

[Transcript]

JAMES O. EASTLAND, MISS., CHAIRMAN

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, ARK.  
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., N.C.  
THOMAS J. DODD, CONN.  
PHILIP A. HART, MICH.  
EDWARD V. LONG, MO.  
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, MASS.  
BIRCH BAYH, IND.  
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, N. DAK.  
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, MD.  
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, FLA.

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, ILL.  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, NEBR.  
HIRAM L. FONG, HAWAII  
HUGH SCOTT, PA.  
STROM THURMOND, S.C.

SUBCOMMITTEE:

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, ARK., CHAIRMAN

SAM J. ERVIN, JR., N.C. ROMAN L. HRUSKA, NEBR.  
PHILIP A. HART, MICH. HUGH SCOTT, PA.  
JAMES O. EASTLAND, MISS. STROM THURMOND, S.C.  
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, MASS.

WILLIAM A. PAISLEY, CHIEF COUNSEL

## United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES  
(PURSUANT TO S. RES. 31, 90TH CONGRESS)

April 17, 1967

Mr. Ted Van Dyk  
Room 176  
Executive Office Building  
Washington, D. C.

Ted:

Enclosed are the tape of the Vice President's remarks during the University of Georgia forum on April 14, 1967, and most of the typed transcript. The rest of the transcript had not been typed when I left Athens on Saturday, and will be mailed directly to the Vice President's office when it is finished, which should be today.



Paul Woodard  
Advance Man for the Athens Trip

PW:m

INTERFRATERNITY COUNCIL  
236 ACADEMIC BUILDING  
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA  
ATHENS, GEORGIA



WILLIAM RALPH PARKER, PRESIDENT  
DOUGLAS KIRBY RUTHERFORD, VICE PRESIDENT  
MARION NESBIT DASHER, SECRETARY  
DAVID C. REDDICK, TREASURER  
WILLIAM DALLAS HASTY, CHIEF JUSTICE

April 17, 1967

Attention: Mr. Martin McNamara

Please find enclosed the remaining four pages of the  
Vice President's Forum, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia,  
April 14th.

Interfraternity Council  
Fritz Rosebrook, Adviser  
U. of Ga., Athens

*Two Van Ryk*

Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey  
Vice President of the United States

University of Georgia  
April 14, 1967

(applause)

Introduction by Bill Parker, President, Inter-Fraternity Council

First, if I might, let me please introduce the members of the panel. First, the Moderator, Dr. George Parthemos, Vice President in charge of Instruction; Miss Marcia Mulkey, Georgia's number one debator and speech major at Georgia; Dr. William T. Blackstone, Head of the Philosophy Department. On this side, Mr. Bill House, Past President of the Student Body here at the university. Next, Dr. Richard Murdoch, Professor of History at the university.

It is indeed a pleasure to have this distinguished gentleman with us today, along with his wife who is sitting down here on the front row. We are indeed fortunate to be able to coordinate this time today after yesterday. I just want to express to Mr. Humphrey how much we enjoy having him here and welcome him anytime. I now give you the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey. (applause)

Vice President Humphrey

Thank you, thank you very much. (applause) Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Parker, members of the Inter-Fraternity Council, President Aderhold, and members of the faculty of the University of Georgia, my fellow students, and these prosecutors and inquisitors to my right and to my left. I'm very, very pleased

that it's been my privilege to be invited back to this great campus once again. And in the three years that have transpired since I was here last, tremendous things have happened. First of all, I..as I recall that since that time the Georgia Bulldogs have been down to the Cotton Bowl and have given a good accounting of themselves. (applause) I'm looking forward to the privilege of meeting your illustrious and famed coach, Vince Dooley, I hope he's around here. (applause) We are deeply indebted up in Minnesota for one of your illustrious sons of this university, a great All-American, a great All-Pro, that did an amazing job for the Minnesota Vikings -- Fran Tarkenton. (applause) I only wish we had had enough sense to keep him, but I guess he wanted to go to the big cities -- gone up with the New York Giants, leaving us..well now let's see here..leaving us folks out there in the Midwest to having to look around for another All-American from the University of Georgia. And if you have one, just send him up anytime -- we can use him.

I'm going to take just a little time here for an open statement and then I want to get down to business, because I believe that every, every American citizen ought to have the right to take one bite at a live public official and today it's going to be a sort of a meet the press, no holds barred. I don't know what these fine interrogators are going to ask me, but I was terrified a little bit when I found out that Marcia Mulkey was on the panel, she being the champion debator, which means that she'll most likely ask a question like we do in the

Senate. You give a short speech and then..give a long speech I mean, and then a short question. And as a Senator, I give a long answer to a short question. Oh yes, I wouldn't want to forget, I've been looking forward and hopefully that I might hear one of the world's famous bands, the Dixie Redcoats, but... (applause) I never could understand how you folks put together both Dixie and the Redcoats, but if you can do it, it's alright. (laughter)

Coming to a university audience is the greatest challenge that a man ever has in public life. Harry Truman once said that every time he faced a university audience he used to ask himself was this speech really necessary. And I ask myself that question, then I answer it, yes. Because, particularly in a state like Georgia where the voting age is, I recollect, is 18 -- a proposition, which by the way I think would be well to be accepted in every state in the Union; and as you know, there is such a Constitutional Amendment pending in the Congress on it. College students, university students age 18, or whatever age, have a responsibility in this time and place such as no other generation's ever had, and you know it. I don't need to lecture you on it, or sermonize on it. I said that I was here three years ago, and I saw a different campus than I see now. Just a few days ago, Mrs. Humphrey and I returned from a two week journey in Western Europe. We went there as the representative of your country to look, to listen, to learn, and where necessary, to explain. And I saw a Europe there that was as different from the one that I saw six years ago, as day and night. I saw a Europe

that had been rebuilt out of the ashes and rubble of World War II into one of the most modern, progressive and competitive societies that the world has ever known. It's just one way of me telling you that the pace of change is incredible. The only question about change is not whether we have it, but what do we do with it. Is change for the good, or is it just change for the sake of change? In the day of science and technology, the likes of which the world has never know, we have incredible changes taking place. And every one of us are asking ourselves now, will science and technology be the master of the human being, or will it be the servant. And that's what a university is all about. Whether or not out of our learning, and whether or not out of the enrichment of our intellect, we can somehow harness the great scientific and technological developments that are coming every day in this world, and harness them for human good, for social progress. Because the very same scientist that can create an atom bomb can also create atoms for peace. The very same scientist that can design an intercontinental ballistic missile, and a fantastic weapon system, can also use that same intellect, that same intellectual capacity to remake our cities; to help us in problems of human relations; to cleanse the polluted streams that now are to be found all across the face of this earth; to permit us to breath clean air, as we were intended to breath. It just depends upon what you do with science; and it depends upon what you do with change. Some people say that

what we need is time to work these things out. And I say to you again, it depends upon what you are going to do with time. Time is neutral. Science is neutral. Technology is neutral. It just depend upon whether man has made a committment to his own good and to the good of his fellowman. And I believe that I can best summarize what I am talking to you about, so we can get at the questions, by a quotation that I repeat across the length and breadth of this country, because this represents my philosophy. I happen to think that we are living in the greatest age that man has ever known; it's the last third of the twentieth century. And anybody that's worth listening to, or anybody that's worth your time, ought to be thinking about Century 21 and not the 20th Century. Because the lag between the idea and the reality is about a quarter of a century, and we're only thirty-three years away from the year 2000 -- Century 21. Therefore, our thoughts ought to be geared to the kind of a world that's going to be ours then -- your world; because after all, I have an interest in what you're thinking about. By that time that the next ten or fifteen years rolls around, when you're in charge of this country, you're going to have to be looking after my Medicare too. And I'll want to know just how you stand on some of these issues before we turn it over. But you will be in charge; and you're going to be in charge of a world that is literally out of this world. You're going to be in charge of a world that has either partially destroyed itself through madness, through war, through bitterness and hatred; or you are going to be in charge of a world that is beginning to heal the old wounds. When I returned to Washington

last Monday, I said there on the White House south lawn, that if we can make as much progress in the next twenty years as we have in the past twenty years, then the old wounds that now divide Europe can be healed, and the bitter antagonisms that beset nations and peoples can be removed. It just depends upon what we want to do, and what we're willing to do about these things. So let us keep in mind that what we're entering upon now in this last third of the 20th Century, is a great epoch, an epoch or an era of opportunity, the likes of which no generation or civilization has ever known. A tremendous adventure in opportunity, removing the impediments from humankind so that we can enrich our lives, improve the quality of our lives. Opening up new opportunities for people that never knew what opportunity meant. Extending education to the least of these. Making American citizenship just one citizenship. High class, first class citizenship for every citizen, every person within the confines of this Republic, without any regard to his race, his color, his religion, his national origin, or how he spells his last name. That's what we're trying to do. (applause)

And Thomas Wolfe, the great author in the mid-thirties, put it this way -- and this is my benediction to you -- "To every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity. To every man, the right to live and to work and to be himself; and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him. This is the promise of America. Now



that is a very succinct statement of an American creed. Every man his chance, because America needs everybody. And the world that I have seen and that you live in, needs America. It needs it desperately. It needs an America that is powerful and rich; and yet one that is humble and compassionate. It needs an America that will be productive beyond human imagination; and yet an America that will share, and help, and aid, and assist those who are less fortunate. That's the kind of America that we look forward to having. That's the kind of an America that we are today, but we need to make it even better. And it's because of my feeling that we have yet to see the better days of this country; it's because I have infinite, unbounded faith in what I call the volunteer spirit of young Americans, the sense of social concern, the sense of social consciousness of young Americans, that I believe that our best days are yet to be lived. I know of no nation that has given so much and asked so little as ours. I know of no nation that yet has so much to give, and yet has such a great opportunity to do great things as ours. What a great privilege it is to live in this time of challenge. How difficult it must have been to live in other times when there were so few challenges. I kind of think we're lucky people. I think you're luckier than I am because you're a little younger--even though may I say, that I felt somewhat encouraged not long ago when my wife asked me to sign a thirty year mortgage. I thought that indicated at least some spirit of youth in our

household. Or should I say, unbounded confidence by Mrs. Humphrey in her husband. Now with that little reference to my wife -- and by the way I noticed there were an awful lot of dormitory facilities, a goodly number here, but not enough for married couples. I want you young men to know, I'll give you a little lesson in education because I am a refugee from a classroom, you know. I like to come to campuses and meet professors and presidents of universities, because my job is an elective one and politics is a precarious and uncertain business. I like to renew my credentials. I know that it's wonderful to get a federal scholarship, it's great to receive a fellowship or scholarship, or any kind of grant that helps put you through college. I found out a better way. I got a wife. And she helped me. She was a wonderful help to me. (applause) And by the way, she has her M.A. degree four times, three sons and a daughter. Stand up Muriel, I want the folks to take a look at you here. (applause)

And now I place myself in the tender and the merciful hands of these merciless inquisitors. Go ahead.

Dr. George Parthemos

Mr. Vice President, I think it is only appropriate that we permit or let the distaff side of our panel open the questioning, and so I am going to ask Miss Mulkey to put the first question to you.

Marcia Mulkey

Mr. Vice President, we are all very much interested in your European tour. We understand that you conferred with the heads of some seven European governments, and we would like you to tell us what you feel is the single most important impression that these Heads of State left with you, particularly vis-a-vis the United States.

Vice President

I'm sure everybody heard the question; no need of repeating it. The single most important impression that I received was that the Europe of 1967 is no longer an economically dependent Europe. At least on the United States. It is a Europe that is being evermore united. That Europeans are feeling that they are Europeans more than they are Germans, or Dutchmen, or Belgians, or Italians, or British, or Frenchmen. There is a growing spirit of European nationalism and independence. There is a growing sense of the importance of European unity to give Europe a body of strength economically and politically, so that it can be an effective working partner in the Atlantic partnership. I would be less than honest with you if I didn't tell you that Europe is at what I consider to be a point of decision. Whether or not it will be a Europe that becomes inward looking, somewhat isolationists and removed from the rest of the world, self-satisfied; or

whether or not it will be a Europe that takes on its responsibility to the rest of the world and is an outward looking Europe. Now we Americans ought to understand this, because in the thirties and the forties America was very isolationist. We had people who said "why do we want to worry about the rest of the world for? We have everything here we need". And we took little or no interest in the rest of the world and we left it to others. This is what we call the attitude of America first. There are forces at work in Europe today that are talking exactly as we did thirty years ago; saying, Europe first. Remember these are the European countries that have lost their colonies, their empire, they are somewhat disenchanted with overseas activities. And then they have found out that the Common Market that they are developing is a tremendously rich market. They are increasing their trade. They're raising their standard of living. They're becoming a thoroughly modern, competitive, ingenious society. This is what I observed, but I am happy to tell you that the present leaders of Europe still recognize the importance of an effective working partnership between the United States and Europe. But not a partnership in which we overwhelm them, not a partnership in which we call all the shots; but a partnership of equals where on occasion there will be disagreement, where on occasion we'll have to have discussion, and all the time we'll need consultation. The one thing Americans need to watch out for is that we do not

get in the frame of mind that we know what's best all the time. (applause) And finally, Marcia, finally Marcia, may I say the most encouraging sign in Europe are people like yourself -- young people, young people who understand that Europe must be united. Young people who understand that Europe must help a hungry world. Young people who are taking Pope Paul's encyclical on the need of helping the hungry, seriously. Young people who are understanding that the greatest threat to world peace is not the missile, or even the atom bomb, but the greatest threat to world peace is poverty, it is misery, social misery. And what we need in America and in Europe are young men and women of great social conscience, who understand that the gap between the rich and the poor must be closed, or at least narrowed; and not by tearing down the rich, but by helping other people who are poor lift themselves, and lift themselves to higher ground. This is what I saw in Europe and this is what I see here on the campuses of our colleges in America and that's why I like to come here. I just feel a little better every time I do. Next.

Dr. Parthemos

I think I'll ask Mr. House to ask the next question.

Mr. House

Mr. Vice President, what was the reaction of the European Heads of State to our present policy in Viet Nam?

Vice President

Well Europeans are like everybody else; they're primarily concerned with their own problems. Europeans are not particularly concerned one way or another; that is, government officials, about what we are doing in Viet Nam. It's secondary. But without exception, except in France where Mr. DeGaulle takes an entirely different point of view, without...with Mr. DeGaulle removed from this...I would say the other Heads of State in Europe and Cabinet Officers not only understand why we're in Viet Nam, but most of them support our presence there. Some of them may disagree with the tactics that we use, but all of them recognize a fundamental fact, that the integrity of the American commitment, the reliability of the American word once it is given is their protection. And as I found in country after country, and particularly do you see this in Berlin where they live a hundred miles inside the iron curtain, that they know that if we're willing to fight and die in Viet Nam in a place that we hardly know and for people that we've hardly met, that they know then that they can rely upon the American commitment in Western Europe. And the Treaty and the North Atlanta Treaty Organization to which we put our name and our honor, our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor. That's what they think about Viet Nam as it relates to Europe.

Dr. Parthemos

Dr. Murdoch.

Dr. Murdoch

Mr. Vice President, there is currently much discussion on opening up new channels of trade with the Warsaw Pact nations of Eastern Europe. Do you think it would be advantageous to this country to encourage greater trade ties with these countries?

Vice President

Yes I do. (applause) I support that adventure. I want to make it quite clear, I think that the possibilities of trade are much over-estimated. I don't think we're going to have a great deal of expansion of trade, but I think we ought to be there. If I had my way, I'd like to turn loose in Eastern Europe about 10,000 top grade American free enterprise businessmen and free trade unionists, and let them talk and let them bargain, and let them visit and let them try to sell our goods. I don't think they'd become Communists. I do think that we would plant some mighty good seeds of freedom though in that part of the world. Now we ought to encourage contacts with the East, we ought to encourage the relaxation of tensions, we ought to encourage cultural exchange, commerce, trade. We ought to encourage diplomatic recognition of these areas of the world. And we're backing Germany today in her effort for example, to open up commerce with East Germany. We're backing Germany today in her effort for diplomatic recognition in Bulgaria and Hungary and other nations. We're backing the

French and they're backing us. What's most important is that we work together. That the NATO countries and, that is the countries of Western Europe, and the United States, have common policies. That we do not approach these matters unilaterally, that we approach them collectively with a common purpose, common standards and a central policy. And I think it will in the long run lend itself to a more peaceful and a little more secure world. Next

Dr. Parthemos

Dr. Blackstone.

Dr. Blackstone

Mr. Vice President, recently the President has requested military aid to both Laos and Thailand to be put under the defense budget. Does this indicate an increased American involvement there? And, do you think it could be the same kind of involvement as we now have in Viet Nam?

Vice President

Well one can never make sure predictions, Sir, but the reason that the President asked for the military aid to be put under the Defense budget is because the Congress has been insisting on it for years. Namely, that it is not what we consider a part of economic foreign aid. That we wanted to separate in the Congress, and I did as a Senator when I was there, the economic aid, the technical assistance from the



military aid and the military assistance. And we want all of the military assistance to be over to under the defense budget so that when we talk about defense budgets in the United States we're not fooling ourselves. We know exactly what we're spending for armament, and not going around pretending that our economic aid overseas, our foreign aid program is a three billion dollar program, when it's really about a billion and a half, and the rest of it is military assistance. Now we're going to give and do give aid to Thailand, we do give some aid to Laos, and the Thais are faithful and loyal friends. Souvanna Phouma, the Prime Minister of Laos was a neutralist. He became prime minister under the accords of 1962. That agreement of 1962 provided for a government in Laos made up of the right wing, the neutral center and the left wing Communist Pathet Lao. There have been three seats reserved in the Cabinet of that government for the Communists -- they've never accepted them. Instead of that they've been out on the battlefield in guerilla warfare. The Pathet Lao continues to wage war against the established government of Laos even though they agreed not to. And the North Vietnamese regulars are today in Laos in substantial numbers as they are in Northeast Thailand in limited numbers. And we are extending military assistance to those countries because we happen to believe that this... well that this aggression is contagious and it has

a tendency to spread, and that the time to nip it is in the bud. And it would be a whole lot better if the Laotians can handle their own problems with some financial and military assistance from us, but not manpower. And if the Thais can handle their own problems with Thais with our financial and military assistance without our manpower. If we had been able to do that in Viet Nam we wouldn't have had so much trouble these last few months as we've been having so we have tried to learn some lessons and take some preventive action. (applause)

Dr. Parthemos

Miss Mulkey, would you like to ask another question?

Miss Mulkey

Mr. Vice President, how do you assess the Soviet Union's interest in the Viet Nam conflict, or more particularly, do you think the Soviet Union is interested in provoking the conflict between the U.S. and Red China so that the Soviet Union gets rid of troubles on their own border?

Vice President

No I do not. I do not think that the Soviet Union is so mad, so utterly irresponsible that it would like to provoke a conflict between the United States and China. Because any such conflict between any of the major powers would not be, I regret to say, most likely would not be

confined to such a limited area. Once the nuclear powers are in conflict, there is no place to hide. I think the Soviet Union over the years has learned to be a little more cautious and prudent. Not because they wanted to be, but because we have by our actions compelled them to be. And that's quite a story. But to get right back to your question, the Soviet Union, I have a reason to believe, would not mind at all if the conflict in Viet Nam could now be settled on the basis of the..well on the basis of the boundaries and the 17th parallel antebellum -- in other words, before the struggle started. But the Soviet Union doesn't have everything to say. The Soviet Union is in a bitter, ideological conflict all over the world. We saw it in Europe. We saw the Communist Party, for example in Belgium and Italy divided between the Chinese Communist faction and the Russian Communist faction. Any you'll be interested to know that the troubles that we had, those few little demonstrations, were primarily by the Maoists, by the Chinese Communist faction. The Soviet Communist faction, they paraded rather...well they were sort of housebroken they... they weren't in the poultry business in other words. They were a little more restrained. The Russians are in a bitter struggle in the Communist world. And today I think the Russians are much more concerned about China than they are about the United States. I think they are much more concerned about their borders in Asia than they are their borders in Europe. And Mr. Kosygin has given every reason to..

for us to believe that. The bitter conflict, the ideological conflict is one of the great danger points today in the world between the Chinese and the Russians. Now we don't want to accelerate or intensify or escalate the struggle in Viet Nam so as to challenge either of these powers. And that's why we have for example certain limitations placed upon our pilots as they come near the Chinese border so that they don't overfly. That's why we have refused to have this war become one of invasion of the north, because to invade North Viet Nam would possibly trigger the Treaty of Assistance that the Soviet Union has with North Viet Nam to come to the aid of North Viet Nam with troops. It's bad enough to have them there with material. And so your government has to steer a rather prudent course.- As President Johnson has said, it doesn't take any Statesmanship to get the world into a World War. Any nut can do that. You can do that overnight. The task of Statesmanship is to try to bring to an end the war that is. And also if you can't do that immediately, to at least bring it within limits so that it does not spread as into a general conflagration. Because there isn't anybody that's going to win World War III. You won't be around at least to find out. And no country would suffer more from a nuclear exchange than your country and mine, because we're a highly urbanized, industrialized country. And while we do say, and rightfully so, that we have massive military power that can destroy any other country, this doesn't mean that our

country would not suffer unbelievable destruction. So the task today of every man and woman in government or private life ought to be how can you..how can you provide for the peace. How can you pursue this cause of peace? How can you limit destruction and ultimately bring mankind to his senses to understand that force, is no way to settle disputes between people. (applause)

Dr. Parthemos

Why don't we have one more question in the area of foreign policy and then shift to domestic policy, and then we can return again to foreign policy. Who would like to ask the next question? Dr. Murdoch.

Dr. Murdoch

Mr. Vice President, I believe today the nations of the Western Hemisphere are in process of agreeing on some form of Common Market for the hemisphere.

Vice President

Yes.

Dr. Murdoch

What is the administration's view of such a Common Market?

Vice President

The administration as you have heard undoubtedly this

morning, supports the achievement of a Common Market for the Western Hemisphere. Now let me tell you once having said that, to say that you're for peace in this world, or that you're for a Common Market doesn't mean that you get it. You know I..there's a little phrase that I often use that say's blessed are the peacemakers. It takes a long time to make it. Not the peacewalkers, paraders, prayers, the talkers, but the Peacemakers. (applause) And when (applause) And when we say that we want a Common Market, and we do and we now endorse it, and we're going to have to put some resources into it, I think you ought to know what it means. It means changing a whole industrial economic pattern in the whole hemisphere. It means that the Latin American countries which have lived under a wall of protectionism for years, that that wall will have to be torn down, rock by rock, systematically. And as it's being torn down, industries will have to be sort of shorn up so that they don't collapse. Because the power of American industry in this hemisphere is so massive as compared to anyone else, that if the Common Market enterprise is a success, it's going to mean that we are going to have to help strengthen the South American-Central American countries so that they can be effective partners in a Common Market. And we have set the target date of 1985 -- 1985, that's some eighteen years from now. And hopefully in these next eighteen to twenty years, we will be able to achieve what Europe now has in part -- a Common Market. And it has taken even Europe with six countries, six highly

developed countries, it has taken them ten years to move this far -- ten years into the Treaties of Rome. I think that the eighteen year period in Latin America, if we can achieve it, will be a tremendous accomplishment. But we're for it, we're dedicated to it, and I hope that the American people will help whatever administration is in power in the next eighteen years to fulfill the promise and the commitment that we've made for peaceful development. Let's remember that these peaceful commitments are every bit as important as these treaties that pledge us to go to war. I'd like to have a few more Americans take seriously our commitments to the Alliance for Progress. A few more Americans to take seriously our commitments to the United Nations and its humanitarian works. We need the same kind of patriotism for that kind of a commitment that we have for NATO or SETO, or for Viet Nam, or for Berlin.

Dr. Parthemos

Let's turn now to domestic policy and ask a few questions in this realm. Mr. House.

Mr. House

Mr. Vice President, how do you evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a Johnson-Humphrey ticket in '68?

Vice President

Well now, I'll have to give you a very objective answer on that from a subjective point of view. A man that's

been in public life any length of time knows that we have what we call our ups and our downs, and the main thing that you try to work for is that you're coming up for election when you're on the ups and not on the downs. But you can never be sure. But above all, in these days, Sir, certain decisions have to be made, and there are some great decisions that are being made. Decisions on European Unification, Latin American Common Market, trade negotiations, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, East-West Trade, International Monetary Reform. Everyone of these are basic decisions. Many of them will be very unpopular yet they have to be made. And if you make enough unpopular decisions you have an awful lot of trouble on election day. In the meantime you have to do what you need to do. We're not put in public office to run a beauty contest or a popularity contest. I would remind you that one of the great men of America today, and if you were asked to name three great living Americans I think that most people in this audience would name as one of those three, Harry S. Truman. (applause) And I'll tell you why -- because he had courage. He did what he needed to do when it needed to be done. He represented the longterm interest in this country, even at the expense of his short-term politics. And Harry Truman has a place in the history of America that is immortal. It'll be there for ages to come. And I remember when he was very unpopular. And I can remember when every decision that he took seemed to be unpopular. And I can



remember one other thing about him -- he didn't give a hoot. He just went ahead and did it. And I've loved him for it ever since. He's got more spunk at his age than most young people have all put together. He's really some man. Now, how about the Johnson-Humphrey ticket. We have to make some tough decisions, but we're going to take our case to the American people. At least President Johnson is, and I kind of hope he'll take me along. (applause) And by the way, we're going to come to Georgia -- going to give you another chance. (applause) You know I've always been a tolerant man. I think everybody's entitled to one or two lost weekends, but don't make it a habit. And I'll predict this right now, that if we stay with what we're doing, if we don't compromise away what we know to be right -- and I can tell you we won't compromise it away -- I think that when election day comes around that we'll have at least the respect of the American people. And if you have their respect and you're doing what's right, the odds are that you can win. And I want to say to my Republican friends, we'll welcome any candidate you want to put in the field, and we'll give you blow for blow and we'll give you a good clean fight and when it's all over, we'll be back in Washington running the show. (applause) That's my only partisan statement thus far.

Dr. Parthemos

Who would like to give another question in the area of domestic policy? Dr. Blackstone.

Dr. Blackstone

Mr. Vice President, recently great concern has been expressed by members of the academic community across the country over what has been..become known as the "credibility gap". The fear expressed is that if government can control the thought of its citizens by control of information, it can control everything else; and that this strikes at the heart of democratic institutions. Do you share the fear and this concern over the so-called "credibility gap"?

Vice President

If there is a credibility gap, I doubt that there is and don't think that there is, let me just say this, it isn't because the government controls information. As a matter of fact, I am sometimes of the worry that the information media controls government. And that's not an exaggeration. There is free press and there must be. You can't have a free society without freedom of expression. You can't have a free society without the right to have people be different. You can't have a free country without the right of dissent. And even though we don't often like what we have printed that is disagreeable to us, it is absolutely essential for free institutions that that sacred right, that right be protected. But having said that, may I say that with rights come responsibilities. With rights come responsibilities. I'll never forget, I go to Europe and the headline is "Gap Between Europe and America".

Not that it's a question; they say that it's a fact. Well now, how big a gap? There's a gap in every family. That doesn't mean that you all get a divorce. There's differences in a university between a president of a university and his faculty. It doesn't mean that everybody resigns. In a free society there are always differences. It's a question of how much you spend your time enlarging upon those differences. And I would like to just say for the record here, that most of the time what we hear about our country are the mistakes that we make. Most of the time what you hear is some mistake that a politician makes. That makes real copy. An accident on the highway is news. The thousands of men that drive home quietly, sanely, safely -- well, just another day. Troubles make for news, fires make news, murders make news. But that isn't what life is. Life is not one series of murders, fires and assassinations, even though that is headlines. And I happen to believe that the so-called credibility gap is sometimes made a much bigger gap than it ever has any reason to be interpreted as being because conflict is news -- conflict. Now, I'm not blaming anybody for this. This is the way it is. Just exactly as little babies drool. You can't do much about that. That's the way it is. And news is news. But I would suggest that we take a good look over the long run. For example, if you want to look back the last twenty years, I'll talk to you about it. You take a look what was said about, just take one country... Korea. In 1957, the press of this nation and a responsible

press said as follows, "Korea is a hopeless mess". Ten years ago. Today Korea has the biggest economic breakthrough of any country in Asia outside of Japan. Now who had the credibility gap? I think there's..you have to ask yourself. You've got to take a longterm view. You can lose the beauty of the forest by looking at the spots on the trees. And a good Forester can say, "My goodness, I just saw a spot on a tree. The whole forest is going to perish". You can see a little mistake and interpret it to be everything. I don't think that the success of America is due to an accumulation of massive mistakes. And yet,you would think so sometimes. I do not think that the American labor movement is filled up with crooks, even though there was time after time that I read about labor crooks; and that's the ones that make the headlines. I don't think American management is made up out of just selfish profiteers, even though on occasion you read that there are some like that. I don't think that every bank clerk is robbing the vault. And yet most of what you read about a bank is robbery. I happen to think that most things that happen in this country are pretty decent. I think that most people are pretty conscientious. I think that most people put in a full day's work. I think that most young people are very decent. I think most young Americans are very patriotic. Yet I ask you, who gets the news? Who gets in the papers?(applause) All I ask for is the balance. I think that you ought to report the demonstrations, the dissenters, and the pickets. I think they deserve it, they are entitled to it.

I've been one on occasion myself and I like to have that kind of copy. But I also think you ought to report the other things. And when I had, for example not long ago an incident, where seven members of a college newspaper signed an appeal that President Johnson should be impeached, it was a front page story across this land. But when 6,500 student signed a petition and said that the seven were out of their...were not speaking for them -- only they were a little more crude about it -- when six thousand some said that these seven didn't talk for them, they got two inches on the want ad page. Now I don't call that balanced reporting. I think the six thousand had as much right for the copy -- six thousand support Johnson -- as the seven who said he ought to be impeached. Seven were entitled to their ridiculous thoughts. The six thousand were entitled to their constructive attitude. (applause)

Dr. Parthemos

Who'd like to give the next? Dr. Murdoch.

Dr. Murdoch

Mr. Vice President, do you favor any changes in the present system of the draft? And if so, would you care to specify these changes?

Vice President

The President has presented to the Congress the Commission's report, and that Commission as you know has

underscored. I think it supported the so-called Lottery System. This appears to be the system which has the greatest support in the administration and in the Congress. The President has said quite frankly, that he wanted to submit the Commission's report and to permit the Congress to work its will, giving the indication that the Commission had done the most exhaustive job on the part of the...on the part of the President and that would be our..at least our proposal; not our ironclad proposal, but our proposal. We happen to think the present draft system is not equitable. We're looking for a much better one, and whether the Lottery System is the answer, most people seem to think it is. And furthermore, there is the feeling that the draft ought to be at an earlier age rather than at a later age so that there isn't this interruption that takes place in either the married life of a young man or a young woman, or in his academic life. There are some other suggestions that I would like to include, not necessarily in the draft which have been mentioned by many other leaders; namely, of service to our country over and beyond military service. I don't think you can make this a substitute however, for military service. I doubt that the Congress would permit it. But I do think that it would be very desirable for public opinion to focus attention upon the value of this voluntary service in such things as Peace Corps and Vista, working in the ghettos of our cities, and a host of voluntary services that can be performed by capable and young people. It may very well be that if we concentrate on it enough, there

can be some, what you might call, adjustment in military service period for extensive civilian service. But I don't think anybody ought to presume that the Congress is going to give you a choice between selecting a nice spot to work in at home and military service. I think that is kind of blowing bubbles and wishing, and having nice dreams that are not within the possibilities of reality.

Dr. Parthemos

Miss Mulkey.

Miss Mulkey

Mr. Vice President, in recent months there has apparently been a growing cynicism in this country about congressional ethics, especially after the case of Adam Clayton Powell and Senator Dodd. What do you feel should be the action taken in the cases of congressional ethics?

Vice President

Well the very first thing that should be done is to try to figure out a better way of financing campaigns than we presently have. That's number one. (applause) And it's a very serious matter, because the cost of campaigning is becoming not only prohibitive for some, it is becoming a matter of temptation for too many. You simply cannot conduct any kind of a major campaign today with television and radio and news and all the wires for less than small fortunes.

And the present reporting in campaigns is inadequate, ineffective, and frankly doesn't make much sense. Any man that runs for office knows how to get around the reporting laws before he ever files, or he wouldn't file. Because you couldn't possibly be elected for the amount of money you report. It just wouldn't be in the ball, it just isn't possible. So we have been unwilling to come to grips with the realities of campaign financing, and campaign financing has a great deal to do with congressional ethics. Now as to the Congress itself, the Senate has established its own ethics...its own ethics committee. I think this is desirable in both bodies. And then finally may I say that a Congress is what it says it is -- it is a body of representatives of the people. And my dear friends if occasionally you see somebody in Congress that has a dirty face, just remember that the Congress is like a mirror. It's placed over the whole body politic and if you look up in there and see a dirty face, you might ask whose is it. Because there's all kinds of forces at work in this country. This is not to excuse it because a man in public life has greater responsibility for conduct, ethical conduct, than a man in private life. That's one of the obligations that you take when you are in public life. But people are people and even when they are in public life they even act like people. If we start to treat our Congressmen as if they were men and women of distinction, instead of trying to portray them frequently



as incompetents, and as people of little or no character, I think that you would get a better calibre and a higher response from the Congress. But every time a Congressman takes a trip overseas somebody calls it a junket. But if a member of the executive branch goes over seas, they say it's a study mission. Now I served sixteen years in the Senate, I traveled overseas several times and I worked my heart out. And I know that Congress has rules for example, that says you can't take your wife along. Of course if you're in the executive branch and want to take your wife along, that's fine. But if you're in Congress and want to take her along, you either got somebody else to pay the bill, or you've got to pay it out of your own pocket. And I remember the first time that Mrs. Humphrey and I went overseas in 1951. I paid every penny of that trip, and we were right down to bedrock. And I had the newspapers back home writing about Mrs. Humphrey gets free trip. That's what they said in my state. I had to write to every one of those and show the cancelled checks to make them...they didn't believe me. Now if you want to treat a man like he's a crook, you're apt to get him to be one. You just talk to him that way long enough. I think that what is needed in the American student body is a greater respect for the Congress. The Congress of the United States is made up of men and women of high purpose. There always some that don't live up to those standards. There's always some in a church that doesn't live up to it too, but you don't tear down

the churches because somebody turns out to be wicked. And you don't disband the ministry because someone in the ministry turns out not to be as nice as you would like. What we need in America today is a higher respect in the public mind for the Congress of the United States. I served there sixteen years and I can tell you that they're every bit as devoted to public service as any President of a university, any professor, any businessman, any President of the United States, or any Cabinet officer. There are men and women in the Congress that would literally give up their lives for this country, and give the lives of their families. (applause) Now Marcia, I want to give you my final word on it and that's this. If you think that politics, and I know you don't, you've asked a question which is an intelligent and thoughtful one and a necessary one, but my answer to young people and people alike is this: If you think politics is dirty, why don't you get in and do something about it? (applause) If you've got all that good sense..(applause) Politics is another word for power, and that power ought to be used for public good and public morals. And I don't have much time for these people that sit on the sideline and just write and talk, and sit up there in the bleachers. And when we're down here as political people fighting the battle they sit up there and say look at that crook; or look at that double-talker; or look at that credibility gap. If they think that we're crooks, and they think we're double-talkers, and they think we don't tell the

truth, get in and see what you can do. Come on in and join the fight and see what it's like. (applause)

Dr. Parthemos

Alright, we have time for about two more questions. Who would like to give the next one? Mr. House.

Mr. House

Mr. Vice President, I wonder if you would care to comment on Dr. Martin Luther King's current effort to relate the anti Viet Nam war movement with the domestic Civil Rights movement?

Vice President

I think he's in error. I think he's exercising unfortunate judgement. I believe that this will hurt the Civil Rights movement. I do not think it will promote peace in Viet Nam. I regret it. That's my position. (applause)

Dr. Parthemos

Dr. Blackstone.

Dr. Blackstone

Mr. Vice President, as you know, the Great Society programs of the administration have been under heavy attack by their critics. How do you evaluate the success and failure of these programs, and what is their future?

Vice President

Well the Great Society programs are directed toward some of the toughest problems of contemporary life. There isn't any large scale unemployment in America today, for example, but there are unemployed, and there are unemployables. And the Great Society program's directed towards them. To those people are programs of training, programs of motivation, programs that have never been tried before. Every person today that has a skill, or any competence, has a job. Those that are unemployed come from the illiterate, the inadequately trained, from the ghettos filled with bitterness and hatred, many of them, and it isn't just a matter of sending them to school -- it's also a matter of arousing their desire to make something in their life. The Great Society programs are not directed towards making poverty more palatable. They are directed towards finding a cure to this curse called poverty. And I know we are going to stumble, I know we are going to make some mistakes. We have. But we're going to continue to seek and we're going to continue to try, because we must. You know the doctors have been trying to find a cure for cancer for fifty years, and I have yet to hear anybody attack the medical profession because it didn't find the answer to cancer -- and they haven't yet. And we've poured billions into it -- billions. And we ought to pour more into it, if it takes money or people; whatever it takes. Because one out of every three in this audience will have cancer, and one out

of every five will die of it. So we better do something about it. Well one out of every five or six in America is a victim of poverty. Now when we try to find an answer, when we try to do something more than pass out welfare checks, which is no answer, and when we fail, somebody says look at that bunch of boobs -- they didn't do it, they made a mistake, their wasting public funds. Well ladies and gentlemen, we do waste public funds once in a while because we try. Our Air Force has wasted some public funds on airplanes that never flew, but we finally got the Phantom Jet. We've had to waste some public funds in a host of activities -- if you call it waste; I call it investment. But we're going to keep trying till we make some progress. And we're making some progress; just let me give you a little of it. This last year we had over one million young men and women, age 16 to 22, in training for jobs. Six years ago you never had any. This last year we had thirty five thousand young men and women taken out of the bowels of the cities, out of the ghettos, from broken homes and broken families, that had a basic intelligence. And through testing they were found they could be good students. And those thirty five thousand were lifted out of the filth and the degradation of the slums and sent on to big universities in Project Upward Bound. And they are there and they are making a great record. We've had..we've had over thirty thousand graduates from our Job Corps. And oh, how many people have complained about that. Why I hear them say and I read, and

it says, "Thirty five percent of all Job Corps volunteers dropout." "Costly program." Well I'll let you in on the news. A hundred percent of the Job Corps volunteers were dropouts before they dropped out the second time. And there are fewer Job Corps dropouts than there are dropouts out of universities. And seventy percent of the trainees of the Job Corps went out to get jobs at a rate of \$1.71 an hour. The few that came in that ever had a job, and only five percent of them ever had a job, got an average rate of pay of seventy cents an hour. Twenty percent of the Job Corps enrollees that had completed their course of study, went back to school to get a full education. Ten percent joined the Armed Services. That's pretty good. We saved some lives. We're going ahead with these programs -- the war on poverty, Head Start. If we'd never done anything else but Project Head Start, I think the money would have been well expended. Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps I saw right out here at your own airport, giving youngsters for the first time some chance to be something else besides a bum. Giving them a chance to make something out of their lives. The Medicare program. Five and a half elderly since last July have had medical services. Two million dollars have been paid into hospitals; cash payments. Two hundred million dollars paid to doctors. And Grandpa and Grandma, five and a half million of them, have had the best medical service that modern medicine can provide. I think that's some achievement. I think these Great Society programs

are worth fighting for and worth working for. And I'll tell you why. None of them are a handout. Everyone of them are based not upon the concept of a welfare state, but the state of opportunity for everyone. For the right of every man, as I said in my remarks -- every man his chance. Not his chance to get a relief check; not his chance to live in filth and degradation, but his chance to get a job; his chance to go to school; his chance to have a family; his chance to lift himself out of the filth and the dirt of his existence. That's what these programs are about. That's why I'm out here. I think they represent what America needs. And if we'll just get behind them, we can make this America what Abraham Lincoln said it was -- the last best hope on earth. And I hope we will. Thank you very much.

(applause)

Dr. Parthemos

Thank you Mr. Humphrey, very much.

(applause)



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)