

Richard Marks: Good afternoon. I would like to welcome you to another in a series of lectures sponsored by the Associate Student Speakers Program. There are two floor mikes set up on either side of the room and if you would like to ask a question, if you can find the mike, we'll be glad to take them off. Those who... Today we are privileged to have with us a public servant who has been serving America for all of his adult life and at the present time is a visiting professor at the University of Minnesota and at Macalester College. He continues as a member of the Board of Regents at the Smithsonian Institution and was recently elected to the Board of Trustees at Brandeis University. It gives me great pleasure to introduce the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Hubert H. Humphrey.

HH; Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, Richard Marks and my special thanks to Janie Robbins who came down to greet us and I lost her... There she is over here. And Janie, you ought to stand up. You're the best that they are going to have here today. And I do want to thank the UCLA Associated Student Speakers Program for including me in on this occasion. I asked Richard what he expected from me and he said, "More than you're going to give." I didn't expect that that would be the answer I would receive, and I said, "Do you want this strictly informal question and answer?" and he said, "Well you... we would like to have you sort of hold forth for awhile and whatever you would like to talk about. Then from there on out we'll have the questions." And that's the way I'd like it. Now I have returned to the classroom, not voluntarily, but I have returned. Some twenty-five years ago I was a professor of government and then I decided that I would like to practice some of what I had been teaching and I think that's what got me in trouble. But I have felt since having been in government for some twenty-four years that all that I once taught in the courses in American government,--I should say, all the students that I taught were entitled to a refund because compared to what was written and what I taught and what happens and what I've seen, well it just doesn't match. That's all.

I came to college campuses many times in my years... 16 years in the Senate and 4 years in the Vice Presidency and when I was Vice President, in particular, I would say something like this, "that I am a refugee from the classroom," and people would say, "Well, that's good, that's one of the things that helps education." and then I would... I'd look around and I... jokingly, I would say, "I want the president of the university, if he was... if he could get out of the building or get in it, if he was around, that I would like to have him know that my credentials are in good order. I'd look for the member of the Board of Regents or Trustees and tell them that I'd tried to keep up to date and I said, "You know how public life is, particularly elected public life. It's so precarious and so uncertain." And then, I would chuckle a bit thinking that was all a joke. I never realized how persuasive I turned out to be. I've made the complete circle and here I am back again as a visiting professor to my own home university, to a very fine private college, and a member of a Board of Trustees of one of the most exciting and creative universities in America, and still actively engaged in the work of education at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars of which I am privileged to serve as Chairman.

I want to talk to you today about some of our domestic concerns. I know that tomorrow or very shortly you will have a very distinguished man here, Dr. Ralph Bunch, who will undoubtedly be able to enlighten you on many matters of international concern. But this meeting is open for all forms of questions. I did not come here to recruit Lou A. Reicher, I want you to know that before we start, even though I've had one or two whisper to me that if I could make any contact, it would be worth my time. But, I've decided to teach, not to be a broker, so I am going to try to do a little of that today. I asked Richard and Jane on the way to this meeting about some of the activities of UCLA, because every great university has a host of activities that are all too seldom reported or known by an interested public. I know, for example, of your Unicamp for your disadvantaged and handicapped in this community. I wish more people in America knew that about UCLA. I wish that they knew that it was primarily financed out of student activity, out of your Mardi Gras and other programs. I wish they heard that part of student life. I wish that more of our fellow Americans knew about the tutorial work that goes on voluntarily from thousands and, indeed, many thousands of gifted and talented university students. I wish that the word of the Venice project would get a little bit further east than just the boundaries of the State of California. I wish that people, who are so concerned these days and critical, would know of your high potential program for particularly students in minority groups that have high potential and through no fault of their own have been denied a chance to be full and prepared under the terms of orthodox university regulations and standards for a university career. This is a part of the student action that isn't reported. I also think that it's time that the American educational community and those responsible for it recognize that there is a desperate need and a critical need for a re-evaluation of many of the campus rules, much of the administrative structure and the relationship between administration faculty and student. I have very personal views about this. I've never seen any reason at all why it required disturbance to get programs on Afro-American studies. I would have thought that those of us who are educators or claim to be would have been out in front on that a decade ago. Indeed, we should have been. I think that we ought to recognize by now that in the non-academic areas of college life, students must have a very prominent role, if not the controlling role in their rules and regulations. Otherwise, these rules will not be abided by. I think we also ought to recognize that there is a deep concern among many students who expected to get some good teaching that they'd see their teachers and that they'd see their professors. Now, I'm not going to spend much of my time in the next few years on research. I'll let you in on a secret, there are warehouses full of research and I happen to believe that research is needed and it must be continuing. I am a person who believes in basic research in the field of sciences; I believe in research in the field of the humanities of social science; but I do not believe in research for research's sake. I believe that a University is what was once described in Greek literature, Socrates on one end of a log and a student on the other. It's the dialogue between teacher and student. It is a feeling of community and the ability to communicate. Everybody likes to talk these days about the generation gap. Well, as one whose been around a bit, I've seen some young women at age 18 or 20 that were already -- that is in terms of their attitude -- ready for social security and medicare. I found some like that. I found a few at the ages 60, 70 and 75 that were ready for a piece of the action, so I think that I...that one can say that it isn't

so much a generation gap, as it is possibly a communications gap. And we're all so busy; we're all so big; institutions are so big; government is so big; universities are so big; business is so big; everything is so big and computerized that we have lost some of the human elements which ^{are} vital to the educational process. So I intend in the few months that I may be privileged to teach or years to try to spend my time making teaching popular and making teaching, not just research and writing, but making teaching what it ought to be -- communication, where the professor may learn more than he teaches and where the student may feel a sense of rapport with the man that is on the other side of the desk -- so to speak -- or on the other end of the log. Why is it that we have a great deal of concern running through our campuses and all through our community. There are many reasons and you can pick individual incidents. You can pick a particular event and say, "that's it." That's what triggers it. But let's just take a look at the kind of society in which we live. It's, in many ways, a great and magnificent social structure. In many ways, it's a great and unbelievably successful economic structure. In many ways, it's the best that man has been able to create in terms of a political structure. But in many ways, it isn't. And to a sensitive people, it's the gaps, it's the weaknesses, the limitations that cause concern and finally cause trouble unless those limitations, weaknesses and injustices are corrected. Now I'm talking to an audience that is generally described as, "the now generation" -- get it done now. Well, much of what we need to do can be done now. Some things can't. And I happen to believe that frank and straight talk to the best of one's ability with the limitations of his background and knowledge is the best way to communicate. It isn't really important that a professor be popular. It is important that he speak his mind and that the student have the same privilege, that there be an exchange of thought on the basis of intellectual integrity and that there be communication, not just words. Here we see a situation, hunger in this country, and real hunger, not just malnutrition, but people going hungry in a society that for over thirty years has been complaining about a food surpluses. Thank God, at long last, that there is an interest in the American public and particularly among young people and among others to see that something can be done about it. Now this is a problem that can be answered now. If you put yourself to this one, we can get it done now in this Congress, in this year, in this Administration, in this country, so that by the year 1970 not a single man, woman, or child in America is without an adequate diet. That's something for the "now generation" and we can do that. And I hope that you'll bend your efforts to it and study it carefully. When I just give young people a word of advice. When you run up against establishment, be careful that you have your facts right, because frequently the leader of the establishment, as they put it, will find you on some miscalculation of minor significance and that will become the whole frame of argument. So, be sure of your information and you don't need to worry. There's plenty of information that you can be sure of and, if you're doubtful, cast it aside, because you'll have a big enough case with what is positive, certain, sure and sound. So the hunger in the midst of plenty -- it's politically dangerous -- it's economically indefensible and it's morally wrong. All of which, I think, makes a pretty good case for doing something about it. It costs something. Yes -- but not much in this fantastic budget of ours and this economy that's approaching the trillion dollar figure. It is said that for less than one billions of dollars, we can see to it that not a single man, woman, or child in this country goes without an adequate, balanced diet. That's something that we can do.

Unemployment. Now this is a little more difficult, in the greatest industrial boon that the nation has ever known. What kind of unemployment? Hard-core unemployment. Why? Because many of the people that today are without jobs have never had training for the job. They have had no industrial orientation. They are like foreigners in a strange country. Whose fault? -- Theirs. Obviously not. Separate, but equal? Never was. It was separate and unequal all the time, and you and I know it. Now when I hear people say to me, for example, "Well, we've got to give everybody an equal opportunity,"^{now} I say, well, you're going to lose that game right now. People who have been denied for a century must have more than equal opportunity. They must have an extra dose of opportunity. And we're going to have to have the patience and the perseverance and the creativity to find ways and means of inspiring motivation, of bringing skills or semi-skills to people who have none and of following through. We bring in this great nation of ours... a person comes in from Cuba and they're surely welcome. The government of the United States tries to be of some help in orienting that person to a new environment and follow-through for a job. Well, what about a fellow American that may come from Alabama, or Mississippi, or South Carolina, or Minnesota or California that is without skills, without a good education, without a cultural background that equips him for life in the great urban centers. Are we to ignore them and say, "Well, individualism, freedom of choice," The choice being what? More of the same, only worse.

Poverty. Ten years ago, if a speaker came to this campus and talked about poverty in the United States, the student body and the faculty, with few exceptions, would look at him and say, "What is he talking about? Oh, sure there are a few poor people around, we know that, but mainly because they don't want to work." That's what they used to say. And then finally, some of the great spirits or leaders in this country and social leaders in America, people in the academic life and in the fields of social work and the humanities found that poverty was not just an occasional blight, but it was here, indiginous, cancerous, malignant in substantial measure and while it is true we haven't done nearly what we need to about it, we've recognized the problem as a nation in public policy for the first time. Not merely to see to it that the poor had something to eat which is still a matter to be fulfilled in many instances, but that we recognize poverty in all of its dimensions and try to do something constructive to eradicate it. Poverty in the midst of untold wealth. That's why it's so blatantly wrong; -- that's why people rebel; that's why there is such deep tension and frustration, because you and I know it doesn't need to be. There may have been a time that people could be poor, because there wasn't any way to correct it. But believe me, that's not the case today. Now we don't know all of the answers and I appeal to this student body to be understanding. I appeal to you to be innovative, creative, experimental. We do not know how to cure cancer of the body, but we do not throw out every scientist and doctor that fails in an experiment. We say, "Try it again, doctor - go at it again, Mr. Technician. Here is another grant of funds -- follow this idea, follow this particular approach." And for better than fifty years the medical profession of this land has been searching relentlessly for an answer to cancer in all of its forms and we've made some progress, and we hail every progress and we say it's great, good news. Well, there's another kind of cancer of the human spirit, called poverty, and for thousands of years we have looked at it as if it were like leprosy, and isolated the poor. Now, at long last, we say maybe we can treat it; maybe we can find an answer, and we experiment, and when we experiment with public funds and some of it is wasted, immediately there is an investigation and then somebody says, "it's boondoggling" and somebody says, "its corruption." When we ask the poor to help manage their own affairs, when they've never had a chance in their lives to manage anything, and

they make a mistake, we say abolish the community action programs. Ladies and gentlemen, the way to develop a mature individual is to give him the responsibilities of maturity, and many of the poor and the deprived in this country and the disadvantaged have been denied any chance to have responsibility for their lives. They've had no chance to have anything to say about their decisions that affect their lives, and if in the next decade, ^{as} we try to give them that opportunity to make decisions affecting their lives, they make some mistakes, be as tolerant of them/^{will you} as you are of the doctor that has gained fame and a nobel prize who may have spent twenty-five to thirty years making one mistake after another until he found the answer. Just be that tolerant and you're going to have to take a stand because, just as surely as I am looking at you now, there will be a wave -- a move in this country to try to turn back on some of these programs. I don't say they're all good -- some should be discarded, but I say when we succeed in one endeavor, we should build from it and we must be willing to innovate.

And here we live at the time of urban life. What is the characteristic of modern society, urbanization for which we're poorly prepared, physically, emotionally, intellectually and economically. Urbanization. The vast movement of people, not only in America, but all over the world to the cities from the mountains -- the Andes into Lima, into Santiago, Chile, into Rio, into city after city -- from the fields of India into Calcutta and from America that was, only fifty years ago, essentially a rural society into a nation today that has seventy percent of its population on two percent of its land and which in the next few years and the next twenty-five years will double that population, and we'll need to find nineteen million more acres of land for urban development. Magnificent cities with libraries and museums, and commercial structures, and stadiums and orchestras, and factories, and parks and streets. Magnificent cities. A city in which you can build a magnificent new commercial building -- an office building of fifty, ^a hundred stories high and within its shadow the filth of humanity. We know how to build. The magnificence of the city with the filth and the ugliness of the ghetto. Is it any wonder that people are bewildered. Is it any wonder that there is a sense of frustration. Now I suggest that we turn that frustration and bewilderment into constructive purpose. I suggest that we start to make the kind of ^a commitment that this country needs, and I've suggested it for a long time. In reference to our cities, I've said we've needed to do for the American city which in many ways is as demolished as the cities of Western Europe after World War II -- that we needed a Marshall Plan for our cities. ^A And what do I mean by that -- a long term commitment, adequate sums of money, planning, cooperation between the donor and the receiver and considering human values, as well as physical structure. Don't tell me we can't do it. We can build 45,000 miles of interstate highway in this country at the cost of millions of dollars per mile and we can build it on schedule. We can build commercial recreation facilities. We can put the Apollo 8 and ^{the} Apollo 9 ahead of schedule. The most intricate type of design and engineering and technology that the world has ever known. We can create a beautiful, perfect environment for man to go to the moon, but we can't do it in Los Angeles, isn't that amazing.

And in our society it isn't a question of either or, it's a question of doing it together. Many times I have indicated to some of you and others that a society or a nation that can put a man on the moon and pay for it and do it, ought to be able to help and be willing to put a man on his feet right here on earth. To do it and to pay for it. We can do it. Now what are some of the dimensions of this problem. People like to talk about the urban crisis. Well, what do you mean by crisis? Well, the trouble with this day and age is that we use adjectives so generously that you hardly know which one means anything anymore.

You see somebody and you say, "You're beautiful," when you know darn well they're not. When you see somebody and you say, "I hope you're feeling well," when you really have'nt that feeling at all. We say a lot of things. It's the pattern today and we have extravagant language and I am as guilty of it as everybody else.

Crisis. What is it? I figured I'd get a response out of that. All of you Republicans that have to go to class, why you can go. But I want all the dissident Democrats to stay because we're trying to patch up things, ^{now} you know. You ever thought about whose President when Mr. Nixon's out of town? This is what use to worry the country when President Johnson left and I was around. My when you're Vice President you live for those moments. I'm always being deflected here, but I read where Professor Goldman had something to say about abolishing the office of the Vice President. I hope ^{that} we'll get around to that in the question period because I want to take him on here -- after all it's a good place to do it. Well what about -- what do we mean by crisis. Let's define it. I'll tell you what we mean by crisis. -- The worst schools, the poorest schools in the areas that need them the most -- that need the best schools. The poorest education in the areas where the people need the best education. -- That's crisis and that is a fact in all too many cities across America. Secondly, the fewest number of garbage collections in the area where there's the most garbage, 'cause there's the most people who need sanitation protection. -- That's crisis. The high rates of crime in areas where police are needed more often and better police. And there are fewer of them and lower grade police.

Unemployment and low income or sub-employment amongst the blacks, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups. Employment where unemployment -- unemployment where employment is needed.

Pollution. The pollution of water, the pollution of air which has no respect for ethnic group, income, or area. That's crisis.

Housing. And let's just lay it on the line, there is no way to correct the ills of the modern city until you give people decent housing and provide decent housing for them in which to live. And that is a must. Let me give you an example, the late Senator Robert Taft, who was no revolutionary, in cooperation with Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana, who isn't any revolutionary, were the authors of the Housing Act of 1949 and they said in that Act that every American is entitled to a decent home, to decent houses. They proscribed in that Act 1949 that we would build 135,000 units of low-income, low-rent public housing, every year for six years 810,000 units. That was 1949. Twenty years have gone by and in the twenty years we have built less than 500,000 units when it was required in the Act of '49, before this urban crisis was so visible, that we would build 810,000 units in six years. Why? I'll tell you why. Because legislators listened to public opinion. Because legislators were convinced that low-income, low-rent public housing was not wanted, so that today the poor people of America are more poorly housed ^{now} ~~than~~ ^{they} were ten years ago. Do you want something to act on. I'm going to make a suggestion. I'd like to save the world too, but frankly it's a big job. I've worked at it a little bit and I'm not weary. I do become a little concerned as to whether I'll live long enough to make it, but I'll tell you one place to start saving it, right here -- in this university, in this county, where you can look at what you're doing, see what you're doing, see whether what you're doing is effective. The best foreign policy is a working, effective, domestic policy and you're not going to abolish poverty in the world until you make some inroads on it right here in the United States of America.

Of course, that isn't quite so dramatic as some of these other things, I know that. You can be such an expert on some parts of the world you have never visited. It's so easy. But try to be informed on the part of the world where you live and the sum total of the parts makes the whole.

the

Finally, the issue of race tells us what/crisis is and America is a unique country in this. We're multi-racial, not just bi-racial and we are right at the point in our history where we're going to determine whether this is going to be an integrated society. And, I don't mean a non-segregated, I mean an integrated society in which we recognize that there is one race called the human race. Or whether or not, we are going to be the society that the Kerner report spoke about -- separate and unequal. Whether we are going to have American apartheid, whether we're going to have separatism here, or whether we're going to learn to live as a community. And, may I say that the problem of the city focuses attention upon it all because the neglect of the city today is an example of the neglect of the minorities, because more and more of the blacks, the Puerto Ricans, the Mexican Americans, the Indians and others have moved to our inner cities. And when I see my white bretheren go to the suburbs, and ring the center city with a white band, and see the city services of the inner city and the center city die because of lack of revenue and even sometimes lack of talent, I say that's the worse form of discrimination and all the pronouncements and all the brotherhood campaigns put together cannot erase it. There's only one way to meet the problems of this country that are tied up in what we call race and that's to start to treat people like people. I heard an old minister say, and I know this isn't very fashionable these days, but so be it, "Everybody has his right to have his own idea of his own faith" and he said, "The way you treat people is the way you treat God," and I suggest that the greatest contribution that the American student can make to the world is to talk about people -- people or peepul, if you want it that way -- just people. How do we think about them -- not black people, not white people, not brown people, not red people, but people and start to recognize that the great resources of this country, the great potential of this country is yet to be discovered in those people. Well, now they say, "Well, what are you going to do about all this stuff. That's a great idea Humphrey. What are you going to do about it?" Well, first thing you've got to know is what's the problem. I think we've made enough studies. I don't think we've taken them seriously. That's the problem -- that's number one. Well, we've done something. We've made some advances. We ought not to minimize them. The breakthroughs, the beginnings are very important. Model cities, which for the first time coordinate all of the many governmental programs for both physical and human rehabilitation, put a premium upon community planning, put a premium upon local action. The Housing Act which is the most far-reaching housing program -- the Act of 1968. Good, but it has yet to be implemented. We've just put down the cornerstone. The question is whether you're ever going to build any housing under it. It pledges six million low-income housing units in the next ten years, not 810,000, but six million. Let's see whether we get at it. Let's see whether the bond issues will be voted. Let's see whether or not the taxes will be collected. There are some other things that are needed -- an urban development bank. You can't finance the American city with conventional financing any more than you could have financed the opening of the West without the Federal Land Bank, any more than you could have financed the development of REA without the Rural Electrification Bank Administration. It took governmental action in cooperation with

private resources and until we start to find the money, as one Mayor said, not long ago. They said, "What are the problems of the city?" He said, "There are three -- money, income and revenues." Cities today are bankrupt, literally bankrupt -- unable to sell their bonds -- unable to provide their services and here we sit with an obsolescent, obsolete governmental structure -- federal, state and local, that is unable to come to grips with the many conflicting problems of the metropolitan life and the metropolitan area. Take a look at your own area here. Take a look at any other area. The multiplicity of governmental jurisdictions. If you happen to get the county to agree to a plan, then the city doesn't like it. If you get the city to agree to it, then there is a special jurisdiction like the Port Authority that doesn't like it. If you get the Port Authority on, then the state doesn't like it and you have one constant set of problems. What do you have to do. Well, we've got a lot of talk about model cities. I suggest model states. First of all, model states. Now what do I mean by that. I mean let's revise state constitutions. Let's give them the authority to the cities and to the metropolitan areas that are required to raise the funds to do the planning to provide the services. There isn't a city in America that has any authority on its own. It gains all of it from its legislature of its state. The child of the state is the city -- the city is the child of the state. It has only that which it is granted by legislative act, by constitutional authority, or charter and all this talk about modernization of the American city must start at the state capital and the Federal level and when we start to put the two major partners to working together -- state and Federal, or Federal and state, and then authorize -- give the authority for municipal development and new jurisdictions, new legal authorities, then we'll begin to get something done. The cost of land is prohibitive for low-income housing. We need an urban homestead act. How did you open America. You had a homestead act for rural America. That's the way many of your grandparents got their start. An urban homestead act to subsidize the high cost of land values, so that we can find decent housing for low and middle-income groups to take care of their needs and the public services that are required in parks and cultural centers. How do we pay for it? Well first of all, the growth of the economy. What I call the growth dividend. It will run for the next two to three years at the rate over and above all contemplated expenditures that we could set aside, two to three billion dollars in fiscal 1970 and '71. By fiscal '72 it could be as high as thirty billion dollars and that's the kind of injection of finance that is needed. A massive, national commitment. The peace dividend to bring this war to an end and to bring this war to an end to put these resources as quickly as possible into the building and the rebuilding of our urban life, to reexamine and take an inventory of every commitment that this nation has abroad, Not to withdraw from the world, but to quit thinking that it's our plum, our pie, our lake.

Now I want to leave you with a little story about -- I know many of you are deeply concerned about the inadequacy of our whole structure. Remember what Winston Churchill -- I've got two Churchillian stories. There always -- he -- with all of his limitations, he really did get on target many times. Churchill once, in a debate in the House of Commons, was challenged on forms of government and he said, "Democracy is the worst possible form of government ever tried, the worst possible form of government except all others that have been ever tried." And I think,

that when we think about what we have done and what we need to do, that we could be reminded of that sweet little leader of the temperance movement in Britain who called upon the Prime Minister during the war years. And she and her group were deeply concerned about the consumption of alcoholic beverages by Sir Winston. He was noted for having consumed rather copious quantities of it. And they had a little meeting of their group and they made an evaluation on estimate of the volume that he had consumed and they appointed this dear, sweet little old lady in tennis shoes to come and meet with the Prime Minister. And she came in, and he granted her an audience, and she said, "Mr. Prime Minister, I am here to represent the temperance movement and we know that you drink large, copious quantities of whiskey and brandy and other alcoholic beverages and we think it's deplorable. We have estimated the amount that you have consumed, and we have the dimensions of your office, and we have estimated that if all the alcoholic beverage that you have consumed since you were Prime Minister were to be poured into this office, it would come up to about here. And Sir Winston looked at this sweet little old lady and he said, "Is that all you have to say?" And she said, "Yes, what do you have to say?" He looked at where her hand was, he looked at the floor, he looked at the ceiling. He said, "So little have I done, so much is there yet to do." Thank you very much.

RM: I know many of you have 1:00 classes, so we'll just take a minute for you to exit through the crowd. There are seats -- a few of them -- up in the front. Those who would like to stay for the questions and answers possibly could come up and take them. If not, we're just going to wait a few minutes and then commence with the questions. We're going to alternate mikes and if please you could ask just one question and wait for the answer. We have two floor mikes. That's the easiest place to start from.

HHH: Oh, I've got to walk for awhile instead of run. Yes, thank you so much. Thank you all very much.

RM: Think he's running for mayor of Minneapolis.

HHH: Yeah, all set let's go. You go right ahead.

RM: Why don't we start with that mike on that side of the room. Whosoever standing at the mike, I can't see it. Why don't you ask your question and if you can all try to sit down, we can start.

X1: I'm not going to get specific, I don't think.

RM: Will you please speak up.

X1: I won't get specific -- nothing here has been specific till now, but I am going to ask something that I think is basic -- the thing that stood out. You said people are going around saying, "You're beautiful when you know they're really not." Well that's not what it's all about. People aren't beautiful by the way they look and if you don't understand that, you aren't going to start solving any of these problems.

RM: Do we have a question. Possibly at this other mike.

XI: In the light of your previous remarks on the necessity to take care in treatment of people, do you seriously -- yes or no -- believe that there will ever be a Nueremburg trial about the atrocities in Vietnam and will you be called to answer for your actions there?

HHH: I couldn't say whether there would ever be anything like that. If I were to be called, I would be ^{surely} more than happy to state what my participation was. I happen to think that we might be a little better off to try to kind of look ahead and learn some lessons out of the experiences that we have had, which have been sad and costly experiences and see if we can do a little bit better than we did yesterday. I plan -- I don't have a hundred years yet to live. I intend to live every one of them for tomorrow. I don't intend to try to go back and even relive the election, much as I'd like to.

RM: Why don't we just alternate. Is there one on this side of the room?

XII: You asked the dissenting Democrats to stay so, I hope this isn't a low blow, but, all in all, knowing what you know now, if you could look back for a minute and speak honestly from your heart, do you feel that the war was worth it?

HHH: I don't believe that anyone could have foreseen at the time of our involvement, which did not start in 1965, it started much sooner, what this war would really come to and what cost it would really entail or take from the American people. I happen to feel that the cost has been very high and I hope and pray that we can find a prompt and quick answer to it, not only at the negotiating table, but in the deescalation of this war in Vietnam. The things that have happened such as the bombing pause, I actively supported. Development of a political infrastructure which I thought was essential, if you were going to have anything that was good out of it, I actively supported. I only think that history can give you an honest, objective answer to your question. I am too deeply involved to be - to do anything else but to be somewhat subjective. I did what I thought was right. I have not lived a life of public or private hypocrisy. I have made my mistakes, but they have not been mistakes, may I say of the heart. They may, at times, have been mistakes of miscalculation, but public integrity to me is as important as intellectual integrity and I've tried to have it to the best of my ability.

XIII: Professor Humphrey, you talked about people getting their facts straight before they ask questions, so first I am going to get the facts straight and then I'll ask the question. The question regards the pace of desegregation of the public school system in Mississippi under the Democratic administration during its years in power. The latest statistics that I have seen, as of about fifteen months ago, by the Federal Commission on civil rights state that 47% of the Mississippi public school districts are in compliance with the Supreme Court order on desegregation. They also state in the Commission's pamphlet on racial isolation in public schools that precisely 2-1/2% of all black elementary and secondary school students in Mississippi attend schools where there is even one white person. Okay, now, these figures are as approximately the first of January, 1967. By that time the Democratic administrations had been in power for roughly six years and the pace set up at this rate would be from 1954 to that date, The pace would mean it would take five centuries to get the public school system desegregated. If all the change occurred only under the Democrats and not under the Republicans, it would take America 2-1/2 centuries. My question is that, in power, did men like Robert Francis Kennedy not push hard enough or is this the pace ^{which} we must stick to?

HHH: Well, if you want to know if I think the pace is fast enough, the answer is no. That's for sure. ~~XXXXXX~~ As a matter of fact, I spent a

good deal of my life in Congress trying to expedite many things. It took sixteen years, for example, to get a Medicare program. I didn't think the pace was nearly good enough. I introduced the civil rights legislation as the first Senator in 1949. We passed it in 1964. I don't think the pace was nearly good enough. We had 83 days of debate. I thought we would have been able to do it in three. I didn't think the pace was nearly fast enough, but I'll tell you what, we made some progress and we made the breakthroughs and it has a way of moving in geometrical proportions like compound interest. But we are beginning to make progress and the important thing is to keep on the pressure Democrats or Republicans in Congress in the Executive Branch. I think we've got a lot of things to apologize for not having done well enough, but we live within the political milieu of what was possible. I lost every Southern state in this last election, because I said I would not slow down the pace, that I would indeed step up the pace. I paid a high price for it. And the man who is now President of the United States said during that time that the pace needed to be slowed down and I am happy to tell you that since he became President, he hasn't slowed down the pace. More power to him, But this goes back to the other question -- political integrity. I was asked on the platforms in Jacksonville, Florida and Charlotte, North Carolina in Louisville, in Atlanta and in many other places "Mr. Vice President are you for the Department -- HEW's guidelines. Do you think we're going too fast, you think we're going too slow?" I said we're not going fast enough and they need to be enforced. Well, I didn't carry any of the Southern states, but it was politically honorable, even if I suffered an ignominious defeat, but I think I've answered your question to the best of my ability.

XIV: Mr. Humphrey, would you comment on the Walker report of what happened in Chicago.

HHH: I think it's the best report and the most objective analysis that has been written on that tragic situation and I hope it will be studied for more than its headlines.

during last summer in Chicago

XV: Mr. Humphrey, something you said ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ been bothering me for a long time. While you were in your hotel room, the Los Angeles Times quoted you as saying at the time of the demonstrations that those people downstairs who are demonstrating didn't represent the majority feeling in the United States. And, in effect, what I think that it did was to practically condone what the police were doing at the time, and I'd like you to explain this?

HHH: Well, I don't condone brutality on the part of anybody. I do not condone violence. I don't recall having said that but if I didn't I maybe should have, because I don't happen to think ^{that} what was going on in terms of the violence and in terms of the protest represented the majority opinion of the United States. I don't think that's the case. I don't say -- I want it quite clear, I think there were literally hundreds and thousands of people that were there that were deeply distressed with what was going on in the Democratic party, that had honest feelings and convictions and felt strongly about the war and strongly in opposition to the Administration's policy and they had every right to do so and every right to be there. But let me make it very clear to you, sir, that there was a hard-core group that were determined that they were going to have some trouble and they generally get it. And I want..... It is entirely possible that there may have

been two hard-core groups.

XVI: Mr. Humphrey, I am curious to know what happened to the NBTA program, under President Johnson?

HHH: What was that again?

XVI: The NBTA program and what do you think about...

HHH: What was that?

XVI: Manpower Development Training Act.

HHH: Oh, pardon me..NBTA. Yes, sir.

XVI: What do you think its future potential is?

HHH: Well, I think its done well. I think it's all a matter of funding, whether the resources are put to it. It has been very beneficial. It has helped train and retrain over a million workers and I believe that's been a very constructive achievement and I hope that it will be expanded. That's the Manpower and Development Training Act which has been a great deal of help, particularly for persons who have been moved from one skill to another or persons who have no skills.

HHH: Yes, sir.

XVII: You spoke today about the shortage of funds and the need for more projects to end poverty in America, and I am sure we all share with you the need for these changes to be done soon, but I think you fail to mention perhaps what I think is the main reason why we cannot carry on these program. As long as the United States is spending \$70 billion dollars a year, almost ten percent of its gross national product on war, as long as we have our armies all over the world and we are dedicated to this sort of holy crusade of fighting communism, I think perhaps we cannot carry on these projects and this is the main reason. I would like to ask you perhaps something which you can do now, as you're no longer Vice President to contradict the President. Do you think we can have guns and butter? Can we carry on these wars? Can we carry on this crusade of anti-communism, of war? This constant thing which has been going on for the last twenty years and still have butter and build up America and make it a much better place? Can we have both?

HHH: Well, you've described the situation as you wanted it. Let me try to answer it as I would like to. First of all, I am not going to let you or anybody else off the hook too easy about what we can afford in this country, because we can afford a good deal more than we're doing. I don't happen to be very much of a person for guns. I have been spending a lot of time in the field of disarmament. I am trying right now to get university audiences and others interested in the anti-ballistic missile program so that this thing isn't launched to envelop us once again in a very costly defense expenditure. I said, as a candidate for the office of President, that if I were elected I would immediately take an inventory of our commitments around this world and find which ones had priority and meaning in terms of contemporary conditions and which ones should be abandoned. In other words, to tidy up the house, to try to remove some of the extravagant costs that we obviously have, and as I indicated a moment here ago, not to try to be the master of the world, but rather to be a partner in this world. I happen to think that can be done. I must say that many a person today, I've heard in and out of Congress say, "Well, we can't afford, Mr. Humphrey, to do anything about day-care centers. We can't afford community health centers, Mr. Humphrey, because

ten percent of our budget goes for defense. Well, I wish ten percent didn't go, but let me tell you that's one of the lowest defense budgets of any of the major nations and we've got 90% left over. I mean ten percent of our economy GNP, we still have 90% left over. I'd like to see that percentage sharply reduced, but I want to make sure in the meantime that we don't give some people an easy out, who when you reduce that budget are still not for day-care centers and still are not for educational programs and still are unwilling to do something about the cities. Let me give you a little experience at some advantage in the experience. I served in the Congress after the Korean War, and during the Korean War. And I heard all the arguments. And they said, "Once we get this war over" that was taking 14% of the GNP and then 16% of the GNP, "Once we get that over, then we will be doing these wonderful things." Well, what happened when the war was over. I'll tell you what happened. Some of the folks that were voters went to sleep. The Congress didn't act. There was a new administration, taxes were sharply reduced and there wasn't a single anti-poverty program. There was nothing done in terms of Federal aid to education. There was no launching of an attack on the problems of pollution. There were no student scholarship loans. There was no public housing of any consequence. They just relaxed. Now I am not about to let anybody sell me that bill of goods again. I prefer not to have ten percent of this budget for military purposes. I prefer it much less. But, I want to tell you something, if we're going to indulge in that kind of thing called militarism on the one hand, the military budget, then I want you to indulge in a little bit of this civilian activity on the other hand. And how do we pay for it? And we can -- tax reform. There hasn't been a tax reform measure introduced for years and if all administrations, Republican and Democrat alike are guilty. Now I can speak with some integrity on this because, I fought the battle of tax reform, and found out that there were only twenty-six votes in the United States Senate. I had as my partner, one of the most brilliant economists in America at that time, Senator Paul Douglas. And we had major tax legislation before the Congress at the time of the Korean War and, instead of plugging loopholes, they opened some new ones. The middle-income group in this country today is in a taxpayer's revolt. There are loopholes big enough in our tax laws to drive a semi-truck through and that's where you're going to get some of this money. And may I say, that instead of just trying to see how we're going to federate the whole world, which if we can get around to that we'll work on it, would you concentrate your attention on tax reform for awhile and maybe we can build amongst young Americans that are voters, that will be voters or are voters -- a kind of consciousness. So that when a man runs for Congress the next time you say, "Mr. Congressman how do you stand on this tax bill and that tax bill and this issue and that issue," instead of ^{always} saying, "How do you stand on weapons, nepalm, and so on," all of which is important, all of which is important, all of which you ought to ask him, But give him a little of the double treatment, both international and domestic. Because if you don't, mark my words, there's enough movement in this country to keep the military budget big. I have been in Washington twenty years, and I know. The question is, "Is there enough social force in this country and ferment and enough activist political action in this country to keep the civilian programs moving?" Is there enough to put concentration where it ought to be, and you're going to determine that, but you're not going to determine it unless you start talking about it, unless you understand what you're talking about. Tax reform, the dedication of funds for critical programs, that's one of the ways we'll do what we're talking about here today.

RM: We have about time for one more question.

XVIII: Mr. Humphrey, I'd like to ask you a question, but you'll have to clarify a point for me first. You seem to be saying, "hooray for people," and very happy about people, and yet you criticize Robert Taft and the legislature for giving in to public opinion vis-a-vis the housing. Now what do you really mean by the public opinion that they're considering?

HHH: Well, I wasn't trying to criticize Robert Taft. I was trying to pat him on the back. I'm very grateful for his leadership in the Housing Act.

XVIII: But you -- Well you mentioned the legislation.

HHH: What I was saying, sir, is that legislators generally vote what is the prevailing popular will -- public opinion. But the purpose of an education and the purpose of political action is to change public opinion, if you feel strongly about it.

XVIII: Now, what do you mean by public opinion? Are you talking about special interest groups, Pressure groups? You mentioned the Port Authority. I'll mention the National Rifle Association and the John Birch Society for two more.

HHH: Yes, I don't like either one of those last two.

XVIII: And, there's a great problem in this country... and there seems to be a great problem in this country that most of the force brought upon the legislators in the Capitol comes from special interest groups. Now how do you suppose that we can subvert this and get around it? What are we going to do?

HHH: Well, may I say first of all, you're right. Most of the pressure that's brought to bear upon many of the legislators is from a group that has a particular special interest. Now not all special interests are, in my book, bad. For example, to save the redwoods, that was a special interest group and I was interested in it. I thought it was a good idea. We ought to save them. There is a special interest group in this country that happens to feel that we ought to do a great deal more about conservation, and the dedication of public lands for the purposes of national parks. I'm for that. I think you have to make your choice as to what kind of a society you want. Now there is going to be a very strong group, for example, in America that's going to try to convince you and convince me that you're going to get more defense and that you're going to feel more secure out of an anti-ballistic missile program. I just don't think you are and I'm going to go around this country and argue the other way, and I know a little something about it. Now that's two special interests, but I like mine better. And I think that's the way that you have to have conflicting interests and when you come to tax laws, and this is very dangerous to say out here in California, but there are such things as we call depletion allowances. Are they too much or are they too little? Is the capital gains structure in the tax law equitable? Are some of these loopholes that permit -- that really aggravate, mergers that permit companies that have made large amounts of money to go in and buy a company that has lost money and thereby to absorb the losses in order to pay less taxes, thereby increasing the rate of merger, at the same time the Justice Department is prosecuting them for merger. Does that make much sense? I think not. Now, I'd like to do something about that and how are we going to do it. Like meetings like this. Not in a moment. We're going to have to study it. We're going to have to look into it and I want some of the enthusiasm that the student bodies of American colleges have, directed towards these constructive things. Do you think it would be better in America if there were community health centers for the poor people of this country and for

others? Do you think it would be better in America, if working mothers could have day-care centers where they could put their children and not to leave them on the streets of the ghetto? Do you think it would be better in America if we did have a program where people could both own or rent a decent home regardless of income? I think so, Do you think it would be better in America to have a form of income maintenance that did not denigrate or downgrade and humiliate the poor people of this country? I think so. Is the negative income tax good or bad? Is a form of income maintenance good or bad? We ought to study it. And this is where young Americans are going to come into their own in terms of political maturity. Somebody said, "Should we have the eighteen year old vote?" I think so. I have advocated it for years, but I want to be sure that eighteen year olds know what their voting about and I want to be sure that they know that they are voting on crucial issues, not just the issues of peace and war, which are frequently dramatized in very, very bold terms, but the nitty gritty -- the nitty gritty of what an appropriations bill is about. You can have all the dreams in the world about model cities, but if you can't get any money you can't get any model cities. And when I stop to think of what happened in the Congress of the United States when I know that there were 14,000 cases of infectious dangerous rat bite reported to public hospitals in 1967, and one congressman got up and laughed the whole bill out of Congress when we tried to appropriate a few million dollars to help cities clean out rodents. Now if you want something you can do now, well, I'll tell you, You can kill rats and we know how to do it, and we've got the money to do it, and we had the program to do it. Simple things, may I say. These are things that I think students can get activated on, as well as Vietnam and Biafra and, by the way, I hope that you'll do a lot about that. I think the Biafran relief program is vital, but may I suggest that there are some hungry people in California. We can feed both. We've got enough to do both, and I am not going to let the young man off the hook. A country that can build racetracks, saloons, country clubs, and by the way, I've been to all of them. -- A country that can do that can also build hospitals, and day-care centers, and schools, and kindergartens and pre-school programs. We have what it takes to do it, and all you have to do is take a look at the waste in this country and you know that with more commitment and with better priorities, we'd get it done and that's not fancy talk. It's hard, plain talk. I suggest that we start to get at the things that we can do something about and then we'll build ourselves up to do something about the bigger things. I guess that's enough.

RM: Thank you very much.



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