

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS  
STUDENT PANEL  
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

Julius Dusscha

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

February 20, 1967

Repr  
Willie Brown

Terry Francois

Carl Poole

Janb - Now Generation!  
Greetings, Now Generation!

I want to congratulate you. It took me

thirty-eight years to make the cover of Time magazine.

You did it in twenty.

Time was much more kind to you and the rest of the 25-and-under generation than to me. It sort of summed me up as a "Glib, jaunty spellbinder" when I was first elected to the Senate. But listen again to what Time said about the composite Now Generation man:

↳ "He ... will land on the moon, cure cancer and the common cold, lay out smog-free cities, enrich the underdeveloped world and ... write finis to poverty and war."

Some crowd this Now Generation!

Charles Bell

overseas campus  
Peace Corps  
Vista

There was only one trouble with that paragraph.

↳ It came right under a Time picture of five young men asleep and basking in the sun on a Florida beach.

↳ Henry Luce may have made the biggest mistake of Time's life when the Now Generation was put on the cover as Man of the Year.

↳ A few years ago, he threw a big party in New York, inviting all the people who had ever appeared on the cover of Time. / Chairman Khrushchev and a few others couldn't come, but most did.

↳ It was such a great party that everyone agreed Mr. Luce should do it again in a decade or two.

↳ When he does, be sure to claim your rights to an invitation. Everyone who was 25 or under on January 6, 1967, can come. ! *Some Party!*

now  $\angle$  I had my own idea of who should be Time's Man of the Year, but the editors rejected my nominee. But I'll try again next year.

Considered by your committee for the award of 1964

Proposed by you

*you have me wrong -*

$\angle$  My nominee? Snoopy.

$\angle$  It really is great to be at Stanford again, where the winds of freedom blow ... and the rates of tuition grow!

$\angle$  But I am concerned about the Stanford area.

I read in the Chronicle a few weeks ago about a group of scientists who work near here but charter a bus to commute daily from their homes in Berkeley.

$\angle$  The story said they regard the Deep Peninsula as a them "cultural wasteland." One of them commented that Berkeley "just seems more alive than most American cities" (that ought to get the Understatement-of-the-Year Award) ~~and he~~

asked:

"Where do you find a street like Telegraph Avenue?"

Well, I can see only one way for you to stop this Deep Peninsula brain-drain: Chop down all the trees along Palm Drive, replace them with technicolored ban-the-bomb signs, and rename it "Psychedelic Boulevard."

I shall take just a few moments now for a serious preface to our discussion. I am not here for a lecture or an address, but to respond to your thoughts and questions.

There is a great paradox in our society today, which I have not yet seen noted in the press.

We are told that this nation, particularly its majority of youth, is impatient ... restless ... unwilling to wait ... demanding now the changes for which its instincts for justice cry.

And at the same time we are told that this nation and its people are tired of change ... unwilling to "move too fast"...

*Function*



yearning for tranquility ... demanding a pause in the pace of progress.

↳ I have an announcement. I'm for and with the "Now" people and against the "Pause." ~~FE~~

↳ It would be the ultimate tragedy of this century if the United States became enveloped with a lethargic spirit and succumbed to the temptation of a luxurious pause.

↳ We cannot afford a pause. Time is on the side of men of movement, and the world will not wait for the tired nor the timid.

↳ You all know what the Pause People say.

↳ All the major goals of 1933 are achieved.

↳ Aren't the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 enough?

↳ Social justice is here.

↳ Utopia has arrived.

↳ Nirvana is come.

↳ The Pause People would simply have us close up shop and go bowling. Slow down, simmer down, cool it, they command.

↳ The Romans thought they had it made, that it was time for a Pause. And they never recovered from it.

↳ The United States, in the 1920's, thought it was time for normalcy, for a pause. And it took us three decades to pull out of that one.

↳ I cannot conceive of more false reasoning than that which suggests we should stop, relax a bit and pause in our quest for human justice. I just can't buy it.

↳ Not when two-thirds of the world's people are hungry, sick, uneducated and despairing.

↳ Not when starvation and disease stalk large parts of our own hemisphere.

↳ Not when this United States is still blotched with  
poverty, blemished with racial injustice and blighted with  
decaying cities and polluted skies and streams.

↳ We do not have to look far or speak in the abstract  
to find compelling arguments against the Pause People.

There are children today -- even teen-agers --  
~~living in the Watts District of Los Angeles~~ who have never  
stepped on a beach or leaped into a swimming pool.

↳ There are children today living in the Hunters  
Point District of San Francisco -- within earshot of Candlestick  
Park -- who have never been to a baseball game.

↳ Those may seem to be little things. But add them  
to all the other lacks of our slums and ghettos -- too few  
parks, too many outdated books, too few teachers, inadequate  
housing and shallow opportunities -- and you have a people  
who will not and should not pause.

↳ The pause recommended today is not the  
pause the refreshes.

↳ It's the pause that stifles, chokes, and shrivels  
the human spirit.

I'm with you. I want to be where the action is.  
And I suggest that one need not be 25 or under to be of the  
Now Generation.

↳ Winston Churchill was a Now man, and I liked  
what he said:

↳ "The beaches of history are paved with the bleached  
bones of those who waited, and while waiting died."

↳ Pope John 23rd was a Now man, and I liked what  
he told a group of Cardinals in 1959 who thought that the  
Ecumenical Council couldn't possibly be held by 1963."

"All right," said John, "we'll have it in 1962 then."

↳ But there must be, in the midst of those who chant  
"Now," at least a few who ask and challenge: "How?"

↳ It is up to those of us in politics and government  
to try to answer that question.

I'm ready for your questions.

# # #



## Statement on CIA Aid to NSA

Following is yesterday's State Department statement on CIA support of the National Student Association:

We have confirmed with the Central Intelligence Agency that, as stated by the National Student Association yesterday, its leadership has been working over the past two years to terminate the financial relationship concerning support of NSA's international activities which began in the early '50s. Even prior to that time (ed. note: two years ago), the degree of governmental support for those activities had begun tapering off sharply.

U.S. officials added these comments:

1. There was in the cold war tension of the early '50s a spread of Communist subversive activity in international youth organizations and student groups, particularly in Asia, Latin America and Africa.
2. American students, notably the National Student Association, felt the need to counteract this subversive and propaganda activity and to express effectively their own free ideas abroad. The Communist students were well financed from official sources. The American students, however, were deeply handicapped by lack of funds for overseas work.
3. Private contributions were insufficient, here the agreement between NSA and the United States Government that the Government would help support the NSA effort.
4. Governmental support for a institution such as NSA obviously raises difficult and delicate problems. No matter how complete the

freedom of decision and action retained by the students, such support is bound to raise the legitimate question of whether the purse does not influence the policy. We understand and appreciate this, but at an earlier time the alternatives were limited.

5. Overt governmental support for these NSA activities abroad would have destroyed their utility, because NSA would hence have been subjected to attacks as a instrument of government. Its credibility as a free spokesman, which in fact it consistently has been, would have been impugned at the outset. Indeed, such attack would have come precisely from those students who in fact were paid agents of Communist governments.

6. Therefore, if support were to be given at all, covert support was the only feasible alternative. The very fact that the support was covert and thus known

only to two NSA officers a year guaranteed the integrity of the views expressed by the many other NSA members who participated in international sessions. But because it was covert, it also exposed the NSA and the Government to all of the associations which go inevitably with that word.

Next, it would be grossly unfair now to accuse the students of having been propagandists or agents, or to accuse the Government of attempting to influence what were independent, free decisions and views — and the NSA's decisions, policies and actions have been free — as surely is evidenced by the fact that the organization has frequently and sharply differed with the Government. The purpose of the Government support was to provide free students with the means to do the things they would have done unaided had they had the funds.

From Ted  
February 18, 1967

2. ABM

Please see below the President's statement of February 17.

"This brings me to my last observation, which is that this Report reveals the sobering reality of the immensity of the task we have undertaken. Read in the context of recent developments in the Soviet Union -- the buildup of their strategic forces and the deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system around Moscow -- we are reminded that our hard-won accomplishments can be swept away overnight by still another costly and futile escalation of the arms race.

"It is my belief that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached a watershed in the dispiriting history of our arms competition. Decisions may be made on both sides which will trigger another upward spiral. The paradox is that this should be happening at a time when there is abundant evidence that our mutual antagonism is beginning to ease. I am determined to use all the resources at my command to encourage the reduction in tension that is in our mutual interest, and to avoid a further, mutually-defeating buildup. The work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will continue to be of invaluable assistance in this urgent task."

You can safely note, as well, that Secretary Rusk has said that freezes or cutbacks on both offensive and defensive weapons might be included in any discussions with the Soviets.



From Ted  
February 18, 1967

3. Vietnam

Most clearly your recent approach in your speeches is the most effective one.

Suggested answer: First I wish to make it absolutely clear that, at the first real and tangible response from Hanoi, we are ready to bring the conflict to the conference table. However, as Prime Minister Wilson said the other day following his discussions with Mr. Kosygin, thus far there has been no such response.

I believe, therefore, that the best route to peace is to steadfastly persevere in the course already begun -- that is, to proceed militarily ... economically ... in rural pacification ... and in helping the people of South Vietnam build political institutions of their own choosing.

I particularly place emphasis on the latter -- the building of political institutions. For this is perhaps the most critical part of the effort. If progress continues on the other fronts, and if national elections are held on schedule this fall in South Vietnam, I should think that peace would be much closer.

I think we have no reason for haste or for losing our perspective. Despite the present lack of response from Hanoi, the leaders there must be having second thoughts. In the meantime, let us proceed in our efforts to help South Vietnam become both more secure and free.

From Ted  
February 18, 1967

5. Civil Rights - The Great Society - Our Stance  
on Economic and Social Progress

Has President Johnson lowered his sights here at home?  
Will the Congressional election results cause the Johnson-  
Humphrey Administration to speak and walk more softly  
re the Great Society?

Suggested answer: On the contrary. The programs the  
Johnson-Humphrey Administration proposed -- and which  
were passed by the 89th Congress -- were not proposed  
for political gain, but because we thought they were needed  
and because we thought they were right. I do not interpret  
the loss of Congressional seats last November as a repudi-  
ation by the people of those programs. The fact is, few of  
them had even begun to reach the people themselves by the  
time those elections were held. No, we lost seats because  
of normal off-year trends and, frankly, because we were  
complacent in some places.

I think the President's State of the Union message -- and his  
Messages to the Congress since then -- should make it clear  
that we not only mean to stand by those programs but to improve  
them. We do not mean to postpone or delay or compromise on  
what we regard as first-priority work in building a stronger and  
a better America. That means we stand by our health programs...  
aid to education ... help to our cities ... the effort toward cleaner  
air and water ... the war on poverty ... and our fight for civil  
rights and equal justice.

We will stand by those programs. And if the opposition does  
not, we are quite willing to let the people judge in 1968.

Suggested quote re this for Stanford students:

Victor Hugo expressed pretty much the way I feel about it  
when someone tells me that we're going too fast in trying to

5. Civil Rights - The Great Society . . . (continued)

break through the old barriers in our society:

"The future has several names.

For the weak, it is the impossible.

For the faint-hearted, it is the unknown.

For the thoughtful and valient, it is ideal.

The Challenge is Urgent. The Task is Large

The Time is Now. "

From Ted  
February 18, 1967

6. Law and Order

Suggested answer: As you know, we have proposed a new Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill to help bring both better crime prevention and law enforcement to our cities and towns. We are a people who believe in the rule of the law, and we cannot and will not allow people to take the law into their own hands or to threaten peaceful citizens.

At the same time, we recognize clearly that the roots of crime must be simultaneously attacked -- I mean poverty ... discrimination ... lack of opportunity and self-respect. There are very few born criminals in our society; most of them are made by conditions around them. We have to do our best to create an America where crime not only doesn't pay ... but where it doesn't begin.

From Ted  
February 18, 1967

7. Tax Sharing

Here is a chance to get in some licks in a major metropolitan area where there has been much discussion of same.

Suggested answer: It is quite obvious that state and local governments need more revenue. But direct "sharing" of federal tax revenues with the states, no strings attached -- as some people have suggested -- would not be keeping faith with the taxpayer. The sad fact is that many of our state governments are just not equipped to wisely use such money. (And I won't name any specific state governments or governors.) I think many of you probably have seen the reaction of many of the nation's mayors to these proposals -- namely, don't give the money to the states; give it to the cities, and so on.

What we really ought to be talking about is how to make our whole federal-state-local system work more effectively and efficiently ... how to solve problems, without being hampered by old and outmoded jurisdictions and ways of doing things. Some thinking is being done here. And I have a number of my own ideas which I will share with you, if you wish. But money-- just money -- isn't the answer to meeting 21st century problems.

From Ted  
February 18, 1967

8. Bobby

Suggested answer: He is a young man who shows promise.  
As a young man myself, I certainly will watch his career  
with interest.

From Ted  
February 18, 1967

9. California Politics

Suggested answer: I learned long ago that the surest way to get into trouble is to come into a state and tell the people there how they ought to run their business. But Pat Brown looks pretty good these days, doesn't he?

# # #

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey's Address

February 20, 1967

On behalf of the Political Union of the Associated Students of Stanford University, I would like to welcome you to this morning's students interview with the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey.

Beginning with last year's focus series on the United States involvement in Vietnam, and continuing through the current program on the Great Society, The Political Union has promoted a series of programs on issues in American politics. We have done so in the belief that the discussion of vital contemporary problems among all elements of the University community that serves as intellectual growth and a sense of commitment. This morning's program is a unique addition to that educational experience the Political Union hopes to stimulate. At this time I would like to introduce the panel which will participate in this morning's program - from my extreme right - Stefan Halper President of the Institute for International Relations; Mr. Henry Muller, Editor of the Stanford Daily; Professor Thomas Ehrlich from the Stanford Law School; Mr. Julius Duscha, Former Political Correspondent for the Washington Post; my name is Paul Charles Bell and moderating the program this morning will be Mr. Robert Dunn from KGO Television in San Francisco.

At this time it is my great pleasure and honor to introduce the Vice President of the United States, The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey.

"And I want to thank you very much - this is better than Berkeley - you gave me a good start. Mr. Bell, members of the Panel, members of the student body of Stanford University, and my welcoming committee. I understand that I had a very good welcoming committee here today. I want to welcome you, too. Today I was privileged to be joined on my visit to this wonderful campus by three of your public servants, Representative in your State Legislature, Mr. Willie Brown,



one of the Commissioner's in the Bay Area and San Francisco, Terry Franchoise, one of the outstanding attorneys in your great state, Cecil Poole, and in our visit over here we practically settled everything. I'm sure that there is not much more that I need to say except the (- What about Vietnam? -) I'm delighted that I asked this man to ask that question because I was afraid that I might forget to reply. It was a little early, but we will get to it - you can imagine.

On January 6th of this year there was a Time magazine cover that symbolizes at least they tried to symbolize what's going on in our college campuses, and they called this composite figure that seemed to represent everyone and not quite anyone, "The Now Generation", and I thought that I would just give my opinions on that cover greet "The Now Generation", and because the college campus group today represents that generation. It took me 38 years to get on Time - on the Time cover - and it took "The Now Generation" only 20, proving the progress we are making these days. Time, however, was much more kind to you than my generation and the rest of 25 and under group than it was to me. Instead of

I'll just read you a glib, Spellbinder - that was some years back when I was first elected to the Senate, but listen to what Time had to say about you. The composite Now Generation Man - he will land on the Moon, cure cancer and the common cold, lay out smog-free cities, enrich the underdeveloped world, poverty and war. Well, that's quite an order. I want to congratulate you. If you get that all done, it will make serving in public office a delight, and I hope that you can be successful. But there is only one trouble with that paragraph - it came right under a Time picture of five young men that were asleep basking in the sunshine shores of the Florida beach. Now Henry Luce may have made the biggest mistake of his life in that cover picture - on that feature article on the Now Generation making the Now

Generation the Man of the Year, and I'll tell you why. Because a few years ago he threw a big party in New York City inviting all the people who had ever appeared on the cover of Time, Chairman Krushov and a few others couldn't make it, but most did. He invited them all to a party. It was such a great party that everyone agreed that Mr. Luce should do it again in a decade or two, and Mr. Luce agreed that he would do it again, and when he does I want every one of you to claim your rights to be present at that party - every one 25 years or under under January 6, 1967, will have free drinks and dinner on Henry Luce and Time. That ought to be some party.

Now I'm going to talk to you today a little more seriously than about Henry Luce's Time magazine, even though it's a significant publication. I want to - it compares with some others - I'm not here to give you a lecture or address, but we're here for what I said to the panel when we started, I think that every red-blooded American is entitled to one bite of a live public official, and they are going to take their time to do it. Now we're told that this nation particularly the majority of its youth is impatient, restless, unwilling to wait and demanding now for changes which its instincts cry out to be made. They cry out for justice, and at the same time, we're told this by our publicists - we're told that this is a nation where its people are tired of change, and unwilling to move too fast - yearning for tranquility - demanding a pause in the pace of progress. I heard a little bit about that after the last election - most people interpreted that as sort of go slow, stop, not now, don't try. Well, I have an announcement - I'm for and with the "Now People", and I am against the "Pause People". It would be the ultimate tragedy of this century, if this United States with its unfinished revolution became enveloped with a lethargic spirit and fell to the temptation of a luxurious pause, which is being recommended by some timid souls. I don't think that you can afford a pause. Time is on the side of men of movement, and the

world will not wait for the tired nor the timid. You all know what the pause people say - and here's what they're saying - all the major goals of 1933 are achieved. Aren't the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 65 enough? What more do they want? Social justice is here. Utopia has arrived. has come. That's what the pause people say. They'd simply have us close up shop - go bowling, slow down, simmer down, cool it, they command. Now the Romans thought they had it made - they said that was the time for a pause and they never recovered from it. In the United States in the 1920's we thought it was time for a pause and return to normalcy and it took us three decades to get over it. I cannot conceive of a more false reasoning than that what suggests that this nation should stop its programs and social progress - relax a bit and pause in our quest for human justice. I can't buy it - not when two thirds of the world's people are hungry, sick and uneducated and despairing. Not when an arms race threatens to engulf this entire world that could do nothing but bring it disaster. Not when starvation and disease stalk large parts of our own hemisphere. Not when this United States of ours is still blotched with areas of poverty, blemished with racial injustice, blighted with decaying cities, polluted skies and streams. We don't have to look far or speak in the abstract to find compelling arguments against these people of pause. There are children today, even teen agers, living right here in California - yes, in the Watts district in Los Angeles there are children who have never stepped on a beach, or leaped into a swimming pool, or never had a chance even for good care. There are children today living in the Hunters Point district of San Francisco, within earshot of Candlestick Park, who have never been to a baseball game. I know, those things seem very little, but they are part of a full life - but add them all up, add all the other of our slums and ghettos - too few parks, too many outdated books in our schools, too



few teachers, inadequate housing, shallow opportunities, breeding despair and bitterness, and you have a people who should not and I can tell you who will not pause. The pause that is recommended today is not the pause that refreshes. It's the pause that retrenches, and we're not for it. It's a pause that stifles and chokes and shrivels the human spirit. I guess maybe what I'm saying is that I prefer to be where the action is and that's one of the reasons I came here, and I knew there was plenty of it. And I suggest that one doesn't need to be 25 or under to be a member of the "Now Generation". I've met a few people in their late teens and early twenties that ought to apply for Medicare, and I've met some people who are in their late sixties that really ought to be considered as part of the go-go crowd. Winston Churchill was one of those - he was a now man, and I liked what he said. The beaches of history are paved with the bleached bones of those who waited, and while waiting - died. Pope John the 23rd was a member of the Now Generation, and a now man, not a pause man - and I liked what he told the group of Cardinals in 1959 who thought that the Ecumenical Council ~~was~~ couldn't possibly be held as they said in 1963. And that dear and good man said, alright, if it can't be held in 1963 we'll have it in 1962 then. A now man. But there must be in the midst of those who chant now and who demand action, who demand regress of our grievances who are deeply concerned about the times in which we live - there must be people who not only say now, but they have to say how. How do we do it. And I think that it's up to those of us who have been privileged, and I repeat privileged, to have the opportunity of a higher education, privileged to dip into the accumulation of knowledge and culture of centuries. Privileged to be the beneficiaries of this day and age. I think that it's the opportunity and the responsibility of us in Government and politics to try to find the answers as to how - how to do things - how to make change more than

just change for the purpose of change. How to direct it into constructive social paths. How to build a better life - that's what I'm interested in, and I gather this is what you're interested in, so I'm ready to consult with and advise with for a moment or two here the members of the panel, and we'll come to you, too. Thank you very much. Let's go."

Mod. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. I would like to take just a moment to inform you as to how our questioning will run - each member of the panel will be allowed one question in order, and gentlemen of the panel, feel free to ask the follow up questions if it pertains to the same subject and is appropriate. A little later in the program we will have members of the panel ask some of the questions that have been submitted by members of the audience. And now, if we can get right to the questioning. Where the Action Is, please.

Q. Mr. Vice President, why is it that the movement toward a political settlement in Vietnam seems to have been retarded, or broken off by American intervention. Usually in the form of military escalation. Hanoi's flexibility seems to be met with hostilities on our part - I refer specifically to the Gulf incident, raid and subsequent to the north and the mission.

A. Well, my good friend, I hope some day that you run for the Senate because you have the qualities of asking a senatorial question. It carries with it your desire to answer. I practiced that for 16 years in the United States Senate, and I want to compliment you - you're good. There is a difference of view in our country as to whether or not we have followed through on what some people feel are the peace initiatives. I think the best way for me to answer your question is the past weekend - what happened in London. Mr. Kosygin - I've talked with

Mr. Kosygin at length - I met with him in New Delhi - I visited with him privately for almost an hour at the President's Palace in New Delhi. I subsequently visited with him around the noon hour, and then two hours with Secretary Rusk. Mr. Kosygin, at that time told your Government, the representatives of your Government, as he told the President of India Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, the Soviet Union had no influence on Hanoi, and it was unable to bring about any response from Hanoi. He also indicated to us that Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ who had gone to Hanoi had found that his reception was cold and fruitless - to no avail. Now that's a year ago - it was a year ago this month that I had that visit. Last Sunday, Mr. Kosygin, or on Monday morning left London for the return to his capitol in Moscow. The communique from Mr. Wilson, Prime Minister, and Mr. Kosygin told of the fact, namely that an effort had been made to get a favorable response from Hanoi for the opening of discussions and negotiations, and no response had been obtained. I can say to you, my friend, that there isn't a man in this audience or woman, that is more desirous of a negotiated settlement in Vietnam than the man that's talking to you. I have had the privilege of being the author of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, the author <sup>of</sup> the Resolution for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I was considered the "Peacenik" in the Senate, and I haven't changed my views one bit. But let me make it quite clear to you, that when Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Harold Wilson cannot get a response, even a courteous response, from Hanoi, maybe possibly that the peace feeler was, if anything, but fantasy, and surely not a fact. We have not rejected them, and we shall not; so that you may know what the position of your Government is, we are prepared, as of this moment, to reconvene the Geneva Conference. We are prepared, as of this moment, to have a settlement along the lines - under the form of the International Control Commission. We are prepared to accept the good auspices of the Prime



Minister of Britain, the Chairman of the Consul of the Soviet Ministers. We are prepared to accept the proposals of the 17 non-committed nations. We are prepared to go to the peace table any hour, any time. All I ask is that those who want peace, will you please get Hanoi to come, too, because you can't settle something in a one man show. Your Government is prepared for it anytime, Sir.

(Thank you.)

Our next question from Mr. Henry *Muller*.

Q. Mr. Vice President, in 1964 there was considerable discontent among so called moderates over your connection with Americans for Democratic Action, A.D.A. Many people feared that you might be too liberal - maybe too much of a peacenik; but not it seems that the feeling has turned the other way. Liberals are upset that you have not openly expressed any discontent with the present Administration's policy, and are suggesting that President Johnson might be intimidating you into professing views which you do not normally hold. How do you respond to such accusations.

A. I respond that everybody has the right to be wrong, and they're wrong. I'm one of the founders of A.D.A., and I'm one of its members, and many of the critics were neither members or founders. Liberalism doesn't necessarily mean that you're just against somebody. Some people have confused intellectualism with negativism, and liberalism with protest. There is such a thing as turning protest into progress, and the liberalism that is meaningful today is the liberalism of progress, of development, of enlightenment, of enrichment; and I'm happy to tell you that this Administration has carried out practically every platform plank that A.D.A. ever recommended. They just ran out of reasons to criticize us, I'm afraid, in recent days except that there is a disagreement in the ranks of A.D.A. over Vietnam. But, may I say that of most of the national chairmen of A.D.A. there

is no disagreement. Some modest disagreement, but none of them recommend withdrawal, none of them recommend a unilateral settlement. All of us know that it will take a political settlement. All of us know that the struggle cannot be won militarily - that it must be on forefronts - military, economic, political and diplomatic. But some friends have forgotten what we have done. Let me just list to you a little bit what we have done - that ADA wanted done. We have passed, my friends of ADA, and I was out here when ADA didn't get such a popular hand as it now gets. I'm so interested in how liberalism became so popular all at once. When I was carrying its banner tattooed on my back it didn't seem to be that popular. Now there are some that find it so, but we have passed the Civil Rights programs that ADA has asked for, we've entered into the war on poverty, and helped millions of people, at least for the first time to find some hope in life. We have expanded our aid to our cities program from \$3 billion dollars in 1961 to \$9 billion dollars in 1966, to \$10 billion dollars in 1967. We have improved our aid to the poor from a modest sum of \$9 billion dollars in 1961 to \$25 billion dollars in 1967. We have a model cities program, we passed Medicare, we have expanded Social Security, we've the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, now a Space Treaty, and proceeding well on a Nuclear Non- Treaty. We have taken platform plank after platform plank of the Democratic Party and ADA and we've put it into action and we've implemented it. I don't think that you have to prove yourself to be a liberal by saying what makes you a liberal is when you fail. Failure is not synonymous with Liberalism. We have done the things that the liberal program wanted. We have not been able to satisfy some of the critics of our foreign policy in the Far East. And, I might add, we were not able to satisfy some of them in 1947 and 1948. ADA was originally organized because of some of the same disputes that are taking place now in 1966. There were a number of people in the liberal ranks in 1947 that didn't believe in aid to Greece and Turkey, that didn't believe in the Truman Doctrine, that didn't/believe in the Marshall Plan, that didn't believe in NATO, that didn't believe.....



we ought to resist aggression. And so then A.D.A. was then organized to ban the constructive American progressives and liberals, the non-Communist Left, if you please, together to back up the policies of aid to Greece and Turkey. To back up the Truman Doctrine. To back up NATO. To back up the Marshall Plan. And those people are still in A.D.A. - thousands of them, and I'll be at their 20th Annual Meeting, and I'll be there taking my stand as an American liberal without shame, and may I say, with no apology and with a degree of pride in the success of this Administration's liberal program - the most liberal program that any Administration has had in the history of this country - building on the foundations of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman - that's my answer to you, young man.

We'll move right along then with Professor Thomas Ehrlich.

Q. Mr. Vice President, in light of what you say, how do you explain why the academic community, so enchanted with the Kennedy Administration and so disenchanted with the Johnson Administration.

A. I've never been able to find out. I can't imagine because the policies which this Administration follows are the same ones which the late, beloved President followed. I might add that the records of this Government show that John F. Kennedy, as President of the United States, felt and said, as a matter of public document, that the place that we should resist, the Communist aggression in Southeast Asia was in Vietnam. John F. Kennedy had implemented the forces of the United States in South Vietnam by over 20,000 people before he was taken from us by an untimely death. We have followed the same policies. We have pursued the same course. You can say well I don't know whether he would have bombed the North - that's really subject to great argument. Within the Government as to whether this is desirable or undesirable. But insofar as resistance, insofar as supporting the non-Communist elements, insofar as trying to resist

the aggression from the North and to defeat the Viet Cong - let's put it on the record right now - let's not have any mistakes - John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson stood side by side in the National Security Council on that policy, and I think that if the late President was alive today, he'd be doing exactly what this Administration is doing at particular hour. And might I add that I don't think the entire academic community is opposed at all to all of our policies. In fact I go around the liberal community, the academic community - I'm a refugee from a classroom myself. I've held some dubious honor of being a full Professor in my own right, and I find that going out to the great universities, that most of the people are with us. I find that there is a very articulate group of which I have had some exposure myself (you see). in times past. This is the real smart crowd. Now they are going to leave/ They already have all of the information they need. So long, my friends, I don't blame you - the better part of the lecture is over. Thank you.

Professor Ehrlich are you satisfied with your answer, or do you have a follow-up question or.

H.H. Go right ahead, Professor.

Q. Follow-up, Mr. Vice President. Have you as Vice President made any policy decisions on Southeast Asia or other subjects.

A. Professor, as a student of International Law and American Government, I'm sure you know that the Vice President of the United States serves as a member of the Cabinet, a member of the National Security Council, just as does the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, - that's in those Councils that we have our discussions, that each of us gives our input - each of us are asked as to what our views are - each of us has equal right to make his views known, and once that the decision is arrived at within those Councils - the Cabinet and the National Security Council - that becomes the Nation's policy. There is a great deal of difference between serving as a United States Senator and as a Cabinet Officer or a Vice President.

For example a Cabinet Officer - once a budgetary decision is made by the Administration he is required to support that budgetary decision, even though he had made his own recommendations for a larger budget, let's say, or for a smaller budget. When he goes before the Committees of Congress as an Administrative Officer of the Government, he supports that budgetary decision taken by the Cabinet and by the President who is the Chief Executive. The same thing happens in reference to a Senator in a sense. A Senator, I'll use this example, a Senator compared to a Cabinet Officer and the Vice President. I served 16 years in the Senate. As a Senator represented my State. I was not part of an administration, or the executive branch. I was in a very real sense an independent man in anything I wished to do or say. I didn't even have to resolve my - commit myself to support of the party program in the Congress <sup>if</sup> -/I disagreed with them. And as a Senator I pioneered, I experimented, I expressed many ideas publically. As a Vice President, your contact is within the circle, not on the outside. I'll give you a good example. Business Agents of great Trade Unions have become Personnel Officers of companies. That same Business Agent that fought the company for better working conditions for his union members - when he becomes the Personnel Officer he hasn't changed - his job has changed. Then his responsibility is to that company. My responsibility is now to the Government of the United States as it is exemplified in the executive branch. That does not mean that I agree with every decision. It means that my disagreement is expressed within the Councils of the Administration. It means, for example, that the Vice President of the United States may feel that our foreign aid commitment ought to be much larger, that our war on hunger ought to be larger. It means that somebody else in the Cabinet may disagree. And you make your position - you fight it out in that Cabinet situation, and hopefully that you are able to convince the President. Now if you want to ask me have I had any disagreements in the Cabinet, the answer is yes. Have I stated my point of view - the answer is yes. Have I recommended, for example, that we have a bombing pause



and we had one for 37 days, the answer is yes. Did every member of the Cabinet recommend it, the answer is no. Have there been disagreements in the Cabinet, the answer is yes. Have I spoken up to the President, the answer is yes. Do I preserve individual integrity, the answer is yes, but I also took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and I know that under the Constitutional system as Vice President that one of the reasons that we adopted an Amendment to the Constitution which provided that the President and the Vice President should be elected on the same ballot from the same party, was to prevent what some people are asking for. To prevent what happened, for example, with Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr. To prevent what happened to George Washington and John Adams - and John Adams and Thomas Jefferson - for you had representatives of opposite political parties serving in the two key posts, and had open political warfare in the Administration. The least that a Vice President can do for his President is to try to be cooperative. If he disagrees, to disagree within the confines of the Administrative structure. If he disagrees on moral principle, then I would suggest that he speak out. I do not disagree with the President of the United States or policies on moral principle. If I did, I would make it well known. In fact, I think what the Administration is doing on moral principle is to be commended rather than to be condemned, and I think history will prove it. -

Mod. Gentlemen, we would like to move along quickly so we can get as many questions in during the amount of time we have for this session so we will continue right away with Mr.

Q. Mr. Vice President, do you think that the C.I.A. should have helped finance the National Student Association and other volunteer groups, in view of the questions such aid raises about the integrity of these institutions and of the democratic system itself.

A. Well, this is one of the saddest times that our Government has had in reference to public policy. My own view is that these organizations ought to be free and independent. I regret that they were unable to be that way. I tried to help the National Student Association gain private funds from private individuals from private corporations from private sources; as their Vice President, I did that. No other Vice President/<sup>ever</sup> has tried to. I regret to tell you that the private sources did not respond. Every nation needs an effective student organization, but you and I know that the only reason the CIA involvement came with NSA was that the student groups throughout the world were being funded in other countries by the Communist Party and that they were being infiltrated in our own country, and that's why the NSA was established - that's why the ADA was established - to have a non-Communist left, with ADA to have a non-Communist activist National Student Association. I regret that the CIA was involved in this and I am pleased that the President has asked for a complete review of the whole involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency. In all of these matters we ought to preserve these democratic institutions of ours keeping them both free and democratic. They ought not to be Government dominated. But I do think that this question that this whole thing poses the question, how are we going to do this - how are we going to have effective groups that can meet on the world scene and uphold what we believe to be a free way of life, uphold what we believe to be free institutions. How are they going to be funded. How are they going to be backed and supported. It's one thing to say that it all ought to be done by the free economy, the free enterprise system - this is like saying you ought to be able to feed the hungry of the world out of the generous contributions that you make to your fraternities, your sororities and your churches, but you don't. You have to have the Federal Government's program of public law for aiding in the war on hunger. And its the same sort of thing, may I say, in some of these matters

of gathering intelligence, of aiding young people. Private resources just haven't done the job. I hope they can. I'm not at all happy about what the CIA has been doing and I'm sure that out of this very singularly disagreeable situation will come a reformation of that agency, closer supervision of its activities and with recommendations coming to the Government of the United States it will confine the CIA to its intelligence gathering purposes, and to keep it from being associated directly or indirectly with organizations and bodies of men and women and young people that are not needed for those purposes. -

Mod. Mr. please.

Q. Mr. Vice President, is it true that President Johnson's decision to intensify the bombing of Hanoi last December was a political gesture to the Joint Chiefs of Staff as arguments for even more intensive bombing being over ruled by Secretaries Rusk and Mc Namara.

A. No, it is not true, absolutely not true. The purpose of the bombing is designed to do one of two things or both. To slow down the infiltration of the men and supplies from the North and/or to bring some attrition upon the North in the hopes that it will find its way to the conference table. We're not seeking to conquer North Vietnam - we're not even seeking to destroy that regime. We've even extended the olive branch of aid under the speech of the President at Baltimore about two years ago. We wish to see the peoples of North and South Vietnam have the right of self determination. We are prepared to accept a neutral South Vietnam. Your President has said that we will withdraw our forces six months after the cessation of hostilities and after a peace has been arrived at. Many people think that that was a regrettable, unfortunate statement thinking that that was too soon to withdraw our forces. I'm here to tell you that progress is being made in that country, and if we persevere and preserve peace will come. This morning Hanoi says in its official publication from its foreign office that if North Vietnam and the Viet Cong hold on and persist that America is



so divided that they, the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese will win, and the message of our division, evident here and elsewhere, is projected into Hanoi to give them false hope, continuing the war and, if you please, giving them reason to believe that if they just stay with it with guerilla warfare activities, with massive infiltration, with continuity of the struggle, we'll give up, and they'll win and they will have won on the battlefield, but they cannot win at the conference table. I must say that I believe that the greatest contribution that we can make to peace is not to accelerate this struggle, not to escalate it, but to stay with it, to be calm, steady, persevering, have will and determination, and constantly reminding of one and all that we are prepared any time for a total cease fire, that we are prepared to negotiations at any time, that we are ready to seek a peaceful solution, but we are not prepared to withdraw, we will not withdraw, we will not let the 14 million people of South Vietnam become the victims of a regime from the North, or of Communist oppression in the South. This country is not about ready to do that. May I take just another moment to say this. That there have been several elections held in Asia recently. One in Australia, and they love freedom there too, and they had picketers. They had marchers, they had honest disagreements as people do here, and I don't hold people that disagree with me in distrust or calling them bad names, and I don't walk out. The first sign of immaturity, dogma and doctrine and intellectual tyranny is when a person is unwilling to stay and listen. Mr. Harold the Prime Minister of Australia ran on the platform of not only support in Vietnam but he tripled their forces for a country very small, from 1500 to 4500 combat forces and added several thousand non-combatant forces civilians. He not only ran on support of that policy but on conscription. Australia had never had conscription in World War I or World War II, and he won the greatest political victory that any Prime Minister has ever won in the history of Australia. Holyoke of New Zealand who was bitterly attacked by his labor opposition and I know his labor opposition and I know him well

and respect him, and have been the guest of the labor leader. Holyoke ran on the proposition of support of South Vietnam, of the continuity of New Zealand's involvement in South Vietnam, and won a great political victory literally overwhelming his opposition. Sato in Japan accused of being an American even under the cloud of corruption and frustration won a singular victory in Japan. It appears to me that the closer they are to the struggle the more they seem to understand it. And may I say that I was in 14 nations in Asia and talked with 14 heads of government some of them not particularly friendly to the United States - one man for example, Mr. [redacted] of Singapore who I did not personally see, but who recently has said about our participation in Vietnam, that it would be a catastrophe if we withdrew. He's a great critic of America in general - a catastrophe if we withdrew, and furthermore said America in Vietnam is giving us time to build a free Asia. And what do they say in Indonesia which only a little over a year ago was literally to be taken over by the Chinese Communist militants - 3 million members of the Communist Party - the third largest Communist Party in the world - 25 million members of the [redacted] Foreign Minister, an old time personal friend of mine, General Suharto, men of that quality, but in particular Mr. [redacted] has come to your own country and said that Indonesia would not be where she is today once again<sup>in</sup>/the United Nations, once again having rid herself of Communist domination, conspiracy and control, were it not for our presence in South Vietnam. The dividends may I say, our presence there ought not to be overlooked, and one of the dividends is the development of regionalism, the rising expectations of the people in that part of the world for a better life. A whole new spirit of the leadership of the peoples of Southeast Asia to do something for themselves. Yes, I know this is a tragic period. I know it, but I want to remind this audience of one thing. Every time we've taken a stand, it has been for the long term, good. We took a stand in Greece and Turkey, but fortunately we didn't have to lose lives. We took a stand in Korea



and I venture to say that there are very few who disagree with our stand in Vietnam now, that think we did the wrong thing in Korea. We've taken a stand in Berlin. John Kennedy called up 250 thousand reservists. He asked for an increase in appropriation in one day for 6 billion dollars. He ordered 50 thousand combat troops immediately into Germany. He was prepared to fight the Soviet Union - thank God, we didn't have to because of a show of strength. John Kennedy told Khrushchev to get those missiles out of Cuba and we were within ten hours of a nuclear war - thank God we didn't have to do it. But the fact that he was willing to make the decision told me what I think you know - that whoever is President of this country knows that his first objective and his first responsibility is to provide for the common defense and the guarantees of security of this land and fulfill our treaty commitments. Lyndon Johnson has made no new treaties, except the Space Treaty to ban weapons in outer space. He didn't sign SETO - he didn't sign SENTO - he didn't sign \_\_\_\_\_, but he is the President of the United States, and I am here to say that I believe that the commitment that we are making today in South Vietnam, if you stay with it, if you'll give us the time for the elections that are going to take place this Summer which now Hanoi is beginning to berate. Elections first for the district hamlet and villages. Free elections just like the Constituent Assembly, and National elections this Summer, and with those National elections I predict there will be defections for the Viet Cong, and I predict that Hanoi will know that the ball game is over - that they'd better negotiate or escalate. And I predict that within a year that the picture in South Vietnam will be materially changed in the paths of peace and of progress and the development of representative government nation building. That's my prediction for that part of the world. -

Mod. Thank you, Mr. Vice President; thanks to the questions of our panel, we have so far had an interesting and lively discussion on Administration policy

in Vietnam, ADA, CIA, bombing of Hanoi and even a little comment about maturity. Now lets see what some of the questions from the audience will bring and those questions will be asked by our panel beginning with Stefan

Q. Mr. Vice President, this question from the audience. Please outline the major differences between the Vietnam policy of President Johnson, and that advocated by Barry Goldwater in the 1964 presidential campaign.

A. Well, I think there is a good deal of difference. First difference is that President Johnson is a man of restraint. He seeks to apply that amount of power which we have in abundance, he seeks to apply that amount which is necessary for the achievement of limited objectives. I'm quite sure that if you've been reading what Mr. Goldwater and others have been saying, they want considerably more bombing than we're doing. We want to mine . They want to bomb the air fields. They believe in hot pursuit. Also many of them have said that if need be, I don't say that Mr. Goldwater has said it, but many of them who supported him have said it, that if need be we should invade the North. We should get this war over with, and as the President of the United States has said so many times, any hour of the day, you can precipitate a World War, but every hour of the day you ought to try to avoid it. You ought to do everything that you can to achieve your limited objectives without the dangerous development of universal world wide confrontation and conflagration. I think there is a great deal of difference - its a matter of degree, restraint and of general policy. Yes, sir. -

Q. Mr. Vice President, another question from the audience. What would be the implication for the United States' role in Vietnam if there were to be a -Soviet war.

A. Well, I'm sure that that war in Vietnam would dry up overnight. There is no doubt about that, but let me make it quite clear so that the audience may know where I stand. I hope that there is no -Soviet war. I hope that these wars can be

stopped, but I don't think that you stop wars by paying the price of letting the enemy of freedom conquer. I don't think that's the way you stop it. But if such a tragedy should develop, as a -Soviet war, I doubt that it would just be -Soviet - other countries would be involved - hopefully not our own. But insofar as Vietnam is concerned, supplies would be turned off and what happened in Greece would undoubtedly happen in Vietnam. When the border in Yugoslavia was closed off, as you recollect from your history, in the Greek Civil War, the so called Greek Civil War, and the supplies to the Soviet Union no longer were available and when Tito broke with Stalin, the Civil War "ended" and Greek stopped. It wasn't really a Civil War - it was a Communist insurrection, and we met it - just exactly as we are meeting it in South Vietnam. And we had to stick with it - it lasted for 3 years in Greece and two thirds of the city of Athens was under the occupation of the Communist forces. Three fourths of the country. But when the supplies were shut off, and when the United States made perfectly clear that it wasn't going to back out, and one thing about Mr. Truman, he didn't leave you in doubt as to where he stood, and he didn't worry about popularity, and he goes down in history today as one of the greatest Presidents of the United States, not because he was Casper Milktoast, not because he ran every time somebody carried a picket sign, not because he changed his mind because public opinion momentarily was against him, but because he was a man of courage and character and will and determination, and he made up his mind as President his duty was to do what he thought was right, and he did it, and you've got another man in the White House who is doing/exactly the same way, and I predict that history will do as well by Lyndon Johnson in this period as history has done for Harry Truman in his period, and you wait and you'll see the day. -

Mod. Professor

Q. Mr. Vice President, again from the audience. Why should Negro Americans constitute such a large percentage of the deaths in Vietnam; in fact, why should we Negro Americans



fight for this country at all when we are denied first class citizenship.

A. Well, the Negro Americans that are in Vietnam, first of all, get an amazing account of themselves which, by the way is a good place to say it, in California, where you have ways of turning aside open housing and some of the great civil liberties and civil rights people ought to have - that's a good way to it all over the United States and get it off my chest. I happen to be one that believes that a man ought to have the same rights in his neighborhood that he has in the battlefield. That he ought to have the same rights in his home town that he does in his company or battalion or his regiment or his division. I happen to believe that first class citizenship is not only to be available in the military forces but in the civilian life. There isn't any doubt as to my view about it. Now to answer your question - the Negro is not a disproportionate - there is not a number of disproportionate Negroes losing their lives in Vietnam as compared to others - there is about an equal proportion of Negroes related to population in those armed forces. However, it can be said that a number of our Negro citizens entered the armed forces because they are treated like human beings with equality, and have become professional soldiers, and they have given a great accounting for themselves and their record for valor and courage is second to none and it ought to live forever in the memory of the American people - the white people, and all other people. These people, when given a chance, can do as good or better than you or I. But to try to indicate that they are the only ones fighting the war is unjust to them and to their comrades in arms. There are men over there today who are giving a brilliant account of themselves, and they'd like a little support from home. There are men over there who are the finest fighting men that this country has ever had and came right out of your neighborhoods and your colleges and right out of your high schools and they are getting good medical care and doing a good job on combat, they're doing a fine job in passification. As a matter of fact

the American soldier of today is the best combat soldier of all time, and he's the best action soldier of all time. And what they need from the colleges of America today is just once in awhile a pat on the back for valor in service and courage in duty.

Mod. Mr. , you have another question from the floor.

Q. Mr. Vice President, could you give your explanation of the credibility gap.

A. Yes, I can do that. First of all I would think that the newspapers have helped with that a bit. There are always times that you can find some statement of a public official that subsequently does not jibe with what turns out to be the facts. Public officials are asked to answer an awful lot of questions and some of us are foolish enough to do it. And in the process of doing it, we sometimes don't have all of the information. So somebody goes back and says you told me this last year and look what happened. Well, very candidly, its very hard to predict anything thats going to happen. A number of students have credibility gaps - they tell their parents that they think they're doing well in school - and then the grades come in. But that doesn't make them particularly a liar - that just means that things didn't develop the way you'd hoped. The Administration has made some mistakes in this matter - I'll give you a few. I think, for example, that the United States Air Force attempted to get the American people to believe that our bombing was a little more accurate than modern science and technology made possible or that the tactics of Hanoi made possible. Its pretty difficult to put a bomb in a barrel, as they say, when you're going 1400 miles an hour and you're in a bomb dive - you're ducking a Mig or antiaircraft or a Sam, and you have to release your bombs and get away, or be shot out of the air - there is a possibility that someone will get hurt, and they did - there were civilian casualties - there isn't any doubt about it. That adds to the credibility gap.

Mr. Mc Namara came back from one of his journeys and I believe he thought

that we could be out of Vietnam in a year, if he said, if certain things happen. Trouble is the "if" part never got to the public mind - its in the public record, but its not in the public mind. I don't believe that your Government attempts to misinform you. The credibility gap of recent days is that there has been a legitimate and sincere effort from Hanoi to get peace. Thats not a credibility gap - thats a lie. And when Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Wilson will say that they've had no response from Vietnam to their peace appeal, North Vietnam, I think that the credibility gap ought to be on the other side. Its a most amazing thing to me how we can always be so highly critical of our own, and never seem to find very much reason to be critical of the other. But this is the price we pay for freedom. I wouldn't want you to think for a moment that we always know what is the truth. We say too much, try to do too much, and occasionally we make mistakes. And one of the blessings of democracy is that mistakes are always pointed out in capital letters. The acheivements, you find them sometimes in the pages with the want ad column, but they're there - they're printed. No one denies that they're not there. But what makes news, what makes news. Well, I was at Rutgers University not long ago. There were 14 thousand people at that - I think it was the Tri Centennial - there were 42 countries represented - there were the great intellectual leaders of those 42 countries on the platform. From Oxford, from the University of Utrecht, and many great universities. The entire news story of the day was - Vice President speaks, students walk out. Not what the Vice President said which is most likely unimportant, but what the President of the University of Utrecht said was important - very important. What one of the great professors from Oxford was very important. And there were approximately 40 in the back about a block and a half away on which the television cameras had been previously trained because of pre-arranged operations, and the 40 walked out, and that was the picture. The 14 thousand who stayed, the 42 nations who were represented



a great university who had its tri centennial was lost in the news. May I say quite candidly, I don't think that that is real reporting. I think that's part of it - I think that should be noted. I think it should be given proper emphasis, but it is not the whole story anymore than crime is the whole story of a city's life. Its the unusual, but its not the whole story. Credibility is on both sides, I might add.

Next. -

Mod. I'm afraid our time is up -

V.P. I've got a little more, if you want some.

Mod. Got time for a few more?

V.P. Yes, sir.

Mod. Thank you very much - I'm sure we'll appreciate it. Mr. Bell, go ahead.

Q. A question from the audience. What is the position of the present Administration concerning the existence of the Draft in a state of undeclared war and is this a departure from American tradition.

A. Well, the Draft Law, of course has been adopted by Congress and is operative all during this period whether there is a state of a declared war, or not. Fortunately the Draft Law is under complete re-examination, and I believe within the next few days a report of the Marshall Commission, Bert Marshall being the Chairman of that Commission, will be made available to the President, to the Congress and to the public, and there ought to be some modifications - there apparently will be some recommended - I'm not sure what they will be. Insofar as the undeclared war is concerned, let me just say a word about that. Many people have asked, why don't we declare war - there is a war going on, and that is true, there is a war going on. The reason that a war is not declared is because we don't want a bigger war. The day that we declare war in South Vietnam, the treaty obligations of the Soviet Union and Communist China will come into play. It doesn't take any intelligence to get a war with the Russians - we can get that right away if that's what some of you want. I

don't want it. I want a . I want us to get a better understanding. It doesn't take any real statesmanship to get into a struggle with Communist China. That's why we try to keep our planes away from that border. That's why we have limitations upon certain bombing target practices. So the state of undeclared war is so that we can have some hope of gaining a peace - some hope of bringing a limited struggle to a conclusion, and not to give any legal right or any legal reason to the allies of South Vietnam to be compelled by a formal declaration of war on our part to honor the treaty commitments of the Soviet Union and Communist China to North Vietnam. I hope that we will still maintain the posture that we have and not be emotionalized into a declaration of war. Next. -

Q. From the floor. If the theory is valid why does the Thai Ambassador ask the United States to withdraw our military from Vietnam.

A. I never did think that the theory was valid. I don't have much belief in these kind of theories. The theory is (1) if South Vietnam falls, then somebody else will fall, somebody else will fall, so on down the line - its automatic.

theory has some relevance but as to its validity, its as though you were contemplating human affairs and political affairs with the precision of engineering and technology - it just doesn't work that way. The Thai have not asked for the withdrawal of American forces. I would like to say quite candidly and firmly frankly the Thai have cooperated very well with the United States and presently the Thai are making an extra effort in South Vietnam. The Government in Thailand is not only making an effort in South Vietnam - fortunately it is making an effort in its Northeast provinces, or agricultural reform for political and social action, so as to prevent the intrusion of and the growth of guerrilla warfare tactics. I think this is very fortunate. The Thai have cooperated with us in a number of matters which I am not at liberty to discuss which are in the security of this nation and in the security of their nation, so I believe that there must be some misunderstanding between us as to





without any collaboration or without any coordination, both reminded China that if they continued their hostilities on India they would be confronted by the combined power of the United States and the Soviet Union - even though said separately, even with no cooperation or coordination, our national interest and the Soviet Union's national interest precluded the Chinese Communists conquering India. And its amazing how sometimes these national interests do come together without any alliances, without any coordination. I think in the long run quite frankly, its my view that as this trouble keeps on in China that the Soviet Union may very well feel that it is to her national interests to see this struggle in North Vietnam brought to a close through her good auspices. Thereby giving the Soviet Union a special entre into North Vietnam. We're not Communist oriented. We do not agree with the Soviet Union on a host of things, but if Mr. Kosygin can be helpful in bringing about a negotiated settlement which would preserve the territorial and political integrity of South Vietnam, he will have the same kind of cooperation from this country that Mr. Kosygin received when he went to of India and Pakistan to have a peaceful settlement of the struggle between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

Your Government is not worried particularly about who is the honest broker in these matters. What we want is a honest settlement, and what we want is some action from the party today that refuses to give us a response. Now thats going a long way - isn't it amazing how we're always having to say what we'll do. I wish somebody, sometime that seems to feel that we're so wrong could get me a little indication of what Hanoi is willing to do. Hanoi tells us, you quit the bombing - Hanoi tells us, you get out of Vietnam - Hanoi tells us this and that and we say now if we'll just do this then Hanoi will talk. We have yet to hear from Ho Chi Minh or the Foreign Minister of North Vietnam that even if we did cease the bombing, that they would talk. oh, we hear from their country cousins - we hear from some self-appointed peace emissary who says that he thinks they would. But we're dealing with some rather difficult matters.

We'd kind of like to hear from the principals. Now if anybody that is opposed to our policy has any contacts with Ho Chi Minh and I think that as long as you're speaking for him you ought to know what he's thinking. As long as you're speaking in terms of what we ought to do and how wrong we are we ought to know what Ho Chi Minh thinks we ought to do and what he's willing to do. And we can find out just a little bit of what the reciprocity would be, what the mutuality of interests would be, you'll find the Government of the United States prepared to walk that extra mile for peace. But I want to make it crystal clear, we are not going to fade away - we are not going to give up - we are not going to let the Communist regime from the North over run the peoples of the South. We are not going to let it happen in Southeast Asia, anymore than we were willing to let it happen in Greece, anymore than we're willing to let Berlin be gobbled up. And its more difficult to defend Berlin than it is Saigon any day of the week. But you don't hear many people today saying why don't we give up Berlin, yet Berlin is 100 miles within the Communist territory in Europe. Berlin today is a divided city and why don't we hear any more talk about it/because we've taken our stand, because there are people today in Europe who know that we'll not permit this part of the world be taken over. And I happen to believe that that firmness without the umbilical, that that resolution without being belligerent, that that sense of strength without false pride has stood us well in the cause of peace, and if you'll just stick with it, and if we'll just stick with it in Vietnam we are going to get peace. If we run away from it, there will be no peace there and Indonesia and other parts will be in severe jeopardy. I don't say they'll fall. I say it will be more difficult. I do say what the Foreign minister of Indonesia said that our presence in Vietnam has permitted Indonesia to become a free country again - 100 million people. I'll ~~not~~ take his word for it - before I'll take the word of my next door neighbor who can't even spell Indonesia.

Mod. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for a very enlightening discussion.

V.P. Thank you very much, all of you dear souls who stayed.





# 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)