

Mr Richard Jeffries
President, Student Board
of Governors.

NOTES

President of Creighton
Father Sean

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY

OMAHA, NEBRASKA

FEBRUARY 2, 1968

Invite
8 to 7

Breaking newsweek

As a "child of the prairie" myself, let me begin by saying that I applaud Mr. Schepers' recent letter to Newsweek. You may have noticed that he had occasion not only to criticize the condescension of a polished Eastern lawyer who visited here recently, but also minimized the size of his audience.

Let each of the 5 thousand persons here today know that the record stands corrected. !

In all fairness, I should say that Mr. Schepers was as much concerned with the coverage Creighton students received in the press as he was with Mr. Nixon. He has my fullest sympathy on both counts.

My own attitude toward the press fluctuates, but I generally take my guidance from Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"The press is the best instrument for enlightening the mind of man, and improving him as a rational, moral, and social being."

He also said:

"The man who never looks into a newspaper is better informed than he that reads them, in as much as he who knows nothing is nearer the truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors."

Taken together, I think those sentiments are an authoritative and consistent statement of the value of the press in American democracy.

Let me also say that I think Newsweek is a truly outstanding publication. It's article on poverty, discrimination, and urban blight in America was, for instance, journalism at its very best. !

I am here today to talk with you, not to you.

I shall answer your questions as well as I can.

∟ That is a promise I issue with considerable humility, because there are some complicated questions before this nation now.

∟ I think we know pretty well what we are for and against in principle. And those principles can guide us both at home and abroad.

Social injustice: We oppose it.

Discrimination: We oppose it.

Exploitation: We oppose it.

Full opportunity for every man, woman and child:

We support it.

Self-determination: We support it.

National development: We support it.

National security: We support it.

Peace: We seek it.

That is what mankind everywhere wants. Every human being on this earth seeks to determine his own destiny in his own way -- free from coercion and fear, tyranny and want.

The search for that right and that freedom is the great story of this last third of the 20th century.

∠ It is being written in the new nations. It is being written in the cities and towns of America.

∠ And we, as the richest, the strongest, the most powerful nation on this planet, can give leadership... can reach out to help bring self-determination and the right to choose to a greater part of that human family.

∠ Or we can turn selfishly inward...try to forget others...leave this country and the world divided between rich and poor...healthy and sick...hopeful and despairing... peaceful and seething...threatening and threatened.

I think, I know which way we are moving, because I have talked to a lot of young Americans -- not only people like you, who will assume roles of leadership in our society with the best education available...not only the Peace Corps volunteers, the VISTA volunteers, and the

Teacher Corps volunteers...but disadvantaged young people
in Job Corps camps, in the Neighborhood Youth Corps
and on city streets.

The quest is always the same -- a better America,
a safer world.

But how?

We have the power.

We have the material plenty.

We have the most educated population in the world.

But we
~~We~~ have the will?

If this nation cannot solve its problems at home...
if it cannot help create conditions for a stable and lasting
peace in this world...what nation can?

But how do we do it? I hope that can be the focus
of our discussion today.

#

APPEARANCE OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

AT CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY

February 2, 1968

Mr. Humphrey:

Thank you. Thank you very much. My thanks to you, Mr. Jeffries, the President of the Student Board of Governors. Wherever I go I am always acknowledging Presidents. Don't you have any Vice Presidents around here? Father Linn, members of the panel, members of the student governing board, faculty and students and our fellow Americans and friends. I want to make one or two observations for just a moment. This is a question and answer period. I think that every young American ought to have a right to take a good bite at a live public servant and I thought I would come out and offer myself as a sacrifice, but I was really flattered into coming here, because the letter that I received from Mr. Richard Jeffries read as follows: "On behalf of the student body of Creighton University I would like to cordially invite you to speak on our campus." Well, we get about 100 invitations a day and that first sentence didn't shake me and it didn't really move me to be quite frank about it, even though I appreciated it. And then I read paragraph two. "The Student Board of Governors has embarked on a lecture series designed to expose our student body to outstanding American intellectuals and statesmen." And he still said "Your appearance would be the highlight of the series." Well, now, Adlai Stevenson used to say, "Flattery is all right if you don't inhale it", but when I read that second paragraph I took 10 deep breaths and said "yes". And I do want to express my thanks to Mr. Jeffries. I doubt that you will ever be elected to anything again after this demonstration of poor judgment, but at least you have become President of something. You know these days if you are in public life and happen to be part of the administration, you are not sure you are going to get invited to anyplace by anybody for anything. And if you do you are not sure what the reception will be like. I was reminded of a story the other day about these invitations. Knowing when you read the public

opinion polls what is happening to you and then you read all about yourself and what's happening to you and how unpopular you may be and the trouble you may be in. It's sort of like that industrialist that, I believe he was down here in Omaha and became very ill and went off to the hospital and was there for a week and nobody wrote to him nobody talked to him, nobody called him, didn't send any letter, didn't get any cards, didn't get any flowers. It went into the second week and the same conditions prevailed. Finally the local union got together and the Executive Board had a meeting and they considered the situation of their boss and a resolution was adopted which was subsequently sent to the hospital, affixed to a card and the resolution said as follows: "The Executive Board of Local 100 has met and duly considered your situation and condition and by a vote of 8 to 7 we wish you a speedy recovery. I was told by Mr. Jeffries that it was about that way here. And I want to thank the eight. It was most appreciated. I have been reading national publications getting ready for this day and I am very happy to see one of the leading correspondents of the nation, Mr. Schepers, here today. I was talking to my friend, Mr. Nixon, and he said he wanted me to bring you his greetings. I read that recent letter and some of you may have noticed that Mr. Schepers took some note of the recent discussions here on the campus. He criticized the condescension on the campus, he criticized the condescension of a polished eastern lawyer but what he did more importantly was to minimize the size of the audience. Well, I want the press to know how grateful I am for the 5,000 persons who have turned out here today. I have found that if you start with a large figure that when they start to hammer it down you come out a little bit better than you should have. In all fairness I should say that our friend, Mr. Schepers, was as much concerned about the coverage that Creighton students received

in the press as he was about the gentlemen he wrote about. Now, my own attitude towards the press, I think you ought to know it fluctuates a bit. I sort of take the Jeffersonian attitude. Thomas Jefferson had some comments about almost everything and he said of the press that it is the best instrument for enlightening the mind of man and improving him as a rational, moral and social being and then just to prove to you that men in his day were a bit inconsistent too, he said at another time that a man who never looks into a newspaper is better informed than he that reads it. Inasmuch as he who knows nothing is nearer the truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors. Now, that was Jefferson, that wasn't Humphrey, I want you fellows of the press to know. He is one of the patron saints of our democracy, one of the founding fathers, so let me also say that I, so there will be no doubt about it, I have enough trouble with these daily newspapers and weekly magazines that I think Newsweek is truly an outstanding publication. In fact, its article on poverty of recent date discrimination and the urban blight was some of the best example of the finest journalism and scholarship. Well, I am here to talk to you about things more important than these casual observations. I want to talk with you, I don't want to talk to you, down to you, or at you, I want to visit and I would like to be able to do what I can in answering your questions, at least to the limit of my ability. Now, I know there are many questions that confront you and I would like to set a frame of reference for our discussion today, however, you are at liberty to go as far afield as you would like may I say to the panelists and I intend to get to the audience too. I don't want any rigged shows, even though we have never been together and I haven't the slightest idea what they

are going to do to me. I haven't even as yet looked over their political pedigree. But looking on short glance, it looks fair, I would say. I think that it looks fairly well balanced. I think we, as Americans know pretty well what we are for and what we are against in principle. What we are for and what we are against in principle does not always come out in fact. And I think that we also know that those principles can guide us, both at home and abroad. And in the last three months, it has been my privilege to represent our country on three continents, to have been to some 20 countries, to have visited over 50 of the major American cities. Mrs. Humphrey and I traveled together to most of these faraway places. We have been with the rich and with the poor. We have been in the teeming and glittering cities and we have been in the hovels of the slums. We have been in the bush country of Africa and in the great capital cities. We have been with young people, the old, the sick, and the well. Since I have been Vice President of the United States, I have been to over 550 American communities. I have traveled to 4 continents and have visited over 35 countries. And these visits are not merely perfunctory. They are hard working, deep probing visits. For the purpose of learning and for the purpose of trying to convey what our country stands for. Lincoln once said that it was the last best hope of earth. He also said that we will either meanly lose it or nobly save it. Those are eternal and mortal words. Because every generation has to make that decision. There is no finality to what will happen to us. We are the stewards of our own destiny. Now, I said there are certain principles that guide us. And one principle I think we ought to keep in mind

in terms of the world in which we live, since this world is very small, very intimate, now, that is what communication has done to you, that is what science and technology has done to you. Fifty years it might have been the size of a basketball, today it is like a marble. You can travel from Chicago to London in 1940. Put it this way, in 1940 from Chicago to London took longer than from Chicago to Saigon in 1966, 67. This world is being constricted and with the supersonic transport which will soon be a fact it will again even be that much more closely knit. I can say to the young people in this audience that what happens in the middle East, which I think is the real danger spot of the world in the next year, two years, few months, or whatever it may happen what happens in the Middle East will have more effect on your lives than anything that is going to happen in the Middle West. Your neighborhood is no longer just Omaha, Nebraska, or the United States. Your neighborhood is the entire world and there is no way you can isolate yourself from it if you would like. There are some that say, stop the world, I want to get off. Well, I think of a few I would like to let off, but I can't stop the world, nor can you. There will be a few that will leave this terrestrial globe in the next five years, but they will go to the moon and I don't know whether they will find it any better there or not, but they will return too, so the simple fact of our time and our life is that you are stuck with what you have and you gotta make the most of it the best of it and there isn't any way at all that you can pretend that what happened someplace else is not your business, because it is forced upon you there is no place to hide in the space age. There is no place that is safe in

the nuclear age. There is no way that you can build a world community unless it is built on law and order and respect for individuality, that is, build a world community that is safe and yet at this time with these known scientific technological and political facts as obvious as your own face and your own body itself there is yet growing within America a spirit of withdrawal a neo-isolationism a kind of forboding and feeling that it shouldn't be, that we ought to get away from it all and what a tragedy it would be if that were to become the policy the accepted standard. Now some of the other principles I think that we ought to understand that the country stands for, even if it doesn't always fulfill them. It is our national moral commitment, social injustice. No nation has ever taken such a firm stand against it. We oppose it. Discrimination, segregation It has been legally abolished. In practice. Yet to be abolished. Exploitation, we oppose it. Full opportunity for every man, women and child. As a principle we embrace it. Full opportunity for every kan, woman and child. As a principle we embrace it, we support it. Self determination for an individual to be himself. As Thomas Wolfe, the poet, put it, "For whatever it be, every man his chance. Whatever his manhood or his vision can be, every man his chance." That's self-determination. And self determination of nations too. National development, we support it at home and abroad. National security, we support it at home and abroad. Peace, which is the main business of mankind. We seek it relentlessly, pursue it as we pursue truth itself. Now these things that I talk about, this is what mankind wants. This is what you find wherever you go. This is not unique to Americans. Every human being on this earth seeks to determine his own destiny in his own way. He would like to be free from coercion, tyranny and want. The search for that right and that freedom is the great story of the

last third of the twentieth century. This is the overriding concern of mankind. The search for freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom from tyranny. All of this is being written in the new nations as they struggle to their own independence and self determination and it is being written in the cities and towns of America as millions of our fellow Americans are asking to become participating citizens in this great republic of ours. And we as the richest and the strongest and the most powerful nation on this planet have an obligation. We can give leadership, we can reach out to help bring self determination and the right to choose to a greater part of the human family. And we can do this without imposing our will. As John Kennedy once said, "We seek to make this world safe for diversity." We don't seek to have the world stamped "Made in the U.S.A." But we do not seek to have a world either that has the boot stamp and the heel of the dictator, of the oppressor. I say we can offer leadership for this better way or as I said a few moments earlier, we cannot turn selfishly inward, trying to forget all others, leave this country and the world divided between the rich and the poor, the healthy and the sick, the hopeful and the despairing, the peaceful and the seething, the threatening and the threatened. I have a feeling I know what way you are moving, because I talk to a lot of young Americans, and there are all kinds of young Americans. Some that are more quiet than others. Some that demonstrate. Some that don't. Some that demonstrate with their feet. Some that demonstrate with their deeds. All kinds. And all kinds are needed. I know that some of you will assume great roles in our country. I have talked with Peace Corp volunteers, VISTA Volunteers, Teacher

Corp volunteers and I know that they are concerned of people, but I have also talked with the disadvantaged young people in the Job Corps, in the neighborhood Youth Corps and on the city streets and I know that these young people, too, want a better life. The quest is always the same, a better America, a safer world. But the questions come up, how? Thomas Huxley once said, "A great nation is not judged by its wealth or its power, or even its size. But the question is, "What will you do with these things. What will we do with this wealth which is incredible in the world of the poor. And we live in the world of the poor. What will we do with this power, a power which imposes upon the leaders of this country not the acquisition of more power, but how to restrain what power we have and the use of it. We have material plenty. We have the most educated population in the world. There are more young people in American Universities today than in all the rest of the world put together. We are blessed, blessed, blessed with wealth, with power, with affluence, with education, with science, with technology, and so I put it this way. If this nation can't solve its problems here at home, what makes you think anybody can do it anyplace else. If we can't conquer poverty in our own midst, what makes you think there is any hope for Africa or Asia. If with our wealth, our knowhow, our technology, our money, our food, our education, if we can't help people lift themselves to a position of dignity and self respect what makes you think it can be done in India or on a subcontinent, or in Sub-Sahara Africa, where we have just recently been. I'll put it another way. If we with what we have cannot help people gain self determination in this world, who do you think will. If we can't help create the conditions for a just and enduring peace, who do you think can?

If we haven't the stamina, moral and physical, in terms of physical strength, as well as moral purpose to prevent banditry, violence, aggression, who do you think can or will? This nation produced 40% of everything that was produced in the world last year. This one American, and as I have told you already, there are more people in our institutions of higher learning than all the rest of the world put together. The technological gap is a fact of life even with Western Europe itself. But how are we going to do what needs to be done? I think we have, as the President put it the other day, we have the capacity, we have the ability, we have the resources, but the question for this generation and for mine too, is one: "Do we have the will?" "Do we have the purpose?"

You know the late and beloved Pope John XXIII said, "Where there is constant want there is no peace". Pope Paul, whom I visited with only a few months ago said in his famous encyclical of which he gave me an autographed copy, one of the originals, he said: "Development is the new name for peace", and yet at the very time that we are saying that there are people in this country that say cut back on foreign aid. Cut back on the war on hunger, and at the very time that we know that these are the facts of life, there are people that think that the way that you get peace is just shouting for it. Blessed are the peace makers, not the talkers, or the walkers, but the makers and the making of peace is the most difficult business in the world. It is not for the timid, but the brave. It is not for the passive, but the active. Peace is not negative, but positive. And it is made through unbelievable sacrifice.

Sometimes it is even made in death itself. I think that we helped make the peace when we resisted Hitler. I think we helped make the peace when we stood firm in Berlin and Iran and in Greece and in Turkey and even in Korea. Sometimes the cause of peace requires the supreme sacrifice. And it also requires a love of mankind. A willingness to share, give, and a willingness to understand, but also again I quote this famous man. I guess I am filled with his life, because just recently we re-dedicated the Ford Theatre in Washington where the beloved great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, was struck down by the assassin's bullet. We opened that theatre again as a living memory to the memory of this man at a time which is most appropriate. Lincoln said, you know, "With malice toward none." I think we can accept that. "And with charity for all" I hope we can accept that. But then came the lines that separate men of character and decision. "But with firmness in the right". As God gives us to see the right. You see that is the difference. No man believes more fully and more firmly in the right of discussion, debate and dissent than the man that is speaking to you. My life has been filled with it. But also there is another word that comes in democracy. Not only debate, discussion and dissent, and dialogue, but decision and somewhere along the line, you have to make decisions and that is when you take on the mantle of responsibility. That is when the luxury of talk evaporates and the burden of duty becomes your load. All right, my fellow students let's go to it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Vice President: In the context of your opening remarks, would you care to comment on both our present position and our projected future involvement in Southeast Asia, specifically Viet Nam. In light of the continued adverse pressure of world opinion, both friendly and neutral, the existence of the seemingly intemperate and sometimes unstable government in South Viet Nam, to whose support we are committed and the deep divisions within American society itself as to the moral and political justifications for the war.

Well, that is a very concise and factual statement of the situation as it now prevails. That is why the decisions relating to this are so difficult and complicated and painful. Let me just pick up piece by piece. I don't remember exactly the full sequence, but about the government that is there. I recognize that this government has its limitations. I know the leaders of the government, but it is an elected government. And it was elected in a free election with hundreds and hundreds of Americans, reporters and others observing it with a very critical and caustic eye and they could get very little to write about except that it had here and there spots of corruption. I might say that you can get good stories like that out of the United States. We are not without stain, and we have been at this business for 200 years. But by and large, it was a reasonably good election. There were several candidates for President and they openly campaigned and what is more important there was no censorship during the campaign and equally important, the government offices paid the money to the opposition for the campaign. Something we have been talking

about in this country, how to finance campaigns. There were for every seat in the assembly seven contestants. Seven for every one in the lower house. And six for every one in the upper house. And the quality of the people elected to the two houses of Congress is unusually high. Scholars, business leaders, labor people men of different faiths, very, very able people. The future of this government one cannot predict, except to hope that through the process of election that there will be a greater support for the government. It was a risk. We urged that there will be a greater support for the government. It was a risk. We urged upon the military directorate, upon the people of Viet Nam that they have elections during a war. No other country under attack or under a siege has had elections during a war, save our own, in the war between the states. No country in Europe with highly sophisticated societies, and every election district was hotly contested not merely by opposition candidates, but by the terrorists of the Viet Cong. Over 600 people were murdered by terrorists in the recent presidential election and I didn't see many people in America who love freedom who believe, as they say in democracy, raise their voices at all in shouting shame, shame, and yet as those people went to those ballot boxes they were under threat of death. Many candidates were kidnapped and seven were assassinated, before they ever had a chance to vote for them. But the government is there and it is an elected government, and may I say as compared to North Viet Nam, when did they have an election? So everything is in terms of options and alternatives. It isn't a matter of comparing that government against perfection. How does it rate in terms of the democratic

experience of other countries in the area, particularly in that divided peninsula. I'll let you make up your mind. Now, insofar as our commitment in this area,,we are not in Viet Nam, my fellow Americans, simply because of South Viet Nam, even though wisely or unwisely, we made a treaty commitment. It wasn't President Johnson that made it. It was made a long time ago and it is a treaty commitment that has been honored by four Presidents of the United States. Now you can say, as many do, we shouldn't have done it. All the should have people, all these Monday morning quarterbacks, but I was in the Senate when we voted for that treaty and only two people voted against it. And the Majority Leader of the United States Senate was one of the signatories to it. And mark my words, if the American word and the American signature on a treaty means nothing these days, then there is no hope for peace. I just had a meeting yesterday morning with the major of West Berlin. What do you think the people of West Berlin would think if we reneged on our commitments someplace else in the world? What do you think the Communists would think? If we said, "Well, this treaty we don't like." We pick and choose. Who would know which treaty was to be fulfilled? Nothing could be more dangerous to the piece of the world than the uncertainty as to what we meant. It was said after World War II that had Hitler known what we would have done, he might never have started. That's what we were told. And it was even said in World War I that had the Kaiser really known and believed that America might have come in with its power he might never have marched. I think it is fair for the students of history to at least examine the records of the post war years of World War I

in the 1930's before Hitler started his march. Most of the scholars said then and now, whether they are right or wrong, that is your decision. They said then that had Hitler been stopped when he sought to fortify the Rhineland maybe it never would have happened. Four times Hitler's general staff said "You mustn't do this, it's too dangerous" and he said "The democracies are weak. The democracies have no courage, the democracies have no will. They will not resist". And he marched and marched and marched and we stood and stood and stood and backed up and Mr. Chamberlain said when he went to Czechoslovakia, "These are a strange people in a distant place and I bring you back peace in our time". Inside of 16 months, there was world war. Now maybe this isn't the same picture today, but I have a feeling out of history that aggression has a continuity of pattern. The appetite of an aggressor has never been satisfied until it has been stopped. And some people believe as I do, that we shouldn't have Armageddon by the installment plan. That it is much better to take your stand early. Now, I have been very intrigued by the thoughts of some and the expressed word of some. One of the most famous columnists in America said that if we are going to take our stand in Asia we ought to do it in Australia. Well, I talked to the Australians about that. They said "Do you mind if we could move it out just a little ways from us?" What makes it more moral to take the stand in Australia than it does in Southeast Asia? Is it because they are white? Anglo Saxon? No, we are in Southeast Asia today because of treaty commitment, yes. We are also there, may I say, because we know what would happen to the millions of people in South Viet Nam today

if there were to be overwhelmed and if you don't believe so, take a look at what's happening right now in all the villages and the cities. The unbelievable carnage and terrorism, which all too often has not been the subject of discussion in America with the 50,000 or more who have been murdered in cold blood, innocent victims not men in uniform, but we are there in Southeast Asia because of our own national interest as well. 250 million people, vast resources, the 5th largest nation in the world, is Indonesia. I was there three months ago, Two years ago Indonesia was a Communist captive. Two years ago Sukarno was in full charge. He exploited and adulterated and corrupted his people and his nation and the P.K.I., the puppets of the Communist Party at Peiping, China, were in complete control. They miscalculated. They tried to rid the few generals who were left that might resist and there was an uprising and why? Well, I want to say first of all, the Indonesians had fought bravely for their own independence and freedom. I do not want my words to be interpreted that we did anything for them overtly, because we didn't. But I will tell you this, that they know and they have said that the reason that they had reason to believe that they could succeed was because we were in Southeast Asia in Viet Nam. That American power had been committed. They know that the future was in their hands now. It could be a future for free peoples and free nations. And this is what every leader says in Asia of the free countries of Asia, including the Prime Minister of Japan. What you generally read about him is the demonstrations of the leftists. But Prime Minister Sato recently said that the hope of free Asia is in the outcome of the struggle in Viet Nam and that America gives free Asia a chance to be free. This is what Lee of Singapore has said, who has been no particular friend of the United States. This is what Nay Win of Burma has said. This is what all the

non-Communist leaders have said. Not one has recommended our withdrawal. The people who are closest to the fire do not recommend it. And I have always been intrigued, and I will close on this point, how some people in America feel that it is perfectly all right for every American to die for Berlin, and we are committed to it, don't kid yourself, we are, and for a long time, and many of those today that preached peace, preached that we shouldn't be in Viet Nam, don't say a word about the fact that we might have to lay down every life in a terrible nuclear holocaust because of the developments in Europe. But those same ones say you ought not to be in Southeast Asia. It is my view that the danger of war in Western Europe is very remote, very remote, and the main reason is, the Soviet Union has found that it is far too risky a business to have a nuclear confrontation in Western Europe with the United States of America and its allies, and they have become a more responsible power because we have sought to contain them without being belligerent. We hope that somehow or other we can have the same results in Asia. I think you do know that the last two wars in which America has been involved started in Asia. Half of the population of the world is to be found more of that in Asia. We are a Pacific power. We have to be concerned about Asia. Our national interest is involved in Asia and the shield of peace in this world today is the integrity of the American commitment. On the day that that integrity is violated, there is no peace, there is no hope. That is my view. Thank you.

Mr. Vice President: Would you please comment on the existing credibility gap and its effect on domestic and foreign support of administrative policy.

I have never been able to understand what this so-called credibility gap talk is all about. There is always a danger in being a prophet. Many times people will say "I think something is going to happen and it doesn't and somebody picks it up right away and says credibility gap. I'll tell you about a little credibility gap that I had the other day. I was up in Minneapolis I spoke to the Labor Movement of my state. There were 1100 registered participants. They were in a hall something like this only they had another banquet hall and they opened it up and had closed circuit television. The St. Paul Pioneer Press said: "The Vice President of the United States today addressed 11, addressed more than a 1,000 is what they put, more than a 1,000 labor leaders of Minnesota and Western Wisconsin. He was greeted by approximately 75 pickets. That was a reasonably accurate story. The morning Minneapolis Tribune said: "The Vice President of the United States addressed approximately 850 labor leaders and he was greeted by 125 pickets". The Minneapolis Star in the afternoon said: "The Vice President of the United States addressed 650 labor leaders and he was greeted by 140 pickets" and the Washington Post said "The Vice President of the United States was addressed an audience of approximately 500 labor leaders and he was greeted by approximately 200 pickets." There is a credibility gap. I agree with you. That is a real credibility gap. I am sure that you have a school of journalism and this is a case study for you.

I won't say whether the speech was good or bad, I was just betting at the statistics for a while. The first account was accurate; it got a little less accurate as it went along, but I don't blame anybody. There were a lot of re-writes. And you never can tell what the views of people are on re-writes. But the so-called credibility gap is a phrase that has been taken up that indicates that somebody is deliberately deceiving the American people. That is not the case. There are times, for example, that you predict, that the President has to offer a budget message. He has to prepare that budget for fiscal 1969. He started 6 months ahead of time. We were preparing the budget that the President presented last week last September and we have to make projections in that budget. We even have to project what the crops will look like, because we have an item in that budget for the Department of Agriculture, and if you can control what is going to happen in rural America in terms of crops, well, you qualify for one of the real prophets. So when the budget comes down and we find out at the end of the year that you need a supplemental because the domestic budget has been either cut or increased or the problems that we have have changed. Somebody said they didn't tell us the truth. There was a credibility gap. Somebody else says, "Well, you didn't give us the right figures on how much it was going to cost in Viet Nam." We don't know how much it's going to cost in Viet Nam. We have to make estimates. We can't tell you what the enemy is going to do in Viet Nam. We don't know how long the war is going to last. There is one thing I am sure of. It will last a lot longer if we keep thinking we are going to lose it. But we can't predict for sure. We have to make estimates, and the estimates are what the Congress has to deal with, and there has never yet ever been an estimate that came out perfectly, so somebody says there is a credibility gap. Bob McNamara, one of the most

distinguished public servants that ever served this country, one of the most faithful, one of the most honorable. He was a great man when he was with Ford Motor Company. He only became less, he became mortal, he became filled with incredibility when he came with the Government, but he was good enough to do well for the Ford Motor Company. He was a hero. He was one of the whiz kids. He was one of the leading corporate executives of the world. He somehow changed when he came with the government. I don't think he changed at all. He has worked a lot harder. What did he say. He said: "If there is no further overthrow of the government, if the enemy does not increase its rate of infiltration, if North Viet Nam does not violate the borders and he gave about five if's. He said that by 1965, this is what he said in 1964, we can begin to withdraw our forces from Viet Nam. The trouble is that he had if's in it and nobody paid any attention to the of's. Because all of the things that he put in there as provisos went by the Board, because there were coups in Viet Nam. There was political instability. North Viet Nam did infiltrate. North Viet Nam did violate the DMZ. And we did not withdraw. No, I would think the credibility gap is a kind of a struggle between those who report the news and those who make predictions. And I tell you what I have learned a long time ago. Don't try to be a prophet. If you prophesy rightly you are forgotten. If you make a bad prediction, why you are worked over. So there are no Humphreys in either the Old or the New Testament. We do not qualify.

Mr. Vice President: Yesterday the Administration re-stated its willingness to meet with the North Koreans to negotiate for the release of the men of the Pueblo. In view of the recent Congressional reaction to this incident to what extent would the Administration be prepared to use force to save the men of the Pueblo should the current negotiation fail?

Well, that would be the one thing that I would not talk about in a public place. What we are seeking to do, sir, above all, is to use diplomatic means hopefully, successfully to obtain both the release of the men and the SHip. We are not looking for another place to fight. We are not trying to open up another front. We want no further extension of any war. We hope to be able to bring to bear through the United Nations, through the Armistice Commission, through the good offices of nations all around the world, sufficient diplomatic pressure and concern to bring about a peaceful solution of this act of piracy on the high seas. This is what we hope. I think that for the Vice President of the United States as a member of the National Security Council to discuss what might be done in terms of military action would violate our national interest would be most improper. I can only tell you that every conceivable alternative is being fully discussed, studied, worked on. But we prefer not to approach this problem with threat. We prefer to approach it through the channels of diplomacy using every known means of the diplomatic community and international law and international institutions to find a solution. And we have gone to every one of the countries of the world asking for their cooperation. This is a very serious act. It is the first act of piracy on the high seas in 100 years,

and any nation that has a merchant fleet or any nation that is a naval power has every right to be deeply concerned and we are not the only naval power. I think I might say to you while we are on it that certain comments have not been very helpful and there ought to be a setting at rest some of the doubt.

Number One: This ship, the Pueblo was not a combatant ship, nor is it so listed or known in the international community. Number Two: It was in international waters, both by our fix and by the intercepted recording of the fix of the North Koreans at the time that they intercepted it. There was only a difference of approximately one half mile in where the North Koreans said they found the Pueblo and where the commander of the Pueblo said he was. We are not the only country that has a ship like this on the high seas. We have 5 such ships and the Soviet Union has 18, one of them is off the coast of South Carolina right now. And our territorial waters are three miles, North Korea says that they have 12 miles. When President Johnson was at Guam for a meeting of the Allies about a year ago he could look out of the house in which he was staying and sleeping and he could literally throw a rock and almost hit a Soviet ship. It was that close, what they call a spy ship, intelligence ship, a trawler. Even now off the shore of North Korea where the Enterprise is, there are Soviet ships right there now and one of them is an intelligence craft. Off the coast of California this last year, we had Soviet trawlers and Soviet intercepting ships or intelligence ships, they call them spy boats, all the time. This is common practice and may I say that it was rather lucky that we had a Soviet ship like this in the Mediterranean at the time that Nassar was accusing the United States of using its bombers during the war between Israel and the Arab States and at the very time even that the King of Jordan joined in this propaganda had it not of been for the fact that the Soviet

Intelligence Spy ship was there intercepting every movement of our planes as they did, they might have believed it. These ships actually serve the cause of peace. They alert all parties as to what is going on. Now we have no way of knowing what is going on in North Korea except through this kind of intelligence. If you send agents in a totalitarian society they are murdered. It has to be done electronically. You can't even send agents into Cuba. They are murdered. Yet we have to know what is going on in Cuba, my fellow Americans. We have to know something about what is going on in the Soviet Union. For your defense we have 50 some thousand troops in Korea under United Nations command and under United Nations resolution. We have to know what is going on in North Korea. Are they getting ready to attack or aren't they? Are they mobilized or aren't they. In this police state you can't penetrate except electronically. And, therefore, these ships serve very useful purposes. Now, they said, "Why weren't they escorted? Because that is provocative. What do you think we would do if the Soviet Union had a battleship alongside a trawler three miles from the Golden Gate bridge where they have been and they have been there this last month. We would consider that highly provocative if they had a rocket ship with nuclear weapons or even conventional weapons. There has never been any what we call accompaniment or any escort with this kind of ship. It's an international practice that you don't have it. And then somebody else said, "Well, when the Pueblo was in trouble, why didn't the American Air Force come and rescue it?" Well, let's just take a look. It

was surrounded by four PT boats, two destroyer escorts. They were boarding it. Now you can say, "Well, didn't the Captain know this? Didn't he know he was going to be boarded?" Not at all. As a matter of fact, his sister ship, the Banner had been in those same waters and had been harassed seven times more seriously than this. This goes on all the time. The Soviets harass us all the time. If we shot every time that some Soviet ship came along side of us we would have a war every other week. The Soviet ships have been hounding our fleet in the Mediterranean. They go on like this all the time. The duty of a president hopefully is to keep a nation out of a struggle if we don't have to get into it. So they said, "Well, why didn't you call in the Air Force?" Well, I'll tell you why. North Korea had an Air Force based 25 miles from the Pueblo. They had 400 MIGS. We would have had to bring our Air Force in from bases in Japan or Okinawa or further away. to be refueled in flight at night in bad weather in unfamiliar area and plus the fact if you started dropping bombs whose ship you might hit. We have had a little trouble already even if we have good weather. Once in a while somebody complains that we hit one of their ships. I don't think we would have saved the Pueblo or the men. We did the right thing. You can always trigger a war. And finally, let me say this. Remember this, North Korea has an alliance with the Soviet Union and China that reads as follows: "When North Korea is under attack and requires the help of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic and demands such assistance it shall be forthcoming immediately."

Now, if you want a big nuclear confrontation, a big nuclear war, you can get one. We just sort of thought we had enough trouble right now. And we didn't think we ought to have to call up every body in this room. So your President is exercising restraint, he is exercising every known means of diplomatic maneuver and power and at the same time we are obviously having to see to it that our ally in South Korea which is a valued ally is strengthened and that their forces are in ready alert. We hope and pray for a peaceful settlement. I hope that you are praying with us for it, and help us get it, because this has been a very dangerous act on the part of North Korea. Rather than complaining about your government what ought to go up from the whole world community is an outcry of outrage, a cry of outrage that this kind of an act on the high seas could ever take place. I sometimes wonder what is wrong in our own country. When we seem to be willing to nit pick at a Commander of a boat who, by the way, was from Omaha, and an orphan boy, who as I recall has a fine record, to nit pick at one of our fellow Americans, to doubt the judgment of the commander of the 5th Air Force, to complain about the President of the United States because he didn't send forces immediately to start bombing the living daylight out of everybody in sight, and nobody has ever gotten around to saying, "North Korea, what did you do this for?" You know people all around the world listen to us. You know what the North Korean radio has been saying lately? They have been picking up the statement of every American official that has talked and they broadcast it and when one of our officials in Congress said that we had no right to have a ship there, they put it right on

the radio and broadcast to the whole world. Said a leading Government official of the United States said America had no right to have such a ship there. When somebody else gets up and makes a speech and says we ought to bomb a city right out of North Korea as one of them did, they get up and say: "The Americans are preparing an aggressive attack upon North Korea. We just have to know what we are saying and you have to understand, my dear friends that the Communist propaganda is wicked, clever, subtle and effective, particularly when people haven't had the chance to have a free press like you have. A chance for freedom of discussion like you have. These are the problems that your country faces and I have been involved in these problems. Mrs. Humphrey knows this has been one of the most difficult weeks in our national life. What this country needs right now more than anything else is standing together, keeping its cool as the younger generation says. Standing firm with malice towards none and charity for all, but with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, and not begging trigger happy and hopefully trying to find ways and means of bringing any kind of dispute to conference and to peace and to negotiation, which is exactly what we are trying to do in this world. This nation wants no war. This nation has done more in the cause of peace than all of the nations of the world put together and as a young American you ought to be proud of the heritage of your country. Proud of what we've done. The lives that this country has given for other countries, the money that this country has poured out for other countries, the people that we have sent

around the world for other countries, all in the cause of peace, and today there are millions of people free and independent because we stood firm. I just came back from the Congo where President Mobutu thanked me with tears literally in his eyes for the fact that we had saved his country three times by our little assistance. Last time we only helped him with three C-130 cargo planes so he could move his troops, and get rid of the mercenaries. He said that our independence is due to the United States of America. You are for us what Lafayette was for you. He knows. I hope you know it too.

Mr. Vice President: What effect does the Viet Nam War have, financially and in terms of manpower on domestic issues such as the war on poverty, crime in the streets, city riots.

Well, there isn't any doubt but what the war in Viet Nam takes a great deal of our resources. We ought not try to pretend that it doesn't. It is a very costly enterprise. It's prime cost is in the loss of life, which is irreplaceable. I suppose we got all kinds of figures and they don't particularly make me happy. The percentage of our gross national product that we are spending today on defense and even the war in Viet Nam is no larger, may I say, than it was in 1958 when we had no war. But that doesn't satisfy me. Because our gross national product is very large and it is a fact that the cost percentage wise of the total defense budget is today not any larger than it was 10 years ago. Even with the struggle, but we are losing lives. I am not at all sure, though Mr. McKenney, that if we had no war that we would be doing some of the things that you and I want done. All of my life I have worked on problems like the

poverty program, aid to our cities. I was the mayor of the City of Minneapolis. I have been involved in Federal Aid to education, higher education, elementary and secondary education. This is my work. I was one of those so-called New Dealers, you know, and always considered one of those dangerous liberals. And I was involved in the social programs of America, programs that i thought would open up the areas of opportunity, and many of them have come to pass. But I was in the Congress after the war in Korea was over. We had in Dorea many more men than we have in Viet Nam. We lost in Korea 55,000 dead, 167,000 wounded. The war in Korea was very expensive in every day. And when the war was over, we didn't have any poverty programs. We didn't have any federal aid to education. We didn't have any job corp centers. We didn't have any Medicare. We didn't attack the problems of our cities. We cut taxes. And we had three recessions, by the way, in either years. Three of them. In 1960 the man that became the President of the United States made his message and said, "We have to get this country moving again." It was at dead center. The gross national product was increasing at the rate of 2.3 which was almost losing because of the increase in our population and work force. So I don't think that it means that if we don't have a war that you will get the things done for your cities that you want done. That depends on how you vote. That depends on what your concern is. It depends on what your purpose is. There were more poor people in America in 1954 after the war in Korea than there are in 1968. There were more unemployed in America in 1960 when we had nowar than there are today. They were more illiterate in America in 1954, the year after the war ended

than there are today. There were more people age 65 and over that were living in pauperism with no medical care than there is today. So the war ending in Korea didn't change anything at all. As a matter of fact, if it did anything it slowed down social reform. If you really want to do something about your cities, you have to build a body of public opinion for it. There are many people today that say, "Oh, we would just do everything for our cities, if we didn't have this war. I want to know where they were when we needed their help before. I introduced bill after bill into Congress. The facts about our cities were just as bad in 1960, 1958, 1956, 1954, 1952, 1950 as they are today. Every bit as bad, in fact, worse, much more has been done. You couldn't get a corporal's guard. We were hounded out so to speak. We were called dangerous radicals, liberals. We didn't have either press support or public support. How I ask you to join me when this struggle is over, because it is going to be over. I can't predict the day, but it will as all others, come to an end, and when it is all over, are you willing to stand up and have as much enthusiasm for re-building America as some people say they now have? Are we willing really to invest in foreign aid? And in aid at home? Are we willing to pour in the billions to our cities that they need. Are we willing to really do a job in job training. I don't want to act like a cynic, because I am not. I am an idealist, but I have been around, and I have seen many a good person leave me when the chips were down, as they say, and when the fighting really starts.

I introduced the first bill on Medicare as a Senator on May 17, 1949. It passed in June of 1965. I introduced the first bill for Job Corp Centers in 1954. It became law in 1965. We passed it once or twice in the senate and they killed it in the House. The very first bill I ever voted for in my life as a Senator was Federal Aid to Education. We passed it in the Senate, they would **kill** it in the House. They either killed it on religion or race. One or the other. They always had somebody to kill it. They either killed it because it was violating states' rights, it would give the Negroes some help or it was going to help the Catholics. That's right, that is the way they did it and you know it I fought for Federal Aid to Education all of my Congressional life. Who do you think got it passed finally? A fellow from Texas. And he almost didn't get it because the same old forces went to work. A combination of the segregationists on the one hand and the bigots on the other and they sure do make good partners. And today we have a tremendous program. Listen, I didn't put **you** up to it. But this question comes up once in a while. I think you would like to know what the budget figures are. For health and education, let's start 1961, that is the last year, just before President Kennedy, fiscal '61. The total amount for education in the budget was 500 million dollars. The total amount for health, education and welfare was 3 billion, 900 million dollars. In 1964 that had been increased to 5 billion, 700 million, under President Kennedy for fiscal 1968 that is the one we are just finishing, this year, fiscal '68 up to June 30 14 billion, 500 million dollars. The budget for this year, 15 billion, 400 million dollars. We've had to fight, fight, fight to get that up and that's why we got some enemies. This doesn't always make you friends. There aren't that many poor

people in this country. We have been able to reduce the segment of our poverty group in America by a million and one half the last year. Two years 1/7 of the population, 1/5 of the population of America, was in what we call the poverty group, now it's 1/7. Now the total expenditures including social security, because social security has a great deal to do with the care of the needy, and particularly the aged, the sick and the handicapped. In 1961 with all health, education, welfare, and social security benefits the total budget was 19 billion, 300 million dollars. That's a sizable amount of money. In 1964 it had gone up to 20 billion, 200 million dollars. In 1968, and if you will pardon the plug, with the Johnson Administration it has gone up to 42 billion, 100 million dollars. In 1969, 46 billion 700 million dollars. There are a million, 300 thousand students in college today under Federal guaranteed loans or grants or scholarships. There are a million, 475,000 men and women under Job training programs today. 4 years ago there were 33,000. In this budget we are presenting a job program, for job training and recruitment and placing many men that are hard core unemployed with federal expenditures of 2 billion, 100 million dollars. And Henry Ford II heading up the greatest alliance of businessmen this country has ever known in a massive effort to find jobs for our hard core unemployed. We have had to fight a war on the one hand against an aggressor and we have had to fight a war against the ancient enemy of poverty on the other hand. I pray for the day that the war against the aggressor can be over successfully and that peace can be re-established. Without any conquest, seeking to destroy no one, but seeking the right of self-

determination. And then I am going to come back to this college as I am across this country and I am going to say to everyone: "Now you were the folks, at least some of you that wanted us to launch a massive attack upon slumism. The slum of the broken down building. The slum of the ghetto. The slumism that is found in poverty, and frustration and bitterness and neglect and disadvantage. All right, follow me, are you willing to pay the price? I think you will be, but I want to remind you just in case you have forgotten.

Now, let's take one out here. There is a gentlemen back here. Yes, sir. Mr. Vice President, you have discussed the national will, together with a renewal of the national purpose and moral purpose and you have also discussed the world community. Now, once we find it can be unified under a national will what is to say that our national will coincide with the other wills of the other countries within the world community?

Well, I would hope that our so-called national will, if we agree on the principles and I thought we at least some kind of a common denominator that we would find ourself in a position to be a contributing, helpful member of this international community. I think that our record is pretty good at that. We stand ready today to strengthen the United Nations in its peace keeping operations. We stand ready today, I went to a mission in Europe here for the President of the United States to try to increase the activities of our European partners as well as ourself in the war on hunger. In the Economic Aid

to the developing nations working with the industrialized and developed nations to be able to pour more of the resources into the developing countries. I can't be sure, of course, my friend, that the national will of America will always be trained or directed toward constructive purposes. All I can be sure of is that my will will be and I will try to help in every way I can to convince others that their ought to be. I happen to believe that we must be a responsible working member of the international community. I happen to believe that the greatest task of mankind is to find a way or to help promote, should I say the conditions that make possible a just and enduring peace. And I am willing to give a lot of my life, indeed, all of it for that goal and that purpose. And what we are doing in this dialogue, what we are trying to do and I hope we can do it is to get a sort of consensus amongst our people, so that we can direct our efforts towards development, war on hunger, through education, the things that we know. At least have some positive contribution to a better world. We can never be sure whether these will answer the problems, but we are sure of one thing, that if we don't do something about these things, if want continues to expand, if poverty becomes overmore present, if illiteracy continues to be the pattern for more and more people we can be sure of this, that will not help make a peaceful world. We can be sure that it will contribute to trouble. We can't always be sure that if we were able to educate all of mankind; if all of God's children could be well fed; if they could all be healthy; we can't at all be sure even if they all had jobs and they were all prosperous that they would be moral. We can't be sure of that. All we can do

is try at the same time that we improve our material wellbeing to improve our moral and ethical well being at the same time. That is what a college education is for, young man. That is the whole purpose of it. If all you are here for is to get information, buy yourself a World Almanac, it's cheaper. The whole purpose of a college education is the enrichment of the spirit, the emancipation of the soul, and of the mind and of the spirit. That is what it's all about. To give you a better understanding of your role as a human being in this great universe, that lives under Divine Providence and Divine guidance and I really believe it does. That is what education is about. I hope that you are finding it that rich and rewarding an experience.

Got anybody over here? Anybody else? Yes sit, right here sir, this gentlemen:

Last week, if I am not mistaken, the South Vietnamese Chairman or Minister of the pacification program resigned. Now, would you care to discuss, Mr. Vice President, the effect of the apparent weakness of the pacification program despite the possibility of a military easing.

Yes, that's General Tong. He's a very good man. I was very sorry that he resigned from that position. He, however, has another position, as you know. With the military of South Viet Nam which is directed towards a very fundamental problem, the corruption issue. Might I be very candid with you. It is a

problem. But it is a problem all over Asia. It isn't unique to Viet Nam. Those who are the students of Asian life will tell you that this is one of the problems that does affect public life all too often and it doesn't, it isn't by the way, relegated just to Asia. I think it has had a tendency to be a bit contagious in the Caucasian-Anglo Saxon areas as well. The pacification program, I think is mis-named. So many people think that pacification is just related to, well, just keeping down the bandits, so to speak. Well, it is much more than that. The pacification program is nation building. It relates to the revitalization of an economy, to the production of pork and rice, to the building of schools and the training of teachers and the setting up of a community government and village government and it relates also to security. It is a combination of what I tried to say here earlier which I didn't say well. That there are two essentials for any country. National security and national development. You can't have one without the other. There is no security without development in the long run. You can't have just police. You cannot have, however, national development if you have no security. And the real problem in Viet Nam has been the inability to provide adequate security throughout the countryside because of the guerrilla war. Now this is not an unusual situation. In Malaysia where I have been, for seven long years the Malaysians fought a bitter struggle against only a handful of guerrillas, with the forces of the British Empire at their side. And finally, after seven long years they were able to subdue the guerrillas and finally bring some peace to their country, but even now, it has broken out somewhat again.

The same thing is true in the Phillipines. The Hucks are still active in the Mountains. And there is still some guerrilla activity in our latin American countries. Even in Venezuela, one of the most developed countries in Latin America. And surely in Columbia wehre they call it the Violence and it has been on for 50 years and it always impedes social progress. Just about the time that you get a community built up, in comes the guerrillas and burns the houses down, burns down the schools, the public health center and the church and whatever else is around and that destroys the town. Pacification has been slow and this recent outbreak in Viet Nam will surely set it back. I think this is a very sad period for us. I don't want to be overly optimistic nor unduly pessimistic. Let me tell you what I really think is happening. I really believe, and we know from caputred documents; we capture many documents and I regret that they don't always seem to find their text in public print even though they are made available. Ho Chi Minh, for some months now, has broadcast, has sent orders, in fact they have orders out to all of the Viet Cong cadres and to all the North Viet Nam units that there would be what we would call, like World War II a D-Day. Attack day. And on that day, all over Viet Nam there was supposed to be Viet Cong attacks which would result in a popular uprising and taking over the country. That is what they thought they had. And they even changed the name of the national liberation front to the Revolutionary Adminstration. That is what they call it now. And in 38 cities of the main cities today in, 38 of the main ones and many others, there has been a tremendous amount of terrorism. What has happened. The populace did not join the Viet Cong. The political maneuver based upon terror and attack

in the hope that somehow or another the populace would, either out of fear or out of conviction come to the Viet Cong. It did not realize, did not come about. There is fighting today. Before I left to come to you today, I called what we call the situation room in the White House which has up to the minute up to the hour, direct line contact with our main headquarters in Saigon and elsewhere in Viet Nam. And there is still fighting in the city of WHey, in the outskirts of Saigon and in some 38 other cities and some of the province capitols. And the Arvin, that's the army of South Viet Nam, is giving a mighty good account of itself. The estimated fatality, fatalities, my dear friends, not wounded, we don't know about the wounded, because they get them away, many of them, is over 10,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese thus far. The known loss of the Allied troops is under 800. These have been suicidal attacks with tremendous ferocity. They have been waiting a long time and the main attack we expect at Keisong where there are over 40m000 North Vietnamese that are not in North Viet Nam, that have invaded South Viet Nam. That have sanctuary in Laos and some of them coming across the Cambodian border. And your government has not been violating the Cambodian border. It has violated it once when some troops got in 75 yards in a fire fight. And we apologized. And we have had photographs laid out to show tha t the International Control Commission photos which I have seen of 10 to 15 thousand Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops in sanctuary, safe behind the Cambodian border. Ready to attack your brother. We can't touch them. Because to do so would be to violate the borders of another country. To do so would be to extend this war and yet your President is always accused of escalating violence. By the way, who do you think escalated

this last little number. Who is escalating what? And at the very time that our men are under severe attack, I can read signs saying, "Stop the bombing". Well, I want to say if you have a brother, if you have anybody out there I hope that your President doesn't listen to that advice. He doesn't get it from me, I tell you that. Because the only chance that that young man has for survival is for us to use some of the power that we have in this kind of a war. These men that attack Saigon our Embassy, you would never have known that they were Viet Cong. They were dressed like anybody else. They were looking like the normal Vietnamese pickets. Some of them even were in police clothes. Mascarading, if you please, under cover as if they were South Vietnamese police. 19 trained terrorists just exactly as a band of men went into Seoul, Korea, with, what were their orders? They have 2,500 trained saboteurs and terrorists from North Korea moved into South Korea. Their orders were to behead President Park and to drag his body through the streets and to assassinate the American Ambassador and kill the members of the cabinet of the South Korean Government. This is what you ought to be sick about. We are not fighting North Korea. We want no war there. South Korea rages had no raiding parties on North Korea and yet there have been 500 incidents of raids and attacks from North Korea into South Korea this past year as compared to 50 two years ago. I think you have to be aware of the kind of world we live in and what do you think it would be like if we weren't there to help them? To help the ones that are suffering the attack. All right, I think we have to quit now. I will take

one more question. Back here, then, I have kept you too long.

Given that the United States meets aggression around the world at a cost of over 25 billion per year and that we spend less than 2 billion dollars per year on foreign aid to prevent these aggressions shouldn't our government spend more on the preventive aspects of aggression, namely, foreign aid?

I couldn't agree with you more. I think that the amount of development funds that we use of aid is totally inadequate and I deeply regret it. I must say, however, that every time there is a military confrontation, it is the most expensive operation that man ever knew. It obviously is. I do want to make the record clear. We do not respond militarily all the time. Your Government and your President saved peace in the Mediterranean just a month and a half ago on the Cyprus issue when the Greeks and the Turks were ready to go at it. Both of them are our allies. Bitter over the problems of Cyprus, the Turks had their planes on the runway, their ships loaded and so did the Greeks and within hours they would have been in open combat. President Lyndon Johnson personally sent his special representative, Cyrus Vance, who worked day and night even though he is a sick man and the President day and night on the telephone, day and night directing this effort to prevent it. A major confrontation and war in the Mediterranean. Your President helped contain the war between Arabs and Israel. Your President used a hot line the first time with the Soviet Union, with Moscow, with Mr. Kosygin. I don't know exactly, yes, I do know, but I shan't tell you, exactly what

was said. I can only tell you this, that the results were good. The Soviet Union could have been involved. They had 2 billion dollars worth of arms and they are on the Arab side and they suffered a very devastating temporary defeat. Your President did not want to see that war extended. We again used our good offices. We use it all the time. We do not respond militarily all the time. We have had restraint, unbelievable restraint, but we have also had to take positions once in a while, all of which have been dangerous. I will never forget 1962 when I was in Minnesota, in October of that year when President Kennedy, I was a majority whip of the Senate, one of President Kennedy's floor leaders. I received a call that said, "Come Immediately". It was the Cuban Crisis. Mr. Khrushchev and his missiles. We were closer to total war in that week than we have been at any time since World War II. And no one knew up until the last minute what was going on. We had moved and deployed our entire Strategic Air Command, all of our bombers, all loaded with nuclear weapons, everything was set, I know. In fact right here at this place you ought to know better than anybody else. Our at Offutt Air Base. And every airport had its places, its B-52's, it's B-47's ready to go. We moved the fleet from the Pacific into the Atlantic. We stalled for time to get it through the canal and then we served warning on Mr. Khrushchev. We said: "Get out" or it's going to happen". And for several hours, no one knew what was going to happen. Then came the message. And we had to use a very inadequate message system called a wireless. That is why we have a hot line now between the Soviet Union and the United States so we don't go through that kind of hair raising experience again, but Mr. Khrushchev withdrew. Mr. Kennedy

took the firm stand. And he could have had a stand which I know was right, that could have led to confrontation. It was a risk. We had to do it in Berlin three times and Mr. Truman told Stalin in 1945 where to go and told him to get his troops out of Iran or the American 15th Air Force would come forthwith. And he left. He said you will not come through Freece and Turkey and he wasn't very popular. One thing about Harry Truman, he was right, but not very popular. And when he stood in Korea, when he went to korea in June, of 1950, and stood there in August of 1950, 88% of the American people supported him. They said you are right, Mr. Truman". When things went bad in January, 1951, the same polls showed 66% said withdraw. If a President listened to popular, public opinion polls, this country would have been divided into the Confederacy and the Union. The North and the South. Lincoln wasn't popular. He was the most beleaguered and bedeviled President that this country has ever had. And today Korea would have been a dagger of Communism pointed at the heart of Japan and Japan would have been a totally different country than it is had Mr. Truman not been President. He was President. He wasn't trying to be the most powerful idol of the day. Popularity is a wicked toxin for men who have responsibility. Popularity is all right for movie stars but it isn't very good for Presidents. Presidents need to be right, need to have character, need to make decisions. Thank you 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