ed Harris - L OPENING STATEMENT VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA MARCH 13, 1967 mayor Ha & there aregone here ince My fellow students, I don't intend to talk long today -- simply to get things started. I hear from myself all the time. I'm far more interested in hearing from you. In the way of beginning, I'd like to point out that -- very quietly, without any big hoopla -- we have just entered the final third of the 20th century. LSome Carl Sandburg lines, which I read as a schoolboy, have always stuck in my mind: Barry Heldwater

"I am riding on a limited express, one of the crack trains of the nation ... hurtling across the prairie into blue haze and dark air go 15 all-steel coaches holding a thousand people ... I ask a man in the smoker where he is going and he answers: Omaha."

When those lines were written, the outside limit of man's aspiration was to ride an all-steel train to Omaha.

Today we are in sight of the moon, and beyond.

We take for granted the kind of society we live in.

But I think it might do us some good to get some perspective on our times.

The overall changes the first two-thirds of this century have brought to our lives have been greater than those in the several <u>centuries</u> preceding. And, if we talk about technological change alone, we see more new developments than in the <u>5 thousand years</u> preceding.

I tell you today that the next 33 years will make the last 66 seem a period of stability

These are the years in which you will be in charge -- or, as a young fellow looking ahead myself, I should amend that to say these will be the years when you will almost be in charge.

What are these years going to bring?

As chairman of the Space Council I am quite sure today, for instance, that we shall see ahead the establishment of permanent bases on the moon ... the development of a whole family of earth-orbiting stations, manned and supplied by regular ferry services ... the launching of unmanned probes to every part of the solar system, and probably manned expeditions as well.

As chairman of the new Marine Sciences Council,
I am equally sure that we shall develop man's capability
to live on the ocean's floor ...

that we shall use the tides as energy sources ... that we shall use de-salinated water to make deserts bloom.

In the next 15 years alone -- the years in which you will be at the peak of your creative and productive abilities -- we shall certainly see:

In medicine, the routine transplantation of internal organs from one person to another and the widespread use of artificial organs.

In education, a <u>general</u> use of teaching machines in far more sophisticated ways than today.

In psychiatry, the common use of drugs to modify the personality. Sample and Trying the

In industry, the application of automation to many kinds of management decision-making.

In engineering, the channeling of water from surplus areas to shortage arces thousands of miles away.

all your should

In worldwide communications, the everyday use of translating machines.

Hank JBa Hank JBa Hank JBa Const. OSU Athlite Munter

By the year two thousand -- when many of you will bear direct responsibility for national policy -- the scientists tell us we can foresee the virtual elimination of bacterial and viral diseases ... the modification of genetic chemistry ... the evolution of universal language ... commercial transport by ballistic missile ... the use of robots for everyday work and of high-IQ computers for sophisticated tasks ... and the probable creation, in the laboratory, of primitive forms of artificial life ... and shortly thereafter, chemical control of the aging process ... and perhaps even modified control of gravity.

Many of these things we will welcome without reservation. A few bear with them seeds of great danger.

The widest number are, in a sense, "neutral."

Their benefit to man will depend on how we use them.

Many of the mistakes ... the injustices ... the imbalances ... and undesirable social conditions, caused by change, which we live with today are here because earlier in this century they either were not foreseen -- after all, they got here in a hurry -- or because their probability was ignored.

Today we have the chance to avoid those mistakes.

We have the chance to make changes work for man, and not against him.

There are many ways we can do this -- through
the upgrading of our education ... through the development
of our human resources -- as in the war on poverty ...
through greater and better cooperation between the government,
private business, agriculture, labor, our universities.

But the surest, and most important, way to get at the problems of tomorrow is for <u>you</u> to become personally involved in the world around you.

You remember that old recruiting poster:
"Uncle Sam Needs You."

Well, he does. Your country needs you. It needs you in the Peace Corps. It needs you in VISTA here at home. It needs you in volunteer organizations. It needs you at your work, on your farm, or in your office as a responsible, involved citizen.

The time is now. The time is yours.

And I hope you don't mind if I come along.

Now I'd like to hear from you.

# # #

## TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS AND FORUM

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FIELD HOUSE, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA
March 13, 1967

PETERSON - HICKERSON REPORTING SERVICE
LUTHER 7-9227 - 605 BEACON BUILDING
TULBA, OKLAHOMA 74108

1	
2	
3	
4	TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS AND FORUM
5	
6	THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
7	VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
8	
9	FIELD HOUSE, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
10	STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA
11	March 13, 1967
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	Frank L. Peterson Certified Shorthand Reporter 605 Beacon Building Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103

MR. CHIC DAMBACH: On behalf of the Forum Committee and Student Association, I would like to welcome you all to one of the really great events in the history of OSU. I would like to introduce the people on the platform with us. To the far left is Dr. James R. Scales, who is advisor to the Forum Committee. The next is Dr. Dan Kroll, on the Great Issues Committee, who has been very instrumental in making this program possible. We thank them for their help, and especially that of Dr. Robert Kamm. Then there is the Mayor of Stillwater, Mayor Henson; and then to my right is Bob Bird, president of the Student Association of OSU.

The panel members who have been selected to ask questions of the Vice-President are, to my far left, Merrill Jacobs, a graduate student in political science; Richard Bernard, a freshman in political science; Martha Merritt, a senior in political science; and Dale Stockton, the debate coach here at OSU. I am Chic Dambach, the chairman of the Forum Committee.

Doctor Kamm, the president of the university, will escort the Vice-President to the platform, and Senator Fred R. Harris will make the introduction.

SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS: Thank you very much for that warm greeting and thank you for a fantastic turnout for our distinguished visitor here in Oklahoma and in Oklahoma State University. LaDonna and I are very proud to accompany here one of the great men of our age in America. It has been our

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be attacked and to be solved; and he is a man of unabashed,
unashamed patriotism for his country and belief in its strength
and future.

And so it is a great honor for me to say, ladies and
gentlemen: The Vice-President of the United States, The
Honorable Hubert Humphrey.

thrill there in Washington to come to know our visitor in a

and his wife, Muriel, have been in ours. And I can say to you

very warm and personal way. We have been in his home; he

there are few men who burst into greatness, were called to

bution to our country and to the people of the world have

stretched over a long period. He is old fashioned in the

sense that he doesn't believe that there is any other base

for decisions for those in public office other than the time-

less base of morality. He is old fashioned, in that he is a

man of deep compassion. He is honest with himself. He is a

man who believes in people, who believes that problems are to

greatness, during the very brief period in the life of their

country, but our visitor today is one whose service and contri-

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you. Thank you very much, my obviously good friend, Senator Fred Harris. I do want to thank you for a most generous introduction.

May I first of all pay my respects to the officers of the Student Association, to Gene Reid, of course, and to Bob Bird and to Charles Dambach and to your distinguished

president of Oklahoma State University, who had the good judgment, the good fortune and the good sense to do his graduate work at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Robert Kamm is one of our illustrious graduates, and we are just highly honored that he is the president of this excellent university at Stillwater, Oklahoma. There are many here that I should like to note by name, but one of the first things a man in public life learns is that if you start naming too many you always leave somebody out.

Fred Harris, since he did on me. Adlai Stevenson used to say that flattery was all right if you didn't inhale it; but I just took a great big, deep breath when Fred Harris was introducing me outside, because he gave a very flattering introduction.

But we are proud of Mr. Harris, Senator Harris, as the United States Senator. We are proud of both of your United States Senators. I know of no state of the 50 states that is more ably and competently represented in the United States Senator Monroney and Senator Harris. These are two great senators.

Now, I understand that this hall has been graced by some other people. I understand my old friend Barry Goldwater was out here to see you. Well, I don't want to have any of these late shows and these reruns, so we won't go through that '64 campaign again. We will just leave it. Barry spoke for the

19th century. I want to say a word for the 20th century. I may even get so reckless as to go to the 21st century if you encourage me. Then I understand that the Tijuana Brass was out here. Well, I want you to know that I am a fan of Albert's myself, and I think the Tijuana Brass is better than either Goldwater or Humphrey. In fact, we almost had the Tijuana Brass come to my son's wedding, until they had to change the wedding date and we couldn't fix up to get the Tijuana Brass away from a commercial appointment that they had, because I had in mind a large charitable contribution on their part.

I was greeted as I came to your university by two youngsters, two fine young people, a grandson and a grand-daughter of a very great American, and a great American that lives in the spirit of this university. I understand that there are buildings here named in his honor, in his memory, but there is something greater than a building in his memory and it is the tremendous program of technical assistance that the United States of America has underwritten since the days of Dr. Henry Bennett of Oklahoma State University. It is a marvelous thing to be able to leave such a lasting impact upon not only your state, your university, but upon the world. I am pleased that President Kamm is here and that some of the members of the Board of Regents or Trustees, and the Deans of the respective schools are here because I think I ought

to explain something to the students. You see, I am an elected officer of government. I have been reading the public opinion polls, and my work is rather precarious. It has an uncertain tenure. You never can tell when I will need work, and I am a refugee from a classroom, I want Doctor Kamm to know. In fact, when he was in graduate school, first, I was Mayor of Minneapolis, and prior to that when he was in graduate school I was Professor of Political Science over at Macalester College, so just in case things don't work out as I plan them working out in 1968, I want to leave my application over here on the desk. I have grown to like this university already; and I am an easy grader, students. I thought you ought to know that.

I have been somewhat shaken today, though. Nobody has walked out yet. Generally, when I go to speak there are a few people that get to the wrong meeting, and just at the time I get up to talk they get up and walk out. They find out they are in the wrong place. But I don't want to encourage any of that at all. The best part is yet to come, the questions that are going to be asked. I want to visit with you very briefly and then to do what you came here to see happen, to have the panel ask questions, and hopefully I shall try to provide at least responsible and responsive answers.

I don't intend to take too much of your time in this preliminary statement, but I do think that we ought to remember one fact. We have just entered the final third of the 20th

11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |

century. We are no longer in the first part of the 20th century. We are in the final third. We are looking now, and everything that we do, everything that we talk about, everything that we plan from here on out, ought to be Century 21, and I am going to talk to you about it because you are going to have a lot to say about this final third. You already have a lot to say. Don't you vote here at the age of 19 in the State of Oklahoma? In some places -- not yet? You want to. Well, I am for having you vote at 18, so I am for the constitutional amendment.

Just to give you an idea of how far we have come and what has been happening, I want to quote some lines of Carl Sandburg, my favorite American poet, and in a very real sense an author. These are words that I have spoken so many places that they are sort of old hat to some of the people that follow around. Here are the lines that Sandburg wrote:

"I am riding on a limited express, one of the crack trains of the nation.

Hurtling across the prairie into blue haze and dark air go fifteen all-steel coaches holding a thousand people.

I ask a man in the smoker where he is going and he answers: 'Omaha.'"

Well, now, my dear friends, when those lines were written the outside limit of man's aspiration, of his imagination, at least for many, was to ride in an all steel train as far as Omaha. I might add, Omaha is a nice place, but don't make

that your only ambition in life at this time. But this gives you some idea of where we are and where we have been; because today we are in sight of the moon and beyond. We take for granted the kind of a society we live in; but I think it might

do us some good to get a perspective on our times.

The overall changes of the first two-thirds of this, the 20th century, have brought to your lives and to mine greater changes than all of those in the several centuries preceding, and if we talk about technological change, scientific change, we have seen more new developments in the last 50 years than in the 5,000 preceding years, and that is quite a comparison. And I think I can tell you today as one that is deeply involved in science and technology in our government that the next 33 years will make the last 66 seem like a period of stability or retreat. These are years in which you will be in charge, these next 33; and I want to take a good look at you, because you are going to have to be in charge of my Medicare, ' and I want to be sure I get it. These are the years that you are going to be running things, and I want to make sure that we have some idea of what things these next years are going to bring. I know that you have a great coach here, a great athletic director, and he knows how to have that slowdown game in basketball. I hope he can slow things down just enough for me to be able to enjoy the next 33 years that we have here, and I will get around to him a little later.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As chairman of the Space Council, and that is one of the functions I have, I should tell you that every time the Congress assigns a Vice-President to do anything it's a rather unusual assignment. The Vice-President is the only officer in government that has responsibility but no authority. You can receive all the complaints, but you can't do much about them. But I have been selected, as every Vice-President is, to the office of chairman of the Space Council. That's to deal with all of these fantastic developments in outer space, the exploration of the stars. Only last summer I was made chairman of the Council on Oceanography, to deal with all of the seas. I told President Johnson, I said, "You know, the Congress has really made quite an evaluation of us. The waters cover 71 per cent of the earth. Space is infinity. charge of space, I am in charge of 71 per cent of the earth. How are you doing with the little speck that you have?" I told him that my fish and astronauts are acting better than his voters do. Well, as chairman of the Space Council, I think we get a little idea of what the future has in mind. Let me tell you what we see.

We see the establishment of permanent bases on the moon in the next ten years for sure, maybe the next five; the development of a whole family of earth orbiting stations, manned orbiting laboratories. We will put our next telescopes to look at the stars, not on top of a mountain but in space.

We have built the biggest telescope that you can put that has any useful purpose already. What is it, Mount Palomar? We will put the next telescopes two to three hundred, four hundred miles above the earth and view the cosmos and the universe. We will have manned and supplied earth orbiting stations by a regular ferry service. We will have people that are on earth that go on up and change the batteries, repair the satellites and come on down. Our next exercise in the space program is to develop the techniques where men can live in space a hundred days, two hundred days, a year; where they can go on up and do their scientific research, literally have a university in orbit. And look at how some of these professors are going to look when they take off in a rocket to go up there and spend another month or two with their friends in outer space. It's going to happen. There will be the launching of unmanned probes to every part of the solar system, and probably manned expeditions as well, and I am talking about Venus, Mars and Jupiter. We are going to learn about our environment. And lest anybody ask you what we want to do this for, I can only tell you this: That you are children of the sun, the solar system, and you ought to know all about your neighborhood. Your neighborhood is no longer Stillwater or this university or Oklahoma or the United States or even this world. The environmental conditions that will affect your lives in the next 33 years or the next 50 years will also be environmental

factors from space itself, and we need to learn more about our home. As chairman of the new Oceanography Council or Marine Science Council, I am equally sure we are going to develop man's capability to live on the ocean floor. We are now perfecting building mechanisms, machines and structures to put buildings on the floor of the ocean so that you live there and study there and work there. We are contemplating how we will mine the sea bed and its vast depths of gold, of manganese, copper and precious metals in the ocean, on the ocean floor, and we intend to exploit and develop it. We shall use the tides as sources of energy, and we shall have desalinated water to make the deserts bloom. That is within the next few years, between atomic energy and the oceans we will have vast quantities of water at an economical price that literally will make the deserts bloom.

In the next 15 years in which you will be at the peak of your creative capacities, we will see in medicine, for example, the routine transplantation of internal organs from one person to another, and the widespread use of artificial organs. This is modern surgery. In education, a general use of teaching machines in far more sophisticated ways than today. In industry, the common use of drugs to modify the personality. Now, some campuses are already engaged in this with LSD. In industry, the application of automation to many kinds of management decision making; in engineering, the channeling of

water from the surplus areas to the shortages, to the deficit areas thousands of miles away. In worldwide communication, communications satellites. I can say to Doctor Kamm, the head of your university, that within the next 15 years a university such as Oklahoma State University will be conducting classes not with just your professors here, but through the techniques of communications satellites and closed circuit television. You will be able to have professors from ten different countries on your campus any day, so that the communications satellites will revolutionize the whole experience of education and make you students of the world.

By the year 2000 -- and that's quite a long ways away, but not as far as it appears -- many of you will bear direct responsibility for national policies. The scientists tell us that we can foresee the virtual elimination of bacterial and viral diseases; the modification of genetic chemistry; the evolution of a universal language; commerce, transport by ballistic missile; the use of robots for everyday work and high IQ computers for sophisticated tasks; and the probable creation in the laboratory of primitive forms of artificial life, and shortly thereafter -- and I am afraid they are a little late with this one -- the chemical control of the aging process, and perhaps even modified control of gravity. We know we will control the weather. We know that that can be done in just a short period of time.

These are the things that the student of today must think about, because what is taking place in the laboratory today, my fellow students, will be a reality 15 to 20 years from now, and everything that I have mentioned to you today is taking place in the laboratory. It is there in experimental form, and it is now only the matter of perfecting it. Who would have dreamed that we would have come as far as we have? The computer, the first computer, is 17 years old, and it's a museum piece in the Smithsonian Institution. John Glenn's space capsule, our first space capsule, is six years old, and it's a museum piece. We are moving at such an unbelievable pace of scientific and technological change that you wonder, "What next?"

Now, I must say that science and technology are neutral. What happens with this change is in your hands.

Most all of these things that I have talked about can either be for good or for evil. Their benefit to man will depend on how we use them, and that's why we need the liberal arts college. This is why we need to study the humanities as well as the sciences. Many of the mistakes, the injustices and the imbalances and undesirable social conditions that are caused by change which we live with today are here because earlier in this century they either were not foreseen or they were probably ignored.

Now, make no mistake about it, the scientific changes

1 that I have spoken to you about will literally revolutionize 2 the American society and the society of the world. The question 3 is: What is going to be the impact on people? Will we have 4 more humane people? Will we have a more just society? Will 5 we have a society in which there is a greater degree of oppor-6 tunity, or will we use these instruments to be our masters 7 rather than to be masters of science and technology? Today 8 we have the choice and we have the chance to avoid these 9 mistakes. I believe it was Toynbee who reminded us that these 10 are the most dangerous of times and yet they are the most 11 hopeful of times, filled with unbelievable danger and yet 12 filled with unbelievable promise. Who was it that said --13 H. G. Wells, that civilization is a race between catastrophe 14 and education, and I think it is. For the first time in our 15 lives we have the means, the tools, to make it possible for 16 all of mankind to share in the benefits of developed civilization.

One of the ways to do this, as I say, is to upgrade education. The development of our human resources -- and this is what your government is trying to do, working together with government and private industry and trade unions and agriculture and universities, a great new American partnership, to do what? To upgrade the quality of life, not just the quantity of life, but the quality of life, and we are reaching down now to the least of these. We are going into our ghettos and our

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

world poverty areas and we are finding there that there is great talent, great ability that has gone to waste, and we are beginning to rescue that and bring it into the mainstream of American life, because of all the wonders that I have spoken to you about, remember what St. Augustine said. He said the most wondrous thing of all is man himself, much more wondrous than any scientific breakthrough. And the question that we have to keep in mind is: How do we develop the moral, the ethical purposes as a people to convert this fantastic wealth and productivity, this science and this technology into the kind of a world which we want? How do we use nuclear energy for peace rather than for war? How do we organize the peace in the world so that man can save himself from bloodbaths? How do we finally narrow the gap between the rich and the poor nations of the world? Because, make no mistake about it, where there is constant want, there is no peace, and poverty is the greatest threat to the peace that we have.

So this is what a university is about, and this is what you are about, and that is why I came out here, to remind you of an old recruiting poster that your fathers knew, and it still is being used. It's that poster that says, "Uncle Sam needs you," and they used to have that finger out like that. Well, he does, and he doesn't need you men just in the Armed Forces, because there are ways that they take care of that, as you know. But he needs you, though. This country needs you.

25

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It needs you in the Peace Corps. It needs you in VISTA, Volunteers In Service To America. It needs you to help the children that are deprived, that have had an inadequate education, and on every campus of every college and university there should be a cadre of young men and women, bright, dedicated, socially conscious, that go on out to help the underprivileged, to train them, to work with them, to take the university and make it an experience in life rather than on the campus. I want the American universities to be involved in community life. I want them to be, as we say, where the action is, and a university needs to be a part of a living community, not just the campus itself.

Now, I am going to go over here and sit down, and you can toss those questions. Be a volunteer. Join up.

Don't be a cynic. Let me just tell you as one who has been in graduate school: You don't prove yourself to be an intellectual by just being against things. You just prove yourself to be wrong sometimes. Join a political party of your own choice. If you want some private advice after the meeting, I will talk to you. I have heard so many students say, "Oh, I don't want to get involved in politics, it's dirty." They just want to sit up there, you know, on the sidelines, and when the folks are out there on the political battlefield they just want to stand there and say, "Look at those crooks." Well, if you think politics is dirty, get yourself a bar of political

Ivory soap and get in there and clean it up. That's all I am telling you. Give of yourself, and when you give of yourself you will get more than you give. The greatest joy that a person has in life is working with others, sharing with others, and the more you give the more you receive. The more you share the more you have. The more you work, the more energy you have, so since you really want some action, go to it. I will try to help you out. Let's go.

MR. DAMBACH: The questions being asked are from the panel members themselves. Many of them have been submitted by the students, and we appreciate those questions. To begin the questioning is Mr. Dale Stockton.

MR. STOCKTON: Mr. Vice-President, many have argued that the war in Vietnam poses serious moral questions, and I notice that you spoke about the need for humanities to discern some of the questions of a humane society. How does the Johnson administration treat the moral elements in any serious question of international affairs where the national self-interest has to be given premium?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The best definition that
was ever given of a war was by General Sherman, and I do not say
this in profanity, but only as a historical reference, that
war, General Sherman said, is hell, and that's it. It is
carnage. It is destruction. It is blood. It is death and
it is pain. But mankind has been striving for centuries to

find a substitute for war, and no country has done as much to have urged that substitute or that alternative, no country has done more than the United States of America. We know that the war in Vietnam has tragic implications and tragic developments. This is true of every war. But as to the moral aspect of it, if I may just try to put it in perspective, I don't believe it's very moral, my well-fed, prosperous fellow Americans, since this nation does have about half the total gross national product of the world for our two hundred million people -- the rest of the three billion get the rest of it -- I don't think it's very moral for a nation that has been blessed as this one has, that has the role of responsibility in world affairs that this one has, the role of being really the leader of free peoples -- even though we didn't design it that way, it has happened that way -- I don't think it would be very moral to let a totalitarian, dictatorial, tyrannical regime roll over nations, absorb them in the name of peace. Let me just -- if you will give me a moment. Today we have a better relationship with the Soviet Union than we had 20 years ago. It is our hope, and we have some reason to believe that that hope can be fulfilled, that the United States and the Soviet Union can work together on a number of matters to create a more peaceful and a more stable world. But in 1945 at the end of World War II, the American people, as usual, dismantled their military establishment. Mr. Stalin did not. He had

25

twenty million men under arms. In 1946, Mr. Stalin said to Harry Truman, then the president, "I want to keep certain provinces, certain areas in northern Iran. My forces are there. I am going to keep it. I am going to take it." And we could have said, "Why, go ahead, it isn't worth the life of one American. Who cares?" But President Truman didn't say that. He said, "Mr. Stalin, you signed some agreements. You are going to keep them. Get out. And if you don't get out, the power of the United States will be used to get you out." A little later, Mr. Stalin tried us again -- by the way, Stalin got out. A little later, Mr. Stalin tried us in the northeast provinces of Turkey; and then there was the civil war in Greece, which was not much of a civil war. It was a Communist inspired insurrection. Mr. Truman 20 years ago yesterday issued what was called the Truman Doctrine, and it was unpopular. America was relatively disarmed, but Harry Truman said that "It will be the policy of the United States of America to aid and protect nations who are made the victims of armed minorities within and aggressive forces from without," and that has been the policy of this country through every president, regardless of political party. We could have given no aid to Greece and Turkey. There was no one to defend them. They were helpless, they were prostrate, they were broken. Berlin, in 1948, there were people today -- then, who are still talking the same way today, that said, "Why take a stand for

25

Berlin? It isn't worth anything. It's rubble. It's a hundred miles inside of the Communist world, inside the Iron Curtain," and Harry Truman said, "We are not going to let Berlin die, because the day you let West Berlin die, on that day every other nation is threatened, because the aggressor has an insatiable appetite," and we took the risk of confrontation again with the Soviet Union. We did it in Cuba. We did it in Korea, and we are having to do it in South Vietnam. The morality of this is that it is not moral for a people that believe in freedom to sacrifice the freedom of others simply because it would require some sacrifice on your part to protect the freedom of others. The lesson of life is to protect and to help others. Now, our nation -- I will wind this up in a hurry. I know many people have said, "Look, we have killed innocent people, our bombs have killed civilians and babies and mothers, and I suppose there is truth to that. There have been people that have been killed. But your government has not bombed civilians. Your government has not bombed open cities. Your government has sent its bombers in after targets, military targets that have been placed in an area surrounded by civilians, and your pilots today are under more severe limitations and restrictions on bombing than any pilots that have ever been sent to fight so that they don't have unnecessary killing. But remember this, that Mao-Tse-tung said the people are the sea in which the fish of the guerilla swims. The guerilla warrior

is in the sea of the people, and sometimes innocent people are hurt, but I want those who have moral outrage against our America on these matters to ask what is the morality. What is the morality of having 50,000 officers of local government, teachers and nurses and doctors killed and assassinated and beheaded and kidnapped as the Viet Cong has done in South Vietnam?

What is the morality? I guess that's enough.

MR. STOCKTON: I can see your concern for the people of foreign countries, and we are certainly in sympathy with that. We spend about three billion dollars a year, or a month, on the war and we have given traditionally a little less than two billion per year for economic aid of the underdeveloped countries. Doesn't the fact that we are spending 18 times as much in one year on the war than economic aid show more concern really for the welfare of America than it does for the underdeveloped nation?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: We are in a war, and wars are expensive. That's the most expensive luxury, the most expensive operation that any country can possibly have. I can't think of anything that is more wasteful than spending 60 -- 50 billion dollars for defense, unless you desperately need it. The greatest blessing that this world could have is if you could have disarmament and arms control so that we could convert these resources into peaceful uses. It would be wonderful if you didn't have to have a police department in Stillwater

1 or Oklahoma City, but you do have to have one, and you can 2 better use that money to pay for teachers and doctors and 3 social workers and to help the mentally retarded and to help 4 the crippled, and it would be much better, but there are times 5 when you are compelled by life -- the realities of life to 6 take and spend resources for other things. We are spending 7 about two billion dollars a month in Vietnam right now. Now, 8 not all of that is for military. Much of that goes for food, 9 supplies, medical care, for economic aid, so that it isn't 10 all as if it's being used for bombing. Your government has 11 said through the President of the United States that if we 12 can get peace in Vietnam we are prepared to join with North 13 Vietnam, we are prepared to join with all of the neighbors of 14 Southeast Asia in a massive program of economic development 15 of Southeast Asia. It is we who are asking for this. I have yet to hear a spokesman for China or Hanoi to say that they 16 17 are willing to spend a nickel, or whatever their form of 18 currency may be, for any development in the Mekong River or 19 for Southeast Asia, but your government is willing to. Your 20 government is putting money in the Asian Development Bank; and your government is not spending just two billion dollars 21 a year in foreign aid. The total amount of foreign aid, in-22 23 cluding our Food for Peace program, our economic assistance, 24 our contributions to the World Bank, the Inter-American Develop-25 ment Bank, the Inter-American Development Association, the

1 United Nations, runs over six billion dollars a year. That's 2 a rather substantial sum. So that we have not been -- we have 3 not been niggardly. We have not been the people that have 4 held back. We might ask once again what would happen if you 5 could get peace, and I want to talk to you just one minute: 6 When I was in the Congress, in Korea -- the war in Korea came to an end. We spent more money in Korea by far than we are 7 8 spending in this struggle. We are spending about 9.9 per cent of our gross national product today in Vietnam. That's for 9 your total defense, not Vietnam, total defense; that's every-10 11 thing. We are spending about -- a little over three per cent 12 of our GNP right now for Vietnam, three per cent. At the end 13 of the war in Korea we were spending vast sums of money, up as 14 high as 16 per cent, from 14 to 16 per cent of our GNP. The 15 war was over. The cities of America had slums, the poor of the 16 world were poor, the hungry of the world were still hungry. The schools of America needed Federal aid. The slums and the 17 poor people of America needed help. Did our government and 18 did our country take the money that you saved after war was 19 over in Korea and put it into these other things? The answer 20 is no. No, we didn't. We cut taxes, we cut expenditures and 21 we said, "The war is over. Let's retrench." Now, the war is 22 going to be over in Vietnam, and we pray it will be over soon. 23 We don't know. We can't tell. But when it is over, your 24 government is already today under appointment by the President 25

establishing and has established a task force, a study group to plan the projects and the programs for America and elsewhere in the world after Vietnam. And I want your help, because I am going to be out with my picket sign on that day and say, "Now, since we don't have to spend 22 billion dollars a year in Vietnam, are you willing to use that money in the war on poverty at home? Are you willing to use that money in the war on hunger through the world? Are you willing to use that money for economic development around the world?" After Korea the American people said no, the Congress said no. After Vietnam, I hope that you will be with me so we can say yes, because I think that's what we need to do.

MR. DAMBACH: Next will be Richard Bernard.

MR. BERNARD: Mr. Vice-President, in line with your very determined words that you just expressed on Vietnam, let me ask what might perhaps be the key question: Why aren't we bombing Hanoi and Haiphong?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Why aren't we?

MR. BERNARD: Right.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: War is a dangerous business. Even limited wars are very dangerous. The purpose of your country, since World War II, has been to organize the peace and not to promote a conflagration between the superior powers. There are two great world powers today and only two great world powers at this stage, the United States of America and the

1 Soviet Union. There are other dangerous powers, such as 2 Communist China, even with its turbulence, and there are others of smaller countries that could precipitate a set of conditions that could drag other people into the fight. Your President tries as Commander-in-Chief to prevent the development of conditions that would draw into this limited conflict in Vietnam the major powers. In other words, we want to be sure, No. 1, that we take no step if we can possibly avoid it that would precipitate or trigger the participation in a military manner by the Soviet Union. Remember, the Soviet Union has a treaty with North Vietnam, and how do you think Ho Chi Minh feels? We have a treaty with South Vietnam. When South Vietnam asked us for help, we came with it. When Ho Chi Minh asked for help, he got some SAMS -- surface-to-air missiles-some guns, some trucks, some gasoline, but that's it, and we are hopeful that that's all it will be, and we don't want to see the hordes of Chinese come pouring over that border, so we have restrictions. We have certain restrictions that denies us -- our pilots, for example, getting too close to that Chinese border. We do not believe bombing Hanoi as such would be of military value. Hanoi is not a particularly important military center. There are some facilities around Hanoi, in the outskirts of Hanoi, like a thermo plant, a cement plant, a steel plant, that are of military significance. Those targets are now being taken out. We had hoped that that wouldn't be

1 necessary, because some day they will have to be rebuilt, and 2 that's why we have exercised this incredible patience and 3 restraint, so that we didn't bomb them out. What good would 4 it do to bomb out and destroy Hanoi? It's a city that has no real military industrial capacity, and to bomb it would 6 only be to engage in unnecessary loss of life and destruction 7 of property, and as to Haiphong the same thing is true. Now, 8 as to the harbour of Haiphong, we could mine the harbour. 9 We could, I said. I want to be very careful here so my friends 10 of the press understand this. We could. We are not. We have 11 made no such decision, but we could mine it. We could shell 12 it with guns or drop bombs, but it just so happens that in that 13 harbour a number of Soviet ships come every so often, and about 14 the first time you drop a bomb down the smokestack of one of 15 those ships you want to remember some other lessons in history. 16 Remember the Maine. Remember the Lusitania. And it doesn't 17 take any sense to get this country of ours into a major war. 18 It doesn't -- the art of statesmanship is not how you get into a war, a nuclear war. Statesmanship is how do you prevent it, 19 and we have been trying to prevent it. Now, we feel that we 20 can interdict the supplies that come out of Hanoi and out of 21 Haiphong without running the risk, first, of unmerciless 22 destruction of civilians in Hanoi, and secondly, of running 23 the risk of civilian losses in Haiphong and coming into open 24 confrontation with the Soviet Union. I can only tell you 25

25

that the targeting that we have in North Vietnam is carefully thought out by the best commanders we have, the best diplomats we have, the best advice that the President has. And I might add that the issue is not whether we should bomb or not bomb. That's not the issue. Some people have tried to make that the issue. The issue is: What is effective? What is it that is effective in preventing the success of aggression from the north and of promoting self-determination in the south? The rate of bombing, the intensity of bombing, the targets that are bombed, all of these are strategic and tactical problems. It isn't a matter of whether you should bomb or you shouldn't bomb. And for those that think if you stop the bombing you will get peace, I say the evidence is on the other side. We have stopped it. We didn't bomb a single place in North Vietnam from 1963 to 1965, and the war was raging in South Vietnam at that time, and North Vietnamese mainline troops were in South Vietnam. The National Liberation Front had been organized out of Hanoi. It was operating in South Vietnam. Your government didn't drop one single little bitty firecracker in North Vietnam, much less a bomb, and we appealed, as did other governments, to North Vietnam for peace. We had 25,000 American troops in 1965, January, in South Vietnam. We never bombed a place in North Vietnam until February, 1965. Did it bring Ho Chi Minh to the conference table? Not on your life. They poured in more men, more supplies, more mainline units, and

later on we bombed. Then in May of 1965 we had a five day pause. You know what the response was from Hanoi. They considered it an ultimatum. They never even opened the letter of your government to that government. They rejected it out of hand through the Russian ambassador who brought it back to the United States and said, "I am sorry." Later on in 1966 we had a 37 day pause in the bombing, and why? Because certain countries came to us, eastern European countries. We have no lack of contacts, you know. We have hundreds of diplomats. We even have selfappointed ones. We have all kinds of diplomats all over the world. We had the vice-president of the United Arab Republic. We had the president of India, we had the 17 non-aligned nations. We had the -- we had all kinds of people. We had the Holy See, the Pope and the others that were trying to help us bring a conference. The eastern European countries, socialist, communist countries, came to our government and said, "If we could get 14 to 20 days" -- this is a historical fact -- "14 to 20 days, we think we can get North Vietnam to come sit at a conference table and start to talk." Your government weighed this very carefully. The military commanders were opposed to it. They said, "It will cost American lives. It will only result in failure, and it will mean that supplies pour in from the north at the expense of American lives." But your President is a man that wants to see peace, as is your Vice-President, and we have done a little bit for it in our lifetimes, too.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so we took the risk, and at the end of 14 days we didn't 2 get a nibble. It was like fishing in a lake where there were 3 no fish. They came in and said, "Give us seven more days, or 4 until the twentieth day." We gave 20 days. No bombing. They 5 came back and said again, "We have had no luck. Give us seven 6 more days." And we went to the twenty-seventh day and not as 7 much as even a courteous reply. Instead of that, denunciations 8 from Hanoi. And at the end of the twenty-seventh day, the 9 people that had come to your government suggesting that we 10 have a pause in the bombing in order to get negotiations didn't 11 come back again. It was all over. We went ten more days while 12 we had men like myself and Arthur Goldberg and Averill Harriman 13 and Dean Rusk and the Pope, the President of India, Mr. Tito 14 of Yugoslavia, the Vice-President of the United Arab Republic, 15 we had hundreds of diplomats and others that are not classified 16 as diplomats out trying to get a peace feeler. We didn't even 17 get a whisper. And now it is no longer a matter of a pause. 18 The North Vietnamese say that they want your President to 19 give an unconditional permanent cessation of bombing pledge, and maybe they might talk. I want to remind this audience 20 that in Korea we had talks that lasted two years, and twice 21 as many men, Americans, your fathers, your fathers and brothers 22 and cousins, twice as many of them were killed after the talks 23 started as before. So your President has said that we will 24 negotiate any place, anywhere, under any reasonable circumstances. 25

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

in any proper forum, but we want to be sure that when we negotiate and when we stop the bombing to get the negotiations that there is at least some little give on the other side; as he said, any little indication that they are really interested. And I must say: Is that asking too much? Why is it that we don't have Americans today buying ads in papers in other countries and saying, "Ho Chi Minh, won't you come to the conference table?" I can tell you today as your Vice-President that if anybody in Oklahoma can contact Ho Chi Minh and get him or any of his emissaries to come to a conference table, I give you my word as your Vice-President and a member of the President's Cabinet that we will have the Secretary of State or a prominent ambassador at that conference table within 24 hours, and we will have a cease fire and we will have the peace. But we can't get anybody to talk about peace except in America. We have got a lot of folks here talking about peace; but we need people on the other side talking about peace.

MR. DAMBACH: Martha Merritt.

MISS MERRITT: The President has been described as having a credibility gap with the American people over the war in Vietnam. In your opinion, does that credibility gap exist?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I am sure you expect me to say no, and that's just what I am going to say. I don't believe a credibility gap does exist. Some people feel that we must have all of the detailed information every day about what we

25

are going to try to do. Now, the surest way to not get peace is just to talk too much about every contact that you have. Right today, just as we are in this room, your government has contacts with forces that represent North Vietnam, the Viet Cong. There is no lack of contacts. We either have them ourselves or our friends and allies have them. We are never short of contacts. There is always a chance, we always hope there is a chance that those contacts will materialize into something real; but if I were to be asked by one of my friends from the press, "Who is that contact?" and I said, "Well, I can't answer that," somebody is going to say, "Well, there he goes again. See, he just won't tell you the truth." Well, I want to tell you: If we start telling who the contacts are, they are gone, they are out of business, and we have lost -- time after time this same thing has happened, time after time, because people have leaked -- the news has leaked or some information has leaked, and it has been resulting in failure of our efforts, diplomatic efforts. I think what the credibility gap refers to is, for example, that the cost of the war in fiscal '67 was more than the President's budget was for '67. Now, there was a reason for that. We didn't know what our rate of buildup would be. We didn't know what might happen the next year, and we ended up after Korea having billions and billions and billions of dollars worth of military equipment that you paid for as taxpayers, and that your government sold at five

25

cents on the dollar afterwards, and we don't think that's very smart planning. So we said, "Look, we will see what goes through fiscal '67" -- that's up to June 30, 1967 -- "and we will come back to Congress in January of 1967 and ask for a supplemental." Some people say, "Well, the President should ask for it all at once. He knew it was going to cost another nine billion dollars. Why didn't he ask for it?" He didn't know it was going to cost nine billion dollars at all. He was hoping it wouldn't cost nine million dollars, and that's not credibility. I think that you had better -- let's put it this way: Why is it that some people are unwilling to believe their President, their Secretary of State, their Secretary of Defense, but seem to be willing to believe some wandering troubador from North Vietnam, or somebody else that comes around and says, "Well, I have got some information," and then when we say that the information is not accurate, somebody says, "Well, we don't believe you." I am of the opinion, my fellow Americans, that the man who is in the White House today and the man that preceded him and the man that preceded him -- I think that every President of the United States has in his heart and in his mind but one desire, how to keep a peaceful world and how to protect this country and make it a better country. I don't think you have ever had a President, Democrat or Republican, that didn't try to do what they thought was right, and you don't have Presidents that lie to you about your lives. You don't

have a Secretary of State who purposefully lies to you or 1 falsifies the record, or the Secretary of Defense. These men 2 3 are human beings. They love their families. They love their 4 country. Why is it that we have to have people believe that somehow or another, for some cheap political gain, which ob-5 viously isn't working, some cheap political gain that a Presi-6 dent or a Vice-President or a Secretary of State or a Secretary 7 of Defense would deliberately falsify? They are not going to 8 do it. What North Vietnam wants out of this country today is 9 doubt, suspicion, division, and if this country becomes filled 10 with doubt about its leaders in this crucial thing -- you can 11 argue about social security and minimum wages and farm programs --12 but we are in a battle, and if the enemy can promote division 13 and disunity, promote doubt and confusion, can promote lack of 14 trust of you in your generals, in your President, in your Vice-15 President, in your Secretary of State, in your Secretary of 16 Defense, if the enemy can do that, they will win this war; 17 18 because, remember, Ho Chi Minh said, for himself and for his forces then known as the Viet Minh, "We did not win the war 19 against the French at Dien Bien Phu," he said, "we won it in 20 Paris." I happen to think that the Viet Cong and North Vietnam 21 and their propagandists from North Vietnam and Hanoi are hop-22 ing that they can win this war in Washington, that they can 23 win it in Oklahoma, that they can win it in Minnesota, by 24 dividing us, by getting us to be doubtful of each other, to be 25

suspicious of each other, to distrust each other, and don't you let it happen, because the men that you put over there -- and your government put them there, and they didn't go because they wanted to take a trip -- there are 425,000 men over there. If you are not going to give them support, you ought to take them home. You have no right to leave those men over there without support.

MR. DAMBACH: The final question this afternoon will be from Mr. Merrill Jacobs.

MR. JACOBS: Mr. Vice-President, to what extent do you foresee a permanent United States military commitment to Southeast Asia, not only in Vietnam but such places as Thailand? Does this look like a permanent arrangement?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The question is as to what extent do I see the possibility of a permanent military commitment, not only in Vietnam but in other areas of Southeast Asia. I don't see any permanent placement of American forces in Southeast Asia. You know the President of the United States did give a public commitment on this matter of South Vietnam. I think I should share with you a little intimacy about that. The President was in Manila and there was a great propaganda campaign going on all over the world to the effect that the United States was building permanent military bases, that we were going to stay there permanently; that we were going to make

25

it an American military base. Your President said that six months after the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the troops of North Vietnam, and after the agreement upon peace terms, six months after those circumstances have been fulfilled that we would withdraw all American forces; that we would turn over all American bases to the civilian authorities of the South Vietnamese Government. Now, that was a pretty broad declaration. Some people think it went too far, because there are countries that are divided, such as Korea, in which we still have 50,000 troops on that 34th Parallel, and I might add that I think that investment and that guard there is well worth it. We have no intention of making Southeast Asia an American garrison, none whatsoever. Our intention is, and our hope is, that we can help Southeast Asia develop the viability and the strength to defend itself and build itself, and we think the prospects are good. Let me show you some of the evidence that has taken place already. We, first of all, as most of us -- I think if I would go through this audience and ask you what you know about Southeast Asia, most of you would start out with chow mein, Chaing Kai-shek, and then down to -- you could name some of the countries, and this is not any reflection on you. The American educational establishment has not truly interested itself in the main on Asia. We are children of Europe, most of us, and yet in our lifetime the struggles in which this country has been involved have

25

started in the Pacific, Pearl Harbour, Korea, and now in South Vietnam. Asia represents one-half of the population of the earth, and I don't think that the United States can be a world leader with a half-world knowledge, and Asia represents a vital and strong people that need and want to come out of their backwardness in many areas into a whole new life, and there is a mighty contest going on in Asia today between the forces of militant Asian communism on the one hand and nationalism and the desire for independence and freedom of the people on the other hand. Now, our participation today in South Viet Nam, while it has been costly and painful, has yielded some results. For example, for the first time the Asian nations are working together in regional organizations: The recent economic conference in Seoul, Korea, where the ten Asian nations set up the Asian Pacific Council for further consultation in terms of economic and social development; the Southeast Asian Educational Conference at Bangkok, where they are planning a vast expansion of both elementary -- of elementary, secondary and higher education; the Japanese Foreign Ministers Conference in Tokyo, a tremendous new interest by Japan in building a better and more stable Asia; the improved relationships that we have in Asia with India and the prominent role that both India and Pakistan will play in the future of Asia; the peace at Tashkent, which Mr. Kosygin of the Soviet Union, to his everlasting credit, helped bring about. These are the

signs of a new and better Asia. There was a war going on in Asia not long ago between Indonesia and Malaysia. That war is over, and that war took thousands of lives. Indonesia, which is one of the great nations of the world, only a year and a half ago was in the iron grip of Chinese Communist power, iron grip of it. Three million members of the Communist party, 25 million members in the Communist fronts, Sukarno and his group had completely gone over to the Chinese Communist party, and they had withdrawn from the United Nations, broken their relationships with other countries, and our presence in Vietnam, my fellow Americans, has helped Indonesia regain her freedom. The Foreign Minister of Vietnam told the man who is talking to you -- and I have known him for 20 years -- he came to my home in Minnesota in September of this year, and said in substance that, "We are winning the freedom of Indonesia, Mr. Vice-President, we are winning it back, because the United States of America is in Southeast Asia defending free people and warding off Communist aggression." They never would have had a chance, so there is progress, and much is beginning to develop; and I think that you are going to see a tremendous development in Southeast Asia, the Asian Development Bank, the Mekong River Development. David Lilienthal, as you know, is over there with a tremendous plan, a great plan of engineering development, so be of good cheer and remember that nation building takes longer than winning wars.

\* \* \* \*



## 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.

