

New York
in McDonald

NOTES

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

LUNCHEON

SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

September 27, 1966

Dr. Merenberg
Chausella
Galbraith
Lincol Van Deerlen
Mayo
Frank Curran

↳ This has been my first opportunity to visit the
Scripps Institution of Oceanography. I have had an
exciting tour and I've learned a great deal. It has
made me proud to wear my new nautical hat. ✓

~~I'm not going to give a speech today.~~ I should
~~like~~ like to share with you a few thoughts.

↳ As many of you know, I am chairman of the
newly-created National Council on Marine Resources
and Engineering Development.

Quite a title

↳ This new Cabinet-level planning and coordinating body has been established to implement a significant new national policy -- a policy to enlarge our understanding of the marine environment and at the same time to employ that scientific knowledge for the practical benefit of man.

↳ Since I am also chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, I sometimes get the feeling I have been put in charge of everything out of this world.

↳ More seriously, though, my participation in these activities has intensified a concern I had -- and often expressed, in fact -- as a United States Senator. That science and technology should be wisely integrated into our total society.

↳ There are those who see science and technology

as threats to humanistic values.

I do not share that view.

↳ I believe science and technology can be
liberators of mankind. By harnessing them, we can
create new dimensions of freedom -- freedom from
dull, routine work; from isolation; from the captivity
of frozen and stratified social systems; from disease,
ignorance and hunger.

I say we can create new dimensions of freedom.

It all depends on how we use our new knowledge and
==
processes.

↳ ~~We in the federal government have been, and~~ *has done much*
~~are, doing our best~~ to stimulate creativity and
excellence in these areas.

↳ ~~We have~~ *It has* nourished fundamental research and
sponsored the training and education of a large part

of our scientific and technological manpower.

And, in doing this, our own horizons have been widened and we have found ourselves a major consumer of the scientific and technological product.

We have learned a great deal about decision-making processes.

We have learned to live with complexity. We have learned to live with change. We have learned the techniques of broad and inter-disciplinary management.

Partnership ↙ And we have managed to do this while maintaining the integrity and independence of the universities and industries which have been our partners.

↘ Out of all this we have also learned that scientific and technological advances do not always come with prescriptions attached for curing society's ills.

~~now that~~

I believe, ~~now that~~ we have learned to live ~~reasonably~~ with science and technology, that we must increasingly turn to the business of making them work more effectively in our behalf.

↳ All around us are problems of urbanization, of pollution, of traffic congestion, of crime.

There are perhaps even more pressing international problems such as the population explosion and the imbalance in world food supply. ↳ In a world of ~~such~~ ^{vast} resources, starvation and chronic malnutrition are not morally acceptable.

↳ Much of our scientific and technological output to date has been devoted to the demands of national defense.

↳ We have built many and better swords. Now we must, too, build more and better plowshares. ~~we~~

Popul
Food

we must apply the same efficiency and intensity devoted to programs for national defense to programs for economic and social progress.

↳ Here in California you have both the need and the resources.

California, is, in fact, almost a nation in itself -- a remarkably rich and productive nation containing within it both the problems and the means to solve them.

~~You have in California an awareness of the possibilities and the readiness to tackle them of both private citizens and your state government.~~

and, I have been impressed by Governor Brown's use of state, university and industrial talent for his continuing studies of "California and the Use of the Ocean."

↳ I have been impressed, too, by his joint efforts with industry in applying methods of systems analysis to economic and environmental problem areas.

↳ These things are just the beginning of what may be accomplished by states and localities, by the private sector, by the federal government -- by all of us working together -- if we really commit ourselves to applying the knowledge and tools at hand.

↳ Yes, I believe science and technology and democracy are highly compatible. ^{and} I believe they can be most compatible in a nation with gifts and characteristics such as our own.

↳ Our government's new initiative in marine science ~~affairs~~ will furnish a welcome opportunity and example of how we can marshall our intellectual, science and engineering capabilities to serve the public interest.

and / We shall continue to nourish basic research.

But we intend to translate understanding of the marine environment into a mature ocean technology...to promote international understanding and cooperation...to exploit fisheries in meeting world-wide starvation...to collect data to improve weather forecasting...to abate pollution in our estuaries and sea shores...and to foster development of offshore minerals and fuel resources.

h We are on the threshold of a new age of exploration. Our dreams for the oceans are not those of poets or prophets. In our long tradition we intend to develop the bountiful resources of the sea to serve man's pressing needs.

h Finally may I say this: The American people have always had -- perhaps because of the vastness of our land and resources -- a breadth of vision and imagination.

Perhaps we may never be able to close the gap between what is and what we believe should be. But if there is a place where that gap may finally be closed, it is in America.

↳ Today we are in the midst of ~~precisely~~ that adventure.

↳ If we use both our intelligence and our wisdom, ~~I believe~~ we have the chance to enter an era where science and humanism may finally come together in the ultimate cause of man's freedom.

#

Luncheon

Address by the Vice-President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey,
on the occasion of his visit to the University of California, San Diego's
Scripps Institution of Oceanography - September 27, 1966.

* * *

Introductory remarks by Dr. John S. Galbraith, Chancellor, University of California,
San Diego:

Ladies and gentlemen:

As Chancellor of the San Diego campus of the University of California, I am
pleased to welcome you on this significant occasion.

When I came to San Diego a couple of years ago, I was puzzled about the slogan,
"San Diego, City in Motion." Motion can be in various directions, including down,
and I wondered what kind of motion was involved in this community. But it is now
evident for all to see, that San Diego is a city on the move, and that move is on the
way up and that that way up will be closely associated with oceanography.

The Scripps Institution, as we all know, is the world's leader in the field of
oceanography and the Vice-President's visit here today is based on his recognition
of that fact and of the importance of maintaining Scripps' preeminence.

You were invited here today because of your interest in oceanography. I do not
have the opportunity to recognize each of you individually who have supported the
development of oceanography in the San Diego area, but I do wish to introduce to you
all of these seated at the head table.

On your right, Walter Kohn, chairman of the San Diego Division of the Academic
Senate of the University of California; next, Gordon MacDonald, associate director
of the UCLA Laboratory of Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, on leave
to the Institute of Defense Analyses in Washington, D.C., and chairman of the
President's Science Advisory Committee on Oceanography - - incidentally, there are
two others member of PSAC here today, Walter Munk and Henry Menard are out here in
the audience - - next is Charles J. Hitch, vice-president of the University for
administration; William A. Nierenberg, whom you all know, the dean and director of

the Scripps Institution of Oceanography; Congressman Lionel Van Deerlin, and Mayor Frank Curran.

It is now my privilege to introduce our distinguished guest, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice-President of the United States.

Text of address by the Vice-President:

Chancellor Galbraith; Dr. Nierenberg; my good friend, the Congressman of the 37th. I have difficulty remembering all of these districts, but Lionel Van Deerlin is one of our most able and effective congressmen and I'm just as happy as I can be to be permitted to join him in this visit to Scripps Institution.

I look in the audience and I see many old friends. I'd surely like to say just a special "hello" to Herb York, who has been to see me so many times, and to you, Dr. MacDonald, it seems like we just left each other about a week ago. We had a very fine report from Dr. MacDonald, the PSAC report, on this whole subject matter of oceanography and we have asked each of the constituent members of the oceanographic council to give that report very careful analysis. So Doctor, we'll have you back, I'm sure, and we'll look forward to it.

Today I thought I would just take a few minutes, just to visit with you. I've been doing a lot of speech-making, and I feel a little inadequate to the occasion for a speech today. I know that I'm in the presence of men and women who are professionals, scientists, technicians, scholars. I surely do not claim any expert knowledge in the areas of science and technology, and particularly as it relates to marine resources or oceanography.

This has been a very pleasant and rewarding experience for me. It's my first opportunity to be in this part of California, this very beautiful area. I know Mayor Curran has always told me that this was about the best part of California,

and I also know that Lionel Van Deerlin has claimed that this is the best part of California, he has no doubt. It's beautiful, and I can well understand why you like to be here.

I asked Dr. Nierenberg this morning, "How much do you have to pay to get a job here, to have the privilege of living in the wonderful area?" He didn't tell me, but I gathered from his silence that it's reasonable, and I'm not going to in any way expose any of our private conversation.

I've had a very exciting tour today, getting acquainted with people and whales, and also becoming much better acquainted with the vast amount of research that's going on in Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

As you all know - at least if you don't know I'm about to tell you - by Act of Congress I have been designated as the chairman of the newly created National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. The Vice-President was made the chairman of that cabinet-level Council, and we have our work cut out for us by statute for the next 18 months.

This new cabinet-level planning and coordinating body has been established to implement a significant new national policy, or should I put it, to implement a new emphasis on national policy: policy to enlarge our understanding of the marine environment and at the same time to employ that scientific knowledge for the practical benefit of men, applied science as well as basic science.

Since I'm also chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, it sometimes passes through my mind that I'm being put in charge of everything out of this world. I don't want it to get out of this room, but if the President of the United States thinks he has a large jurisdiction over which to preside, imagine the dimensions of my domain - space and the oceans, the oceans taking at least 4/5ths, or around that, of the earth's surface - and I don't want to make any comparison lest it may get back to the White House, but I'm very pleased that the Congress has seen

fit to give me jurisdiction in the depths of the seas and out into the vast cosmos of the great universe.

Now, more seriously, my participation in these activities has intensified a concern that I've long had as a public official, and often expressed; namely, that science and technology should be wisely integrated into our total society, and that these all-important intellectual developments and attainments should never be set aside or compartmentalized, but rather to be into the very fabric of our life.

There are those who see science and technology as threats to humanistic values, and I'm sure you've all heard that. You've heard so many people say that our great emphasis upon science and technology indicates that we've lost our sense of idealism, that we're more concerned about theoretical knowledge than we are the living conditions of man. Well, I do not share that view.

I happen to believe that science and technology can be the liberators of mankind. By harnessing them, we can create new dimensions of human freedom: freedom from dull, routine work, which, of course, we see everyday in automation and our new machines; freedom from isolation, which we see everyday as we expand the mechanisms of communication; and freedom from the captivity of frozen and stratified social systems, because science and technology have a way of breaking through these encrusted stratas of the social institutions; and freedom from disease and ignorance and hunger. Surely modern science and technology are making the great breakthroughs in our battle against these ancient enemies of mankind, these enemies that beset so many of the children of this earth: the disease that plagued the human race, and the ignorance that is so prevalent in all areas of this world of ours, and this impending and real threat of hunger, at a time when it seems almost inconceivable that the word hunger should ever be uttered again.

I say that we can create, and I underline and the underscore the word can, new

dimensions of freedom. It all depends on how we use this new knowledge, and the new processes that this new knowledge brings to us. Now, we in the Federal government have been, and I think are, doing a good deal to stimulate creativity and excellence in these areas of science and technology, and, indeed, the integration of the fund of knowledge that comes from the exploration in science to our social problems.

We have nourished fundamental research. I see men here in uniform and I think it's appropriate that I should say that while our great armed services are the envy of the world and the pride of this nation and very competent in their first requirement, in their first duty of providing for the common defense, the armed services have been very instrumental in promoting research and development in a host of fields far beyond weapon systems.

I recall serving as chairman of a sub-committee on scientific research in our government - this is the same committee which presently Senator Ribicoff chairs - and when we would hold our hearings, I would frequently ask the members of the armed services that came before us, "How much of your research fund are you putting into basic research?" And I think it can be said here that we owe a great deal to the armed services for having been willing to place a good deal of emphasis upon basic research, where you never quite know what you're going to find, but research for the love of research and for the search of knowledge and truth. I only hope that that emphasis will be maintained, and it has.

As I said, our Federal government has done a good deal to stimulate this creativity and it has nourished fundamental research and it is, and has, sponsored the training and education of a large part of our scientific and technological manpower.

Several times in this visit to California, my fellow Americans, I have noted that this state enjoys Federal grants far beyond those of any other state in this land. And I don't want to rub it in, I just want to mention it to you. If I were

in the mid-west; I can tell you that someone would rise immediately and say, "Why have you let it happen?", because there has been a good deal of discussion about what some people believe to be the imbalance of the sharing, or the imbalance of the granting, of R and D contracts and of the research funds that come from our many departments of government, an imbalance geographically.

Let me put it this way. I one time held some hearings on this very subject and I learned there - one of the eyewitnesses was Dr. Revelle, I believe, who is now at Harvard University, I believe, but anyway there were several of them, I think Herbert York, you got in on that one, too, if I'm not mistaken - and I learned that one of the reasons that this great state attracted so much of the scientific resources was because of its education system, its educational structure.

I've been talking about this out here, because I've learned a long time ago that most people take things for granted. If it's good, you think it ought to be good, you know; you really don't stop to figure out why it's good, it just ought to be that way. Well, I'm one that hasn't always had it so good, and so if I see it good, I enjoy it. I think we are prone to become a little indifferent to some of the blessings that are ours.

The state of California has set a pattern, or has set an example, for the nation of what it means to invest in education and reap dividends. The dividends that this state is reaping today are beyond anything that anyone could have dreamed 25 years ago: the dividends of new industry, the dividends of an influx, of course, of new people; the dividends of a very, very active economy; and the dividends of stimulating minds.

This is a state of creativity, of imagination; it's a vital state, as we've said here on this platform, it's a state that is moving and it's moving in one direction: it's moving forward. I'm convinced that the main reason for this is because a long time ago certain basic decisions were made; namely, that every boy and girl in this

state would be given an opportunity for a first-class education in a first-class educational establishment. Now it's been difficult to maintain that standard and I suppose in some areas, it's not been possible, but at least it's been the standard. you didn't start out trying to be second rate.

Imagine, as we were saying here, Dr. Nierenberg, about the foresight of people years ago to establish this institution, Scripps Institution. And imagine the foresight of those who planned your great University system to have these branch universities, spread out throughout this great state, which university, of course is one of the truly great educational institutions of the world. So you today have about a little over 6 billion dollars of Federal funds in research R & D contracts coming into the private enterprise system of this state and to your great academic institutions. I have digressed completely from what I had here, but I'll get back to it so don't worry.

I couldn't help but notice as I drove along these lovely highways and I looked out here a while ago - and if the Air Force is here I want to remind them they shouldn't be doing this right now - I couldn't help but note as I looked out at the (General) Atomic research laboratories, very few states can even dream of such a possibility. I think you can really judge the future of a part of the world, or a state, or an area, by the amount of research that is going on. That's it. Industry knows that. You can pretty well bet on what a stock is going to be in the years ahead by taking a look at the research dollar. That's why many people in the market do watch what's being done with that research dollar.

I've traveled in every state in this land, without exception, at some time or another since I've been in the Senate and as Vice-President, and when I think of what it means to bring into a state great research facilities: what it means in terms of the type of people that come to utilize those facilities and what that ultimately

means in terms of the change of thought patterns and habits and the mental climate, the environment, the social environment; when I see what you have here, I know why California has a great attraction, and why it has a tremendous future. It hasn't had anywhere near its better days, or its best days. I know many states long for these same facilities.

Getting back here now, I said that we in the Federal government have been doing a good deal about this, and we have. And, in doing this, our own horizons in government have been widened. I think a great deal about the decision-making process and processes, right out of the scientific community itself. We've learned to live with complexity, we've learned to live with change. And we have a better means of adapting ourselves to change. We've learned the techniques of broad and interdisciplinary management, and the new scientific community has developed techniques of management that will stand American industry well for generations yet to come.

This is one of the real by-products, one of the real dividends, of the investment in science and technology. If there's any one thing that I think that NASA has been able to do, it is to develop a management philosophy and a management system in cooperation with industry and universities in the scientific community, that is really a marvelous creation. It maximizes everything that it touches.

The difference today between much that goes on in other parts of the world and much that goes on here is the quality of management and the new techniques of management that have come out of this interdisciplinary system that has been so vitally a part of the new scientific approach.

We've managed to do all of this while maintaining the integrity and the independence of universities and of industries, which have been partners in government. And this new partnership is the new strength of America. The partnership, as I've seen it in space work between NASA, the defense department,

the manufacturing establishments, the great industries, the great universities, the medical community; a tremendous working partnership wherein we've been able to pool the best of each of the separate parts and literally to come out with an entirely new product and new institution, or new mechanism. The partnership that I've witnessed on university campuses, my own University of Minnesota, I've watched the change that's taken place there. That change is one where only a few years ago you'd have your mathematics department, your physics department, your biology department, and so on. They were separate and distinct, and they were like separate sovereignties in the United Nations. Now we have been able to cross-breed, so to speak. We have this interdisciplinary activity where the school of engineering and the life sciences work together, in which we've been able to blend the medical school in with the engineering school and with the departments such as the department of physics and others and made them into a new entity. I claim no real professional knowledge of this, but I am a layman observer and I do observe, and, as a result of it, occasionally learn a little something.

Out of all this we have learned that the scientific and technological advancements do not always come with prescriptions attached, with neat directions for curing society's ills. Now that we have learned to live with science and technology, and to see that it doesn't overwhelm us, we must increasingly turn to the business of making science and technology work more effectively in our behalf. We've learned how to keep it under control, so to speak, to make it a part of our life.

Now, how are we going to make it do something for our lives? Well, all around us are these problems of urbanization. These are problems that I have some responsibility toward, or should I put it this way, the President has asked me to be his eyes and ears about our cities, and I think I have some appreciation of the magnitude of the problems that affect our cities.

So we see these problems of urbanization, of pollution, of traffic congestion, of crime. That sentence itself would open up a full-scale lecture in the field of political science. I want to return to the classroom, because I've never heard quite so much dribble in my life as I've heard about some of those problems. You know we're not going to correct these problems with just a checkbook, even though some people have made those recommendations. I don't want to be misunderstood. Somebody said money isn't everything, and it isn't necessarily the first, but I want to tell you, it makes a good second. It does help. The definition of good government, according to an old teacher I had, was good people and money. That's part of the definition, and it used to be quite so, but there's something else now.

We're going to have to take a good long look at the whole legal structure of our society, of our metropolitan areas. The biggest problem facing our cities today is not the lack of resources, it's the lack of the organizational power to do the job. The City of New York has 1,400 separate governing jurisdictions. Nobody can govern than, and this is not to detract from the qualities of those who've served that city as mayor. But when you have 1,400 separate, independent, autonomous, governing jurisdictions in an area the size of the City of New York, how do you make a government? How do you make a plan? How do you design for the future? What if somebody just decides they're not going to be in on the plan? It would be like trying to build an interstate highway and have somebody say, "No, when you go by my property we plan on planting tulips. I'm sorry, the highway ends here." And that is what happens.

One of these days we'll get down to where we have as much scientific know-how in government, possibly, as we have in these great universities of science and technology. We'll understand that Constitutional law has to be updated, just like scientific methods have to be updated. Statutory law has to be updated. When we finally get the full realization of one man and one vote,

which will change the complexion of our legislatures, and orient them towards the present world and not toward one of history, or of ancient history, then we'll start to make some progress. But the science community has something to offer, in these fields of urbanization, of pollution, of traffic congestion.

There are perhaps even more pressing international problems, such as the population explosion and the imbalance in world food supply. And, I might add that in a world of vast resources, starvation and chronic malnutrition are not morally acceptable. So we're beginning to understand now that it takes more than compassion to feed the hungry. The United States has been filled with compassion and we've exported and given away billions of dollars of our food -- only to find out that our people, that people in other parts of the world, are still hungry, that the population outstrips the volume of food. And now we're getting down to where we are going to teach people how to produce their own food, which is where we should have been a long time ago and in the meantime attempt to help close that food gap with whatever temporary assistance we can give.

Much of our scientific and technological output today has been devoted to the standards of national defense and to the demands of our national security. We have built many and better swords, because of science and technology. Now we must build more and better plowshares, using that same know-how, that same technical scientific ability, to make the plowshares as well as the swords.

We must apply the same efficiency and intensity devoted to programs for national defense to programs for economic and social progress, trying to find, for example, answers to the causes of poverty; to experiment, to be willing to try, to be willing to accept all the blame and all the condemnation and all the criticism that comes from those who are blessed with little knowledge and little know-how, as we are seeking some answers. But the social scientist has to be willing, as Harry Truman said, to take the heat or get out of the kitchen. He

has to be willing to run that risk and make himself a sacrifice, if need be, to explore and to experiment into the causes of man's inability to live with himself and with his neighbor.

Here in California you have both the need and the resources to advance on the economic and social front. California is, in fact, almost a nation unto itself, remarkably rich and productive, and containing within it both the problems and the means to solve them. I've been very impressed by Governor Brown's use of state, university, and industrial talent and for his continuing studies of California and the use of the ocean. This is a remarkable undertaking. I've been impressed, too, by his joint efforts with industry in this state in applying the methods of systems analysis to economic and environmental problem areas. These things are just the beginning of what may be accomplished by states and localities, by the private sector, by the Federal government, by all of us working together, by the university and the scientific community as a team partner.

If we really commit ourselves to applying the knowledge and the tools at hand, I just can't believe that any society that thinks that it can put a station on the moon, and man it, and that it can rendezvous in space with fixed objects, can't solve traffic problems. It's a contradiction that defies the human mind! It's just incredible that these conditions exist here on earth and that we have not set ourselves to correcting them. Any nation that believes that in the year 1985 it might make a manned flight to Mars, or at least an unmanned landing on Mars in the early 1980s, ought to at least be willing to project, for the hope of mankind, that we'll be able to park our car. The economic loss, the waste of time, the unbelievable loss of energy and emotional balance due to traffic congestion is something that ought to attract the attention of the best minds of our scientific community.

Yes, I believe that science and technology and democracy are highly compatible. I think they can all live together and I believe they can be most compatible in a nation with the gifts and the characteristics such as our own, in an open society.

Our government's new initiative in marine science will furnish a welcome opportunity as an example of how we can marshal our intellectual, science and engineering capabilities to serve the public interest. I believe that we're launching a new endeavor here, if not a new endeavor, an expanded endeavor which will have more payload and more payoff than even our space activities, or should I put it, at least as much. And we shall continue in this process as we explore in marine research to nourish basic research.

We intend to translate the understanding of the marine environment into a mature ocean technology: to promote international understanding and cooperation, to exploit fisheries in meeting worldwide starvation -- the seas may yet feed the children of this earth and provide that protein that's so vital to the proper development of mind, body, and spirit -- to collect data, to improve weather forecasting, surely this will be a product of marine research; to abate pollution in our estuaries and seashores -- and that's an immediate problem, gentlemen -- and to foster development of off-shore minerals and fuel resources and the needs of a growing industrial community worldwide for fuel is virtually unlimited. That need is, I think, far beyond our present calculations.

We're on the threshold of a new age of exploration. This has been my theme for a long time. There are new worlds to conquer, there are new discoveries to be made and there are new explorers yet to be found and new explorations to be achieved. Our dreams for the oceans are not those of the poets and the prophets. They are practical dreams. In our long tradition, we intend to develop the bountiful resources of the sea to serve man's pressing needs, and this great University and Scripps Institution alone, is like the father, so to speak, of the whole marine technology, and we're so indebted to you.

Finally, may I add this. The American people have always had, perhaps because of the vastness of our land and resources, a breadth of vision and imagination that far exceeds that of most of their contemporaries or their fellow men. Perhaps we may never be able to close the gap between what is and what we believe should be. But if there's one place on this earth where that gap between what is and what we think should be, may finally be closed, I think I know where it is -- it's right here in America, where there's a restlessness and where there's a constant desire to do better.

Today we're in the midst of that adventure. We are the 20th century explorers. We are the Leif Ericksons, the Christopher Columbuses, the Magellans, the Cabots of our time. And that age of exploration now has two dimensions for sure, into the infinity of space and into the dark recesses and depths of the ocean. And if we use both our intelligence and our vision, and we have both, I think we have the chance to enter an era where science and humanism may finally come together in the ultimate cause of man's freedom. Surely the purpose of all that we do, of all of our efforts, must be the enhancement and the enrichment of man's life: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; a moving spirit and a demanding discipline.

Thank you very much.

#

Text of Press Conference held by Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey
on the occasion of his visit to the
University of California, San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography

September 27, 1966

Vice-President Humphrey: All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're ready to entertain your questions, Congressman Van Deerlin and myself.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, have you noticed an increasing displeasure among students and professors over our South Viet Nam policy?

Vice-President Humphrey: Not a bit! As a matter of fact I think that there's a considerable diminution of the vocal dissent amongst the academic community and the student body. Permit me to say that in all of these many instances that we visit these fine university and college campuses, there's a very, very, very small handful of people engaged in what we call the protest and if I may say in all candor, when you go to an audience of 15,000 and find 20 on the other side, I don't really call that 50-50 unless you consider 50-50 to be one horse and one rabbit. There really is a very small amount of dissent given far too much notice.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, what happened in the gubernatorial primary in Minnesota?

Vice-President Humphrey: The governor won!

Question: Did you support the other candidate?

Vice-President Humphrey: I supported the endorsed ticket because the bylaws of our state party constitution do not require, but have asked that those of us who are the elected officials of our state support the endorsed nominees or the endorsed ticket of the state convention. I was the author of that provision some years back and I thought in good conscience that since I had sponsored it, I should adhere to it. I did not take an active part in the primary.

I considered both candidates to be extraordinarily able. Both of them

are friends of mine and both of them have been with me in Minnesota political life most of my days of public life. I had the feeling that whoever won the primary could go on to win the general election. The governor, I think, benefited greatly from the primary. I think that his political popularity has been greatly magnified and he has proven himself to be a very formidable candidate and competitor. I expect the governor to win quite handily in November. I speak of Governor Rolvaag.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, last night you spoke of complacency among the California Democrats in rather strong words. Could you be specific, please. What specifically were you referring to? What kind of complacency do you see in California?

Vice-President Humphrey: Well, now, you've been around these political meetings long enough to know that one of the charges that an outsider seeks to bring to those he visits with is don't take anything for granted, don't be complacent, don't take it too easy. After all, those of us who come in to be, hopefully, to be of some assistance, to candidates or a candidate, try to remind the local supporters that elections are sometimes lost for lack of dedication and enthusiasm. @@

I am one of those persons that believes you should give everything you have when you go into a battle and I wanted to be sure that, in light of the more recent evidence, that Pat Brown is doing very well in California, that no one was going to take it easy. It was just a little evangelical message in the field of political action that I think is needed in every state. I'll make the same speech on that line in Oregon and in Montana and Idaho and Minnesota and across the land. Don't, in other words, don't take anything for granted when you're fighting the Republicans.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, there's some concern that the President is waiting until after the election to announce that additional funds are needed for the Viet

Nam war, thereby justifying cutbacks in research in oceanography and other fields, and generally a restriction in that type of expenditure.

Vice-President Humphrey: No, I don't think the President's playing any games with anyone. I think the President is waiting to find out just what the needs will be in Viet Nam. We surely do not want to go through the experience that we did in the Korean struggle, where there was overexpenditure and huge inventories built up at public expense and subsequently had to be liquidated at a very few cents on the dollar if liquidated at all. So what President Johnson is doing is, I think, prudent and frugal. He is waiting to get what we call the bill, how much more will we need in a supplemental appropriation.

Now we're going to go ahead with our research programs. We'll establish priorities. You can't do all the things that you would like to do, but surely in the field of oceanography, I can tell you that I had a letter from the President in the month of July asking me, as chairman of the Council on Marine Resources, in other words, oceanography, to present to the President sometime before the first of December, a program that he could present to the Congress, in this field of marine research and development.

Question: What is your impression after your visit here at Scripps Institution of Oceanography?

Vice-President Humphrey: Well, it's been a very brief visit, of course, and an impression would have to be somewhat limited in peripheral, but this is the leading oceanographic institution in the nation. It's one, I believe, if not the first, one of the first, and it has an enviable record for professional competence and oceanographers from all over the world come here. So I know that in visiting this institution and talking to members of the faculty, that you are talking to the experts, to the people that know the most about the ocean resources. And I intend to return, may I say, as I've

indicated, in a more leisurely manner, because I do intend to visit most all of the oceanographic facilities of this government, to become better acquainted, just as I have with the space facilities.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, do you have any comment on the type of private political thunder which is raised to help out a public official or a party official, such as the charge against the Republican chairman here?

Vice-President Humphrey: No, I think I'll let the folks in California handle that one.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, what are the administration plans for another open housing bill in the context of the civil rights bill in Congress?

Vice-President Humphrey: We will undoubtedly present anew our civil rights proposals for the 90th Congress. Those proposals may be somewhat altered in light of the hearings, but not their basic purpose or their basic objective. But there will be a representation, as I now understand it from what I've heard from the leadership in the Congress and at the Cabinet level of government, of these proposals.

Question: Can you give us any idea of what the alterations might be?

Vice-President Humphrey: No, pretty much along the way I suppose, that the House altered the measures.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, the other night on a television program, you said that you think that President Johnson's point of view is a little more mature, a little more responsible, and a little more in the public interest than that of Senator Kennedy's. Of course, we all know that the President is more mature, but I'm wondering what you mean by "he's a little more responsible" and "a little more in the public interest"?

Vice-President Humphrey: He is President of the United States, that was what I was trying to signify, not trying to be critical of Senator Kennedy. I know that's a favorite pasttime in political circles, to try to get us a little

bit off base and appear that it's somewhat critical, but let me make my position very clear. The Senator from New York is an able and popular man. He has a very fine record and he has a following that is, of course, very large. He has made his position quite clear as to President Johnson's presidency. You may recall the question put to me was "Do you think that Senator Kennedy is out to 'get' President Johnson?" and I said, no. In fact Senator Kennedy has said that he will support President Johnson in 1968 and Vice-President Humphrey. I take him at his word. And I have reason to believe that he means just that.

What I was trying to indicate, and I didn't do it very well, to be frank about it -- the questions come pretty fast -- what I was trying to indicate is that a man who is President, does have very heavy responsibility. I've been a Senator, and I know that as a Senator you have a good deal more freedom of action than you do in an executive office. And this is not to be critical. In fact, senators should have that freedom of action, as I said. Senators should be able to investigate, to inquire, and to interrogate. That is one of their duties and privileges. A President has the responsibility of governing for all of the people; he's Commander-in-Chief; he's the chief spokesman of this nation in foreign policy and these are very heavy burdens and I think that President Johnson is carrying out these responsibilities very well and, as I said, in the public interest.

I don't think you can make comparisons between a President and a Senator, because their roles are different. All I can say is, thank goodness that Bob Kennedy is a Democrat. I'm glad he's on our side. I welcome him to our state. He did us a good deal of good out there and we're going to have his brother in Minnesota very shortly. I'm going up to Massachusetts with Teddy Kennedy very shortly. I've been in New York and there isn't going to be any fight between the Humphreys and the Kennedys.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, Congressman Ford said this week that the Naval flyers in Viet Nam are not adequately trained. That's a reflection on our Miramar Naval Base, right here in San Diego.

Vice-President Humphrey: Well, there are lots of statements made. This is the season for statements, and I suppose that it's fair to say that if you keep making statements, and I make a lot of them myself, some of them are a little off base. And I think that Congressman Ford, who's a good man, just got a little out of--you know, we get a little over-enthusiastic sometimes. I think he's a little wrong there.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, as you travel around the country and note the number of incumbents of both parties that have been beaten in the primary, do you see some sort of wave of voter discontent against the incumbents?

Vice-President Humphrey: I don't think that very many incumbents have been beaten in the primaries. There have been a couple.

Question: Governor Smylie and Congressman Martin?

Vice-President Humphrey: Governors have some difficulties. They have, as I've said, the most, I'm speaking primarily of Congressmen, they have a very, very difficult task. They have limited resources, for their many needs of their people. The people want many things, and the governorship today is one of the most difficult offices to fulfill, I think, in public life. It's one of the most challenging, one of the most interesting, but one of the most difficult and I've been nothing short of amazed, in the manner in which Governor Brown has been able to give really constructive leadership in this state, and he's done it extraordinarily well. But on the Congressional level, in the primaries, I recall in our democratic primaries one or two maybe that were (defeated). One I know, Congressman Smith in Virginia -- he wasn't exactly an administration supporter -- was defeated, but other than that, I don't recall any. I know that Jim Morrison was defeated, but that

was in a different situation in Louisiana, not a primary, but a runoff.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, what is the shake-up in the State Department, I mean, last week: what can we expect in the future in the State Department, any more personnel changes?

Vice-President Humphrey: Well, the man to ask that question is the man who makes the appointments. I think the new appointments of last week were good. I think they tend to strengthen the department. Mr. Katzenbach is an international lawyer, as you know. This was his first area of study of law; he's a very dedicated man. The best that I see there is that Mr. Katzenbach comes in with an open mind and with a true sense of international cooperation as the base from which he operates. I think that he'll do very well as Undersecretary and Mr. Kohler is an experienced diplomat, very experienced man, and I'm sure will be a real asset to the department.

Question: Do you expect that to have any impact on our negotiations with the Soviet Union on the nuclear arms or nuclear ban?

Vice-President Humphrey: I can only say that this government is deeply concerned about the danger of nuclear proliferation and that there is a very definite concern about the need of a non-proliferation of a nuclear treaty to prevent this proliferation. In other words, a non-proliferation treaty and agreement. I can see Mr. Katzenbach being quite instrumental in this, quite frankly, because he is an adroit negotiator. He's a very astute lawyer. He fully understands the whole body of international law. As I said, this was his forte before he came to the justice department and it may very well be that his appointment indicates a strengthening and a continuing strengthening of our interest in arms control, effective arms control, and a non-proliferation agreement.

Question: Mr. Vice-President, would you care to make a realistic prediction as to how many seats the Democratic party will lose in the Congressional election this year?

Vice-President Humphrey: Oh no. I can only say this, I don't think we ought to lose any. I can also say, with great candor, that we won seats in 1964 in that overwhelming presidential victory, seats that no Democrat had ever occupied for, in some instances, for 25-50, even more, years. It will be difficult to hold all of those seats. But having said that, sir, I believe I can say with equal candor, that the freshman class of the 89th Congress is the most active and most energetic and the most talented group of Congressmen that have come to Washington in my memory, in all of my experience there. Lionel, I think you'd tend to agree with that.

Congressman Van Deerlin: No question at all, with the possible exception of the 88th Congress, of course.

Vice-President Humphrey: Thank you very much!

Congressman Van Deerlin: Best press conference I've ever had...isn't this wonderful?

#



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