

March 16, 1965. Washington, D.C.: Non-Governmental Organizations  
Foreign Policy Conference.

For drafts and other information see Box 924 (23.E.7.1B), Foreign  
Affairs General Files: "15a. Correspondence & Miscellaneous by  
Subject: National Foreign Policy Conference, 1965."

Also see corresponding Speech/Appearance file.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TRANSCRIPT OF BACKGROUND REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY  
at NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS MEETING,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TUESDAY, March 16, 1965, 4:25 p.m.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Mrs. Louchheim. My dear friend Katie, Mrs. Hubbard, Charlotte, and Ladies and Gentlemen: It is of course a wonderful privilege to be able to be with you this afternoon and to discuss with you and not talk at you some of the concerns of our country in the field of international relations and of course some of the concerns of our nation in terms of its own internal affairs, because it goes, I believe, without saying that what happens at home conditions what we are able to do abroad and what happens abroad oftentimes has a very serious impact on what we are able to do at home. The way we live here, what we say, and what we do, the example that we set in our domestic, internal affairs, will surely have some bearing upon the impact of our policies and the acceptance of those policies abroad..

I start with that lesson, because I don't believe you can really discuss foreign policy or international policy without constantly keeping in mind from whence that

policy is derived, what is the motivating and the driving force behind it, what kind of a people and what kind of a nation enunciated the policy, and is the policy that we seek to apply elsewhere in the world basically different than we apply here?

You no longer can keep secrets in an open society and I should remind you that whatever we say or do is oftentimes distorted abroad--distorted sometimes not intentionally, other times intentionally. In the journals of some of our most friendly countries and friendly allies there is misunderstanding of American purpose and American policy oftentimes because there isn't an understanding in depth of this nation and its purpose and its life, just as we sometimes misunderstand other people and other conversations in friendly countries because we do not understand or appreciate their traditions and heritage and culture in depth; and superficial statement or superficial reporting, superficial analysis which may not be intentional but only because of lack of knowledge and lack of time can promote misunderstanding.

Then of course there is that other part of the world in which our every action and every word is distorted

by design--not always but whenever it fits the design of that part of the world.

I don't think that we can do too much about that except to be sure in our minds that what we are doing we believe to be the right thing. We have to expect that the opposition press--as they would say in the domestic campaign--would give you a rough time and you have to expect in international policy that the enemies of freedom are going to do everything they can through their mechanisms of propaganda and subversion to distort your purpose, to becloud your aims, and to confuse your policy.

Now, with that as a sort of background, let me proceed with some remarks, and I want you to know that I will try to answer questions, if you wish that opportunity. I used to say, when I was a United States Senator, that every good American was entitled to one bite out of a live United States Senator--[laughter]--and I still hold to that proposition insofar as a Vice President is concerned. But I don't think it applies to Presidents.

I doubt that there are any people in the world today more conscious of international affairs and more outward looking than the American people. And you please note, that I said international affairs and not foreign,



because I am not of the mind that anything in this world is foreign any longer. It is international. It may come from areas in other parts of the world, but it is not foreign.

Now, while we are conscious of international affairs, it may at times seem by word and deed otherwise, but when we consider the record of the past two decades the American commitment to participation in world affairs is beyond question. A generation ago we ended that isolationism that was bred of illusion--and I lived in the part of America where isolationism was the mode of the day, or the mood of the time--the illusion that we could be safe in our continental fortress separated by vast oceans from the politics of Europe and Asia. A bitter war and two decades of tortuous peace have taught us the folly of that illusion. At least, most of us have learned that lesson. Some people are very slow learners and some refuse to learn at all.

The lesson that we have been slow to learn in that period of isolationism we have been slow to lose, and in the past twenty-five years we have helped fight and win a great war, we have helped rebuild a prostrate European continent, we have defended Europe in the face of

Stalinist Russia, we have assisted a host of new countries to achieve their independence, we have stemmed the tide at least momentarily and I hope for the long run towards nuclear destruction with the test ban treaty. It was a forward step. We have sent our men and our women overseas in the Peace Corps, in our AID missions, in our information programs, our cultural exchanges, and in our armed services.

We have spent our public and private money and our human resources on an unprecedented scale. All of this has been done in the last twenty to twenty-five years. All of this is new for us and a very complicated experience.

Now, I think it is wonderful for Americans to be superanalytical and supercritical. It is a sign of mental health. Indeed, it is a sign of our strength: only the strong can afford to be selfcritical. It is the weak who are always "right" and "never make a mistake." But I don't think we ought to make it a national pasttime just to see how wrong we are. Once in a while it is good to take an inventory of some of the right things that we have done as well as inflicting a

sort of self-punishment for the wrong things that we may have done, and I do not believe that you prove yourself to be a great intellectual or a knowledgeable man by just citing our shortcomings.

I think you can prove that you have the interests of the world at heart and of this country if we can advocate constructive things. The things that are wrong are generally so obvious that you don't have to be very bright to point them out. But the corrections that need to be made do require some knowledge and some understanding of the world in which we live and the human reactions of the people that govern this world--or try to govern it.

Now, when you set out on such a task of involvement on a worldwide basis in international affairs, you are bound to make some mistakes. You may sometimes waste money--and, my goodness, we do point that out! That, by the way, is not something that we should accept without concern, but there are even greater mistakes than wasting money.

You will run the risk of misjudging political and social problems in many parts of the world. We are not



all world citizens. We do not all know everything about everybody. We really don't really know very much about a lot of folks right close at home. Is it any wonder that occasionally those that fashion our international policy may make a misjudgment.

I have served in local office and I must confess that I have seen very astute local government officials misjudge policies and programs and social forces within their own community. In fact, I gathered the whole country misjudged what would happen at Selma, Alabama, a little over a week ago on Sunday.

You may be sometimes impatient, expecting immediate results where immediate results are not possible. And to conduct foreign policy or international policy in this country is nothing short of one of the most difficult of all assignments because the American people are inherently impatient.

[Continued on page B-1.]



3-16-65

B Sec. elk

Now all of these are risks, amongst many others, that we face because of our involvement in a world, and not in a very peaceful and very happy world even.

Remember, there will be a lot of things that would go wrong in this world if we just dropped out of existence; maybe much more. And I might add there would be a lot of things go ~~wrong~~ in this world, as has been said so many times, if you had never heard of Karl Marx, or Lenin, or Stalin, or Mao, or Chou En-lai, or all the rest of them. There are powerful social, economic, scientific, technological forces at work in the world today that at least momentarily defy control or understanding.

Now we are told today that there is a rising tide of neo-isolationism in this country. We are told by some that we must reduce our commitments abroad in order to meet our commitments at home. This is the either/or philosophy--guns or butter. I have heard that for a long time. I have heard people say you can't have both. Well, you can; and you have. And we have got too much butter, and some people are a little concerned about the number of guns we have, too.

[Laughter]

This is the one nation on the face of the earth

today that can have all of the peace-time goods it needs and all of the defense goods that it needs, and let the world know it.

That is not a threat or a boast; it is a fact.

No other nation on the face of the earth can do that.

We have the capacity economically, financially, industrially in productive power to do much more than we are doing at home, and much more abroad, and much more militarily, and still be a solvent, strong, powerful nation. We haven't even approached a cruising speed, much less forcing the engines of our productivity.

We are told by some that there are places in the world where we have no business, and where we should leave the people to their own consequences, even if these consequences involve domination by totalitarian forces. And we are told by others that democratic government is impossible in many neighboring countries, and that we had better get used to military dictatorships. And we are told by some that the United Nations once was a useful tool of our policy, but now that it includes so many new nations it is too hard to get our own way, so we ought to let it die on the vine.

Now these some that I refer to, fortunately, are a very limited number, even if they are quite articulate.

We are told by some that our citizens will no longer carry this burden of international responsibility, and that we had better cut back and withdraw--now--in orderly retreat.

Now the members of this audience who have for years appreciated the prospects of success and the consequences of failure in the conduct of our national security, or our foreign policy, know that there can be no retreat from involvement in world affairs. There can be, and no doubt there will be and should be, changes in the pattern of U. S. involvement. The breakup of the bi-polar world, the world of the USSR, USA, which has characterized the international relations of the past two decades, and some easing of tensions between the East and the West, may have changed the pattern of US involvement in world affairs, but it has not diminished it.

I might digress to say that, if anything, the changes may not have been as much as were required. The world has changed, the power structure in this world is obviously changed; and, with that, the response to the power structure by any one nation, or any group of nations, must change.



But we retain the role of world leader, at least leader of the Free World that we inherited at the end of World War II. And in that role our responsibility extends to distant Asia, and Africa, as well as to the countries on our doorstep or in Europe.

I would like to note, also, that since we Americans love to tell each other that we are world leaders that the role of leadership isn't always a pleasant one, not even in politics at home. When you become a leader or someone designates you as one, or you have earned it, you are on the spot. People expect more from you; they are more critical of you; they have ceased to understand you as well or be so forgiving. And the higher you rise in the echelons of leadership, the more serious the criticism for every mistake, and, indeed, the more serious the mistake if you make one.

So, if you want the title of world leader, expect to have a little trouble. If you want to have the honor and the glory of being known as the greatest nation on the face of the earth--and we say it every day--expect somebody not to like you, expect someone to be highly critical of you, expect someone to want to dethrone you.



Because I, for one, see not too much difference between international politics and domestic politics, except the stakes are greater and the tools are a little more devastating.

And, as one that has been in politics for some time, I think I have a little appreciation of both the glories and the joy of winning, and the ignominy and the pain of defeat. And I want you to know, right now, that I like winning much better.

[Laughter]

Now, the fact that our responsibility remains worldwide does not mean that we will commit ourselves to military involvement in every crisis that erupts around the world. We do not aspire to any Pax America. We have no desire to play the role of global policeman or gendarme. In fact, I have frequently suggested that we do much to strengthen the UN's police peacekeeping role. Although we shall honor our commitments to assist friendly nations in preserving their freedom, we have no desire to interject American troops into explosive local disputes.

But in those areas where we are committed militarily now, you can argue about whether we should have

made those commitments or not. But where we have made the commitment, our responsibility as a world power prevents any rapid scaling down of our commitments.

Our commitment, for example, in Viet-Nam should be understood in this light.

Now, some might ask: Why is it so important to preserve the freedom and the independence of Viet-Nam?

People are asking this all over America. And, may I add, that some people are inspiring the questions as well as asking them.

I would answer that the position of the United States in Asia and throughout the world will be greatly affected by the nature of our response to the crisis in Viet-Nam.

First of all, our word is either good or it is not. Our commitment is either kept or it is not.

Now if we demonstrate our determination to stand by one friendly nation, then another such nation may never be assaulted. If, on the other hand, we do, as a few have suggested--just up and pull out of South Viet-Nam--we can expect more of the same elsewhere. Retreat is contagious; particularly, if it is self-afflicted retreat.

Ultimately, what we are talking about is our own security, and we do have a vital interest in these areas of the world to which we have made commitments, or we wouldn't have been there. We not only have a sense of commitment to others; we have a commitment to ourselves. And if we have learned one lesson, I hope it is this: that the appetite of an aggressor is never satisfied by giving him another country. If you haven't learned that, my fellow Americans, then what have we learned. What price glory? And, make no mistake about it, that while aggressors today may not always move divisions of troops that are visible across boundary lines, that anyone that understands modern aggression knows that it can be an aggression in many and weird ways--an aggression by infiltration, by subversion, by terror, by propaganda, by assassination.

And I am of the opinion that those of us who truly believe in peace and believe in a world in which security has a home, and in which freedom has a hope--that we had better understand the nature of modern aggression. And the aggression that we are going to face for years to come may very well be this unorthodox aggression of the



"wars of liberation," which are nothing more or less than aggression by modern totalitarianism.

The last totalitarian power that used massive divisions for aggression went down into unbelievable defeat--the Nazis. I think the Communists learned something from that. On the one hand, they preserve very carefully the image of a nation and of a people that are a system, or have an ideology that does not seek to move its vast military maintenance against its neighbors. On the other hand, the international apparatus of the Communist system moves through its satellites, through its regimes, through its propaganda, through its trained agitators, its trained subversives--and it has them. And, as one who has long professed, and I believe lived by the so-called liberal cause, I have never been able to understand why we haven't been more knowledgeable about the techniques, and the ways of the modern aggressor. We are facing that today. And, my fellow Americans, either we are going to learn how to meet this threat of guerrilla warfare and all of its apparatus--either we are going to learn how to face up to these "wars of liberation" which can destroy a continent as well as a nation; or, we are going to be defeated in one field after another.

[B section elk, continued on page C-1.]



It may well be that the totalitarian has no desire to blow this world to pieces. I doubt that any dictator would so design. I hope not. But I have a feeling that they would like to pick it up piece by piece. And if we are nibbled to death we are just as dead as if we are eaten at one bite. And these are some fundamental lessons that we need to learn, and once we have learned those basic lessons, then we can decide what kind of methodology or methods we are going to use to combat this form of aggression.

And that of course is where a legitimate debate can take place. But I have little time for those that feel that there is no aggression. Because aggression is as obvious as the sun in the skies.

Our stakes in Southeast Asia are too high for the recklessness either of sudden withdrawal or general conflagration. As usual, our decisions are complicated and are made complicated by events. The easiest way to have a policy that is understandable is either to be for or against it. I have served in the Senate long enough when I heard Senators just get up and denounce the United Nations. People understood that. They said,

"Well, now that man, now there you have a superduper patriot. He is just against the evil UN." Somebody else would get up and say, "The United Nations will just save you," and then you had a little group that said, "Well, now, there is a wise man." Then some of the rest of us would say, "It has its strengths and it has its weaknesses," and you would start to explain both-- and you would lose the audience! [Laughter] One of the troubles, one of the difficulties of being reasonable in an irrational world is that you have a small clientele. [Laughter. Applause.]

But I happen to believe that we don't have to choose between inglorious retreat and unlimited retaliation. Our President has said that our response will be measured and appropriate, and that response that we use today is measured, fitting, and appropriate, not merely a military response.

I want you to understand what our President says. We are not merely talking about a military response. We are talking about a diplomatic response. We are talking about every possible type of response to the situation that prevails in Southeast Asia. No doors are closed.

But by the same token we have no intention to evacuate, leave, withdraw, and fail on our commitments. People up home need to know that and they need to know it in Viet-Nam, so that there can be no wavering, no indecisiveness. The stakes can be secured through a wise, multiple strategy if we but sustain our national determination to see the job through to success.

And if I can say nothing else, one thing I want to say and be remembered in this audience today, whether you agree with me or not, I think we have to let the aggressors know that we do not tire, that we are not afraid, that we seek no extension of war, we seek no acceleration of war, we seek no general conflagration, we seek peace.

But we are not about ready to weary in our responsibilities, nor are we going to, because of temporary difficulty, run, fold up our tents, deny our friends, leave the battlefield, or say that it is all, and we are done. We are not that kind of people. If you think so, why, study the lessons of Valley Forge, and you can study a lot of other lessons, too: The first three years of World War II.



One thing this world needs to be reminded of in 1965 is that this country is willing to fulfill its commitments, to maintain its involvement in world affairs, to relentlessly, pursue every honorable means for a just and an enduring peace, and at the same time not to let, in the name of peace, people be destroyed and nations conquered.

Now, members of this audience representing foreign policy organizations all over the country, you can do much to strengthen the determination of the American people to support their Government in meeting its commitments now in Southeast Asia and in many other areas of the world. But it is in Southeast Asia today, the area where your support is needed more than ever in this year. I am not going to go into any further details. The President has spoken about this repeatedly.

I have heard people say that we should negotiate. And I have heard the President say, and produce the evidence, with whom?--when Hanoi and Peking say they will not, that they are going to win anyhow.

This nation has always had as its record the peaceful solution of every difficulty if there is a will



to peace. But I remind you that we learned from Neville Chamberlain, if we learned anything, that you don't make peace by selling out other people's countries--and you don't have any moral right to do it anyhow.

Now, a second area where we need your help this year is in the area of the foreign aid program, and maybe you can be a little more effective in this one--and if you don't think the foreign aid program is in trouble, then please see me privately after this meeting! [Laughter] We have been cutting back on our foreign aid program when we should have been expanding it--now that ought to get me into a lot of trouble--at a time when our mutual assistance or foreign aid program is more effectively administered than any time since the Marshall Plan--and I think David Bell is one of the best administrators that this Government ever had, and I think he has done a masterful job.

We hear cries to trim the size of the program, to change or emasculate its content. One of the three problems with foreign aid is we have changed commanders on it about every other month. That is an exaggeration for dramatic purposes, but I think we have had at least

seven or eight foreign aid administrators in the last ten or twelve years. The exact number escapes my memory. But you can't keep changing the design of the program, the driver, the accessories, and occasionally removing a wheel, and expect it to stay on the straight and narrow road, particularly when there are just a lot of roadblocks along the way.

So these efforts to emasculate this program, I say, should be rejected. This is a rich country. This doesn't mean that we ought to give away our bounty. But it is a fact. If you look at the way we spend our public and private money, you will find that precious little of it goes to foreign aid. You will find that it is considerably less than one per cent of our gross national product. And to hear some people talk about it, you would think that we were just throwing it around. We spend three times as much--no, two and a half times as much for tobacco as we do foreign aid. And I have a feeling that foreign aid may be better for you--since I quit smoking. [Laughter]

You will find the budget of the Alliance for Progress is a pittance compared to our annual bill for

for golf balls and sport cars. Now, I want to make my record and my position clear. I use this whenever I become critical. I am not telling people that they should not buy golf balls. In fact, I think they ought to buy a few more. And I don't want anybody here to think that they shouldn't have a sport car if they want one. I think you should. As a matter of fact, I wouldn't mind having one myself. [Laughter]

I am not telling you that you shouldn't do these things. I am just telling you that we should do the other, too. As my Dad used to say--or did, I should say--Dad never once in his life ever scolded me for staying out late. He never ever told me what time to go to bed. That is a fact. But he was the best getter-upper in the whole country. [Laughter] He used to tell me any man that can play around all night can work a long day. All I am saying is, dear friends, I love golf balls and I love sport cars, but I also know that there are some other things we have to do.

Fortunately we can do both. Foreign aid is indispensable to the success of American national security policy. It is indispensable today, as it was in



the height of the cold war. The difference is that it is a little tougher now, a little more difficult. We were able to get more positive and quicker results in Western Europe. We were dealing with a highly industrialized, educated, modern society, even though it had been temporarily destroyed by bomb and fire. The brainpower was there, the know-how was there, the technology was there to rebuild all of it. But when you start to apply modern technology in Africa and in Asia and in Latin America, when you come to grips with problems that are centuries old, backwardness in some areas much worse than that, and you bring to bear a limited amount of economic assistance, you can not expect miracles and you will be very lucky if you get any ascertainable results at all.

A third area where your support is needed concerns our commitment to the United Nations. Now, this is not a happy situation, and it raises some political and legal problems for the United Nations' largest contributor, as I am sure it does for other members. Therefore today we hear voices advocating abandonment of the United Nations, withdrawal from the United Nations. Those voices are misguided and they shouldn't be listened to. They would

abandon an imperfect instrument for preserving world peace because they dislike our imperfect world.

There is one thing about the United Nations: It surely does reflect the world in which we live. There are always a few deadbeats, and there are always a few people that would violate the law, there are always some that are a little more advanced than others at home or abroad, and the world--and one thing about representative government,<sup>as</sup>/I have said to our friends when they criticize the Congress, I say, "Well, quit criticizing your friends and relatives," because there it is.

[Continued on page D-1.]

It is right there. The Congress of the United States is like a photograph of the American nation, and if, occasionally, you see a wart here or there, or a dirty face, it could be your own.

[Laughter]

And the United Nations is somewhat of a reasonable facsimile of the world in which we live, with all of its contesting forces, with all of its many differences and degrees of advancement or progress, however you wish to label it.

It is an imperfect world, and I suppose it is fair to say that the UN is somewhat imperfect. But to abandon the UN, or to immobilize it through crippling restrictions or failure to support it, would only prove that our generation has forgotten the lessons of half a century of nationalism and isolationism.

Let those who would destroy the United Nations recall the international anarchy that followed the end of the League of Nations.

In a nuclear era, when anarchy can lead to annihilation, the United Nations deserves the support of all nations; large and small, rich and poor. And it is



my view that the heroes of the world community are not those who withdraw when difficulties ensue; not those who can envision neither the prospect of success nor the consequence of failure--but those who stand the heat of the battle, the fight for world peace; and, in this instance, the fight for world peace through the United Nations.

We Americans have such a stake in this great international instrument. It is one means that we have of bringing an international response to international issues. It is one means that we have of preserving national identity and still be enabled to bring together a multilateral or international force.

Now, it may take time and patience and a high capacity to absorb the frustration before the General Assembly gets back on the track, or selects a somewhat different road ahead. But I am confident that the UN is an institution, as I have said before, in the throes of growing pains, and not in the grips of a fatal disease. And this great group right here can play an important role in convincing your Congress (this is where the problem is) and the American people that the UN continues to be indispensable to the aims of United States foreign policy.

to the aims of the United States for a world of law and order and peace.

And I want to warn you that just as foreign aid is in trouble--and it is in serious trouble, and unless you get busy to do something about it, unless you put its problems in proper perspective in terms of its need, as an instrument of our national security policy; unless you do that, you are not going to have any foreign aid.

Now, I think you need some shock treatment. I want to predict here that unless there is a resurgence of interest in and understanding of the importance of our economic and technical assistance abroad, as well as our military assistance, that you will end up with little or no technical and economic assistance, and with crippled military assistance. It is that serious.

There was a time in this country when people went from town to town and city to city, and spoke up for America's role in the world, and willingly admitted that it would cost something. And, if you don't start speaking up now, recognizing its limitations--I mean the foreign aid administration's limitations--recognizing that

we make mistakes, recognizing that from time to time money is poured down a proverbial rat hole--and you have to recognize that unless you are willing to go on out and talk about this, and recognize the limitations as well as the need, that the Secretary of State and the President of the United States are going to end up with a dilapidated, crippled, emasculated, so-called foreign aid program that they would be better off not to have at all. That's how serious it is.

I have been on Capitol Hill today. I know of what I speak. And the same is true of our participation in the United Nations.

I have heard many critics say, "Well, I think the Government has lost a little interest in the UN. You know, I get around; I hear what people say; I am a part of this Government. I haven't lost a bit of interest in it."

[Laughter]

And the President of the United States hasn't lost any interest in it either.

[Applause]

In fact, the President of the United States is



one of the staunchest defenders of the UN and our participation in it--an advocate.

But the UN is getting in trouble, where people can get up and say, "Do you want all those little nations making decisions for you? Look at the UN. It has fallen down here, and the Russians don't pay their bill."

I happen to think that the Soviet Union has an obligation under the Charter to pay its dues. And so do the other nations. So does the Republic of France; so do all of them. But I also have a feeling that we have an obligation--all of us--to see to it that this great international instrumentality for world peace and world order isn't destroyed because of the failure of a few of its members.

Maybe I am a patient man; I am an optimistic man. I think there are solutions, and I think we will find them.

I must say that there are times that it is a little--that you can understand why people lose patience. But it is up to us that are supposed to know a bit more about these things to see to it that those voices do not become the majority.

Well, I don't want to get off on the UN any more. I happen to think it performs wonderful service, and I believe strongly in its peacekeeping operations. And I want to ask my fellow Americans in this audience today what do you think would happen if the UN had to withdraw its troops from Cyprus, from Gaza--in just those two? Do you really believe that the United States of America can ignore that? Do you really believe that the peace in the Middle East would be better served if the UN wasn't there?

It is already an unsteady peace.

Why, my fellow Americans, we would be required just out of sheer national need and security to do something about it.

The peacekeeping operations of the United Nations are the best bargain that freedom-loving people ever received.

[Applause]

What's more; they are right.

Now, I have touched on three areas where your interest and support is urgently needed, and I am going to draw this message now to a conclusion. We need to

understand the requirements of these three areas of Southeast Asia, of foreign aid, of the UN, if we are to meet our responsibilities. But just as the United States cannot escape its present responsibilities around the world, so America cannot avoid its responsibilities at home. And what we do, or fail to do right here, as I said in the beginning, has tremendously important consequences for our international relations. We cannot convincingly speak of brotherhood among men, and praise the virtues of democracy, while at home we permit widespread denial of the elementary rights to vote and to assemble peacefully.

You have heard it before. But I would say that one of the most significant acts of foreign policy in the last year was the passage of the Civil Rights Bill. I think this did us more good in many areas of the world than any one thing that we have done for years.

[Applause]

And I think that one of the acts that is causing us great harm abroad now, as well as great shame at home, is the denial of equal opportunity in voting, and, indeed, in many other areas of human endeavor that we are witnessing at this very hour. [D Section, elk. Con'td E-1]



My fellow Americans, you can't have your little old party back home without recognizing that it affects somebody else. I hear people every once in a while say, "Well, leave us alone. This is a local affair." There isn't anything that is really local any more, and you know it! We are all tied in together.

What happens in the Middle East is maybe more important to America now than even what happens in my own Mid-West. We have problems in the Mid-West, but they fade into insignificance compared to some of the problems in the Middle East. And what happens in Southeast America is possibly more significant than what happens even in Southeast Asia, at least as significant. As a matter of fact, it's pretty difficult to fight in Southeast Asia for freedom with people who are not Caucasians and to deny in some parts of the United States, yea in practically all parts of the United States, and far too many, but in this classic incident in Selma, Alabama, to deny people there of color the freedom and the rights that we say we are defending some place else in the world. It just doesn't make sense!

There is a much simpler way of talking about it.

Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Recognize that the real struggle in the world today is over human dignity. The real difference between the totalitarian and the free man is not in the books that he reads, but in his understanding of the worth of man.

I'm essentially a religious person, and I'm proud of it. I really believe that God created man in his own image. I believe that there is a spark of divine in every person. And I believe that is the meaning of human dignity. I think that is the only thing that really qualifies you for human dignity. Education doesn't because I have seen a lot of people who are highly educated who haven't acted very dignified. Nazis were educated, many of them. But they did not respect human dignity, nor were they dignified.

But those of us that believe in freedom ultimately are saying, or what we are really saying, is that we believe that man has a right to be free because he was created by a divine force and inspired by that divine power and therefore no other man has the right to govern him without his consent. No man has the right to destroy that which God gave.

Chemlock  
ERASABLE

The big struggle in this world today is not only over methods of production and forms of production, which by the way shift and change, but over man's relationship to man and man's understanding of his relationship to a higher power, to a nobler force, to a Divine province. That is it. That is what it's all about. And that is what our foreign policy should be directed towards, and that is what our whole national security policy ought to evolve around, and that is what we are trying to do back home here in this war on poverty.

We are not against poverty just because people are poor. We are against poverty because poverty destroys the human spirit. It not only leaves you poor in purse, it leaves you poor in spirit. It's the frustration, the hopelessness, the disillusionment of poverty that is worse than the economics of it.

And we are out to destroy poverty, to wage war on poverty, not merely with loans and grants but through education and through brotherhood and through equal rights. The theme of this Government today is opportunity, opportunity and freedom. That is what this Government stands for. That is the Lyndon Baines Johnson theme for America.



And I'm part of that team. We are interested in creating a society, a set of social institutions, policies and programs that insure, for generations yet unborn as well as those presently with us, opportunity, the chance for a man to emancipate himself from his fears and from his bigotry and from his backwardness. And we think we are going to make it too. We have a lot of enthusiasm for it.

[Applause]

So may I say that when the eyes of the world are upon us, as they are today, a world composed primarily of non-white people, what they see in some sections of America doesn't make them have too much faith in those of us that proclaim democracy and proclaim it as white men. Everywhere people are measuring the ideals of American democracy against the harsh reality exposed in that small southern town, Selma, or that big northern city, New York, or some other city, pick it or choose it.

Much has been accomplished. We can be proud of much that we have accomplished. My gracious! When I think of how Washington was when I came here in 1949! I wonder if you recall. I wonder if you know that your own Government sponsored a youth program here in the United States.

By the way, we sure are extravagant. I think we had 80 people. We had an international youth conclave, Katie. That was the same year that they had 30,000 in the Soviet Union. I have never been able to understand this. I might just as well get this off my chest now.

[Laughter]

I have never been able to understand why the Communist forces have been able to have youth meetings of thousands of people, young people, and bring them from all over the world and give them the best of care and very clever they are at it too--people have a good time and they get a lot of good indoctrination, of their kind of good indoctrination. But we just have a real tough time getting a hundred people together. We can't quite afford it, you know.

Well, anyway, we had 80 of them. They had been up at Cornell University, or Syracuse, one of those great universities--I believe it was Syracuse if my memory serves me right. I was in the Senate. It was about 1950. And they came down here and they had had quite a time up there. They had been brought in primarily from Africa and many of them from French Africa and they were told about what we

were doing for equal opportunity, and they wanted these young people to know about democracy and they said, "This is a great country", and you and I know that it is.

And, you know, they went over here to the White Tower or the White Castle or one of the hamburger stands, and right away some fellow behind the counter said, "You, colored fellow, get out of here." That's right. I had already given them a fine, you know, "Come up and lecture" up there at the Capitol and told them about the greatness of our society. The State Department called me up. I was always available for these things, you know.

[Laughter]

And they said, "Senator, would you tell these young men and women what a great place we have here, about the nation's Capitol", and I gave them everything I could think of. And then they left my office all cheered up, and this was a fact. And they went down town. They couldn't get in a hotel. They couldn't get in a restaurant. They couldn't get in a movie. And they couldn't even get in the hamburger stand. And they came back up to see me.

[Laughter]

Well, I did do something for my country. I took



them to the Senate dining room. And that was one year after the first colored man had been in the Senate dining room. And I don't mind telling you I took the first one.  
[Applause]

And I had somebody walk up to me and say, "Don't you realize this is rather unusual and violates our traditions?" I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "Your luncheon partner." "Why", I said, "That gentleman has been out to my home. He has had dinner with Mrs. Humphrey and myself, and I want to tell you, if he is good enough for my home he is good enough for this ptomaine parlor."  
[Laughter]

And this is why they said in those days that Humphrey was brash. Well, I was, and I'm glad of it, because it needed to be said. Today it's a different city. Thank goodness. We have made such wonderful progress. So many people have contributed to it. And it's so much a better place, and we are such a better country for it.

As our President said last night--I think in his greatest hour--that was one of the most magnificent addresses that has ever been given.

[Applause]

He said we would be richer and better because of what we plan on doing in terms of equal opportunity--not poorer, not worse. And we will be. Just think of the brainpower that we have kept submerged through inadequate education, separate but equal. Both white and colored have suffered because of that doctrine. Just think of the unlimited, just think of the economic losses we have taken because of segregation. Just think of what this evil curse of racism has done to us, the tragedy of it!

Look what it did to Hitler. And for goodness sake, let's make it clear for the whole world that if we make mistakes here, it's not the mistake of policy. It's a mistake of an individual. Let it go from this place and this time forever and ever that the policy of this country unequivocally, unalterably is the policy of equal opportunity for every person that is a citizen of this Republic in every area of human endeavor. That is one thing that we can do for our country and for the world.

[Applause]

And we are going to have a bill up there in Congress tomorrow on equal rights, voting rights. And we are going to need your help and once we get that bill passed,

we are going to need some more help. We are going to need your help to see to it that when people have the right to vote and that voting right is protected and that the votes are honestly counted, three new achievements, may I say in some areas.

[Laughter]

That when those three achievements are on the masthead of our table of success, then we had better make sure that we have the education and the programs of social betterment that make this legal right of the right to vote a reality, a meaningful reality. Because the right of a job without discrimination is nothing if a man isn't trained for the job. And the right to vote becomes an exercise in legalism, unless there is the education and unless there is the training, unless there is the hope of a better life that can come with the exercise of that right to vote.

All of this is a part of our foreign policy-- absolutely. When we preach freedom and democracy, the least that we can do is to love it enough to practice it.

Thank you.

[Standing ovation]

MRS. LOUCHHEIM: Mr. Vice President, I think our



enthusiasm has been adequately, perhaps, expressed by our applause. Your very kind Mr. Vice President has said he will take questions.

I know you always do--but do us the honor of telling us who you are please.

MR. WILL: I am Herman Will of the Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns. I would like to express, I know for everyone, our gratitude to the Vice President for his charge and challenge to us. We acknowledge our gratitude for the help of the Administration too in what they are doing.

In line with your last point, Mr. Vice President, about the United Nations and human dignity, do you have a word for us about what priority is given by the Administration to the situation on the Hill where there are four United Nations conventions or treaties on human value awaiting action and one for 17 years of genocide which was submitted to President Kennedy?

A Yes, I'm aware of those conventions--this Administration is. I hesitate to speak decisively because I am not at all sure just what the time schedule is. But I think you could look forward to seeing this Administration

moving most of those conventions to Congressional action in this session of Congress.

[Applause]

Next? I know I have kept you a long time. You know this is such a beautiful place to talk. And the Vice President doesn't get a chance to say anything, you know. I'm up there in the Senate and I have to preside and the most I can say is "The Senator from Montana", and "The Senator from Oregon", and whenever I get turned loose on an unsuspecting and polite audience, I just go after them.

Yes, the gentleman here? [Indicating]

Q Mr. Vice President, we are aware that the burrowing has begun and is reaching a relatively advanced degree in Thailand already. So let's take that part of Southeast Asia as a concrete example. Are you satisfied with the steps we are taking, both public and private, to assist in matters appropriate to making the world safe for diversity, the forwarding of the capacities of individuals to govern themselves and thus have a reason to defend themselves?

A I can only tell you that all of our efforts in this area of the world, having been so sorely tested, are

under re-examination. I do not feel free to speak to you about particular programs lest I may speak out of turn. You know, I am in a little different role now than I once was. Why, you should have caught me a year ago.

[Laughter]

I would have come right at you. But let me reassure you of one thing, that we think we have learned something from mistakes made as well as successes achieved. We watched the manner in which our aid program has been applied, for example, in Viet-Nam. Where has it been effective? Where has it been successful? In many places it has, by the way. The aid program has been received by the Vietnamese rural people with great gratitude and support and very few of our aid people have at any time been molested.

We have learned a good deal about how you can promote better self-government, starting at the lowest social unit, so to speak, right down at the little village or, as we would say, at the township or precinct level. I think we have to keep in mind in instances of these areas--take Viet-Nam, for example, this area of the world has been occupied by foreign powers for yea hundreds, thousands of



years. The French had occupied it for, how long--200, approximately? The Chinese occupied it for centuries. Actually, the Vietnamese have had little or no chance to develop self-government, a stable government. They have been in constant war and constant attack for all of their lives, all this present generation.

And one of the policies that is followed by the Viet Cong in this instance, or the Communist forces, is the assassination of leadership. I wonder how many of us realize that? The methodical, systematic assassination of every mayor or every little local official that shows any ability at all. They don't take time to try to convert them. [Indicating slashing of throat] And then they start converting a few others after terror has been spread and after you have eliminated your leadership.

And one of the real problems that we have in many countries and that other countries have more so for themselves, in the newly developing areas of the world, is this paucity of trained leadership. Now, it's not their fault. It's really the fault of the colonial powers. But it did--in many of these countries if you can destroy a hundred or 150 or 200 top people, you have destroyed the

core of leadership. Now, we have seen this happen in communities in our own history where leadership can be destroyed and a whole area of a country is set back. And we have seen it happen in more developed countries in other parts of the world.

So I must say that we are trying to take cognizance of this. And in the instance you mentioned, of the burrowing in under Thailand and in other areas, we are trying to revise our programs and strengthen them accordingly. We are working very closely, as you know, with the Malaysians and they fought for seven years. We are working with the Philippines. They had their problems with the Huks, and still do.

We are trying to learn from others and having other people learn from others that have gone through this same thing. It's a very, very difficult assignment for a modern, highly industrialized nation to know how to meet this rather primitive and yet diabolical form of aggression and attack.

We cut the--two hundred years ago, my dear friends, in the French and Indian Wars, the British columns were cut to ribbons. The finest, the cream of the British

75  
army, 1759-1760. You heard about Burgoyne's defeat and a few others, haven't you? Braddock, and the rest of these? Well, in those early days of American history, guerrilla warfare tactics were practiced by our colonies and the Indians, and they would hack up a British square, brigade or a company or a regiment and just chop it up into bits. We lost that talent, I guess, of being able to conduct a counter guerrilla activity.

All right, next? In the back here, sir? Way in the back?

Q [African Methodist Episcopal Church]: My concern is primarily with foreign aid and with what we can do as church members in assisting the program after its passage. We will do what we can to help pass it. I was concerned to know what you might suggest that we could do to indicate our personal concern, as well as our monetary concern, for all these countries who will be receiving foreign aid from the United States.

A You mean after?

Q After.

A After. Well, I hope that your confidence in how well it's going to go through is something that



buoys me up for a moment.

[Laughter]

I want to take just a little of the first step, if I may, with you about passing it. Because there is a certain disenchantment now gripping Members of Congress about what, if anything, we can do in Africa. In the meantime, the Chinese are moving into Africa with some very, very astute and meaningful and effective diplomacy and conspiratorial activity. We ought not to forget that. We are going to be facing--we are not only going to be facing it, legitimate freely elected chosen governments in African states are going to be facing more and more difficult problems.

I would hope that in our foreign aid bill that we will not sacrifice that area of the foreign aid, particularly in economic and technical assistance, for the African states. And this is in serious jeopardy, serious jeopardy. Even our Alliance for Progress funds are in some jeopardy.

Now, once that we have passed the bill--and you, Reverend, I will go with you, you convinced me, we are going to pass it.

[Laughter]

Once that we have passed this bill, we are going to need a combination of both public and private efforts-- and I believe a very great deal of private effort, private capital, private efforts on the part of the non-profit groups. The development of the cooperative movement, for example, in these underdeveloped areas is very, very important. Where there is a shortage of capital, you have to pool what little you have. We ought to be doing everything we can to develop educational institutions in these areas.

I sometimes feel that we get so concerned about capital projects we hesitate to put enough emphasis upon the educational institutions that are needed, the universities as well as the elementary. Our churches have been doing good work in many of these areas. They could do more, particularly in the social welfare aspects. The churches can't very well do much in housing or basic community development of big enterprises, but they can with personnel.

Our Peace Corps effort, by the way, is maybe one of the most effective instruments that we have today. It needs backing. It needs support. We are having a little difficulty on recruitment. Can I be frank with you? I hope that we are not becoming--I hope that we haven't let the bloom fall off in this beautiful flower. This Peace

Corps effort is a tremendous effort. And we need young people. We need people of all walks of life and ages in the Peace Corps. That is about as satisfactory an answer as I can give you. I hope that I can do better by you sometime.

All right. One more and then I better run along or I'll keep you here forever.

MR. BEN NEUFELD [National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor]: Way back last year when you were in the Senate, the Congress expressed what we take to be the clear intent that the domestic agricultural worker should not have his social status, economic status, jeopardized because of the bracero program and its importance to Mexico.

My question is, can we expect sometime in the near future some statement analagous to that of the Congress on the Administration's intent in this regard?

A I hope you will forgive me, but I didn't quite get the thrust of your question. Would you please restate that. I'm not ducking you. I'd be glad to try to answer it if I can.

Q Well, at the present time, since Congress permitted the bracero program to expire--



A Yes?

Q The Secretary of Labor has been on the firing line between the growers who want the use of Mexican workers continued.

A Yes?

Q And the agricultural workers and their friends who don't.

A Yes, sir?

Q The question is, in effect, is the Administration going to take a stand publicly and will it take a stand in the near future so that either the Secretary of Labor will get off the hook or those of us who are working on behalf of the farm workers will know that we have got to get out and work harder?

A Well, the Secretary of Labor is the Administration in this area. He speaks for the Administration. The bracero program is at an end and the Secretary of Labor has asked for these workers, these needs to be met by domestic workers--and, by the way, I will give you a little project. We are going to need about 200,000--and we need people. They will be given rather--they will get housing, they will get transportation, they will get sick

benefits. There is quite a program for them. And here's an opportunity to take people literally off the streets and give them an opportunity to earn a good wage and some gainful employment during these summer months when explosions take place, social explosions, quite readily in some of our large cities.

I just came away from a meeting where we were discussing this very thing, just before I came here. So let me assure you that the Administration's program is one of trying to fill these labor needs, these needs of the growers, with domestic labor. And our domestic workers will be encouraged and you that are in the union movement on this, that work on this matter--or if you're not union, whatever your position may be--you're going to be given the help of this Government to consummate an effective employment recruitment program to take care of those needs.

[Applause]

Thank you very, very much.

[Standing ovation]

- - - -

*Wm Hubbard  
Kate Locken*

Remarks of  
Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE

Department of State

March 16, 1965

(OFF THE RECORD)

There are no people in the world today more conscious of international affairs and more outward-looking than the American people. It may seem otherwise at times. But when we consider the record of the past two decades, the American commitment to participation in world affairs is indisputable.

A generation ago we ended that isolationism bred of illusion, the illusion that we could be safe in our continental fortress, separated by vast oceans from the politics of Europe and Asia. A bitter war and two decades of tortuous peace have taught us the folly of that illusion.

The lesson we had been slow to learn we have been slow to lose. In the past 25 years we helped fight and



win a great war ---

--We have helped rebuild a prostrate European continent;

--We have defended Europe in the face of hostile designs of Stalinist Russia;

--We have assisted new countries to achieve their independence;

--We have stemmed the tide toward nuclear destruction through the Test Ban Treaty;

--We have sent our men and women overseas in the Peace Corps, in the armed services, in AID missions;

--We have spent our public and private money and our

human resources on an unprecedented scale. *all of this a new and complicated experience for us.*

When you set out on such a task, you are bound to make mistakes.

└ You may sometimes waste money.

└ You will run the risk of misjudging political and

social problems in other parts of the world.

↳ You may sometimes be impatient -- expecting immediate results where immediate results are not possible.

↳ All these are risks we face because of our involvement in the world.

↳ We are told today that there is a rising tide of neo-isolationism in this country. ↳ We are told by some that we must reduce our commitments abroad in order to meet our commitments at home. ↳ We are told by some that there are places in the world where we have no business and where we should leave the people to their own consequences -- even if those consequences involve domination by totalitarian forces.

↳ We are told by some that democratic government is impossible in many neighboring countries -- that we had better get used to military dictatorships.

↳ We are told by some that the United Nations once was

a useful tool of policy, but now that it includes so many  
new nations, it is too hard to get our way -- so we ought  
to let it die on the vine.

↳ We are told by some that our citizens will no longer  
carry the burden, and that we'd better cut back and withdraw  
in an orderly retreat.

↳ The members of this audience -- who have for years  
appreciated both the prospects of success and the consequences  
of failure in the conduct of our foreign policy -- know that  
there can be no retreat from involvement in world affairs.

↳ There can be -- and there no doubt will be -- a change  
in the pattern of U.S. involvement. ↳ The break-up of the  
bipolar world which has characterized the international  
relations of the past two decades and <sup>some</sup> ~~the~~ easing of tensions  
between East and West may have changed the pattern of U.S.  
involvement in world affairs, but it has not diminished it.



✓ We retain the role of leader of the free world that we inherited at the end of World War II, and in that role our responsibilities remain world-wide. ✓ In that role our responsibility extends to distant Asia as well as to countries on our doorstep.

✓ The fact that our responsibility remains world-wide does not mean that we will commit ourselves to military involvement in every crisis that erupts around the world.

✓ We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme. Although we shall honor our commitments to assist friendly nations in preserving their freedom, we have no desire to interject American troops into explosive local disputes.

✓ But in those areas where we are committed militarily, our responsibility as a world power prevents any rapid scaling down of our commitments.

L Our commitment in Vietnam should be understood in this light. Some might ask: Why is it so important to preserve the freedom and independence of Vietnam? I would answer that the position of the United States in Asia and throughout the world will be greatly affected by the nature of our response to the crisis in Vietnam. Our word is either good or it is not. Our commitment is either kept or it is not. If we demonstrate our determination to stick by one friendly nation, another such nation may never be assaulted. If, on the other hand, we pull out of South Vietnam, we can expect more of the same somewhere else.

L Ultimately it is our own security that is weakened.

Our stakes in Southeast Asia are too high for the recklessness either of sudden withdrawal or of general conflagration. We need not choose between inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. The stakes can be secured

through a wise multiple strategy if we but sustain our national determination to see the job through to success.

L Members of this audience, representing foreign policy organizations all over the country, can do much to strengthen the determination of the American people to support their government in meeting its commitment in Southeast Asia.

This is the area where your support is needed more than ever this year. #

A second area where we need your help this year is in support of the foreign aid program. We have been cutting back on our foreign aid program when we should be expanding it. At a time when the foreign aid program is more effectively administered than at anytime since the Marshall Plan, we hear cries to trim its size, to emasculate its content. These should be rejected.

We in this country are rich. If you look at the way



we spend our public and private money, you will find that precious little of it does go to foreign aid. You will find that it is considerably less than 1 percent of our Gross National Product. You will find that the budget of the Alliance for Progress is a pittance compared to our annual bill for golf balls and sports cars.

Foreign aid is as indispensable to the success of American foreign policy today as it was in the height of the Cold War. It is up to you to impress this upon the American Congress.

A third area where your support is needed concerns our commitment to the United Nations. This is not a happy situation and it raises some political and legal problems for the UN's largest contributor as I am sure it does for other members.

Therefore today we hear voices advocating abandonment

of the United Nations -- withdrawal from the United Nations.

They are misguided. They would abandon an imperfect instrument for preserving world peace because they dislike our imperfect world. To abandon the U.N. -- or to immobilize it through crippling restrictions or failure to support it -- would only prove that our generation had forgotten the lessons of a half a century of nationalism and isolationism.

Let those who would destroy the United Nations recall the international anarchy that followed the demise of the League of Nations. In a nuclear era when anarchy can lead to annihilation, the United Nations deserves the support of all nations -- large and small, rich and poor. The heroes of the world community are not those who withdraw when difficulties ensue -- not those who can envision neither the prospect of success nor the consequence of failure -- but those who stand the heat of the battle -- the fight for

world peace through the United Nations.

It may take time and patience and a high capacity to absorb frustration before the General Assembly gets back on the track or selects a somewhat different road ahead.

But I am confident that the U.N. is an institution in the throes of growing pains -- not in the grip of a fatal disease.

You can play an important role in convincing the Congress and the American people that the U.N. continues to be indispensable to the aims of U.S. foreign policy.



I have touched briefly on three areas where your interest and support is urgently needed this year if we are to successfully meet our responsibilities abroad. But just as the United States cannot escape its present responsibilities around the world, so America cannot avoid its responsibilities at home. What we do or fail to do at home has important consequences for our foreign policy. We cannot convincingly speak of brotherhood among men and praise the virtues of democracy while at home we permit widespread denial of the elementary rights to vote and to assemble peaceably.

Today the eyes of the world -- a world composed primarily of non-white people who have only recently achieved self-government -- are focused on Selma, Alabama. Everywhere people are measuring the ideals of American democracy against the harsh reality exposed in that small Southern town.

Civil Rts  
Act.

Much has been accomplished in recent years to ensure equal opportunity for all Americans. The Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960 and 1964 established procedures to challenge flagrant discrimination in the use of voting tests. Since 1957 over 60 voting suits were filed and hundreds of thousands of Negroes have been registered. But Selma demonstrated that much more needs to be done.

Tomorrow the President will send to Congress legislation to ensure that no citizen can be denied his constitutional right to vote. His powerful and inspiring message to the Congress expressed a renewed commitment of America to equal opportunity for all. I expect Congress will promptly consider and pass a comprehensive and meaningful voting rights bill. In so doing, we will be demonstrating to the world that there exists no hypocrisy between American ideals and American intentions, between

what we aspire to abroad and what we practice at home.

We are a powerful resourceful people -- capable of doing our part to shape the world we live<sup>in</sup>/and at the same time righting old wrongs here at home.

I come here today with this message: This Administration has made its commitment to world responsibility.

We do not intend to take the easy way. We are ready to take every long, tiring step toward the time when there can be security in the world and when the opportunities for a better life are opened to more than a few.

There is a world revolution going on. But it is not a socialist revolution or violent uprising of the international proletariat. It is a revolution of the common man, who seeks justice, dignity and fulfillment for himself and his children. And we are not only on the side of this revolution. We must lead it. And we intend to lead it both at home and abroad.



# 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)