OPENING NOTES

Mali

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

STUDENT QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

Greetings, Now Generation.

I want to congratulate you. It took me thirty-eight years to make the cover of <u>Time</u> magazine. You did it in twenty.

I was reading the other day what <u>Time</u> had to say in its cover story about the composite Now Generation man:

"He...will land on the moon, cure cancer and the common cold, lay out smog-free cities, enrich

the underdeveloped world and...write finis to poverty and war."

There was only one trouble with that paragraph.

It came right under a <u>Time</u> picture of five young men asleep and basking in the sun on a Florida beach.

I want to take just a few moments now for a serious preface to our discussion. I am not here for a lecture or an address, but to respond to your thoughts and questions.

There is a great paradox in our society today, which I have not yet seen noted in the press.

We are told that this nation, particularly the majority of its youth, is impatient...restless...unwilling to wait....demanding <u>now</u> the changes for which its instincts for justice cry.

And at the same time we are told that this nation

and its people are tired of change...unwilling to "move too fast"...yearning for tranquility...demanding a pause in the pace of progress.

I have an announcement. I'm for and with the
"Now" people and against the "Pause."

It would be the ultimate tragedy of this century if the United States became enveloped with a lethargic spirit and succumbed to the temptation of a luxurious pause. We cannot afford a pause. Time is on the side of men of movement, and the world will not wait for the tired nor the timid.

You all know what the Pause People say.

All the major goals of 1933 are achieved.

Aren't the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 enough? Social justice is here.

Utopia has arrived.

Nirvana is come.

The Pause People would simply have us close up shop and go bowling. Slow down, simmer down, cool it, they command.

The Romans thought they had it made, that it was time for a Pause. And they never recovered from it.

The United States, in the 1920's thought it was time for normalcy, for a pause. And it took us three decades to pull out of that one.

I cannot conceive of more false reasoning than that which suggests we should stop, relax a bit and pause in our quest for human justice. I just can't buy it.

Not when two-thirds of the world's people are hungry, sick, uneducated and despairing.

Not when starvation and disease stalk large parts of our own hemisphere.

Not when this United States is still binched with poverty, blemished with racial injustice and blighted with decaying cities and polluted skies and streams.

We do not have to look far or speak in the abstract to find compelling arguments against the Pause

There are children today -- even teen-agers -living in our big cities who have never stepped on a
beach or leaped into a swimming pool.

There are pre-school children who have never had a story read to them, or seen a book.

Those may seem to be little things. But add them to all the other lacks of our slums and ghettoes -too few parks, too many outdated books, too few teachers, inadequate housing and shallow opportunities -- and you have a people who will not and should not pause.

The pause recommended today is not the pause

that refreshes.

It's the pause that stifles, chokes, and shrivels the human spirit.

Him with you. I want to be where the action is.

And I suggest that one need not be 25 or under to be of the Now Generation.

Winston Churchill was a <u>Now man</u>, and I liked what he said:

"The beaches of history are paved with the bleached bones of those who waited, and while waiting died."

Pope John XXIII was a <u>Now man</u>, and I liked what he told a group of Cardinals in 1959 who thought that the Ecumenical Council couldn't possibly be held by 1963:

"All right," said John, "we'll have it in 1962 then."

But there must be, in the midst of those who chant "Now," at least a few who ask and challenge: "How?"

It is up to those of us in <u>politics</u> and <u>government</u> to try to answer that question.

I'm ready for your questions.

#

[Transcript]

2	UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI
3	Panel Presentation
4	Featuring
5	THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
6	Vice President of the United States
7	Student Panel:
8	Mr. David Altman Editor of The News Record
9	
10	Miss Marsha Greer President of Memorial Hall
11	Mr. Steve Nechemias Second-year Law Student
13	Mr. Glen Weissenberger President, local Interfraternity Council President, Regional Great Lakes Fraternity Council
14	MODERATOR:
6	Wilbur R. Lester, Esq. Professor of Law, University of Cincinnati
7	
.8	Jointly Sponsored by Orientation Board and the Arts and Sciences Tribunal
9	Held at the Fieldhouse, Thursday, September 28, 1967, between the hours of 1:40 and 2:40 o'clock p.m.
0	1. 10 and 2:40 0 clock p.m.
1	
2	
STIL	

23

24

MODERATOR LESTER: May we come to order.

Members of the entering class, honored guests,

ladies and gentlemen, welcome.

Most of you probably know the general nature

of this gathering, but for those of you who don't, and to

refresh the recollection of those who do, permit me to point

out with some specificity the nature of this meeting.

It is an educational activity of the University

of Cincinnati students. It is a part of the Orientation Week

sponsored by the Orientation Board and the Arts and Sciences

Tribunal.

Still more specifically, as an educational meeting we must have an atmosphere of free discussion and free inquiry under orderly procedures.

Our honored guest has agreed to answer questions. For many reasons, including the one that he has taught political science at the university level, I am sure his answers will be both interesting and to the point.

Our panel of students is prepared to ask sharp and penetrating questions. The members of the panel wish to thank the many of you who submitted suggestions. The panel will try to reflect your interests.

All of us in this Fieldhouse wish to hear each question and each answer. Any disturbance, such as shuffling about, blocking the view of others, or shouting, will deny

some of us the opportunity to hear a question, or to hear an answer. I am confident that nearly all, if not all of you, want to help in making this a good meeting. If any person, however, persists in disrupting our discussion, he must be prepared to leave.

This is the format we will follow:

First, our honored guest will make introductory remarks for five or ten minutes.

Second, the four students on the platform with me will question our guest for about twenty minutes.

I shall act as moderator.

By the way, since there is no one to introduce the introducer, I am Wilbur Lester, of the Law School faculty.

Third, toward the end of the program, except for an emergency, please stay seated until our honored guest and his party have left the Fieldhouse.

There are two brief words of thanks. I wish to thank the Brass Choir and its director.

I wish to thank two students who worked as hard as these four to be ready in case one of these should be ill. Those two students are Miss Joe Anne Greiser, an officer of Mortar Board, and Mr. John Hagner, President of O.D.K.

At this time I will introduce the members of

1 our panel, who are seated in alphabetical order. 2 Mr. David Altman, Editor of the News Record. 3 Miss Marsha Greer, President of Memorial Hall 4 for the past five quarters. 5 Mr. Stephen Nechemias, second-year law 6 student, and among our best. 7 Mr. Glen Weissenberger, President of both the local Interfraternity Council, and the Regional Great Lakes 8 9 Fraternity Council. 10 I request our honored guest be brought to the 11 platform. 12 (Vice-President Humphrey was escroted to the 13 speakers' platform.) (Applause.) 14 U.C. PRESIDENT LANGSAM: Ladies and gentlemen, the University is unusually fortunate in the distinction of 15 16 its guest today. 17 Allow me first to ask Mrs. Humphrey to stand and be recognized. Won't you, please. 18 19 (Applause.) 20 PRES. LANGSAM: Now, ladies and gentlemen, the Vice-President of the United States. 21 22 (Applause.) 23 VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you. Thank you, very much, Mr. President. I am generally accustomed to 24 25 addressing people as Mr. President.

Dr. Langsam, I am very honored and pleased that Mrs. Humphrey and I have the privilege of being on this great campus of the University of Cincinnati; and it's good to have as our moderator one of your most distinguished leaders in academic life, Professor Lester.

I have met the members of the panel. They treated me with civility when I came into the auditorium. I trust they will be that way from here on out.

There is, however, no commitment on their part or mine as to how this is all going to come out; a totally unrehearsed program, which undoubtedly will be revealed by the nature of my answers to their intelligent questions.

I was just told while we were in the wings, so to speak, a little about this great university's history; the first west of the Alleghenies in many of the disciplines law, medicine, pharmacy, just to mention a few.

And also of some of its great sons and daughters: the former President of the United States, William Howard Taft; a student, professor and dean, a former Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Dawes; former Speaker of the House, Nicholas Longworth.

So you have your share of politicians. I thought I'd just make you stand up and be a little respectful of politicians before we started. I know you wouldn't want

to say anything or do anything that would in any way cast reflection upon those men of public life.

Now, this is a rather unusual set of circumstances. I generally am accustomed to speaking standing up, but I appreciate the privilege of sitting down. This is going to be a question and answer. I have a few remarks that will not take very long, and then we will go to it.

One of our most illustrious scientists,

Dr. Sabin, of polio fame, is a gentleman that I've known and respected for years, and I did want to take this opportunity of paying my respects to him while I am here on your campus.

My first line of prepared manuscript of these immortal words is, Greetings, you new generation. I think I'm really greeting members of the new class, the freshman class, the Class of '71, so I want to welcome you into the rigors of academic life. Some of you will be casualties along the way. None of you, I hope, will be fatalities. And I trust that I can come back here later on and see many of you get your degrees.

I want to congratulate you for many things.

It took me 38 years to get on the cover of Life Magazine,

and you did it in 20, because I just saw a cover of Life with

a picture of the New Generation. I don't know if I recognize

any of you from that picture, but you were there.

I was reading the other day about the composite of this new generation. Maybe you didn't know you were all of this. I think I should let you in on the secret. This is the composite NOW generation man. Not just the New Generation, but the NOW generation man.

He will land on the moon.

Goodbye.

(Laughter.)

He will cure cancer and the common cold.

He will lay out smog-free cities.

He will enrich the underdeveloped world, and write finis to poverty and war.

Well, you are an ambitious crowd. I hope that you can make it. Those are very noble ideals.

There was only one trouble with that paragraph, and it was as I read it. It came right under a Time picture of five young men asleep and basking in the sun on a Florida beach. I don't really think you're going to do all those things sleeping. It was the wrong picture for the right lyrics.

I want to take just a few moments now, though, of serious preface to this discussion. I am not here for a lecture. You will get plenty of those from here on out.

Nor am I here to address you, but rather to respond.

There is a great paradox in our society today

which I have not yet seen properly noted in the press. We are told that this nation, particularly the majority of its youth, is impatient, restless, unwilling to wait, demanding right now the changes for which its insticts for justice cry out. At the same time we are told that this nation and its people are tired, tired of change, unwilling to move, or move too fast, yearning for tranquillity, and demanding a pause in the pace of progress.

You get this all in the same magazine, the same story.

Well, now, I thought I ought to choose up sides on these separate pleas that are made of these separate positions. I have an announcement. I am for and with the NOW people, the N O W people; and I really can't quite join, in fact I'm against, the "pause" people.

I think it would be the ultimate tragedy of this century if the United States became enveloped with a lethargic spirit and fell victim to the temptation of a luxurious pause. Time is on the side of men of movement, and the world will not wait for the tired nor the timid. You either join change, and direct its course, or it rolls over you, and you have no recourse but to call it guits.

Now, the Romans thought they had made it.

They became quite satisfied, and they said it was time for a pause. "Live it up; just enjoy what we have." They never

quite recovered from that lost weekend.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The United States, in the 1920's, after
World War I, thought it was time for a return to normalcy,
for a pause, "Take it easy; enjoy what we have." And it took
us three decades to pull out of that lost weekend.

Now, I cannot conceive of more false reasoning than that which suggests that we should stop, relax a bit, and pause in the quest for human justice, individual improvement, or excellence. I just can't buy that argument. Not when there are two-thirds of the world's people that are hungry and sick, uneducated and despairing; and not when it is generally accepted that where there is constant want there can be no peace; not when starvation and disease stalk large parts of the earth, and, indeed, of our own hemisphere. And I can't believe that we ought to quit, take it easy, roll over and play dead, pause, when this great country of ours is still afflicted by blotches of poverty in some areas, and in all too many instances blemished with racial injustice, and is victimized by blighted slums in our cities, and the blight of polluted skies and streams; just to mention a few of the tasks ahead.

We do not have to look very far, or to speak in the abstract, to find compelling arguments against the pause. There are children today, far too many of them, that have never seen a doctor, never had a physical checkup, never

2

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been on a beach, never leaped into a swimming pool, never known what it was to really see the great out-of-doors.

There are far too many young people today that have never had the refreshing experience of a job; what's more, never learned how to work, have had no training for it.

And there are far too many people today that believe that the only duty of government is welfare, rather than to have a state of society in which there is opportunity so that you can do something about your own welfare, rather than having other people take care of it.

It's the pause that I am talking about now that stifles and chokes and shrivels the human spirit, and I am one of those that likes to be where the action is. That's why I am in politics. There is plenty of action there. You are not guite sure just what is going to happen, but there is plenty of action.

I suggest that one need not be 25 or under to be a member of the New Generation. As a former teacher I have found students at age 19 that should have been collecting Social Security and were ready for Medicare.

(Applause.)

I have also found people in the history of our country, like Oliver Wendell Holmes, who was speaking to his dear friend Justice Brandeis as he was walking down

1 one of the streets of Washington, when Brandeis was about 2 85, and he said to Holmes as he saw a beautiful young thing 3 walk by, he said, "Oh, what I'd give to be 70 again." Now, 4 that's a young man. He is of the New Generation. 5 Winston Churchill, one of my heroes -- we 6 all have them, you know -- he was a NOW man, and I liked what he said: "The beaches of history are paved with the 7 8 bleached bones of those who waited, and, while waiting, died. 9 Pope John XXIII was a NOW man, and I like what 10 he told the College of Cardinals in 1959, who thought that 11 the Ecuminical Council couldn't possibly be held by 1963. 12 "All right," said John, "we'll have it in 1962." What a man. 13 But there must be in the midst of those who 14 chant NOW at least a few of us who ask and challenge, HOW? 15 If you want to do things now, the question is, 16 How? And it's up to those of us in education, as students, those of us in politics and government, to try to find that 17 18 answer, or the answer to that question. 19 Now I am ready for some of the questions 20 over here. 21 Thank you. 22 (Applause.) 23 MODERATOR LESTER: Marsha, would you ask the

MISS GREER: I have sort of a broad personal

24

25

first question.

question to start with, Mr. Vice-President. I was wondering how you feel about this subject:

After the death of Presidents Roosevelt and
Kennedy there was existing a feeling that the vice-president's
role in government should be increased. As vice-president
do you feel that the role has expanded? And, if so, how?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I sure do. It
surely has.

Von know Take NA

You know, John Adams once said of the vice-presidency, "It's either nothing or everything." And he also had some other little things to say about how the mind of man could have fashioned such an inconsequential position, sort of a way to humiliate humankind.

I've often said the vice-presidency was maybe designed for people who were somewhat aggressive and brash, and it gives us a sense of humility; to force action, you see.

But the vice-presidency, like every other office, or every other position, changes, not so much by law as by practice. And I would say that since the late 1920's, maybe starting with -- Well, I think possibly Mr. Dawes was an active vice-president, in international matters in particular -- but let's say that since the middle twenties, and up through the thirties, and up until now, the office has taken on new significance and new duties, both by statute and by precedent.

Through statute the vice-president is now a member of the cabinet. He is a member of the National Security Council. He is the Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Peace Corps. He is the Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He is, more importantly, the Chairman of the Space Council, coordinating all of the activities of this government in space research and development. He is Chairman of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Council, known as oceanography. Now these are the official positions that are by statute. He is, of course, the presiding officer of the Senate.

By tradition and precedent he is often a spokesman for the administration. He has less administrative duties than many, so he can be, as we say, more out around the country.

I have presently the role of serving as the liaison officer, speaking of my own vice-presidency, with the local government officials, only last week meeting with some 400 presidents of school boards; meeting with the mayors, city managers, local government officials, and state legislative leaders.

I am Chairman of the President's Council on
Youth Opportunity, trying to coordinate the youth activities
of our government, working with local government. I am a

member of the Smithsonian Board of Regents. I finally became a regent of a great educational institution, the Smithsonian Institution being one of our very finest and greatest.

Now, those are some of the duties, plus foreign travel, a great deal of work with heads of state that come to visit in Washington, foreign ministers, and meeting regularly with the President on legislative programs — a full day's work, I can assure you, of about sixteen to eighteen hours.

The Vice-President is an expert in few, if any areas, and a general practitioner. I am one of the few general practitioners left in government.

MODERATOR LESTER: Steve.

MR. NECHEMIAS: Mr. Vice-President, do you think that Ronald Reagan will be your counterpart as vice-presential candiate in 1968?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I really couldn't say. I'll tell you, the Republicans have never really asked me about the choice for their candidates.

(Laughter, and applause.)

MR. NECHEMIAS: The question presupposes your own candidacy. Is that a safe assumption?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, it's a good one, let's put it that way. I don't know whether it's safe,

but there is something about what you said that is reassuring to me.

(Laughter.)

A

MODERATOR LESTER: Glen.

MR. WEISSENBERGER: I would like to turn to the national scene a minute.

Mr. Vice-President, the President has stated,
"Much can explain, but nothing can justify the riots of 1967."
Would you analyze the situation with this statement?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I think it's really self-analytical, and self-explanatory. What the President has said, which most of us I think would tend to agree with, that the riots are symptomatic of social conditions that are in many instances intolerable, or at least very bad; that there are inequities and injustices that have not been corrected; too many of our people have been deprived of a real opportunity for first-class citizenship and participation in American life.

Many have said that what he also implied by his statement, that while these things may be true, while we have poverty, and we have slums, and we have inadequate education for some people in some areas, and we have one-seventh of our population in what you call, under the standards, as poverty, that we have a way to redress these grievances, other than violence. We have the ballot box;

.

'

we have ways of peaceful protest, ways or petition. We have many ways to find answers, rather than indulging in violence, and lawlessness, and rioting, and looting, and arson, which frequently works on the innocent. The very people that are supposed to be helped are the ones that are injured.

So what the President has said, that in a society of law, under law, that we have the processes of law to correct the injustices, and we ought to work through those processes; that you cannot tolerate nor condone lawlessness, violence, rioting, in the name of social justice. You just can't do it. It's unjust, and it all too often brings damage upon the very people that it is supposed to symbolize trying to help.

So I believe the President's statement speaks for itself, and it's very concise. Obviously you can see why he's President and I'm Vice-President. He said it in a short statement and I had to spend three minutes on it.

MODERATOR LESTER: Dave.

MR. ALTMAN: Mr. Vice-President, there is another question the Republicans may not have contacted you about, but I wonder if you can speculate for me on what you think the top issue of the 1968 election will be.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I don't know if I can say THE top issue, because that really calls for possibly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a greater understanding of what's going on in this country than I possess. But I think there are two or three issues that will be of relatively equal priority.

One of the concerns of the people, which will be voiced a great deal in the campaign, is the subject of lawlessness and violence and crime. Whether or not that issue will be discussed in a manner that is helpful or constructive is yet to be seen, because, really, most law enforcement is a local government -- state government and local government responsibility. There are more police officers in New York City than the total number of federal inspectors in all the departments of government of the federal government. We do not have a national police force, and I'm opposed to one. I think the federal government is big enough, without having a national police force working all the precincts. I think this will be an issue, though. I think people are concerned about it, I think they are going to be talking about it, and they will be blaming each other.

Viet Nam. There will be those that think the administration's position— There'll be several positions. There will be those that are opposed completely to what the administration is trying to do; those who think we ought to do a whole lot more; and those who think we ought to get out. And then

there will be others who will just kind of weave in between. But that will be surely an issue.

And then I imagine one of the other issues will be whether or not this administration has really promoted the economic and social well-being of the country, and I come out four-squarely and say it has.

Those will be the basic, the more basic issues.

MR. ALTMAN: Do you think the "make or break"

issue is yet to emerge, then, and will emerge over the next

year?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I don't think there is a "make or break" issue, one issue. I think that everything we say will be conditioned primarily by the war, and general concern in the nation about crime and lawlessness.

MODERATOR LESTER: Marsha.

MISS GREER: Mr. Vice-President, I have another question.

In the light of the recent racial violence that exists in the country right now, could you please evaluate for us the success or the failures of various government programs, such as the Job Corps, or Aid to Dependent Children, or Slum Clearance, in relation to this type of a problem.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: One thing that Americans ought to understand is that this phenomena of

25

1

rising expectations, which most college students have heard about, and which is talked about frequently in the literature and the language of our time, is not peculiar to Asia, or South America, or Africa. There are rising expectations in America. And I suppose one of the indications of the success of certain efforts is the restlessness of people who for the first time have been touched by a modicum of improvement, and want much more. I think it was Napoleon that once said that the poor never really revolt. They are too poor, too sick, too indolent. Most all revolutions, most all radical movements, have been led by educated people. They have generally been led by people who have really had some of the good things of life, and are dissatisfied because so many of their compatriots, or of their group, so to speak, have not shared in this. Our own Revolution wasn't led by poor people. It wasn't led by illiterates, either. There hasn't been any. The French revolution wasn't led by poor people, nor was it led by illiterates. The communist revolution was not led by the poor, nor by illiterates. The poor and the illiterates never lead anything. They just die.

It's when you start to come out of that sickness, that despair, that things begin to happen. Now, this is the paradox of it. On the one hand some people say, "Well, don't arouse them," just as there have been

4

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

great men who have said about China, "She's a sleeping giant. Let her sleep." But she isn't sleeping any more. She's dangerous, a dangerous giant. She's awake. And how she's going to conduct herself may be very important in your lives.

Our slums are no longer just slums. They're awake. People are wanting things.

I think the one instrument that has changed the world more than anything else in the last hundred years is the television. And maybe add to that the transistor radio. People no longer live in ignorance. Even if they can't read or write, they can hear, and they can see, and as the Chinese philosopher said, "One picture is worth ten thousand words." And when you see the conditions of the world on that tube -- and the poor people see that as well as the rich -- in the furthest corners of the earth there's still public television, and in our cities and our ghettoes there are many televisions, private and public. And for the first time poor people are seeing, or somebody that's had a high-school education, or a tenth-grade education, that just knows enough, and has had his sensitivity developed enough, is seeing how you live, how the rest of America lives You can't hide any more. You can't hide the poor, and you can't hide the rich. We're out there, we've got that television camera on us. And we're fighting a war on

5

7

8

6

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

25

television. We have riots on television. Not make-believe wars, not cowboys and Indians, but real wars, right in your front room now, on that television tube, right there. Mothers have seen their own sons killed, watched it on television. It has actually happened in America. They've seen their own sons killed in battle on American television broadcasts from Viet Nam.

And you've seen riots, right on television; you've seen members of your own family involved in that riot. right on television. It's changed everything. So this is a whole new ball game, as we say.

Now, are these programs working? Well, the answer is Yes. Are they doing enough? The answer is No. Does it mean we ought to do more? I think so. But I want to be very clear what we're trying to do.

If all that we were trying to do today was to ease the pain of poverty, we'd just continue to write out checks. There's an easy way to take care of poverty of the purse - just give everybody some money. Some people think that's what we ought to do, too. And some people say we ought not to give them anything. Those are the two extremes.

We try to take a middle course. We've said to a young fellow, for example, in the Job Corps: "You're not just going to get money. We're going to pay you a little bit, \$60 a month, or so; but you're going to go to

school; your're going to learn a trade; you're going to learn how to act; you're going to learn how to be a part of society."

Now, we've trained over 70,000 like this, every one of them a school drop-out, every one of them unemployed; 80 percent of them never had a physical examination in their life; 55 percent of them illiterate; fellow Americans from your home town; and today their average rate of pay for those 70-some thousand is \$1.92 an hour, and 70 percent of the total number of graduates have gotten a job, 10 percent went back to school, and the rest of them joined the armed forces.

Now, I submit to you that's a pretty good record of rescue. The trouble is we need not 70,000, or 90,000, but we need 250,000.

We benefited last year in education eight and a half million youngsters that had disadvantaged educational backgrounds, or deprived educational backgrounds. The Headstart Program. My goodness, if we'd never done anything else in the last few years than Headstart, it's been worth it all. We've given little kids the first chance in their life to have a decent environment, the first chance to get some good food, the first chance to be cleaned up and have good clothes, and for the first time we've brought parents in that never knew a school authority, never met a school

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

authority, never met a teacher; and they've been brought together.

Project Upward Bound, 38,000 young people just like in this room here today, that were ready to drop out of school, or were school drop-outs, that had basic intelligence, had been picked up, given an opportunity, and they are in the great universities of America right now, in over 200 of our universities and colleges -- Project Upward Bound students.

How do I know but what one of those students will become one of the great scientists? Because most great scientists started with nothing. Most of the people that you really talk about today started with very humble beginnings.

I think that a lot of the things we're doing has been very helpful. We've experimented, and we've made mistakes. There's always somebody being overpaid; there's always somebody goofing off on the job. And there'll be some students here that will be goofing off on the job, too. and some professors that will be goofing off on the job. And there will be some politicians that do it, and some preachers that do it. But you don't close up the churches or the schools or the government.

Now, what you have to have is a sense of perspective. And one of the real problems today is what makes

news are people's mistakes. Not people's achievements, but people's mistakes. For every time an achievement is reported, ten failures are reported. It's what we call the "journalism of protest," of conflict, rather than of advocacy and achievement.

You don't get your name in the paper because you drove home and didn't get arrested. You get your name in the paper if you got drunk and drove home and got arrested. You don't get your name put in the paper as a government official if you do a good job every day. You're lucky if you can get reelected.

(Applause and laughter.)

MODERATOR LESTER: Glen.

MR. WEISSENBERGER: How does the administration plan to meet the needs for the funds for the programs you have just been discussing, while supporting a war in Viet Nam? Will we be only able to do an insufficient job in both areas?

What I am really trying to say is: Will the continuation of the war financially hamper President Johnson's Great Society?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, obviously, when you take on national commitments, and international commitments, with limited resources, you are not able to do everything you want to do.

I would like very much, speaking for myself, for us to be able to devote more funds, let's say to our cities, and to our education. I'll only say this: we're giving more to it now than ever before, war or no war. And when I hear people criticize that we're not doing enough, I always remember the years that I put in Congress and we couldn't get anybody to do anything.

We're spending right now three times as much money on federal aid to education as we did four years ago.

We have urban programs now that are three to four times larger than any we ever had four years ago. I know it ought to maybe be a little more. Some people think it's too much already.

And they may have a point in some of these programs. But, speaking for myself, there are certain programs I would like to see expanded. But I want to be quite frank with you: there are certain things I would like to do with my family that we can't do. There are certain things I would like to buy that we can't buy. And I have to tell my son that, "You can't expect to have a home as good as your dad has the first day you get out of college." It doesn't make any impact, I want you to know, but I tell him that.

People want things in a hurry. You can't get everything in a hurry. There are no instant solutions.

Now, let's talk about the international thing. There are some people today that say, "Well, we ought to just

take care of things at home, and we just don't have the means to take care of it abroad, and do the things at home that we need to do."

We don't have that easy choice.

I want to remind this audience of something.

What kind of a world do you think you would be living in today if Harry Truman hadn't stood firm after World War II with old Joe Stalin?

And, by the way, Harry Truman spoke to him in words that he could clearly understand, that didn't take a Harvard degree to explain what he meant.

(Applause.)

The Soviet Union refused to take the troops out of Iran. Harry Truman said, "I'll give you five days, Joe, or I'll send the Fifteenth Air Force and the American Army in to push you out. Now, make up your mind what you're going to do." Joe got the message. He left.

There was a possibility of Greece and Turkey going completely into the Communist orbit. A President of the United States with a hostile congress said, "We're going to do something about it." He sent men, equipment, and money, and we met them.

The President of the United States had the choice when the Soviets were going to take over Berlin. His cabinet was against him. The newspapers were against him,

1

3

4

6

8

9

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

most of them. Most of the politicians were against him, in Congress. And Harry Truman said, "We're going to take care of Berlin. We'll have the airlift. If need be we'll send our forces in." And we did. And Berlin is a free city.

John Kennedy was faced with Mr. Khruschev, when Mr. Khruschev said to Mr. Kennedy at Vienna, "Maybe this is the time and the place to have the war." And John Kennedy had Berlin again threatened, in 1961. You know what he did? He called up 250,000 reservists, gentlemen, and ladies, right in this United States, and sent 50,000 of them to Europe. We appropriated -- and I was there -- in one afternoon, an additional eight billion dollars, just like that, and said to the Soviet Union, "Now, we're going to come into Berlin, and we're going to stay there." And we sent a division of troops, and the Vice-President of the United States was sent to Berlin to welcome those troops, and those troops were ordered to go through the corridor, and if they were stopped, to shoot. How, you know the fact that they didn't have to was just our good luck.

But imagine the kind of a world it would have been had we given in every place. Imagine the kind of a world it would have been if Mr. Khruschev got by with those missiles down in Cuba. We've got enough trouble with just old Castro, much less those missiles.

Imagine the kind of world it would have been

1 in Korea. 2 And, by the way, I -- Oh, my goodness, I 3 was going to show you a little paper. My secretary has it 4 here, a little paper I was going to show you from Korea, 5 1951, '52. 6 (Handed to Mr. Humphrey). 7 Here's a little statement I thought some of 8 you might be interested in. Listen to this statement. 9 This is a news quote from a prominent newspaper. 10 "American airmen cheerfully machine-gunned 11 civilians in North _____, and wiped out village 12 after village." 13 What country do you think they are talking 14 about? 15 "You are inhuman, you Americans, because you 16 are bogged down in this _____ war, which you aren't 17 able to get out of, and which you are waging with a ferocity. 18 a spitefulness, a cold insensitivity that stupifies the world 19 and fills it with indignation. 20 "3. Fighting on will prolong indefinitely 21 the terrible sufferings of the people." 22 Now, that all says, "...civilians in North 23 Vietnam, and wiped out village after village. ... You are 24 inhuman, you Americans, because you are bogged down in this 25 immoral war. . . . Fighting on will prolong indefinitely

the terrible sufferings of the Vietnamese people."

No, that isn't what it says at all. These are statements on Korea, 1951, from Le Monde, a French newspaper; from Favaral, in this free 1951. And from one of our leading American publications in 1952. The same line, same business; same statements. They didn't even take time to correct or change the words.

Imagine the kind of a world it would have been had Korea gone down the drain. There wouldn't have been a free Japan today.

So, what I'm saying is, we don't have easy options. It's 20 years since World War II, and, believe me, without American forces in Europe, without Americans standing guard and taking up the real heavy duties, we couldn't be where we are today.

And I think young people today have to ask themselves the question: "What kind of world would it have been today if somebody had not taken some of these stands?"

"Oh, it may have been a better one," some people will say.

I think it's entirely probable that we could just forget the whole world for the next ten years, and live it up and have ourselves a ball like no one's ever had, and no one really would touch us. I don't think there's much doubt that we could do that. I think we could. We frankly did do that for a while. Adolph Hitler had no more right to

take over Germany than I have a right to take over the universe. Adolph Hitler went in and fortified the Rhineland without ever having a right to do it. He violated every treaty, and people stood back and let him do it, because we were on a binge. We weren't going to do anything about it. When Franklin Roosevelt said "Quarantine the aggressor," in 1937, he lost the next Congress. He never opened his mouth on quarantining the aggressor for another three years. It was the most unpopular political statement a president ever made.

The draft was extended, 202 to 203, August 30, 1940, before Pearl Harbor. Hitler had already conquered the Lowlands. One vote in Congress, one vote, the refusal to fortify Guam. The American people, 1940.

I think that these stands that we've taken have been vital to our security. They've been costly, they've been difficult, they've been painful; but we weren't intended to have a much easier life than we have. Despite all of this we have the best life on the earth.

MODERATOR LESTER: Mr. Vice-President, I think Steve has a question that follows up right along this line.

MR. NECHEMIAS: Mr. Vice-President, do you see any way that we can continue this Truman policy, and avoid the Viet Nams of the 1970's?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, I do. I

personally believe that the struggle that's being fought out
in Asia today is not over Viet Nam at all. If I thought
it was only over Viet Nam I would seriously doubt whether the
cost of it, and the sacrifice of it would be justified.
And I understand many times why people are very concerned,
and very discouraged and very upset about the struggle in
Southeast Asia.

It's my view that what's going on in that part of the world is very similar to what went on in Europe in the immediate postwar years. Asian Communist aggression, Asian Communist militancy, Chinese variety, is on the march. If it succeeds, it's only a matter of time until you will have to take a stand some place else.

Now, the intesting thing about this part of the world is what the people who live there think. I sometimes doubt that we are quite fully able to comprehend their views and their feelings.

The Prime Minister of Singapore, who only two years ago was very critical of the United States, and made some very damaging statements about our country, will be a guest of the President of the United States shortly, at his request -- not the President's request. This is the man who said within the month that American presence in Viet Nam is the only hope for freedom and independence in Asia.

General Sukharto, of Indonesia, and the

Foreign Minister of Indonesia, the men who have purged their
nation, in part, at least, of the Communist control which was
over that country only a year and a half or two years ago,
have said repeatedly that American presence in Southeast
Asia gave them the opportunity and the chance to rid their
country of foreign domination and Communist control.

Nay Win, of Burma, who only a year and a half ago didn't dare leave his country -- was a captive, literally, of Communist China -- today has spoken out openly about the importance of American presence in Asia.

I've been in Asia three times, and I'm no expert on this part of the world; I've talked to the leaders of 14 of their countries. Many of them -- all of them are disturbed over the war. So am I. I hope that war is never popular. Somebody said to me the other day that this is an unpopular war, and I said, "Thank God. I hope we never have a war that becomes popular." I can't think of anything that would be a greater debasement of character than to make war popular.

But every one of these leaders, every one, from the President of India to the President of Korea, every one of them, are fully convinced that our presence in Southeast Asia is vital to their security, and vital to the hope of freedom and independence in that part of the world.

Now, I just happen to believe that if all of

Asia, or large sections of it, were to go under a totalitarian 2 rule, of some form or another, which is aggressive, which is 3 militaristic -- Totaltarianism is not sweet love and kindness and brotherhood, you know, it's a militant philosophy, and 5 Chinese totalitarian communism is the most militant 6 philosophy in the world today, the most aggressive militant 7 philosophy -- If that goes unchecked, we'll either meet them some place else in Asia, or we'll meet them in Hawaii, or 9 Australia, or Seattle, or San Francisco. Some day you'll 10 meet them. 11 You don't think the Chinese Communists are 12 building those ICBM's for a Fourth of July celebration, do 13 you? 14 (Applause.) 15 They know that there are no ICBM's aimed at 16 them. 17 (Applause.) 18

MODERATOR LESTER: Mr. Vice-President, I think we should only impose upon your time for one more question, so I will ask Dave to ask that question, and I hope he makes it a good one.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I'm sure he will.

MR. ALTMAN: We've been discussing the

Great Society, and its programs, and the need for them. I

would just like to ask you, in view of the world situation

in Viet Nam, and possibly in Germany, and possibly in Korea, and possibly in South America; and in view of the riot-torn summers we've experienced, and it looks like it might get worse; and the fact that we're going to have to spend more money in some areas, yet cut expenditures, what is the priority system that our government will use to determine what stays and what goes?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: That is a very good question. An extremely difficult one, I might add.

Let me just state first of all that it isn't all as bleak as that. It could blow up any time. We're living in an explosive world. The proliferation of nuclear weapons makes this world more dangerous every day, and yet it is your government which has promoted the nonproliferation treaty; it is your government which asks for the nuclear test ban treaty. I was one of the co-sponsors of it, so I know the initiative that was taken.

But it is also true that it's better off now than it has ever been. The Alliance for Progress is working. The Organization of American States is being strengthened.

A year and a half ago the Dominican Republic looked like it was gone down the drain. Today it is not nearly what they would like, or what we would like, but it is a free and independent country, an elected government, with all of its

inadequacies.

South America, Central America, Latin America, regional development, growth of a common market, improved gross national product, per capita income-- it is better.

Europe is immeasurably better. One of the great success stories of American foreign policy is Europe. The relationships between the East and the West are better. In our relationships today a Rumanian Communist is president of the United Nations, yet he is not a stooge of the Soviet Union, or of China.

It is better. Asia is better. There are developments in Asia today that have never taken place in a thousand years. The Asian, the Southeast Asian association is a fact. A regional development in education, health and agriculture.

The Pacific-Asian Conference that was held at Seoul, Korea, two years ago, of ten free nations of Asia, is a going concern. Its second meeting was held in Bangkok.

The Asian-American Bank is a going concern.

Japan has taken a great interest, economic

interest, in the development of Asia.

India is a free country, despite the fact that she's been attacked twice in five years by Communist China

Things are not worse. Things are better.

America is better.

ACCURATE REPORTING CO. - CINCINNATI 44. OHIO

We have problems in our cities, but we had them before.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What's better in America is that the health of the American people is better; there are more jobs; there's greater income; there are more students in school, six and a half million in our universities; tremendous social progress made in our country. For the first time we've cut into the ranks of the real poor, we've reduced the number in poverty in one year by six and a half million. We're beginning to get at the illiterates. We're having an aroused American public conscience about the quality of life in the slums of our cities. The urban coalition, representing tremendous enterprise, some of the great bankers and financiers and businessmen of America, along with church leaders, and political leaders; a thousand men in the Urban Coalition meeting in the nation's capitol, making a ntional commitment to the development of a better life in our cities.

Things are better.

I think the real trouble in America is we enjoy beating ourselves about things are bad. Of course there are problems. There have always been problems. Terrible problems. When people went to the West they had problems. They couldn't get along with themselves or the Indians. When they opened up the great grasslands of the West they had problems -- drought and pestilence.

We've always had them. But we've got more to do with today than ever before. More young people better educated, more science, more technology. Tremendous breakthroughs are taking place.

am, there are so many pessimists, I don't like to get where there are such crowds. But I have reason to be optimistic. In Washington I'm sometimes jokingly referred to as Washington's perennial, congenital optimist. That's supposed to make you bad, you know. I say I welcome the title. First of all, there isn't as much competition over in that area.

There are some people who feel that they

prove themselves an intellectual by being a pessimist, and

being a critic. You don't prove yourself intelligent by

being a critic. You sometimes just prove you don't know

very much. Criticism is not to be equated with intelligence.

Sometimes it is just equated with a belly-ache. You're just

unhappy.

I don't say that you should be Pollyannish or foolish about your country, or about yourself, or about your college, or your state, or your family. But I think that America represents something more than the sum total of mistakes. And when I look back as a student of history, and I am a professor of government and of history, I think when I

study what America has been it isn't just the sum total of her limitations and her mistakes. This country hasn't gotten where it is because every man that was president didn't know what he was doing. It didn't get where it is because every businessman was a crook. It didn't get where it is because every man in a pulpit was a hypocrite. It didn't get where it is because every generation was worthless. Yet, when you read each generation, when you think about it and hear about it, you think that everything has gone wrong. There's more good being done in the world today than ever before, more sick being healed, more naked being clothed, more poor being fed, than ever before; more good being done by your country than ever before.

And I think it's about time that we understood it, and not go around and sell ourselves short, because let me tell you something: If we can't make things work out here if we Americans with our wealth, with our power, with our education, with our science, with our technology, with our security, if we can't make a better life for people here, who the dickens do you think can in this world? We do represent hope in the world. We represent the last chance for a lot of people. And I'm proud to be an American and help people have that chance. And we're helping an awful lot of people today have the only chance they ever had, either at home or abroad. And I think that's the mission of

(APPLAUSE.)

MODERATOR LESTER: Our program comes to an end, and would you please stay in your seats until the Vice-President and his party have left.

Thank you.

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.

