

California Wine (Pat Brown)
Balance of Payments Gov. Ralston

- Gov. Sawyer
- Gov. Hatfield

REMARKS BY

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

WESTERN GOVERNORS CONFERENCE

PORTLAND, OREGON

June 11, 1965

① Minnesota
Governor
Mrs H + I are
looking forward to
seeing you

① singing
Miss Cutforth
① the Buchanan

" Cultural Activities
and McDonald
Chad farm.

It is always a pleasure to be in the West --
and especially in Oregon.

My grandfather, John Humphrey, was a pioneer
in this state and my father was born in Albany, Oregon.
But the course of events took my family all the way back
Minnesota and
East to South Dakota. In any case, I feel I'm not a
carpetbagger here today and that I have genuine
credentials as a Westerner.

my father

Pat Brown - all the
time I thought you
for me.

West -
Growth
Vitality

Pioneer
Spirit
Vitality

L The West is filled with the pioneer spirit.

There is a vitality here that lifts men. There is a feeling of things being done, of challenges accepted.

People look toward tomorrow.

L The spirit of the West is the American spirit.

To the Governors here today, I say: Your states, among these United States, are leading those who are meeting the complex problems of this century with imagination and with action -- on a state level, at the local level, and in cooperation with the federal government and with the private sector.

Partnership
Fed - State
& Local

L Our efforts to create a better America depend in great part on your actions to create a better state, a better city, a better citizen.

(X)

L In our nation, no Governor can afford to abdicate his responsibility in the hope that problems may be solved at some other level.

By the same token, this American nation cannot afford to ^{it} abdicate international responsibility in the hope that world problems will disappear -- or that someone else, someplace else will do the worrying and take responsibility for meeting those problems.

The Price
of
Leadership

Speak of
Vietnam

Today, all of us are concerned with Vietnam.

For the past six months there has been ^{considerable} ~~a~~ debate ~~in~~ ~~this country~~ concerning our role there and in Southeast Asia. American universities particularly -- including

some in your states -- have been filled with this debate.

But I regard this ^{discussion} ~~debate~~ as healthy. After all, lest we forget, this is a society which believes in free speech, in public debate, in an active role for its citizens. I would, in fact, be worried about ^{our} ~~this~~ country if there were no debate.

Debate

My personal view is that much of this debate, however, has not been concerned with the central questions of our presence in Vietnam: Are we doomed to repeat the mistakes of the past? Are we willing to sacrifice a small nation to aggression in the false hope it will buy our own security?

And, make no mistake about it, it is open aggression we face in Vietnam.

Are we Americans going to meet our responsibilities in the world? Or are we going to again turn inward on ourselves -- as we have in the past with such tragic result?

In this nuclear age, there is no place to hide.

Our action in Vietnam is a part of the continuing struggle which we must be prepared to wage if we are to preserve free civilization ~~as we know it~~ and resist the expansion of totalitarian power.

To be sure

1 The break-up of the bipolar world and the easing of East-West tensions have changed the pattern of our involvement in world affairs, but they have not diminished it.

↳ We retain our role as leader of the free world. And in that role our responsibilities remain world-wide. In that role our responsibility extends to Asia as well as to countries on our doorstep.

and the

President ~~Johnson~~ has made it unmistakably clear that we intend to meet those responsibilities.

↳ We originally made a commitment in Vietnam in 1954.

↳ Three Administrations have maintained that commitment.

now Some may debate the wisdom of our original decision in 1954 to take up the responsibilities which the French relinquished.

Keep

Keep | But this question has little relevance today.

The President ~~Johnson~~ has spelled out the principles
~~on which~~ our policy today is based ~~and~~

They are three

First: In the face of armed conflict -- in the
face of continued aggressions -- we will not withdraw,
we will not abandon the people of Vietnam. We shall
keep our word. !

Our refusal to withdraw is based on our recognition
that ~~sudden~~ withdrawal from Vietnam would only weaken
the position of free societies in Asia. ^{Thailand,} They would regard
withdrawal as a loss of interest by the United States in Asia
and as an enticement to accommodate themselves to
Communist China.

We ^{stated by Rome} reject the belief that by some inevitable law
China is destined to swallow up all of Asia.

And I find it curious that so many proponents of the inevitability theory also advocate the "Titoist" doctrine that Vietnam would become an independent neutral nation if we would withdraw our military forces. The arguments are absolutely incompatible. Nonsense!

↳ We refuse to withdraw because withdrawal would mean betrayal of those who have opposed the spread of Communism in Southeast Asia, would mean certain death or exile.

↳ Finally, in relation to the Sino-Soviet contest, our withdrawal would prove right the Chinese thesis that militancy pays -- and discredit the Soviet thesis of peaceful coexistence.

↳ Second: Recognizing that a political solution of the conflict is essential, we stand ready to engage in "unconditional discussions." We have no desire for further military escalation of the war.

✓ We stand ready to consider any solution which would bring peace and justice to all of Vietnam, North and South.

I would like to make crystal clear who is in favor of a political settlement and who is opposed, who has offered the olive branch and who has rejected it.

✓ President ~~Johnson~~ ^{7th US} has affirmed not only our willingness to hold unconditional discussions to end the war, but our ardent desire to do so.

✓ What has been the response of the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peking?

✓ They have rejected every peace offer from any source. They have spurned the efforts of the UN to mediate. They have scorned the offer of the British. They have brushed aside the efforts of the Indian government.

In short -- the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peking have rejected all efforts to restore peace and justice to the people of Vietnam.

— they refuse to even talk peace.

Third: We recognize that the people of Vietnam must have a cause for which to fight. They must have hope of a better day.

↳ We have made it clear to the people of Vietnam that to improve their lives and fulfill their hopes we stand ready to support a massive cooperative development effort -- not only for Vietnam but for all of Southeast Asia. It is our hope, ~~as President Johnson has said,~~ that "the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war."

↳ These three principles -- honoring our military commitment, a continuing willingness to seek an honorable political solution, and a massive economic development program -- remain the bases of our policy.

↳ The struggle in Vietnam has a special significance for the United States as the defender of the free world because it confronts us with a bold new form of aggression --which could rank in military importance with the discovery of gunpowder. ^{so-called} I refer to the "war of national liberation."

↳ Vietnam offers a classic example of what can be accomplished by militant Communist forces intent on deliberate subversion of a country from within.

↳ There, we have seen a Communist state refuse to leave its neighbors in peace.

We have seen the infiltration of Communist cadres to strengthen and direct guerrilla warfare in violation of international accords.

We have seen the Communists who control and direct the war from Hanoi insist that the war in South Vietnam is internal because many of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese.

∠ We have seen them portray the struggle as a civil war -- in which the "popular forces" are arrayed against "American imperialism."

∠ It is this new sophisticated form of warfare that is becoming the major challenge to our security, to the security of all free nations. This new warfare is often more dangerous than the old -- a war in which the leaders cannot be located, in which the sources of supply cannot be easily cut off, in which the enemy forces are not outsiders but indigenous troops -- in which signed truces do not halt the struggle.

∠ The supreme challenge today is to prove to our foes and our friends that the new face of war is no less pernicious than the old . . . that it can be defeated by those of strong mind, stout heart and a steel will.

We know now that most Communist regimes do not desire to blow the world to pieces. They prefer to pick it up piece by piece.

↳ How do we successfully meet the challenge posed by "wars of national liberation?"

↳ First, of course, we need balanced and flexible military forces able to respond rapidly to any situation.

↳ But military power alone is not an adequate response to "wars of national liberation." These wars feed on seething social discontent.

↳ To meet this discontent requires a subtle blending of economic aid, political expertise, educational efforts, information and propaganda programs -- combined with military power.

↳ Where "wars of national liberation" flourish, the military struggle is only one part of a larger social and political struggle.

↳ These struggles will continue and revolutionary ferment will increase until governments come to power able to implement systematic social and economic programs designed to abolish shocking social and economic inequality between the privileged few and the impoverished masses. . . between glittering capitals and festering slums . . . between favored urban enclaves and primitive rural areas.

↳ For the masses of the people in the developing countries of Asia, the status quo is no longer a burden to be patiently borne. It is an oppressor to be cast off.

↳ The primary responsibility for preserving the independence and security of a country remains with the people and the government of that country.

↳ If the people and their leaders have no will to preserve their independence, no outside force can save them.

↳ If the government can provide the people with a cause for which to fight, with a program inspiring sacrifice and effort, that government can be capable of defending itself against Communist infiltration and subversion from within.

But, Where subversion from within is supported from outside, as is the case in Vietnam, outside assistance is needed if such a government is to achieve this capability.

↳ As I have said, in overcoming "wars of national liberation" military response alone is not enough. In Vietnam there is a little-noticed side of the struggle -- the struggle for a better life.

↳ It is the battle of the Vietnamese people not merely to survive, but to build, to make progress, to move forward.

↳ In the past decade, rice production has been doubled. Corn output is expected to be four times as large next year as it was in 1962. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955.

↳ The average Vietnamese can expect to live only 35 years. Yet there are only 200 civilian doctors. A new medical school we are helping to build will graduate that number of new doctors each year.

↳ Meanwhile, we have helped vaccinate more than 7 million people against cholera and millions more against other diseases. More than 12,000 hamlet health stations have been built and stocked with medical supplies.

↳ In Vietnam -- as everywhere -- "civilization is a race between education and catastrophe." Education is the foundation of any country's future. For it is impossible to run a government, local or national, to man factories or to enrich the national life without

trained and educated people. Elementary school
enrollment was 300,000 in 1955 -- it is five times
that number today. Vocational school enrollment has
quadrupled. The University population is increasing
steadily.

This progress has been achieved against the
most appalling odds. It has been made despite the
carefully planned and executed program of terror and
harassment carried out by the Vietcong. The Communists,

But There is a curious misconception abroad that
the Vietcong is a great idealistic movement, a sort of
"Indo-Chinese wing of the American Populist Party" --
to use Arthur Schlesinger's phrase. In reality, they
are, ~~he continues~~ "a collection of very tough, disciplined,
terrorists whose gains have come in the main not from
the hopes they have inspired but from the fear they
have created."

↳ In the countryside, agricultural stations
have regularly been destroyed and medical clinics raided.

↳ Malaria control team members have been killed or
kidnapped. ↳ Village chiefs, school teachers and others
who represent order and social service have been made
special targets by the terrorists.

↳ All told, it is estimated that 10 thousand civilian
officials have been killed or kidnapped since 1954. If
one were to use comparable figures for the U.S. in
relation to population, this would amount to 130 thousand
officials.

} Get
this!

↳ Yet the effort goes on despite these attacks and
dangers. ↳ Brave and tireless Vietnamese continue to
take seeds and fertilizer and farming know-how to the
villagers.

↳ Teachers continue to man the schools.

↳ Medical teams go into the country despite the clear and always present danger.

↳ And at their side -- I am proud to say -- go American civilian workers. And they, too, have been killed and kidnapped. These men and women, Vietnamese and American -- and increasingly of other nationalities -- are the unsung, unpublicized heroes of this phase of the struggle. So long as they persevere "wars of national liberation" can be defeated.

} over
30 flap
in Vietnam

↳ In assisting independent nations -- whether in Southeast Asia or in our own hemisphere -- there will be required on our part patience as well as courage, "the will to endure as well as the will to resist."

↳ But our willingness to meet our obligation to assist free nations should not be confused with a desire to extend American power or impose American ways.

↳ We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no desire to play the role of global Gendarme.

↳ Where multilateral organizations are ready and able to defend independent nations from Communist assault, of preventing internal rebellions from leading to chaos and anarchy, we welcome their intervention. As we know from recent history, international organizations like the UN are not always capable of stepping in quickly.

When they are capable we welcome their presence.

↳ Our stakes in Southeast Asia are too high for the recklessness either of withdrawal or of general war.

and We need not choose between retreat or unlimited retaliation.

When Not
then we
must

The stakes can be secured through a wise
multiple strategy if we can sustain national determination
to see the job through.

AID
FOOD

Our Vietnamese friends look forward to the day
when national independence and security will be achieved,
permitting the withdrawal of foreign forces. We share
that hope and that expectation.

But we know ~~that~~ that hope cannot be achieved
if the United States shirks its obligations -- if we
withdraw from the world, to retreat from its responsibilities.

If we refuse to share the burden of preserving
the peace -- who will take it on?

If we refuse to share the burden of defending
free societies, who can guarantee their survival?

If we ~~will not join in the defense of democracy,~~
~~what are its future prospects?~~

~~becomtered and weary~~
~~who's then the Communist~~
~~has won.~~

L In a complex world, we must practice patience and perseverance -- patience to defend free nations in distant Asia as well as those close to home.

L We must not be lured by quick and easy solutions.

L We must not abandon our goals because of frustration.

L We must continue to pursue the goal of peace and freedom -- acknowledging both the prospects of success and the consequences of failure.

~~In this task, I ask your help.~~

We must recognize that the defense of freedom may require the use of Power - but ~~power~~ ^{military} power alone is not enough - Our Cause is Peace - let the world know it - and we have the faith, the will, & the means to pursue it.

ADDRESS OF HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
BEFORE THE WESTERN GOVERNORS CONFERENCE

JUNE 11, 1965

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Governor, and Governors. And, may I pay special reference to Governor Sawyer, who is the Chairman of the Governors Conference, and to the ladies of the Governors. What a wonderful evening this is.

Mark, I want you to know that I've been getting a full view of your life from the most accurate reporter, and I'm not at all sure what the future of politics may hold for either of us, but I can dare say tonight that it will be a stalemate in terms of the personal references that I've heard.

(Laughter)

If my wife is as honest and truthful with you as yours has been with me--

(Laughter)

--oh--oh--my.

(Laughter and applause)

And, Governor, I don't blame you. I like Miss Cut-throat too!

(Laughter)

She's a lovely lady and a marvelous artist, and Antonette has been filling me in on all of these little personal matters--

(Laughter)

She said, "Mr. Vice-President, watch him. If his ear twitches, I must go over and hold his hand."

(Laughter)

But the Governor exercised great self-control.

(Laughter)

There are several references that I want to make this evening. First of all, I'm very pleased that the Western Governors have seen fit to help the President in his program on the balanced payments.

Charles de Gaulle didn't profit one bit from this meeting, and California wine was served.

(Laughter)

I am--

(Applause)

You would do almost anything for that Pat Brown, wouldn't you?

(Laughter)

I was particularly pleased with the final cultural activity of the evening--these musical selections are rather hard acts to follow, as I've been reminded here. But that "Old MacDonald Had a Farm"--I understand the soloist was Bill Miller. That's just what I thought.

(Laughter)

Anyway it was fun, and we've had a delightful evening haven't we? Thus far at least.

(Applause)

It'll be just about a month, a little over a month, and the Governors, the ladies, will be in Minnesota. And we're really looking forward to your meeting of the nationwide Governors Conference in our twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and the only reason that Mrs. Humphrey isn't here tonight is because we've extended an invitation, and if you haven't received it you will. You're to come out to our home some 38 or 39 miles west of Minneapolis, through beautiful farm country, and come out to our little lake cottage or lake home--if it's a cottage, it's been overpriced--

(Laughter)

--but we're inviting you to come out there, and after the invitations went out, why Muriel said, "Oh, my goodness, we've got to do something with this place." As a matter of fact, I wondered why she suggested we have you out there. I think she just wanted to remodel. So she is there presiding over the remodelling and we do hope that by the time you get there, the kitchen will be completed

and the driveway..

I told one of the governors, I think it was Pat, that, speaking of that Governors Conference, I said, "I want you to know that it's going to cost me \$1457 just for you to get your car turned around in my yard. But I don't want you to think it isn't worth it, because it is."

(Laughter)

This too is part of the Great Society.

(Laughter)

Well, I didn't come here just to have fun, even though that's really a most desirable activity, particularly after a long conference. I came here to talk to you about some serious matters and I'm not going to tell you how to run your States. You can tell us how to run the country. But I don't think that the Vice President ought to tell the President how to run the country or Governors how to run their States. I think you know how to do it. I do want to say that I feel very much at home in Oregon. I'm not a carpetbagger. My grandfather, John Humphrey, was a pioneer in this State, living near Albany, Oregon. My father was born in Albany, Oregon--

(Applause)

Of course, Governor Hatfield, he--Grandfather did move. He went to Minnesota, and a little bit later, my father, when he was in manhood, went to South Dakota, and a little bit later, why, he let his son Hubert go back to Minnesota, so if I seem to have been travelling in the early days of my life I can only say that I've kept it up ever since. And now I find myself back here in this beautiful great State in the Pacific Northwest.

This whole Western area so much represents the vitality of this Nation. You've heard that repeatedly, but it is a fact. And it represents this spirit of progress and growth that is so typical of our country. And it also represents, I think, what we need these days in America, a real premium and priority upon our human resources and our natural resources, because this great country of ours has a long ordeal ahead of it and we must be prepared for it, not to batten down the hatches, so to speak, but to stand on the deck, to face the storm and to meet adversity wherever it may be and to overcome it.

We need the kind of sustained vitality that this great area of America so typifies. And I know that you as Governors, and you as fellow citizens, are doing what you think is best to maintain that

strength and to expand it. I would say that the prime purpose today of our government is to conserve and to develop our great human resources, to lift higher the standard of American performance in American life and to do so not only because it is morally right, which is of course the first imperative, but because it is an absolute political necessity. This great America cannot survive in the kind of a world in which we live unless it is performing at top performance on a basis of excellence.

And therefore we have a number of endeavors in our States and localities and in our Federal Government, and above all, in our private life, in our private sector, to improve the overall standards of life, the overall well-being of the American citizen. Why? So that we can be what we are destined to be--leaders. Not just leaders for ourselves, but leaders for others and leaders for a cause and leaders that are capable of sustained leadership. All of this requires a partnership. If I can say one thing here tonight in reference to the Government of the United States and that Government is not in Washington--it's there in part; it's in your State capital, it's in the City Halls and County Courthouses; in the townships, in the hundreds and thousands of little separate independent governmental jurisdictions. If I can say one thing that I hope you will accept as fact and as truth, it is this: that the day of playing off one element of government against another is over. That may have gained a certain degree of popularity years back, but there is no room for it now. If ever we needed to understand the government of this country is in all of the different levels; that it starts, so to speak, at the local level and proceeds up from there to the State and the Federal level, and that it is a working partnership, rather than built-in animosity, now is the time we need to understand it.

And I have dedicated what efforts I may give and what talent I may have, to trying to promote a greater unity in this Nation and doing away with disunity, a greater understanding and less diversity. And I for one am not going to indulge myself as private citizen or as public official, in setting group against group, region against region, or government against government. There just isn't room for that any longer, because we have too much to do. Too many things to achieve, too many responsibilities to fulfill.

So we join together in our efforts to create a better America, and the best thing about this country is we know it can be better. Oh, it's good. And to say that it can be better is not to deny its already great achievements. We join together to make this a more prosperous America. We know its already prosperous, but we also know that in that prosperity there are those who have not shared; they've been left behind. Why? I haven't the time to say. All I can

say is it is a fact, that in every one of the 50 States, in every area under the Flag of the United States, there are people who could have done better, who need to do better, who need to be brought out of the backwaters of American life and put into the mainstream. They need to be upgraded by their own efforts, and with the help of others.

And so we join together as Governors, as legislators, as a Vice President, or as a Mayor or as citizen, or as an industrialist, or as a labor union official, or whatever it may be, we join together to create a better America, a better environment, a better America in terms of its cities, its countryside, its industries, its voluntary organizations.

Now just as every Governor has a responsibility in his State, and you can't put it off to someone else. We were sitting here this evening and just visiting as neighbors and talking about, well, where is the real focus sometimes of public attention? I was the mayor of a city of over a half a million people and I thought that was the most engaging and interesting political or public position I ever had, without exception. I was very close to the people. No matter what happened, somebody called up the Mayor. You feel so that you're right on the spot.

Well, surely, the same is true of a Governor, even more so, because it's a bigger area for which he has responsibility and he can't pass the buck very successfully at least. He's held accountable; he must assume his responsibility and by the same token, my fellow Americans, this nation cannot afford to abdicate its international responsibility. And when we speak now of the Nation, we speak of both domestic and international responsibilities. We can't abdicate, we can't ignore these responsibilities in the hope that the world problems will disappear. And we can't even sing that old song "Stop the World, I want to get Off". There's only a few that are getting away from this world--two in Gemini IV, two in Gemini III, and I doubt that we'll get many over 20 in the largest capsule that we'll put into orbit in the next 10 years.

So most of us are doomed to be right here, and we better stick with the task of making it a better world.

Now I want to speak to you tonight very seriously as your Vice President, about a matter that I ought to know something about. I've served for 16 years in the United States Senate and of those 16 years, 12 years on the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was my privilege to be a delegate to the United Nations, appointed by President Eisenhower in 1956. I've attended a host of international conferences, representing our country. And today I'm a member of

the National Security Council in the President's cabinet, and I think you ought to know that your President has seen to it that the Vice President of the United States is informed totally, completely on every development that this Government knows anything about. Every single morning that I'm in the Nation's capital, and even when I'm away, I have a full report of the events that take place in this world that affect our country, from the best intelligence that this nation and our allies can provide.

The American people have a right to know that this government is at least knowledgeable in depth. I don't always--I can't tell you how good one's judgment may be, because that can only be tested by circumstances. But you can know, you can know what goes on, and this I try to know. I thought I knew a good deal of what went on when I was a Senator. I worked hard at that task as you do at yours. But the truth is that no private citizen and no Member of Congress or at least very few if any, can know in the intimate detail all that takes place that is made--information that is made available to the highest councils of this government. This isn't to say that we keep it away from the people. It's simply to say that sometimes the information that you receive is not fully accurate; it's not complete and you have to piece it together over a long, long period of time.

I want to talk to you tonight about a part of the world that you're deeply concerned about and over which I have grave concern, because I am a father, a parent and a grandfather. I am a citizen. I am a public official. I have a voice in this government. And I want to be sure that what I say and what I think and whatever action I may take would at least be what I believe to be right, based on the information that I have available.

I want to talk to you about Viet-Nam. I want to talk to you about what we're doing there. I want to talk to you about why we are there. I want to ask your advice and your counsel, because, may I say prayerfully, and may I say with all sincerity, we wish we knew even yet better what to do than we're doing. We don't say we have all of the answers. But we seek to do what is right.

Now let's take a look at how we--how this all came about.

Our commitment to Viet-Nam is not new; it's over 10 years of age. I know that the past six months there's been considerable debate throughout our land concerning our role out there in Southeast Asia. American universities, particularly, including some in the States represented here, have been filled with this debate. I regard this discussion as healthy. After all, lest we forget, this is a society that is committed to the proposition of free speech and the right of

petition. We believe in debate and discussion. But we also must make decisions. I would in fact be very worried, if there wasn't debate. I'd be worried about our country if people were not concerned and failed to express that concern. No one has the wisdom and the judgment to stand aloof from public examination or constructive criticism. My personal view is that much of this debate, however, has not been concerned with the central questions of our presence in Viet-Nam, and I say our presence because we're there; your sons are there; your Nation's honor is there. The commitment of this Republic is there; every one of us.

What are the central questions? Are we doomed to repeat the mistakes of the past? And I think we know what some of those mistakes are. Are we willing to sacrifice a small nation to aggression in the false hope that it will buy our own security? Or is it so far away that we don't have to be concerned. And make no mistake about it, it is open aggression that we face in Viet-Nam. Are we Americans going to meet our responsibilities in this world, or are we going to again turn inward as we have in the past, on occasion, and pay the tragic and high price?

I think we ought to remember that in this age, in this nuclear and space age, there isn't any place to hide. You can't escape reality, and you cannot escape the actions of others. Troubles in little nations can be the downfall of big nations. The business of peace is not merely the responsibility of the great powers. It's also the responsibility of everyone.

Now our action in Viet-Nam is a part of the continuing struggle and I underscore the word continuing struggle, which we must be prepared to wage if we are to preserve free civilization and if we are to resist effectively the expansion of totalitarian power. There was once a time, say, 15 years ago, in which the power centers of the world were strictly the United States and the Soviet Union. That bi-polar world is gone. There are other power centers--Europe, the Soviet Union, China, the United States. And we've had as we know, some easing of East-West tensions, at least some partial easings, that may have changed the pattern of our involvement in world affairs, but all of these matters, be they changed or not, have not diminished our involvement.

We retain our role as leader in the free world.

Now I don't think we really aspired, or conspired, to be leader, but we are. And the sooner we recognize this the better we are going to be off. We better recognize that the role of leadership offers no privilege, no sanctuary, no ease. Leaders, whether you're Governor, or President or Vice President--once that you are a leader in whatever your pursuit may be, public or private, you take on

responsibility; you take on duty. Leadership--the mantle of leadership--rests heavily upon the shoulders of that nation or person that bears that mantle. Leadership is a burden, a duty, and, unless we are willing to fulfill that duty and bear that burden, the mantle of leadership will be lifted from us and there are those who would purloin it away. The President of the United States, I think, has made it unmistakably clear that we intend to meet our responsibilities. We made that original commitment in Viet-Nam in 1954, and three Administrations have maintained it, Republican and Democratic. The President has spelled out the principles on which our policy today is based. Maybe tonight I can help to bring some order out of what appears to be a great deal of confusion in the thinking and in the news about Viet-Nam and our relationship to it.

Now what are these principles on which our policy is based?

Well, first, in the face of armed conflict, in the face of continued aggressions--and this is aggression--military, propaganda, subversion, terror, infiltration. Aggression with a new face, but aggression. And in the face of that aggression, the first principle is we will not withdraw; we will not retreat; we will not give up; we will not get out, and the world needs to understand it.

(Applause)

We'll keep our word. And keeping our word is rather important.

If our commitment in Southeast Asia is worthless, then what makes you think anybody in Europe will believe that it is worth more there. Are we only to face aggression in Western Europe? Are we to say that that's the only part of the world where aggression shall be viewed as an evil, when we know that we face an international worldwide conspiracy, and not merely a localized one? Our refusal to withdraw is based on our recognition that withdrawal from Viet-Nam would only weaken the position of free societies in Asia. What would happen to Thailand, to Malaysia, yes, to India--to every country? They would regard the withdrawal of the United States as a loss of interest by this Republic, and as an enticement to immediately accommodate themselves to Communist China, a tremendous power in the area.

Now, we reject the belief stated by some, that by some inevitable law, China is destined to swallow up all of Asia. And I've heard this by so-called intelligent commentators. There's nothing in the rule of law, nothing in the rule of nature that says it shall be so. And I find it rather curious that so many proponents of this inevitability doctrine, that China must be the major power and take over Asia. I find they also advocate that a sort of a

Titoist doctrine, that Viet-Nam would become an independent, neutral nation, if we would just withdraw our military forces. What kind of intellectual gymnastics is this? What nonsense. We refuse to withdraw, because withdrawal would mean betrayal of those who oppose the spread of communism in Southeast Asia, and it would mean their certain death or their exile.

And finally in relation to the Sino-Soviet contest, which is the big contest today in the world, our withdrawal would prove right the Chinese thesis, that militancy, aggression, brutality, pays, and that would discredit the Soviet thesis of peaceful co-existence.

Now there is a second principle involved in our policy. Recognizing that a political solution of the conflict is essential, we stand ready, we, the people of these United States, to engage in unconditional discussions. We have no desire for further military escalation of the war. It is not we who escalate the war, and yet I hear voices that would indicate that all of the problem was here. I must say to those that the enemy is not in Washington; it's in Hanoi, it's in Peking, it's in Communist circles, not here.

We stand ready to consider any solution which would bring peace and justice to Viet-Nam, North and South, but this does not mean a solution that would violate the integrity and the safety of those in South Viet-Nam to whom we've given a commitment.

Now I'd like to make it crystal-clear here tonight who is in favor of a political settlement. Because when I hear some voices and read some things, you'd think that we were not. You would think that somehow or other it was the enemy that wanted peace. I want to make it clear who is for this settlement and who is opposed to it.

Who has offered the olive branch of peace and who has rejected it, my fellow Americans? The President of the United States, speaking for the people of this country, has affirmed not only our willingness to hold unconditional discussions, negotiations to end the war, but he has indicated again and again our ardent desire to do so. What has been the response of the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peking? They have rejected arrogantly every single peace offer made from any source--from the United Nations, from the Soviet Union, from any source--they spurned the efforts of the UN to mediate; they have scorned the offer of the British; wouldn't even allow the former British Foreign Minister to visit. They have brushed aside the efforts of the Indian Government. They have indulged in name-calling upon the proposal of the so-called 17

so-called non-aligned countries. In short the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peking have rejected every effort to restore peace and justice to the people of Viet-Nam. They have refused to talk peace. They have refused to consider it.

The third principle of our policy is that we recognize that the people of Viet-Nam must have a cause for which to fight. They must have a hope of a better day. And we've made it clear to the people of Viet-Nam that to improve their lives and to help fulfill their hopes we stand ready to support a massive cooperative development effort, with other nations, not only for Viet-Nam, but for all of Southeast Asia, friend and foe alike. I ask my fellow Americans to give me any other instance in history where a Nation that has taken such abuse as this one and we have given 169,000 lives for freedom since World War II--I ask you when did any government in the memory of man offer such generous consideration to friend and foe alike.

It is our hope that the works of peace can bring men together, in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war.

Now these three principles honoring our commitment, a continuing willingness to seek an honorable political solution and a massive economic development program, remains the basis--the bases--of our policy.

Now this struggle in Viet-Nam has a special significance for the United States, as the defender of the free world, because it confronts us with a bold new form of aggression which could rank in military significance and importance, mothers and fathers, with the discovery of gun powder. I refer to the so-called wars of national liberation; the guerilla-type war, that we haven't been able quite to fathom, to find the answer to, and your sons and daughters must find it and we must find it. Viet-Nam offers a classic example of what can be accomplished by militant Communist forces intent on deliberate subversion of a country from within. There we have seen a Communist State refuse to leave its neighbors in peace. We have seen the infiltration of Communist cadre to strengthen and direct guerilla warfare in violation of every international accord. We have seen the Communists who control and direct the war from Hanoi insist that the war in South Viet-Nam is nothing but a little internal uprising, because many of the Viet-Cong are also South Vietnamese. We have seen them portray the struggle as a civil war, in which the "popular" forces, that is, the Communist forces, are arrayed against "American imperialism".

Now it is this new sophisticated form of warfare, Governors, fellow citizens, that is becoming the major challenge to our security,

and to the security of all free nations. If it succeeds in South-east Asia, it will be tried in South America. If it succeeds in Southeast Asia, it will surely be tried in Africa. No place will be safe. And the sooner we come to grips with it and find the answer and beat it and defeat it, the sooner will be peace of the world be safeguarded and the hope of mankind be preserved.

This new warfare is even more dangerous than the old. This is a war in which the leaders cannot be located, in which the sources of supply cannot easily be cut off, in which the enemy forces are part outsiders and partly indigenous troops, in which signed truces do not halt the struggle.

The supreme challenge today is to prove to our foes and our friends that the new face of war is no less pernicious than the old, and that it can be defeated by those of strong mind and stout heart and steel will. We now know that most Communist regimes do not desire to blow this world to pieces; you can be assured of that. They just want to pick it up piece by piece, if you'll let them. They know what nuclear power means; they know what terrible devastation can be wrought upon this world. And so they seek to nibble the world to death in the hopes that free men will not see the attack, and not identify it as aggression.

Now how do we successfully meet this new phenomena of wars of aggression, of national liberation? Well, of course, we need balanced and flexible military forces, able to respond rapidly to any situation, and we have them.

Let me just remind this audience tonight that this Nation is not weak. In terms of our military power, we have more power than all the combined forces on the face of the earth. What we must be sure of is that we have will, determination, perseverance. But you and I know that military power alone is not an adequate response to these so-called wars of national liberation. These wars feed on seething social discontent, and to beat this discontent, requires a subtle blending of economic aid, political expertise, educational efforts, information and propaganda programs, combined with military power.

Now, I've heard many people discuss this situation and some people say, well, the Liberals, they're not for the use of military power. And other people say, well, the Conservatives are. This is a foolish, and may I say a very, very inadequate, and I would say inaccurate description of the views of people. But if some people prefer to call themselves Liberals, let me say to that group, the use of power in the defense of freedom is at times required. And

if some people feel more comfortable by calling themselves Conservative, let me say to them that the mere use and the use of military power alone is sometimes counter-productive. We don't need to divide ourselves up into these neat little compartmental categories. We need, as I said, a subtle blending of the economic aid, of political expertise, of educational efforts and information, combined with military power. And where these wars of national liberation flourish the military struggle is only part of a larger social and political struggle. And these struggles will continue, and revolutionary ferment will increase until governments come to power able to implement systematic social and economic programs, designed to abolish shocking social and economic inequality between the privileged few and the impoverished masses; between the glittering capitals and the festering slums; between urban enclaves and the primitive rural areas.

And this is why we have foreign aid; this is why we have technical assistance; this is why a World Bank; this is why an Inter-American Development Fund; these are all part of a national security effort. You do not stop aggression any longer by just the use of force. You have to get at its root causes, or the revolutionary ferment will devour the landscape of confidence. For the masses of people in the developing countries of Asia, the status quo--and its true of other areas too--is no longer a burden to be patiently borne; it is an oppressor to be caste off, and we have to recognize that.

The primary responsibility for preserving the independence and security of a country remains with the people and the government of that country. If the leaders and the people have no will for their own independence, no outside force can help them. If the government of the country can provide the people with a cause for which to fight, with a program inspiring sacrifice and effort, that government can be capable of defending itself against Communist infiltration and subversion from within. But, where subversion from within is supported by forces from outside, as is the case in Viet-Nam, outside assistance is needed if such a government is to achieve the capability of survival.

Now, as I've said, in overcoming these wars of national liberation, military response alone is not enough. I want to show you for just a moment now in Viet-Nam, a little-noticed side of this struggle. I don't think you've read much about it or heard much about it. I want to tell you about the struggle for a better life under the most incredible of conditions. It's a battle of the Vietnamese people themselves, not merely to survive, but to build, to make progress, to move forward. In the past decade, rice pro-

duction in their little country has more than doubled, despite the determined effort of the Viet-Cong to destroy their rice fields. Corn output is expected to be four times of what it was in 1962. Pig production has more than doubled in the past 10 years. The average Vietnamese who can expect only to live to an age of 35, yet they have only 200 civilian doctors in the whole country. So a new medical school is being built and we're helping along with others to build it, and that school will graduate more doctors this year than all of the doctors in Viet-Nam for all--for the entire country.

Meanwhile, your country, my country, we've helped vaccinate more than seven million of their people against Cholera, and millions more against other diseases; more than 12,000 hamlet health stations have been built and stocked with medical supplies, and many of these supplies are a gift of the pharmaceutical houses of this country in Viet-Nam as everywhere. Civilization, as they say, is a race between education and catastrophe. Education is the foundation of any country's future that we know. It's impossible to run a government, national or local, to man factories or to enrich the life without trained and educated people.

What's been the situation in Viet-Nam? Elementary school enrollment, 10 years ago, in 1955, was only 300,000, and despite fire and flame and sword and bomb, it is today 1,500,000 in school. Vocational school enrollment has quadrupled. University population is expanding rapidly.

Now this progress, my fellow Americans, has been achieved against the most appalling odds. Put yourself in their situation. It has been made despite carefully-planned and executed program of terror and harassment carried on by the Viet-Cong Communist. You know, there's a curious misconception around this country that the Viet-Cong is a kind of a great idealistic movement, a sort of Indo-Chinese wing of the American Populist Party, but it isn't. It has no relationship to progressivism. It's relationship is to war, to terror, to brutality, to conquest. In reality, the members of the Viet-Cong are a collection of toughs, disciplined terrorists, whose gains have come in the main not from the hopes that they have inspired; they have no program but from the fear that they've created. In the countryside, agricultural stations have been regularly burned and destroyed. Medical clinics in hospitals raided, and burned to the ground. Malaria control team members have been killed and kidnapped by the hundreds. Village chiefs, school teachers, and others who represent order and social service have been the special targets of the terrorists. All told--get this figure--it is estimated that 10,000 or more civilian officials have

been killed or kidnapped since 1954. The mayors of hamlets and cities beheaded, decapitated, and their head put on a pike and marched through the village to terrorize the peasantry, the people.

Now if you were to translate the figure in Viet-Nam in relationship to their population and ours, if you were to have a comparable figure for the United States, it would mean the loss of 130,000 municipal and local officials. What do you think would be the situation in this country? Is there any wonder there is instability there? As soon as a leader shows he's able to govern, he's killed; he's sought out by gangland war. Yet the effort to build a viable economy in Viet-Nam goes on, despite these attacks and dangers. Brave and tireless Vietnamese continue to take seed and fertilizers and farming know-how to their villagers. Teachers in larger numbers, despite the fact that they are the special targets of assassination; assassinated in the presence of their students, continue to man the schools. Medical teams go into the country, despite the clear and always present danger, and at their side, I am proud to say, go hundreds of American civilian workers side by side, and they too have been killed, some of them, and kidnapped. These men and women, Vietnamese and Americans, and increasingly, other nationalities--and there are now 30, better than 30 flags in South Viet-Nam along side of ours. The cause of freedom is getting allies and recruits. These are the unsung, unpublicized heroes in this phase of the struggle. And so long as they persevere and so long as we encourage them, so long as we do not let them down, wars of national liberation can be defeated. And that's why I come here to speak to you.

Now in assisting independent nations whether in Southeast Asia or in our hemisphere, there will be required on our part patience as well as courage, the will to endure as well as the will to resist, the totalitarian lives in the hope that we will weary, that we can't take it, that we're soft, that we are too self-centered to continue this struggle. I want the word to go from every city and State that we have what it takes, the moral fibre, the stamina, the courage for the sustained effort. Our willingness to meet our obligation, to assist free nations must be unmistakably clear, but it should not be confused with the desire to extend American power or impose American ways. We seek no territory; we have no imperial ambitions; we do not seek to put trademark "Made USA" on the goods or the countries or the governments of other people; we aspire to no Pax Americana; we have no desire to play the role of global gendarme, where multilateral organizations are ready, where you can have the United Nations with its peace-keeping operations or the Organization of American States. We welcome their intervention. As we know from recent history, however, organizations like the UN are not always capable of stepping in quickly and timely action is what is important.

When they are capable we welcome their presence, and when they are not capable we have an obligation to those international peace-keeping machinery operations to see that the peace is kept. Our stakes through Southeast Asia are too high for the reckless either withdrawal or general war, and we need not choose, my Fellow Americans, between retreat and unlimited retaliation. The stakes can be secured through a wise, multiple strategy, if we can sustain the national will, the national determination to see this job through.

What worries me more than anything is that we may become too impetuous; the public opinion might be roused to drive us too far or to drive us out. This must not happen. And those of us that have responsibility must take this message to the American people and educate and persuade. Our Vietnamese friends look forward to the day when national independence and security will be achieved, permitting the withdrawal of all foreign forces. That's our desire; we share that hope and that expectation. But we know that hope cannot be achieved if the United States, the world's great power, the steward and the custodian of freedom, shirks its obligation. If we withdraw from the world merely because its untidy and unruly or retreat from its responsibility; if we refuse to share the burden of preserving the peace, who will take it on? If we refuse to share the burden of defending free society, who can guarantee their survival.

In this complex world I submit that we must practice infinite patience, and perservance; patience to defend free nations in distant Asia as well as those close to home. And we must not be lured by quick and easy solutions, because there are no tricks; there are no gimmicks. We must not abandon our goal because of frustration, but we must continue to pursue the goal that is ours, the goal of peace, with justice and freedom with honor, acknowledging both the prospect of success and the consequences of failure. We must recognize that our power today may be the only safety factor in an unsafe world, and it must be used with care and it must be used appropriately and with reservation. We are the peacemakers, and the building of the peace that we seek will take time, but we must build on it. But you do not build this mighty cathedral of peace by letting the vandals destroy it. You build it by each generation, adding a block or stone to its mighty edifice.

And I believe that no matter how difficult the task may be or how much sacrifice we must make or how long it will take, that the American people will earn their honored role of leader if they will be but true to their convictions, and remember that freedom is indivisible, that the freedom that we fight for elsewhere is our own, and that the security we seek for others is for ourselves, and that

this world will either be inspired by the ideals of freedom or dominated by the tyrants of totalitarianism.

(Applause)

- - -



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