have had the Economic message, an Inaugural Address and at least a Presidential message after message to Congress proposing new or renewed programs.

Going back to January 25, 3 weeks after the State of the Union message, Johnson sent Congress his Budget for fiscal 1966.

To the extent any budget bears the imprint of a President, Johnson's proposals for fiscal 1966 spending etch his economic, sociological and international profile with discernible clarity.

Last year's budget was set at \$97.5 billion. This year's prediction is \$99.7 billion.

Last year's deficit will total about \$6.3 billion. This year's estimate is \$5.3 billion.

Last year's cash payments to the public totaled \$121.4 billion. This year's outlay calls for \$127.4 billion.

Expressed in terms of increases over last year's budget, the 1966 requests do not at first appear excessive. But there are other criteria.

Expressed in terms of what we're buying for the money, the President's new budget lends itself to closer inspection -- as does the original bookkeeping peculiar to Mr. Johnson's attempt to create a conservative image.

What are we buying?

Less military research and development, for one thing. Less military personnel, less new weapons and equipment, less military assistance and less military operation and maintenance for another.

Less help for farm income stabilization, less conservation this year, with reductions in land, water and power resources, less money for fish and wildlife, forests, and general resources surveys.

Less money is allocated for highways, commerce and transportation.

Less money is provided for veterans.

Where does the increased spending go?

Largely for the downpayment on President Johnson's Great Society. More federal money for public housing, urban renewal and community facilities.

More federal money for welfare, public assistance, health services and research.

The thrust of the President's message -- more spending for welfare, for education, for health.

(His Budget gymnastics were appropriately described in the January 31st issue of the Washington Star:)

"The preparations of the 1965-66 budget had all the posturing of an Elizabethan morality play. Evil was personified as the \$100 billion dollar figure.

"The forces of Good -- the President, the Cabinet and other trusty aides -- armed with scissors and self-denial -- went out to do battle with the inevitable figures."

"The President dramatized the struggle by taking his army of aides down to the Texas ranch before the Christmas holidays. Reporters were given steady details of the battle in a series of soliloquies and confidential asides that then found their way into headlines.

"Soon the President had the press pondering would he or wouldn't he stay under \$100 billion. One day he was losing, one day winning.

"After Act one on the Texas ranch came a series of messages to Congress on health, defense and education.

"In morality plays, the forces of Good always win. And they won in the finale last week. The President submitted a \$99.7 billion budget."

The preceding remarks should indicate my distaste for many Great Society programs. I know many of you who concur are wondering what can be done to stop or slow the trend, so let me conclude with what, in my opinion, are the Republican challenges.

Although outnumbered in both Houses of Congress by two to one majorities, it will be our duty during the next two years to continue to function as a vocal, yet responsible, opposition. To do otherwise

would be to destroy the very fabric of our two-party system.

The tremendous task facing the Republican Party in rebuilding its political fortunes had a steadying influence on the meeting of the Republican National Committee in Chicago in January.

Republicans simply can't afford an intra-party struggle; nor can they escape the past.

The meeting ended in an atmosphere of harmony and rededication. It is idle, though, to talk about a "new policy" or a "new philosophy," as is being done in some of the comment.

It isn't so much that the Republican Party must change -- though all political parties as well as institutions must turn with the times -- but that the impressions regarding the party must be changed.

The issues which really brought about defeat were not the positions of the party nor of its candidates.

It is time, as all agreed, to stop blaming each other as to what happened. The central issue, as Richard M. Nixon said, is not whether there is to be a third party but whether there is to be a second party.

It is not a matter of political organization, or who is or is not national chairman, but whether an "out" political party can win a campaign in the face of the almost overwhelming communications facilities and vast sums of money available to those in public office.

In the last campaign the nation experienced the effect of an attack that so distorted the positions of its candidates and of the party

itself that they were made to seem entirely out of step with American life.

The impossibility of countering this attack, in the short time of a campaign, resulted in the alienation of independent voters and many Democrat conservatives who often are found voting with Republicans.

On the other hand, a President is in the news every day. His words and his thoughts influence our daily lives. Federal bureaucracies are entwined even in community life, and daily we are told how this and that agency has produced the necessities or benefits of individual existence.

The problem of an effective answer, and of a consistent and persistent presentation of alternatives, is the vital problem facing the Republican Party.

Its voice must match that of the party in power. One move at the conference was a resolution to organize a Republican coordinating council. The first meeting was held in Washington, D. C. on March 10, at which time a Declaration outlining the plans and purposes was unanimously adopted. Another Chicago decision was to take whatever means are necessary to reach a greater audience on a regular basis.

Whether it can be done remains in doubt. But it must be accomplished. The Democrat Party now has a registration advantage of two to one, and has crushing majorities in the Congress.

If it is not corrected, and quickly, there will be a continu-

ing rush toward a one-party government. Already there is a growing public awareness of this danger.

Republicans have before them the greatest and most important challenge in this generation.

And mark my words, there are those who would destroy our two-party system under the false label of what they euphemistically call a "great national consensus" or the "vast middle ground of American thought."

These are the same persons who are quick to label practically any opposition to the so-called Great Society as being either generated by extremists or smacking of disloyalty.

These are the people who have tried to create the national myth that the Great Society is, in actuality, equally attractive to Democrats and Republicans alike.

But, like the Pied Piper, their real purpose is to paint a false picture of something for everybody in order to lure Independents and Republicans into a permanent one-party structure of government. Just a quick glance at the history books will point to the decay and corruption that march in cadence with one-party rule.

The task that lies ahead won't be easy, but as Chairman elect Ray Bliss recently remarked, "When you begin pondering either the lateness of the hour or the length of the road ahead, you're all through in politics."