

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

SENIOR SEMINAR IN FOREIGN POLICY
FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"REFLECTIONS ON OUR NATIONAL AIMS"

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
AUGUST 24, 1965

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Thank you very much, Ambassador Jones. I am very pleased to see Ambassador MacArthur (Secretary MacArthur) here. I just said to him a moment ago his overseas assignments must have seemed very easy and manageable compared to working in the vineyards of the congressional government, but he spoke kindly of the members of Congress, and I appreciate that very much because I sort of feel congressional as yet. I have only been away from the congressional environment, that is on a constitutional basis, for about seven months, so it takes more time than that to wean me from old habits, attitudes, friends, and environment. Mr. (Ambassador) Jones said to me that he would like me to concentrate my attention upon American aims which is a broad subject and, yet at the same time, gives us the opportunity for a good give-and-take discussion here on American foreign policy, national security policy, and international policy. I am going to just be as informal with you as one would be in a college seminar. I am a refugee from a classroom, once tried to be a professor of political science, and I can remember those days when we would have seminar groups,

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

and we would have a very good exchange of ideas. I came here primarily to learn from you, and there is very little that you are going to learn from me. That is not false humility; it is a fact. I have considered my years in government as a constant learning process. There is one area in which I feel I have some competence, and that is an understanding of and I hope a knowledge of and some tolerance for, the processes of government, the procedures and the institutions of government. I would add to that some understanding of and knowledge of the persons in government because our government is both institutional and very personal. The very nature of our governmental structure at the congressional level with committee chairmen and subcommittee chairmen and leadership, elected leaders, policies of government are brought into being by not merely messages and documents and persuasive argument but also personal relationships. This is not to downrate the governmental process. It is just to look at it as a fact -- as one of the realities of life. Therefore, the Foreign Service officer, the employee or the officer of the respective departments represented here, and it is

a good cross section of our government, those officers need to know not only the issues and the policies and the programs but also the people, the methodology, and the functioning of the structure of government. Now having said that about the legislative branch, let me say that the executive branch is even more so because it is a highly personalized branch with the tremendous power and authority being in the executive office of the President and in the respective cabinet departments and independent or semi (quasi) independent agencies. I don't suppose there is any government in which there is so much power vested in any one man as there is in our government. It isn't the limitations of the constitution alone that, or should I say the restrictions of the constitution alone, place limitations upon the exercise of that power of authority. Actually, it is tradition and habit and the American spirit that has come into being over 200 years of governmental experience. I recall a book written I think by Gerald Johnson. I believe he used to be professor of political science at Johns Hopkins if I am not mistaken. He wrote a book amongst many others on Roosevelt and the

preface to that book was that he noted that Roosevelt and Hitler came into power in 1933 in the same month. Why did they act so differently? Both represented mature, intelligent people, great nations. The world situation was a situation of depression and of international confusion and almost chaos. He noted that from his vantage point as a political scientist that possibly the controlling influence wasn't so much the constitution because there was the constitution of the Weimar Republic in Germany, a great progressive document, and there was the constitution of the United States, a document that we consider to be the most important and far reaching, and I'd say progressive, of all written law, but what was important was that Roosevelt was the inheritor of Locke, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, P.H. Green, Hobhouse and others, and even the great Bentham School of Philosophy. But Hitler was the inheritor of Hobbes and of Nietzsche, Wagner and some of the what you might call the authoritarians of the totalitarians -- in other words, the impact of environment, social habits, pattern, tradition and conditioning. Well, I think this is still true. I think that one of the reasons today that we

have a responsive government is because we are brought up that way, and it is intangible, but it is more powerful than even the tangible. I mention this because in the exercise of American power, which is beyond comprehension, I don't think anyone around this table -- I'm sure the speaker doesn't understand it -- I don't think anyone really understands -- the measure of our power -- the unbelievable amount of sheer military power that we have, the economic power that we have, legal power -- it is beyond anything that the world has ever known. Yet, we use that power with restraint; we use it with a sense of compassion; we use it with a sense of justice; we use it in the cause of freedom; we actually restrain the power to a point to where we permit those who have no power to, if not make decisions that relate to the powerful, at least condition the decisions that relate and effect power. I am not saying that we have all power because we do not. In fact, in a very real sense, we are less powerful today than we were let's say in 1950 when we had a monopoly on nuclear weapons, when our nation was much more prosperous in relationship to the rest of the world. Today that bi-polar

power system is even altered -- the one between ourselves and the Soviet Union -- it has been shattered, at least fractured so that they are other power centers of potential power centers. But having said all of that and knowing that one doesn't have time here to go into minute detail to explain each of these rather sweeping phrases, I think it is fair to say the amount of power that this nation has is far beyond anything that any one of us ever dreamed possible. Yet, we exercise that power with great restraint which is a tremendous asset in terms of our moral position in the world -- I believe our political leadership position in the long-term good of humanity. I talk to men that are in the forefront of the (men and women of the) use of this power because the Defense Department, CIA, the intelligence officers or services, all of the many Armed Services that we have, the State Department, our AID program, NASA, and all those who are engaged in any type of foreign activity -- they are the extension of the power base of the United States. You are the fingers, the hands, the arm, the extension of this great power base and therefore your conduct and your

understanding of the reservoir power that you represent and how to apply it where you are is every bit as important as a decision that may be made in the power center itself. We are inter-related, inter-dependent, inter-connected, and I think this is one of the reasons that we need today in our Foreign Service a higher degree of political sensitivity that we never had before, not just professional proficiency and efficiency, but political antenna, political sensitivity to understand what's going on and how do you react to it, and to understand it early enough so that whatever you may do about it or however you may react to it will have some beneficial effect in terms of what are our national aims and what is our national interest -- our national needs. Well, the composition of this Senior Seminar in Foreign Policy is a good indication of the extent of U.S. foreign policy commitments in 1965. I am quite sure that many of our fellow citizens don't quite realize as yet just how many commitments we made and how deeply involved we are in everything that goes on in this world. I come from the Mid-West and many is the time that I said to the citizens, that I was

privileged to represent when I served in the Senate, that the developments of the Middle East -- what happened in the Middle East -- was maybe more important to the lives of the people that I represented from the Mid-West, than what happened in the Middle West, than what happened out there on those parched deserts or along the Nile, or in all of this area that we call the Middle East or the Near East -- might very well condition the lives of every person or affect the lives of every person in the entire Mid-West of the United States, in fact, the whole country. I used to explain our foreign policy on the basis of self-interest, and by the way, that is the best basis to explain anything. It doesn't prove that a person is selfish or greedy or stupid if he has self-interest and when you can have national interest and international interest become synonymous with self-interest or, that is identity with self-interest, you have a foreign policy that has a broad base. It has support. It's when the foreign policy or the international policy of a country appears to be separate and above and outside of the reach of the individual or he doesn't relate his own life or his own

experience to that policy that you begin to lose your constituents. I have heard many people say that the State Department doesn't have any constituency. I think that's ridiculous. The State Department has the biggest constituency in the world. So does the Defense Department, so does the CIA, so does every national security agency in this government, once that you identify your efforts with the life of every man, woman, and child in the nation. I heard the President of the United States say today to the Peace Corps trainees at the Presidential Office -- about 12:45 he invited them in after the signing of the extension of authorization of the Peace Corps -- I heard him say to them that their work for peace was the most important work in the world. He said the most important word -- one simple word that is more important than any other is peace. On his desk he had memoranda about the impending dispute in the steel industry, troubles in the Maritime Industry, some of our views in reference as to whether or not we should be selling wheat to the Bloc countries -- a whole series of memoranda on all kinds of so-called difficult problems. Not one of them

meant that much -- they didn't mean even a snap of your finger if there is no peace. Because if a major war breaks out, why, it's all these memoranda and all the issues that are on those sheets of paper or described on those sheets of paper that fade into insignificance. I want to say that, while I am not a member of the State Department and never have been -- I've been keenly interested in its work -- the Foreign Service has the biggest constituency in the world if you'll identify it. That constituency doesn't include the employees of your departments, except as a part of the constituency as my mother, my brother, my sisters, my children, my grandchildren -- those are your constituents, and that's why I think that you can identify what we have tried to do with the people. I have found, I want to say as a political man, the most interesting topic for the audiences that I speak to to be matters of foreign policy, not farm price supports, not even economics or taxes or even tax reduction. When I go before an audience, I can ramble around with them and use every technique that I have developed as a man in public life on some of these issues and I think

the issues are very good, but the minute you start to talk about the United Nations, the moment you start to talk about our alliances, the moment you start to talk about our commitments overseas, the very minute that you start to explore our relationships with any part of the world, at that moment the audience stands at attention. Right then you lose all of the chatter, all of the noise; right then and there you have audience contact, as we say. Why? Because the average person knows very well that that is all that is really important. Having said that, we all said, oh, of course, our domestic economy relates to the strength of this foreign policy and that is why we try to build this economy. That is why I have been going around this country preaching in behalf of the President and our country that we are seeking to develop resources because we need them for the long pull. I also find that people like candor. They like to be told frankly what you believe. I believe that we are going to be in trouble for the foreseeable future. Therefore, I think we have to develop an attitude, mind and spirit that can hate this trouble, so to speak, that we don't crack up under the strain,

that we don't become impetuous or emotional, that while we are concerned and while we recognize that there are moments and hours of crisis and crises that we don't explode, that we don't become emotional, that we don't become angry, that we have patience and perserverance and forbearance and also that we have policies and programs and action. It is one thing to be patient, but you have to ask yourself for what. What are you seeking with the patience? Well, as a world power, we've inevitably been drawn into situations which require the use of American power. Now I come to a word -- power -- I've been using this word power with you. Strangely enough, the academic community in America doesn't like this word, and this is part of the problem we have today. This is not in my notes. This is just flying through my mind at the moment. Power has been associated so long in the world with evil. Most people that have possessed power have abused it, and surely most nations that have had it have used it for self-aggrandizement, for imperialistic purposes, for anything but sharing and service. I think there is always the temptation for any nation to misuse power. I think that

temptation is ours. We are tempted at times. This is why I believe that while sometimes some of us are, if not severely criticized, slightly ridiculed or appealing to what we call the spiritual fabric of life and the so-called do-good attitudes, this is essential. This really, I won't say dulls the edge of the power because we don't want to do that, but it puts the power in the proper sheave. It doesn't keep the sword out there whirling around cutting all the time. Many of our friends who are good, thoughtful, serious citizens, who surely do not want to say or do anything that would injure our country or its destiny, become critics unknowingly sometimes and then after once becoming a critic you become somewhat trapped by your own words and your own commitments. They become critics because they hate power. Really, they fear it; they are suspicious of it. They can't quite bring themselves to understand that in the kind of world in which we live we do have to occasionally commit the use of military power, economic power, political power, education and propaganda power, call it what you will. It's foreign to some of these sensitive souls and minds. I know I've had some feelings

that way myself on many occasions. Yet, as I tried to say to some of our good friends that while the use of sheer military power is not the solution to any problem, it can be said with equal candor that when such power is needed and it is not used, then there isn't any solution at all that you can find to any problem. The Police Department is not the answer to the social ills of a community, but without a Police Department there is no chance at all to get at the social ills -- to preserve a degree of decorum and of order that permits one to use reason and intelligence. So we have had to use our power, military, economic, and political. We used it in Greece and Turkey; we had to use it in Berlin and Korea, and we have used it in the instance of Cuba and Southeast Asia. In exercising this responsibility of the use of power we've been required to devote vast resources of men and material, and I must say that we are going to be required to do it in the foreseeable future. As they put it, you ain't seen nothing yet. That is the vernacular; that is the street talk. I think we are inevitably going to have more of the same and more times and maybe in larger doses --

not just for ourselves, but for others. This is a restless world. Any world that is in change, and any social structure that is in change, is never an orderly one. I digress to say this is true of civil rights movements; it's true of the labor movement. When the labor movement was fighting for the right to organize, do you think they went around and just had nice little pink tea parties and coffee parties? People were killed, riots, people were thrown in jail, beaten. Anyone who is a student in social life in America knows this. I don't know why we are always so shocked. This doesn't mean you condone it; it doesn't mean that you endorse it; it just means that it is sort of like bringing up a family. There are just some things that happen, and you have to be prepared for it if you want to be a parent. You do not have the kind of world that we have with all the technological, scientific, economic, political changes of the contesting forces that are at work in this world pulling and tugging without it being unruly, disorderly, troublesome, dangerous, chaotic, but always promising. This is why I frequently said, and would not jest

as much actually as in seriousness, that if you are tired, if you don't seem to be able to take it, move over and let somebody in that will. You don't have room on big football teams for people who decide they need a siesta in the second quarter. We put in not substitutes; we'd just put in another platoon. That's why the quality of football in my part of the country is relatively good. It's high power all the time. I repeat that in this kind of world in which we live if somebody feels that this is just a little bit too much for him, he owes it to himself at least and then to the others, to his country, to say "Look, I'm just not cut out for this. Why don't I just sort of pack up my bag and leave. Put a replacement in, will you please, because it's going to be this kind of world for a long time to come, and we are going to have to wrestle with it." There was a time in the history of the world when we had a 100 years of war; then we had a 30 years' war; then we had a 7 years' war. I don't know what makes anybody think that we have gotten so much better. I'm not advocating this. Wars are just of peculiar and different types. The industrial revolution left in its wake unbelievable

turmoil. The human rights revolution is leaving in its wake turmoil and trouble. The world power revolution is leaving in its wake trouble, and we are the trouble shooters. That's why we are here. We are supposed to be trained and disciplined and enlightened to how to put out fires on the one hand and at the same time more importantly how to direct energy. That's really what you are for. How do you direct these great forces into constructive paths? I don't think we have to indulge ourselves in any myth of American omnipotence or in the myth of American omniscience when one states that our power has been used primarily to prevent the expansion of Communist power and tyranny and to preserve peace. We have tried to do this many ways. On various occasions we have united with our friends and allies to build organizations to prevent this expansion -- NATO, SEATO, both designed to curb the expansion of Communist power emanating from either the Soviet Union or from China. From the very beginning we have used our power and prestige to bring about the establishment of the United Nations, whose principal purpose is the preservation of world peace.

By the way, I think we ought to constantly remind the world of that and not let ourselves be trapped into talking about it as just a debating society, because that is exactly what the Soviet Union would like to make out of it on occasion and that's what the Communist powers would like to make out of it. They do not want it to be an effective instrument of international law and order. I might say that when we got down to Article Nineteen, since we now have taken another position on it, I might just as well tell you what my position has been all the time -- I never did feel that you could get burglars to pay for Police Departments. If you caught one that would be willing to do it, he was either a fool or perhaps you controlled him enough so that he would. It's very hard to get an arsonist to hand out plaques and medals to firemen and pay for the cost of the Fire Department. Now it was to our interest to have the United Nations, to have a peace keeping operation, no matter who paid for it. I can tell you one thing, it's a whole lot cheaper than anything we knew ourselves because there is one thing we do surpass in -- we can do it more expensively than anybody

else in the world if we do it alone. There isn't any doubt about that; I'll stand on that argument without fear of successful contradiction from any office in the land. So it's always been my view that one of our national aims ought to be strengthening the United Nations' peace keeping machinery, and maybe we can't do it ourselves, maybe we can get somebody else to do it. There's nothing wrong in that. Why do you think politicians have so many volunteer committees -- to get other people to do for you what you want them to do. Do you really think all these volunteer committees just spring up out of the love and affection and the enthusiasm of the people? I hope you're not that naive. Occasionally one or two do and they generally don't have any money and they are generally very ineffective. The ones that really are effective are the ones that are funded by somebody else and the ones that are organized by you or somebody else, and you have people out there doing all these nice political jobs and you don't argue about Article Nineteen. You are apt to have a businessman's committee for somebody funded by the money that you receive from COPE, American Federation of

Labor and CIO. I don't know why we can't be honest with each other about these matters. It just sometimes makes me think that we are very immature and hypocritical. Why the members of Congress feel this way is more than I know because if anybody knows how to get elected, they do. There wasn't a one of them elected by their mother. They were elected by putting together the most intricate type of operation that very few people could follow, because if they followed it, they would have all violated it. What's that flaw we've got in Congress that tells you how much money you can spend? Anyway, everybody violated it that ever got elected -- Corrupt Practices Act. You don't really violate it; you just circumvent it. Now, going back to the United Nations, it is important that we have the United Nations, and it is important that it be strengthened. It is our only international response to the international Communist movement. It is important that we give it priority attention. I'm speaking now for Hubert Humphrey. I think that we should recognize it, and many of the things we do we have to do bilaterally and unilaterally. Many times we have to take

action outside of the confines of any of the presently developed international instruments but I say to you that it is important that the United Nations be a friendly partner to the needs and the aims and the aspirations and the policies of the United States. Therefore, it ought to have top priority attention because it may not be very strong. It may not be able to save the peace, but it can sure cause you trouble if you don't pay enough attention to it. I've been around public life long enough to know that you don't always keep your eye on the one who can always just help you. You keep your eye on the one who can trip you. So we look at the United Nations affirmatively and negatively. It has some liabilities that require some concessions, and by the way, every concession you have to make for the United Nations, you have to make anyhow outside the United Nations. That's the way we started out -- by concessions on the use of our power. We've got so much power we don't dare use it. We have these fantastic big weapons that we can't use now in Vietnam. We are trying to buy back those old skyraiders that we gave to DeGaulle who

sold them to Cambodia. That is something you might think about a little bit too. We have these fantastic new weapons that are just, for all practical purposes, in the immediate struggle -- in the immediate, useless -- but in the overall, not at all, because they are the major deterrent -- the major deterrent -- to China and the Soviet Union, but insofar as that struggle right down there, the peninsula right on North and South Vietnam, the weapons that we are using there, many of them, are very much the same weapons that were developed in World War II that we tried to give away to everybody. Now we are trying to collect them back. Where are those anti-aircraft guns, where are those bazookas that we haven't used, where are those old weapons? We just love new weapons. We love new gadgets. It's just like if you have a car that is perfectly good, you know it's good, but you just found out they have a better cigarette lighter on the new one, and it has new hubcaps, and Mama wants it, and the kids want it, so you get a new car. It's the same way with weapons. But don't misunderstand me. We need the major weapons for the massive deterrent, for the big

deterrent. It is the big power, but the struggle that we're fighting is the one that we are fighting in the tall bushes, in the jungles, with the small weapons. So I would say again that anything we can do to strengthen the peace keeping operations of the United Nations, to help put out some of these smaller fires, will be of great help to us. Now we don't aspire to any Pax Americana (Pax Americana) depending upon how you wish to put it, and we don't have any desire to play the role of global policeman. I think the President put it pretty well some time ago that if we're not at the gate, who is? Is there a person there to stem the tide and to stop the intruder? We don't have any real desire to interject American troops into explosive local disputes, but it would be a foolish country and a foolish President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense who didn't consider every dispute of potential danger. Who would have thought that arresting a drunken driver in Los Angeles could have precipitated that riot? I want to remind you that there are just as many pent up emotions and just as many pent up hates in other parts of the world as there were in Los Angeles, and

even more so, and some little dispute that looks like it is inconsequential and wouldn't amount to anything can just start it right off. That's why everything is important. World War II started by the shooting of a Duke. They used to have open hunting season on Dukes. They have been shooting Dukes as a national pastime in some of these countries, as I recall my history. But when that Duke was shot at that time and that place under certain pressures and conditions, it ignited a chain reaction. Long before anybody found out about the chain reaction of the atom, there was a chain reaction of humans. There is still chain reactions. That's why the explosive situation in Latin American today is not just isolated to Columbia or to Venezuela or in the mountains of Peru -- it could spread in every area as important. We don't just put down disputes or have other governments try to meet their own disputes by putting them down with military means when we get at it and find out that there are festering social, economic, and political conditions that bought on these disputes. Now some people say you are underestimating the fact and then that what you are really

saying is that Communists don't really have anything to say about it -- these things just come. I'm simply saying that the Communist is like a geiger counter. He goes around, he comes over the social terrain, and every time he finds a source of chaos and power that can be exploited, he grabs on to it. That's his business. The sooner we remember that, the better we'll be off. Well, I guess I have talked to you long enough. You have some questions that I am sure you want to ask me. I'll just summarize by saying that our national security policy must represent a balance, and, may I say that at times an adjusted balance, depending on the situation between the use of military power, economic power, political persuasion, political initiative, social power, and social reform. I don't believe any one of them is adequate. It's very much like some of our local conditions. I want to say there is so many similarities between what's going on in other parts of the world and what is going on at home that I sometimes wake up in the middle of the night and say "I wonder just where this has happened." When you get down to the problem of race relations in our

own country, look at the number of dispossessed, the number of people that have been bypassed, and you can go around and spend the next two years arguing why. I am here to tell you they have been bypassed. I am here to say to you that they were not properly educated. I am here to say that they are poorly housed, that there is a higher rate of disease. There is a higher rate of unemployment against the Negro as compared to the White, and more so amongst the Negro youth as compared to White youth. I am telling you the facts. Now how do you meet that problem when you don't mean it by just building new houses, and you don't mean it by just passing a new civil rights law, and you don't mean it by just having fair employment practices? You mean it by all of it plus everything else that you can think of -- all at once. So for the man that wants to take it leisurely and say well I'd like to deal with housing the next five years, he is just digging his own grave. You can't have better housing without better jobs. You can't have better jobs without better education. You can't have better education unless you are going to have better jobs because the

frustrations set in. You can't have better families unless you have better neighborhoods, and we can't have better neighborhoods unless you improve family life. It's all tied in together. It's the same way with our foreign policy. You cannot have peace in Vietnam by just the military, no matter how many victories they win. You'll never be able to get any peace in Vietnam if you just try to apply foreign aid. So we have to synchronize and in a sense harmonize and integrate the whole apparatus, and we have to develop equally competent skills and disciplines. That's why, when we pride ourselves upon the competency of our military power, we have to ask ourselves about our economics. Are we doing enough? Have we learned really yet how to put to work the capital resources, the technical assistance of this country and other countries, other under-developed countries to close the gap between the rich and the poor. Are we really facing up to the fact that if that gap does grow wider that there is no peace, or do you think that you have a formula for peace, even if the gap does grow wider? If you have, I wish you would hurry up and tell somebody about it. So, we just have

to come out boldly, courageously, and say to ourselves and to others that time is running out, and I think it is. I think the world is somewhat better, in many ways, but it is also somewhat worse. The fact is America is much more prosperous than it ever was. The fact is the schools are much better than they ever were. The fact is there are more jobs than there ever were, more dividends, more profits, better wages, except for some. Everything is relative, and when the 85% have a better life and the 15%, in relationship to the 85 level, have a worse life, you have trouble. At home, you've got it right now. What do you think about the world when the 15% have a better life and the 85% have a continuing growing worse life? That's what you're facing. If not, that's the wrong figure -- it's about -- I'd say about 60% -- let's say about 65 -- 35/65. Thirty-five per cent of humanity is doing better. Sixty-five per cent of humanity finds itself, relatively speaking, losing ground compared to the 35, and everything is relative. It depends on how you look at it to mean what you see if it is a backdrop or a means of measurement.

This is why that I believe that one of our national aims must be the mobilization of human resources, capital resources, technical resources on a massive scale, such as we have never envisioned. We are really running into problems far beyond what we ever dreamed. We are just now beginning to find out what's going on. Sometimes I think these domestic explosions that we have can teach us great international lessons if we will learn from them. We are beginning to find out a little more about foreign aid. I have my own particular prejudice views. That is one of the advantages of this country. You can have all the prejudice views you want; you just keep talking about them and if you get enough of them out, somebody may synchronize them, synthesize them, and bring together a reasonable view. I've always disagreed with the idea of huge, large, capital investments before you have an infra-structure that could absorb it. In fact, I've believed for a long time that much of the large capital investment ought to be by multi-national groups -- world banks, big international banks, and that the education, the health, the food, the technical assistance and so forth -- a lot of

that can be done bilaterally. Mr. Fulbright has some views on that; so do some others. I do believe, may I say, that the President ought to have himself a nice good international political fund, maybe of a million dollars or so that he could use, frankly, to help your friends, then you have a project. We are in competition, and when that competitor comes on up there and you have to meet him, you ought to be able to act quickly and not have to go through some big international organization. But we have not and, since we are leaders and we always say we are, you know, and others seem to agree with it until they want their way, I think it is up to us to call upon the industrialized powers of the world to do a great deal more than they've done in international development -- availability of capital, availability of technical resources because we are not winning that struggle in Africa, in Asia, and in Latin America. We are doing better in Latin America, but when you awaken a people you better be sure that you have something for them to do once they have their eyes open. My daddy put it another way. He said "Never give a man a T-bone steak if you plan

on feeding him hamburger the rest of his life, because once he has tasted it" -- that good steak, we like T-bones out there in the Mid-West before sirloins, I don't know why they ever quit serving T-bones around here, but then: this business of awakening the multitude and showing them the promised land, the good life, and then all at once you close the door on them, this is even worse. I think we ought to recognize that once we have the obligation to awaken, to need, then we must have the follow through, just exactly as we are doing at home in our war on poverty. You have the little children in the program called Headstart. You give them six weeks of the best and then you shove them right smack bang down in the slums again. That Headstart; that's false start. If you are going to have Headstart for the three and five year olds, you better use the same period of time you have to fix up the neighborhoods and start doing something with the families and see that daddy has a job and seeing that there is some playground and that there is some vocational training and I don't know what else. There is a massive lot to do, but let's just quit pitying ourselves.

You can't just put six weeks of Headstart and put the child that you lifted right out of the dirt and the grime and the mud and the broken home or whatever it may be and then drop him right back in it. This is why Headstart now which was started out to be a little summer program is continuing. Since we learned that once you got a headstart, you had better continue to move, and don't have back-up -- a false start. Now we have had Headstarts on a hundred and one countries. We have touched them with food and with money and with capital -- power. They got just enough of it now so that they are restless. Our task is to help them lift themselves, to develop that new leadership. to help to get others to do a bigger and better job, and I've often thought sometimes instead of having all these arguments with DeGaulle and others of what we ought to be doing is not arguing with them at all but simply saying "Well, that was very interesting, but now you know there is a great area of the world in which we ought to all work together and see if we couldn't put 5,000 technicians there. We don't need to have them all Americans. As a matter of fact, we'd be better

off if most of them weren't. We'll need two or three billion dollars in that area. We are going to need this; we are going to need that, and just let them whistle in the breeze about complaints while we lay out before the world tremendous ideas, programs, and policies challenging them to come forth with their part." It's a whole lot more important than our arguing about the Soviet Union on peace keeping funds in the United Nations. We got bogged out for one full year or a year and a half arguing about the Soviet Union paying dues to the Police Department when we should have been arguing about them taking a little of their money and coming over here and help in an international fund, a larger amount of it to work in Africa or to work in Asia where you can sanitize it by running it through the international system. Well, Ambassador Jones, I just came down here to ramble and talk with you. Now, I'll let you talk at me.

QUESTION: How do you feel about the situation in Vietnam? Specifically, can you identify the causes of it, how it's going? I know you're optimistic, but how do you feel about it now?

ANSWER: Well, let me first say I've never been too optimistic about what the situation is. I think I've known enough about the hard facts to know that this is a very, very difficult situation and one that hasn't been a winner. I think there are some temporary and current improvements both psychologically and militarily that are of some help at home and abroad, but I don't think we ought to start adding up the score right now because it won't look too good. I think you have to face up to fact No. 1 that most people don't even know how to spell Vietnam, much less where it is. This great nation of ours has had little or no Asian orientation. We are a European-oriented people. We know all about Europe. We get more excited about Berlin or Paris or Bonn or someplace over there in one day than you can get the whole country excited in five years about Asia. Now there are a few articulate people about Asia, but if we were really very

concerned about Asia, we would be showing more concern in the public press and in public office about what's happening in Japan, because what's happening in Japan right now is not very helpful to the United States; and our relationship with Japan is not exactly what you'd call the most cordial. They're formal; they're official, and the government is friendly, but governments come and governments go. People stay on forever, and I've always been a little bit more concerned about how some of the people think than how the government thinks because if the people think all right, the government will do all right. Don't worry about that. I've always found out that you can get a Congressman up here to do just about what you want to if you can count . . . (tape not audible) . . . back home. They start jingling that telephone or writing those letters and getting on the bus and coming down here. He just gets intelligent so quick. It's amazing how much information he can have overnight. Vietnam is far away to most Americans. Not only is Vietnam a long ways away, it isn't China. They don't think it is. In India they just didn't quite understand why we were there.

Now that doesn't mean that I think that it is not important. I do think that it's important. I think the test of power any place in the world is important, and I therefore try to explain our Vietnamese policy, not only on the basis of our national honor, not only on the basis of so-called commitments, because there are many commitments that have been made and there is of course a commitment of 54 and 60 and 61 and so on, but they're different kinds and types of commitments and different degrees. The main thing is that aggression is underway in that part of the world, open naked aggression. Americans understand that. They don't understand all these commitments with governments that come and go faster than the pages of a calendar. You know, I mean we're used to a more orderly society -- but they do understand aggression. And when you say that one of our purposes in South Vietnam is to make it clear that the rule of international life shall not be brutal force but rather shall be negotiations, diplomacy, conferences, law and order, and that we are not, as a major power, going to permit the Communist mechanism and the Communist movement

to use naked aggression for the gaining of its purposes, when you tell them that, they understand that. You don't need to bring in Saigon. Hell, who cares about where Saigon is. As a matter of fact, the people that I know, they don't even know where it is, except some of the smarter ones, they think they're smarter, and they've never been there, and then they really couldn't care less. But they do care about aggression and they do think that the only way that you can bring some degree of order in the world and some chance for man to work out his problems in a degree of peace or at least in a reasonable environment of peace is to stop the aggression before it gets too big. They remember World War II. They're a lot smarter than some of their teachers. So put it on the issue of aggression. Then if you also put it on the matter that here are some people who are really trying -- at least -- they would like to have a little freedom. They never have had any. That's what I told them in Wisconsin. They had the Chinese for eleven or twelve hundred years on their back. They had the French for 300 years. They really haven't had a nation, but they are

trying to make one, and they ought to have the right to try to make that one, and what we're really trying to do out there is quite simple. It's not very profound. We're just simply saying to the regime in the North "Leave your neighbor alone" because if the Communist powers can get by with taking over that neighbor, then it will take over a hundred other little countries just as well. Where do you draw the line? Which country gets to be more important, and you, if you want to talk about honor, you talk about honor and principles that this country believes in, not national honor in the sense of our soldiers being shot and therefore we must out of patriotic honor merely defend the life of that soldier. That's honor, yes, and that's important, but more important is the fact that this country committed itself to a world of peace, committed itself in the United Nations Charter, and in treaties and in words of Presidents, and in State documents we committed ourselves to being willing to sit down and try to work out the difficulties of this world around a conference table through diplomacy and negotiation, to reason rather than to force, and then

we also, and I tell it, look just as we are willing to apply the power that we have, not just for the Vietnamese, but even for ourselves, because we know that the aggressor is never satisfied. There's the history of the world written with the insatiability of aggressions. Never did one satisfy it. In our century, or in other centuries, never, and so as I said to these students who were carrying those signs, "Get out of Vietnam", I said that's exactly what we'd like to do, that is our policy. "Get out of Vietnam." God only knows we want to get out of Vietnam, but we'd like to know who is going to come in before we get out. We don't intend to get out and let the Communists come in. What we'd like to do is to permit Vietnam to work out its problems in peace. We'd like to be able to help those people, economically, socially, technically, with capital resources, with human resources, so that they have a chance for freedom. We believe in a change. The whole idea of America is opportunity. A chance -- give people a break and if it's good for us at home, it's good for them, and that's all we're asking. I ask the people to understand the new forms of

aggression, just like there are new forms of advertising, just exactly like there are new treatments of disease. There are new forms of aggression. There's a new virus. You correct the one, and you get another. And the new form of aggression is working and if this form of aggression can work in Vietnam, why can't it work in Venezuela or Columbia, or why can't it work even in Chile, or Peru, or someplace else? Where does your interest lie? Is it just here? I thought we got over that. I thought isolationism was dead. I thought we'd made up our mind that we live in a rather small world, and that whatever happens any place in the world is of some interest to us, some concern, and whenever a caller is on the move, and whenever a burglar is on the move, it's a danger to you. He may be in some of your neighbor's home today or tonight. He can be at your home tomorrow. There's a constant buildup here of psychological warfare. If they win there, they have a chance to win someplace else. It's just exactly like we feel about the Congress. We're passing bill after bill up there. What do you think we talked about this morning? We had some fella

saying "We ought to go home". The President and the Vice-President say "When you're winning, stay". When you got a winning hand, keep playing the game. And we're going to pass every bill we can before we leave here, every one, if we only stay in session until February next year, because once these fellas get home and they get a chance to start nip-picking and all the nip-pickers get to working on the nips and the naps, why then you'll have a tougher time next year passing any bills. The Communist knows that if he can win in South Vietnam, the people start in that area, they're not all world citizens, they're not looking over South America over in Europe. The Thais are in trouble, and the Burmese are in more trouble and then somebody else is in more trouble, and then everybody starts to accommodate themselves, as they say, to the new realities. Well, let one of the accommodations to realities be the fact of American power for the purposes of freedom. Let other people start to accommodate themselves to some other realities, namely that people have a right to live in peace. One time in my political career I was having a little trouble with our Chamber of Commerce back home, a very

fine group of business people. They are my good friends. I won a couple of elections, and finally, I said to them, "Now look, let's have an understanding. Do you want to get along or don't you? It isn't any longer a matter of my accommodating myself just to you. You'd better learn to accommodate yourself to me, and we can have peaceful co-existence, unless you want to fight. And, if you want one, I'm prepared to give you one. I've been licking you regularly, and I'm really ready to give you another one, but I don't want to do it. I'm for you. I like you. You're my friends. You're not necessarily an unpaid or paid supplement to the Republican Party. Why don't you just start being the Chamber of Commerce? Let's get along." And you know something? We learned to live together quite well, and we're both much better off. And I have a feeling that one of the reasons that they thought that was a good idea was that they had a couple of stinging defeats. People do join. I've suffered both defeat and victory, my dear friends, and I want to come out foursquare for victory. It has a great influence on people, so on Vietnam, I would

say that I try to emphasize that initiating for the peace, we've good many things going for us. The fact that the Viet Cong and North Vietnam have arrogantly repudiated all peace efforts and then finally, as I've said to my people back home, "Look, we may make mistakes, and I'm sure we have, I'm positive we have made a lot of them that I don't even know about, but your enemy is not in Washington. The enemy is in Hanoi and Peking. Your friend is in Washington." He may be a friend that errs in his judgment on occasion, but that's your friend, and you name me any other government, anywhere in the world that has said to friend and foe alike, that when you sit down to a conference table and we can bring about a peace that we're prepared to help you as well as the other fellow. We've said to North Vietnam and South Vietnam, we've said to the whole outfit, we're prepared to work with you. We'd rather have bread than bombs. We'd rather build schools than tanks. We're ready to help you. I think this has an effect, and I've never been afraid to go before these audiences. As a matter of fact, if I'd really pull it out of them, I mean really go to work. I think we could even

do better. There is a hand full of people I've talked to you about before. They feel worried about this use of power, and I must say that just the word itself kinda sends a shiver or two up my back all the time when I'm thinking about it, but we are a powerful nation, and there's nothing worse than a person that has the tools and the means to do some good and not to use them. You can forgive the fellow who has nothing, because he can't do anything, but for a person that has his grainery full of grain and the people are starving and for him to not feed them, he is a sinner of the worst order, and for a person who has money and power to stop the burglar when the burglar and the arsonist are going through the community and refuse to do it, he's an accomplice to the crime. The sins of omission, Mr. Roosevelt once said, are worse than the sins of commission. I think that's true internationally too. We have it. This is our problem, to get people to understand that we have this responsibility. O.K. Anybody else?

QUESTION: I think that one of the occupational hazards of the folks who are at this table here is that we don't know

how the people in this country feel in their reactions on things. Now if we don't stand for . . . (tape not audible) Do you feel that the American people will stick with the obligation of international burdens of law and order or are we going to have to expect reciprocal turns to turn inward?

ANSWER: No Sir, I think the American people follow good, intelligent leadership. I have people say to me and have had them say to me time after time, people that have disagreed with me on a partisan basis. I didn't get elected just by Democrats. In my state, you can't get elected that way. There aren't enough. They have to believe you. They have to trust you. They'll forgive you for a lot of foolish ideas. Most people are quite generous, quite forgiving. If that weren't the case, I'd still be selling sodas in Humphrey's Drugstore. They're very very reasonable and fair with you, if you talk to them frankly and you tell them what you are trying to do. If you show any intelligence and any grasp of the situation, the average citizen in America does not understand all of the detailed problems. You

wouldn't expect him to. He isn't down here. He doesn't get the intelligence reports. He's not in your work. But he's paying you just like he pays his doctor, just like he pays his dentist, and his lawyer. He's paying you to give him advice. Now he may not always take it. Even people refuse to take the advice of a doctor, even when they are critically ill, but most people take it. Most people follow the advice of their attorneys, even when it sometimes bothers them and they wish to goodness they didn't have to. Most people will follow strong leadership, and that's why I think the matter of our foreign involvement and our foreign commitments, while it isn't the most popular subject, it isn't one that always makes people stand up and cheer. They know that this is part of the burden of maturity. It's not always very popular, you know, and it's not always very pleasing to have people, to have the doctor come and tell you "Look you've got to change your pattern or to do this" or the lawyer to come and say to you "Look, I've been looking over your papers." There are certain things you ought to do. You wish you didn't have to do it. Or to have your banker come to you and say "Look, you are

spending more than you ought to. You can't pay the payments on your note." But most people respect that kind of advice. I really think that we have what it takes with reasonably good leadership. They don't expect you, people don't expect you, to run for office. They expect you to tend to office. They expect you to do the job that you are educated to do. I found that out. I've always went on. I've never ran away from the foreign policy issues in all my life in politics. I've always felt that you could explain it to the people, and they would come up with it. Let me show you how foolish some people are about it. The most popular institution in the world which gets more votes than anything is the United Nations. Every public opinion poll is oversold, I am sure, to some people, but you can go down into an area in which they say the Rednecks are, or the Minute Men, or the Ku Kluxers or the Isolationists -- you can go to any one of those areas and there is yet to be a poll that showed less than 75 per cent of the people strongly in support of the United Nations. Yet, ever so often I run into some stupid politician who is going around running down the United Nations.

I said "Why don't you down mother?" People love mother too. They love the United Nations. The United Nations is a popular instrument, and you know why -- because the people instinctively feel that it has some good to it. They instinctively feel, and they're pretty smart, pretty smart. They think it's not bad at all, these Americans around here, that if there has to be enforcement in the Congo, it may be better that it's made up of the Irish, and the Tunisians, and somebody else and the Indians rather than made up from Illinois, and Iowa, and Massachusetts, and California. They know the United Nations has a role to play. They're for Food to Peace too. They are even for foreign aid. Who likes to give money away? Who likes to be in the position of forty-year loans at some unbelievable rate of interest that you can't possibly get at home? There's a good opportunity for a bit of demagoguery here. Here's a little country way off over some place that you've never heard of that just elected a president, or somebody got into office some way, and it has an Ambassador. Next thing you know, we're making him a thirty-five-year loan at one-half of one per cent and

no interest payments or principal payments for the first two or three years, and then you have a little project in your county trying to get a new sewer for the county seat, and they say "Oh, you have got to wait. We just don't have enough money for that." Not only that, when you do get it you pay five per cent or six per cent and you start paying the first year, and they say "Well now, just what do we do to get like that little country that I can't remember the name of. How do we get like that"? And the joke is you have to get a few Communists and then they'll give you a cheap loan you see. Well, you see, that's what the demagogue uses out of the road. Now how do you answer that? That's used a good deal. You answer it simply on the basis of the overall national security interest of this country by saying "Look, we've taken all of this into consideration." There isn't any doubt that some of this foreign money is poorly spent. There isn't any doubt but what some of the countries that get it will spit in our face and there isn't any doubt but some of it, even if well spent, won't work. And if you don't believe it, look around this town and see some of the

stuff that is happening here -- our own citizens -- you have an example in every community doing the same thing, money poorly spent. A loan made to somebody and he hates the fellow that loaned him the money and insults him the rest of his life and even if it was well spent, it didn't work, and I've always found out, just like I used to defend civil servants when I was uh . . my favorite local little editors used to complain, always attacking the bureaucracies, civil service, so I'd get a list of all the civil servants in every town in Minnesota. I had a little trouble getting it; you would think the Government would provide that, but I finally got it, and I'd go into the town that had this little editorial about these terrible bureaucrats and the waste in the Government. I'd get right up and read the name; I'd say "Now Fred Smith, that editor over there thinks your daughter, Susie, is down there working in the Department of Interior as a never-do-well, corrupt, illicit, immoral, that's what he said right here in the editorial, read it, because that's who he's talking about. He's obviously talking about her, because she is one of those civil servant bureaucrats. Unless he wants

to write an editorial and say that everybody else but Susie and if that's the case I want to remind you about Julius over here," and I'd have about ten or twelve or fourteen names or fifty, depending on the size of the town and I'd just take on that little editor and make him just eat coal for a little while and let him explain that he didn't mean Fred Smith's daughter or John Jones' son or somebody else around the country.

QUESTION: Are the American people getting better acquainted with . . . (tape not audible).

ANSWER: Golly! It was very effective. Sort of jungle warfare.

QUESTION: In addition to presiding over the Senate, one observes a neurotic number of very important programs being placed under . . . (tape not audible).

ANSWER: Well, this office is growing, just as the country has and as the government has. I suppose it started back in the Roosevelt Administration, primarily with Henry Wallace

in the war years and then surely Mr. Truman and Mr. Barkley -- Mr. Barkley did a good deal of foreign travel as you may recall and also was very active with the Congress when he was the Vice-President and then Mr. Nixon under Eisenhower. I think the role grew much more. When the President was ill Mr. Nixon had to take on a large amount of administrative duties and he was chairman of the President's Equal Opportunity Commission or committee and then the laws were changed, as you know, to put the Vice-President under the National Security Council, a member of the cabinet, and then later on became chairman of the Space Council by statute, and also regent of the Smithsonian, but President Johnson was Vice-President. I think he understood, after a very active life as Senate Majority Leader, that the life of a vice-president could be very inactive unless it was put to good use, and he has surely given me a great chance, and the assignments that I've had, I like. By statute, of course, the chairman of the Advisory Council to the Peace Corps, I'm very interested in the Peace Corps; it's one of my pet projects. I was the legislative man for it under President Kennedy's Administration.

I introduced the bill and I'm chairman of the Advisory Council on the Poverty Program and we meet regularly. I'm sort of the President's monitor for that program. I help coordinate many agencies in it. The President asked me to coordinate the activities in the field of civil rights. We do this, I might say, quietly. We have the President's Equal Opportunity Council by executive order. I'm chairman of that. We have a very small staff which all the agencies of government funnel their information through. We try to coordinate all the activities like Title Six and Title Four of the Civil Rights Act, and I've headed up some of these ad hoc groups such as the President's Travel Task Force and this new Youth Employment Opportunity campaign. Now he's asked me for this back-to-school campaign. I get a lot of them and, then he gets me around the country a great deal, and the space council work takes me into a good deal of activity. I find it very engaging, very, very wonderful. It gives you a broad view of the Government, and I'm very fortunate to have a good, friendly personal relationship with the President, which is one of many years. It isn't new, and that relationship has been maintained and that's not the easiest thing

in Washington, when people always have their sort of weekly hunt of Vice-Presidents and Presidents. Can you find anything that the President disagrees with the Vice-President on or vice-versa. Is the Vice-President off here on some tangent by himself and the President over here and this President gives me a good deal of leeway. I think he understands me and therefore he permits that. But, I love the job.

QUESTION: Your comments in reference to Japan, and the importance of getting to the people -- I wonder if you would care to elaborate a little bit more on our standpoint -- the relative importance of getting to the elite. This is the problem we're getting overseas.

ANSWER: Well, it is the toughest one, and I really don't have any pat answer to it, honestly, and I know that we've made many efforts to do so. Our labor movement, for example, working in consort with other labor movements -- there is a considerable Socialist and some Communist influence in the labor movement in Japan. I'm not knowledgeable enough about that country, I regret to tell you, and I think I'm quite

typical. I maybe spend a little more time on these matters than most people, and I'm ashamed to tell you how little I know. I only know about some of the troubles in the Far East. How little I know. How much I think I ought to know! I'm not trying to be too humble about it. It's just a sad fact. I just work at it, and yet, I'm a college graduate. I'm a graduate student in international relations. I've read until it ran out of my ears. But most of the stuff I read, they buried that stuff a long time ago. It's all been changed and I feel that our programs of information, of cultural exchange, of our contacts with labor, of the group leaders that are brought to the countries -- we're going to try to have an exchange with the Japanese Parliament, the Diet, and ours. I think this will be somewhat helpful to get the kind of working exchange that we have on a systematic basis. We've had one with Canada, and we've had one with Mexico; we've had one with the British Commonwealth, and this is, I'm quite sure, a great help. The Vietnamese problem, of course, is the number one thing that has cooled off some relationships between ourselves and some elements

of the Japanese population and the political leaders of the moment. I also think that Japan ought to be taken in as a full partner just like we do Germany. It's just my view of it. I think it is. I don't think we give it quite enough attention. We're always worried about any move we make in Europe lest Germany be offended. I think we ought to be equally concerned about the Far East. Japan represents the modern industrialized power of the Far East. It's one of the great powers of the world. I think she needs every consideration, every one that we give to England, France, Germany, and even more so because she took an awful beating from this nation. There are undoubtedly scars of humiliation, of defeat. There's so little interchange of our people despite the great trade that we have. So few Americans know about Japan. I think we have to do as much about her as we are going about Latin America. We're beginning to understand Latin America. Our newspapers are even writing about Latin America. Now they think it is here to stay. Ten years ago you never heard anything about Latin America except that somebody got shot. We're beginning now to find out that

there's a Latin America, that there are several Latin Americas. Every country is different. Every one has a little separate identity. There's the northern part, and the southern cone, and there's Central America, which is different from Latin America, and there's Mexico -- that's different from them all. We're beginning to understand this thing. It takes a tremendous amount of information on the part of our own people and our community and theirs. The use of television and radio here at home and abroad I think has a great deal that can be said about it that's helpful. This matter of getting to people and molding public opinion is a long-term proposition, a long time. I don't want to be misunderstood about the Japanese situation. Our Government relations are good, but I have a feeling that this is not the most popular period for Americans in Japan. I've talked with our Ambassador. I've talked to others. I've talked to American businessmen, and they generally give you a pretty good idea. They're quite pragmatic about the whole thing. They don't try to kid themselves, because they have some pretty big investments, some of them. Some of their bankers, some of my friends that are

in the banking business, that I've talked to tell me that there's a bit of a chill when bombers take off from Okinawa. This doesn't help. I don't say that we shouldn't do this. I think we just have to recognize these things and then figure out what do we do. I imagine one of the reasons now that we're a little more careful on where the bombing B-52's come from may have some relationship to this. I would hope so. I think that there are some things you don't always have to put on the front page.

QUESTION: I would like to ask, Mr. Vice-President, about the talks which occurred . . . (tape not audible) One of the problems with foreign aid is identifying foreign aid as a matter of self-interest . . . (tape not audible) Ours is a foreign aid that's really never known how to interpret or translate . . . (tape not audible) . . . It would be very interesting to hear from you how we would do this, but at the same time, in thinking of a separate . . . (tape not audible) . . . you may have wondered if part of the discussion we have just had on the American people getting better acquainted with other parts in which we

discovered . . . (tape not audible). . . . Well, foreign aid is for the birds, but no, we don't mean the Alliance for Progress. Is this a sort of . . . (tape not audible). . . ? Is this a part of the answer or is this the whole answer?

ANSWER: Well, it surely is part of it. I agree with that last statement about the generalization that's made "but I don't mean the Alliance for Progress." The Alliance for Progress is possibly not well understood detail by detail but it means something. It is like the Marshall Plan. The Alliance for Progress, it is a concept, it is a program, it is directed at a target. It isn't just foreign aid, you know, for the whole world. All at once we've begun to believe that the people that live in the Southern part of the Argentine are closer to Minnesota than the people who are over in Europe or in the Middle East. They're not, but we think they are. We've developed a mystique or a romantic feeling about Latin America now. I think this is good. You have to have that. You cannot sustain in the American public over a long period of time these commitments of such amounts unless you sort of -- unless it's dramatized.

It has not just the cold blood or the cold facts of the double-entry bookkeeping. It also has to have a little romance to it, a little razzmatazz, you know, a little simpatico, and let me tell you, that is important, not only important in Latin America. It's important every place. Most people want some packaging. If that were not the case, then much of the American commerce is on the wrong wave length. We spend more time packaging goods than we do developing the goods. I suggest that one of the reasons the Alliance for Progress is effective is that we packaged it. It was launched in the White House. It was a special time; it was given some special attention, and it was dramatized, and it was reported, and we were told that these were our neighbors. Look at where they are. They are our neighbors, but they are a long ways away, and they don't speak our language any more than people in other parts of the world, that is they do not speak English, but they're in our hemisphere. Now! What does this lead one to? It leads me to this -- that possibly we ought to look over our foreign aid program on the basis of finding other packages that can be developed

and putting over some of what you can't put in the package into an international type of fund. Let the World Bank do a little bit more. There will be the Asian Bank. Let's get that developed. We do have the Inter-American Development Bank which we've tied in with the Alliance for Progress. But I believe that some of the emphasis that's been placed upon the multi-lateral approach, even in capital supply, has great merit. And then when we find some area where we want to work ourselves, such as in the MeKong Delta, now, where we want to put a little extra emphasis, even though that's multi-national, we're going to emphasize that, because there is a crisis. We've lost men. There's blood there, and there's American manpower. We're going to be interested in the MeKong Delta, or whatever you call it. This is really going to be something. When I heard the other day that the French had never even built a bridge across this river -- that may not be true, but I heard somebody say it at the White House -- one of our top officers. When I think of that, when I think that there had been really no development of this river, then you understand why we have problems as

we have them today. Here was a friendly power, a colonial power in this country for a hundred and fifty years, or a hundred years or whatever the period of time was, a long period of time, and they didn't do a thing. All they did was develop Saigon, a few others, but none of the resources. This is why we reap a whirlwind today of trouble. Too many areas in the world like that. And I think we ought to, as I said a while ago, instead of arguing with Charlie DeGaulle and everything, I just keep reminding them about the great opportunities that exist here, to sort of let him know inversely and reversely that we knew he didn't put one damn dime in it. He took a lot out and we just think it is time to pay back. A few other countries in the world all have strong currencies and all those European central bankers are somewhat -- I keep reading in the paper that they can do something to the dollar. Well, I want you to know that I think the dollar is a mighty good thing. I've been after it a long time, and I finally got ahold of enough of it to make life enjoyable. I don't intend to have any European banker who isn't taking on his responsibility in the world -- I'm just that much of a

Mid-Westerner -- start to tell me what to do about the dollar when they're not doing enough about Africa and Latin America and Asia. I think we ought -- I don't want to be that mean to them -- I just think you ought to subtly remind them that if they are interested in all this stuff, we've got a place for them to work. That's up to you fellows. You're supposed to be the experts in that. I want to go back. I have not found that foreign aid is a negative politically. It is up here in Congress because we are sort of infestuous. We just work on each other. But, it isn't our home. It isn't exactly a great big plus, but do you think that the Maritime subsidy is a plus in Minnesota? Do you think the wheat subsidy is a plus in Rhode Island? Of course it's not. There are all kinds of things that are not pluses in different areas. But you can live with it, and you can vote as a Senator from a state in the New England areas and vote even for a farm bill and get re-elected. You can vote in the Mid-West for something that relates as I did even for the Fairless Works digging out that river up there. That hurt our ore-mining industry. I didn't get defeated. I sometimes

wonder why I did it, but I voted. I just do not believe that all of these are negatives.

QUESTION: Sir, may I ask you quite frankly to give us your comments as to the influence of the press up on the Hill. To what extent are votes swallowed one way or the other by editorials as opposed to correspondence.

ANSWER: Not too much, I would say. Not the editorials here. The editorials back home make a great deal of difference. A Congressman is a very, very shrewd and astute political barometer. He's always a little more timid and sensitive than you would think because American politics is basically pressure politics, and if you are a worrier, you know, and if editorials are going to govern you, it is the local editorials, not the ones of the Washington Star, the Washington Post, or the Star or the Daily News. If you are from the Seventh District in Iowa, who cares what they say down here, unless you just want to be popular. Washington? What you ought to do is to be popular back in Dubuque and Sioux City. That's where you get the votes, and that's the people

you're representing. Those editorials back there do have an impact, I can assure you, and what is more, the type of news that comes out, radio, and television. I would say that television has changed a great deal of the public's attitude on many issues. One telecast, one good telecast, in which you are on, where you can be a participant, even the news, is worth, oh, so much other publicity, so many people see it. So many people hear it. If you can be a participant on the Today Show, or if you can get on even your little local television station back home, they can write a lot of editorials about you, but if you have any way to get across, if you come through, fairly good, it just erases a lot of that other. So don't underestimate the impact of editorial comment or news and the printed word, but there are other ways of overcoming it. The television, I think, has been the saving grace of this. Television on these issues is pretty good that we are talking about, the big national hook-ups and all.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice-President, my question concerns disarmament and arms control. First of all, do you think there is any

chance that there has been any meaningful agreement in this field. Secondly, how do you think the people of this country are reacting to our efforts?

ANSWER: Well, I met with the Advisory group before Mr. Foster went to Geneva. It was my view, and I've so recommended, that we ought to limit our initiatives at this conference to certain specifics, such as nuclear proliferation. I think this is the most important issue. I think this has the political importance, the political appeal to it that makes it important too besides being terribly important in terms of the future of mankind. I think we ought to get on that one because this is the one that means something to us. It means something to the Soviet Union too, and you'll never get any agreements unless they are mutually beneficial. I mean the agreement has to be mutually beneficial. I don't believe that this is the time that you make a big case out of general disarmament. It's very difficult to ask the American people on the one hand to stand by you on Vietnam and on the other hand have somebody working the precincts on general disarmament. That doesn't mean that you abandon that

at all. It's a matter of timing. It's more or less making plans in your life. You may decide that you're going to send your oldest son, your second son, and your young daughter all off to great private schools. Just everything's going great. Everything's coming up roses. Then all at once mother gets sick. Well, then, you have to make up your mind. You can't have mother sick and three children in private schools. Well, we've got somebody sick over in Vietnam. So you can't do everything over here, but that doesn't mean you'll abandon it. It means that you keep it alive, you keep that hope alive, you keep it on the table, so to speak, but you work on the other -- at nuclear proliferation, and I would say the second one would be on comprehensive test-ban agreement. I doubt that you're going to get that as quickly as you get non-nuclear proliferation. That's the one that we have a great interest in, and the Soviets, and I think it is the biggest issue of our time.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice-President, you talked about the use of power. We do seem to have a great deal of tenderness involved. Is there some possibility that we confuse the use of power

with violence. I seem to see that in some reactions to domestic uses of power.

ANSWER: I think so. We've never been, over our long history, a nation that used military power particularly, except in extreme cases where we tooled up in a hurry, World War II, World War I, but we've been armed now for twenty-five years, really, as a world power. Slowly but surely beginning to seep into us, to our minds and thinking, that we may very well be in this sort of a situation for rather extended, continuing extended periods of time. We have an ambivalence now. I mean we have a sort of split personality. We have a kind of schizo about it. On the one hand you and I know that we ought to use that power, and then we say "Oh, but I wish we didn't have to", and the minute that somebody reminds us that we really ought not to have and gives us a good speech on it, we feel badly and then we start to reassess and I guess that's all right too, as I was saying here, that we have so much power that you really do need somebody giving you not only weekly sermons about it but rather almost daily sermons. You ought to go through a kind

of anguish and pain about this all the time. I don't think we ought to get happy about the use of power. Let's put it that way. I don't think we even ought to become accustomed to it, because then it becomes too easy because power is one of the ways that we have a sort of doing away with our troubles supposedly. It's like taking large doses of pain reliever. It really doesn't get you around to revising your living habits and doing the things that you need to cure the organic defect or the problem that you have. So, I have a feeling that we'll just go through life kind of miserable. It's kind of a Calvinistic approach to it. You know, you like to live a man's life with all of the minor and major sins, but you just don't enjoy it. It's miserable. There's a lot to this in terms of religious ethic of this country, to be in all frankness. I think maybe this is the controlling factor. There is the religious ethic about the evil of manpower and what he might do with it. This is one of the main arguments about big governments. You can always get a big appeal, you know. I mean you get out and you talk about that government in Washington. You know, that

one that is away from you -- that great big government -- evil. They just draw conclusions. This is the argument about big business. Big business is evil. Big union, evil. Big bank, evil. Just bigness, power. Now, slowly but surely, there is a fashioning of a more rational position, but I must caution you out of my parochial instincts to say that I wouldn't want to get accusomted to all this big power without having somebody occasionally remind us what Lord Acton said "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely", and I think it is true. You have to watch it, because it is too easy to use that old military power, just move in on them. You would be surprised how many people will support that in a hurry. I want you to do more thinking about these things. We have to find the harder and the more difficult answers. I think I have to go pretty quick. I wouldn't want to cut you off. I've had a great time with you. If that is agreeable with you, I'll depart.





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