

Second Annual

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.
MEMORIAL LECTURE SERIES



Honorable

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

8:00 p.m.

Curry Hicks Cage

18 April 1969

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. This is a name whose greatness has touched the lives of millions of men throughout the world. Montgomery. Selma. Birmingham. Chicago. Stockholm. Washington. Atlanta. These cities all knew his greatness.

Memphis.

His body is gone, but his dream lives on. His life ended in the ultimate repudiation of his philosophy of non-violence, but his spirit could not and cannot be ended.

It is this spirit which the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Lecture Series seeks to perpetuate. The emphasis of the series is on seminal thought. Each year, the King Memorial Lecturer will address himself to a subject of importance to the future of mankind and the advancement of civilization. In this way, the students at the University of Massachusetts help to memorialize the man, to perpetuate the quest, and to realize the dream.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Lecture Series is jointly sponsored by the Distinguished Visitors Program and the Senior Class.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, the thirty-eighth Vice President of the United States, first achieved national prominence when, at the age of 34, he was elected mayor of one of the nation's largest cities, Minneapolis, Minnesota. In 1947 he was re-elected by a margin of two to one, winning the largest majority in the city's history. Humphrey was elected to the U. S. Senate in 1948 and returned in 1954 and 1960. In 1964 he was elected Vice President.

Humphrey's first act as Mayor of Minneapolis in 1946 was to establish a Human Relations Council, one of the first in the nation. He was also responsible as Mayor for the enactment of the first municipal Fair Employment Practices Act in the United States.

At the Democratic National Convention of 1948, he risked his political career by leading a floor fight for a strong civil rights plank. It was the adoption of this plank which caused Strom Thurmond to bolt the party and run as a Dixiecrat. In the Senate, he consistently championed civil rights legislation. Many of these bills, called visionary at the time, are now incorporated into law.

Among them are: Anti-Lynching in 1949; Commission on Civil Rights; Fair Employment Practices; Prohibition of Jim Crow in Public Transportation; Outlawing Poll Tax in Federal Elections, all in 1951; and many more. He was a strong supporter of the Civil Rights bills of 1957 and 1960, and in 1964 he was floor manager in the Senate for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In recognition of his two decades of leadership in this field, President Johnson made Humphrey coordinator of all Federal civil rights programs.

Other legislation Mr. Humphrey sponsored include the Peace Corps, Food for Peace, the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, Medicare, Job Corps, War on Poverty, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Scholarships for College Students, National Council on the Arts, and others.

Mr. Humphrey currently teaches at Macalester College and the University of Minnesota in St. Paul and Minneapolis. He is an honorary alumnus of the University of Massachusetts, having received an honorary doctorate during the Commencement Exercises of June, 1966.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
MEMORIAL LECTURE SERIES COMMITTEE

Margaret L. Franson, '69 Chairman
Christopher D. McGahan, '69 Program Coordinator
Wayne M. Thomas, '69 President of the Senior Class

Mrs. Lois Frey, '64 University Program Director
Professor William Havard Chairman, Department of Government
Professor George Sulzner Department of Government
John O'Connell, '70 Chairman, Distinguished Visitors Program
Nancy Donovan Class of 1969
Edward Bowe Class of 1970
Ronald J. LaBrecque Class of 1970
Thomas O'Connell Class of 1970
Norman Patch Class of 1971

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. MEMORIAL LECTURE SERIES
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 1969 LECTURER

ITINERARY, APRIL 18, 1969

10:00 a.m.	MR. HUMPHREY'S ARRIVAL GREETED BY PRESIDENT LEDERLE	WHITMORE HALL
10:20	LV. WHITMORE (by car)	
10:30	ARR. COMMITTEE FOR THE COLLEGE EDUCATION OF BLACK STUDENTS	EUGENE FIELD HOUSE
11:30	LV. ORCHARD HILL (by car)	
11:45	ARR. LUNCHEON (by invitation)	STUDENT UNION
1:20 p.m.	LV. STUDENT UNION (walking)	
1:30	ARR. SEMINAR "THE AMERICAN PRESIDENCY"	SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION 120
2:30	LV. SBA (walking)	
2:40	ARR. MEMORIAL HALL PRESS CONFERENCE - CLEARANCE, NEWS BUR.	MEMORIAL HALL AUDITORIUM
3:15	COFFEE HOUR (by invitation 'til 3:45, open to public thereafter)	MEMORIAL HALL
5:15	LV. MEMORIAL HALL (by car)	
5:30	ARR. HOTEL	LORD JEFFREY INN
5:45	COCKTAILS & DINNER	
7:30	LEAVE LORD JEFF (by car)	
8:00	ADDRESS	CURRY HICKS CAGE
10:00	LV. CAGE (by car) (approximate time)	
10:15	ARR. PRESIDENT'S HOUSE	
10:30	COCKTAILS (by invitation)	PRESIDENT'S HOUSE



Student Sponsored Distinguished Visitors Program
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS 01002

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. MEMORIAL LECTURE SERIES
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 1969 LECTURER

REVISED ITINERARY, 18 APRIL 1969

10:00 am	MR. HUMPHREY'S ARRIVAL GREETED BY PRESIDENT LEDERLE	WHITMORE HALL
10:20	LV. WHITMORE (by car)	
10:30	ARR. COMMITTEE FOR THE COLLEGE EDUCATION OF BLACK STUDENTS	EUGENE FIELD HOUSE
11:30	LV. ORCHARD HILL (by car)	
11:45	ARR. LUNCHEON (by invitation)	STUDENT UNION
1:20 pm	LV. STUDENT UNION (walking)	
1:30	ARR. SEMINAR "The American Presidency"	SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION 120
2:30	LV. SBA (walking)	
2:40	ARR. PRESS CONFERENCE	MEMORIAL HALL AUDITORIUM
3:15	COFFEE HOUR (by invitation)	MEMORIAL HALL LIVING ROOM
4:00	COFFEE HOUR (open to campus)	
5:15	LV. MEMORIAL HALL (by car)	
5:30	ARR. HOTEL	LORD JEFFREY AMHERST INN
5:45	COCKTAILS & DINNER	
7:30	LV. LORD JEFF (by car)	
8:00	ADDRESS	CURRY HICKS CAGE
10:00	LV. CAGE (by car) (approximate time)	
10:15	ARR. PRESIDENT'S HOUSE	
10:30	RECEPTION RECEPTION (by invitation)	PRESIDENT'S HOUSE

Dr. Lederle
Mr. Boyden

000418

Dr. Randolph Bromery
Bobby Henderson
Stan Kanard
Committee for the
Collegiate Education
of Black Students
(Cebbs)

Martin Luther King
Memorial Lecture
Series -

REMARKS

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senior Class

THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

~~Lecture Series~~

Distinguished Visiting Professor
MEMORIAL LECTURE

Margaret Franco

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Chris McHanna

AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS

Nancy Donovan

APRIL 18, 1969

Wayne Thomas

Paul
Drake
+ Mr. Reardon

Cage

Two weeks ago this country observed the first anniversary
of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The
tragic death of this heroic figure in the worldwide struggle
for freedom, justice and peace was remembered in many ways.

Across America and across the seas, people of all races --
the rich as well as the poor -- marched and sang and prayed
and spoke of the unfinished work for which Martin Luther
King, Jr. gave his life.

(Im Had - 1964)
(I arrived at Fort Lederle)

Handy
Running
Track

- 2 -

~~They celebrated that, in life,~~ Dr. King had demonstrated
how one man, by the force of his character, the depth of
his convictions, and the eloquence of his voice, can alter
the course of history. ~~And in remembering this life, the~~
~~people grow strong.~~

People stopped their daily routines to ponder what
Martin Luther King had brought to this country and what
this country had yet to do to achieve his dream of an America
reconciled and reborn.

* * * * *

~~an eloquent~~
Martin Luther King was the ~~greatest modern~~ spokesman
against violence and hatred -- a fact which made all the more
tragic the arson, looting and violence which swept America
in the aftermath of his death.

- 3 -

Commentators were quick to say that these acts dishonored the man who died -- and that was true. Indeed, it was so obvious that it scarcely needed to be said.

But these commentators forgot to say that other people distorted Dr. King's life in more subtle, but equally tragic, ways. Too much of the initial white reaction to Dr. King's death was that of fear rather than of grief and shame. For these people Dr. King had become primarily a restrainer of Negroes instead of a dedicated fighter for equality and justice.

Martin Luther King was, to be sure, an apostle of non-violence. But more fundamentally he was an apostle of social justice by means of non-violent direct action. To be non-violent while sitting on the sidelines is easy enough. To be non-violent in the midst of a battle is something else.

All too often, the comfortable people in our society applauded Dr. King's message when he stressed non-violence but turned a deaf ear when he brought up the hard realities of social justice *and the demand for social reform*.
[This nation must come to understand that non-violence for its own sake, unaccompanied by visible and ~~meaningful~~ *positive* social change, can only produce escalating tensions in our society and a corresponding erosion of our capacity to solve these problems peacefully and within the framework of law.

~~And although tension is often essential for social change, the burden of action must always rest with those who are privileged, not with those ^{who} have been denied full participation in this nation's economic, social and political life.~~

- 5 -

↳ The test of a people, like that of a man, is not how it accepts good fortune, but how it responds to adversity.

↳ It is precisely at such moments — when our complacency is shattered by the thunderbolt of tragedy — that a nation has a chance to move forward.

↳ Today -- one year after Dr. King's death -- we must ask ourselves two questions: Have we sought to make the tragedy of Dr. King's death not a time when America lost her faith but rather the moment when America found her conscience? 3↳ And more specifically, have we faced up to the hard realities of achieving social justice in America?

↳ On both counts -- one year later -- the answer ~~must~~ *regrettably* is clearly be: "No."

* * * *

now, why do I pass this harsh judgment =
~~on me~~

well/ A little more than a year ago the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders -- the Kerner Commission -- released its historic report and recommendations. On the first anniversary of this report, Urban America and The ~~entitled~~ Urban Coalition released a study, One Year Later, which evaluated our progress to date in meeting the goals of the Kerner Commission.

This appraisal stated that:

"--Poverty remains a pervasive fact of life...and the continuing disparity between this poverty and the general affluence remains a source of alienation and discontent.

- 7 -

"--Ghetto schools continue to fail. The small amount of progress that has been made has been counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities.

"--At present, there are no programs that seriously threaten the continued existence of the slums."

∟ And as the Kerner report warned, a year earlier, the study concluded: "For a year later, we are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less equal."

∟ I was distressed at the meager attention given this important evaluation when it was released six weeks ago.

∟ For this report outlined, as did the Kerner Commission document before it, the specific action which must be taken in America to reverse this alarming pattern of social disintegration.

- 8 -

We must understand our basic challenge: to achieve not only equity in opportunity but equity in results. And equity in results refers to very concrete goals -- the right to a job at decent pay, the right to an adequate income if one cannot work,, the right to an education which releases rather than destroys human creativity, the right to decent housing in safe neighborhoods, the right to good health care and sufficient nutrition.

the right to participate in the making of decisions that affect the lives of those to be helped.

Clearly, if America is going to remedy the inequality and injustice of our society, we must begin conducting our public business in a largely different manner than we have in the past. *The Powerless must ~~be~~ share in Power - the Community must be governed by its members; ~~that~~*

- 9 -

and Above all else, we are going to have to reorder our
priorities and start putting first things first.

* * * *

Today we stand at a critical moment in the history of
 the United States -- a moment when the right decisions
 taken forcefully and courageously can dramatically alter the
 priorities of our national life.

Let us be absolutely clear about what is riding on these
 decisions: no less than whether or not America can ever
 achieve Martin Luther King's dream or implement the
 specific objectives laid down by the Kerner Commission more
 than one year ago.

The first and foremost ~~primary~~ decision
 is to ~~end~~ the War in Vietnam
 to pursue this goal through a negotiated
 political settlement. - to seek a class-free -
 to promptly reduce the number of American
 troops to demand the withdrawal of
 all foreign forces

Mr. Humphrey -

Just a reminder:

There will be a
question asked
referring to the
"Write for Peace" on
campus now. - a
campaign to urge
students to write to
Congressmen re Vietnam.
Could you please comment.
Thank you.

000428
and to assure the right of self-determination
for all of Vietnam - north-south - by
free elections under ~~international~~ ^{international} ~~agreement~~ ^{agreement} upon
international guarantees. To end the
war ^{may be} ^{10 -} the number one objective.

↳ The opening skirmish in this battle over national
priorities will be fought over money for the initial deployment
of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. ↳ But this debate
is only symptomatic of the more fundamental decisions that
must be reached in the coming year over military spending.

↳ Unless we are successful now in slowing down the
nuclear arms buildup, it can be predicted without qualification
that our military planners will win approval of a number of
oft postponed weapons programs, costing, in the end, many
hundreds of billions of dollars.

↳ And it can be predicted with equal certainty that as
this military spending accelerates, our urgent domestic needs
will be shortchanged and our efforts to mobilize the country
to eradicate these deprivations will fall woefully short.

~~Obviously we must not deploy the ABM -
and second, we get no additional security and
the formidable resources needed for
our domestic programs~~

This is why negotiations with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons are so critical. If we can freeze the strategic weapons race at its present levels, or begin the process of mutual phased reductions of the nuclear arsenals, there is a chance of winning the battle of priorities...there is a chance that we can indeed begin putting first things first.

I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these negotiations. When responsible leaders of great nations approach their vital security interests, they do so with great caution. I know our leaders will not agree to anything that endangers our national security. And I make the same assumption about the Soviet leaders.

~~But I also assume that the Soviet leaders would not lightly enter into these talks with us.~~

- 12 -

We must believe, until their actions demonstrate otherwise, that the Soviets understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral -- a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which has become meaningless in terms of securing for either side a decisive military advantage.

It is primarily for this reason that I have opposed the decision to proceed with ~~a~~ ^{the} modified deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system. I remain unconvinced that the security of our second-strike forces requires such action at this time, especially when the small risks of postponing deployment of the ABM at this time are compared to the considerable risks of postponing the urgent domestic needs which confront America.. the Social Democrats

in our cities -

- 13 -

↳ It is especially important that prior to the negotiations we exercise great restraint in word and action on matters relating to strategic weapons.

↳ My concern for restraint causes me to regret very much those statements of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird imputing to the Soviets a commitment to achieve a first-strike capability in strategic nuclear weapons.

↳ Less than 4 months ago, Secretary Clark Clifford reached quite different conclusions as to the Soviet strategic posture. And Secretary of State Rogers clearly contradicted these forecasts of a Soviet first-strike capability at his first press conference in Washington two weeks ago.

- 14 -

Secretary Laird's forecasts of Soviet strategic intent -- statements which depart markedly from earlier U.S. pronouncements -- can only raise doubts in the Soviet mind about our strategic objectives. And we know from the past that doubt or uncertainty on either side about the strategic goals of the other has been a principal stimulus to the nuclear arms spiral.

A far more prudent course, in my opinion, would be one which avoided raising spectres of massive Soviet strategic commitments until we have determined through direct talks their actual willingness or unwillingness to decelerate the arms race. Then we will not have to speculate on such critical matters. We will know.

- 15 -

and Let me also note at this juncture: I would hope our government would enter into these bilateral talks with a truly comprehensive proposal, one that raised for negotiation all major questions of strategic weaponry and did not restrict unilaterally the flexibility and freedom of our negotiators.

This point is critical because the principal long-term threat to the strategic arms balance between the Soviet Union and the United States is the development of MIRV (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles) -- a system which equips each ICBM with a number of separate warheads aimed at different targets.

- 16 -

If, as President Nixon suggests, the Soviets understand the defensive characteristics of a limited deployment of Safeguard, they will be equally quick to get the message of MIRV -- a manifold increase in our strategic offensive capability. The Soviets can be expected to respond to such a massive expansion of U.S. nuclear forces with an equally concerted effort of their own -- and the balance of terror will have reached unprecedented heights.

My fundamental point must be underscored: the availability of resources to attack our urgent domestic problems will, in the end, be largely a factor of our capacity to hold back the impending flood of new offensive strategic weapons without endangering the real security of this country or our people.

- 17 -

It is time, in short, to be willing to run the same risks in the cause of peace that we are willing to assume in acquiring the weapons of war.

* * * *

Those of us who fought for and eventually secured the historic civil rights legislation of the 1960's recognize that these laws could never have passed without the active support of the remarkable civil rights coalition which arose in their behalf.

Thoroughly bi-partisan in nature, encompassing a broad spectrum of civil rights, religious, labor, business and service organizations, this coalition generated the political muscle we needed to win in Congress.

In the past several years, and especially since the death of Dr. King, many persons have lamented the fragmentation and apparent dissolution of this potent force for social justice in America. Many persons, including myself, have often called for a rebirth and reenergizing of this force.

It is time, I believe, to recognize that powerful bi-partisan aggregations do not arise in a vacuum. They arise in response to real issues...specific challenges...and concrete legislative goals. With the passage of all major outstanding civil rights laws, the civil rights coalition of the 1950's and 1960's has understandably lost much of its focus and impact.

- 19 -

L Today the issue of military spending -- highlighted now by the question of deploying the Safeguard ABM system but extending far beyond this immediate issue -- has the potential for creating in America an organized force for social justice comparable to the coalition which carried on the civil rights battle for two decades.

L Dr. King loved America...and those Americans who seek to honor his name and memory should rally together now to win this battle over national priorities...because unless this battle is won, this year, the outcome of all subsequent encounters over resources for cities, for education, for health care, for jobs and housing, and for food will be largely decided even before the issues get to Congress.

- 20 -

↳ Our military budgets will continue to expand; our domestic allocations will become proportionately smaller.

↳ This is precisely the outcome of President Nixon's recent cutbacks in the Federal budget.

↳ We have failed to achieve Martin Luther King's dream for America primarily because we have failed to generate the bi-partisan political commitment necessary to do the job.

↳ We now have the chance to summon this strength if we focus our efforts on the job of ending the insanity of the strategic nuclear arms race and then fighting to see that these resources are used for urgent domestic needs.

- 21 -

~~This does not ignore the fact that additional resources will be made available by an expanding economy or a ~~reformed~~ reformed system of taxation.~~ It is, rather, a frank admission that to do the job ~~on the scale outlined by the Kerner Commission~~ will require not only massive resources, but also a clear national commitment growing out of an explicit re-ordering of our national priorities.

~~We should stop talking about the rebirth of the civil rights coalition, at least as we have known it for the past two decades.~~ We must have the vision to see the urgent need for an entirely new force in American society to carry on the tasks for which Martin Luther King died...a force which addresses itself to the critical question of national priorities.

-22-

NO DOUBT MANY OF OUR ALLIES IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS BATTLES *of yesterday*
WILL STAND WITH US AGAIN. *L* NO DOUBT MANY OF THE ORGANIZATIONS

~~WHICH FIGHTED SO VALIANTLY FOR SO MANY YEARS WILL ENTER IN THIS~~

~~NEW STRUGGLE.~~ *L* INDEED, THEIR WISDOM AND ABILITY WILL BE VITAL
INGREDIENTS FOR SUCCESS.

L BUT WE WILL *need the help of* ~~NEED BE APPEALING TO~~ THE NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS

WHO NEVER EXPERIENCED THE STRUGGLES OVER VOTING RIGHTS, PUBLIC

ACCOMMODATIONS, SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND THE OTHER ISSUES WE TOOK

TO THE PEOPLE IN THE 1950's AND 1960's. *L* AND THESE NEW RECRUITS *can*

GIVE US AN INVALUABLE BOOST IN MORALE, ENTHUSIASM, AND EFFECTIVENESS.

L THERE ARE MANY THINGS THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA CAN DO TOGETHER. *! Together*

L WE CAN MOBILIZE THE RESOURCES -- BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE --

THAT WILL BANISH THE SPECTRE OF POVERTY FROM OUR LAND.

L WE CAN ROOT OUT THE LAST VESTIGES OF DISCRIMINATION, SEGREGATION
AND INEQUALITY ... IN SCHOOLS ... IN EMPLOYMENT ... IN HOUSING ...

AND IN PUBLIC SERVICES.

-23-

We can see to it that
~~WE CAN COMMIT OURSELVES UNRESERVINGLY TO THE BROAD PROGRAM OF~~
~~AS RECOMMENDED BY THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL~~
~~DISORDERS SO THAT AMERICA WILL NOT BECOME "TWO SOCIETIES, ONE BLACK,~~
 ONE WHITE -- SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL."

AS INDIVIDUALS WE CAN SEARCH OUR OWN SOULS FOR THE REMNANTS
 OF PREJUDICE AND INJUSTICE.

WE CAN FEARLESSLY STAND UP FOR HUMAN DIGNITY AND FREEDOM --
 AS WE STAND -- IN OUR DAILY LIVES.

WE CAN SUMMON THE COURAGE FOR RECONCILIATION AND REJECT THE
Courage
 OF VIOLENCE. *This is the message of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.*

IF WE DO RECOGNIZE THE TESTAMENT IN THE LIFE AND DEATH OF
 MARTIN LUTHER KING -- IF WE DO REDEDICATE OURSELVES TO THE MISSION
 OF HEALING THE TORMENT OF OUR POOR AND HUNGRY, OUR DEPRIVED AND OUR
 ILLITERATE -- THEN THIS TRAGEDY WILL INDEED BE REMEMBERED, NOT AS
 THE MOMENT WHEN AMERICA LOST HER FAITH, BUT AS THE MOMENT WHEN
 AMERICA FOUND HER CONSCIENCE.

-24-

THIS IS OUR OPPORTUNITY ... IF WE CAN NOW SUMMON THE COURAGE
AND FAITH SO CLEARLY DEMANDED BY THE TIMES ... AND THE COURAGE
AND FAITH WHICH CHARACTERIZED THE LIFE AND WORKS OF DR. MARTIN
LUTHER KING, JR. —

#

SDS { Mike Minsky
Bart Kaplan

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Second Annual Martin Luther King, Jr.

Memorial Lecture Series

Sponsored by The Distinguished Visitors Program and The Class of 1969

Remarks delivered in Curry Hicks Cage, University of Massachusetts,

Amherst, Massachusetts

18 April 1969

Transcription by Willa F. Sobel
May 12, 1969

This is the University's Distinguished Visitors Program. We will introduce tonight's guests on the platform. The honored guest of course this evening is former Vice-President Hubert Humphrey, who in just a few moments will deliver the Second Annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Lecture. This special appearance program is coming to you 'live from the University, through the facilities of Five College Radio, WFCR, and member stations of the Eastern Educational Radio Network. Mr. Humphrey arrived at the University this morning at 11 A.M., about an hour behind schedule, when he met President John Lederle at the Whitmore Administration Building. The former Vice-President then went to the Orchard Hill Residential College on the campus at the University to speak with faculty and students of the Committee for Collegiate Education of Black Students. After a lunch break, Mr. Humphrey briefly re-assumed his new role as professor, for a seminar discussion on the topic, The American Presidency. It was open to students by invitation. Now about twenty minutes behind schedule, he was met at a press conference by close to fifty members of the news media, representing area radio, television and newspapers. He spent the remainder of the afternoon at an open coffee-hour discussion with students. About ten minutes ago, he was scheduled to have left dinner at an Amherst restaurant where he was guest of honor. The fifty-eight year old political figure is now serving as a professor of political science at the University of Minnesota, and at McCallister College in St. Paul. Mr. Humphrey is now also on the Board of Directors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and he is the Chairman of their Board of Consultants.

According to the New York Times of March 30th, these two jobs require a minimum of nine days of work each month, and they net the former Vice-President about \$105,000 per year. In addition, he's been named Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; that's an institution for advanced study in international relations -it was authorized by Congress last year and is currently being organized in Washington D.C. He's also a member of the Board of Trustees of Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts.

Perhaps his most important activity nationally is that of recognized leader of the Democratic Party, and chairman of the newly formed Policy Committee. A major fraction of his time and energy is being taken up in the task of raising funds in order to cut away at the 8.1 million dollar campaign debt that was incurred by his party last summer and fall. He told me this afternoon that so far he's raised about one and a half million dollars of that sum on the lecture circuit.

(applause)

Mr. Humphrey and his entourage are now entering Curry Hicks Cage and moving toward the platform where in just a few minutes you will hear ^{the beginning of} the Second Martin Luther King Memorial Annual

Lecture. (loud applause continues) I believe Wayne Thomas, the president of the Class of 1969 of the University will be the first to speak, to introduce the other guests, and then the former Vice-President himself. Mr. Humphrey has received a standing ovation from this capacity crowd at the Curry Hicks Cage. Now here is Wayne Thomas of the Class of 1969.

Wayne Thomas:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am Wayne Thomas, president of the Senior Class and we welcome you tonight to the Second Annual Martin Luther King Lecture Series. With me on the platform this evening is the chairman of the Martin Luther King Lecture Series, Miss Margaret Franson; also the program-coordinator of the series, who will introduce Mr. Humphrey, Chris Mc Gahan. (applause)

Chris McGahan:

Thank you, Ralph. (laughter) My name is Chris McGahan. I am program-coordinator of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Lecture Series Committee. I'd like to welcome you here. We were talking earlier in the evening with, er, Mr. Humphrey, and he was commenting on, er, what a pleasant day he had had here and what a pleasant day we had had with him, as a matter of fact, and he said that, er, this was one of the most, er, physically attractive campuses he had seen. (laughter) I think perhaps he was being a bit facetious, but he also said that it had the best-looking student body; and of course since he's been walking (laughter) ...Since he's been walking around all day with my fiancée I couldn't help but agree. (faint laughter) At any rate, I take great pleasure and pride in presenting to you now the 38th Vice-President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert Horatio Humphrey. (loud applause)

Continued on page 1.

Thank you very much, Chris. When you introduce a fellow he's introduced, and I do appreciate it. First may I express my warm thanks to President Lederle, Dr. Boyden, members of faculty and students, members of this community, for the privilege that you have given me today to be with you and on this fine campus. I want to thank the Senior Class and the Distinguished Visitors Program, sponsors of the Martin Luther King Memorial Lecture Series, and particularly these young men and women that have given so freely of their time to me today, Margaret Franson, Chris McGahan, Nancy Donovan, and Wayne Thomas -and many others. And I want to say how much I have particularly appreciated the opportunity that I had to meet a gentleman that visited the campus of my college where I'm privileged to teach, at least part-time, McCallister College, Dr. Randolph Bromery, and to commend Mr. Bromery and the Committee for the Collegiate Education for Black Students, your CEBS Committee, Bobby Henderson and Stan Kinnard, for what I think is one of the finest learning

programs and education programs that any college has been able to put together. I think you're worthy of a fine compliment.

(applause)

Now, as an old farm boy, I was glad to see you've plowed the ground around here. (laughter) I don't know whether this net, er, I don't know who you thought you were having for a speaker; maybe you're right. But apparently you've had some others here and they've jumped out, according to what I see.

(applause)

I've been looking forward to visiting your cultural shrines (laughter) , such as The Pub and The Drake (loud laughter) and Ma's Rendevous but I couldn't make those so they said, Well, we'll give you two others: and they introduced me first to "Fort Lederle" and ~~then~~ "the Cage". I came in here and I looked at that track and I said, That gave me an idea -I've been running most of my life, and I looked around here and I almost started to want to warm up again and then I thought, No, I'd rather have the peace, and the quiet, and the tranquility

of campus life these days... (laughter and applause) I was visiting with an incoming student at the University of Minnesota last week and I said to him, I said, "Fred, what are you planning on taking?" He said, "I'm not sure. Either the Administration Building or the Library." (laughter) Tonight I hope that I can take a little of your time and I want to say that I look upon this occasion as a very somber, serious occasion because it is a memorial; and a memorial ought to be an occasion that brings the best out of us and it ought to be an occasion on which we make a re-dedication of our lives.

I am very honored to hold an honorary degree from this university. I obtained that degree in 1964. Since that time this great university has more than doubled in size, but, more significantly, it has grown in stature. And is there any better place to deliver a memorial or a lecture in memory of, in testimony of and in memorial to, a great and passionate American than a university campus?

Two weeks ago this nation of ours observed the first

anniversary of the anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. I'm privileged to be a member, at the invitation of Dr. Martin Luther King's wife, to be a member of the Dr. Martin Luther King Memorial Foundation. We're looking forward to the possibility, not the possibility but the eventuality, of a great living memorial to this man and this spirit. Now the tragic death of this heroic figure, a man that I knew not only as a figure but as a man and as a friend; the tragic death of this heroic figure in the world-wide struggle for freedom, and for justice and peace, on this anniversary was remembered in many ways. All across this land of ours and across the seas, people of all races, the rich as well as the poor, sang and prayed and spoke of the unfinished work for which Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his life. I was in Oslo, Norway, for the funeral of Trigde Lvg, the first Secretary General of the United Nations, and while visiting the home of the birthplace of my mother in Christiansen, Norway, and having a little dinner that night with some of the townspeople and friends and relatives, I think you would be proud to know that as the final act of that evening the people gathered together there sang We Shall Overcome. Dr. Martin Luther King lives. Would that some of us that had the heart-beat and the flesh and the blood of what we call life lived as fully as he yet lives.

Dr. Martin Luther King demonstrated how one man -because I have many people say, What can I do?, I'm just one- but he demonstrated how just one man, by the force of his character and the depth of his convictions and the eloquence of his voice and the manner of the man himself, can alter the course of history. One man, greater than an empire, stronger than an

army. People stopped their daily routines just two weeks ago to ponder what this man had brought to this country and what this country has yet to do to achieve his dream of an America reconciled and of America re-born. Yes, what an eloquent voice.

Martin Luther King was to be sure an apostle of non-violence, that's what he is remembered for in part. But more fundamentally he was an apostle for social action for social justice by means of non-violent direct action. To be non-violent while sitting on the side-lines is easy enough; but to be non-violent in the midst of a raging battle is something else. And all too often the comfortable people in our society applauded Dr. King's message when he stressed non-violence, but they turned a deaf ear when he brought up the hard realities of social justice and demanded action for social reform.

Now this nation must come to understand that non-violence for its own sake, unaccompanied by visible and positive social change, can only produce increased and escalating tensions in our society, and a corresponding erosion and adulteration of our capacity to solve these problems easily and within the framework of law. So I submit to you that the test of a people, like that of a man, is not how it accepts good fortune but how it responds to adversity. It is precisely at such moments, when our complacency is shattered by the thunderbolt of tragedy, that a nation has a chance to move forward.

[A DEMONSTRATION BEGAN HERE]

(Now, keep your eyes focussed here because here's where the action is, right up here.)

(applause)

Let me say in all frankness I appreciate the manner in

which all of this is carried out, and I really mean that. I believe in the right of dissent and I also believe in the right of advocacy. Tonight we're having a little of both and that's the way it ought to be on a college campus.

(applause)

So, today, one year after Dr. King's death, I think we have to ask ourselves but two basic questions, and you've been asking it all day as I've visited with you: Have we sought to make this tragedy, of Dr. King's death, not a time when America lost her faith but rather a moment when America found her conscience? And, more specifically, have we faced up to the hard realities of achieving real social justice in here, in America? And are we doing it here, in our own villages, our own towns, our own states? I understand my friend Kenny O'Donald was here not long ago and he spoke to you about the necessity of positive political action here at the local level. Ladies and gentlemen, you do not build a better world from without -you build it from within. A nation's policy abroad is no better than its actions here at home. This is what determines it.

(applause)

So have we really faced up to these realities? And I think that the answer, quite frankly, a year later, is, No.

Now why do I pass this harsh judgment: It's not easy to do. Well, a little more than a year ago, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, known as the Kerner Commission, released its very important report and recommendations. It ought to be "must-reading" for every student, along with Dr. Martin Luther King's "Letter from a Birmingham Jail". If you have not read that letter then you have not

imbued yourself with a sense of social conscience. Read it. It's one of the most moving dissertations ever written by any American or anyone else. Well, on this first anniversary we found that the Urban Coalition released a study entitled "One Year Later", and that study evaluated the progress we've made this past year. And what did it say?

Poverty remains a pervasive fact of life, and the continuing disparity between this poverty and the general affluence remains a source of alienation and discontent. Ghetto schools continue to fail, and the small amount of progress that has been made has been counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities. Finally, at present, -and listen to this- there are no programs that seriously threaten the continued existence of slums. Now, my fellow Americans, a nation that can <-keep a schedule on building interstate highways and put billions into it, a nation that can keep a schedule on the Gemini and Apollo program and putting a man on the moon on the year and the day that we said we would ought to be a nation that can help build enough houses so that every single American family can be housed in a decent home and in a safe neighborhood. And, I might add, we did all those things even though there were strife and war and turmoil. We can do what we want to do. The question is, We haven't made up our mind what we want to do. Now I was very much distressed, as I am sure you were, at the meager attention that this report received. For this report of a year later outlines specific steps that

you and I can take to correct the situation, just as the Kerner Commission Report did. Now I say that we must understand our basic challenge, and that challenge is to achieve not only what we mouth, equity in opportunity, but equity in results. Sometimes it's not even enough to have equal opportunity, particularly when some people have been denied any opportunity for two-hundred years. Sometimes you need a little extra opportunity in order to catch up with all the equal opportunity that you and I have had. I think that needs to be our standard.

(applause)

And what do we mean by "equity in results"? Let me refer to some concrete goals: The right as well as the training for a job at decent pay. The right -not the beneficence here now, but the right- to an adequate income if one cannot work, instead of the demeaning system of welfare which plagues this nation. The right to a quality education which releases rather than destroys human creativity. And the right to decent clean housing in a safe neighborhood. And the right to good health care and sufficient nutrition. And, finally, the right to participate in the making of the decisions that affect one's lives. These are some of the things that mean equity in results.

Clearly then, if we're going to remedy the inequality and the injustice, we must begin conducting our public business in a largely different manner than we have in the past. The powerless -and there are powerless people in this country- must share in power, and you and I have to see to it that those

gates are opened. And the community must be governed by all of its members, not just some of its members. This is what we mean by participatory democracy. And above all, we're going to have to re-order our priorities, and start putting first things first.

Now we today stand at a critical moment in the history of the United States, and it's a moment of great opportunity -or it could be a moment of catastrophe. A moment when the right decisions taken forcefully and courageously can dramatically re-order the priorities in our national life. So let us be absolutely clear in this lecture here tonight, this memorial service in a sense, what is riding on these decisions, what are the stakes: No less than whether ^{or not} America can ever achieve Martin Luther King's dream, of his children and their right to be judged not by their race but by their character, or implement the specific suggestions laid down by the Kerner Commission more than one year ago.

My friends, I think we all know, some of us with heavy heart and others with anger, the first and foremost decision that this country must face (and find the way, and use every means at its command to find the way) is to end the war in Vietnam and to pursue this goal with every means at our command through a politically negotiated settlement.

(applause)

And I am reminded that there is a group on this campus that is asking you to do what they call "Writing for Peace", not just to the President but to the Congress, and I hope that you'll cooperate with that group. And I hope that you will pour out your heart, and do it not only with sentiment but

do it also with the conviction that you not only want to see the end of a war but you want to see the beginning of a great new adventure in America, to see to it that there is not only equity of opportunity but equity of results, not only equality of opportunity but a richer life for every one of the people of this land that bear the title man or woman or citizen.

Now there's an opening skirmish in all of this and you know that I've been deeply involved in it; and it's going to be fought over money: money for the initial deployment of the safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. But this debate is only symptomatic of the more fundamental decisions that must be reached in the coming year on military spending. And unless we're successful now -and I mean now- in slowing down the nuclear arms build-up, particularly after we've passed the non-proliferation treaty and the test-ban treaty and the treaty to ban the orbiting of weapons of mass destruction in outer-space -I say that unless we're successful in slowing down that nuclear arms build-up it can be predicted without qualification that the military planners will win approval of a number, in fact a host, of post-poned weapons programs which I know about, which members of Congress know about, which cost in the end many hundreds of billions of dollars. Either the flood-gates will be opened, or they will be held tight and the flood-tide pushed back. And it can be predicted with equal certainty that as military spending increases our urgent domestic needs will be short-changed.

So there you have it. And this is why I believe, and I have said from every platform that I could, not just this year but

last year, that I oppose the anti-ballistic missile system in a democratic administration just as I oppose it now in another administration -because it isn't a partisan issue.

(applause)

This is not a partisan issue. This is an issue that involves our sense of judgment and values. Now we must open negotiations as rapidly as it is diplomatically and humanly possible with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons. If we do, we can freeze the strategic weapons race at the present level, at stage number one. Or we can begin the process of mutual phased reductions of the nuclear arsenals. I say that there is a chance, and a chance of your lifetime, of winning the battle of priorities. There is a chance at long last that we can put first things first.

I don't have any illusions about this; I've been around the government a long time. And I know that it's not easy to negotiate with the Soviets -I tried it. I spent more time with Mr. Krushchev than any other American. I have been a delegate to the United Nations representing this country, negotiating with Mr. Kuznizkov and others of the Soviet Union. I have visited from time to time with Mr. Kosygin as the representative of your government. I am not unmindful of how stubborn they can be. But I submit that when responsible leaders of great nations approach their own vital security interests they do so with great caution -and they should. And I know that our leaders will not agree to anything that will sacrifice our security; and I make the same assumption about the Soviet leaders. I happen to believe that we're at a moment at which there is a strategic balance. I happen to

believe that we're at a moment when the political, international-political, environment is conducive to discussions and talks. And therefore I say we must believe, until Soviet actions demonstrate otherwise, that they understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral, a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which really is meaningless in terms of securing for either side a decisive military advantage. And it's for this reason, above all others, that I have opposed, continue to oppose, will oppose with everything at my command the decision to proceed with the deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system.

(applause)

I remain unconvinced, and I've heard nothing to change my mind, that the security of our so-called second-strike forces -and I now know that you understand about this first- and second-strike force operation- requires such action at this time especially when the small risks of postponing deployment are compared to the considerable risk of postponing the urgent domestic needs which confront America. Let me tell you the missiles that I think threaten your security today: The missiles of hate, of deprivation, of humiliation to millions of our fellow citizens, of filthy, rotten, degrading poverty, of sickness, of illiteracy. And those missiles are just as destructive as the SS9 which a president and a secretary of defence talk about. They are what Dr. Conant once called "social dynamite". And they're exploding. And they're going to continue to explode. And the only defence that I know against those missiles is an offensive: An offensive of

program, policy, commitment, and priorities; and resources -men and material- to see the rebirth of our cities, to see a nation reconciled and reborn, which was the prayer of a preacher from Georgia by the name of Dr. Martin Luther King.

So you see, I think it's especially very, er, urgent, that we proceed, and that prior to these negotiations we never do a thing by word or deed that upsets the situation. Restraint is what's needed. And my concern for restraint causes me very much to regret the statements of the Secretary of Defence, Mr. Laird, imputing to the Soviets a commitment to achieve a first-strike capability that could demolish and annihilate us. Because less than four months ago a former secretary of defence who had the same information came to quite different conclusions as to the Soviet strategic posture. And the Secretary of State today, Mr. Rogers, clearly contradicted these dire forecasts of Soviet first-strike capability at his first press conference in Washington two weeks ago. Americans do not need to act out of theory. Let Americans now once again act out of confidence and moral leadership; and if we do, my friends, we will have gained a great victory for this country, a victory that the world longs for America to have. Secretary Laird's forecasts can only cast doubts on the Soviet mind about our objectives; and when those doubts are cast you can expect the other side to act accordingly. A far more prudent course would be one which avoided raising this specter of massive Soviet strategic commitments until we have determined through testing and talking their actual willingness or unwillingness to decelerate the arms race. And when we discuss with them we'll know and we'll not have to speculate on such critical

matters.

So I would hope now that our government would enter these bilateral talks promptly, even if the Congress approves the measure of the President. I plead with you, President Nixon, and this University campus before thousands of young people, even if your proposal to the Congress to authorize the safeguard modified anti-ballistic system is approved, even if the money is appropriated, look to the man you visited not long ago in Independence, Missouri, who, when the Congress insisted that Mr. Truman have seventy air-wings which he said we didn't need, he set the money aside and refused to spend it. Mr. President, I ask you to set the money aside and refuse to deploy the missile until you have tried, tried, and tried, to stop the arms race with the Soviet Union.

(applause)

There are other facets, but time prohibits all the details. Many of you have heard of the MIRV. Maybe I should mention to you that it's also in the arsenal of projected weaponry. It's known as the -it's spelled "MIRV", we have these short titles for everything now- but it means Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles. It's a system which equips each Minute Man ICBM with a number of separate warheads aimed at different targets, increasing our offensive capacity. Now, if as the President suggests, the Soviets understand the defensive characteristics of the limited deployment of ^{the} Safeguard, if that argument is valid, I submit they will equally be quick to get the message of MIRV, which is a manifold increase in our strategic offensive capability. And

the Soviets can be expected to respond to such a massive expansion of U.S. nuclear forces with an equally concerted effort of their own. And what happens? The balance of terror will have reached unprecedented heights with no new security for anyone.

Now, my fundamental point, the availability of resources to attack our domestic problems, will in the long run, be largely a factor of our capacity to hold back the impending flood of new strategic weapons. It is time, in short, to be willing to run the same risks in the cause of peace that we as a government and a people have been willing to assume in waging war and in acquiring the weapons of war. I call for a risk for peace in nineteen-hundred and sixty-nine. We've had enough. We've had enough of spending, enough of war, enough of weapons, and the time has come to call a halt. And that's what the students of America need to ask of their government now.

(applause)

Now this issue of military spending can be a great catalytic force. It has the potential for creating in America an organizing force for social justice comparable to the great coalition which made possible the civil rights battle for two decades and the successful culmination of it in legislation. Dr. King loved America. Those Americans who seek to honor his name and memory should rally together now to win this battle over national priorities. How well I remember that day in August of 1963 when we marched in the Freedom March to the Lincoln Memorial. My fellow Americans, there was dissent in the tradition of this country. There

it was, peaceful, orderly, moving, dramatic, powerful, and it shook this government from top to bottom; and and there hadn't been a civil rights measure passed from 1877 to 1963 of any consequence and that act, the leadership of a man of spirit and conviction, tying in young and old, black and white, rich and poor, church and labor and business and government. It aroused this nation, because in America there is a basic sense of justice and good-will amongst the citizenry that will respond to a clarion call when you're decent, when you're frank and candid and open, when you're honorable and when you're active. And the memorable Freedom March is one of the great moments of history. We could use another, under the same kind of decent, honorable, non-violent, patriotic dedication for the cause of social justice in this country.

(applause)

You see, I happen to believe that unless we win this battle the outcome of all subsequent encounters over resources with cities, for cities, for education, for health-care, for jobs and housing, for food, will largely be decided before the issues ever get to Congress. Our military budget will continue to expand. Our domestic allocations will become proportionately smaller. And this is precisely the outcome of the cuts in the budget that have been made even in recent days. We spend more for an anti-ballistic missile. We spend less for Head-Start, for education, for health, for children, for the elderly. I submit that we've failed to achieve Martin Luther's dream for America because we have failed to generate the truly bi-partisan commitment necessary to do the job. We're frittering away our

energies when we need to concentrate and consolidate. And we now have the chance to summon that strength if we focus our efforts on the job of ending the insanity of the arms race, and then fighting to see that these resources are diverted to urgent needs. We must have the vision, therefore, to see the urgent need for an entirely new force in the American society to carry on these tasks, a force that addresses itself to these priorities.

Now no doubt many of our allies in the old battles of yesterday will stand with us again. We need their wisdom and we need their ability. But what we really need is the help of the new generation of young Americans, who never had experienced the struggle over voting rights or public accommodations or school desegregation, or the other issues that we took to the people in the 1950's and the 1960's. No fault of your own, just wasn't your time. And these new young recruits can give us an invaluable boost in morale and enthusiasm and effectiveness. There need be no generation gap. The gap in America is not between generations. The gap in America is between two societies, separate and unequal. And, my young Americans, don't, don't delude yourself; these false battles over young and old, your parents' generation and yourself, are make-believe games. The real battle in America is whether or not there will be one America, as we've put it so many times, one nation, indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all; or whether there's going to be two Americas, yours, and the other.

That's in our hands.

So there are many things that we can do to unite and we can do together. And the word is "together". And those who lead us apart are the enemies of freedom and justice. We can mobilize the resources both public and private in this country to banish the specter of poverty. We have the tools and the means to do it. We can feed the hungry -this year. This year. We have the money, we have the food. I ask you to help get it done. This isn't something we have to wait for. We can root out the last vestiges of discrimination and segregation and inequality in schools and employment, in housing and in public office. And we can see to it that America will not become these two societies, separate, one white, one black, separate and unequal. And as individuals we can search our own souls for the remnants of prejudice and injustice which infect us like a fever. We can fearlessly stand up for human dignity and freedom in our daily lives, individually. And we can summon the courage for reconciliation and reject the course of violence.

This is the message of that minister of the Gospel who believed in peace and who believed in service -the message of Dr. King. I say this is an opportunity -let's not miss it. What a chance to get a smile once again on our face. It's an opportunity if we can now summon the courage and the faith so clearly demanded by the times, and the courage and the faith which characterizes the life of the man that you honor tonight by this memorial meeting and this memorial lecture.

Let there be an immortality to greatness. And the immortality to greatness is not in a man who has been buried, but rather in the lives of those whom he has inspired. I hope tonight that I can go away from here knowing that hundreds and thousands of young people have been inspired not to destroy this land but to re-build it, not to repudiate this country but to call it to its greatness; not to say that America has lost its way but rather that it's time to find a better way; not that America is sick but that America is changing and changing for the good.. That's the language of young men and women. So let's go to work.

Now I'll take your questions. Thank you very much.

(Prolonged applause. Standing ovation.)

* * * * *

Transcribed
April 27, 1969
Willa F. Sobel,
from WFCR tape.

#

TAPE 2

MC: We do have time now for a thirty minute question period. There are mikes in the aisles and we do ask you because there are only thirty minutes to keep your questions brief and to the point.

Q: Mr. Humphrey, I was so happy to hear you speaking. You said all the things that I believe in so very much. I really share your fears of the Anti-ballistic System and everything. That's just the way I feel. I don't have any questions to say because I don't really have anything to say, and I just wanted to say that I didn't think that you did either.

Humphrey: I thank you very much. Thank you. (to applause)

Q: Mr. Humphrey?

A: Yes, sir?

Q: In recent weeks light has been thrown on ...

Humphrey: Would you come a little closer to the mikes? I didn't hear you, sir.

Q: Er, in recent weeks light has been thrown on G.I. anti-war activities, such as many anti-war underground newspapers that've sprung up among the nation's, er, army bases. Legal action now seems to be taking place to gain the right of assembly and free speech for G.I.'s. I was wondering if you could comment on this, please.

A: Well, one of the problems that you have when you have a military situation or a military reservation or a military order is that you're under strict rules and regulations. If you want to know what my view is, I've never been afraid of free speech. I have believed in a free press. I have believed in the right of every person to have the right to say what he wants to say. I don't

always say that you have to take him seriously, but I think he has a right to be heard. (applause)

Q: Mr. Humphrey, ...

Humphrey: Yes, sir?

Q: (cont'd) Do you believe that ROTC should be on campus? and if you do, do you believe that it should have academic credit?

Humphrey: I didn't get the last part, there.

Q: (cont'd.) Do you believe that if, Well if you do believe that ROTC should be on campus, do you think it should have academic credit?

A: We were talking about this all this afternoon, and it appears to me that what what has happened now is that there is such a conflict over ROTC being on campus, that it may very well be that there, that the values that you gain from it, if any, are less than the values which you would receive if you had the military training replaced in what we call the Officer Candidate Schools. I do feel that if a student wishes to take Reserve Officer Training in the hope later on that he can go to an Officer's Training School that he ought to have that privilege, Whether or not it should be for credit, may I say whether or not it should be for credit, I

believe that should be left up to your administration, and I gather that most of the faculties are rejecting it. (applause)

Q: Mr. Humphrey? In your speech you indicated a great admiration for peaceful demonstration. Yet it seems over the past several years that violent demonstration has been the only way to effect change in our national government. I'd like you to comment, please, on the character of our national government when violent demonstration seems to be the only way to effect change.

A: I do not believe so, sir. I happen to believe that some of the most effective for change have been the non-violent ones insofar as

the participators and the movement were concerned. To wit: the marchers in Birmingham; the sit-ins. These were non-violent. They represented under some of the laws of the states what they called civil disobedience, but they were non-violent. The march in Washington in 1963, ⁱⁿ which I was proud to participate -non-violent. I participated in picketing in Washington D.C. as a United States senator, the national theatre, to change the patterns of segregation in that city to desegregation -non-violent. I happen to believe that a well-organized, non-violent, non-destructive protest and dissent does you a whole lot more good in a free and democratic society, if you expect democratic processes to work, than to engage in violence which only arouses repression and arouses the strength of those -and strengthens those who would like to put you down. I want to persuade in America. I believe that there is reason in this country. I believe there is a basic source of good will and if we organize it we'll make more progress in a shorter period of time than we will by violence and destruction -that's my view. (applause, prolonged)

Q: Mr. Humphrey, er, in your speech you seemed to endorse the right for peace, er, campaigning. Now, I would like to know whether this indicates a change in your opinion, er, as to the war in Vietnam, er, whether you are now against the war in Vietnam. I would also like to know, er, whether you believe that, er, the original decision to engage in this war was a mistake and whether this decision originated in , er, the minds of, er, certain people in Washington D.C., or whether this war represents, er, a logical extension of a hundred years of American imperialism and is, er, due to economic and social conditions in America. (applause)

A: You were ahead until that last sentence. (laughter) Er, no,

it doesn't represent a change in my mind. My friend, I don't know of anybody that's really been anxious for this war. I have sought a political settlement and the President of the United States and the former President of the United States has sought a political settlement of this war. The former President of the United States gave up his political -his political life, to try to get a conference started at Paris. I think this President of the United States understands the imperative necessity of finding some say, some means, of extricating ourselves from a war in Vietnam without placing the people in South Vietnam at the mercy of those who would destroy them. I have advocated that we have systematic withdrawal of American forces. I have urged, as I have publically, for months and for years, that we proceed to seek and insist upon, with the help of others, a cease-fire. I have believed that there ought to be universal elections throughout all of Vietnam to determine whether or not it should be a divided nation or a united nation, one country. I happen to be a peace man, and I've been all of my life. No, buddy. And may I say that I really think that Franklin Roosevelt was a peace man. I really think Woodrow Wilson was a peace man. I think Dwight Eisenhower was a peace man. And the commitment to Vietnam started in the Eisenhower administration. I've never known a president who was more for peace than Dwight Eisenhower. It was extended under John Kennedy and he was a peace man. The question is, How. And now we think that we have arrived at the point -at least some of us do, and I said so a year ago, and this isn't just something new, I spoke this way, my friend in the campaign- if we could get people to listen. I happen to believe that the time now is possible for us to have a de-escalation of this war and hopefully a political negotiated settlement. All I'm saying is, It must

be the priority business of this government to find a, it, and to do it in such a manner that those who have sacrificed their lives did not do so in vain, and that a population in South Vietnam is not consumed or destroyed out of bitterness or out of assassination or out of war it^(c)self. That's all I'm trying to do.

Well, I, you know, I learned a long time ago in a free society that you're lucky if you can please half your family, much less half the constituency. (laughter and applause)

Q: Mr. Humphrey?

A: Yes, Sir?

Q: Last Spring or last summer and ^{as late as ~~the~~} ~~at the~~ convention-

Humphrey: I'm sorry; this is rather bad acoustics here...

Q: Last spring or last summer, and even as late as the Democratic convention, did you ever seriously consider the possibility that there were other Democrats who ^{would} not only have made stronger presidential candidates but who would have made better presidents of the United States?

A: Never, for a moment. I thought I was fully prepared. (applause) (prolonged)

Q: Mr. Humphrey? Er, Mr. Humphrey? Sir?

A: Yes, Ma'am.

Q: Er, when you speak that the poor people should not have to be poor, er, when there are oil rebates and ...

Humphrey: Just a minute. I didn't get you and ^{I want to hear it because} I know this is going to be good. (laughter and applause). Well, what were you saying, please. Just a little clearer up here, it's...

Q: When the airlines, are, such as TWA are given, er, are guaranteed not to lose money by the government and there are oil rebates and farmers are paid not to collect crops, er, when can we get, er, rid of the insidiousness of the welfare system and ^{have a} ~~the~~ guaranteed annual

incomes, so, in the words of Hosea Williams who was here last month, there won't be socialism for the rich people and capitalism for the poor people but equality of economy, for everybody. (applause)

A: I was just really straining to hear what you say. It's very difficult up there, the horns, you can see where the horns are, and it doesn't get back here very good. Er, did I under...

Q: What I say is, ~~there~~ is there a possibility in the near future of a guaranteed annual income...

(Humphrey: Ahhh...)

Q(cont'd.): and an abolishment of the welfare system.

A: Yes. There is. You say the possibility of either a negative income tax or a guaranteed annual income or other forms of income maintenance that are a lot better than a welfare system which demeans the family, which does not adequately take care of the family or the recipient, and which I think continues welfarism rather than remedies it, and the sooner we get rid of what we presently have the better everybody's going to be off, the tax-payer, and the recipient. (applause)

Yes, sir?

Q: Do you think the mood of a nation determines its history? And if so, How in regards to the history of the United States?

A: Well, if I gathered the thrust of the question, I believe the gentleman said, Do I believe the mood of a nation determines the history of a nation. Is that correct? Well, Yes, I think it does. (applause,) We'll get the mike down there for you.

Q: There seems to be some discussion among the military and political observers of the day that President Nixon is about to pull an Algeria -like DeGaulle did- and just saying, The heck with Vietnam, and pulling out gradually, and forgetting the peaceful negotiations. Would you advocate such a move as this?

A: You mean a sudden pull-out?

Q(con't.): Well, not a sudden pull-out, but a gradual pull-out, like DeGaulle....

A: Well, I think that I did say in the campaign that if I were committed and elected to be President of the United States, one of my first acts would be to sit down with the leaders of the government in Saigon and ^{to} tell them that we were going to have a phased, systematic, pull-out, withdrawal, of American forces, just as the Vietnamese forces were taking over their responsibilities of self-defense. Now, they have 800,000 men in the Vietnamese army, and I happen to believe that they're now getting to a point where they can be primarily responsible for their own self-defense. But I would like to see that withdrawal be one of not only our forces but also of other foreign forces. And that is a part of the negotiations. And the sooner- And that's what's going on in Paris in the private talks. And if you mean a precipitous withdrawal, NO. If you mean a phased withdrawal, YES, providing that it's coupled up with what I call a negotiated political settlement at the conference table. I think this can work, and I happen to think that the Vietnamese are beginning to understand it.

Q: Do you see President Nixon effecting such a withdrawal now?

A: Well, he said he had a plan to end the war. I don't say that unkindly, but he did say it, and it did shake me a little bit, because I didn't have one at the moment. (laughter) I hope he has. (more laughter and applause) And may I say to the gentleman -because it sounded a little bit on the light side, and it's not, this is serious business- I really believe that the President will do everything within his capability, his power, his understanding (and he has plenty of it) to bring this war to ^{a conclusion,} completion, and he's going to have my help. I'm not jumping on his back. I

8
had people on mine for four years. I'm going to try to help him a little bit, if I can. And I'll do everything I can to give him my help to get this struggle to an end, and defend his actions when he does it. (prolonged applause)

Q: We have, er, we have heard you denounce violence and ask for peace. I would like to hear you denounce the overthrow of the Guatemalan government that took place in 1954, the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1962, the Dominican invasion, er, an, er, a few years later; and I would ^{also} like to hear you denounce the massacre of 500,000 people in Indonesia. I have not heard you denounce any of those. (applause)

A: Well, now, if you'll give me some choice, so I can see how my batting average is, I'll be glad to do it. I don't remember 1954 in Guatemala. [Just a minute (to M.C.), let's give full time to this question.] I don't recall 1954. I not only denounced the Bay of Pigs, but the president of the United States, John Kennedy, a great man, took full responsibility for it. Went before the editors and said so. You ask me, do I denounce 500,000 massacred in Indonesia. No one likes any massacre, and if it took place, I not only denounce it I regret it; but I want to tell you what I more denounce, was the attempt of the Communist Party to take over the people of Indonesia, which they almost did, in a mass attack of the assassination of the leaders of the country which they failed to get by with, and thank God Indonesia has cleaned them out and today has a reasonably responsible, non-Communist, government, -a lot better than what they had. (applause)

Now the gentleman ^{that} ~~was~~ wanted to ask me a question.

Q: Er, Yes, sir. It was a matter of batting average, you seemed to call it. My first question would be, er, Is it a matter of batting averages, but, er. But I think the actual question is,

er, These "responsible Non-Communist governments"; which we seem to be instituting in such resort areas as, er, South Vietnam, Indonesia, and, er, other pleasure spots; These are not -these are not- responsible democratic governments. I- (applause) I sincerely doubt that the State Department has any -has any-, er, plan of establishing responsible democratic governments. I think that the State Department wants to establish ^{governments} which are reasonable and responsible to the American economy, to the American military, and to the American social system. (loud applause)

A: I think our young friend states what many people believe to be a fact, and I'd like to comment upon it. I don't claim to be an oracle of truth; I happen to have some opinions. I have visited Indonesia, I know the people, er, many of the people in Indonesia, I have been in Jakarta, I have been in Damak, I have been in Java, I have been with the people and I want to say that while they do not have a democratic government, we had nothing to do with their successful revolution against Sukarno, they did it themselves, they purged themselves of a control on the part of the Chinese Communists in Indonesia that was strangling that country, that had that country at war for five years with Malaysia, a war which is now settled, an economy which is now at long last ~~to~~ come back, and a people who once again have started to live. The United States government -by the way, the Indonesians are very proud of the fact that they were able to clean their own house, so to speak- ... Secondly, you know we aren't in the business of establishing other people's governments; I hope we get over this crazy notion that we can go around the world and establish governments for people. The best [through applause] that we can do is to help people have the right to establish their own governments, and some of them we won't like.

Quite frankly, I'm not too happy with the government in France. But I don't have much to say about it. (laughter and applause)

And I'm not particularly happy about the government in Washington but I don't have much to say about it. (laughter and applause)

On the one hand we get accused of establishing governments, and on the other hand we get accused because we don't. Now, you can't have it both ways, boys. You've got to make up your mind. And what the purpose of this government is, is, in any of its foreign policy, -should be, at least- to try to help people in the right of self-determination. And if you think that every country is going to come up with a full-fledged democracy, then you'd better take an elementary course in American government. Democracy is not something that is easily attained. It represents the culmination of the fine art of self-government. And as Winston Churchill once said, Democracy is the worst possible form of government except for all others that have never been tried. And it's one of the most difficult to attain, and it doesn't come quickly, it doesn't come by a magic wand. There are very few democracies in the world today, and those few that are there, they've spent hundreds, if not hundreds at least generations, trying to perfect it. So let's get over the silly idea that somehow we can just march on in with money, and idealists and power, and establish a democratic government. You just can't do it. But you can help them establish one, if they want to establish one. (applause)

Q: Mr. Humphrey?

Humphrey: This gentleman right here. We're going from side to side I believe. Yes, sir?

Q(cont'd.): Mr. Humphrey, I was over in our Student Union listening to this broadcast, and I heard the first person ask you a question, and I thought that he was right, that he said a beautiful thing, he said that you were mentioning all the words that were in our hearts

and you were. You were talking about peace, and love, and brotherhood, and these are the things that all of us feel. You talked about Martin Luther King, for whom, to whom, we all feel a great debt of gratitude. And we thought this was a beautiful thing on your part. And I happened to be thinking of a statement that John Kennedy once made, that, If this country, or any country, does not provide for peaceful revolution, it must accept violent revolution. Kennedy was a great man; he also wrote a great book, called ^{The} Profiles in Courage, in which he delineated the histories of certain men. When it came ^{their} time to make a choice, they chose to follow their conscience and not their pride. They gave up, they committed political suicide, because they believed in what they were doing. Eugene McCarthy was such a man. I would like to know (applause), Mr. Humphrey, Where were you, where was your peace, where was your hope, where was your love, in Chicago, when a man of peace, spoke of a great future for this country; he spoke of a future in which students ^{knew} ~~who~~ they were and where they were going. I want to know, Mr. Humphrey, when this man rose up, committing political suicide, because he believed that peaceful revolution was possible in America?

(applause, prolonged)

A: Well, my friend, I have known the distinguished senator from Minnesota a lot longer than you have. We grew up together, in politics together. And I'd put my, er, I wouldn't detract for a minute from Eugene McCarthy. I do not go around casting aspersions on what I think a man, a man of good quality and good character. I happen to believe, though, sir, that there was a time when I put ^{my} life on the line, not once, but a hundred times. I did it when I cleaned up the city of Minneapolis, sir, when no one else would do it. I did it at the Democratic convention when I fought for civil rights and did it for twenty years. (Now, just a minute.)

And I did it, my good friend, in this last campaign; when I was asked the questions whether I was for law and order or law and order and social justice, and I said, Social justice, and law and order. And I did it when I said that the fundamental issues in this campaign were arms control and race. And when the other candidate was asked, Do you believe in a speed-up in desegregation or a slow-down, he said, A slow-down. And when I was asked, I said, In a speed-up. I paid my price. And I have no apologies to make to a man who, may I say, has paid less. Thank you. (applause, prolonged; shouts of approval)

Yes ma'am?

(con't.) the same
Q: I [not a lady but A man is speaking] just want to comment. I admit that you have done great things in your life. Really great things, Mr. Humphrey.

Humphrey: Thank you.

Q (con't.): Really great things. But I want, I want to make one comment. I want you to bring back a memory to some of us who were watching television during the Chicago conventions. When Julian Bond was nominated for vice-president, you can tell, once in a while the camera would pan down on him, and you could tell that he was excited; and when a newsman asked him, Are you going to accept this nomination?, he said, I don't know, I'm too young. Maybe they'll change the Constitution. I want to do it because because I think it's great, I think I can make it. And, er, I really thought that he could. I really thought that Julian Bond would make a great vice-president. But when the time came, he said, I can't do it. I can't accept the nomination, I'm too young. I'm only asking this, Mr. Humphrey: When we realize that our time has gone by, why can't we say, Our ideas are too old.? (applause)

15
A: I think one could, but I'd hate to have had Moses say that when he came with the Ten Commandments, because he was a rather old fellow. He had some pretty good ideas. (applause) (Humphrey laughs too.)

Q (cont'd): Remember Moses had to leave Palestine? I think he left laughing because he knew it was the will of God.

Humphrey: I agree with that. (cheers) We're in concurrence, dear friend. Thank you very much. See you later.

Yes, sir?

(laughter and applause, no response to "Yes, sir".

Yes, ma'am? Better pull that mike down.

Q: In respect to the war in Vietnam again. Er, if we do pull out the troops do you believe that we should still remain there in a peacetime capacity, in the sense of a Peace Corps, like we had for instance in Africa or in South America?

A: If they want us. Only if they ask for us and want us.

Only. By the way, the Peace Corps goes to no country without an invitation. And I do happen to think that those are the kinds of policies that in the long run are going to count. Can I just take a moment to say that I believe that we're going through a period in which there's - in which we've used power and money when it was really necessary in the immediate post-war world as the ultimate undertaking of our- of what we call- our national security policy. I think now we're coming to a period in which we're going to have to use understanding and cooperation more than we have ever used it before. And this is one of the reasons, as I went back into teaching, that I'm trying to get my young students to understand a great deal about the different countries in which they live. You know, you generally hear people say, Now let's talk about Asia. Now, of course there're a couple billion people there and they're all very different. I asked somebody the other day - Somebody the other day said, I want you, Mr. Professor, to talk to me about China. Young fellow

was very interested. I said, When you name me five people in China by name, then you ^{and} I'll start to talk, but until then what's the use in talking: You won't know anything and I won't know much more to tell you. We've got to be able to understand a culture, the economic the social forces; we haven't understood it. We didn't understand even Japan, prior to World War II. Now we're beginning to understand and may I say that the Black community in compelling ~~many~~ often-times and in many other instances demanding that there be ethnic studies are doing the nation a great service, because until we start to understand the cultures of people, the background, the ethnic origin and background, the traditions of people, we'll never be able to design policies of government or private that are going to be anywhere near as effective. The knowledge explosion is here. Now out of this knowledge we need to get some judgment. And I think we are at a point now in our national life when we're going to be substituting enlightenment and judgment and knowledge for money and power. Thank God the time has arrived because I don't think there's any way, in a nuclear age, that mass military power ^{can} be effective. It can be catastrophic, it can annihilate, but it cannot in any way solve -it can dissolve, but it cannot solve-problems. And it's going to take a lot of patience as well. I wish it didn't take so much, but it will. That's my view of it.

Now we're back here. Which side are we on? Oh, over here...

Q: Mr. Humphrey, I'm a Japanese student studying at this university.

In connection with the questions asked about the war in Vietnam, I should like to hear your view on the proposed return of Okinawa to Japan. We know very well that Okinawa plays a very important role in American strategy in Asia, but in last year's election the people in Okinawa chose Mr. Iara, the joint candidate of the opposition parties, indicating the desire to have their island

returned to Japan. In your opinion, would it be a good idea for the United States to return the island rule to Japan, and if so, what should be the status of the American bases there? Do you think that the United States should withdraw the nuclear bases there?

A: I think that Okinawa should be (applause) (You know, of course, that we returned jurisdiction of the Bonan Islands first.) I believe that Okinawa should be returned to Japan. I believe that we should negotiate whatever kind of an arrangement ~~that~~ we can that is satisfactory to the people of Okinawa and Japan for bases if they're willing to have them, and what kind of bases they're willing to have. I do not believe that the security of the United States requires over the long run the hold on Okinawa, and what's more, I think it exacerbates the political situation between ourselves and Japan and I think it gives the more leftist elements in Japan something to play politics with, engage in demagoguery about, and I think it would be good for the democracy of Japan for the United States to return Okinawa to Japan.

(loud applause)

Q: Mr. Humphrey: Why, if you think the abandonment of the present welfare system and the possible enactment of the negative income, or the guaranteed, or ~~the~~ negative, tax, er, or guaranteed income, is so feasible why didn't it happen during your administration?

A: Oh, I can tell you that: because I'm just one voice, and one view, er, apparently. Er, you know, one thing we have to get in mind is that because you may think it's right, or I may think it's right, there're 200,000,000 Americans and there happen to be 535 members of Congress. One of the real problems that we're having today is that people seem to forget that you have to work with the majority, in order to get something done. Now, I was for the Medicare Program

for sixteen years.

Q (cont'd.): Well, you seemed to feel that it was so possible now...

A: No, I didn't say it was possible, I said that we ought to be for it. I want to get it done if we can. I hope that we can get it done. I think we've come a long ways. As a matter of fact, when you get corporate executives, like Mr. Miller of the Ford Motor Company, advocating the negative income tax, when you get leading foundations, for example, such as the Brookings Institute and others, proposing forms of guaranteed income like an annual, like an, a guaranteed annual wage, then I think you're beginning to move. Some of us have been working on this for ten years. You know, it's like.... I said to a class today, No matter how warm the hand, it takes twenty-one days to hatch an egg, -even if you need the chick. And I know you can't get it any sooner. Now there're times that it takes, that it takes time to get things done. There're very few things that're instant; coffee and tea, and neither one of them are too good. So I think that we've got to get at it, that's what I'm talking about. Get^{ting} at it; then maybe in a few years, or a year or two, four years, we'll get it done. I think we can.

Q: Mr. Humphrey, could you comment please on Mr. Nixon's proposal for an all-voluntary military force?

A: I didn't... For the what?

Q (cont'd): An all-voluntary military force.

A: Yes. The question was, Would I comment on the, on Mr. Nixon's proposal for an all-voluntary military force. Well, I'm not sure just when he made that. He said he wanted to study it. That's a great deal of difference in saying that you really want it. Er, but I feel that he wants to study it, er, in the hopes that he can get it. Now let me tell you what I think would happen today if you had an all-voluntary military force. I spoke to your press-conference today about this.

If we could have it, and you can guarantee to me that it wouldn't be a force that was made up of those who just couldn't get jobs in the private economy, well and good. But I think I know what would happen today if you had an all-voluntary military force, even with high pay: That force would essentially be black. Because too many black people cannot get employment; it would be filled with Indians - too many Indians cannot get employment. I don't think that Blacks and Indians and the poor ought to defend the rest of us. I happen to believe that a military establishment ought to have some kind of a general base. And I'm always a little suspicious of these professional standing armies. They sometimes want work to do. And I'd rather have a citizens' army that's a little anxious about getting out of the service than one that wants to continue to stay in the service. (loud applause)

Q: Mr. Humphrey,...

A: Yes, sir.

Q (cont'd.): As some of my fellow question-askers have done, I'd like to make a statement, but instead of directing towards you, I'd like to direct it towards my fellow college students here and also to anyone who is listening over the radio stations. Now there are times when we get a fever pitch like tonight with a prominent figure coming onto campus, and we really get all anxious about what we can do. But so often just a very few continue with this fever pitch and most of us just settle back into an ease and just go our own way. Now, we have a group, The Writing of Letters to Congressmen; I think this is good. We have programs, for example, the Peace Corps and things like this; I think this is good, but this takes a year of your life. Now I have a suggestion and an invitation to ask any of my

fellow college students here: I know we all have to earn some money during the summer, to get back into school. But there are programs in your own home town -I come from Lowell and there's programs in Lowell that you can do- volunteer programs, such as Head-Start. These things will take up as little as one hour a week, or full-time. Full-time Head-Start was from 9 to 12. There are other programs in the cities, in your city. I don't know if you've looked into it. I didn't look into it. But this is something you can do. You get frustrated at times, at writing Congressmen and Senators and Presidents and nothing seems to happen. But this something that I think that you can do and I think it'll be a pleasant experience for you for the summer.

A: May I join with you [during applause]. We are very close to the end of our time here. Let me just join with this young man that ~~who~~ has made a very, very, very, helpful suggestion. There are institutions in this state for the mentally retarded that are desperately in need of help, do you know that? My wife and I have put a good deal of work in this. Five million families in the United States with this affliction: one out of every 400 babies born with this affliction. There are institutions that need help on playgrounds and in recreation programs. There are many others. I hope that I -and by the way I know that you do a lot of this and I want to compliment you. I wish that the real message of the students were getting out to the public. I went to the University of California at Los Angeles recently and I found that that university sponsors a camp: ~~for~~ ^{the} students, for 5,000 disadvantaged kids in the summer. I found that they had

19
hundreds of their students doing tutorial reading. I found that they had hundreds more working in playgrounds in Los Angeles. I found that they sponsored a full recreation program for disadvantaged kids in Venice, California; and I found that nobody else knew it except a few on the campus.

Every time there's a campus disorder, every time that somebody raises some Cain around here and gets into some trouble he's on television. I wonder when we're going to focus the cameras on the young man or the young woman that goes down and helps the Head-Start. I wonder when we're going to focus the cameras on the young man or young woman that helps a kid that's handicapped physically or mentally. I wonder when we're going to focus the cameras and the news^{up} attention on the thousands of young men and women -450,000 of them last year from American colleges- that volunteered in inner-city programs. I think that the young students of America ought to demand equal time for a change: some people have been getting more time than they deserve. I want those of you (that are doing good things to demand equal time. (applause, prolonged)

One more.....

This is... Is this it?

Humphrey: Alright.

M.C. : It's funny, I was going to say that you were in fine company up there with Miss Francen and ...

Humphrey: I kind of like this too, but your boy-friend's up here.

Q: Concerning Eric Goldman's book, The Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson, er, I was wondering if you could comment on his evaluation of President Johnson having been the wrong man at the wrong time, etc., whatever the quote is; I also wondered if, er, you could comment on why Eric Goldman wrote the book and finally, er, because someone

ahead of me more or less suggested this, er, during the campaign people suggested that, or perhaps it was after the campaign, that, er, you were a man who had been in the wrong time at the wrong place, etc., just as Eric Goldman had suggested that Johnson had been the wrong man at the wrong time or something like that.

A: Well, let me say first of all, I'm not going to comment on Mr. Goldman's book, because I don't think it would be appropriate on my part, not having read all of it, and secondly I have a feeling that people that stand in judgement of their contemporaries frequently are ^{really} unable to get a perspective of history. This is not to say that Mr. Goldman is right or wrong. But I want to say that most of the books that were written about Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Abraham Lincoln immediately after they left office were anything but complimentary. I prefer to let the time of history give me a degree of objectivity. And maybe the objectivity will turn out the same way, but I would like to have a little time. Now let's talk- I'd prefer to talk about my mistakes and my limitations, of which I am somewhat aware. I do have the feeling, sir, that my candidacy came at a time when it was needed but at a time when it could not be rewarded. And I want to tell you why I say that: Because I think the central issues that are going to face you and your generation are the issues that we brought to the forefront, not merely the contemporary issue of the war, but more basically the issue of what kind of a nation this is going to be: the issue of race; the issue of deprivation; the issue of whether or not a nation that says it is a democracy and rich and affluent, can act democratically and have compassion and understanding and, more importantly, can let the powerless share power. I tried to bring that issue to the front. It's a very big issue and I imagine I didn't do it well, which makes me feel rather sad. The second issue that I thought was the controlling issue for the future ~~was~~

the issue of
 for the rest of this century, was the arms race, I felt so as
 a senator, fifteen years ago, ten years ago, I am the author of
 the Food for Peace Program and the co-sponsor of the Nuclear
 Test Ban Treaty. The author of the Peace Corps. The author of
 the disarmament agency. I've spent a lifetime working at it. And
 I really believe that those issues were just at the wrong
 were at the right time but not ready for acceptance, because the
 nation was concerned about riots and trouble and crime and dissent
 and every time that I used the phrase -Let me give you an example:
 We spent a lot of ^{money} ~~time~~ testing the voters, as you do in these
 public opinion surveys. When the question was asked, Will you
 support a candidate who says that he is in favor of law and order,
 period, or will you support a candidate who says he is in favor
 of law and order and social justice, period, the difference in the
 polls on that issue were from 5 to 8 per-cent. You dropped
 8% at a maximum, 5% at a minimum, every time you said "social
 justice".

Now I found that some of the issues that I was working on were
 not very popular, but I'll tell you what I think: I think a man
 has a role to play in public affairs. Sometimes he may not be the
 one to receive the honors; but he may be one that is to plant the seed,
 and not reap the harvest. I feel that we did put this right. We
 lost an election but we lost it honestly. You not only need good
 winners but you need good losers. You not only need to have a
 campaign but you need to have an education. And a political
 campaign ought to be more than balloons and razzle-dazzle and
 confetti. It ought to be a great, a great mass education pro-
 gram. And we tried to make it that. We came mighty close.

I'll tell you, when you lose by less than one-half of one per-cent in the greatest nation on the face of the earth, I don't exactly feel like I was the unwanted child. Nor do I feel as if I were rejected. I just sort of feel that the whistle blew before we could make the last touchdown.

Thank you very much.

(Prolonged and loud applause)

M.C.: And, Mr. Humphrey has received a standing ovation from this capacity crowd this evening. That concludes our coverage of the appearance this evening, of former vice-president Hubert H. Humphrey, who delivered the Second Annual Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Lecture as part of The Distinguished Visitors Program at the University of Massachusetts. It was the final event of Mr. Humphrey's ^{day-long} visit to the Amherst campus, and came to you live from the Currey Hicks Cage through the facilities of the Five College Radio, WFCR. This is Jack Hopejoy speaking, and this is the Eastern Educational Radio Network.

#

*Remarks
The Honorable H. H. H.
The Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Lecture
U of Massachusetts
Amherst, Mass
April 18, 1969*

Two weeks ago this country observed the first anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The tragic death of this heroic figure in the world-wide struggle for freedom, justice and peace was remembered in many ways. Across America and across the seas, people of all races, the rich as well as the poor, marched and sang and prayed and spoke of the unfinished work for which Martin Luther King gave his life.

~~Despite forecasts of violence, the day of memorial passed quietly and peacefully in most cities; only sporadic disturbances in Chicago and Memphis marred this day of remembrance.~~

People stopped their daily routines to ponder what Martin Luther King had brought to this country and what this country had yet to do to achieve his dream of an America reconciled and reborn.

~~But~~ they celebrated ~~again what Dr. King~~ that, in life, Dr. King had demonstrated ~~that~~ how one man, by the force of his character, the depth of his convictions, and the eloquence of his voice, can alter the course of history. And in remembering ^{this life,} the people grew strong.

* * * *

(Martin Luther King was the greatest modern spokesman against violence and hatred--a fact which made all the more tragic the arson, looting and violence which swept America in the aftermath of his death.

(Commentators were quick to say that these acts dishonored the man who died--and that was true. Indeed, it was so obvious that it scarcely needed to be said.

(But ~~most of~~ ^{these} the commentators forgot to say that other people distorted Dr. King's life in more ^{subtle} ~~subtle, more~~ but equally tragic, ways. Too much of the initial white reaction ^{to Dr. King's death} ~~was~~ that of fear rather than that of grief and shame. For these people Dr. King had become primarily a restrainer of Negroes instead of a dedicated fighter for equality and justice.

(Martin Luther King was, to be sure, an apostle of non-violence. But more fundamentally he was an apostle of social justice by means of ~~non-violence~~ non-violent direct action. To be non-violent while sitting on the sidelines is easy enough. To be non-violent in the midst of a battle is something else.

3/

[All too often, the comfortable people in our society ~~appeared~~
applauded Dr. King's message when he stressed non-violence but
turned a deaf-ear when he brought up the hard realities of ~~racial~~ social
justice. [This nation must come to understand that non-violence for
its ^{own} ~~own~~ sake, unaccompanied by visible and meaningful social change, / can only produce
~~processes~~ escalating ~~racial~~ tensions in our society and a ^{corresponding} ~~stead~~
erosion of our capacity to solve these problems peacefully and
within the framework of law. And although tension is often ~~is~~
essential for social change, the burden of action must always rest
with those who are privileged, ^{with} not/those who have been denied
full participation in this nation's economic, social and political
life.

[The test of a people, like that of a ~~man~~ man, is not how
it accepts good fortune, but how it responds to adversity. It is
precisely at such moments--when our complacency is shattered by the
thunderbolt of tragedy--that a nation has a chance to move ~~forward~~
forward ^{and achieve greatness.}

4/ *And More specifically,*

Today--one year after Dr. King's death--we ~~must~~ ^{must} ask ourselves two questions: *Have we faced up to the hard realities of achieving*

social

~~racial~~ justice in America?

Have we sought to make the tragedy

of Dr. King's death not a time when America lost her faith

but rather the moment when America found her conscience?

On both counts--one year later--the answer must clearly

be: "No."

* * * *

A little more than a year ago the National Advisory Commission
--the Kerner Commission--
on Civil Disorders, released its historic report and recommendations.

On the first anniversary of this report, ~~the~~ Urban America and The

Urban Coalition released a study ~~which~~, One Year Later, *which* ~~wherein~~

~~they~~ ^{our} evaluated ^{to date} the progress ~~which the coalition had made~~ in meeting

the goals ~~set forth~~ ^{of} the Kerner Commission.

This appraisal ^{stated} ~~concluded~~ that:

"--Poverty remains a pervasive fact of life. . .and the continuing

disparity between this poverty and the general affluence remains a

source of alienation and discontent."

"--Ghetto schools continue to fail. The ~~small~~ amount of progress that has been made has been counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities."

"--At present, there are no programs that seriously threaten the continued existence of the slums."

And as the Kerner report ^{a year earlier,} ~~warned~~ ^(had) the study concluded: "For a ^{later,} year ~~later,~~ we are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less equal."

I was distressed at the meagre attention given this important evaluation ~~of~~ when it was released six weeks ago. For this ^{outlined} ~~contained,~~ report ^{before it,} as did the Kerner Commission document, the specific ^{Taken in America} ~~action~~ ^{things} which must be done to reverse this alarming ~~pattern~~ of social disintegration.

We must understand ~~that~~ our basic challenge: ~~to~~ to achieve not only equity in opportunity but ^{also} equity in ~~the~~ results. And equity in ~~the~~ results refers to very concrete goals--the right to a job at decent pay, the right to an adequate income if one cannot work,

6/

the right to an education which releases ~~humanity~~ rather than
destroys human creativity, the right to decent housing in
~~and safe neighborhoods.~~
~~stable communities~~ the right to good health/^{care} and sufficient
nutrition.

(Clearly, if America is going to remedy the inequalities
and injustice ^{of} ~~in~~ our society, we ^{must begin conducting} ~~are going to have to conduct~~ our
public business in a largely different manner than we have ^{in the past,} ~~been~~

~~accustomed to doing.~~ ^{to} (Above all else, we are going to have
^{Reorder our priorities and}
to start putting first things first.

* * * *

(Today we stand at a critical moment in the history of
the United States---a moment when the right decisions taken
forcefully and ^{courageously} ~~and~~ can dramatically alter the priorities
of our national life.

(Let us be absolutely clear ~~of this~~ about what is riding
on these decisions: no less than whether or not ~~that~~ America
^{ever} can achieve Martin Luther King's dream ^{implement} or the specific objectives

7/

laid down by the Kerner Commission more than one year ago.

(The opening skirmish in this battle over national priorities will be fought over money for the initial deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. But this debate is only symptomatic of the more fundamental decisions that must be in the coming year reached/over military spending.

(Unless we are successful now in slowing down the nuclear arms buildup, it can be predicted without qualification that our ~~risk~~ military planners will win approval of a number of ~~long-delayed~~ ^{often-postponed} weapons programs ~~existing~~ costing, in the end, many hundreds of billions of dollars.

(And it can be predicted with equal certainty that as ~~these~~ this military spending accelerates, our urgent domestic needs will be shotchanged and our efforts to mobilize the country in eradicating these deprivations will fall woefully short.

(This is why negotiations with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons are so critical. If

8/

we can freeze the strategic weapons race at its present ~~low~~ levels,
or begin the process of mutual phased reductions of the nuclear
arsenals, there is a chance of winning the battle of priorities. . .
there is a chance that we can ^{indeed} begin putting first things first.

- 4 -

We now stand at a critical moment -- a rare opportunity to break the upward spiral of strategic weaponry which has dominated U.S. - Soviet relations since the dawn of the atomic age.

We have had reason to believe for many months that the Soviet leaders are willing to begin bilateral negotiations over the control of offensive and defensive strategic weapons. Only the tragic Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia kept these talks from beginning last fall.

I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these negotiations. When responsible leaders of great nations approach their vital security interests, they do so with great caution. I know our leaders will not agree to anything that endangers our national security. And I make the same assumption about the Soviet leaders.

But I also assume that the Soviet leaders would not lightly enter into these talks with us. If that assumption is wrong, of course, all bets are off.

~~But~~ we must believe, until their actions demonstrate otherwise, that the Soviets understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral -- a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which has become meaningless in terms of securing for either side a decisive military advantage.

We must pray that the Soviet leaders see the futility and folly of pursuing further a course which cannot possibly add either to their security or to ours, but which will instead lead all mankind closer to the brink of nuclear disaster.

It is, therefore, vitally important that we understand the urgency of beginning these bilateral talks as rapidly as possible.

I do not agree that these negotiations should await progress in settling more general political problems. The imperative of our present circumstances -- that of preventing the next round in the nuclear arms race before it is irreversibly launched -- cannot await the solution of political disputes many years in the making, and that will be many years, if not generations, in solving.

#A
page 9

It is especially important that prior to the negotiations we exercise great restraint in word and action on matters relating to strategic weapons.

It is primarily for this reason that I have opposed the decision to proceed with a modified deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system. I remain unconvinced that the security of our second-strike forces required such action at this time, especially

when the ^{small} risks of ~~not deploying~~ ^{postponing deployment} of the ABM are ^{at this time} compared to the ^{considerable} risks of postponing ~~the~~ the urgent domestic needs which confront America.

More than this, however, there remain severe questions about the efficacy of the Safeguard system in comparison to other steps which might be taken to protect our ICBMs or to strengthen our Polaris fleet -- steps which would avoid moving to the next level of nuclear weapons technology.

My concern for restraint in word and action prior to U.S. - Soviet negotiations also causes me to regret very much those statements imputing to the Soviets a commitment to achieve a first-strike capability in strategic nuclear weapons.

In a world where our Polaris fleet is constantly on station, in a world where we have proceeded very far in the development of multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles, I do not believe the Soviets could seriously delude themselves into thinking a first-strike capability was possible.

These statements, moreover, necessarily arise from a series of assumptions of long-term Soviet behavior, assumptions which by their nature can be neither proven nor disproven at this time and which remain, to say the least, a matter of considerable debate among our intelligence community.

Secretary Clark Clifford reached quite different conclusions as to the Soviet strategic posture less than three months ago. And Secretary of State Rogers clearly raised doubts about the reliability of these forecasts of a Soviet first-strike capability when he stressed the negotiability of the Safeguard system in any future arms control talks at his first press conference in Washington two weeks ago.

These forecasts of Soviet strategic intent -- statements which depart markedly from earlier U.S. pronouncements -- can only raise doubts in the Soviet mind about our strategic objectives. And we know from the past that doubt or uncertainty on either side about the strategic goals of the other has been a principal stimulus to the nuclear arms spiral.

A far more prudent course, in my opinion, would be one which avoided raising spectres of massive Soviet strategic commitments until we have determined through direct talks their actual willingness or unwillingness to decelerate the arms race. Then we will not have to speculate on such critical matters. We will know.

I trust we are wise enough to understand that within the Soviet government, as within our own, are found widely varying opinions and beliefs on the issue of strategic weapons. We must, it seems to me, be exceedingly careful not to erode through ill-considered statements or decisions the influence of those Soviet leaders who may be advocating a more rational policy of controlling the strategic arms race -- those men who now seem to favor bilateral talks with the United States. For we can never doubt the Soviet Union's capacity to propel the arms race to new and more dangerous heights if saner and more rational heads do not prevail -- just as the Soviets cannot doubt our ability to do likewise.

10/

note
Let me also ~~state~~ at this juncture: I would hope ~~that~~ our government would enter into these bilateral talks with a truly comprehensive proposal, one that raised/all major ~~issues~~ ^{for negotiation} questions of strategic weaponry and did not restrict unilaterally the flexibility and freedom of our negotiators.

Long-term
This point is critical because the principal ^{long-term} threat to the strategic arms balance between the Soviet Union and the United States is the development of MIRV (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles)--a system which equips each ICBM with a number of separate warheads aimed at different targets.

If, as President Nixon suggests, the Soviets understand the defensive characteristics of a limited deployment of Safeguard, they will be equally quick to get the message of MIRV--a manifold increase in our strategic offensive capability. The Soviets can be expected to respond to such a ~~massive~~ massive expansion of U.S. nuclear forces with an equally concerted effort of their own--and the balance of terror will have ~~reached~~ reached unprecedented heights.

11/

My fundamental point must be underscored: the availability of resources to attack our urgent domestic problems will, in the end, be largely a factor of our capacity to hold back the impending flood of new offensive ~~strategic~~ strategic weapons without endangering the real security of this country or ~~our~~ ^{our} people.

~~It is at time we demonstrated the maximum ability to run risks in the cause of~~

in short,
It is time, ~~it~~ to be willing to run the same risks in the cause or peace that we are willing to assume in acquiring the weapons of war.

* * * *

Those of us who fought for and eventually ~~secured~~ secured the historic civil rights legislation of the 1960's recognize that these laws could never have passed without the active support of the remarkable ^{civil rights} coalition which ~~arose~~ arose in their behalf.

Thoroughly bi-partisan in nature, encompassing a broad spectrum of civil rights, religious, labor, business and service organizations, this coalition generated the political muscle we needed to win in Congress.

In the past several years, and especially since the death of Dr. King, many persons have lamented the fragmentation and apparent dissolution of this potent force for social justice in America. Many persons, including myself, have often called for a rebirth and reenergizing of this force.

It is time, I believe, to recognize that ~~substantive~~ powerful ~~and~~ bi-partisan aggregations do not arise in a vacuum. They arise ~~in~~ in response to real issues. . . specific challenges. . . and concrete legislative goals. With the passage of all major outstanding civil rights laws, the ~~liberal~~ ^{civil rights} coalition of the 1950's and 1960's has, ^{understandably} lost much of its focus and impact.

Today the issue of military spending--highlighted now by the question of deploying the Safeguard ABM system but extending far beyond this immediate issue--has the potential for creating in America ~~an~~ an organized force for social justice comparable to the coalition which carried on the civil rights battle for two decades.

Dr. King loved America . . . and those Americans who seek to honor his name and memory should rally together now to win this

13/

battle over national priorities . . . ~~because~~ because unless this battle is won, this year, the outcome of all subsequent encounters over resources for cities, for education, for health care, for and jobs and housing, ^{be} for food will largely be decided even before the issues get to Congress. Our military budgets will continue to expand; our domestic allocations will become proportionately smaller. This is precisely the outcome of President ~~Nixon's~~ Nixon's recent cutbacks in the federal budget.

~~presently~~
We have ^{primarily} failed ~~so far~~ to achieve Martin Luther King's dream for America, ^{failed} because we have ~~been unable~~ to generate the bi-partisan political ~~commitment~~ commitment necessary to do the job.

~~now~~
~~and then using this new force in behalf of~~
~~if we focus our efforts on the job of ending the insanity of the~~
~~strategic nuclear arms race...~~
~~This will not simply be a rebirth of the civil rights coalition.~~
~~It will be an entirely new force in American society--one which Martin~~
~~Luther King saw as essential if this nation was to survive and one which~~
~~we can create... now...~~
~~is now within our grasp to achieve--if we can only summon the faith~~

if we focus our efforts on the job of ending the insanity of the strategic nuclear arms race...

This will not simply be a rebirth of the civil rights coalition. It will be an entirely new force in American society--one which Martin Luther King saw as essential if this nation was to survive and one which we can create... now... is now within our grasp to achieve--if we can only summon the faith

13A/

We now have the chance to summon this strength if we focus our efforts on the job of ending the insanity of the strategic nuclear arms race and then fighting to see that these resources are used for urgent domestic needs.

the fact that
This does not ignore ~~the~~ additional resources ~~that~~ will be made available by an expanding economy or a thoroughly reformed system of taxation. It is, ~~rather~~ rather, a frank admission that to do the job on the scale outlined by the Kerner Commission will require not only massive resources, but also a clear national commitment *growing* ~~which grows~~ out of an *explicit re-* ~~equitable~~ ordering of our national priorities.

~~and so~~ *We* should stop talking about the rebirth of the civil rights coalition, at least as we *have known* ~~have~~ it for the past two decades.

the urgent need for
We must have the vision to see/an entirely new force in American

~~society~~ society to carry on the ~~new~~ tasks for which Martin Luther King died . . . a force which addresses itself to the critical question of national priorities.

14/

No doubt many of our allies in the civil rights battles will ~~not~~ stand with us again. No doubt many of the organizations which battled so valiantly for so many years will enlist in this new struggle. Indeed, ~~without~~ their wisdom and ability will be vital ingredients for success.

But we will also be appealing to the new generation of Americans who never experienced the struggles over voting rights, public accommodations, school ~~and~~ desegregation and the other ~~maternalistic~~ issues we took to the people ~~and~~ in the 1950's and 1960's. And these new recruits should give us ~~and~~ an invaluable boost in morale, enthusiasm, and effectiveness.

This is our opportunity . . . if we can now summon the ~~right~~ courage and faith so clearly demanded by the times . . . and the courage and faith which characterized the life and works of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.



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