

St Thomas 001617 March 18, 1970  
Spee R

MEMORANDUM

April 6, 1970

TO: D.J. Leary  
FROM: Norman L. Holmes

Per your request, enclosed is a xerox copy of HHH's Public Affairs class, March 18, 1970. It arrived April 1. As you also requested, a copy has been forwarded to Caryl Conner.

Usula  
Just Put in our  
speech files  
Bill Hamm at later on

Enclosure

001618

HHH AT PUBLIC AFFAIRS CLASS, ST. THOMAS COLLEGE, ST. PAUL,  
MINNESOTA MARCH 18, 1970

INTRODUCTION:

As you know this is a class in public affairs ~~reporting~~ <sup>reporting</sup>  
and also a Mass Communications class, and we invited Prof.  
Humphrey to come here as an educator and to talk about his  
feelings on the mass media, and he will give some intro-  
ductory remarks, and then open to questions. I'd also  
like to point out that Professor Humphrey is an honorary  
graduate of St. Thomas College.

HHH:

I want to thank Prof. Larson for giving me the identity  
that I need here on this campus, that I am an honorary  
graduate of St. Thomas. May I assure this student body  
that this is much easier than going through the regular  
course work. I recall somewhere along in my public and  
private life) that I attended a commencement exercise  
where I was getting an honorary degree, and the man in  
charge (I don't believe it was the President of the  
college, Monsignor Murphy), but I think it was just one  
of -- the Dean of Faculty, I believe it was, who said that  
there's a great deal of difference between earned degrees  
and honorary degrees, and then he spent about 15 minutes  
reminding those of us that were about to get an honorary  
degree that we really didn't deserve it. But it was about  
the only way that they could get us to come and hopefully

001619

they'd make a contribution, I think, to the college or the University. Now I'm not going to waste any of my time in the social niceties, even though it's always good to come to St. Thomas and to participate in a class discussion. I received a letter from Mr. Larson, your instructor in Journalism, that said as follows " We would be particularly interested in learning your views about the mass media and the coverage of politics and government by newspapers, television, news magazines, etc.", and I'm sure he also meant radio - I wouldn't want to leave that out. And I shall take a few minutes to give you some personal observations, ~~that are~~ rather unstructured discussion with you, and then why don't we just engage in some dialogue of questions, and hopefully that I could supply a few answers, at least my personal reflections on the whole subject of communication, because that's really what we're talking about, as it relates to public affairs.

I would open what I have to say by pointing out that there's been a great deal of talk about what we call the "generation gap". I don't believe that is a real fact of life. I think the most important gap is what we call the "communications gap". That sometimes exists between people of the same age group, as well as people of different age groups. It surely exists amongst different cultures, and frequently amongst nation states. It even exists within government itself. The lack of proper communication with-

001620

in the Executive branch of government, amongst the different departments, where you will frequently see department heads coming before committees of Congress testifying on the same subject, but having - apparently never clear<sup>ed</sup>~~ing~~ their testimony through any system of communications so that they are on the same wave length, or upon the -- or coming out with more or less the same point of view. You obviously see a serious problem with communications in the international field. I think the most heartening sign of the present world scene, with all of its troubles (and it has a tremendous array of difficulty and difficulties on the horizon) -- the most heartening sign is that we are beginning to open up communications between what were <sup>non</sup>~~in~~communicable areas only a few years ago. The communications between the United States and the Soviet Union are much better today than they were a decade ago, far better, and we are for the first time beginning now to communicate between the United States and the People's Republic - what we call ~~the~~ People's Republic of China or <sup>the</sup>mainland China. Now it is through communications that I think you have the best opportunity for producing conditions that are conducive to peace. Because communication is just another word for education, just another word for education - in its broadest sense. Now a word on what I think is education and this gets down to the whole subject of the mass media and politics.

Education or an education, as you people know in this classroom, is not merely your experience here as a

relationship to teacher; this is a part of the educational experience. The simple fact is that education includes your total life experience. And I've gone up and down the length and breadth of this county talking to educators, not so much about their professional educational standards, because ~~XX~~ I think most of the ~~XXXX~~ professional educators know a good deal more about how to teach than I do, know a good deal more about the methodology and the technology of teaching than I happen to do, than I happen to know. But I do think that there is something else to education that educators may occasionally miss. And that is the relationship of the community and what happens in that community to the learning experience of a child, an adolescent, or an adult. And I think we're beginning to find/out. I think we're beginning to find out that no matter how good a University system ~~is~~ you build, or how good a high school or secondary or elementary school system that you may construct, that the quality of education is effected, not only by the relationship in that classroom or the quality or the curriculum, but very much by what goes on in the neighborhood, the community, the total social environment from whence that student comes. And if we're going to really improve the learning experience in America - and that's what I prefer to call it, rather than just education - if we're going to improve this learning experience, it's going to require a total improvement or an improvement of the total social enviroment, because you

001622

can't take people out of an environment of hostility, violence, filth, degradation, obsolescence, irresponsibility, take them out of that environment and move them into a school environment and then back into the hostile environment again, without developing some sort of emotionally unbalanced personality, and without really minimizing the effectiveness of your formalized educational experience. Now the third thing that I would emphasize to you is the relationship now of the mass media, as we call it, to what I consider the most important subject of education, namely politics. And I speak now of politics, not particularly of partisan politics, but public affairs, public policy. The - Teddy Roosevelt once said of the White House that it was a bully pulpit. Woodrow Wilson said of the White House that it was the world's great classroom. I think that the two of them could put their respective observations of the White House into a composite, and what you'd come up with is to say that the White House, the Presidency, the office of the Presidency must include both the bully pulpit inspiration, in spirituality, as well as the objectivity and the rational thought of a classroom. Wilson was a professor; he was the President of Princeton University; he was a distinguished writer, scholar, and student. Teddy/<sup>Roosevelt</sup> was a politician to his fingertips; he had a - very few men in public ~~life~~ life have ever had the feel of politics, the nuances, the intangibles tht are so vital to the political man or ~~to~~ to the political personality as Teddy Roosevelt. And

Teddy, on the one hand, said "It's the bully pulpit, the White House." He saw it as literally a podium from whence to inspire and lift the people. Woodrow Wilson saw it as a lectern, as a classroom, from whence you educated the people, in which you brought rational ~~XXXXXXXX~~ thought to bear upon the critical human and ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ technological problems of the age.

Now where does the mass media fit into this? It is the ~~XXXXXX~~ media, whether it's the printed word, or the electronic device of radio or television that is the bridge, the conduit, between the public,-for the moment let's call the public the student,-and the professor. It is the mass media, the printed word, the electronic transistor, the television, this powerful camera that I'm going to speak to you about in a moment, that is the conduit, the bridge between what people may think is going on and what is going on. It is the conduit between the leader~~s~~ and the citizen, and between the citizen and the leader, and it is also the great communicator for the citizen body itself. Now Mass media plays a decidedly important role in what we call the democratic experience, or the democratic process. Mass media plays a ~~XXXXXXXX~~ strategic, critical role in the totalitarian society. Imagine what Hitler could have done with television. Just ponder that. Don't let me explain to you; it/ just think about it. The Chinese have said that "one picture is worth 10,000 words". I'm here to tell you that

one picture of real life scene, with action, with movement, and voice, and now in color, is worth a million words. One powerful ~~now~~ dramatic photograph, in movement, a picture - now with color television, with the voice, with the action, with the content, is a - it's like an injection of adrenalin into the entire body politic. And therefore this instrument called the television has more responsibility and is burdened with more responsibility, those who operate it, than any instrument created by the hand of man, without question. And that's a broad statement, but it <sup>is</sup> a fact, for good or evil. And it is in its infancy, may I say; we've had television as an active force in American public life for less than 20 years; for less than twenty years. The first major campaign that used television to any degree was '56, 1956; some in '52, very ~~xxx~~ little in '48; it actually came into its full - into what we think of as a powerful political force in the election of 1960, the televised debates between John Kennedy and Richard Nixon. Now this camera - I look <sup>at</sup> it as a neutral force until it's put to the hand of man, like most things. Science is neutral; time is neutral. As a matter of fact, many of the things that we attribute to pollution <sup>today</sup> are neutral - until you put man <sup>'s hand</sup> to it, or man starts to use it. I saw a group of students the other day in a picture ~~the/other~~ that were taking the sledgehammer out, you know, and were beating up an old 1959 Ford, up in Ann Arbor, Michigan, beating the thing into a pulp, as a demonstration against pollution. Well a 1959 Ford doesn't pollute anybody until a man gets

in it. As a matter of fact I've got a 1930 Ford; it's quite nice; it isn't polluting anything; it's out there at Waverly, Minnesota, locked up/a garage, up on jacks <sup>in</sup> that so/the tires don't get to beat up during the wintertime. I said to a group of students that what they should have been saying is to sign a pledge that they weren't going to drive to school. That's the way you stop/pollution. Or better yet, to sign <sup>another</sup> a petition to the Ford Motor Company tht they get a gadget that they can put on the car that eliminates the polkhtion. It's the use of the car that pollutes. It's the use of science that causes difficulty. And it's also the use of <sup>an automobile</sup> ~~the car~~ that helps; it's the use of science that helps; It's the same thing about media. P And it's very difficult to discuss media today because it has been put into the framework of political controversy, and I think that's most unfortunate. The present Vice President's helped on that more than he should, because - what I think he has done is to take some half truths and try to make whole truths out of them. Now any man in public life has his personal views about the media, because I'll tell you when~~x~~ you think the media is good, when you;re in public life - when you think it favors you. I always think the newspapers are good when there are good stories about Humphrey; that's a good newspaper, you know. This is the way a public man generally feels about the personal matters of the media. <sup>Now</sup> /I say this in jest. Now

001626

if this is taken out of context, by that camera, it can make me look bad. It's a fact; I just used that for a ~~purpose~~ purpose. Now it that's all that goes on the screen, ~~somebody's~~ <sup>"Well</sup> somebody's going to say /Now, there was Humphrey saying his definition of a good newspaper is exactly when they're good to Humphrey." And that could be on because they try to project the whole world in 10 seconds. You've got to; ~~you've~~ you've got a time span. I'm not complaining about that; they only have 24 hours in a day and there's a lot of things going on in the day and they don't stay on the air 24 hours, so there - somebody has to make these judgments. But those judgments are critical; those judgments are critical. I can remember as a Senator when I would have different broadcasters come to me and we have a wonderful group of press and radio and TV people around what we call Capitol Hill - there's about 600 - over 600 newsmen on Capitol Hill, covering the Congress of the United States. No shortage of coverage, I can assure you. And I remember very well that, as a Senator, there'd be some great cataclysmic <sup>take</sup> event ~~place~~ ~~place~~ place and a man would come and say "Would ~~you~~ you come up to the Senate Radio and TV Gallery; we'd like to get you on." And I'd say "Well, you know, I mean, yeah, I'd be glad to come on up." <sup>I mean,</sup> /After all, you're in public life. <sup>'d</sup> "Now And you get on up there and they/say /What we'd like ~~to~~ to have you - we'd like to have you discuss the Middle East crisis. We got 20 seconds. Would you do that?" Now this is the point. This is the point, my fellow students. And I'm a student. You can't discuss even your name in twenty

001627

seconds. You can hardly say "Hello". And one of the dangers in our insatiable desire for what we call the news, is to get so much news in a hurry that we get really nothing, except just an immediate flash of what happens. News ~~XXXXXXXX~~ requires interpretation, understanding, background. It requires, in fact, from the audience, <sup>and</sup> that's why this educational system of ours (is so important) - it requires an experienced, reasonably well educated audience. Now I know that the people that are in television, and radio and the newspapers cannot give you a four hundred year lecture ~~of~~ - I mean a lecture on four hundred years of Soviet life, or Russian life. I'm teaching a course in ~~AM~~ American-Soviet relations. You think I spend my time on the last day to current events. I've got to teach that course from the perspective of four to five hundred years of Russian life, because what the Communists are doing today ~~is~~ is what the Czars did a hundred ~~years~~ years ago in many ways. So for me to - ~~so~~ for news to really have its educational value requires an educated citizenry. Then when the news flash comes through a whole series of events like a computer takes place in ~~your~~ your mind and it starts to feed in and you come out with some really, not emotional reactions, but some ~~reasonable~~ reactions of mind and reason. Now let me make it clear, I don't think camera A or Camera B can spend all the time to give you all that you ought to know. I think that's what - that's ~~why~~ why we need a multiplicity

001628

of what we call news sources. We need editorial comment. We need actual news reporting. You're ~~XXX~~ journalists here; if you work for the AP or the UPI or one of the great news services, you're supposed to report what takes place, now what you think takes place, not what you hope takes place, but what takes place. But an editor~~x~~, a feature columnist writer, is supposed to do it in depth. He's an interpreter/ <sup>of the news.</sup> We need both. And above all we need the documentation. We need the dissertations. We need the in-depth studies. And we need the historical and contemporary background amongst a broad citizenry, may I say, that makes the news flash merely trigger in your mind a whole sequence of events and a whole panorama of knowledge, that gives you the chance to make judgment. A man's judgment is no better than his information. And part of the purpose of the news media today is to give you information. So let me just summarize it. Let's not be critical of the instrument, the printing press, the television camera, the microphone, the tape - all this does is record what we human beings do and say. Let's also be very tolerant of those who make the judgments as to what the time frame permits, those of us who are the readers, the listeners and the viewers have available. What is our time frame and what is ~~theirs~~ theirs? There are subjective judgments made into what comes to you as news, and this is inevitable. The important thing is that you have a variety of news outlets. That's what we mean by free press. Now somebody is

001629

going to say "Look, I like <sup>the</sup>/NBC news better." "I like the CBS news better." "I like the ABC news better." "And I like my local television better." They got - different people like their favorite commentators, their favorite news sources. Somebody's going to say "Look, I'd rather read the Minneapolis paper." Somebody'll say "Oh, now I like the St. Paul paper." Somebody says "Cancel them all out. Get me the New York Times." Somebody else 'll say "I like the Christian Science Monitor." Somebody else says "No, I like the St. Louis Post Dispatch." "I like the Chicago Tribune." "I like the Los Angeles Times, or the Denver Post." ~~xxx~~ Good. That's the point that I'm making. The availability of those sources. Because in a pluralistic society, you have what <sup>we</sup> ~~you~~ call freedom of choice. Now put that up against a government-owned, government-controlled, government-censored press, with all of the inadequacies of human judgment in a free press. May I assure you that those inadequacies fade into insignificance when you compare them to the - what would be the colossal inadequacy of a subjective judgment of a government press. So you see, life is a choice of alternatives. I can sit up here and stand up here today and point out what I think are lots of inadequacies in a particular news story, but I have to say "compared to what?" And the only other comparison that I have is between an uncensored press and a censored press, between a free press, in the sense of variety of news sources - that's what I really mean by a

001630

free press - uncensored - variety - a multiplicity of news outlets and a controlled government outlet. I was in the Soviet Union at the time of the space shot, when Neil Armstrong touched down on the moon. The people of the Soviet Union didnt know about that until Monday morning, 10 o'clock, despite the fact that Neil Armstrong had touched down on the moon on Sunday. They had to have a meeting, so to speak, I suppose, of some of their top people to decide how much should they know about it, on a great event like that.

Well with all of the abuses that this country has in the media, and I think the media'd be the first to recognize that it has limitations, there would be none that ~~is~~ is ~~is~~ equal to that kind of government control or censorship.

~~Nothing~~ Now having said that, I want to make it very clear that I think it is the duty of the media to constantly to set ~~its~~ its own standards of excellence, to consider not only what it does ~~not~~ in terms of <sup>spot</sup> news, but in terms of citizen and national responsibility. I think it ought to be recognized that most professions do have standards, lawyers, doctors, professors, teachers, dentists, engineers, architects, chiropractors, osteopaths, - they're licensed, they belong to associations, they have standards - a man can be disbarred from the law, from law; he can be disbarred as an engineer or an architect; the clergy - all of them have standards. I think it is imperative that the media have standards, not that government imposes - I'm

001631

unalterably opposed to that - but that there be professional standards within the media itself. Now I know they say they have them; I don't deny that. I think it's just important that they constantly re-evaluate them. The same media that calls for a re-evaluation of American foreign policy should re-evaluate itself and always asking /what is its role? What is its role? in national and international life? What is its role? I'm not here to define that. That's not my duty. I have only personal, subjective points of view. I am not a man that is an expert or a professional in the media. But I submit to you that communication, like education, must have standards. It cannot be just catch-as-catch-can. We don't permit it in education; we don't permit it in politics. Lot's of people abuse what we call political standards and sometimes they're caught and they go to jail or they lose an election. There are way s of punishment; there are ways <sup>of</sup> ~~for~~ reprimand. I think that the media itself, (and by the way, I'm not alone in this. This has been a subject of consideration for a long time) must constantly lay out <sup>before</sup> ~~for~~ itself and the public its - what it thinks its duties are , it's responsibilities are, and not only its privileges, not only its ~~commercial~~ commercial opportunities, but its citizen responsibilities. You cannot ask the rest of the world to be involved, you cannot ask everybody else to sacrifice if you're not going to ask those who are asking to sacrifice. Now way back in the

001632

1940's there was a commission on the media - that's long before television that published a report - I've asked to get a copy of it - I've forgotten its details - but I think this journalism class should get it. The then President, former President of Chicago University Mr. Hutchins, Dr. Hutchins was a member of that commission. There was also one during the period of the Eisenhower Administration. The commission on violence, that subcommittee - that subsection on the media, is something that this ~~XXXXXX~~ journalism class ought to study. One of the problems <sup>with</sup> of the Presidential commissions is that the commission reports come out, a few interested people get copies, and then they are filed away. I happen to believe that every Presidential commission ought to be backed up by citizens committees in the country on a continuing basis, ought to be backed up by a joint committee in the Congress on a continuing basis, and ought to have, if possible, at every university and college across the country, a special selection of students and faculty that monitor to see what's done about those commission reports. The Koerner Commission, the Commission on Violence, the National Crime Commission, the Commission on Automation and Technology, the different Commissions that we've had on media - all of these are filed away and they go into the archives of government and occasionally somebody reaches back into their subject matter to make a speech.

Now let me conclude by saying this, that American politics, as we know it, the politics that is competitive,

001633

in which there are choices to be made, the politics that lends itself to representative government and access of people to the political process and government requires an active, penetrating, inquiring, fearless media, an active, penetrating, inquiring, fearless media. Government-  
or politics is another word for power, and Lord <sup>?Aktin</sup> ~~Akin~~ was right "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." The camera, the photograph, the television, the printed word, the transistor, the radio, are ways of - in a sense - both cleansing the political process, dissecting the political process, exposing the political process, communicating the political message, evaluating the political message, and keeping the society open and free. In our kind of a society a media that is constantly looking, exposing, inquiring, evaluating, is fundamental to what we call freedom. Now just ~~ex~~ remember that freedom is not easy. And remember that it is subject to all of the human limitations. Winston Churchill wonce said of democracy that it is the worst possible form of government, except all others that have ever been tried. And Adlai Stevenson reminded us that self-govern~~ment~~ is not self-executing, it requires sober thought and sober think~~ers~~, and it also ~~requires~~ requires the right to inquire fearlessly, it ~~requires~~ requires an arena like a University in which you can discuss any idea ( I've always looked upon a university and a college as a safe haven for the most unorthodox ideas

001634

and of course this also brings to my attention that you cannot discuss ideas unless there is an atmosphere in which there is a willingness to listen as well as to be permitted to speak. And those who are the intolerant, those who would deny the right of free speech, by whatever action they undertake, are the mortal enemies of freedom. I think Voltaire had a great deal to tell us when he said that he maynot agree with ~~the~~ a word of what you have to say, but he will die for your right to say it. And I think that ought to be inscribed in every college and university across ~~the~~ this country. I don't care who it is that has to speak - he has the right to be heard. Somebody has the right to give a rebuttal, but when words are stamped out by chanting, demonstrations, violence, freedom is threatened. And students need to remember that, because most of the cherished liberties of mankind have been lost because a majority stood silently by - the silent majority, may I say - that didn't have enough fortitude and enough interest in the public concern and ~~the~~ public welfare to stand up and not to let a handful determine what would be the course of action, or the course of no action.

Well I think I<sup>'ve</sup> may be given you enough of the broad background. I know some of you'll want to ask me about specifics. What I've tried to tell you is that this - and I want/you <sup>to leave</sup> with this thought - this instrument that I look over here - <sup>it's</sup> ~~it's~~ so amazing, so wonderful - I just came back from Mexico where the Ministry of Education, working now

001635

with a number of the Latin American countries, is undertaking ~~now~~ a program of secondary education through the use of television. Those Latin American countries do not have the - either the intellectual or the financial resources to build great school buildings in every rural village for the campesino. They do not have the teachers. so they're beginning to use this powerful instrument called television for education and with workbooks and curriculum and courses and teachers using the television and the videotape, but most of it live television. In Great Britain an Open University is underway now through the British Broadcasting Corporation, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ in which you get a college degree through the Open University, that is, the educational process comes through television. And you will have some of the best professors that Britain has to offer in a regular established course work in your community with your books, your workbooks, with your readings, with television. Lord Crowther is the man who is at the head of it that set up - that was in charge of the commission to set<sup>it</sup> up. I was in London this last summer; I met with the upcoming faculty of this open university. They will have a maximum of 40 hours per week - 40 hours per week on live prime time television for education - to help build a better society. And as I travel<sup>ed</sup>/through Africa as your Vice President, in country after country I had the people come to me and say "What we need more from your country than anything else, Mr. Vice President, is help in electronics, television communication,

001636

radio communication. Dr. Martin Luther King once said that the modern science and technology had made the world into a neighborhood. He ~~sxx~~ said it was up to man to make it into a brotherhood. What a wonderful, philosophical, perceptive statement. Technology has made the world a global village. There is no place to hide. There are no hills and valleys any longer. The electronic media penetrates. And whether you can read or write is not so important as the fact that you can listen and see. And that television message today and that radio message has become one of the great forces in public life. Now we have a special responsibility. You see, what I think about this country is that we're really an experiment in human relations, and that if we fail, we fail greatly. It isn't only that we fail, but we fail everybody else, because we ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> ~~sxx~~ the one country on the face of the earth that has the tools and the resources to make democracy work. And Democracy depends upon an enlightened ~~sxxxxxxx~~ citizenry and a participating citizenry, a concerned citizenry, an involved citizenry. And none of that is possible without people knowing what's going on, unless they feel drawn into it, unless they feel they're a part of it. And I think the mass media is vital to this. Might I say to those who have been highly critical of the mass media, that I doubt that much would have been done in this country about the problems of race relations had it not have been for the mass media. I think that one picture of a dog, a police dog, being set upon that poor black man in

001637

Birmingham, Alabama, an AP photo, appearing in every newspaper across this country, shocked the American people. That one picture was worth not 10,000 words, but millions. I think the fact that the camera has been able to go into the ghetto, and I wish it did more of it, not only to look for the violence, but to look for the other kind of quite violence, not the noisy violence; I'm talking to you about the violence of filth, the violence of degradation, the violence of lonesomeness, of frustration, of alienation, that doesn't show itself in battles on the streets, when that camera goes into these ghettos and shows those of us, most of whom, in America today are well off.

Because this is the only society in the world, ~~where~~ <sup>in which</sup> most people are not poor. Most people are not poor - excluding the Scandinavian countries. We're the only society in the world today in which the majority are well off - all the more our guilt, because of the spectre of poverty and hunger and malnutrition and inequality in our midst. And I submit <sup>that</sup> to you/the violence of the word is sometimes worse than the violence of the fist. The violence of prejudice is more - sometimes more deadly than the violence of the bullet. The ~~XXXXX~~ violence of not being wanted, of neglected - is maybe more violent and more dangerous than the violence of a riot. And that camera and that radio and that printed word and that picture can show it. When you see helpless people in Appalachia sitting on the porch with listlessness all over them and apathy

001638

and indifference, and looking almost - not only intellectually backward and spiritually depressed, but physically debilitated, that's violence - a quiet kind of violence. So I appeal to the media to lift our lights and to brighten up our lights and lift our sights. I appeal to them to help make America a better country. And I think that balance is required. And I hope and pray that that balance is always being measured. I don;t stand as a critic; I do not know enough to be that objective a critic in a classroom, because I think my job is not to convince you; my job is to get you to think through these things yourself. I think every student in this classroom has a special responsibility as you go into the field of journalism to ask yourself "What's it for?" - /Just a job? Just to make a living? Is that all? I can give you some other alternatives, if that's all. I'm sure that a man that becomes a teacher has to ask himself, "Is this just a job?" "Or does this mean something? Do I touch people's lives, their minds, their spirits? Or am I just trying to make money?" And I ~~XXX~~ believe that journalists particularly have to ask that, I think like a good doctor. You just trying to get rich? Or you really trying to save a life? Because a journalist - a journalist may save more lives than a doctor. I wonder if you've really thought of it that way. I think that a politic~~XX~~ian may and I think ~~YNAZ~~ he may also destroy more than some people ~~YNAZ~~ <sup>who</sup> spread poison. I think we have to ~~xx~~ constantly have to ask ourself what are the moral values that we place upon our respective occupations

001639

andpursuits. This is a new dimension. ~~XXXXX~~ Young men - I listened to a doctor on the television this morning on the Today show who was primarily giving of his great talents to the poor and the needy. I have a son that's a lawyer that gives a lot of time to the poor. There's a whole new spirit coming out of these professional schools. Young lawyers today are really interested in what's happening, not - they don't all want to be corporation lawyers and if they are corporation lawyers - by the way modern corporations today are being required by some of these brilliant young lawyers coming out of these law schools to permit those lawyers to have a certain <sup>number</sup> ~~amount~~ of hours to work in the community. The lawyers are demanding it. And young doctors are demanding - even in great hospitals today that they have some time to work in a neighborhood health center for nothing. I think ifprofessins.are willing to do that and we as educators surely ought to be willing to do ~~that~~ it, I think ~~then~~ then you as budding journalists ought to ask yourself "Am I just going to work on a newspaper?" "Am I just going to work on a television camera?" "Is that all I'm going to do?" "It's important. I can get a job. I can make some money. But what is my mission? What's my purpose? What is it that I can do with it?" And I don't think I can make your mind up for you. I think you have to ask yourself. I think you cannot have a society that's going to do much if it loses faith in itself. If all we ~~hear~~ hear is what/s goes wrong, then allwe're going to do is add to what goes wrong. If all a child hears from his

001640

parent from the day that he's born until he leaves that household is that he's a ~~XXXX~~ failure, that he doesn't live up to standards, that he's no good, that he's a bad boy, or she's a bad girl, I venture to say that as you speak to them in that way, that's the way they're ~~going~~ going to act, except in a few instances. Some rise above it. I think therefore then America itself must have constantly balance. Now you're going to have to ask yourself what is news, what is news?. And thank goodness that many people are. And I'm not trying to draw judgment. I just ask you to ask yourself. You're concerned about many ~~XXXXXX~~ things. You're concerned about Blacks, Indians, Mexican-Americans, I pray to goodness that you always will be and that you'll do more about it, but are you also concerned about something, for example, that my wife and I have a little interested in - that un - that exceptional child, that unusual person. For years the mentally disturbed, the mentally retarded - we need thousands of young people today in these institutions to help, thousands of them. Some of you are very concerned about waste in Government. When you drive through the national forest are you concerned about throwing a cigarette butt out the ~~XXXXXX~~ window if it starts a forest fire? We're all concerned about pollution. Who puts the beer cans in the ditch? I doubt that it is Hamm brewery, they can't drink that much. I think we have to ask ourselves what our role is? Ok that's enough. Who wants to be first? Yes sir.

001641

AUDIENCE: You- keep emphasizing that a man's judgment is no better than his information, and judgment is real important in our representative type of democracy. To what extent do you think that the government should be allowed to withhold information, such as secrets and military secrets, things that affect the country. INAUDIBLE .....

HHH: Very little. Very little. I think most of the information<sup>that</sup> is withheld really isn't that vital to our security, having been in government for some time. It appears - and most of the information gets out anyway. I have to tell you in all honesty, I - every morning at 7 o'clock for four years a man came to my apartment or would meet me at my office, from the national security agency, and would give me one of two booklets, one prepared for the president, one prepared for myself, as Vice President. We got what we call the highest level briefings every morning, without exception. No matter where I was, any place in the world, that information got to me. And I can honestly tell you that a lot of it I read in the New York Times the same day. And I think it's simply because most of it was information that was pretty much in the areas of public information and was being ~~K~~ carefully digested and reported, excellent reporting. You know, the quality of the American press, which people complain about a great deal is so much better than most of the world's press that there's no comparison. Have you ever been to see some ~~X~~<sup>of</sup> the tabloids in London? You

001642

like to know, it's really - as much as we/complain about our newspapers, and we're great complainers about it - by and large, we get tremendous coverage. And considering also - not just in the metropolitan areas of the big Eastern cities, but all across this country, you can be out at Phoenix, Arizona, or you can be up in Butte, Montana, or Fargo, North Dakota, and the great news services give us tremendous coverage, and of course, with/<sup>modern</sup>television, with the network television in particular, and the feed-ins to network television, there is an unbelievable amount of information that gets to our people. I believe that freedom of information, as Congressman Moss, I believe it is, of California, has fought for in Congress for years is very vital to the Democratic process. Now there may be a few things, for example, as to the actual disposition of certain strategic weapons in a period of considerable conflict and tension in the world that - for purposes of national security - that you have to keep under control. Obviously you don't want to have somebody publish - as one newspaper did in World War II - the code, that - you know, one of the newspapers in World War II in this country decided to break the code. I mean you have to ask yourself whether or not that's really the way you ought to protect your sons and daughters when you're engaged in an all-out war.

AUDIENCE: Do you think it's the responsibility of the press to ----- the information?

001643

HHH: Yes sir. Yes sir, and they're going to make mistakes.  
 Look at. Everyone ~~is~~ <sup>of</sup> us ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> subjective. We try to be ob-  
 jective. And I think that it's constantly - that we're ~~is~~  
 constantly going through a process of re-evaluation, and  
 we must do so. And there will be excesses. Somebody  
 wants to ~~get~~ get that story; sometimes he can't wait to get  
 all the facts. This is tru of politicians; some - we pass  
 laws before we get all the facts. We have to make decisions.  
 We ~~make~~ make judgments. We get into wars before we get all  
 the facts. This is a human frailty. And I think we have  
 to be sufficiently tolerant to see that that frailty is  
 not just in the media, but is also in the ~~is~~ people that  
 the media report ~~on~~ on. Yes. This gentleman.

AUDIENCE: Inlight of these comments, how might you evaluate  
 the Nixon Administration's recent reluctance, seeming re-  
 luctance concerning the situation in Laos, in terms of  
 releasing information and this sort of thing?

HHH: Well I think that frankly ~~is~~ President Nixon has  
 gone quite a ways in releasing information on Laos, much  
 more so than the ~~previous~~ previous Administration, of which  
 I was a part. So I would commend the President on what he  
 has done on the ~~releasing~~ releasing information on Laos. I think  
 that the President took a good hard look at it and I venture  
 to say that every military advisor told him <sup>not</sup> to do what he  
 did. And I'm sure that some of the top people in the State  
~~Department~~ Department said "Mr. President, don't do it." Because

001644

when I was Vice President I knew that there was bombing going on in Laos, but I was under strict instructions not to talk about it, even though you knew it and everybody else knew about it, you, I mean, it's like something's going on in your neighborhood and it affects your family and everybody in the neighborhood knows about it except you, you know, you know about it but don't talk about it. No, I think Mr. Nixon, in this instance, was quite open about it. It took him some time, but under - considering the background that I know of suppressing that information, I commend the President on it. What I don't commend the Administration upon is what I consider to be the kind of indirect pressures upon the media, which, by the way, the media's responded to. I want to be very frank. Isn't it nice to be a free man again. Right. I think that Mr. Agnew's attack upon the media really made them worried, and I think that the media has been a little more fearful ever since. I don't think they've necessarily been better, I said more fearful. I don't think there's any doubt about it. I think that that one period of time when the Vice President and the Chairman of the FCC, Federal Communications Commission, and members of Cabinet, wives of Cabinet members, started all talking about dissenters, protesters, and the media - all in one package - I think that that had a very, very serious effect upon the dissemination of news in this country. Now I think that the media'll maybe come out of it, but don't

001645

tell me that they're not thinking about it twice. I had in one instance, sir, when I was on a TV show, I had the producer of that show tell me that I was to make no reflections upon the President or the Vice President or the Administration, under instructions. Now this wasn't a news show. This was another kind of show that I was on, that we weren't supposed to play jokes on. Now that's going someplace, I might add. That's going somewhere. And I must also say that I've watched a very substantial switch in coverage, which I, by the way, am not particularly complaining about. When Mr. Nixon went to Europe as President of the United States in February, his coverage was excellent, and there were riots and demonstrations, in fact, the greatest demonstration that's ever taken place by a visiting political figure in the history of Italy, took place when Mr. Nixon went to Rome. Now you read about it and look at the television, and see how much they covered it. I went to Rome and someone, the president of the Young Communist League from Milano dropped a little celbphane bag of yellow paint upon the master of the Opera standing alongside of me, and it was a news story all over the country. You'd think that the country was going to come apart. When a President of the United States, as in the Inaugural - in the Inauguration of President Nixon, there was a movement in the city to harrass that Inaugural, to protest it. They were given a permit by the outgoing Administration as they were in every instance, to have space in - on the mall, that we provided every time that

001646

they requested, space for their protesters. They had up a huge tent on the mall, and they had hundreds, thousands of people there to protest Mr. Nixon's Inaugural. I wasn't for it. I don't want you to misunderstand me. I think that the Inaugural should be a matter of great dignity and respect for the Presidency. And the only time there was any really major coverage of it ~~was~~ is when - as he went around a corner, coming up by the Treasury Building, some people tried to dash towards his car. On the night of the Inaugural when they were going to have substantial numbers of protesters, there wasn't a single camera over at the tent. And that was a deliberate policy of not to cover it and of course, by not covering it, you didn't know about it. I was there; so were thousands of other people. Now that is a decision that was made. Frankly, I like the decision. I think they've covered too much of that kind of business. I think that there's something else going on in the world, except somebody getting run over and having a fire and leading a protest. I think there's a lot of good things going on, ~~and~~ and they ought to be covered and they are being covered. <sup>you</sup> But/again need balance. But I think that Mr. Agnew's recent attack//~~is~~ that he has leveled on the press, and picking out what press, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and those effete Eastern liberal snobs, or whatever you call it, that indicates to me a very substantial attack. And how much fight-back has there been. How much fight-back. Well you had Dr. Frank Stanton

001647

got up and made one speech. And you had a couple of others making it. Instant - there isn't any more of this instant stuff after a Presidential message; you know/ that you're not supposed to make/<sup>an</sup> instant response after a Presidential message. Well why not? You get the copy of the message hours before. You don't believe, do you, for a single minute that the President just gets on television and that Walter Cronkite, or Eric Severeid, or Chet Huntley, or Frank Reynolds or - I've covered all the networks, I think, here /now - you don't think that those men just listen in like this and say "What did he say?" They've got that text for - held for release at noon the day - of that day. If that speech is at nine o'clock, they've got that text in the morning, not later than noon. They've studied it for hours. So that when they come on afterwards, for what they call the instant reaction, it ~~is~~ isn't instant; they've had a chance to look at it. But not even that has been eliminated. And by the way, without speaking for the Democratic Party, we tried to buy some time for a response. And we had a man willing to put up \$250,000, to raise it. I think you ought to call Fred Harris, and ask him what happened when he tried to buy the time. We had some difficulty. Now fortunately for one of the networks, they had on the NBC show, a week for the Democrats, and a week for the Republicans. I like that. That's the way it ought to be. I just simply say there have been some pressures and this is what I mean by government pressure, government pressure. And I think govern-

001648

ment pressure on the media - the pressure on the media  
not be  
ought/to/coming from the government, ladies and gentlemen.

The ~~XXXXXXXX~~ pressure on the media ~~ought to come from~~  
~~the media~~ if it ought to come from, ~~XXXXXXXX~~ should come from  
the media ~~and~~ and from the University, from the school of  
Journalism; government's got too much power. And it has  
too much authority to permit the government of the United  
States to start to exercise any form of censorship, direct  
or indirect. Now everyone of us in government has some-  
times spouted off. I have. I've gotten angry with them.  
Im entitled to that. That keeps ~~you~~ you from getting ulcers.

But a concerted attack is one thing; a sporadic attack is  
another. Yes anybody else? Don't hesitate here. Yes sir.

AUDIENCE: Minnesota Legislature has been in committee  
hearings on state aid to non-public education. Would you  
comment on the constitutionality and the advisability of  
this aid.

HHH: I don't know about that constitutionality of it.  
But I do know this - that we've got to find some way of  
aiding private institutions, or the public ~~is~~ is going to  
have to take on a greater burden of taxation, of ~~educational~~  
educational responsibility, than they've ever had before.  
We did in the Congress of the ~~United~~ United States, find ways  
to do it that are constitutional. For example, higher  
education - I think this school ~~has~~ has maybe had some - college  
has had some aid for ~~dormitory~~ <sup>a</sup> dormitory or a classroom or a library,  
and it doesn't violate the Constitution. I'm sure that under

001649

our elementary and Secondary Education Act, the funds that have been provided for books, for library services, for some of the facilities, do not violate the Constitutional requirements. And it's my view that if the Federal government can do this through forms of aid to education, then the state government can. However, I would have to look at the exact language of the state constitution; but insofar as violating the Federal Constitution, there are forms of aid. Now direct aid to a school, I mean, large lump sums for just general education, I am sure would be looked upon - on private institutions, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, whatever they are, as a violation. But the other forms of aid that I talked about, to the individual student, for a particular type of facility that is required because of what is considered to be the common defense or national security or the general well-being, ~~XXXXXX~~ I think that can be justified. Yes Sir.

AUDIENCE: You spoke of the educational programs over TV in England, (HHH: Yes.) and what do you think is the responsibility of the network-s, granted they are profit-making networks, what do you think their responsibility is, their direction is, in <sup>our</sup> ~~the~~ country? Do you think they ought to turn back part of their time, free of charge, for educational or ~~XX~~ other purposes, for the good of the country?

HHH: I don't necessarily think they have to put it back free of charge, but they could follow the Xerox Corp. philosophy a good deal; I think this is one of the better examples,

001650

of where you get tremendous amount of solid, substantive programming that's done up <sup>by</sup> the best. By the way, the commercial broadcasters, generally do a better job. And that's why I like to tie them in. I think that there is a way for the networks to do more of a public service broadcast, give more time. Some of it would be done free because they have that obligation under their licensing. And if you read the hearings under the Federal Communications Act, which I ask you to do, you will see that those who were at that time speaking for the FCC, to become a law, because they wanted these channels desperately, they then said they ought to give as much as  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{1}{3}$  of all of their prime time for purposes of education, radio, free time to the public. Now that's been forgotten, but you ought to go back and look at those hearings. I've read them. I think that what we've gotten into here, is saying to the networks "You've got to give a lot of free time." I don't think that's really the point at all. I think ~~WXX~~ what is necessary, is that there be certain amounts of time that is really - that qualifies under what we would define as public service. That will require some definition between the FCC and the broadcasters. Now whether that's sponsored or not, to me is - that's a matter for the networks to work out. I do think for example, that the networks ought to be required in Presidential election years, to provide a block of time to each candidate, the party of each candidate, so that the party can dispense that time to its

001651

candidate or to whomever speaks for its candidate, a block of time. Now that could be either provided free, or it could be provided under an appropriation from Congress. But there ought to be a block of time provided so that you don't have to get in there and scurry. Now let me tell you what you have to do. I went through this. I didn't have money in '68. I could not buy time in August. I didn't have any money. You have<sup>got</sup>/to put it on the line, you know. No charge it. There's no credit cards for TV time. You can go - you can die on a credit card, but you can't get TV time. You can pay for your funeral on a credit card. You can. Fly to Hawaii - even tell you to bring your wife along on credit card. But you've got to have cash on the line. Now if you don't have the cash early, you lose the better ~~slots~~ slots, and that is a very important matter in buying time. Fortunately, the networks try desperately, and they really do try ( and I think we ought to make it clear) they try to - even if you come in late- to find you some way that they can get you some time. But they frequently knock off good programs then - they have to knock off good programs which irritates the ~~public~~ public no end. You have to be very care - I used to go - like Bonanza - I said "No, no, no, don't take ~~it~~ off"- you know, or Laugh-In or some - "don't do that"/<sup>you know,</sup> or take one of these - I got to get one again on each network, but -"don't ~~knock~~ knock that one off" and particularly, and let me tell you the worst program to knock off is the wrestling matches.

001652

Oh,  
 Oh yes. /You would be surprised, the letters that you get, the vitriolic letters. People say "I just didn't need to listen to that ~~verbal~~ dribble that you were going to ~~XXXXXX~~ put on that TV. I want<sup>ed</sup>/to listen to those wrestling matches, or sports events. Anyone else here. Yes sir. Right back here, this gentleman.

AUDIENCE: I was wondering , Sir, if you could comment on the recent announcement that the Postal authorities can now open certain mail from overseas in an effort to find Irish Sweepstake tickets and -

HHH: Oh I'm just sick and tired of the government invading everybody's privacy. There's got to be another bettrd way. Wiretapping, opening mail, no-knock - what's happening to us? I just - as bad as these abuses are - the worst abuse is when you give the government the right to start probing into everything that you're doing, as a legal right. Now they're going to do a lot of it anyway, and only a congressman or a Senator'll stand there ~~as~~ as your protector. Don't ever underestimate taht Congressman or that Senator. I've been in the Executive branch of Government, and I'm here to tell you that they've got a lot of ways to check you ~~out~~ out and check up on you. And there's a lot of people that feel ~~XXXX~~ that that's just exactly what we ought to be doing. Because they've got a job to do; they're not pernicious, but they want to do certain things. And we've got to find some ways within the framework of civil liberties, not civil abuses, but civil liberties, at least through due process of law. Now if they can go and get a court order to open up

001653

a piece of mail, that I might - I might give that considera--  
tion. But I'm not about ready to let the government of the  
United States, or some bureaucrat in that government decide  
that the mail/is coming through may have something in it  
about the Irish Sweepstakes. If that's our number one prob-  
lem - right after St. Patrick's Day, I must say this country  
is in a fine fix. But we've got to watch this. This is  
very, very important; i'm pleased that you brought it up,  
because there is a tendency now, because of crime, and  
violence, and protesters, and the drug problem, and all of  
these things which come and go, by the way, they do, / if  
you have any perspective of history, - there is a tendency  
now to say to the government "Will ~~you~~ you protect us; you  
just get right on in there; get the Justice department -  
just let the m go." Listen the IRS and the Justice Depart-  
ment have got plenty of authority without getting a lot  
more. And what you need - that's one of the things that  
this television camera is great about and the free press,  
~~if~~ they give you some ~~protection~~ protection. They really give  
you some protection. And I would hope that in this country  
we would start to assume ~~once~~ once again, if it isn't too  
old fashioned, that a man is innocent until proven guilty.  
My gosh, the fact that he is sometimes is under Grand Jury  
indictment, or ~~he's~~ he's being investigated, or he is sub-  
poenad - listen the average person - ther's a poll been  
taken - what is your reaction when a man is subpoenaed -  
overwhelmingly the people assume that he's guilty of some-

001654

thing, just to get a subpoena. You may be subpoenaed to come and say what you think of Heinz beans, or which kind of ketchup do you like, the kind that slops out, or the kind that you have to pound out, you can get all kinds of subpoenas. But the word subpoena has taken on in the public, something bad, something about your character. The worst thing about being hailed into court, or a grand jury, or subpoena, is not that you will be convicted, or not even indicted, but you have scar tissue from that moment on on your character. That's what happens, and it gets in those files. Listen, I've seen some of these files in the government. Oh boy. I have. I frankly have seen some looking at myself, and if I'm that bad a guy I ought not to be here. Because I can tell you, of course, that most everything that's in a government file is just what somebody said. One thing I think you ought to know about the FBI; the FBI does not pass judgment ~~does not~~ ~~pass judgment~~ on you. The FBI is a rumor, fact, observance gathering organization. I mean an FBI agent doesn't stand in judgment ~~of~~ of you. I happen to think it's a pretty good instrumentality of government. It ~~has~~ has a tremendous sense of responsibility, and it really does. What the FBI does is to put anything that any <sup>body</sup> ~~thing~~ wants to - they ~~wxxxxx~~ write on into the Justice Department and they say "You know what, I just found out that St. Thomas is full of troublemakers." And then they start listening

001655

about six. I was going to include myself, but I've been working on myself enough here this morning. And that goes into a file. And most people that are in public life or any private leadership ~~leadership/pos~~ position have a file. Now that's all reviewed if you're up for government position, or appointment. That's all pulled out, and somebody has to make a judgment. I remember one time and one instance - I shall just tell you without giving ~~you~~ the name of the man - when I was Senator, the Attorney General came over to me with a file on a particular person that was going to receive an appointment. And he said "What do you think about this." I said "All the trash that's in that file, was said by the same people who hated your brother, and they weren't for him and they're not for this fellow, and I wouldn't pay any more attention to it than if you found it in a garbage can." And he said "Well, how do you think we can appoint this fellow?" I said "Well, appoint who you wish. He'll just never be confirmed, that's all." I was then Senior Senator from Minnesota, and I said "First of all, the man's a good man; he's an honorable man; he's a decent man; and this is just sheer dribble; and worse things were said about your brother and he got elected President. So we're ~~just~~ just not going to pay any attention to that are we?" And he said "That's right. We don't pay any attention to that." Because it was just a lot of bunk. But this is a fact gathering. Now, you've got to make - I want those facts gathered. I

001656

want that information gathered, but it's ~~again~~ again the matter of judgment. Yes sir.

AUDIENCE: A few weeks ago ~~when~~ in Time there was an article about Howard K. Smith, and he was more or less supporting Agnew's statements on the press, and he said that he viewed a political assassination of Lyndon Johnson, that he was kind of foreseeing the same thing of Nixon. Do you see this political assassination ~~of~~ of President Johnson?

HHH: Well, I just finished reading a piece from the Columbia Law - the Columbia School of Journalism Review by Ted White about Hubert Humphrey. Teddy White and the Making of <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ President and I'm sorry I didn't bring it over here because it was the appropriate thing for me to read before I come here, because it made me exercise self-discipline. This article says in substance, and I'd be glad to send it over to this class. Teddy White is not a flamboyant, irrational character. He said that every view that had been taken of Hubert Humphrey during the campaign made him look like a sinister character. Now I think that's an overexaggeration, but I don't believe that at all; I really don't believe that. I think that there were <sup>a</sup> certain number of people that went after President Johnson in a manner which I consider unfair. I think that's true. This is the price that you pay in politics. I just ask you to - (I don't like it) but I want you to go back and read what Thomas Jefferson had to say, what John Adams had to say, what Abraham Lincoln had to say - there's never been a

001657

President of the United States that wasn't subjected to unbelievable attacks from the media, whatever the media was at the time, without exception. I have a little notebook full of this sort of thing because I've been interested in what people have done over the years. And Thomas Jefferson attacked the newspapers with unbelievable vitriol, because he considered that he had been punished and abused as they called him an atheist and everything that they could think of. They called Abraham Lincoln an ape. That's the kind of stuff that - really we're treated well compared to what they used to do to people. It's - these are personal judgments made of people. But remember this, remember that no matter what the media does to a public official, particularly a President, he has the command of that microphone. When President Nixon wants to go on that network, he goes on. The networks make that available. And it's really kind of a competition. And I think that people that overdo it, that make you look too bad, lose their credibility anyway, because most people know that that's not quite true. Plus the fact that a man is elected, a lot of people have got a state in him already and they're not so sure that they kind of like all that abuse. It's my personal view that despite the abuse that President Johnson took that he run for re-election, he would have been re-elected. It's my view. I've told him that and I believe it to this day because he was the incumbent President of the United States, and there ~~have~~ <sup>were</sup> only been two incumbent

001658

Presidents defeated in the 20th Century, and one of them was defeated because of a massive world-wide depression, defeated Herbert Hoover, and other one was Taft, / simply because of the Bull Moose Party. So my fellow Democrats, watch out. In the twentieth Century, in 70 years, only two incumbent Presidents - So - it's - I suppose you can always make a case for somebody that abuses you. I've thought that I've had a lot of rough times out of the press, and the only thing I ask is what I'm getting this morning. I ask the right to reply. I don't care what they say if I can get back - give me equal time. Give me the right - in other words, and let me have it on time, not late, but one time. Now for example, I can give you an instance - don't get me wrong now, I'm just giving you for instances - my trouble - I'm a former public official, and I can't really teach, you know, because I'm always - kind of on the spot. But let me give you an instance. I went to University of Massachusetts. I had a hundred and fifty to two hundred people, fifty hard core people in the front, they had a meeting on the Seven, you know Chicago Seven, that day on the campus with everybody all over the New England States coming to Amherst. They decided to attend my lecture that night. I've been invited by the student body to come back. Gee, it was the nicest compliment I've ever had. I've been commencement speaker at University of Massachusetts; I've been their distinguished lecturer, and on a student referendum I was selected to come back. I

001659

thought it was a great compliment. With five thousand young people in that auditorium. After a certain amount of monkey business, <sup>and</sup> harrassment, and four letter words, and barnyard talk, and antics, all of which I've experienced myself, and none of which I thought was particularly new or ~~waxh~~ worthy of a University, I said "Good night." You know, I got paid for the lecture, if they didn't want to listento it, that's fine for me. I wasn't Vice President or Senator /I didnt have to go through that nonsense any more. I was a private individual - free enterpriser - and ~~xx~~ so I told the students, in so many words, "when you get your rules of conduct so a man can be hearæd, let me know. I'll come back. Until then, good evening." Give me my check; I'm going home. Now frankly, I went back downtown, and we had hundreds of students, <sup>come down, a</sup> and we had ~~the~~ better show than ever before, because right away I got television, and I got radio, I had all the New England states and the New England network, I ~~had~~ had the Boston and New York television; gee, it was great. I wasn't getting any of that in the auditorium. But it come through like Gangbusters at the end. Now what I want to tell you is that that made the press. It's news. I grant you that, and it should have made ~~the~~ the press, No doubt abut it. I just left the University of Arizona last week; I had the biggest audience that any University man has ever had at the University of Arizona. When I left the auditorium, over a thousand young people followed me to another room and asked <sup>me</sup> /if I'd spend an hour

001660

with them in questions and answers, which I did. I got a full front page story in the Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona newspapers, (both of them/highly Republican) complete coverage, front page, five pictures/the masthead, I have it in my office, by the way; and I have the lead article "Humphrey Star on Campus". Did you read about that here? I've been looking through the Minneapolis and the St. Paul papers ever since I got back; now I'm not made about ~~it~~ it; I'm just telling you a story. Now it isn't any further from Amherst ~~to~~ - Phoenix and Amherst, same distance; and I gather they got telephone lines working; and I think that film travels either way; and I ~~think~~ believe that the UPI and the AP are there, either way. Now, when you can get an almost thunderous reception, which they themselves report in their local papers, I ask you "what is it that makes news?" Now you have to ~~answer~~ answer that, I-frankly I thought I did alright, and I got paid both places. That's pretty good. I used to do these ~~things~~ things for nothing, when I was Vice President. I've spoke at a hundred and fifty colleges and Universities since 1964, and only now recently have I been doing well. Yes, sir.

AUDIENCE: In reference to Joe McGinnis's book, The Selling of the President, do you think that the blame could be attached to anyone, perhaps the mass media, because of - in terms of politics, people would rather be entertained than informed?

001661

HHH: No, listen, I think that Mr. Nixon's campaign was well run, and I think that Joe McGinnis' book is a dramatic exposition of what can and should be done with the use of the media. I believe that most politicians do not know how to use the media to its fullest. And I think that those of us that don't know how to use it to the fullest condemn it the most. It's my honest view, that had we had the money early enough, because that's what it takes - and somebody said "What do you need in Politics?" Well you need a good candidate, a good cause, a friendly constituency, and money. And money is ~~K~~ important on time. Now experts are available; people know how to do this. We could have packaged a Joe McGinnis type of program. But we didn't have it in June or July or August. Our money came in-the first money that I got came in the first week of October, and you couldn't hardl-y design a big media campaign with a tired, fatigued candidate at that time, and that I was, because we'd been fighting an up-hill battle. No I think Mr. Nixon used the media to perfection. Actually, my honest view is ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> he is not a natural for the media, and how they did as well with him as they did is still somewhat of amiracle to me. But they did <sup>it</sup> well, and most of it <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ because to use the media well, you have to be reasonably relaxed, you have to have it rather well staged, you cannot rely <sup>upon just</sup> ~~on~~ what's going to happen. Now I tried to use the media, for example, in what we call the question and answer thing, and I just took 'em just like this - I'd go into a big meeting, and gosh I didn't

001662  
know who was there. I could rest assured that a lot of people were there to cause me trouble as there ought to be in any political campaign; I mean the opposition ought to be around, not to make it easy for you, but to kind of put you on the spot. So I'd take my questions and answers and some fellow'd get up and give me a jim dandy, you know, one that no matter how I answered it, I'm in trouble, and or maybe give me a Senatorial question, which is a rather long speech and then saying "Isn't that right?" or "Aren't you guilty?" Now they never permitted that in the Nixon campaign. When they had their questions and answers, you were selected and it looked very good; there were businessmen and students, short-haired ones, long-haired ones; there were blacks; there were whites; there were liberals; there were conservatives; but everything was - it was a controlled experiment. And it looked solid and spontaneous. And then there were always all the right backgrounds. And by the way, lighting. Let me tell you what happens to me. I can walk out of this room right now and go out in the street, and before I go two blocks ~~and~~ somebody will stop me and say "Mr. Humphrey, you've lost weight." This happens every day. "Mr. Humphrey, you look younger." "Mr. Humphrey, you're taller than I thought you were." Now let me tell you why. (Go right ahead, young lady, have lunch.) Here's what happens to you frequently - most of the television that you're on. You're down here in a well, like this, see. And you look like you're the biggest runt in town, you know. You're down like this. Now - plus the fact lighting can make all

the difference in the world. Do you know <sup>889 1363</sup> you know Senator Percy of Illinois, you've heard of Senator Percy. How tall do you think Senator Percy is?

AUDIENCE: Five,-five.

HHH: Yeah, about five-four and a half. I've seen him stand alongside of Clinton Anderson who is six foot one, and Clint Anderson looks like he's a dwarf. That's an editorial exaggerzation, but it's for purpose of emphasis. The truth is that Chuck Percy wasn't President of Bell/Howell for nothing. He knows how a camera works. And he knows how to station himself. Very important. Very, very important. And I - the first time I saw him - I like Senator Percy; I think, by the way, that he's an outstanding man in public life - but I watched this man and he is incredible. He never looks like he's either 55 or 58 years of age. He doesn't look like he's five foot five; he looks like he's at least 6 foot, and about forty. Now particularly, and when he goes to a television studio, if he has any way - his staff people ahead of him, they get those lights fixed up; they've got it all worked out - chart. Now we finally got that in the ~~XXXX~~ last part of the campaign; I got letters from people said "You ~~kyo/~~, you started to look better as the campaign went on." I felt worse, but - - And the reason is I had a fellow <sup>that</sup> we hired from Chicago that ~~wax~~ was outstanding. He could have made a corpse look alive, and almost did. So what Mr. ~~MXXXXXXX~~ McGinnis is simply saying is ~~kyo/~~ there are ways to use the media, and that's, you know, that's - I hear a lot of people say~~ing~~ "Well,

001664

isn't that awful?" Not at all. That's not awful at all; that's the way it ought to be used. And when you're running around campaigning - we had to make a choice, since we didn't have money, we had to go on out and try to get the free media, which we did; we got a lot of coverage, tremendous amount of it. OK. Over here.

AUDIENCE: Sir, do you feel that the best showman will make the best public official?

HHH: Not one bit. I think that's one of the real dangers. And I'm waiting for you to get the question so ~~that~~ I <sup>could</sup> ~~can~~ answer it. I didn't know it would be you sir - but - the worst word in politics today is image. That isn't what you need. What you need is substance. Abraham Lincoln wouldn't have done very well on television. He wasn't young; he didn't look ~~xxx~~ that pretty; and I think that you have to be more than - you have to have more ~~xxxxx~~ than just being a good actor, or a good image. But if you have a little <sup>plus</sup> substance/the other, it's mighty healthy, mighty fortunate. Yes sir.

AUDIENCE: How are you going to get this to come across on television?

HHH: I think that by the use of the - greater use of time, which I think the networks and the Congress and other can help, so that we discuss issues. The best television time today that we buy are the ten secondslots, the thirty second ~~xx~~ slots, the one minute spots. Now my good friend, with all candor, there is nothing that is a world~~x~~ wide consequence

001665

relating to this economy or this community that you can discuss well and thoughtfully and maturely in one minute. You can give the inputs, that Heinz Catsup is the best - that's about - give you about ten seconds, or something - but it doesn't tell you much about what's in it. Now if you're going to discuss something, you're going to take more time. Now I think that the idea of the debates, the old fashioned discussion of debates, not necessarily debates even, just even discussion, dialogue, between candidates or between panelists is a very helpful way and there can be some ground rules ~~they~~ set, so that despite the fact that you use one - ten second spots one minute spots, five minute presentations, and that's a maximum- you start losing audience after five minutes, under the present system; but if you have several people, if you have a debate going on between the principals, they'll stay because it's a scrap, a contest; it's when you're on alone, you got to be ~~XXXXXX~~ pretty good to hold them unless you're President of the United States, or unless there has been plenty of pre-announcement, that some historic position is going to be taken; if you can build up the anxiety, you can hold people. And I think that the equal time provisions of the law have got to be amended to permit people to - despite the fact that - that one candidate might not appear, that the other candidate - if there are three or four, that if there's two that willing to appear, let them appear; let them battle it out. I think that'll

001666

help raise the level. Anybody else? There're telling me  
I'm supposed to go to lunch. Thank you very, very much



# Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



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