Let's pretend that defeat is victory.
Let's pretend that our enemies are really friendly.
Let's pretend that a public debt acknowledged to be more than three hundred billion dollars is good for the country because we owe the money to ourselves.
Let's pretend that government by spending money it doesn't have can create a real prosperity for all people.
Let's pretend that we can buy the friendship of other countries.
Let's pretend that Castro is not a Communist and then when that deceit has been exposed, let's pretend that the existence of a Communist beachhead 90 miles from our shores isn't much of a threat.
My friends, the real issue of 1964 which is hidden and disguised and ignored is the stark, cold issue of survival.
Have we as a people lost our courage? Are we afraid to face reality? Are we so dedicated to our material creature comforts that we are unwilling to hear the truth?
The Democrat administrations since 1945 have encouraged us to play this game of let's pretend . . . to indulge in wishful thinking . . . to close our eyes to reality.
The mission of the Republican Party in 1964 is to save this nation from the delusion of wishful thinking . . . let's pretend . . . appeasement and accommodation.
Our mission cannot be accomplished by substituting a "me-too"
Republican administration for the wonderful wizzards of sleight-of-hand who now control our destiny in Washington.

Where, you ask, have we accepted defeat and called it victory? In Berlin, when we permitted the Russians to block our access and adopted the expensive airlift. Responsible officials have recently revealed that those who advocated strong policy of insisting upon treaty rights were over-ruled by timid men... this timidity encouraged the Russians to initiate the Korean War.

And what about Korea? The men who gave their lives on that battlefield died fighting in a war the political authorities would not permit them to win.

We were told that making Laos neutral was a victory. Now supplies and arms pour through that nation to support the Communists in South Viet Nam.

In the fall of 1962, Khrushchev commenced the installation of ICBM's in Cuba. Our administration appeared to take a firm stand. We demanded inspection - we demanded removal of the missiles - we demanded removal of the Russian mercenaries who were supporting Castro. And then after the election, we were told to pretend that we had won a victory even though there was no inspection... we did not examine the missiles which were withdrawn and the Russian troops remain on Cuban soil.

We have been told by those who practice let's pretend that the nuclear test ban treaty is a victory. Have we forgotten that when
President Eisenhower, with great goodwill voluntarily suspended our program of testing, the moratorium was broken without warning by the Russians.

Since the end of World War I we have sent 109 billion dollars to other nations pretending that by giving away money we could buy peace . . . and we've succeeded . . . succeeded in strengthening our enemies and alienating many of our friends.

Let's pretend is a game for children and for foolish, timid adults.

The shooting stopped in 1945, the war continues. A strange, sometimes hidden, sometimes open conflict . . . a riot in South America . . . a riot in Japan to protest the visit of the President of the United States . . . an American plane is shot down . . . agitators move from Cuba to Panama and so it goes.

The makers of America foreign policy must put aside the game of let's pretend and once more dedicate the power of America to the protection and preservation of this Republic wherever and whenever it is threatened.

Our history demonstrates that we do not intend to impose our concepts on other people. Let our actions now demonstrate that we do not intend to let other nations impose their concepts and their controls on us.

But isn't that dangerous, the timid voices question. If we insist upon our treaty rights in Cuba and Panama or upon access to
Berlin, won't we be provoking World War III and isn't anything better than war?

When the Eisenhower administration took firm steps to protect the offshore island of Quemoy and Matsu, the Reds backed down. There was no third World War.

When the Eisenhower administration moved quickly to prevent a Communist take-over in Guatemala, the Reds backed down.

When the Eisenhower administration moved promptly in the Mediterranean, it did not provoke a third World War.

When President Kennedy gave notice that we would not tolerate the installation of missiles on Cuba, the Reds backed down.

No man can predict the future. May I suggest the decision we must make as a people in this Republican primary in 1964 is clearly defined. Are we to continue to surrender and back down and speak softly and accept violations of our solemn treaty rights or are we to stand firmly on the right and declare to all the world that, loving peace, we love freedom more.

We have spent untold millions of tax dollars to build the greatest defensive weapons systems in the world. If we continue to stand before the world as the greatest power, but a power which is afraid to use its strength, which in effect says, "It's better to be Red than dead", we are participating in a gradual surrender of the American Republic.

When Castro broke the solemn treaty obligations between
Cuba and the United States by shutting off the water supply to our base at Guantanamo, I said we must turn the water on again.

The governor of New York, who is the only other announced candidate for the presidency on the Republican ticket, disagrees with my position. Evidently the governor is satisfied to let Mr. Castro violate our treaty rights. Apparently, if the governor is sincere in his position, he would order our Marines to surrender Guantanamo should Castro attempt to take that base physically.

Oh, there's a difference you say, between turning off the water and taking the base. The difference is only one of degree. I am not satisfied to let Mr. Castro either turn off the water or take the base. I cannot and will not sugar-coat or ignore the reality of our position. The existence of Castro's Communist Cuba in the Western hemisphere, supported by the Russian mercenaries and Communist arms, violates the Monroe Doctrine, threatens our commerce, our people, and our existence as a nation.

Castro came to power with our aid and assistance and this was a grievous mistake. Castro could have been eliminated had we supported the brave Cuban patriots at the Bay of Pigs and our failure to support them was a grievous mistake.

Each passing week strengthens the Castro regime in Cuba, and the government of the United States is required to take action. This need not be a military invasion - there are other avenues which must be explored initially. The people of Cuba long to be free. There
are Cuban patriots eager to liberate their homeland. Economic pressure can be applied, but if all else fails, we must be prepared to use our military force.

We have a legal and a moral right to occupy the Guantanamo Naval Base. We have a legal and moral right to that water supply. A great nation loses its claim to greatness when it refuses to enforce its legal and moral historical rights.

Those voices who are attempting to obscure and confuse the issues in this campaign have made much of my statement that American missiles systems are unreliable. And by the way, you might make note that my opponents have translated "unreliable" to "inaccurate".

Under ideal conditions and simulated tests, the American missiles have been amazingly accurate. But last week the third Atlas blew up in its silo - reason unexplained. And no war has yet been fought with missiles. This magnificent new weapon has not been tested in the crucible of combat. All of the literature and knowledge pertaining to the art of war argues that it is foolhardy and reckless to abandon a weapon system which has proven its capabilities in favor of a new and untried system of weapons.

I suggest that it is reckless and irresponsible to phase out our manned bombers as this administration is doing until the new missile systems have proven their ability to carry destruction to an enemy under combat conditions.
There is scientific belief to support the possibility that when our enemy exploded his last atomic weapon in the atmosphere, he discovered that this massive explosion created forces which destroy or limit the ability of our present guidance systems used on the missiles.

We are now prevented by the test ban treaty from determining whether or not this possibility is an actuality. Until we do have an answer to this question it is, I repeat, reckless and irresponsible to abandon our manned aircraft which have proven their ability to reach a target and destroy an enemy.

Keeping in mind that the issue of this campaign is whether or not the Republic shall survive, let's turn our attention to the United Nations. Here again, the governor of New York and his supporters have severely criticised my comments on the UN. Gov. Rockefeller claims to have been an architect of the United Nations while serving in a Democrat administration in the Department of State. And what he attempted to plan may have been an effective instrument for keeping the peace. Perhaps as a proud parent he is blind to the imperfections of his child.

The United Nations has not kept the peace. It has not lived up to its promise. The threat of Russian veto has moved the decision making power to the general assembly and here the free nations of the world are out-voted by governments which were not even in existence at the end of World War II.
The United Nations is worthy of our strong support only if it can be made to serve as an effective instrument to keep the peace. If it does not serve that purpose, then we are indeed foolish to continue to supply most of the money and to abide by decisions influenced by our enemies.

I have suggested that our task should be to strengthen the UN and to make it an effective instrument, but we will never do this if we blindly insist that we are pleased with the UN accomplishments to date.

Here at home our domestic policy has been, if possible, a greater game of let's pretend than has our foreign policy.

Mr. Johnson has recently said let's pretend we can cut taxes without cutting spending and buy prosperity.

He has said let's pretend that money we are committed to spend can be ignored in the budget and thus we can have an apparent reduction. Even a little child knows that you can't have your cake and eat it too.

I am pleased to hear that Gov. Rockefeller has complained of federal spending and federal taxation. I would be more impressed if I could forget the fact that as the governor of New York, Mr. Rockefeller has increased government spending by 62-1/2%, has increased taxes and then to avoid a further increase, described the additional revenue to be taken from the people as fees rather than taxes.
The only true relief available to the domestic economy will come when we truly reduce federal expenditures and then reduce federal taxation. And with this reduction we must remove those aspects of the federal tax system which might just as well have been deliberately planned to penalize the free enterprise system. You know what they are and I needn't enumerate them.

In this area of domestic economy I must invite Gov. Rockefeller's attention to a serious error ... for he has been suggesting that it is my purpose to destroy and repeal our social security system. I suspect Gov. Rockefeller drew these conclusions because in New Hampshire and elsewhere I have said that the social security system is not adequate to the promises made in its behalf ... I have said that it needs an element of voluntarism. It is inadequate ... it does suffer from being entirely compulsory.

When I was first campaigning for the Senate of the United States, I told my fellow Republicans there were certain institutions which had been created under Franklin Roosevelt which we must preserve and improve. Among these I listed social security, FDIC, unemployment insurance, etc. And I said then that no responsible Republican would advocate the repeal of the social security laws.

The present social security system is inadequate because it does not have adequate guarantees. The fund is more than a billion dollars over spent at this moment. Those older citizens who must depend upon social security are now at the mercy of the body of
federal taxpayers. All the funds collected during their working years have now been spent.

To strengthen the social security system a portion of it must be funded just as any insurance policy is funded.

To keep the promise it pretends to make we must make sure funds are available to pay the commitments.

Now the amount of money paid under the maximum benefits of social security is not enough to permit an individual to live in peace and dignity in retirement. Therefore, I have said we should make it possible on a voluntary basis to enlarge these benefits for the responsible members of the working force who desire an adequate retirement program.

As many of you know, the amount of money paid into the system by a worker has no relation to the amount of benefits that worker may receive when they retire. Thus an individual with a very spotty record of employment, who has been covered by making contributions for less than 5 years of his life, receives the same payment as does an individual who enters the work force at 21 and makes payments every pay day until retirement at 65. And I have said that while we must provide a minimum for everyone, we must also recognize the superior contributions of the steady, industrious worker and that the benefits should in some way reflect the amount of contribution.

The governor of New York may be satisfied to let Castro
break our treaty rights . . . the governor of New York may be satisfied to let Panama ignore our treaty rights . . . the governor of New York may be satisfied with the present social security system . . . the governor of New York may be satisfied with the McNamara plan to do away with manned bombers.

I am not satisfied - and I do not believe the American people are satisfied to let Mr. Castro break our treaty rights . . . to let Panama ignore their obligations. I am not satisfied with our present social security system. It must be improved. I am not satisfied with our present foreign policy. It must be strengthened. I am not satisfied with those defense department decisions which might lessen our ability to defend ourselves.

This great Republican Party of ours was born to meet the nation's need in an hour when the future of the Republic was threatened. The prospects of that day were indeed bleak. Men of good conscience were required to make a decision which tested their commitment to the cause of freedom. In this hour of travail and tragedy the Republican Party once again is challenged. Can such a nation and such a people prevail.

The decision we must make will not be reached in the convention hall at San Francisco, or at political meetings such as this. The answer to that question will be reached in the hearts and minds of the people of America wherever they may be . . . in the small towns and in the cities . . . in the factories and the office buildings . . .
... in the churches and schools. We seek to win, not a partisan victory, but rather a victory for freedom. It is not our intention to force our will upon other nations, but rather to extend the sovereignty of the individual as proof of our recognition that a loving God created this world and its people and intended that all men should be free.

I ask you to commit your hearts and your minds and your money to this cause - not in support of Barry Goldwater, but rather in support of those concepts upon which this nation was founded.

For we knew then and we know now that life was not intended to be easy.

We knew then and we know now that freedom is not easily won or easily kept.

We knew then and we know now that men of courage accept freedom's first requirement of individual responsibility. No man - no political party - no national administration can guarantee with certainty that our enemies will be defeated - that our cause will prevail.

But our party can pledge itself to these policies of courage and thrift, compassion and initiative, which offer the best possibility of ultimate victory.

Our party can put aside the dangerous game of let's pretend and I predict that if we do - if we offer to the people of this land a clear cut choice - if we provide an opportunity to those who would
enlist in the service of progress and peace and freedom, we will merit their support.

The bankrupt policies of the New Deal, the Fair Deal and the New Frontier have been clearly stamped by history as a dismal failure. Some men will choose the easy way - close their eyes to reality - insist on playing let's pretend - seeking only the immediate material reward . . . thrusting aside their share of the responsibility for the world of tomorrow. But that cannot be and must not be our choice.

I ask your support in this campaign because the nation needs your support - I ask your help because your help is needed - I ask you to face the truth because the truth must be faced - I ask your support for this nation - I ask you to examine your own hearts and your own consciences. We must not - we dare not fail.

Thank you.