

11/17/67
FRIDAY PMS

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY
BEFORE NATIONAL SIGMA DELTA CHI CONVENTION

St. Paul, Minnesota -- Vice President Hubert Humphrey Friday, (November 17, 1967) warned that a "new isolationism" is emerging in the United States.

The new isolationists are not yet in the ascendancy, and they certainly are not found among the decision-makers in the Administration, but they make up "a sizable coalition which looks inward rather than outward," he told the National Sigma Delta Chi Convention here.

Humphrey charged that this group is poisoning the world environment, alarming this country's friends around the world and triggering "counter-reactions" in other nations.

Their activities, focused on narrow self-interest rather than the needs of others, are reflected in the efforts under way to reverse America's policy of liberalizing international trade, in recent attacks on foreign aid, in arguments against international obligations in Southeast Asia and elsewhere, and finally, in the current assault against the domestic War on Poverty, he said.

In contrast to these views, Humphrey said he and the President propose "that we follow in Asia the same course which we have successfully followed in Europe: a dual policy of firmness and of willingness to coexist peacefully."

"We do not want to be world policemen. The job of international security is a job for many nations. We do not seek to inject ourselves into every dispute, everywhere in the world," the Vice President declared.

"But," he added, "when confronted with stakes as high as those in Asia today, it would be foolish and immoral to abandon the people of Asia or subject our own people to the larger danger which would surely follow."

(con't)



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Page 2

Humphrey, who has just return from a trip to Vietnam and other parts of Southeast Asia, said U.S. policies there are aimed at buying time necessary "for free nations to strengthen themselves against internal subversion and external aggression" and for "a new generation of Asian Communist leaders to turn away from militancy and toward a new era of internal development and international coexistence."

#



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
NATIONAL CONVENTION SIGMA DELTA CHI
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA
NOVEMBER 17, 1967

When I was still a professor of political science in these parts and before I was first elected to public office, my favorite quotation about the press was Thomas Jefferson's: "Were it for me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate to prefer the latter."

Since entering public office, however, I have come to prefer Samuel Johnson:

"The liberty of the press is a blessing when we are inclined to write against others, and a calamity when we find ourselves borne by the multitude of our assailants."

I have a few observations to make. Then I welcome your questions — on the record.

* * *

Today I want to visit with you about something that has concerned me more and more over these past few weeks: The emergence of a New Isolationism in America.

I lived through the Old Isolationism. So did many of you. I doubt that many of us would wish to repeat that experience — the experience of a nation which not only closed its mind to the outside world, but closed its heart to many of its own citizens.

If I had to offer Humphrey's Definition of "isolationism" as it applies to national life, I might give something like this: "That frame of mind which causes a nation, and its individual citizens, to withdraw within themselves and their own narrower, self-defined interests while becoming less mindful of the needs and interests of others."

I believe our America of these late 1960's has begun to feel these habits of thought once again.

I do not believe they are yet in the ascendency.

They are certainly not shared by those of us with responsibility in the present Administration.

But they have once again come to the surface.

We find them in the strong, well-organized effort now being mounted to turn back our long-standing policy of liberalizing international trade.

— In the recent attacks on foreign aid;

— In the arguments now being made against international obligations;

— And finally, in the assault we see today against the domestic war on poverty and other programs designed to lift all Americans into the social and economic mainstream.

These attacks do not exist in a vacuum.

They not only affect the policies and programs under fire.

They alarm our friends around the world.

They trigger counter-reaction in other nations.

They poison an entire world environment in which many countries are involved in such critical efforts as reform of the international monetary system ... regional economic integration and development ... and closing the desperate gap between the rich nations and the poor.

Now by no means are the same Americans behind all these efforts. In some specific instances, in fact, they are in opposition to each other.

For example, many of the people who oppose some of our present international commitments would not agree at all with those who oppose programs for opportunity at home.

But the net effect of this ad hoc united front is to create once again in America a sizeable coalition which looks inward rather than outward... in terms of disengagement and cutting back.

I think that right now — certainly in 1968 — there must be a national confrontation on this basic issue.

* * *

Were I to go back to my old role as an academic (I have no such immediate plans in mind) I would write a good deal about the history of the post-war period — and especially our break with the Old Isolationism.

Out of the tragedy of World War II we learned the sterility of a policy of Fortress America.

We learned the danger of self-delusion in the face of a clear and rising body of evidence which told us: Manageable trouble is building into unmanageable catastrophe.

We committed ourselves to the United Nations and the Marshall Plan.

When Communist expansion reached outward in post-war Europe and elsewhere, we committed ourselves to NATO and other alliances for mutual defense.

We committed ourselves, around the world to collective security and mutual assistance.

We committed ourselves, around the world, to policies of national security and national development — neither one of which can exist without the other.

But it was not really until Korea that our new habits of thought were truly tested.

It was in Korea that President Truman had the courage to put this nation on the line for others — for the first-time in this century when we were not under direct attack ourselves.

He backed up our post-war policies with power.

And he did so on a continent where few of us had relatives ... where the names were hard to pronounce ... and where the skin colors weren't like our own.

Our effort in Korea was not popular at home. Nor was President Truman popular for committing us to what he thought was right.

But I doubt that many in this room today would question either the rightness or the wisdom of Harry Truman's decision — a decision which I believe not only added to world peace and stability, but which finally wrenched American public opinion into the realities of the post-war world.

It was at about the same time, I believe, that we broke through the Old Isolationism in our domestic life — specifically in the areas of equal opportunity and human rights.

We have moved steadily forward in those areas, both through law and action, in the intervening years.

Since those early 1950's America has forthrightly taken her place as a responsible world citizen. And, here at home, we have moved steadily forward toward creating the free and equal society which our Constitution prescribed.

Both abroad and at home, there has been turbulence. There has been controversy and disagreement.

But Americans, by and large, have supported these national directions and commitments.

* * *

What happens now?

Here at home we see the phenomenon known as "backlash."

We see, among some people, a feeling that we have come "too far, too fast" in working

toward full equality of opportunity.

We see the emergence of some Negro spokesmen who would abandon the creeds of constructive non-violence and integration and preach violence and racial separatism.

Voices are increasingly raised, too, saying we should "cut back on our international commitments" ... that we are "trying to do too much" abroad ... that we should take care of ourselves.

We hear questioned not only our presence in Vietnam and Asia, but also such fundamental and successful undertakings as our Atlantic Partnership with the nations of Western Europe and the Alliance for Progress in our own Hemisphere.

And as these voices are raised in America, voices are inevitably raised elsewhere — asking whether or not we have the staying power necessary for world leadership.

* * *

Last week I returned from a mission to three Southeast Asian nations.

Each of these nations — Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia — has received, and is receiving in varying degrees, our help.

Over the past three years I have visited almost all the major independent nations of Asia.

All have relied to some degree on our shield of strength, while trying to build new growth and regional cooperation to sustain themselves.

Wherever I have been in Asia, I have been asked these basic questions: "Are you going to abandon us? Do you have the will to persevere?"

I have always replied, on behalf of the President and of my government: "We have the will. We will not abandon you."

For Asian leaders, without exception, have made clear to me that were we to abandon our role in Asia ... were we to pull back before they could fully stand on their own feet — which they are desperately trying to do — they would be under immediate pressure to come to terms with the militant, aggressive Asian communism which they have resisted for 20 years.

I say we cannot turn away while an area rich in resources ... high in strategic importance ... containing more than half the world's people is subject to such pressure.

We do not want to be world policemen. The job of international security is a job for many nations.

We do not seek to inject ourselves into every dispute, every place in the world.

But, when confronted with stakes as high as those in Asia today, I believe it

would be both foolish and immoral either to abandon the people of Asia or to subject our own people to the larger danger which would then surely follow.

I have described a policy of withdrawal from Asia as a policy of Armageddon on the Installment Plan. I mean exactly that.

We are not talking here about the pros and cons of what might have been done in years past, by many people and nations, to avoid our present involvement in Asia.

We are talking about the hard facts today of Communist aggression and subversion across a vast continent.

We are talking about a regime, which soon can be armed with nuclear weapons, which preaches and believes the dogma of the cynically-misnamed "war of national liberation."

We are talking about independent nations, and millions of people, who are next-door neighbors of that regime.

Don't get me wrong. I do not propose to isolate or attack or inflame Communist China.

What I do propose — and what our President proposes — is that we follow in Asia the same course which we have so successfully followed in Europe: A dual policy of firmness and of willingness to peacefully co-exist.

That is why I have talked of "containment without isolation" of Communist China and of policies of "bridge building." That is why our President has talked of "reconciliation" and of "peaceful development" of a continent without regard for ideology.

I believe that, if President Truman's decision in Korea is seen today as a milestone in the peace and security of the world — and as a milestone in America's maturity as a nation — so will today's course in Vietnam be seen tomorrow.

I believe that, if we have the courage to stick it out today, we may all be alive and thankful tomorrow that, working with the nations of Asia, we bought time — time, which is often the most priceless item on the shelf of history.

— time necessary for free nations to strengthen themselves against internal subversion and external aggression;

— time necessary for a new generation of Asian Communist leaders to turn away from militancy and toward a new era of internal development and international coexistence.

* * *

Peace and diversity in the world ... peace and justice in America: These are the things I believe are at stake today as we face the pressures of a New Isolationism.

I think we have no choice. I think we must continue our full national involvement not only in building a better America, but in helping others create equal conditions in their own countries of human betterment and progress.

So I believe we must persevere, at home and in the world, in the two priority tasks of this last third of the 20th century:

-- National security, to provide the necessary shield of safety:

-- National development, to provide the economic and social progress -- and hope -- which can move men and nations toward a better, more peaceful, self-sustaining life.

Our national interest demands it. And so, I think does our national conscious.

Now, I'm ready for your questions.

#

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
NATIONAL CONVENTION SIGMA DELTA CHI

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA
NOVEMBER 17, 1967

you Revolution

✓ Robert White
✓ Bernard Riddle
Russell Hurst

Invitation
Local 246-
8-7-
Wishes you
a speedy recovery

WHEN I WAS STILL A PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL
SCIENCE IN THESE PARTS AND BEFORE I WAS FIRST ELECTED
TO PUBLIC OFFICE, MY FAVORITE QUOTATION ABOUT THE
PRESS WAS THOMAS JEFFERSON'S: "WERE IT FOR ME TO
DECIDE WHETHER WE SHOULD HAVE A GOVERNMENT WITHOUT
NEWSPAPERS OR NEWSPAPERS WITHOUT A GOVERNMENT, I
SHOULD NOT HESITATE TO PREFER THE LATTER."

SINCE ENTERING PUBLIC OFFICE, HOWEVER, I
HAVE COME TO PREFER SAMUEL JOHNSON:

VPS
Spindale

“THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS IS A BLESSING
WHEN WE ARE INCLINED TO WRITE AGAINST OTHERS, AND
A CALAMITY WHEN WE FIND OURSELVES BORNE BY THE
MULTITUDE OF OUR ASSAILANTS.”

I HAVE A FEW OBSERVATIONS TO MAKE. THEN
I WELCOME YOUR QUESTIONS -- ON THE RECORD.

* * *

TODAY I WANT TO VISIT WITH YOU ABOUT
SOMETHING THAT HAS CONCERNED ME MORE AND MORE
OVER THESE PAST FEW WEEKS: THE EMERGENCE OF A
NEW ISOLATIONISM IN AMERICA.

I LIVED THROUGH THE OLD ISOLATIONISM. SO
DID MANY OF YOU. I DOUBT THAT MANY OF US WOULD
WISH TO REPEAT THAT EXPERIENCE -- THE EXPERIENCE
OF A NATION WHICH NOT ONLY CLOSED ITS MIND TO THE
OUTSIDE WORLD, BUT CLOSED ITS HEART TO MANY OF ITS
OWN CITIZENS.

└ If I had to offer HUMPHREY'S DEFINITION
OF "ISOLATIONISM" AS IT APPLIES TO NATIONAL LIFE,
I MIGHT GIVE SOMETHING LIKE THIS: "THAT FRAME OF
MIND WHICH CAUSES A NATION, AND ITS INDIVIDUAL
CITIZENS, TO WITHDRAW WITHIN THEMSELVES AND THEIR
OWN NARROWER, SELF-DEFINED INTERESTS WHILE
BECOMING LESS MINDFUL OF THE NEEDS AND INTERESTS
OF OTHERS."

└ I BELIEVE OUR AMERICA OF THESE LATE 1960'S
HAS BEGUN TO FEEL THESE HABITS OF THOUGHT ONCE AGAIN.

But └ I DO NOT BELIEVE THEY ARE YET IN THE
ASCENDENCY,

└ THEY ARE CERTAINLY NOT SHARED BY THOSE OF
US WITH RESPONSIBILITY IN THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION.

└ BUT THEY HAVE ONCE AGAIN COME TO THE SURFACE.

WE FIND THEM IN THE STRONG, WELL-ORGANIZED
EFFORT NOW BEING MOUNTED TO TURN BACK OUR LONG-STANDING
POLICY OF LIBERALIZING INTERNATIONAL TRADE,

-- IN THE RECENT ATTACKS ON FOREIGN AID;

-- IN THE ARGUMENTS NOW BEING MADE
AGAINST INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS *involvement*

-- AND FINALLY, IN THE ASSAULT WE SEE TODAY
AGAINST THE DOMESTIC WAR ON POVERTY AND OTHER PROGRAMS
DESIGNED TO LIFT ALL AMERICANS INTO THE SOCIAL
AND ECONOMIC MAINSTREAM *of this nation*

h THESE ATTACKS DO NOT EXIST IN A VACUUM.

THEY NOT ONLY AFFECT THE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS
UNDER FIRE.

h THEY ALARM OUR FRIENDS AROUND THE WORLD.

h THEY TRIGGER COUNTER-REACTION IN OTHER NATIONS.

h THEY POISON AN ENTIRE WORLD ENVIRONMENT IN
WHICH MANY COUNTRIES ARE INVOLVED IN SUCH CRITICAL
EFFORTS AS REFORM OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY
SYSTEM ... REGIONAL ECONOMIC INTEGRATION AND
DEVELOPMENT ... AND CLOSING THE DESPERATE GAP
BETWEEN THE RICH NATIONS AND THE POOR.

h NOW BY NO MEANS ARE THE SAME AMERICANS
BEHIND ALL THESE EFFORTS. h IN SOME SPECIFIC
INSTANCES, IN FACT, THEY ARE IN OPPOSITION TO
EACH OTHER.

h FOR EXAMPLE, MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO OPPOSE
SOME OF OUR PRESENT INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS - *Rushes in*
38 ASIA.
WOULD NOT AGREE AT ALL WITH THOSE WHO OPPOSE PROGRAMS
FOR OPPORTUNITY AT HOME.

h BUT THE NET EFFECT OF THIS AD HOC UNITED
FRONT IS TO CREATE ONCE AGAIN IN AMERICA A
SIZEABLE COALITION WHICH LOOKS INWARD RATHER THAN OUTWARD...

IN TERMS OF DISENGAGEMENT AND CUTTING BACK.

↳ I THINK THAT RIGHT NOW -- CERTAINLY IN
1968 -- THERE MUST BE A NATIONAL CONFRONTATION
ON THIS BASIC ISSUE -- *a great debate and*
great decision.
* * *

↳ WERE I TO GO BACK TO MY OLD ROLE AS AN
ACADEMIC ^{and} (I HAVE NO SUCH IMMEDIATE PLANS IN
MIND) I WOULD WRITE A GOOD DEAL ABOUT THE
HISTORY OF THE POST-WAR PERIOD -- AND ESPECIALLY
OUR BREAK WITH THE OLD ISOLATIONISM.

↳ OUT OF THE TRAGEDY OF WORLD WAR II WE
LEARNED THE STERILITY OF A POLICY OF FORTRESS AMERICA.

↳ WE LEARNED THE DANGER OF SELF-DELUSION IN THE
FACE OF A CLEAR AND RISE BODY OF EVIDENCE WHICH TOLD
US: MANAGEABLE TROUBLE IS BUILDING INTO UNMANAGEABLE
CATASTROPHE.

✓ WE COMMITTED OURSELVES TO THE UNITED
NATIONS AND THE MARSHALL PLAN.

✓ WHEN COMMUNIST EXPANSION REACHED OUTWARD
IN POST-WAR EUROPE AND ELSEWHERE, WE COMMITTED
OURSELVES TO NATO AND OTHER ALLIANCES FOR MUTUAL
DEFENSE.

✓ WE COMMITTED OURSELVES, AROUND THE WORLD,
TO COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE.

and ✓ WE COMMITTED OURSELVES, AROUND THE WORLD,
TO POLICIES OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND NATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT -- NEITHER ONE OF WHICH CAN EXIST
WITHOUT THE OTHER.

✓ BUT IT WAS NOT REALLY UNTIL KOREA THAT
OUR NEW HABITS OF THOUGHT WERE TRULY TESTED.

↳ IT WAS IN KOREA THAT PRESIDENT TRUMAN HAD
THE COURAGE TO PUT THIS NATION ON THE LINE / -- FOR OTHERS
THE FIRST-TIME IN THIS CENTURY -- WHEN WE WERE NOT
UNDER DIRECT ATTACK OURSELVES.

↳ HE BACKED UP OUR POST-WAR POLICIES WITH POWER. *decisions decisions and*

↳ AND HE DID SO ON A CONTINENT WHERE FEW OF US
HAD RELATIVES ... WHERE THE NAMES WERE HARD TO
PRONOUNCE ... AND WHERE THE SKIN COLORS WEREN'T
LIKE OUR OWN.

↳ OUR EFFORT IN KOREA WAS NOT POPULAR AT
HOME. NOR WAS PRESIDENT TRUMAN POPULAR FOR
COMMITTING US TO WHAT HE THOUGHT WAS RIGHT.

*Great Decisions
are seldom
Popular!*

↳ BUT I DOUBT THAT MANY IN THIS ROOM TODAY
WOULD QUESTION EITHER THE RIGHTNESS OR THE WISDOM
OF HARRY TRUMAN'S DECISION -- A DECISION WHICH I

BELIEVE NOT ONLY ADDED TO WORLD PEACE AND STABILITY,
BUT WHICH FINALLY WRENCHED AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION
INTO THE REALITIES OF THE POST-WAR WORLD.

↳ IT WAS AT ABOUT THE SAME TIME, I BELIEVE,
THAT WE BROKE THROUGH THE OLD ISOLATIONISM IN OUR
DOMESTIC LIFE -- SPECIFICALLY IN THE AREAS OF
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS.

↳ WE HAVE MOVED STEADILY FORWARD IN THOSE
AREAS, BOTH THROUGH LAW AND ACTION, IN THE
INTERVENING YEARS.

↳ SINCE THOSE EARLY 1950'S AMERICA HAS
FORTHRIGHTLY TAKEN HER PLACE AS A RESPONSIBLE
WORLD CITIZEN. AND, HERE AT HOME, WE HAVE MOVED
STEADILY FORWARD TOWARD CREATING THE FREE AND
EQUAL SOCIETY WHICH OUR CONSTITUTION PRESCRIBED.

yet, BOTH ABROAD AND AT HOME, THERE HAS BEEN
TURBULENCE. THERE HAS BEEN CONTROVERSY AND
DISAGREEMENT. *a fundamental change does not
come quietly or easily.*
BUT AMERICANS, BY AND LARGE, HAVE SUPPORTED

THESE NATIONAL DIRECTIONS AND COMMITMENTS.

* * *

L WHAT HAPPENS NOW?

HERE AT HOME WE SEE THE PHENOMENON KNOWN
AS "BACKLASH."

L WE SEE, AMONG SOME PEOPLE, A FEELING
THAT WE HAVE COME "TOO FAR, TOO FAST" IN WORKING
TOWARD FULL EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY.

L WE SEE THE EMERGENCE OF SOME NEGRO
SPOKESMEN WHO WOULD ABANDON THE CREEDS OF
CONSTRUCTIVE NON-VIOLENCE AND INTEGRATION ^{AND} PREACH
VIOLENCE AND RACIAL SEPARATISM.

VOICES ARE INCREASINGLY RAISED, TOO,
SAYING WE SHOULD "CUT BACK ON OUR INTERNATIONAL
COMMITMENTS" ... THAT WE ARE "TRYING TO DO TOO
MUCH" ABROAD ... THAT WE SHOULD TAKE CARE OF
OURSELVES.

WE HEAR QUESTIONED NOT ONLY OUR PRESENCE
IN VIETNAM AND ASIA, BUT ALSO SUCH FUNDAMENTAL
AND SUCCESSFUL UNDERTAKINGS AS OUR ATLANTIC
PARTNERSHIP WITH THE NATIONS OF WESTERN EUROPE
AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IN OUR OWN HEMISPHERE.

AND AS THESE VOICES ARE RAISED IN AMERICA,
VOICES ARE INEVITABLY RAISED ELSEWHERE -- ASKING
WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE THE STAYING POWER NECESSARY
FOR WORLD LEADERSHIP.

* * *

LAST WEEK I RETURNED FROM A MISSION TO
THREE SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS.

EACH OF THESE NATIONS -- VIETNAM,
MALAYSIA AND INDONESIA -- HAS RECEIVED, AND IS
RECEIVING IN VARYING DEGREES, OUR HELP.

↳ OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS I HAVE VISITED
ALMOST ALL THE MAJOR INDEPENDENT NATIONS OF ASIA.

↳ ALL HAVE RELIED TO SOME DEGREE ON OUR
SHIELD OF STRENGTH, WHILE TRYING TO BUILD NEW
GROWTH AND REGIONAL COOPERATION TO SUSTAIN THEMSELVES.

↳ WHEREVER I HAVE BEEN IN ASIA, I HAVE BEEN
ASKED THESE BASIC QUESTIONS: "ARE YOU GOING TO
ABANDON US? DO YOU HAVE THE WILL TO PERSEVERE?"

↳ I HAVE ALWAYS REPLIED, ON BEHALF OF
THE PRESIDENT AND OF ~~THE~~ ^{our} GOVERNMENT: "WE HAVE THE
WILL. WE WILL NOT ABANDON YOU."

~~THE~~ ASIAN LEADERS, WITHOUT EXCEPTION,

HAVE MADE CLEAR TO ME THAT WERE WE TO ABANDON

the Pacific
OUR ROLE IN ASIA ... WERE WE TO PULL BACK BEFORE

THEY COULD FULLY STAND ON THEIR OWN FEET --

(WHICH THEY ARE DESPERATELY TRYING TO DO --)

THEY WOULD BE UNDER IMMEDIATE PRESSURE TO COME

TO TERMS WITH THE MILITANT, AGGRESSIVE ASIAN

COMMUNISM WHICH THEY HAVE RESISTED FOR 20 YEARS.

↳ I SAY WE CANNOT TURN AWAY WHILE AN AREA RICH
IN RESOURCES ... HIGH IN STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE ...

CONTAINING MORE THAN HALF THE WORLD'S PEOPLE IS

SUBJECT TO SUCH PRESSURE.

↳ WE DO NOT WANT TO BE WORLD POLICEMEN. THE
JOB OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY IS A JOB FOR MANY NATIONS.

↳ WE DO NOT SEEK TO INJECT OURSELVES INTO EVERY
DISPUTE, EVERY PLACE IN THE WORLD.

↳ BUT, WHEN CONFRONTED WITH STAKES AS HIGH AS THOSE IN ASIA TODAY, I BELIEVE IT WOULD BE BOTH FOOLISH AND IMMORAL EITHER TO ABANDON THE PEOPLE OF ASIA OR TO SUBJECT OUR OWN PEOPLE TO THE LARGER DANGER WHICH WOULD THEN SURELY FOLLOW.

↳ I HAVE DESCRIBED A POLICY OF WITHDRAWAL FROM ASIA AS A POLICY OF ARMAGEDDON ON THE INSTALLMENT PLAN. I MEAN EXACTLY THAT.

↳ WE ARE NOT TALKING HERE ABOUT THE PROS AND CONS OF WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN DONE IN YEARS PAST, BY MANY PEOPLE AND NATIONS, TO AVOID OUR PRESENT INVOLVEMENT IN ASIA.

↳ WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE HARD FACTS TODAY OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION AND SUBVERSION ACROSS A VAST CONTINENT.

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT A REGIME, WHICH SOON
CAN BE ARMED WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS, WHICH PREACHES
AND BELIEVES THE DOGMA OF THE CYNICALLY-MISNAMED
"WAR OF NATIONAL LIBERATION."

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT INDEPENDENT NATIONS,
AND MILLIONS OF PEOPLE, WHO ARE NEXT-DOOR
NEIGHBORS OF THAT REGIME.

DON'T GET ME WRONG, I DO NOT PROPOSE
TO ISOLATE OR ATTACK OR INFLAME COMMUNIST CHINA.

WHAT I DO PROPOSE -- AND WHAT OUR
PRESIDENT PROPOSES-- IS THAT WE FOLLOW IN ASIA
THE SAME COURSE WHICH WE HAVE SO SUCCESSFULLY
FOLLOWED IN EUROPE: A DUAL POLICY OF FIRMNESS
AND OF WILLINGNESS TO PEACEFULLY CO-EXIST.

↳ THAT IS WHY I HAVE TALKED OF "CONTAINMENT
WITHOUT ISOLATION" OF COMMUNIST CHINA AND OF
POLICIES OF "BRIDGE BUILDING." THAT IS WHY
OUR PRESIDENT HAS TALKED OF "RECONCILIATION"
AND OF "PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT" OF A CONTINENT
WITHOUT REGARD FOR IDEOLOGY.

↳ I BELIEVE THAT, IF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S
DECISION IN KOREA IS SEEN TODAY AS A MILESTONE
IN THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF THE WORLD -- AND
AS A MILESTONE IN AMERICA'S MATURITY AS A NATION --
SO WILL TODAY'S COURSE IN VIETNAM BE SEEN TOMORROW.

↳ I BELIEVE THAT, IF WE HAVE THE COURAGE TO
STICK IT OUT TODAY, WE MAY ALL BE ALIVE AND
THANKFUL TOMORROW THAT, WORKING WITH THE ^{free} NATIONS
OF ASIA, WE BOUGHT TIME -- TIME, WHICH IS OFTEN
THE MOST PRICELESS ITEM ON THE SHELF OF HISTORY.

-- TIME NECESSARY FOR FREE NATIONS
TO STRENGTHEN THEMSELVES AGAINST INTERNAL
SUBVERSION AND EXTERNAL AGGRESSION;

-- TIME NECESSARY FOR A NEW GENERATION
OF ASIAN COMMUNIST LEADERS TO TURN AWAY
FROM MILITANCY AND TOWARD A NEW ERA OF
INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL COEXISTENCE.

* * *

✓ PEACE AND DIVERSITY IN THE WORLD
PEACE AND JUSTICE IN AMERICA: THESE ARE THE
THINGS I BELIEVE ARE AT STAKE TODAY AS WE FACE
THE PRESSURES OF A NEW ISOLATIONISM.

✓ I THINK WE HAVE NO CHOICE, ~~I THINK WE~~
We MUST CONTINUE OUR FULL NATIONAL INVOLVEMENT
NOT ONLY IN BUILDING A BETTER AMERICA,

BUT IN HELPING OTHERS CREATE ~~THE~~ CONDITIONS IN
THEIR OWN COUNTRIES OF HUMAN BETTERMENT AND
PROGRESS.

So I BELIEVE WE MUST PERSEVERE, AT HOME
AND IN THE WORLD, IN THE TWO PRIORITY TASKS OF
THIS LAST THIRD OF THE 20TH CENTURY:

-- NATIONAL SECURITY, TO PROVIDE THE
NECESSARY SHIELD OF SAFETY;

-- NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, TO PROVIDE THE
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS -- AND HOPE --
WHICH CAN MOVE MEN AND NATIONS TOWARD A BETTER,
MORE PEACEFUL, SELF-SUSTAINING LIFE.

Our NATIONAL INTEREST DEMANDS IT. AND SO,
I THINK, DOES OUR NATIONAL CONSCIENCE.

Now, I'M READY FOR YOUR QUESTIONS.

#

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE
NATIONAL CONVENTION OF SIGMA DELTA CHI IN
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

11/17/67

Thank you very much. Thank you very much my special introducer and my good friend, Bernie Ridder, Father Whalen, Mr. Chandler, our distinguished Minnesotan, Dr. Jones, and members and guests of the great journalistic fraternity of the Sigma Delta Chi, and ladies and gentlemen.

First of all, I want to say to Bernie Ridder, that Ed Stanky and Hubert Humphrey had a meeting of the minds and a touching of the souls. What happened to the White Sox and what happened to the Twins brought us together. Then I would like to inform you that the Washington Redskins have yet to win a game, but I went there last Sunday and Otto Graham lost all possibility of being invited to the White House, in saying that the Vice President had better judgment on football than the President. It's nice to be first.

And it's mighty nice to have an introduction that isn't written by the State Department. Generally, those introductions are about three or four words long that says, "Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President," and many people say, "of what?" But not my friend Bernie Ridder, who believes in the right of the editor and the publisher to have editorial license. And liked what he said. It's like what my old friend Adlai Stevenson used to say about flattery. He said, "It's alright if you don't inhale it." But while he was talking, while Bernie was talking, I was breathing deeply. It's nice to come home to get some reassurance.

This audience is sharp. I couldn't help but think, as I was sitting here looking over this fine audience, of the same thoughts that came to my mind this evening in this same city, when the Mayor of St. Paul welcomed us so well on that occasion. It was a meeting of many of the farm families and farm leaders of our midwestern and upper midwestern area. For a member of the administration to speak to a farm audience is either courageous or ridiculous, and I tried to make it courageous. And as I said to them, as I am about to say to you, because I've been reading your resolutions. I don't think you really mean it. I think you want to arouse our interest is all.

But I mentioned this little story last night of that industrialist

you know, who became critically ill and went to the hospital. He was there for weeks and no one called him and he didn't receive a card and no one wrote him a letter and it seemed as if everybody forgot him. And then the local union had a meeting and the representatives took a vote and the card came finally. It said, Local 246 wishes you a speedy recovery by a vote of 8 to 7.

I have a feeling that Sigma Delta Chi invited me by a vote, I don't know of what, but I sure want to thank that one who was willing to have his arm twisted.

Today I hope to present to you a few of my own observations of the current domestic and international scene, and then as we said here to make myself available to your questions. I know that's a hazardous pursuit for me, but I've always believed that every American is entitled to one bite at a live administration official, and I came out to offer myself as a sacrifice. I know that what I read that Presidents are dumpable and I imagine they're expendable. The President said, "Go forth Hubert, bring them my greetings, and your body", and here I am.

Well, now my friends, when I was a professor of political science in these parts, just down the street a little ways, I was talking this morning to Dr. Rice about some matters over at Macalester and over at the University. Before I was ever elected to public office, my favorite quotation about the press was from Thomas Jefferson, and it was Jefferson who said that "Were it for me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate to prefer the latter". I think Jefferson said that before he was President, but he did say it. Now since entering public office, however, I've come to prefer the quotation from Samuel Johnson. He seemed to make a little more sense. "The liberty of the press," Sam said, "is a blessing when we are inclined to write against others, and a calamity when we find ourselves borne by the multitude of our assailants." In other words, if you write it nice about us, we think you're great. And you can draw your own conclusions about the rest of it.

Now, I have a few observations to make and as I said, we'll get down to the "Nitty-gritty" of this meeting namely where you ask what's on your mind and I'll try to do my best to respond.

I want to visit with you about something that has concerned me more and more over these past few weeks. The emergence of what I would call a new isolationism in America. Now I lived through the old isolationism, being a son of the prairies of South Dakota and a student of the University of Minnesota. So did many of you live through that old isolationism. And I doubt many of us here or give any would want to repeat that experience -- the experience of a nation which not only closed its' mind to the outside world and outside ideas, but closed its' heart regreably to many of its' own citizens.

Now, if I had to offer Humphrey's definition of isolationism, as it applies to our national life, I might give it something like this. "That frame of mind which causes a nation and its individual citizens, to withdraw within themselves and their own narrower, self-defined interests while becoming less mindful of the needs and interests of others." That about summarizes what the term "isolationism" means to me.

Now, I believe our America of these late 1960's has begun to feel those habits of that once again, but I want to make it clear I do not believe they are yet in the ascendancy. But the seeds are here and the possibility of the harvest should not be ignored. They are certainly not shared by those of us with responsibility in the present administration. But you have once again seen come to the surface these old ideas of withdrawal. Now, we find them in the strong, well-organized effort now being mounted to turn back our long-standing policy of liberalizing international trade. A fight that took thirty years. In the recent attacks on foreign aid; in the arguments now being made against international commitments and obligations; and finally, in the assault that we see today against the domestic war on poverty and other programs that we believe are designed to help lift all Americans into the social and economic mainstream of this nation. Now these attacks do not in a vacuum, they not only affect the policies and programs under fire, giving you interesting copy, but they alarm our friends around the world and they trigger counter-reaction in other nations. They even add fuel to the indiginous attitudes of withdrawal and isolationism which are to be found in some areas of Europe -- a new researching, strong Europe.

They poison an entire world environment in which many countries are involved in such critical efforts as reform of the international monetary system, absolutely vital today, regional economic integration and development, and closing the desperate gap between the rich nations and the poor. Now by no means are the same Americans behind all these efforts. In some specific instances, in fact, they are in opposition to each other. For example, many of the people who oppose some of our present international commitments, such as in Southeast Asia, would not agree at all with those who oppose programs for opportunity and education here at home. But the net effect of this Ad Hoc united front is to create once again in America a sizeable coalition, fragile as it may be and uncertain, which looks inward rather than outward, in terms of disengagement and cutting back. I think that right now -- certainly in 1968 -- there must be a national confrontation on this basic issue. If ever there was a need for the great debate to make a great decision, it is now.

Were I to go back to my old role as an academic, and I don't want to plant any such thoughts in your mind, I'd be better if I didn't put that in print here, I'm sure. I want you to know I have no such immediate plans, however, I do like to mention it, just in case.

Were I to go back teaching, I would write a good deal about the history of the post-war period and especially our break with the old isolationism. A period through which I've lived. Out of the tragedy of World War II we learned the utter sterility of a policy of fortress America. We learned the danger of self-delusion in the face of a clear and rising body of evidence which told us early; manageable trouble is building into unmanageable catastrophe.

We committed ourselves in these post-war years to the United Nations and to the Marshall Plan and others. When communist expansion reached outward in post-war Europe and elsewhere, we committed ourselves rightly to NATO and to other alliances for mutual defense. We committed ourselves, around the world to collective security and mutual assistance, because we found that there's no strength in standing alone. That old adage, that old wise American Benjamin Franklin was right, "you either hang together or you hang separately." And we committed ourselves around the world to policies of national security and national development -- neither one of which can exist without the other. A truth that this generation needs to know.

But it was not until Korea that our new habits of thought were really tested, when we really had to pay the price for good intentions and for public policy. It was Korea that President Truman had the courage to put this nation on the line for others with our treasures and our sacred honor. To do so for the first time in this century, when we were not under direct attack from an outside force. We backed up our post-war policies with decisive decisions, which was characteristic of Mr. Truman, and the use of American power. And he did so on a continent where few of us had relatives, where the names were hard to pronounce, where few of our intellects had ever studied and where the skin colors weren't like our own.

Our effort in Korea was not very popular at home. Oh yes, in the beginning when things were going well, it was going popular. In August 1950, 80 some percent of the people, according to the best public sampling said that it was a right decision, supported Mr. Truman. January 1951, when our forces were being beaten back, 66% said we should withdraw, which is just another way of saying, that great decisions should not be directed by public opinion and popularity polls. Nor, was President Truman popular for committing us to that what he thought was right. He was just about as unpopular as a man could be and still be in office.

I can digress for the moment that I am of the opinion that the insatiable desire for popularity is the single greatest threat to political integrity and national security. Popularity can often be the virus and the toxin which destroys one, and it is more important to be what Lincoln said and he said it so distinctly that it bares repeating in every year, and every age, and every generation. "With

malice towards none and charity for all, but with firmness in the right as God gives us to see it right." He said that when he too, was in trouble. But I doubt that many of us in this room today would for a single minute now question either the rightness or wisdom of Harry Truman's decision. The decision, which I believe not only added to World peace and stability, but which finally wrenched American public opinion painfully into the realities of the post-war world. And it was about that same time or a little later, I believe, that we began to break through the old isolationism in our domestic life -- Specially, in the areas of equal opportunities and human rights, and we have moved steadily forward in those areas of both through law and action in the intervening years.

Since those early 1950's, America has forth rightly taken her place as a responsible world citizen and we've had to pay a heavy price. And here at home we have moved steadily towards creating the free and equal society which our constitution was to guarantee and prescribe. Yet both abroad and at home there has been violence, and turbulence. There has been controversy and disagreement because a fundamental change has not come quietly nor easily. But Americans by and large, have supported these national directions and commitments.

Now what happens? Or, what's going on these days. Well, here at home we see the phenomenon known as "backlash." We see, among some people, at least among some, a feeling that we have come "too far, too fast" in working towards full equality of opportunity. We see the emergency of some Negro spokesmen, who would abandon the creeds of constructive non-violence and integration, and preach instead violence and racial separatism. We even see those who in the name of progress and orderly government condone and encourage violence even though the means of peaceful regress of agreements are always at hand.

Voices are increasingly raised, too, saying that we should cut-back, reduce, withdraw from our national and international commitments. And they say we are trying to do too much abroad; that we should take care of ourselves, never really asking that if this great nation, rich and powerful as it is, is incapable in assuming the mantle of international leadership. Who is? If with our wealth and our power we have to give up and back away, who shall stand? If we here questioned not only our presence in Vietnam and Asia, but also fundamental and successful undertaking as our Atlantic partnership with the nations of Western Europe -- Europe, and even some who question our alliance for progress in our own hemisphere. And as these voices are raised in our America, voices are inevitable raised elsewhere asking whether or not we have the staying power necessary for world leadership.

We never really quite understood that leadership gives one no privilege; that it is not a luxury, but rather it is a burden and imposes a heavy responsibility. The honor of leadership carries with

it unbelievable trials and tribulations. Last week I returned from a mission in three Southeast Asian nations. Each of these nations -- Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia -- has received, and is receiving in varying degrees, our help. This was my fourth journey to Asia in three years. I have now visited most of the free independent nations of that continent. All have relied to some degree on our shield of strength, while trying to build for themselves a new growth and regional cooperation in order to sustain themselves. And there has been considerable growth and regional cooperation. Wherever I have been in Asia, I have been asked these basic questions, as I was these past weeks. "Are you going to abandon us?" "Do you have the will to persevere?"

The Prime Minister of Malaysia, a nation that he represents that has fought the struggle against subversion, Communist control for 12 long years and finally gained its freedom. Ten years with the help of Britain. It took 12 years. He said to me point blank, "Mr. Vice President, if you're nation is to abandon Asia then all is lost, all we've sacrificed, all we've fought for is gone." I was told the same thing by Saharto in Indonesia, a nation that has just rid itself of self-indulgent leaders or leader, a false ideology, gross mismanagement and unbelievable corruption, at the cost of better than 300,000 lives in a blood bath. And I was told there as I've been told in every place, "if you abandon us now, there is no hope."

"I've always replied to these questions on behalf of our president and government, and I believe the American people, that we have the will, that we have the determination and that we will persevere; we will not abandon them. Asian leaders without acception have made clear to me that were we to abandon our role in the Pacific and Asia, were we to pull back before they could be able to stand on their own two feet, which they are desperately trying to do, they would under immediate pressure to come to terms with the militant, Asian aggressive Communism, which they have resisted for some 20 years.

Let me say to this distinguished audience, that militant Agressive Asian Communism is not a subject of academic discussion or philosophical disertation. It is a hard cruel, cold fact in that area of which I speak. So possibly they think of it and discuss it in realistic, sophisticated terms. Some of us who are so far removed from the harshness and the cruelty of it. I say that we cannot turn away. While an area so rich in resources, high statergic importance, containing more than half of the world's people, is subject to such pressure.

Oh, we do not want to be the world's policemen; we prefer to be it's builder. The job of international security is a job for many nations. We do not seek to inject ourselves into every dispute, every place in the world, nor do we. But when we are confronted with stakes as high as those in Asia today, I believe it would be both foolish and immoral either to abandon the people of Asia or to subject our own people to the larger danger which would then surely follow. I have

described a policy of withdrawal from Asia, particularly Southeast Asia, as a policy of armageddon on the installment plan. And I mean exactly that. Now we're not talking here about the pros and cons of what might have been done in the years past, all of us are members of the "might of" club or "could have" club or "Should have" club. We should have done this, we might have done that or we could have done this. You cannot relive the yesterdays, regrettably. So we can't talk about the pros and cons to any real good in order to try to explain how to avoid our present involvement in Asia. We are talking about the hard facts today of communist aggression and subversion across a vast continent, some of which has presently come under that control. We are talking too, about a regime, which soon can be armed with nuclear weapons, missiles entering the space age which it preaches and believes the dogma of the cynically-misnamed "war of national liberations."

We are talking about independent nations, and millions of people, who are the next-door neighbors of that regime. Don't get me wrong, I do not propose to isolate or attack or inflame communist China. I do however propose to understand it's reality. What I do propose, and what our President proposes is, that we follow in Asia the very same course which we have so successfully followed in Europe: A dual policy of firmness and of willingness to peacefully coexist.

That is why I have talked of "containment without isolation" of communist China and of the policies that are collateral of "bridge building" slowly and surely. That is why our President has talked of "reconciliation," and of "peaceful development" of a continent, without regard for ideology. That is the policy of this government, and I believe that if President Truman's decision in Korea is seen today as a milestone in the peace and security of the world, and I think it is, and as a milestone in America's maturity as a nation, so will today's course in Vietnam be seen tomorrow. I believe that if we have the courage to stick it out, to stay with it today, we may all be alive and thankful tomorrow. That working with free nations of Asia, we bought time -- time, which is often the most priceless item on the shelf of history. Particularly if it is time that is put to good use. Time necessary for free nations to strengthen themselves against internal subversion and external aggression: as they are, time necessary for a new generation of Asian Communist leaders to hopefully turn away from militancy and towards a new era of internal development for their own people, an international coexistence. Peace and diversity in the world. Peace and justice in America. These are the things I believe are at stake today as we face the pressures of this new isolationism, domestic and abroad.

And building a shield of strength for free people and free nations to build nations. Persevere in the two priority tasks of this last third of the twentieth century. And those two priority tasks are national security and all that it means to provide the necessary shield of safety, and national development, to provide the economic and social progress and the hope which can move men and nations towards a better and a more peaceful self-sustaining life. And never underestimate the politics of hope which gives great courage to millions of people.

I believe our national interest demands what I have said. And so I think, does our national conscience; to do less would be unworthy of us. Now, Ladies and gentlemen, it's your turn. I'm ready for your questions. (Applause). Thank you.

Mr. Chandler has said that I can sort of field the questions as a good center-fielder would....over here.

Question:Mr. Vice President.....I think the Freedom of Information Committee of this organization severely criticized the administration for so-called misleading press policy. There's been a great deal of criticism of a so-called credibility gap. Could we have your comments, sir?

V.P.: Well, I'm sure you wouldn't expect me to agree with that resolution. Nor, do I. I think it's always dangerous to try to be a prophet with detail and accuracy and there are a few prophets that I know in public life. Most of them have a history of some centuries past. Whenever one makes a prediction in this changeable world of ours, whether its on the public scene or in science and technology, you always run the risk of being proven wrong.

For example, last year we had a prediction that we'd have bad weather this year. That's what the meteorologist told us. That's what the best specialist in the world told us and we had the best growing weather we ever had, and we had the largest crops this world has ever known and we again have surpluses. Now, I know that somebody can say that it's unfortunate that the Department of Agriculture mislead the people in telling them there might be some bad weather and we should have some additional acreage to give us a margin of safety. But, no matter how righteous this administration may think it is or any other, it does not have a pipeline to divine providence and we just couldn't judge it.

Now, I don't think that was a credability gap, but I think it was just one of those things that you're asked questions by bright and intelligent men like yourself. Some of us do not quite have the bright and intelligent answers. We try to do the best we can. There is no designed purpose, or any premeditated purpose, on the part of

any official I know of in this government to deliberately mislead the press of America or the media. If that were the case, it would be most unfortunate. I for one surely do not indulge in it. I regrettable sometimes say things when I don't have as much information as I should have. That's a human weakness, not premeditation deceit. Thank you.

(Clark Mollenhoff - Chairman of SDX - Freedom of Information)

Question: Mr. Vice President, Isn't this quality of leadership dependent upon credibility and to get away from business of projections, none of us can make, there are a good many cases that we make reference to in report where it isn't projections, it's inaccurate, misleading statements relative to things that have past. Specifically, the air war, the probs of air war in Vietnam, and the question of whether the Joint Chiefs of Staff policies the targets were being hit. The administration took the position, there was essentially no difference. There was testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and unanimous report by the Senate Sub-Committee that said there was this great difference. They made the targets, the number of targets. The Defense Secretary said these were unimportant targets, and then they hit them the next week. Now, there are a good many other cases I would like to go into all of them with you.

V.P.: I'm aware of them. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are professional military people and they look upon every possible bridge, every possible bank, every possible dike, every possible road, every possible factory, every possible anything as a target. The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief, and his advisors are members of the cabinet as well as the Joint Chiefs.

The decisions that are being made about the struggle in Vietnam are not merely military. We have been told 101 times that this is not a struggle that can be won entirely by the military, that it is political, it is economic, it is social, it is diplomatic, and therefore, the military advice and Council that you get must be phased into the other higher policy considerations.

I don't remember which Frenchman it was that said that war was too important to be left to the Generals. I don't downgrade our Generals, I think they are great and capable men, but they are essentially military men.

I know that the targeting has changed in the struggle in Vietnam. It is changed as the need for change was understood and concluded after advice and counsel. When some of our military men testified for a committee, they testify under and they say "yes, I recommended the following targets." I want to tell you that the target list was mighty long. There isn't any doubt about that (Mr. Vice President) Just a minute. The answer is coming, it's on it's way. May I say, Mr. Mollenhoff, you write a column every day and I don't get a chance to answer you everyday. (laughter)

What I'm saying is that in the overall decision making process when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff sits with the President of the United States, and I have sat with them time after time. And the recommendations are made. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs speaking for the Chief under the law of the United States of America and he is the spokesman for the Joint Chiefs, has not fundamentally, basically, openly disagreed with the President of the United States. He has made his recommendations, he is permitted to make any debate or any rejoinder that he wishes and then the decision is made with his concurrence. And that is a matter of record.

Now I have been in those conferences, and I've read in time after time how the Joint Chiefs were not consulted. Well, General Wheller is consulted. I've sat at the Tuesday luncheons in which are the most secret luncheons of this government, in which the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of the National Security Council sit. And I have heard the discussion of the targets. And I have heard the Joint Chairman of the Joint Chief make his own evaluation as to what were the rights ones and what were not. And I submit there has not been a basic disagreement between the President and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs speaking for the Chiefs, when the whole situation has been discussed in terms of the context of our objectives.

The Joint Chiefs, for example, when one of them recommends, and has recommended, that the Harbor of Haiphong be mined. But when that is brought into the full discussion of the policy of this nation and what might happen if that were the case. If a Soviet ship were blown to bits, what the implications and possibilities of that might be then the spokesman for the Joint Chiefs finds that the decision which was being made or being taken under consideration was the right decision. I don't think there's been any major policy difference. There have been differences of advice and counsel.

Every man in this audience knows that in your own business when you sit around a table of board of directors. What kind of a board of directors is it that you do not have people who speak up.

Many times in these conferences I have spoken up without having my point of view agreed to. Does that mean that there is a vast gulf between the President and the Vice President? It doesn't mean it at all. It means that on the moment when you present your point of view, you present it as you see it. But when you present it in context in points of view that others have, that point of view might take on an entirely different coloration. So, while there are differences, no one has ever said in this government that there has been an unanimity of opinion. What we have said, is that after consultation, we have come out with a program with a policy always subject to alteration, always subject to amendment.

As yesterday, a particular target was bombed in Hanoi, which was one of the targets on the target list for a long time which was not agreed to until only recently. And why? There were real diplomatic and political reasons for it. It may well have been, in some instance, that a particular

person was in Hanoi from a country that was trying to do us some good in Hanoi in order to bring this conference to a peace table, -- bring this struggle to a peace table. That could have been the case. I don't say it was. But if that were the case, then it would surely have been wise, it seems to me, not to have had American bombers swooping over Hanoi on that particular target on the day that the Joint Chiefs said it should, when the Joint Chief or the Chief of the Air Force didn't even know that that particular diplomat might have been in Hanoi. That's why you got a President. This is why you have a National Security Council so that we can fuse together so that we can bring together many different bits of information to arrive at a policy. That's the best answer I can give you and it's an honest answer that is mighty closely related to facts of the situation I've just described. (Applause).

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: I don't believe you should indulge yourself in either the right or the license to lie. You can indulge in the right to keep your mouth shut. You don't have to answer every question. There's a lot of difference between prudent silence and deliberate falsehood. So I would disagree with Mr. Sylvester. (Applause).....

V.P.: Yes, Sir.

Question: (Inaudible).....

V.P.: He said he hoped - Oh I have many hopes to and I hope they come true. Some of them look a little dismal at the moment.

V.P.: (.....Inaudible)

I don't think it is wise for any man to predict how long this struggle may last. Who knows? The length of the struggle is not in our hands, but alone, it's also in the hands of the enemy. Who knows? Who knows what could happen? I mean, after all who know how long the blockade of Berlin would last? We didn't know. It might have been a week, it might have been a month, then all at once it came to a halt. Who knows when the enemy may decide that they can't achieve their objectives through force? They might try to achieve some of them through diplomacy. Who knows whether or not they will de-escalate or finally just withdraw, which is, by the way, what I think might happen. That's my point of view. Now that isn't agreed to by everybody in the government. But I've got a right to have my point of view, this is a free country even if I am Vice President. (Applause). Let me say that I hope that General Westmoreland's right. I don't know that he is. This I do know, that from the best estimates that we can obtain from our military and the military observers and technicians of other nations, that we have begun to experience considerable military success in Vietnam. But quite frankly, the struggle is not going to be run only militarily. You may have military success, but if you have a political failure, you're not going to have an end to this struggle. It's a balanced proposition. So I don't want to make any predictions. The only prediction I ever made on it, which I got spanked for for the moment, was when I

spoke to the Governor's conference here in Nineteen hundred and Sixty-five; when I said I thought it would be a long, costly and ugly war. Hubert H. Humphrey, July 1965. (laughter). And my credibility still stands. That's the best I can tell you. Yes sir.....

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: Well, as you can plainly see, you can't always tell by the label what you're going to find. (Applause). Lot's of difference in the package. And I think I know what you mean, and may I say he's my friend. I'm sorry that on some matters we occasionally disagree, that what I told Mrs. Humphrey last week. She was wrong. But I haven't convinced her. That's my only comment, Sir. Thank you.

Question: Mr. Vice President.....from Montgomery, Alabama. Could you tell us what effect you think the campaign of former Governor George Wallace will have on the republican conservatives and on the blue collar democrats in the north and other sections of the nation in regards to the presidential campaign of 1968.

V.P.: Now the wish may be the father of the thought. I must confess that my objectivity is somewhat corroded and erroded by my subjectivity on this matter. But I have studied, as best I could, the samplings, public opinion analysis that have been made, and what has been presented to the political community, both academic and in the real politics, indicates that if Mr. Wallace makes the attempt on a third party ticket for the Presidency, that it might very well afford Mr. Johnson the chance to carry several of the Southern states with a plurality; Actually drawing votes away from the Republican nominee for candidate. It would undoubtedly also draw some votes, that third party candidacy, from the democratic ticket in some of the northern cities. But our analysis, as best we can interpret that analysis, one that we made ourselves but from what the public polls demonstrate, is that Mr. Wallace's candidacy would not be injurious to President Johnson's re-election, but on balance would possibly be a plus in terms of a Republican candidate. I think it would also depend, I might add though, on the nature of the Republican candidate. And when my Republican friends decide to who they're going to run, and just exactly what they think, even if they do run, then we'll be able to give you a better answer. Thank you.

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: That might happen. What I was really indicating was that I think in 1968, these issues of our national commitments, our international involvement, the whole subject matter of this vast array of programs that the government now has in terms of education and health, civil rights -- all of these things will be brought into the public arena.

They ought to be!

We ought to debate them.

We ought to debate what is the role of the Federal Government in these matters. We ought to debate how far should this country commit itself; what should be the nature of it's international commitments. And I say that

the debate will be healthy. Some people would call it dissent. I call it debate or dissent.

Let me just put it this way. There is not a thing wrong with debate, dissent and discussion. They are absolutely vital to a free society. But something else is vital, too, and this is where you get into the difficulty. Decision! Decision!

Now, I've been in the deciding business, and I've been in the debating business. I've had a little experience in both. And frankly, debating is more fun. I've been a college teacher, I've been a legislator, I often used to want to vote in the Senate, maybe. I'd have Bernie Ridder with me all the time then. But ever so often I had to vote. In fact, all the time I had to vote "yes" or "no". And even when I was absent, somebody said, "How would you have voted?", and I couldn't say "maybe". That's the discussion, the debate and the dissent part. When you get down to the part where you have to decide, and that's what you mean by political responsibility. (Applause).

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: I don't know. And if I did, I think prudent silence would serve the national interest best.

Question: Mr. Vice President, Al, University of Kansas. If I understood you correctly, a few minutes ago you said when you were speaking of Mr. Truman's decisions on the Korean War, that great decisions should not be made by public opinion or popularity vote. Would you care to comment on the role of public opinion and what bearing it has on congress.

V.P.: Yes sir. Public opinion obviously has a very, very effective role in political decisions on election day. And it also has, of course, the advise and counsel that the public gives to the members of congress and to the leaders of government.

I simply say, that like with many other things in life, there are certain temptations that you ought to resist. And if you really believe that what needs to be done must be done, or, if you really believe that the decision that you make is the right decision, you just have to stick with it. Particularly when you get to the position of being President of the United States.

Harry Truman once said, "the buck stops here," and that's right.

You know when you're a Senator you can vote two or three times. You have ammendments, recommital and final passage, etc., etc. I've been through all of those. There's very few tricks in politics I haven't experienced one way or another, I want you to know. And it's much easier for a Vice President to have a good deal of flexability on these matters too, you know; --

a kind of a nod here and a nod there.

But when the President of the United States is called upon, the fate of a nation is in his hands. What he says today about economics affects the British pound, affects the American dollar, affects the balance of payments, affects the monetary system and the fiscal structure. He has to be very, very careful -- even how he looks. Every word has to be measured and weighed.

It's a very difficult thing for those of us that have been in public life, sort of "free wheeling" for quite a period of time, to understand this. I frequently have people feel that when I'm out making a statement that I'm speaking directly for the President, that it is a very clever operation where the President has just fed in the Vice President to sort of probe the atmosphere you know, walk through the land mines first, you know.

That could be on some occasions, but generally it is not. He just couldn't possibly have enough time to figure up all the places that I've been, you know.

So, public opinion, which is your business, in a very real sense and is my business. You know we really are kindred souls. Maybe that's why on occasion we sort of shout at each -- you don't shout at us -- I shout at you, of course that's true, we are kindred souls, we're in the same work, it's education, it's information, it's reflection and generation of public opinion. That has its way in this country of making its decisive position on the election day. It also has a way of influencing or adjusting public policy through attitudes of congressmen, senators and others feel or hear during their elective service.

So we cannot ignore public opinion. What I tried to say, and I'm afraid I didn't say it as well as I should, is that had Abraham Lincoln made his decisions of the emancipation proclamation on the basis of the advice of his cabinet or on what he thought was public opinion, he never would have issued the emancipation proclamation. Had Abraham Lincoln picked his General, Ulysses S. Grant on the basis of popularity and public opinion, Ulysses S. Grant would never have been the man that was in charge of the armies. He was a very unpopular General until he started to win. That fellow, McClellan, that rode that white horse, was the popular General. He was very popular. He led every parade and lost every battle.

But Lincoln had to make the tough decisions. And I think this is generally true of the great men. Not only of our country, but of other countries.

Yes, sir.

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: Yes, I think we're going to come out quite well, much better than we

had anticipated, again. I'm glad we didn't put too much credibility on the line there. The office of economic opportunities budget will be not as good as the President recommended, but it will be rather substantial. The programs for education, programs for health, for pollution control, programs of aid to our cities, are substantially larger than they have been.

One thing that I sometimes feel that we forget is that you have to compare what you're doing with something else. It's like the fellow who said, "How's your wife?" He said, "compared to whom?"

Well, now how are we doing? Well, compared to what? Course we're not doing as good as we should have. There are people in this audience that witnessed me in the Senate for many years. I used to ask for very substantial appropriations -- as you know, Bernie.

They had a listing out here in Minnesota. They said, "there's no economy that could afford to pay the bill that Humphrey wants you to pay."

They had all these news stories, add them all up, every bill I co-sponsored or introduced. And when I looked I shocked myself, I must admit. But I saw a lot of things I wanted done, and I joined, and I added my name as a co-sponsor.

But I wasn't so foolish as to believe that just because you put your name on the bill that it was going to pass next year. I've been at this debating business longer than that. You have to take a longer, much longer look.

I can recall introducing civil rights legislation in 1949, and I wasn't exactly winning popularity contests. In 1964, it passed.

I remember introducing the peace corps legislation in 1959, and it was denounced in many quarters. It became a public law in 1962. It takes some time.

I really believe that we need to compare what we're doing today with what we did do. Let me give you an example: Mr. Reston, in one of his recent columns, had this little item. He hasn't always been a -- well, let me put it this way, -- he has not always applauded the administration. Yet I have a very high regard for him, may I make it quite clear.

He said that with all of this discussion about the cost of the war and so on, it ought to be noted that only four years ago the total investment of the federal government in aid to education was slightly under 4 billion dollars. Today it's 12 billion, 8 hundred million dollars.

Now I know that doesn't please some of my ADA friends. I've been there, I helped write the wildest resolutions that we ever had. Now don't tell me

about it. But I want to tell you that it is 3 times as much as they ever dreamed that they were going to get.

And as a liberal in the congress, I found out that it was alright to try to look for a mile gain. But if you could gain 100 yards, take it.

And that was the difference in what I call a pragmatic and a theoretical one. It's much better to inch along, than it is to stay back in your tent and sulk because the whole world doesn't see it the way that you do.

I've never quite believed that you've proved yourself to be either a liberal or an intellectual by being grumpy. I think you can be both and be reasonably happy on occasion. (Applause). I'm always looking over on this side of the room and I gather that's where the microphone is.

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: I really don't know. I think the best I can tell you is that the selective service law presently on the books is a compromise. It's a result of the commission's study that was made. Some really feel that a much broader base of national service should be included in our selective service or in our military universal service -- military and otherwise.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not believe that domestic service or services in the peaceful economy, the civilian economy, should be equated with military service. I do think, however, there is a role for national service for every American. I think there's a role for service -- a reason for service -- for every American.

There are those who believe in the lottery system, and there are those who believe in the lottery system, and there are those who believe in this system of exemptions. I think we have come to a kind of a reasonable compromise. I hope that it's better than the one we had. That's the best I can tell you.

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: There'll be none here today.

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: Yes sir, may I take the matter of the army first? I want to take you back again to experience that's very familiar to all of you here -- the Korean experience. Do you remember the word "gooks?" Do you remember what the people said about the Korean troops in 1950-51-52, what our officers said, what our non-coms said? Most of them weren't very good. And yet by the end of the war, some of them started to shape up, and today I think it's fair to say that the army of Korea is one of the most effective combat

armies in the world. It took time.

Do you remember what they said about the Korean government? It was corrupt, -- and it was! What they said about the Korean economy -- it was out-dated, old, exploited. And it was!

And 10 years ago -- because I've been doing a little of my research on it, by the way, I've kept every letter that I ever received during the Korean War from the people. I wanted them for a purpose of a dissertation of some fine college student that's going to be under a fellowship that I'm going to establish. I want them to study what happened to the American mind during that time.

Hundred and thousands of letters that said "Stop the war, attack China, cut the costs, stop the killing, step up the army. They were just all mixed up. People didn't quite know what they wanted. Well, now this army of the ARVN is in a very real sense, partly our product, partly a french product. This is an unbelievable kind of war. It almost goes back to the early days of our nationhood when you remember Burgoyne and Braddock, when you remember the French and the Indian wars, when the British regiments would come through, and the French and the Indians would attack them from the ambush and slaughter them.

We've had to re-learn a great deal.

The ARVN units -- and some are good, some are very good -- up in the I-corps area they are very good. Some are bad. It depends on the quality of leadership; some are very bad. They're being retrained.

Many of you have read that the ARVN, that's the regular army of Vietnam, is mainly now what they call pacification. The greatest service that the media can do is to explain to the American people what we mean by pacification.

It means to fight, to hold a hamlet. Pacification; there's nothing very pacific about that. That's the nitty gritty, ugly kind of war where you're out there trying to broaden a perimeter of defense to hold a hamlet against ambush -- guerrilla tactics, subversion, infiltration, terrorism.

But it didn't make the officer corps and it didn't make the ARVN feel very good. They thought they were being downgraded. Why were they put in so-called pacification? Because they're Vietnamese. They speak Vietnamese. Cause they know the Vietnamese, and it's a little hard for a Minnesota Swede to start talking Vietnamese right away, and to understand Vietnamese culture, even though he's a very good marine.

Now, General Abrams was sent over -- one of our best Generals -- to help retrain this army. And to retrain it, may I say, in terms of the experiences of this war. We had very good men over there that trained an army some

years back. The French had some. So this army is having to be retrained and it is. And it is better today. In fact when I was there at the inaugural, the Viet Cong -- and we have captured the documents which -- we captured 5 important documents -- that show the orders had been given, that the attacks were to start on October 29th to destroy the inaugural ceremony. Assassination teams were, by the way, were sent into Saigon to take care of some of us that came there. And their whole operation was designed by the Viet Cong and the NVA to make that inaugural a fiasco -- and a cruel one at that.

The regional forces which are the second level of the Vietnamese forces -- the regional forces along with a few ARVN battalions -- administered three decisive defeats upon the NVA, the North Vietnamese, and the Viet Cong in and around Saigon within 20 Kilometers of the city.

So they're doing better. I went down into the Delta and saw our riverine forces and saw there South Vietnamese regular marines -- their weight is about 90 pounds and they carry from 60 to 80 pounds on their back -- wading up to armpits in the mud.

Some of them are good. It depends on the quality of leadership.

What's needed in Vietnam, and what we hope will come, is that some of the corps commanders and some of the top officers that are not doing their job should be removed, and some are being removed. One hundred and thirty-two officers in the third corps area, in the last 8 months have been disciplined or removed by the then, Prime Minister Ky, and who in turn now has this responsibility.

I think it's a better army. It's not yet what we would like. It's not what they'd like. But for the first time, promotions are being made from the field. The French didn't believe in that in a colonial army. Remember, many of these officers were French trained. Remember that all of the local government in Vietnam was destroyed by French Colonialism.

Just remember this, my dear friends. You're having to re-build a whole country from the bottom up, and they're having to do it themselves. They have militia, they have regional forces and regular forces.

Now, how much have they given? On the basis of our population in comparison with theirs, they'd have an army of 8 million, under present standards. That would be if they had the same population as we have, and they had drawn from their manpower one out of every eight adults.

They've had 58 thousand casualties since 1964 -- of the regular army. That's equal to a million-three-hundred-thousand on the basis of population for the United States.

If we had been involved the same way, population wise, or if they had been involved on our population basis, they would have had a million 8

hundred thousand missing and wounded -- I should say, wounded in action -- on the basis of proportionate population.

Now we've lost about 14-15 thousand men and we've had 110 thousand casualties, approximately -- maybe a hundred in the last week, maybe 112-113 thousand. Of that, 80% of them have gone back into battle. There have been 15 thousand seriously wounded. The rest of them, or many of them, out-patients, or very briefly in a hospital.

We have a better record of casualties now, simply because we have quick evacuation. We can evacuate a wounded man from 20 to 30 minutes from any battlefield. And the rate of survival is higher than its ever been -- medical care is superb!

The ARVN doesn't have all of that. It doesn't have it, and I might add too, of course, that most of our men that cover this war from the media, television, radio, press, go with the American forces. Understandably. You're writing for the American press. What's more the food is better. The logistics are better. It's just better. And there aren't too many of them that cover the ARVN.

I'm not trying to cover up the errors of the ARVN. There's much to be improved. There has been considerable improvement. This is an army that's been fighting for years. It needs better leadership. It's beginning, at long last, to get it.

And in the next 6 months if this government can do what it says its going to do, a considerable improvement can be made.

And finally, let me point this out. The military is now being given training in the revolutionary development training school, for the first time. When I was there in Vietnam 20 months ago, so-called revolutionary development -- that is the cadres that are being trained of young man to go back into these villages and hamlets to re-establish local government and to re-establish control -- those cadres were a promise and a hope. There wasn't a single one trained in February 1966.

Today there are 30 thousand of them.

I went down to that camp and visited with Major Bay, who is the commandant or is the director of that camp. There are 9 thousand of these young men down there now, and they train on the job. They build villages. It's not just theory, it's one of the greatest training courses I've ever known or ever seen, and I'm hoping that some of the media will bring Major Bay to the United States to teach our teachers how to teach.

It's fantastic what he's been able to do.

Now, what are they going to do in that training course now? They're

taking the province chiefs, they're taking the generals and the colonels, all the way down to the non-commissioned officers, and they're putting them through revolutionary development training, too. Because it doesn't do any good to have an officer elite corps that's on one wave length philosophically, politically, and have the revolutionary development cadre on another one.

Cause as Major Bay said to me -- I said -- "What are your main problems?" He said, "Communist attack and corruption."

And one of the reporters said, "Well, Mr. Vice President, what do you have to say about that, when you heard about the corruption he faces?"

I say my answer is: that now we know the reason we're here, that what we're doing here is a success, because a man that can be in his position and openly stand up before a free press, and say that one of the problems in his country is corruption, and pinpoint it on the poor commanders and the province chiefs, and still be on the job; it indicates to me that there's a degree of freedom in South Vietnam and responsibility that some of us didn't know was there.

And you'll be happy to know that since then, one of those corps commanders has been removed, and one of the province chiefs has been sentenced to execution. And right away, some of our good Americans said, "don't you think that that's a rather severe penalty." You know, we're not for all that, -- sometimes!"

The Koreans have a better way of doing it, from their point of view. Have you heard about how they operate? They're in the II Corps area; they don't have too much trouble with the Viet Cong. Theirs is not to reason why; the Viet Cong, but to die. Bang! And that's what they do to them. There isn't any of this business.

Now I'm not advocating it, I'm just telling you. I'm a reporter, not an editor. (laughter)

Question: (Inaudible)

V.P.: I don't know just which ones that would be. Would you enlighten me? (Inaudible.)

The Soviet Union? We're not sending them any aid that I know of. I hope neither by word nor deed, but we do seek to have friendly relations as best we can with the Soviet Union.

You see, this is a very complex world we live in, it isn't all black and white, there are shades of grey. And we don't think that the best way to

promote world peace is to have an open confrontation with the Soviet Union. We just don't believe that.

We do know that they have inter-continental ballistic missiles; we do know that they have massive power. They know that we can destroy them, and they have massive power. They know that we can destroy them, and they know that they can destroy a good deal of us. The idea is to try to prevent that.

Any fool can get this world into a world war. It's statesmanship that keeps it out of it. And we're going to try to use, as best we can, our intelligence and our wisdom, whatever we have, and judgment, to prevent that confrontation.

We're not engaging in any kind of trade with the Soviet Union which amplifies its military power, and it's about time the American people grew up to the fact that the Soviet Union doesn't need a lot of our technical assistance. It happens to be the second wealthiest nation on the face of the earth. It is without a doubt the second most powerful nation on the face of the earth. It has the second highest per-capita income on the face of the earth, and it is just about one of the most industrialized nations on the face of the earth. It has technicians and scientists by the thousands to export -- and there's very little that we can tell them. They're a nuclear power and a thermo nuclear power, and they're, if not ahead of us, at least a tie with us in the space race.

So let's quit pretending that somehow or another that we're going to amplify or magnify their strength by what little we may be doing with them, by trying to sell them some apples or some wheat or by trying to sell them some textiles or some minor little piece of farm machinery.

They are a competent, able people. Our desire is to try to live in peace with them. Our desire is also to try to get them to use their good offices and their sense of good judgment to bring this war to a halt. And we use every means that we have at our command to impress that upon them.

I spent some four hours in conference with Mr. Kosygin, myself. The President of the United States spent much more time with him at Glassboro. We haven't been successful. Whether or not we will succeed in our efforts, I don't know. But I do know this, that we spent years trying to talk about a test ban treaty, and then one day they decided "okay." I do know that we spent months talking to them about doing something about the Berlin Air Lift and lifting the siege of Berlin, and we didn't get anyplace. And one day, we did.

I think that you've just got to pursue that course, carefully, meticulously, cautiously, with every means at your command, but not at any time doing anything, if you can help it, that will trigger any major confrontation between ourselves and the Soviet Union. That's why we're doing what we do.

Now we may be in error. This is a debatable point. I know people have strong feelings about this. But many of our most astute observers in the private life of our nation and government life feel that the way that we're

acting with the Soviet Union now is -- by the way, we're producing some results. I might add, that despite all the criticisms that have been made, we've had more agreements with the Soviet Union in the last few years that I really think are helpful than at any time: the Consular Agreement, the Civil Air Agreement, the expansion of the cultural exchange, and the renewal of the agreement, the space treaty, and the agreement with the Soviet Union on the tabling of the non-proliferation nuclear treaty.

Now that's quite an accomplishment, despite what some people say that the war in Vietnam has ruptured our relations with the Soviet Union. If that's a rupture, then it's a strange kind of medical diagnosis. I happen to think that the Soviet Union has its stakes in Vietnam. It's a Communist country. Let's quit kidding ourselves; it's not a Capitalist country. They'd like nothing better than to have the world Communized. I'd like nothing better than to have it non-Communized.

We ought to understand each other. I believe in a little competition. I don't believe that just because they say it ought to be Communist, that we ought to stand in fear. I report and retort to them, "you're wrong. It ought not to be." But if you have to have a piece of it Communist -- and we have a piece of the world that's not -- and other people are free and independent, we don't intend to let you run over the world. They've learned that lesson. They learned it in this hemisphere: they learned it in Berlin; they learned it in Eastern Europe. Central Europe, and I think they're a rather prudent and responsible nation today.

They understand the dangers of power.

May I come back to one thing that I forgot, because the gentleman may think I tried to evade his question -- or to avoid it. The question was asked a little while ago about the political developments in Vietnam. I've answered something about the ARVN. I tried to make it clear that it's not as good as we'd like, but there's improvement. I'd like to make the same thing clear in reference to government.

Now let's level with each other. I was in Vietnam in Sept. 1966. I met the President of the United States in Los Angeles on his return from Honolulu after the Honolulu Conference, after Mr. Ky had become Prime Minister through a coup. Not through the election process. Our government asked -- our President asked -- Mr. Chou (then the Chief of State, The Chairman of the military directorate) and Prime Minister Ky, the key man of the government -- asked these two men at Honolulu to commit themselves to an election of a constituent assembly for the purpose of writing a constitution to develop a representative government. They committed it.

Naturally, there was doubt; I don't blame anybody for being suspicious and cynical. There wasn't anything to indicate that anybody would follow through. When I met with President Johnson, he said to me, "Mr. Vice President, I do not send you to Vietnam as a military expert." My experience in the

military was, I was the Boy Scout leader for troop number 6 in Huron, South Dakota. I don't claim to be any great militarist. But I have been in the public eye for a long time. He said, "I want to talk to you about how you might visit with.....September, 1966. With a high percentage of the eligible vote participating -- over 80%.

And our most caustic critics, the free press of the world, said that it was a reasonably fair election. I think it could be -- on standards that we have seen some places in the United States. Or a little better!

It was a reasonably good election. And in a country terrorized, that was a good result. Then what was the next thing that was said? Well then I read it, and I heard it by people -- some of them had never been there -- and others who had been there and had good reason to be suspicious. They said "well, they got an elected Constituent Assembly, but it has such divisions it'll never be able to act."

But, you know, it debated, and then people said "look, they're fighting, they're debating." Well, that's the whole idea, isn't it, of a free election? So they debated, and then the word came out: "But they'll never be able to agree on a constitution," but they did. And then the next word was now that they've agreed on it, the military directorate has the power to veto it, and the military directorate will never accept it. But it did. And then the next thing was "ya, but the Military Directorate will set the election laws, and that will vitiate! But they didn't. The Constituent Assembly set the election laws, the elected Constituent Assembly. And then the next thing they said, "but the Constituent Assembly will be dissolved," but it wasn't. It stayed on as a temporary parliament.

And then it was said, "Yes, but the elections for president will be a fraud and a hoax in quotes -- front page. I read it. I think it was printed out here, Bernie. I know it was printed in Washington.

But the interesting thing was that it wasn't a fraud and a hoax. It wasn't as good as you would have liked, it wasn't an election like you would have had in maybe Waterloo, Iowa, but it could have been in some wards and some cities that I know of, (laughter) but a reasonably good election.

And then a senate was elected of 60 members. And how many candidates were here? Well, there was over 180 candidates for the 60 members. That's pretty good. And then there was a House of Representatives; a lower house elected -- over 100 members, and there were almost 500 candidates. That was pretty good. I met with these people when I was in Vietnam this year.

In the twenty months period, five elections -- village and hamlet elections-- in over three-fourths of the villages and hamlets of Vietnam. Now if you're going to say to me, as you have every right to, "well, there was a crook there, and there were some boats stolen there, and there was some there", I can remind you that that's happened in every country that the world has ever known that's had free elections. And more importantly, a course, corruption

has been a pattern of the day in many of these countries.

But by any reasonable standard, it was a good political process. The important thing is that it is an elective government, and I know of no Communist state that has an elective government.

And I suggest as I said earlier, compared to what? Compared to North Vietnam. When did this fellow Ho Chi Minh become a social worker and philosopher as he's painted by some people? Just because he's got a nice white beard, my grandfather had one too, but that didn't make him a social worker. He was a tough Norwegian.

I submit that they are beginnings of representative government. As a matter of fact, my fellow Americans, we may have to coax these people into something that's rather unmanageable. It's a little difficult to get any cooperation between the legislative and the executive branch in Washington. And the biggest problem that this government is going to face in the foreseeable future is how to keep the executive branch and the legislative branch working together for a policy and approgram in Vietnam. They've had no experience, there are no real political parties, there's no sense of political discipline.

I spent hours with Mr. Chou and Mr. Ky on this subject, and I'll let you in on a secret. I talked to Mr. Ky about how to be Vice President (laughter).

I'm going to quit. I'm not ahead, but I'm going to quit. I want to thank you very much for giving me this platform for today. And, can I just say in the greatest sincerity, that I'm very normal, I'm like most anybody else. When you say nice things, I think you're great -- your judgment is superb. When occasionally you work me over, I have doubts.

But I agree with Jefferson in that if you have to make a choice, it might be better to have a free press and no government, rather than a government and no free press.

I do appeal to you in the same vain that you appeal to me, not in criticism, but in fellowship.

There's a great deal of difference between freedom and license; there's a great deal of difference between irresponsibility and responsibility. I think most everybody that has a job to do in this country is responsible -- tries to be.

I know you want me to be responsible. Sometimes I made some mistakes that I deeply regret. I said things that I shouldn't have said. I've done things that I shouldn't have done. I've hurt people when I shouldn't have hurt them. This is human. Sorry, you don't elect saints, and I haven't seen any on either ticket, in case you're interested. Some have described

as such, but I haven't seen them.

Our press is the same way. I think that most people in the press of America, the media, not just the press, are deeply concerned about our country. We have different points of view, and you have an obligation to express them. A good, hard debate is the very life-blood in a free society -- discussion and debate and soul dissent. But let me say that I think it's possible to disagree without being too disagreeable. I think one of the first attributes of a college educated man ought to be good manners.

I can surely say this, that for a young man or woman that's never had a chance, that's been denied an education, that's had to live in poverty, that's been the victim of discrimination, that has been shoved aside and pushed around -- if that person abuses me, insults me, I say well maybe it's just a kind of way of redressing the balance. You can sort of forgive them. But for the person that's had the chance for a good home, a good community, a good job, a good education, every advantage that this nation has to offer, I think that person has a special obligation to dissent with distinction, if he wishes to dissent. To do it as a gentleman or as a lady; to do it as a student, and not to do it will ill manners or in an ugly or unsavory way. Because to do so really destroys the whole validity of dissent, weakens the case.

Now I shouldn't be here trying to advise people how to best oppose this. But I want to say this, I don't think it helps when you call people "murderers," or when you use ugly, angry words. I don't think people that disagree with us are any less patriotic. I think they may be wrong, that's my point of view. I think that what we're doing is right.

I believe in the right to disagree, and I believe in the right to advocate. And I hope that those who think that when we advocate -- I hope that those who say about us when we advocate -- that we're trying to hush dissent, will see that that's not the case.

You know, I've been at this as you have, this business of public information. You have a point of view, so do I. Lets go to it. But I want my chance too. Every man's chance. I think I have the right to defend the proposition of my government. I think you have the right, if you wish, to deny, to debate, to dissent from the proposition of that government.

But I must say in every case we have a special obligation to be responsible, we have a special obligation to offer an alternative. The real dissenter that really serves the cause of freedom, he is not only the man that points out how wrong you are, but also puts up some guideposts and signs as to the right direction to take. Then it adds up to a constructive policy. Thank you very very much.



Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



www.mnhs.org