

# REMARKS

Panel

Press

(X) Not the Foremost Products (X)

OCT 8 4 7 PM  
= here

Dr. Hahn  
Prof. Buring  
Chas. Humphrey  
Sen Bayt

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

STUDENT PRESS CONFERENCE

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

SEPTEMBER 23, 1966

There was a time when education -- even university  
education -- was something that went on within the four  
walls of a classroom.

Refuge  
from  
class  
Room

Now those walls have opened up not only to the  
community but to the whole wide world. And nowhere more  
so than in this great University.

In most universities there were

I am told that, ~~Before the war,~~ ~~you had~~ some courses  
on Europe and an occasional class in Far Eastern government --  
and that was all. ~~I am told that the~~ instructors leaned heavily  
on textbooks. All this was typical of most universities.

Today you cover the entire world, with particular emphasis  
on the non-Western countries. And your specialists not only  
know their languages -- they have lived and traveled extensively  
in their areas.

Objective - Suppress Aggression  
- Promote Self Determination

• Phonix Island Society  
- Neo McCarthyism on Disint

Means not achieved  
unobjectives

✓ Unobjective - a rational settlement - ~~yes~~  
but not succeeded in convincing Ho Chi Minh

We try many ways -

what are we prepared to concede to Ho -

↳ We need that kind of in-depth knowledge.

<sup>especially</sup>  
We need to know not only that immense mass called

Asia, but the history, traditions, politics, economics -- yes,  
and the hopes and aspirations -- of its individual countries.

Asia

↳ Asians neither act alike nor think alike. The differences  
are important to them and therefore to us. — Same as L.A.

~~And I think~~ Nothing quite takes the place of seeing these  
countries -- even very briefly, as I have during the past  
year. It gives you the essential background against which  
to set what you read about them.

↳ I see that, when he was asked to account for this great  
reaching out by a landlocked university, my fellow vice president --  
your vice president, Lynne Merritt -- said: "It's just a matter  
of living in a modern world. Nowadays you have to know what's  
happening in the world."

To which I add: In today's world, what you don't know

can hurt you.

*and for America - a world  
power to have a half world  
knowledge, is both unfortunate & dangerous.*

I know that Indiana University faculty members are in charge of government or foundation projects in Pakistan, Thailand, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Uruguay, Peru, and Venezuela.

I am told that, in any given year, something like 70 members of your faculty are teaching abroad, 200 of your students are studying overseas, and something like a thousand students from other countries are on your campus.

But, since I'm a great believer in "brightening the corner where you are," I'm equally impressed by what you have done to bring the world home to Indiana. It is not too much to say that you have internationalized secondary education in this state -- as well as enriching the international curricula of three-quarters of Indiana's institutions of higher education.

Instead of saying to the youngsters of Indiana: "Go west, and grow up with the country," you are saying: "Study the world, and grow up with it."

After all, this is the world in which we Americans have to live -- and it's not going to stop for us to get off, even though there may be some people here and there who wish it would!

Like every other great institution, this truly international university is the lengthened shadow of a man -- my good friend, Chancellor Herman Wells, and the great work he got under way is being capably carried on by another good friend -- President Elvis Stahr.

One result of their combined efforts, I am sure, is this well-informed audience. So I hope to learn just as much -- or more -- from your questions as you do from my answers.

# # # #

From:  
News Bureau  
Indiana University  
306 N. Union St.  
Bloomington, Indiana  
Sept. 23, 1966

FACT SHEET

\*Persons Appearing On The Platform:

- Hubert H. Humphrey, vice president of the United States.
- Dr. Elvis J. Stahr, president of Indiana University.
- Charles S. Hyneman, Distinguished Service Professor of Government.
- Edward H. Buehrig, Acting Chairman and University Professor of Government.

-----

Panelists:

- Bernard S. Morris, professor of government.
- John M. Thompson, associate director of the International Affairs Center, and associate professor of history.
- Peter H. Smith, Lafayette, Ind., a senior in history.
- Fred Wheeler, Wheaton, Ill., a senior in government.

-----

\*Seating Capacity Of The Auditorium--3,788

-----

Introductory remarks by President Stahr on the appearance of Hubert Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, at Indiana University, September 23, 1966.

\*\*\*\*\*

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. It's my privilege to welcome all of you to this special event which is being brought to you under the sponsorship and guidance of our Department of Government. It's a privilege indeed for me to welcome to the campus a distinguished public servant and a personal friend.

I want to inject at this point the message that we are going to try to get the word around to the Residence Halls that if they possibly can, to keep the dining rooms open fifteen minutes longer because we are getting started fifteen minutes late. There's bound to be somebody who doesn't get the word but I hope it isn't in your dining room.

We are delighted and honored to have our guest here today. His presence extends the efforts and tradition of this University to offer, aside from the ongoing and excellent educational opportunities available here, an added rich dimension of educational opportunity for the whole university family and members of an enlightened community. So, Mr. Vice President, we are happy indeed to have you on the campus of I.U., which is an exciting and stimulating and interested community of scholars, teachers and students. We thank you for taking the time from a very busy schedule to stop by here, not just to address us, but to submit yourself to questioning by our panel of students and faculty members who will get the first crack at you, and by the others assembled here

as we entertain questions from the floor, time permitting.

I would like to introduce the panel to you and to our audience. There are: Mr. Peter Smith, a senior in the Department of History and President of the Interfraternity Council. Hold up your hand, please, Pete. To his left is Dr. John Thompson, Professor of Modern History and Associate Director of our International Affairs Center. To his left is -- is your hand up, John? Thank you. To his left is Mr. Barry Wheeler, a senior in the Department of Government and Chairman of the Board of Academic Review. And on the far end is Mr. Bernard Morris, Professor of International Relations in the Department of Government.

It's also my privilege, Mr. Vice President, to introduce to you and to our audience your host and presiding Chairman of this session, the University Professor of Government and Acting Chairman of the Department of Government, Dr. Edward H. Buehrig, who will be up here in just a few minutes. And, finally, it gives me special pleasure to recognize a man personally known to you, sir, for many years. We know him as an eminent scholar, teacher and a gracious person. You know him as all of these and also as your teacher when you were a graduate in political science a few years back. And since then a long-time personal friend of yours. I'm pleased then at this time to ask Dr. Charles Hyneman, Distinguished Service Professor of Government, to present you, Mr. Vice President, to this audience assembled here this afternoon. Charlie --.



From:  
News Bureau  
Indiana University  
306 N. Union St.  
Bloomington, Indiana

Introduction of Vice President Humphrey  
by Professor Charles S. Hyneman  
Bloomington, Indiana  
Sept. 23, 1966

Mr. Vice President, President Stahr, Members of the Panel,  
Distinguished Guests and Friends of the University, Faculty Colleagues  
and Students:

One might ask why it is necessary to introduce the Vice President of the United States to an American audience. I intend not to introduce the Vice President, but to tell you something about the man who is going to speak to you.

I have known Hubert Humphrey since the year he finished his undergraduate work at the University of Minnesota, and came to my department at Louisiana State University for a year of graduate study. I will not say that he was the smartest graduate student I ever had, but neither will I say that I ever knew another graduate student who was any smarter than Hubert Humphrey. He made his presence known in ways that gave me no reason to doubt he had earned the Phi Beta Kappa key and the magna cum laude diploma he brought with him from the University of Minnesota.

You have read in the newspapers that to be around this man is to hear him talk, but I say that to be around him is to engage in conversation. He is an attentive listener as well as a ready talker. He listens in order to take in information and ideas, and what he takes in becomes material for contemplation. This was a thoughtful man when he was a young man and this is a thoughtful man today.

I had business that took me to Minneapolis during and after the War and I bought more than one steak for the young man and his wife while he was doing further graduate work at the University of Minnesota, while he was teaching at Macalester College, and still later when he was serving as Mayor of Minneapolis, an office he got himself elected to at the unripe age of 33. The acquaintance continued after he went to Washington as United States Senator, and though I saw less of the Senator than I had seen of the student and teacher, I can report with complete assurance some things you ought to know about the man who is going to speak to you. The fundamental mood, the basic convictions, the prime values of the young man from South Dakota and Minnesota never changed as far as I can tell. Hubert Humphrey brings to high public office the personal morality, the convictions about right and wrong, and the determination to see men treated in rightness and fairness that made him nothing less than a legendary hero to thousands of people who worked with him and for him when he was engaged in a crusade for good government in Minnesota.

2--Hyneman

It remains for me to answer the question: What are these convictions? What are the ethical principles that guide his actions? I can do that best by telling you about an event that some of you will remember, but which occurred before some of you were born. It was the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, in 1948--the Convention that nominated Harry Truman for President. I tell the story to you as The New York Times told it the day it happened.

The Committee on Resolutions was considering the platform to be laid before the whole convention for adoption on the next day. The Mayor of Minneapolis, one of the 108 men and women who made up the Platform Committee, pressed for stronger language on civil rights. He urged the Democratic Party to say specifically that if it won the election it would outlaw lynching, guarantee equal employment to all races, secure the Negro's admission to the polls, and treat the Negro like the white man in the armed forces. He could not put his amendment through the Platform Committee. So the Mayor of Minneapolis, 37 years old, unknown east of Chicago and south of Baton Rouge, decided to take the issue to the whole membership of the convention on the next day.

The New York Times does not tell us about the footwork that went on during the night and morning intervening between the two sessions. It does not name even one prominent person who joined in the effort to sell to the Democratic Party the idea that the time had come to incorporate the Negro in the American society. Here is what The New York Times had to say:

"Offered as an addition to the Resolution Committee's plank was the following:

"We highly commend President Harry Truman for his courageous stand on the issue of civil rights.

"We call upon the Congress to support our President in guaranteeing these basic and fundamental rights: 1) the right of full and equal political participation, 2) the right of equal opportunity of employment, 3) the right of security of person, and 4) the right of equal treatment in the services and defense of our nation."

"Mr. Humphrey (the Times tells us) started a demonstration lasting nearly ten minutes when he spoke (in support of his proposed amendment). 'There is no single religion, no single class, no single racial group,' he said. 'We are 172 years late in acting. It is now time for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadow of states' rights and walk forthrightly in the bright sunshine of human rights.'"

The proposed addition to the platform was adopted by a roll call vote of 651 1/2 for it and 582 1/2 against it. Thirty-five delegates from Southern states walked out of the convention later when Harry Truman was nominated for President.

This is the story told by the newspapers and the news magazines. From all that I have heard about the event, I would not say that the unknown Mayor of Minneapolis did this whole job by himself. But I do say that I have never heard any other person mentioned as deserving the credit he got. And I have never heard anybody suggest that the positive promises to do something about the Negro's condition would

3--Hyneman

have been made by the Democratic Party if the 37-year-old Mayor of Minneapolis had not taken on the job. In my own opinion, this event must stand side by side with the Supreme Court's Desegregation Decisions in the story of a New Deal for the Negro in America.

The reason for telling this story is to give you reason to believe that here is a man who is devoted to justice for all men in his public acts because he believes in justice for all men in his personal code of ethics. If you have thought that he did not for a few years speak as loudly for the Negro as he did in earlier years, the explanation is that he thought it more important to move men toward legislation than to put his name in the newspapers. I have heard it said that Hubert Humphrey was more influential than any other one man in bringing Lyndon Johnson to the conclusion that the Negro had to be made a full participant in the American political system. I see no reason to doubt that this is the fact.

The Vice President of the United States is not free to tell any audience everything he believes, for he has an obligation to support the policies of the President. But no Vice President has an obligation to deceive an audience, and here is one who is not going to deceive you. If your speaker tells you what the administration in Washington is doing he will not say that Hubert Humphrey thinks the administration is pursuing a wise policy unless Hubert Humphrey personally believes that policy to be wise. This is the man I know, and this is the kind of man who occupies the second office in the government of this nation.

Mr. Vice President, in my opinion the people of this audience are honored by having you address them.

Transcript of Vice President Humphrey's talk at Indiana University,  
September 23, 1966, 5:00 p.m.

MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you my very close and dear friend, Dr. Charles Hyneman, and I think everyone here can tell from that more than generous and dramatic and friendly introduction that he is my friend and I'm very pleased that he didn't tell you all. I'm pleased that Dr. Hyneman is a man of selectivity and has seen fit to select that which he considers the best and which I surely approve. Dr. Stahr, Professor Buehrig, my friend Senator Bayh that is here with me some place in this great auditorium, Panel, members of the faculty and students, I am sure you know that this is a special delight for me to be able to come to this great campus and I'm happy that I can be here on this the 23 day of September rather than to be here on the day that the Golden Gophers come to this city because I'm a bit worried--I seldom ever confess any lack of confidence or weakness but last week was not exactly a good beginning. It was 24 to 0 at Columbia, Missouri and we didn't get the 24. This has been a bad year for hometown--the Twins came in third--they only came in second last time, that is behind the Dodgers, but they're third this time behind Baltimore and Detroit, and the Golden Gophers have to face you and then they go up to that place called Michigan, and that's a little bit more than we ought to take on in two weeks running.

I'm here for several reasons and I'm going to come right to the point. I think first of all that every university audience ought to have an opportunity to take one good bite at a live, American politician, and I think that you ought to at least have a chance to take a sort of verbal --- verbal swing at the Vice President of the United States. I

MR. HUMPHREY (contd):     see where the Indiana Daily Student had a very fine editorial and I want to thank the editorial writer and the news and editorial staff that said that "Humphrey", and then it gives me a word that means a great deal to a man that is Vice President, it says "important." I want you to know I think this trip was really necessary. I seldom read that back in Washington. And then it goes on to say, "articulate." I'm glad to hear that 'cause some folks feel that I haven't been sufficiently articulate of late. They just haven't been listening and I decided I'd get out and "articulate" for those that haven't heard me become articulate. But I do want to thank the editor because he says, "Don't stay at home just because he's number two," and I must say that I have become fully convinced at long last that the editorials are read and this bothers me because many of the editorials that I've read about the Democratic administration and about the Vice President shouldn't have been read. But thank goodness on this campus you have and I'm really most grateful. Number two --- well it isn't the best but it's close, and like Avis, I try harder.

Then I think I should say to my dear good friend, Dr. Herman Wells, and to Dr. Stahr, your President, that I am a refugee from a classroom and I like to come around to these universities and sort of renew my credentials --- update them. You never can tell about this kind of politics I'm in --- the tenure is uncertain. And from what I read, it may be very uncertain. And I want Dr. Stahr to know that everything that Dr. Hyneman said about me is true and if he'd like me to sort of embellish it, I'm sure I could qualify for a position on this campus.

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): Now I'm going to talk to you just a little bit about the role of a university in the national life and what this university means, not only to Indiana but to our country and to many parts of the world. You know there was a time that a university or an education even in a university education was something that went on within the four walls of a classroom, but you and I know that's changed and now those walls have been opened up, not only by the --- not only to the community but to the whole world, and I can say that nowhere is this community orientation of a university more evident and this opening of a university to a whole world more evident than right here on this campus and in this great university. Before the war in most of our universities there were some courses that were offered, for example, in European Government. We called them "comparative governments," or basic courses in international relations and an occasional course on the Far East. And if you got down Texas way you might get a course in Latin America. Actually instructors leaned heavily on textbooks and most of this was typical of the great universities of our land. But today, those professors and those universities cover the entire world. And with particular emphasis upon the non-western countries, because our teachers, our professors, know that the peace of the world may very well be determined not in Western Europe but possibly in Asia, and surely the prospects for a happier world depend in a very large measure on what they're going to be able to do in Latin America, Africa and Asia.



MR. HUMPHREY (contd): Now your teachers and professors not only know the geography of this world today, and know a good deal about the cultures, but also specialize in the languages. They have learned how to communicate in the idiom --- in the language of the people. They've traveled extensively. Now we need that kind of knowledge in this country in depth and I say we need it because here's the United States that can rightly claim to be a world power, but to be a world power with a half-world knowledge is most unfortunate and could be dangerous. And therefore we have come to the conclusion at long last that our universities and the curricula of those universities should emphasize the breadth and scope of the world scene. There's nothing of course that quite takes the place of seeing these countries --- the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa, to know of their history and their tradition, their politics and their economics, and above all, to know of the hopes and aspirations of the people, and to know the individual countries because every country is different. If you travel as I have in Latin America, and as your Senator has, Senator Birch Bayh, you will know that every one of the Latin American countries, while most of them have Spanish culture, one of Portugese, and at least the Argentine and Chile have a mixture of Spanish and Western European, that each of them are separate. Each are as individualistic as a star in the heavens and you can not generalize. You need to know them separately. So the best thing to do is to see, to touch and to feel and not merely to read. This seeing gives you that essential background against which you can set what you read about them. Now I know that this is a land-locked

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): university, so to speak, but one of your distinguished Vice Presidents, and by the way, universities have several vice presidents. Look at the work I have to do --- just one in our country. Lynne Merritt said, when asked about this great university and its international endeavors, he says it's just a matter of living in a modern world. Nowadays you have to know what's happening in the world. To which I would add this: In today's world what you don't know can hurt you. And what we don't know is what we need to know promptly.

Now I know that members of the faculty of this university are in charge of government and private foundation programs in Pakistan. I visited those programs while I was in Pakistan, in Thailand --- I was there as well --- Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Uruguay, Peru and Venezuela. I believe that I visited more of the University of Indiana projects abroad than most Indianans have and most members of this great University family. I'm told that in any given year something like 70 members of your faculty are teaching abroad, and 200 or more of your students are studying overseas. And something like better than a thousand students from other countries are on this campus. What wonderful exchange of ideas and peoples, a cross-fertilization of intellectual ferment. This is what a campus ought to provide.

Now I'm also a great believer in brightening the corner where you are. Some of you may remember those words. And that means of course, bringing the world that Indiana has touched with its professors and students --- bringing that world right back to Indiana --- to enrich the lives of the people here, and to give the American people a better



MR. HUMPHREY (contd): understanding of the world in which they live. And it's not too much to say that this University has truly internationalized secondary education in this state, as well as enriching, and properly so, the international curricula of three-quarters of Indiana's institutions of higher education. It used to be that they said "go West and grow up with the country," and I think what Indiana is saying is "study the world and grow up with it." After all, this is the only world you have and this is the world in which we Americans have to live. I doubt that many of you are going to be on that first colony that we put on the moon. I have a few people I could suggest for it but they're unwilling to make the trip. And this world that is ours is not going to stop for us to get off, even though there's a song that indicates that we should. We're going to have to live here and we're going to have to work here and make the best of it. Let me say that one of the aspirations of your government and of your great University systems throughout this country, is to make this America of ours what Abraham Lincoln once called it, "the last best hope on earth," and we're doing that in a host of ways, by emphasis upon education --- not only quantity but quality --- there's only one word that should ever be used for American education and that's "excellence." There's no room for mediocrity in this nation. We need the best and we need to have more and more trained manpower and woman-power that can undertake the momentous tasks that lie ahead in science and technology and, indeed, in our social institutions and social structure.

And I'm very happy that I've been able to participate in the life of our nation and in the work of our government at a time in history

MR. HUMPHREY (contd):     when there is a great human revolution under way in which we're beginning to realize for once and for all the true meaning of the Emancipation Proclamation, and in which we're opening gates of opportunity to millions of people that never before had a chance to even touch that gate, much less open it or pass through it. I happen to believe that every American ought to be a participant in the life of this nation and I believe that our university students have a special obligation because of the good fortune which is theirs for higher education to help this nation move forward and to help the less fortunate get their first glimpse of the good life --- to help in the ghettos and in the slums, and to help people who for some reason or another can't help themselves.

Now this great university, like many others I've spoken to, is the link, is really the lengthened shadow of a man. There's always someone --- some figure --- that stands out that has in a very real sense brought an institution like this to its full maturity --- to the richness of its ability and its capacity. And I happen to know that my good friend, Chancellor Herman Wells, and the great work that he has performed in this University put the University of Indiana in the forefront as a truly great international university, and that this is being capably carried on by another good friend and a distinguished educator and administrator who has served his country as well as this University, Professor Elvis Stahr. And I salute these men as I salute the gentleman who's been my friend for better than 25 years, Dr. Charles Hyneman, who has counseled me and guided me --- who always has a bit of rebellion in his heart, who always knows how to question and cross-examine --- and who always expects you to do your best. Now I know I'm before a well-

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): informed audience and Harry Truman once said that every man who leaves Washington and speaks to a university audience ought to ask himself before he arrives, "Should I have really taken this trip?". I know that you're going to question me on many things and I hope you will. I will try, as Dr. Hyneman said, to give you an honest answer. I shall try to be informative and I want the student body of this University to know that I happen to believe that we have a special obligation, all of us now, to speak responsibly. I believe strongly in academic freedom. I believe that one of the sacred rights of our society is the right to dissent. Yes, I believe in that very important foundation or fountain of all freedoms --- intellectual freedom and the right of people to think for themselves --- to be different if you please. I've never forgotten --- I've never forgotten what John Kennedy said in one of his memorable addresses: "One of the goals of this nation was to make the world safe for diversity." And surely one of the goals of American life is to preserve the pluralism of our community --- to seek a unity without demanding unanimity --- to seek a unity based upon respect for the other man's point of view.

But just as I believe in academic freedom, and just as I believe in the right to dissent, I also believe in the right of advocacy and I believe in academic responsibility. They are not enemies. They are companions. And those who cherish academic freedom as I do and as you do have the greater responsibility to make sure that our utterances, that our advice and counsel is objective and unemotional --- that it is responsible and constructive --- that we offer alternatives and

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): options and not merely discussion and debate. Because ultimately there are those in positions of responsibility and leadership who, having listened to the discussion and the dialogue and the dissent and the debate, have to make decisions. And it's when you make the decision that you're tested. It is that moment when you really demonstrate whether you are a man of wisdom or whether you are merely a man of emotion.

Now I turn myself over to this gentle panel. I know that it will be that way. And I ask them to start now and ask me whatever questions they may wish and then we're gonna turn it over to you and I'm going to stay with you until six o'clock, according to your time, and I want you to make this the most fruitful hour of the mutual discussion that we can. I'm ready if you are. Let's go. Thank you.

EDWARD H. BUEHRIG: It's clear from what the Vice President has just said that it is not a surprise to him that since he sat at the feet of Charlie Hyneman, political science has not progressed very far in the direction of relieving the policymaker from the agony of choice. In order to introduce structure into the questioning we have the panel and we do hope that --- and --- we'll see to it that there is time also for questions from the floor. I've asked the panel to confine the first round of questions to Viet Nam. If there is time the panel will also ask questions on other matters. Although I doubt whether we can proceed to the second round. The panel will question in this order, Mr. Morris and Mr. Smith, Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Thompson.

BERNARD S. MORRIS: This member of the panel, Vice President Humphrey, will be gentle because he was well schooled by Dick Scanlon and Irvin Kirkpatrick, among others.

MR. HUMPHREY: Jungle fighters, I might add.

BERNARD S. MORRIS: Also to say that I guessed that some of the applause for academic freedom stemmed a little bit from some minor incident having to do with the DuBois Club on the campus. But I'll get to Viet Nam because I know you can't wait. We liberals --- I say we liberals are sharply divided over the policy in Viet Nam. The power of the liberals --- those for policy and against policy --- is a little out of balance. You, as Vice President, represent the authority of the administration and in addition, as Professor Hyneman pointed out, have a distinguished record --- as a liberal and a fighter for civil rights. The --- what shall I say --- the professor is the intellectual in opposition are powerless and feel themselves very futile. In Washington the egghead in residence is a liberal but one who is --- pro, strongly pro Viet Nam --- a strange choice for a professor to be in residence at the White House, though I console myself by thinking of the Humpty Dumpty rhyme. And as liberals we are concerned with things like means and ends and it seems to me that there has been some disproportion in the means used to accomplish our objectives --- what I take to be the administration's objectives --- in Viet Nam. Viet Nam has experienced so-called strategic bombing, chemical warfare, napalm --- the sort of destruction I don't

BERNARD S. MORRIS (contd):     have to elaborate on. There has been what you might call a Viet Nam backlash in this country where --- not merely things like inflation --- one doesn't even hear the rhetoric of the Great Society any more, and, indeed, there is an incipient neo-McCarthyism in the country when it comes to dissension on Viet Nam. But I won't even talk about the means because I don't think I'm really known as a liberal on the campus --- just a liberal to Scanlon and Kirkpatrick. What I'm known as is a realist in international affairs. And speaking as a realist it seems to me that the means that we have used have not achieved our strategic objectives in Viet Nam. And here I would say that our objective in Viet Nam as I read the administration, was indeed to win. I think that that political sect called the Republican party has a good point here. To win --- that is to say, a rational --- to force the enemy to make --- to come to terms --- a rational political settlement. And it seems that we have not succeeded in bringing Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Cong to their senses. This gets to be a long --- and I trust that Vice President Humphrey's experience at the Political Science Association is accustomed to this form of declarative questioning, but I'll be through in a minute. It seems to me that the opposition now has a better case than it has ever had before because its case stands on the failure of the administration to achieve its objectives in Viet Nam with the great power of the United States in force in that country. And what I think of now is a statement by another writer who said: "In Viet Nam Secretary McNamara has met his Edsel." As a businessman he would've cut his losses. However, losses in a normal foreign policy

BERNARD S. MORRIS (contd):     are more nebulous than a credit-debit ledger. I hope that some of the pragmatism of the American people and of American businessmen will be carried over into our foreign policy operations so that we might concede more now than we were willing to concede say a year ago. All this to ask you now, what are we prepared to concede to Ho Chi Minh and to Viet Nam for political --- as political conditions --- for discussion and for settlement --- hoping that this comes about now before there's a further escalation of the war and perhaps an invasion of Viet Nam and a chance of bringing China in. Thanks very much ---

MR. HUMPHREY: Thanks, Mr. Morris. Professor Morris, I'm not at all disturbed by your declaratory question because as a member of the United States Senate we ask questions like that many, many times. You know you can not ask another senator to yield except for a question and I, on occasion, --- I have had a question that lasted 25 to 30 minutes and I feel --- I feel that you're a very gentle and considerate and prudent man in light of some of my own transgressions, so I shall try to answer. First just let me make these observations since you did dwell on several observations of your own. The point was made, or at least asserted, that the rhetoric of the Great Society had disappeared. That is not true. That is not true. Our investments, for example, in aid to education today are up in the last three years from  $4\frac{1}{2}$  billion to 10.3 billion. Our investments in what we call the civilian programs affecting our cities from the federal government are 24 billion ---  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times greater than

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): they were 2 years ago. We haven't quit. The Great Society includes voting rights legislation, civil rights legislation. It includes clean air --- it includes a battle against the pollution of our streams. It includes the demonstration cities built. It includes rent supplements. It includes higher education and the war on poverty. And while we haven't been able to do all that we would have liked, we have made some, I think, brave beginnings and rather significant ones --- Project Head Start, Job Corps centers with all of their mistakes and all of their limitations --- have done things that are good. Upwardbound for gifted students from our ghettos and slums --- we not only talked about these things, we've been doing them and I know because I have something to do about them. I help coordinate these programs. I help make them work. I've gone into the slum areas of our great cities --- not only to carry a message --- but to activate a program. So the rhetoric is there and so is the substance. But like in a family, sometimes when there is tragedy or when there is illness, you don't always do all that you want for everybody while you combat the illness, and I happen to think there's an illness in this world and I want to talk a little bit about it.

I don't think there's any neo-McCarthyism on dissent. This nation has --- if there's any one thing that I've seen --- it's a large number of placards in the last 2½ years --- there's been no shortage of those --- I have yet to go to a university campus, I have yet to go to a major public meeting but what there are not only dissenters but very loud ones and sometimes, may I say, with not too good manners, but that's



MR. HUMPHREY (contd): still their privilege. I had this happen to me at a campus even like Rutgers. I had it happen to me this afternoon at Muhlenburg College in Pennsylvania. Nobody denied them their right to picket. Nobody denies people their right to dissent. Nobody says they can't be heard on the radio and the television. They're heard all the time. There is no censorship. This government has protected jealously every right to dissent because we believe that in the search for truth you need to have many minds searching for it. And you need the contest --- the competition of ideas. But may I say that those of us that have a different point of view, that our advocate, we too are entitled to the right to be heard. And we're entitled to the same kind of respect that the dissenter is entitled to. I think that what this nation needs is not a debate, nearly as much as it needs communication and discussion --- that we need to learn what the President said we needed in this world, conciliation and reconciliation of views. Now the objective that we seek was well stated by Mr. Morris and I think I took it down, "a rational political settlement," and that is right. It will require a political settlement in Viet Nam and, hopefully, a rational one. We know that this struggle can not be won by military means alone. This is a struggle on the military, the political, and the economic, and the diplomatic front. And while most of the news of Viet Nam is about the battle count, you and I know and I've been there and some of you have, that we are engaged in nation building as well. We have helped the Vietnamese to help themselves. We've helped them build thousands of classrooms, thousands of public health centers. We've helped them

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): print 4½ million textbooks. We've helped them expand their university. We've helped them improve their higher education and yet may I say that half of the classrooms which the Vietnamese have built with their own labor with our help and some of our technical assistance have been burned to the ground by the Viet Cong. And half of the health centers and hospitals likewise. Now what are some of the facts? And I'm a political scientist and I've studied the facts and I am permitted as one in this government to know a little bit about what develops in other parts of the world. The National Liberation Front. It is neither national nor is it engaged in liberation. It has one honest word, "front." It was started --- I venture to say that there's not a person in this audience, including your intelligent faculty, that can give me the name of the man who heads the National Liberation Front. Who are these people that have this passion for anonymity? You know Ho Chi Minh. Well, he's not from South Viet Nam. The National Liberation Front was launched in the month of September in 1959 by a meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee in Hanoi and it was established as a front of propaganda and subversion and intrusion and in penetration and aggression in South Viet Nam. And so was stated openly on the radio of Hanoi. Known in every capital and chancellory of the world. I've traveled in the Asian countries. I've talked with Dr. Radhakrishnan, President of India, and do you think he denies for a single minute that the National Liberation Front isn't a North Vietnamese Communist front. He knows that it is. He frankly

MR. HUMPHREY (contd):      says so. I know of no single statesman in the non-Communist world that does not readily admit that the National Liberation Front was spawned, designed and exported from Hanoi. Also, we also know that there are military forces from Hanoi active in South Viet Nam --- active in Laos, active in Thailand. Souvanna Phouma, the neutralist premier of Laos, a man who during other days was looked upon in this United States as a friend of the Communists, and how many times I heard that from representatives of government. Souvanna Phouma came into my office last year in October when President Johnson was in the hospital recovering from his operation --- came down from the United Nations and said these words to me. He said, "Without your presence in South Viet Nam there could be no Laos." And what did the Prime Minister of Singapore, who is no friend of the United States, say only recently? Prime Minister Lee, he said the presence of the United States in South Viet Nam is all that spares the independence of Singapore and other Southeast Asian countries. These are no lackeys of the United States. Our --- our objective a political settlement. Are we prepared for it? Did you listen to Arthur Goldberg yesterday? Your --- the address before the United Nations? We're not the ones that rebuke the efforts to peace. This Vice President was sent to the Far East on a mission of peace. The Japanese Prime Minister Sato has appointed a special ambassador from Japan as his emissary for peace. We've knocked on every door for peace. Pope Paul has used his good offices for peace. The President of India has used his good offices for peace. The British

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): Commonwealth has used their good offices for peace. The 17 unaligned countries headed by Yugoslavia have used their good offices for peace. The Vice President of the United Arab Republic, whom I have conversed with and met with and discussed with, has sought to use his good offices for peace, and every one of those good offices was accepted by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State or his emissary. And every one of them were rejected by the Viet Cong and North Viet Nam. And even as of this late date when other pleas were made by three Asian countries, the Asian initiative from Malaysia, from Thailand and from the Philippines, an opportunity offered just to discuss the possibilities for the talk of peace --- the door was slammed shut.

I think those are facts that are readily known. Yes, we want a political settlement. We're ready to de-escalate and your Ambassador to the United Nations said yesterday that we are prepared to enter into an understanding and agreement through neutral auspices, a third party or bi-lateral arrangements. To de-escalate our military activity, to withdraw systematiccaly forces from South Viet Nam if North Viet Nam will systematically withdraw their forces from South Viet Nam. We are prepared to de-escalate and including the slowing down and removing of bombing of the North if the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong are prepared to de-escalate and stop their hostilities in the South. We used our bombers because there were military objectives and we happen to think that petroleum dumps which feed planes, trucks, which are used for the purposes of infiltration, are legitimate military objectives. The fact

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): of the matter is that no amount of air power will be enough to defeat a nation or to bring it apparently to its senses. We know that but we have an obligation to protect the forces of the United States and the free nations that are associated there with us and we with them, and what kind of a President and what kind of a military commander would it be that knew and had incontrovertible evidence that massive flows of petroleum were coming in to supply an ever-increasing number of trucks to infiltrate troops for the North if we did nothing about it. Of course, we had to do something about it. Napalm they said. Now, my dear friends, I don't like to talk about war but you use guns, planes and bombs and napalm in war. And I want to say to those who are concerned what we consider to be the atrocities and the terrible things that happen from our armed forces, and war is hell; it's no little Sunday afternoon picnic, and there's no use of going around comparing who has been the meanest, but I'll tell you this, that when the Viet Cong walks into a hospital and kills the people that are in there that are innocent --- that is an atrocity. When they put bombs in a hotel and kill people that are innocent --- in this struggle that's an atrocity. But why try to keep the score that way? The fact is that this nation is pursuing peace. This nation is prepared and this is the word, not only of a man talking on this campus, but of the Vice President of the United States, a member of the National Security Council, and the Cabinet of the United States, and I am privileged to be in on every decision and I have been in on those decisions and I have supported them. In fact, I have encouraged some of them.

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): This Vice President, speaking to you as the second highest office of this land, states as our policy, that we are prepared to go any place at any time under any auspices to meet with anybody to try to find some way to bring a political settlement of this war. And we have said we would go without any preconditions. We said that we would negotiate quietly. We have said that we would try to extract no conditions. What we want to do is to talk. We'd like to get a cease-fire but my fellow-Americans, when I'm asked, what are we prepared to concede to Ho Chi Minh, I want some Americans to ask what Ho Chi Minh is prepared to concede. He's involved in this. We're prepared to negotiate and we're prepared to come there to negotiate without any preconditions. And anybody that knows anything about negotiation diplomacy knows that you don't go about spelling out every single thing that you're gonna say and do before you start. You can't even negotiate a contract with a professor under those terms --- much less to negotiate a political settlement and a diplomatic settlement. Walter Ruether has negotiated some rather important settlements in the automobile industry. He was asked a question like that. "What are you prepared to concede to Ho Chi Minh?" He said, "Do you think I would get anywhere with General Motors if I started out telling them what I'm prepared to concede before I even start?" What we want Ho Chi Minh to do is start to recognize that this is a dangerous situation and to recognize one other thing --- that there's no power on the face of this earth that can drive us from that part of the world. And the sooner that that's understood the sooner there will be some reasonable talk about peace. We want it. We're prepared for it. The President

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): of the United States has already set in motion machinery to make sure that every base that is there becomes the property of South Viet Nam --- not an American Military base. We're prepared for the neutralization of the area. We're prepared to meet under the terms of the Geneva accords. We've appealed to the International Control Commission.

We're prepared to have any auspices and I suggest that as a liberal, and I am a liberal, that they remember their history. It was the liberals who said we ought to resist Hitler. It was the liberals in this country that organized the ADA --- that said that we ought to keep on the American so-called liberal and progressive movement communist infiltration. It was the liberal who stood fast when Harry Truman made his decision about Berlin. It was the liberal who supported the Truman Doctrine that helped Greece defeat the first communist war of national liberation. It was the liberal, if you please, that said they believe in international conduct that was peaceful. It was the liberal who branded aggression in any form as a menace to the peace of the world and I don't think you're very liberal if you're only liberal with Europe. I think that the doctrine of international responsibility which is inherent in the doctrine of American liberalism encompasses the world and I do not believe that aggression in Europe is any greater threat to the world peace than aggression in Asia. In fact, I think that aggression in Asia may very well be the largest threat to world peace and I don't think you're much of a liberal if you're willing to turn over the fate of 15 million people in South Viet Nam to a Communist party and a Communist political regime. I don't call that liberalism. Communism is the very

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): antithesis of liberalism. And it's time for the American liberal to remember that he was the man that was for aid to the allies, he was the man that wanted to resist the Japanese in the Pacific, he was the man that wanted to resist Nazism in Europe, he was the man that said we must resist Communism in Europe, he was the man, if you please, that said liberalism requires you to be an international citizen -- a world citizen. And I repeat, Asia is part of the world.

It happens to be my view that I think that we are preventing the possibility of the catastrophe of World War III by our position today in Southeast Asia where we're closing the security gap --- a gap that exists there and is there --- and to those who have any doubt as to peaceful intentions, remember India. India fashioned its foreign policies to meet Mao and Chou en Lai like no other country ever did. India's foreign policy was constantly designed to be pleasing to China, and yet twice in 5 years China, without provocation, invaded India. You don't need to irritate a Communist regime in China --- they had no irritant from India --- but they're militant --- they're aggressive, and now they're disturbed and they're in trouble and they're dangerous. And this government of yours seeks to prevent the escalation of this struggle --- this government of yours seeks to bring it to the conference table. We've appealed to the United Nations --- we've appealed to every forum that we know to give us help in seeking peace. And I think the liberal community of America ought to stand up and admit that liberalism requires that you have respect for human dignity wherever human beings are found, not just in part of the world.



MR. HUMPHREY (contd): Long question, long answer.

PETER SMITH (STUDENT): Assuming that the Viet Cong are not going to negotiate with us, in your opinion would it help the war much in the South if the port of Haiphong in the North were to be blockaded by mining the harbor or other means?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, that is one of the suggestions that has been made repeatedly --- but one that has as of this date, of course, been turned down by our government because we think this involves some rather serious international implications. We feel that in this instance that we could have very serious trouble with the Soviet Union and we seek to have as normal a relationship with the Soviet Union as it is possible. And I am for one convinced that the Soviet Union's not at all happy about this struggle that's going on in Viet Nam, but it finds itself in a very difficult position because of the contest of ideology in the Communist world. So we have, as your question indicates, refused to take the position that a blockade --- a naval blockade --- or the mining of the port of Haiphong would be militarily desirable in light of the political consequences that it might entail. Every decision that you make has to be judged one way with all sorts of factors weighed and involved. Just as the decision to bomb the petroleum dumps, the POL's, we had to be extremely careful that any time there's a bombing run or bombing mission that there is not a ship in port that could possibly be by mistake, and by mistake, I repeat, the victim of an American bomb. And thus far, may I say, we've

MR. HUMPHREY (contd)        been careful and we will continue to be so. But in every struggle like this with planes that travel at supersonic speed, and they do travel at 1500 to 1600 miles an hour, it is almost impossible to be totally sure that you will not have some error of distance or of judgment. Therefore, we're not going to, at this stage, as I see it, and I hope, may I say, speaking for myself, get into the position where we will mine or in any way block off --- blockade --- the port of Haiphong. I don't think it's really that important.

What I do think is important is to get this message clear --- that no one has ever told you that this struggle would be over in a year. The British fought in Malaysia for 7 years. Magsaysay fought in the Philippines and his successors for 6 years, with the Huks. Wars of national liberation, as the Mao doctrine calls them, are not something that is over in a hurry. It is my own view that when the men of the North discover that they can not take this country over, that they will retreat and come back another day, as they say. Just as they did in Malaysia and just as they did in the Philippines.

There are men in Asia who --- who do understand a great deal about what is going on in that part of the world. I hope, therefore, that it will be possible for us not to extend this struggle any further to the North. We do not want to violate, by land forces, the territorial integrity of North Viet Nam. Your President has said we do not even --- we do not seek to destroy that regime. Have you forgotten that your President said that we wanted to have North Viet Nam if it would but come to peace to participate in the great economic rehabilitation of the peninsula of Southeast Asia? Have you heard any such words out of

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): Peking? Have you heard any such words out of Hanoi? I think not. This government has offered every conceivable --- every conceivable help to those who are in battle today if they would but come back to their lines, go behind their boundaries, reconvene the Geneva Convention, try to find some political settlement for this area. But let it be clear. I don't want ever my words to be misunderstood. We are not going to retreat from that area because there are some voices in this land or elsewhere that wish we were not there. We are there. This has been a long-term problem. We are not merely seeking to suppress aggression, which, by the way, is a mandate under the charter of the United Nations. Two requirements of every member of the United Nations are to suppress aggression and to promote self-determination, were a signatory by treaty to that charter, and we are there to prevent the success of aggression. We are not there to invade the North. We are not there to destroy the North. We're not there to unseat Ho Chi Minh. We are there to bring this war to a halt and to permit the people of South Viet Nam to make their choices as to the kind of government they want, who shall sit in their government, what kind of government, whether they wish to unite with the North, whether they wish to be aligned, whether they wish to be neutral. These are matters for them to decide. We're only asking for the opportunity as an ally for a conference to permit peace to come to that land so that political decisions can be made.

BARRY WHEELER (STUDENT): Well, Mr. Humphrey, I thank you for your lesson on liberalism and I hope the I.U. students take it to heart, but at this

BARRY WHEELER (contd): point I feel the discussion on Viet Nam is no longer --- it's no longer possible, and so since you mentioned academic freedom in your speech, I would like to switch the topic to that. And the question I have is very simple. Do you believe that groups of students should be free to organize, register and conduct activities in a communist organization in a free university as long as those activities are legal in the laws of the United States?

MR. HUMPHREY: My own belief is that yes, they have a right to do it. My own suggestion is --- my own suggestion is that they will be of no help. That those who live --- that those who live by dogma have closed minds --- they are not --- a communist club is not a believer in academic freedom, otherwise it wouldn't be a communist club. I want to give some advice to my non-communist friends. I want to give you some advice, my dear friends. Let me tell you, these communist clubs are activists and a few activists can make a majority look mighty apathetic and might be weak. And I suggest to you --- I suggest to you that if you do have such organizations on your campus, that you find some other organizations that know how to talk about sound, sensible progressivism and liberalism.

BARRY WHEELER: But Mr. Humphrey, if I understand you right, they do have the right to organize and to carry on activities on this university ---

MR. HUMPHREY: Under the laws of the United States. What your campus provisions are, that's something that I'm not --- or what your State laws are ---

MR. HUMPHREY (contd):     what the University's are ---

BARRY WHEELER:         Should the campus provisions differ from the United States provisions?

MR. HUMPHREY:     Well, of course, there are many a state law that differs from the law of the United States. My good friend, you're a student of government I'm sure.

BARRY WHEELER:         Of course.

MR. HUMPHREY:     I just hope that their membership is so pusillanimous that it will be non-existent. Quite frankly, these outfits don't deserve all of this attention. They really don't.

BARRY WHEELER:         But you gave it to 'em.

MR. HUMPHREY:     Any more, may I say, any more than the paraders and placadeers do. I go to a university campus where there are 15,000, 10,000 students that are willing to sit and listen and talk and argue and then I'll find 10 or 15 out there and they'll have some homemade placards and they're waving 'em around. And may I say with all due respect that that camera and that photographer gets that picture of those placards and that's what appears. As if to tell the American people that the student bodies of the American universities are just filled with these. Now I think they're entitled to

MR. HUMPHREY (contd):     some space. I think they're entitled to be heard. I think they're entitled for their picture in the paper. I think they're entitled to meet and I think they're entitled to placard. And I think they're entitled to parade. All of it. But I want to make it equally clear they'd do a whole lot more for their country if they'd start to participate in many of the programs that this country has under way. We need some more Peace Corps volunteers and if you want to work for peace, there's a good place to start. And we need some people to join VISTA --- Volunteers In Service To America. We need some young students to go on out and help the deprived and unfortunate children of America with tutorial work. We need them in the slums and the ghettos where you can do something about peace in your city --- where you can do something about a better life in your community. You don't prove yourself a great humanitarian by just proving your worried about Viet Nam. Why don't you get worried about Indianapolis and Bloomington? Well, we got enough time for one more. Mr. Thompson.

JOHN THOMPSON:     Mr. Vice President, just as a footnote I think you should know that some peaceful demonstrators who went to Indianapolis when President Johnson came to speak in Indianapolis, were arrested, were not allowed to hold up their placards, were not treated in the fashion you described. I don't know whether the administration is aware of that. That's not the question. The question I have, Mr. Vice President ---

MR. HUMPHREY: May I just say so that there isn't any reflection on your national administration. They parade in front of the White House day in and day

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): out, and they're around the Executive Office Building and I've gotten a very good acquaintance and ---. As a matter of fact I gotta tell you a story. I went to Australia and when I arrived before the Parliament, so help me, there were about 25 pickets and I just couldn't help but feel a little more comfortable and a little bit more at home. When I arrived in Cambarra, Australia on the evening there was a beautiful sunset. Sort of like a Texas sunset. When I --- when I awakened in the morning and opened the windows there was a cool breeze that came through, sort of like a Minnesota breeze, and when I went to the lunch that noon, after seeing the pickets in front of the Parliament Building, I was privileged to address the luncheon of the Cabinet and the Ministers and Parliament, and I said to Prime Minister Holt how much I'd appreciated the generosity and the hospitality extended to me because they were very generous and kindly to us. I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, you --- you've really gone out of your way. You've made me feel so much at home. I arrived last night in this beautiful Texas sunset. It made me feel once again my depth of loyalty to the United States, to the President and to Texas. I arose --- I awakened in the morning and I felt like I was back in Minnesota when that good, clean, brisk, fresh air came rushing through the window of the Ambassador's home." And then I said, "When I came to the Parliament you knew I hadn't seen a demonstration for quite some time and there you had some of the best I've ever seen right out there in front. And more importantly, may I say, not only did you give us a good demonstration, but you went out of your way. The head of the demonstration, the one that organized it was a lady from Brooklyn who

MR. HUMPHREY (contd): was a graduate of the University of California, attending the University of Australia under a federal scholarship from the United States of America." I said, --- and that is a true story and I said, "You have proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that not only do we believe in the right of dissent, we're willing to pay for it."

JOHN THOMPSON: Mr. Vice President, there's been some discussion that the present administration has lost touch with the intellectuals in this country --- that there is an estrangement --- that Mr. Goldman left the White House because he felt there was no communication, no dialogue. Is this your view, or do you feel there are ways in which the universities and other intellectual resources can be of help to the administration?

MR. HUMPHREY: My goodness! I --- I know that there is a great need for the dialogue. There isn't any doubt about that. And I know above all that the university, and its faculty and its experts and its technicians are constantly needed in our government. And, of course, they are men like John Gartner who is Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, has panels of university specialists. Every department of our government does. This government isn't all the White House. It's run out of the many departments of your government --- of your Cabinet. There is --- there are 7 Ph.D. ex-professors in the Cabinet of the United States and they're not exactly beyond the pale of being called intellectuals. You see, I'm not one that believes that you prove yourself to be an intellectual when you disagree. I don't think that makes you an intellectual. I really find many people around the country that agree with what the President is



MR. HUMPHREY (contd):     doing and they're fine students, honor students, have written many books. They're intellectuals. I don't suppose I can qualify, but I did get through and I did do some teaching and I did get as Dr. Hyneman said, a couple of those honors they were passing out. Of course, the standards weren't as high then as they are now, but we do not want the lack of touch and communication between the President and the academic community. Mr. John Roach, Brandeis University, only a few years ago considered to be one of the bright lights in American academic life, I know, I remember when he was elected President of the ADA. I remember the critical statements that he would make many times of government policies, and I remember how he was cheered. And I know the respect in which he was held in the American Political Science Association. The respect that Dr. Irvin Kirkpatrick has held in the American Political Science Association. Richard Stammen, to mention a few others. I could go down the line. Dr. Charles Hyneman. There are many others here. They happen, many of them, to agree in the main with the administration, but for some reason or another, if you're not on the other side of this Vietnamese debate, you're not included in that select elite group. It's called the "intellectuals" by the commentator, by the columnist or by the person that judges who are the intellectuals and who they're not --- who are not. No I think there are many intellectuals today that are with us in this government and the worse thing that could happen to this government of ours would be an estrangement between the men of thought, reflection and meditation and the men who have to make policy decisions in this government. Nothing

MR. HUMPHREY (contd):     would be more tragic. And if there is any estrangement, if there is today any aloofness one place or another, then it is of top priority that we do something about it. I find it very refreshing to sit around at night with my professor friends, discuss and argue, and they work me over and how. None of us has all of the facts. None of us know that we have the truth. I'm not at all sure that all that we're doing in Viet Nam is the right way to do it. I could agree with many things that Mr. Morris has said today. I'm not at all sure that the policies that we've pursued in North Viet Nam --- the military tactics --- are doing what they ought to do. But I want some other suggestions. Not merely to be told that you're wrong and that you ought to stop it, but what else do you suggest? Because options and alternatives are the real definition of a constructive intellectual. Not merely to point out the difficulties.

Well, I've been here and taken a lot of your time and I think we ought to have at least one sampling from this audience and I know there must be somebody back there that really wants to let me have one, and I'll take the question and you can --- yes, sir --- yes, ma'am or yes, sir, who is it? The gentleman --- I see a man here, sir.

GENTLEMAN IN AUDIENCE:   Vice President Humphrey, yesterday the House Rules Committee passed by a vote of 9 to 5 I believe ..... the National Dunes Park, and at the present time the Governor of Indiana, Roger Branigin, I believe certain other public officials, especially Northern

GENTLEMAN IN AUDIENCE (contd):      Indiana, are trying to establish ..... for Northern Indiana. I was wondering what your personal view on this is? Will the Federal government allow --- not allow --- but will the Federal government have anything with regard to ..... I believe Senator Bayh talked to the President briefly about this.

MR. HUMPHREY: I think you'd be a whole lot better off to rely upon the advice and counsel of Senator Bayh, your Governor and your other officials. I'm not at all sure I can give you an intelligent answer on that. I really have not --- really I'm not ducking your question --- I just don't know.



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



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