

VICE-PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT BOSTON COLLEGE, OCTOBER 13, 1966

Father McEwen, members of the panel, my fellow Democrats, the soon to be guiding lights of the great sovereign state of Massachusetts, I have just been informed by Father McEwen that I could give a political speech if I would like to. My goodness, this is like saying to a child, "You can have candy if you just reach out and take it." But I'm going to resist the temptation because today I want to be very non-partisan and speak to you in terms of the benefits that this country can have with the Democratic administration.

Truly though, I know that this splendid student audience would much rather have questions tossed to the speaker rather than have the speaker toss out his ideas without any reference to what your desires are to you. And I have said to the panel that I would make but a very brief opening statement and then I want to get right at it because I am one of those Americans who believes that every citizen is entitled to one bite at a live politician and here I am. And I want you to have your chance.

I appreciate your reference to the distinguished former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. Harry Truman always used to say when he visited a university or a college campus, he said he used to say to himself, "I wondered if that trip was really necessary," knowing full well the pointedness of the questions, the relevancy of the questions, and the desire of the student body to have frank and candid answers. Today, I am going to try to do that.

I use as a text for what I have to say today, so that I may place it in academic terms in a proper frame of reference, the lines from a

great President, an outstanding historian and political scientist, a former President of the great university, Woodrow Wilson. Woodrow Wilson said, "I love the Democratic party but I love America a great deal more," which is a way of saying that, while partisanship is surely necessary in the competition of political ideas in a free nation, that partisanship must take second place at least or must be put in its proper place in reference to what you stand for in terms of your country. I heard the President of the United States mention this the other day as he was speaking in New Jersey and he defined his partisanship along these lines: President Johnson said, "First, I am a free man; secondly, an American; a public servant, third; and a Democrat fourth," in that order. And I can think of no better way for a man who serves in public office in this great country to properly station himself in terms of his values and his priorities.

May I say to these students that one of the most encouraging signs that I see as I travel across this land, and I travel a great deal, is the sense of restlessness and ferment, of concern and interest in public affairs, by student leaders, faculty members, and thought leaders in our great country. I've been doing a good deal of public speaking throughout my life and I have visited hundreds of college campuses. Ten years ago, when you went to a campus in a forum like this, ordinarily the dean of student affairs would meet you at the side door and he would be shaking all over and he would say, "I hope you're not going to discuss anything controversial." That day is all over. Now the bulletin boards, instead of carrying social notices about where the next party is going to be, that is there too of course, also carries with it some notes that ask for volunteers in the Peace Corps

or ask for someone to lead a protest movement or join in a protest or in an exercise of dissent. In other words, I think that there is more concern, more keen interest in social values and political values today in the generation of young Americans that now grace our campuses than in any time in my memory. And I want to say to those who are in the field of protest and dissent that you haven't led any more causes than I have. I've been in it myself. I have great respect for those people who speak out but I must say that speaking out is not the only responsibility of a citizen. The right to be heard, the right to have one's point of view, the right to protest, the right to dissent, also carries with it the obligation of presenting feasible and plausible alternatives. With academic freedom comes academic responsibility. With the citizenship privileges comes citizenship duties and responsibilities. Having said that, I think the best thing for me to do now is let this panel open up on me and see if we can't get down to some specific issues that may be of interest to you -- alright, who's the first panel member?

- Q. Mr. Vice-President: a recent poll showed that 43% of the American people are in favor of the Administration's conduct of the war and 39% are not. I realize that many times these polls only tell the story that those who pay for them want to hear. In other words, they are not always totally accurate, but even so, there are many Americans in all walks of life, including the military who say the United States is fighting this war in Viet Nam with one hand tied behind its back. And, for the first time in our history, we are actually in danger of

losing a war. I think the question that sums this all up is, "Why doesn't the United States mobilize and get this war over as quickly as possible?"

- A. May I say our objective is to get this war over as quickly as possible but the method of getting it over may be somewhat debatable and let me address myself to your question. Your question indicates, of course, that while a majority of the American people support the Administration's policies relating to Viet Nam, there is a sizeable number, almost equal, who do not and of that group - what was it 39% - of that group, about 21% of the 39% think we ought to be doing more - not less. So that the desire that is expressed through the polls, at least, from the public, and I have reason to believe that those polls reflect current public opinion, the desire is to do more to step up the activity rather than to ease it off.

Now, what is the Administration's policy? The Administration's policy on the war in Viet Nam is to bring to bear that amount of strength which is necessary for the achievement of our objectives. Now, what are our objectives? Our objectives are to prevent the success of that aggression - our objectives are to stop the aggression - our objective is to permit the peoples of South Viet Nam to exercise the right of self-determination and, together with themselves and those who may be able to help them, to build a viable economy and a free society. Those are our objectives. Now, our objective is not to conquer North Viet Nam - our objective is not to invade any other land and I can say to you that it doesn't take any great deal of statesmanship to get this world into a World War - any fool can do that.

And it is a very dangerous period in which we live - the period of nuclear power - the space age and the nuclear age - a period of great tensions between many nations and, in the Asian area, we face a militant Asian communism that is reckless and, at times, irresponsible, highly militant and aggressive. We are not seeking to have a major war - we are seeking to prevent one. And our purpose in Viet Nam, above all, is to prevent the outbreak of World War III. We happen to think that aggression unchecked is unleashed. We think that aggression as a form of political conduct or as a form of international activity for the achievement of political objectives is highly dangerous. So what we seek to do is put out the fire rather than expand it and we know that ultimately these struggles must be settled politically - that there isn't any easy military victory - that in Viet Nam you have a military front - an economic front - a political front and a diplomatic front. The greatest weakness in Viet Nam today is not military power. There is no power on the face of the earth that can drive the United States and the allies of the free nations in South Viet Nam - no combination of powers that can do so - but I think, having said that, it can also be stated that it is not possible to settle the problems of Southeast Asia simply by military methods. The military has a role to play - a role of checking the aggressor - to permit South Viet Nam to work out its destiny - painfully sometimes - slowly I'm sure, and with fits and starts not always with an even trend so that ultimately you can have a free country that can make its own decisions as to what it wants to do with its own resources - whether it wishes to be a neutral - whether it wishes to join with the north - whether it wishes to have an alignment - whatever its self-determination may be.

So that, I must say to Mr. Egan that, if the American people feel that the answer to our problems is massive war, and I don't think they do, then we are headed down the road of catastrophe because in the period in which we live, there is no place that is safe in a nuclear exchange. And make no mistake about it, we run the risk every day in Viet Nam of major escalation unless we apply political responsibility - political judgment and diplomatic restraint. We seek to bring the enemy to the conference table for a negotiated settlement. We seek to pursue the cause of peace. We can win wars and lose a world. We can win battles and lose our cause. We haven't yet lost a battle in Viet Nam. Militarily, we have had phenomenal success.

The problem in Viet Nam today is building a nation - not tearing it apart. We have the bombs, guns and the weapons to destroy, to destroy and to destroy. What we are seeking to do is to find the manpower and to find the talent - to find the skill to build a community - to reunite a people or to unite a people. And nation building is much more difficult than nation destroying. So, your government today pursues the cautious, prudent but sensible course of exercising restraint upon the use of power.

I want this audience to know that your nation has so much power that it is almost beyond human comprehension and the greatest responsibility that the President of the United States has, and the greatest burden upon his conscience and upon his judgment, is how to use that power with restraint - how to use it for limited objectives - how to use it for specific purposes - without having the power-complex take over reason and rationality. That is my answer and I think we are pursuing the right course.

Q. In recent months, the popularity of Senator Robert Kennedy has enjoyed a dramatic up-swing while that of President Johnson has been dropping steadily. How do you explain this and are you alarmed by it in terms of your prospects for your own political future?

A. Well, that is the question that I get about as often as any and I want to make a few pertinent, I hope, and helpful observations.

First of all, I think it can be fairly said that the Senator from New York, Robert Kennedy, does enjoy immense political popularity. And all I can say is - I thank goodness that he's a Democrat. I sure appreciate that. And I might add that his esteemed and distinguished brother, whom I consider to be a very personal friend and one that I admire and think is one of the finest Senators in the United States Senate, Ted Kennedy, enjoys a great popularity. He's going to be in my state this weekend. Now, it has been reported in the polls that, from time to time, some polls show that the Senator from New York, Mr. Kennedy, has a greater or is coming close to the popularity level of the President. May I just say that Senators and Presidents have different roles to perform. Senator Kennedy is an able man - he's a brilliant man - he knows his work. But he's a Senator. I served as a Senator and, as a Senator, you have a great deal of freedom of choice - a great deal of freedom of expression and freedom of movement, so to speak, intellectually, politically, and every other way.

The President of the United States has the responsibility for the guidance of the destiny of this nation. And I don't think it helps anyone to compare popularity ratings. President Johnson has popularity ratings that have gone as high as 80% in the United States in certain states. He's very popular out in my part of the country right now and I gathered from what I saw in Brooklyn yesterday that he is so popular

there that it is almost illegal. He had thousands and thousands of people. What is important is that President Johnson makes the decisions that are in this nation's national interest and in the interest of world peace. And when you start to make tough decisions, decisions on Viet Nam, decisions on inflation, decisions in reference to the budget, decisions that effect the lives of millions of people, at home and abroad, you draw down on that bank of popularity. You see, popularity is like a line of credit in a bank - it is to be used. What is most important for a President is not that he is popular but that he's right - and a popularity in the month of October in the mid-term of a President means little or nothing. What's important is that he makes the right decisions for your nation.

Harry Truman wasn't very popular, I recall, in 1946 and '47 but he was about the most popular man in America in 1948.

And I think I might add at this point that I've been reading. I'm a student of government. I should say to the authorities of Boston College that because of the uncertain tenure of elective political office, I always like to renew my credentials. I'm a refugee from a classroom, a former professor of Political Science. I tried to keep up to date on the literature to keep my membership active in the American Political Science Association. I may need a job according to what I hear. And, by the way, if I ever have to change jobs and come back to teaching, I want you to know that I'm going to give a refund to all the students I taught before because, having been in government after having taught it, I'm afraid I didn't teach the right things when I was teaching before I got in.

But, going back again, many Presidents have had what they call drops in popularity in mid-term. For example, Franklin Roosevelt was elected with the greatest majority that any President, outside of George Washington, has ever received in 1936. In the elections of 1938, his popularity was down and the Republicans won most of the gubernatorial offices and came within a few votes of winning the Congress two years later. Mr. Roosevelt's popularity curve took a very sudden dip. Mr. Eisenhower had a little of that too. And, I was reading the Time and Newsweek magazines and others about a month before that tragic day in November 1963. You know what the magazines and newspapers were saying? They said, "John Kennedy has lost control of Congress. He can't get his program through - he's slipping. There is going to be trouble in the elections. It just doesn't look like it's going to work out." There was doom and gloom all over the lot. But I think that he was a great President. And I don't think he worried each and every day whether or not he had a percentage among the poll.

I summarize by saying that your President today commands a very, very good rating amongst the American people. The Senator from New York does too. They happen to agree on most issues. Both of them are Democrats - I like both of them and I hope both of them like me.

- Q. Mr. Vice-President: the difference between the Administration and its critics on Viet Nam seems to be which side shall make the first move towards de-escalation. Will you comment on that please?
- A. Yes - there are those who feel that the government of the United States has not pursued. I say there are those, they are few in number, but they are active - that the government of the United States has not pursued a course of de-escalation. Well, I want to remind this audience

that before a single plane was sent to South Viet, Nam, that before a single combat soldier was placed in South Viet Nam, already the national liberation front had been organized out of Hanoi which is a front - it is neither national nor does it liberate - the only honest word about it is front. And, before a single bomb had been dropped by an American plane, already regular units of the North Vietnamese armed forces were in the territory of South Viet Nam committing open acts of aggression. Now this nation of yours and mine has done more in the cause of peace than any other nation on the face of the earth and every responsible citizen knows it - and this nation of yours has had two pauses in the bombing, both of which were suggested by so-called non-allying nations and people within our own country. I was one of them who recommended to our government that we have the bombing pause. We had one bombing pause for a few days and people said, well, that was too short. Some of the critics said, "That didn't last long enough - you couldn't expect any response." So, then we had one for thirty-seven days. It's a fact that countries that are not allying with us, the non-allying countries and some of the communist block countries did say to our diplomats that, if there could be bombing pause from anywhere from 12 to 20 days, they thought they could get some talks going and some discussions going that could lead to a peaceful settlement. We paused for 37 days, de-escalated, and during those 37 days, we saw the movement of trucks and of men and supplies coming from the north to the south but we continued our de-escalation. And we were rejected.

It isn't this nation that is the roadblock to peace. The roadblock to peace is not in Washington and I think you know it. I think

you know the roadblock to peace is in other capitols, in Hanoi and Peking primarily. And I also think you know that the Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Goldberg, has laid out a program on behalf of your government of de-escalation. We're prepared for a cease fire - we're prepared to stop bombing the north - we're prepared for a total cease fire. We simply ask that those who are attacking from the north also stop their attack and stop their bombing. Now, the bombing by a plane upon military targets is, of course, a destructive and, at times, life taking exercise or life taking work. But a mortar and a hand grenade kills too. And mortars and hand grenades have been lobbed into American installations - into the villages of the South Vietnamese. Over 500 of their election officials were either maimed or killed in the recent elections by the Vietcong and the north Vietnamese.

I'll summarize it by saying that this government and my constitutional responsibility as a member of the National Security Council, as a member of the President's Cabinet, that your government is prepared to enter into negotiations unconditionally, without any pre-conditions, at any time, under any honorable auspices - that we are prepared to re-open the Geneva Agreement to have the Geneva Conference formula applied once again. We are prepared to accept the good officers of the International Control Commission. We are prepared to accept the good officers of the 17 non-allying nations. We are prepared to accept the good officers of the Secretary General of the United Nations - of His Holiness Pope Paul. We are prepared to accept the good officers of the President of India - of anybody else, if you can get anybody to sit down and talk with us. And we are prepared to enter into a cease fire as of

this moment, if anybody can give us any indication that we can have a conference that will bring the combatance in this struggle to the conference tables so that we can go through the long and tedious process of a negotiated political settlement of the struggle in Viet Nam.

Your government does not want escalation. But I say to Mr. Healey, I travel, as I have indicated, to these college campuses and other places and I always have a few folks who greet me - you know I don't mind that. In fact, I was at Clark University yesterday and I never have seen a group of men and women engaging in peaceful protest with better manners, and I think, doing more for their cause, by the way, with those good manners than I saw yesterday. And, by the way, I saw some peaceful protest here - that's the way - this is a free country.

But I merely want the record quite clear - and I think everybody here ought to know - that the President of the United States has offered the olive branch of peace time in and time again. He has had in his office the foreign minister of the Soviet Union - the Prime Minister of Burma - the foreign minister of Indonesia - he's gone to the United Nations to talk to the leaders of the U.N. and the Secretary General - he's been in constant contact with the leaders of the world. There is no lack of contact on our part. And when I see a sign out that says, "Peace in Vietnam", I say in all reverence, "That is our prayer." What makes anybody think that this nation wants a war in Vietnam? What makes anybody think this nation wants a war anyplace?

We have a lot of building to do in this world. The greatest threat to world peace today is what Pope John spoke about when he said, "Where there is constant want there is no peace and the hunger that grips mankind today is one of the great threats to peace." We would like to wage

war on hunger - upon poverty - upon illiteracy and upon disease and we are prepared to do so. We have a resolution standing at the United Nations now - the old MacMahon Resolution, which stands there and says, "We are ready to pledge much of the savings that we can make in defense to the cause of building better world order." It isn't your country that is rebuking those who seek peace - your country today keeps the United Nations alive by its contributions. At least, it makes a very significant contribution to the life of the United Nations. Your country today is prepared to help and has helped dozens of nations survive the struggle that is being made, by the way, not just for South Viet Nam, it is for ourselves.

I remind this audience this nation has been in three wars since 1941 and all of them have started in the Pacific or Asia - Pearl Harbor, Korea, now Viet Nam. And I remind you that in Asia, we have a brand of militant communism which has shown itself twice upon a peaceful neighbor outside of Southeast Asia - India. And, if ever a country tried to accommodate itself under the foreign policy of another country, India tried to accommodate itself to Krishna Menon and the late Prime Minister Nehru - to the foreign policy of China - Communist China. The Communist China, without provocation, on two occasions launched massive attacks up against Indian territory - unprovoked aggression. We just happen to think that this is too dangerous a world to let that kind of pattern continue - and I have a feeling that the Soviet Union feels that way too. I have a feeling that the United States of America and the Soviet Union, in this instance, find something in common - that the world is far too fraught with tension and danger to let people who have no sense of

responsibility move recklessly throughout the world and have their way through brute force. We don't intend to let it happen. Just thought you ought to know.

Q. Mr. Vice-President, I'd like to move to a different but related topic - that of foreign aid. The Administration's foreign aid request for the up-coming year was 3.4 billion dollars - the lowest in 18 years. This sum represents less than 1/2 of 1% of the American national income. Of this sum, nearly one billion is for direct military aid, aid which in the past has kept armies well fed but a nation's populace starving and has led to war, such as, the India-Pakistan War last year. The need for more aid of a non-military nature is essential. It has been suggested that the United States place a 1% tax on its national income for foreign aid and this sum be administered by the world bank. Would you comment on this please?

A. Well, first may I say that I do not think that the American foreign aid program was the cause of the struggle between India and Pakistan. I think that the differences between India and Pakistan are much deeper than the fact that both of those nations have shared in some military assistance from the United States. It is a fact that both nations did have military assistance from the United States. It is equally a fact that both nations have a military assistance from some other countries. For example, Pakistan from Communist China - India from the Soviet Union. So, I only wanted to sort of correct, Bill, that one reference because I worked on foreign aid a long time and am quite a strong exponent of it.

I have never felt that the better part of foreign aid was in its military assistance but I think military assistance is, however, essential.

Some of that military assistance you refer to goes to Viet Nam. Some of it goes to Korea where we have an obligation. Some of it goes into Southern Europe where we still have some obligations. But the military assistance part of foreign aid is not a large part of it because foreign aid is not all included in the foreign aid bill.

We have a little over 2 1/2 billion dollars of foreign aid in food for peace. That is quite a lot of foreign aid. And, no other nation came anywhere near as close to making that kind of commitment. And, we still have a good deal of foreign aid that we put into the world bank which is not involved in that particular amount of foreign aid. So, while the Administration's request was low, Congress cut it \$500 million.

What we sought to do with foreign aid was to give some priorities to it. We put foreign aid primarily in Latin America. We put foreign aid, a good deal more than we had in the past, in Africa. We put foreign aid, some of it, in the sub-continent and then, we added on top of that vast amount of foreign aid that comes from the Peace Corps, that's foreign aid; that comes from the United Nations into which we make substantial contributions - which is foreign aid; that comes from the world bank which is over and above the foreign aid bill, which is effective foreign aid; and from the food for peace program which has had a tremendous effect in the world.

Now, my own view is we can afford more foreign aid than we have extended thus far. I have argued that case for 16 years in the United States Senate. I argued the case for foreign aid but, I found in this last session of the Congress, we were lucky to get any. And it isn't the Administration who is reluctant - your President held dozens of meetings on foreign aid in the hopes that we could convince the people

who were the elected representatives of the people of the United States that we ought to have 3 1/2 billion dollars worth of it. They ended up giving us 2 billion 900 million. They ended up even cutting the food for peace program so I make my plea just as you do.

I don't think we want to level a particular, what we call tax, on a particular item. I do not like taxation that is related to what we call locked-in-funds, that is, dedicated funds. I think taxation should go into the general revenues any more than you ought to have a particular tax that says you ought to have it for the military, that you ought to have it for some other function. We have one tax like that - that's the road tax. This is the one tax in the government's fiscal structure and the reason for that is we try to keep our road programs rather self-financed out of the revenues of gasoline, automobiles and the trucks that utilize those roads. Even that, I think, violates a sound principle of public administration. So, Bill, you join with me and I'll join with you and we'll see if we can't convince the American public that they ought to be a little more generous. In the meantime, they think they are pretty heavily taxed.

This country has given in outright grants \$120 billion in the last twenty years for assistance to other nations, and it has given in the last eight years \$16 billion in food - given it away. It has done quite well. I think what we need to do is what we did recently. We are asking the other well-to-do nations of the world to step up their contributions. Some of them have made substantial contributions to old colonies like our friends in France. They have helped substantially the French colonies of Africa and that is good - no complaints - I'm simply saying that they too have a good currency and, since they feel that our

currency is having some trouble and, since we have some problems with the balance of payments deficits, maybe we could all join together and ask others who have been blessed with worldly goods to share and share a little more generously. I make that plea from this platform.

Q. Mr. Vice-President, could you stand another one? About a year ago, very few northern Congressmen, if any, dared to vote against Civil Rights. Now it has become quite respectable again possibly because of recent changes in the racial issue in this country. How important do you think the white backlash will be in the election? Would you say white backlash was not a major factor until black power came along?

A. Well, that is a pretty big order. First of all, Congressmen do vote for Civil Rights. The House of Representatives gave an overwhelming majority vote to the total Civil Rights package of the President in his message of 1966. It was the Senate that didn't vote for Civil Rights. The reason it didn't is that old man filibuster is still hanging around and we haven't quite been able to change the rules of the Senate to bring them into the 20th century. We're still hanging on - and it is a body of great tradition - but some of these days those rules too will be modified and adjusted. But, let the record be clear - the elected representatives of the people that come up every two years - the House of Representatives - did vote for the President's program on Civil Rights and gave it a handsome fourteen majority. That is Number I.

Number II - About the white backlash - there is some backlash, there is no doubt about it. Now, who does it affect? I think primarily it affects localities in which there has been some rioting, lawlessness, looting and burning in which there have been abuses and excesses, in what some people would call, the Civil Rights movement. I don't think

it's going to affect Congressmen or Senators. There seems no such indication because they do not control the police - they do not have local responsibility. I doubt that this will be a continuing force in American life. We have made great progress in Civil Rights. I wouldn't want anybody in this audience to think that, just because we have had some riots in the street which you cannot condone, which by the way, damaged the cause of Civil Rights as much as anything I can think of; riots which deeply injure the innocent, the very people they are supposed to help, the injured - but I wouldn't want you to think for a minute that we haven't made progress.

Why, we have made such progress in the field of human relations in the last five years that it is almost beyond comprehension - the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - the many Civil Rights programs passed in the State Legislatures and Civil Rights ordinances passed in municipalities. We have opened up America - we are making first class citizenship a reality. We have made phenomenal strides in public accommodations, in employment, in education, both in quantity and quality and in desegregation. We have made great strides. Some of the more aggressive militant self-appointed leaders of some groups in Civil Rights decided they weren't going fast enough and I happen to think that those leaders have not really benefited the cause. I think peaceful demonstration - I think the Roy Wilkins - I think the Dr. Martin Luther Kings - I think these men benefit the cause. And they are militant - but they are also within the law. So, I happen to believe that, if we keep at it, then, if you give us a Democratic Congress for the 90th. Congress, we're going to be back with our Civil Rights Bill. We can pass that Civil Rights Bill.

The main problem we had in the Senate was on the housing section. The rest of it, I think, could well have been passed. But, we will come back to pass it all in the 90th. Congress because we believe ultimately this is for the good of the nation and I am of the opinion that most people believe so too, if we can spread the base of the Civil Rights movement and not get ourselves engaged in white power or black power.

What we need is what Lillian Smith talked about - human power. The human power of fair play - the human power of compassion - the human power of social justice - the human power of treating your neighbor as you would treat yourselves. And, once we get that human power backed up by the ballot power, which every American has a right to exercise when he is of legal age, I think we will continue to make steady progress, not just in civil rights, but steady progress in the good of this land because we need every citizen as a first class operating, participating citizen. And we need to have every man and woman in America believe that they have the rights that come with that citizenship.

Might I say that we have an awful lot of young men of colors from different races, creed, and nationality, giving their lives right now for what this country says is its national security. And I know it simplifies it but it also has a direct relevance. If you can have men who can live together, work together, fight together, sleep in the same barracks, and die together in a battlefield, you better learn how to have them live together, work together, play together, be together back home in the peaceful environment of the United States of America. It just makes that much sense - that's all. And it can't be any other way.

Q. Mr. Vice-President, the Republicans are predicting they will gain 30 to 40 seats in Congress this coming election. Are they too optimistic about that?

A. I'm glad you asked that question. I want to read you something. I made a little note. I just thought that might come up somewhere because you see, I have many friends down in Congress. Take the Republican Senator from Pennsylvania - Mr. Scott. He said, "The Republicans will gain 50 seats - that's enough to put the brakes on all the President's social legislation." So, you know what their purpose is. They are not interested in gaining only some seats - they also want to put the brakes on social legislation. I suppose that means federal aid to education - I suppose it means aid to higher education - I suppose it means student loans. I gather that's what they want to put the brakes on.

But, you know, I have a very dear friend in the Senate, the Minority Leader, Mr. Kirksen, and I love old Ev. He's a Senator's Senator. He is a real stand-up man and he is a real good partisan when he needs to be and a good fine American all the time. But one thing about Everett Dirksen, he has a bit of the quality of a Shakespearean actor. He's a dramatic fellow. Now you don't think that he'd just settle for 50 or 40 seats, do you? Why, when Ev got up before the cameras, he said, "Well now, we'll have at least 75 seats." He went the whole way. He felt, if you're really going to have fun and you're going to be a little ridiculous, you're going to go the whole way. I think that was a fine prognostication he made. Nobody took it seriously - including Everett.

Let us take a look here. There was a lawyer from California who does law business in New York who is making suggestions as to who ought to be on what ticket and he made a prediction in 1962. He said, "The American people are going to repudiate John F. Kennedy." He predicted that the Republicans would win 44 seats in 1962 and it was in every

column. They even wrote up the people were going to repudiate Mr. Kennedy. Well, I want you to know that the lawyer in California, practicing in New York, travelling around the United States, is a good candidate - he's a good man - he's a hard fighter but he's a lousy prophet. They gained 2 seats. Now, even the Los Angeles Dodgers hit better than that, in this last game. In 1964, I quoted again the same lawyer - his initials are R.M.N. - he predicted that the Republicans would gain in 1964 40 seats and somebody asked, "Are you serious about this?" "I am not only serious - this is a conservative estimate." And, I think you would like to know that they lost 38 seats.

Never forget what Adlai Stevenson said about the Republicans. Stevenson said when it gets around campaign time, there's something in that period of their life that confuses them. And they travel under the strange banner that says, "Throw the rascals in" - not out, but in. And I don't think we're going to lose very many seats, if any. I think we may lose some in some of the hard-core Republican districts where it takes a little time to educate but we plan to have Mr. Harrington take over an important seat in the state of Massachusetts.

- Q. Mr. Vice-President, there has been a series of published reports that the President hasn't used your talents as effectively as he might. What do you have to say about this?
- A. You know, I just feel it's so wonderful that people are so worried about the happiness of the Vice-President. Really, as a matter of fact, it is a nice thing to have happen to you because the office has a certain number of limitations to it, as you know, and I always enjoy flattering introductions and I think this is the way the people are feeling - mentally, healthy and strong. I read the columns and everyone is worrying that the Vice-President isn't using his talents. I want you to know something.

The people didn't elect me to be President. I only have one President at a time. And they didn't elect me as United States Senator. I gave up that job. And the man who took it said he was able to do more in two years than I was able to do in sixteen. So, apparently, the people are satisfied. I do not believe we ought to confuse the offices that we hold. President Johnson has given the Vice-President of the United States wonderful cooperation in help and support in his endeavors. We're trying to do with this office something that is worthy of the respect, and I hope, the confidence of the American people. I'll give you an idea of my jobs to see whether the talents are being used.

I happen to be, by Congress, Chairman of the Space Council which coordinates the entire space effort of this country. I also was recently appointed Chairman of the Oceanographic Council. That was by statute - the Congress of the United States. You will notice that, whenever the Congress gives me an assignment, it's either out of this world or on the bottom of the ocean. I'm not sure if you can read anything into that or not but those are two important assignments.

Now, what else does a Vice-President have as an assignment? Presiding officer of the Senate - with certain attendant duties - I've finally become a member of the Board of Trustees of a great educational institution - namely, The Smithsonian Institution - that is by Act of Congress. I am the Chairman of the President's Youth Opportunity Cabinet Committee - I am the Chairman of what we call the Office of Economic Opportunity Council which coordinates the poverty programs. I have the responsibility as a member of the National Security Council,

a member of the President's Cabinet, Chairman of the President's Travel Task Force, and a host of others. I think the President is using the Vice-President just about as much as he can unless he just wants to do away with him. There isn't much more that I can do. I also act as a spokesman for our party. Quite frankly, President Johnson as with President Kennedy and, I might say, President Eisenhower, have done a great deal, those three Presidents, to build the meaning and the prestige of the office of the Vice-President. I'm happy.

Q. Mr. Vice-President, I was wondering if you could comment on Neil Sweeney's article, "Not A Dove But No Longer a Hawk" which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times Magazine?

A. I didn't have time last Sunday, to be quite frank. I was overengaging in one of the great American pasttimes. I was much more interested in the Baltimore Orioles and the Los Angeles Dodgers. I really didn't see it. As a matter of fact, I'm still working on the August issues of the New York Times. I can't answer the question since I didn't read that article.

Q. Can I describe it to you?

A. I'd rather read it.

Q. Mr. Vice-President, I've divided some of these questions into groups - these are all on domestic questions, such as, drug control. Would you say a word on some of those domestic questions on the policy of the Administration?

Q. Mr. Vice-President, why is it you changed your liberal policy from when you helped found the Americans for Democratic Action to the conservative policies of the present Administration?

A. That one deserves a comment. That is the first one. I think you would be interested to know that this Administration has enacted most of the platform promises of the Americans for Democratic Action. It isn't Humphrey that changed. Somebody said to me the other day, "What happened to the liberal program, Mr. Vice-President?" I said, "Well, we quit arguing about it and passed it. Now, if that upsets you, I'm sorry. I thought that you meant we ought to pass it." We have - Medicare has been passed - federal aid to education - civil rights - ADA had one emotional binge after the other and I was a part of it. On civil rights - we passed more civil rights legislation than any ADA resolution writer ever even could think of to put in a resolution.

I'm a founder of ADA. I like it. I think it is a fine organization. I think, on occasion, it makes some bad political judgments. But, most of the time, it does its job. It is an independent organization. It is not an appendage of the Democratic party, and it ought not to be. But, as far as liberalism is concerned, let the record be crystal clear - our program in behalf of the elderly - our program on urban development - our program on housing, the demonstration cities bill that is now before the Congress - the civil rights legislation - the voting rights act - the conservation legislation - water pollution control - air pollution control - every one of these programs that have been advocated by the liberal legislators and liberal spokesmen of America, my fellow Americans, they are the law of the land. I don't think you prove yourself a liberal by always being for lost causes. You can be a happy liberal by being for things that you were for that ultimately were passed. I think that liberals ought to rejoice in the fact that the things we were condemned for, for years, have now become the

law of the land. Don't get a martyr complex and say that now they have done it and I'm unhappy. They have accomplished it in Congress and I am happy. I'm joyous. And I still think ADA has a useful function to perform.

Q. Now, what is the Administration's pleasant plan in regard to the farm program?

A. To continue what we have and to build on it - it's done quite well. For the first time, we have no surpluses except in two commodities - cotton and tobacco - and they are dwindling. Farm prices are up - farm income is up and the farmer today is enjoying a better share of the national prosperity than he has in twenty years.

Q. Does the Democratic party absolutely repudiate segregationist candidates of the Democratic party in Georgia and Maryland?

A. The President has done so. And he speaks for the party.

Q. What would you consider the major responsibility facing our generation as we view our world today?

A. Peace - disarmament - international cooperation - nuclear non-proliferation - those are the major issues by far. On the domestic scene - making our cities livable - breaking up these urban ghettos - permitting young people and elderly people, all people, to enjoy a greater area of opportunity. I think those are the major issues.

Q. I think I answered this one. Will the mid-term election using the example of 1938 bring about Republican gains?

A. If I didn't, may I just say, hopefully and prayerfully "No".

Q. Isn't Social Security a specific tax?

A. Yes. I was in error. You are right - it is what we call a dedicated tax and thank goodness that it is.

Q. Your work has long been outstanding in controlling drug information. Can you tell us how much money is going into controlling the information this year?

A. I can't tell you how much - I can only say, in all areas of government, we have done a great deal more in coordination of information - what we call information retrieval, collection, indexing, and collating. I believe we have made a great deal of progress.

Fr. McEwen Mr. Vice-President, I have so many here on domestic and foreign policy that I think we will collate them and send them to you and have the answers drafted for the student newspaper because it is time for us to call this part of the program to a halt and move to the reception. But before I do that, I want to express the regrets of our President, Father Michael Walsh, who is in Louisiana today and unable to meet you and be with you.

On behalf of the student body and faculty, I want you to take a souvenir of the college and I hope to find it adorning some appropriate wall of the Vice-Presidential suite sometime - somewhere in Washington. It is with deep pleasure that I take this opportunity to give you this souvenir of Boston College and thank you very much for your participation in this marvelous meeting today. I thank our guests from the radio-news panel and all our guests in the audience. I deeply appreciate this opportunity to renew and deepen our political education and you have done a job that will give you a full professorship at any university you wish to claim.

Can I just say good-bye here, Father. I know we have kept everybody here very long. I want to thank the panel on my behalf and on your

I want to say to this fine student body that one of the joys of my public life, for it is a very interesting and exhilarating life, is the opportunity to come to civic forums, particularly student forums, and to engage in this cross-examination.

Every man is limited by his information and every man's judgment is no better than the information that he has that he can put into that judgment. I have attempted today to give you my point of view as best as I could of the Administration's position on some of the issues in questions that have been asked.

I can only conclude by saying that we live in the most dangerous of times and yet the most promising of dates. We live in a period of fantastic danger due to science and technology - due to a fast changing world - but we also live in a period of great hope and adventure and the possibility of unbelievable improvement. What will ultimately decide it is the moral values, the social values, the ideals that we hold and our will to pursue those ideals. I haven't any doubt that what the United States of America has all the tools and all the resources to make this the wonder of the world. And indeed, now it stands as almost a miracle in terms of its economy - its prosperity - its political stability and its promise in the world. But I think we have all the tools - I think we have all the resources - I think we have all the technical know-how - I think the only question is, do we have the will? Will we tire? Will we say it's too much? All I can add to that is, if we in this country with what we have cannot break the back of poverty for our own, who can? If we in this country, with all of our power and all of our wealth and all of the blessings that are ours, cannot open up the door of opportunity to more and more people, indeed to everyone, who in the world can? And, if we in America,

can't offer some hope to the world, can't offer some protection to the weak, can't offer some guidance to the young, can't offer some experience from our history to those who are feeling their way now, who can?

I remind you that there has never been a power vacuum in the history of the world - never has been and never will be. We have, by some quirk of fate, not by premediation, but maybe the accident of history, become a leader and a world leader, an international leader, in the cause of human freedom. Now, that cause of freedom is not something that is accomplished in one's lifetime. The cause of freedom is a continuing, perpetuating, demanding discipline on our lives. Democracy is never fully obtained. It has a way of asking us to do more and more each year. And, therefore, each generation has to take up its own responsibilities.

I remind you that leadership gives you no privileges. And when I hear people say, "Well, I notice that a lot of countries don't like us and they don't appreciate us," you shouldn't expect to be either loved or appreciated. What we ought to expect and hope for is that we can gain respect of others for what we stand for and what we do. Leadership gives you no privileges - leadership is not the cloak of comfort - leadership is responsibility - it is the robe of responsibility - it is the heavy burden of responsibility.

And I hope that the student bodies of American colleges will come to the realization that peace building takes a long time. Mankind has been engaged in fratricidal warfare for hundreds of years throughout this globe and for the first time, we have a chance to build a true

fraternity of mankind and this nation is engaged in the greatest adventure that it has ever known. Namely, that of making the world as John Kennedy put it, "Safe for diversity," of trying to reconcile social systems - of seeking, above all, conciliation and, I would remind you, that the pursuit of peace is like the building of a mighty cathedral. It is not the work of a day or even a generation - it requires the plan of a master architect and the labors of many, maybe for decades in generations. I think the only question we have to ask ourselves is, "Did we add one or two building blocks to that edifice of the cathedral of peace?" I think we have because I think peace is education - I think peace is the war on hunger - I think peace is social economic development - I think peace is technical assistance - I think, above all, it is hope.

I travel throughout this world a good deal and I hear many cynics say, "Oh, they don't like us." But, I'm here to tell you they do. I hear many say they don't appreciate us. I'm here to tell you they do. I was in 14 nations of Asia between December and February - in Asia three times. I did not find one single Asian leader of any of the Asian countries - India, Pakistan, Japan, you name it - that didn't think our presence in Asia today was absolutely vital to their survival and to the hope of independence and self-determination. As President Marcos put it, "There is a security gap temporarily," and we're helping to fill it. But, more importantly, as Lincoln put it, "This America means something to more than just we Americans. It has a mystique of its own. It has a glory of its own." Lincoln put it, "We will either meanly lose or nobly save the last best hope on earth." I think we are

determining that every day. And, if we weary - if we falter - if we complain - if we give up - if we get angry because somebody doesn't like everything we do - we're going to meanly lose it. And we can nobly say that, if we keep this economy strong - if we continue to broaden the vision of social justice - if we reach out and show the world that we can treat our own people as equals - that we really believe in human dignity and that we not only believe in it but that we practice it here, I think that we do offer hope to the world.

I am convinced our foreign policies will be no better than our domestic actions. I am convinced our national security will be no better than our faith and the perseverance and the patience that we have. So, I call upon students today to have persevering patience, not apathy, not indifference - to pursue noble goals and there are noble goals. I mentioned some of them - of the imperatives of our time - and what are some of those imperatives?

One of them, my good friends, is arms control - to break this unbelievable spiral of the arms race. And your government is prepared to take those steps.

Another one is to end nuclear proliferation before this fantastic destructive weapon gets into the hands of reckless, irresponsible people or becomes used by miscalculation or accident and triggers a world conflagration and it could happen. I know of what I speak.

Another one is economic and social development for the underprivileged of the world because the people are not going to die quietly any longer. Rising expectations is not a phrase - it is a fact. And above all, we simply must have racial harmony at home and abroad because, I remind my Caucasian friends and my Christian brethren, we

are a small minority in this world and, if you really believe in what we say we believe in, a brotherhood of mankind, we have to start to practice it here and show that we mean it.

That is what I think America's about. America is not just a nation - it is an experiment in human relations - it is an experiment in self-government - it is an experiment in world order - and, if we can make it work here, and that is what I am trying to do in my limited way, that is what you are trying to do, if we can make this country the shining example of what an organized civilized country ought to be, of what a modern progressive humanitarian nation ought to be, I think we will make a powerful impact on the world. You see, I happen to believe that the revolution of our time is not Karl Marx and Lenin and Stalin. I think the revolutionary spirit of our time is Thomas Jefferson who said, "The only legitimate objective of government is the happiness and the well-being of the people."

THANK YOU.



Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



www.mnhs.org