

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

TENTH ANNIVERSARY DINNER

THE CATHOLIC ADULT EDUCATION CENTER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 31, 1966

It is a privilege and a pleasure to participate in the tenth anniversary celebration of the Catholic Adult Education Center of Chicago.

It is a special pleasure to join you in honoring Adlai Stevenson through the Adlai Stevenson Award. And I'm singularly honored to be the first recipient.

Adlai Stevenson would cherish this award. For him, spirited discussion of public issues was indispensable to the functioning of democratic government, to the health of a free society.

For him free discussion included public airing of issues whose time had not arrived. "Our country," Stevenson stated in October 1952, "was built on unpopular

ideas, on unorthodox opinions. My definition of a free society is a society where it is safe to be unpopular."

As a man who spent much of his professional life in this community, Adlai Stevenson knew and valued the contribution of this Center in probing the controversial issues of the present and the future.

During the past ten years, under the distinguished leadership of Monsignor Daniel Cantwell, Dr. Russell Barta, and Mr. Vaile Scott, you have practiced that "free speech in the Church" which the German theologian Karl Rahner has described as essential to the formation of the Christian conscience.

You have debated within the community those hard issues which Adlai Stevenson aired for over a decade before the American people - the issues of nuclear war and peace, of social inequality and injustice at home and abroad, of urban blight and rural decay brought by technological revolution, of freedom and dissent at home while challenged by tyranny abroad.

For many Americans, his views once sounded faintly heretical. In politics, the difference between a heretic and a prophet is often one of sequence.

Often prophecy is heresy - properly aged.

An essential quality of a statesman is a willingness to risk being prematurely wise - and an unwillingness to hide one's wisdom. The man whom you honor epitomized this concept of statesmanship.

Adlai Stevenson sought to maximize the element of rationality in politics. As an experienced political leader, he knew that one of the difficulties of being reasonable in an irrational world is that you have a small clientele. No public man in our time did more to enlarge the clientele of reason in politics. It was Adlai Stevenson more than anyone else who brought back to American life the spirit described by John Adams as one of "public happiness."

This spirit is reflected in "delight in participation in public discussion and public action, a joy in citizenship, in self-government, in self-control, in

self-discipline and in dedication." In this spirit Stevenson attracted to public life in its broadest sense the many talented men and women who today serve their country and the world community. Many of these are in this room tonight.

He brought dignity and honor to public affairs. He graced the term politics with the nobility of his spirit, the brilliance of his mind, and the eloquence of his speech.

A free society such as ours cannot flourish without the enlightenment which private groups like the Adult Education Center bring to public life. "The essence of republican government," Adlai Stevenson once said, "is not command. It is consent."

The enlightened consensus required for representative government to function is created when public spirited individuals provide the leadership and the platform for searching scrutiny of the burning issues of our time.

Today a burning issue of our time is the role of the United States in Southeast Asia.

Responsible citizens are divided on the policy we should pursue.

There are those who believe that we have overreached ourselves in involving ourselves so deeply in the defense of a country and a people thousands of miles from home.

They suggest that we reduce our commitments in areas outside what they believe to be our natural "sphere of influence."

There are citizens, too, who counsel deeper involvement through a sharply-increased escalation of the war - including possible use of nuclear weapons.

But, it seems to me, both overlook the facts of mid-Twentieth Century life.

Neither of these views provides a firm premise for the foreign policy of a world power in the Twentieth Century.

The first overlooks the indivisibility of freedom, the interdependence of the defense of freedom in all areas of the world.

This position further overlooks the attempt by Asian Communists to prove that peaceful coexistence is a fraud . . . that the misnamed "wars of national liberation" will bring Communist victories over non-Communist states which ultimately will lack the will to oppose them.

An abrupt withdrawal from Asia might bring short-term comfort at home, but only at the expense of freedom abroad - the freedom of the Vietnamese people in this case.

To sacrifice the people of Vietnam would only leave other Asian countries defenseless before new Communist aggression unchecked and in fact encouraged.

To those who counsel deeper and more intense involvement, we could tomorrow destroy the war potential of both North Vietnam and Communist China by using the powerful weapons that underpin our national military strength.

But with what result?

Our days of nuclear monopoly have passed. Who among us is the one who wishes to pull the nuclear trigger?

Finally, both arguments are inconsistent with our American traditions of self-determination and of humanism.

Those who call for withdrawal must ask themselves: Will you bear personal responsibility for the millions of men, women and children we would leave behind to meet their inevitable fates?

Those who call for a quick nuclear victory must ask themselves: Will you bear personal responsibility for the possible unleashing of World War III - and for the nuclear holocaust that would follow nuclear attack?

I believe we have no choice but to follow the difficult middle course - the course described some 12 years ago by Adlai Stevenson in a lecture at Harvard University:

"The task is to work with allied and friendly countries to create a world environment favorable to the steady growth of free institutions. This means political arrangements which will make possible the unity of action essential to survival but which at the same time are consistent with diversity . . . The task never ends. Progress will be slow . . . To search for a 'solution' prematurely is more likely to produce war than peace.

"Because of the nature of free societies, it is of the utmost importance to prevent war, if possible, and if this is not possible, to keep any future war as severely limited in scope as possible.

"It is a sign of strength, not of weakness, to be able to keep war limited.

"To generalize hostilities to a world scale would imperil the very institutions we seek to save by war.

"Our objective is not the destruction of Communism by war. Our objective is not the incitement of others to violence. Our objective is not to rectify the boundaries and correct the unnatural divisions that afflict the world by force, but by peaceful processes.

"Our objective is a peace consistent with decency and justice. And our prayer is that history will not say that we led a noble war but a lost cause."

Governor Stevenson then went on to say that men's hopes were contained in "our ability to convince the rulers of the other (Communist) world that they cannot extend their system by force, or by stealth, and that unless they use force against us we will not use force

against them; that our coalition (of free nations) exists but to serve and to save the imperishable principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

"Intolerant power respects power, not weakness."

What Adlai Stevenson said 12 years ago remains true today. We do not seek, by force or stealth, to impose our social and political system on others. And - lest the world be plunged into a disastrous spiral of lawlessness - we must oppose those who do.

An old Senate colleague of mine used to say, when the debate got thick and heavy: "Don't interrupt me now, I don't want to be handicapped by too many realities."

Today, we dare not shrink from the recognition of "too many realities."

Let me enumerate some of the "realities" of this struggle.

First, there is the reality that we face in South Vietnam no mild-mannered liberal evolutionary reformist party or movement. We face dedicated Communist-led terrorists seeking by force to subject a nation to their will.

Some of these revolutionaries are from the South. Some are from the North. Some are irregulars. Some are regular North Vietnamese soldiers. Some of their supply and direction comes from the South. Some of it comes from Hanoi. Some of it comes from Peking. Their creed is Communism and their means is terror - murder - violence - war.

Second, there is the reality that what is happening in Vietnam is not an isolated occurrence, unconnected to events elsewhere.

Those who inspire and support the use of force in Vietnam have made their plans clear. Those plans include the use of subversion, of propaganda, of assassination, of sabotage, and of outright military action to gain their objectives throughout the world.

In some places, such as Vietnam, aggression has come in the guise of a war of national liberation.

In others, such as India and Korea, it has come as movement of regular troops across a national frontier.

The Communist-backed terrorism in Vietnam is being felt not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Latin America.

Third, I would point to the reality that - faced with this aggressive force - our response has been measured and our objective peaceful.

Last April President Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, made clear the unconditional nature of our offer toward peaceful negotiation.

He has reiterated that offer many times. He has emphasized that so-called National Liberation Front representatives could be represented in the negotiations.

Last May the President ordered suspension of bombing in the North in the hope that this might stimulate negotiation.

In December we suspended the bombing again and for 37 days.

In the past several weeks, the President has sent emissaries throughout the world to seek some means leading toward peaceful negotiation.

Initiatives outside our own - by the UN Secretary General; by 17 non-aligned nations; by the United Kingdom, Ghana, India and other Commonwealth nations; by Japan; by the United Arab Republic; by Pope Paul VI - have been undertaken without success. - All of these we have supported and embraced.

We have stated unequivocally again and again that we support any effort toward negotiation, no matter where initiated. And we have directly communicated to Hanoi our willingness to begin immediately unconditional discussions.

What has been the response from Hanoi and Peking? I read from Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday:

" . . . The U.S. imperialists are clamoring about their desire for peace and their readiness to engage in unconditional discussion in the hope of fooling world opinion and the American people . . ."

From Peking has come an unusually violent torrent of hate propoganda regarding President Johnson's - and I quote - "filthy and vicious . . . basket of peace."

It is clear that - in this time as in the past - those whose creed is force disbelieve the determination of democratic societies to resist their force.

Given this response to the U.S. peace offensive, President Johnson had no choice but to take steps to restore military pressure on North Vietnam.

He announced his decision this morning to resume air attacks on military installations in North Vietnam.

But, in announcing this decision, the President emphasized that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our own pursuit of peace."

Ambassador Goldberg has been instructed to request an immediate meeting of the UN Security Council, and he has done so!

We shall do all we can to implement the Pope's suggestion that the full resources of the United Nations be used to achieve a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

The President's statement this morning indicates that we will continue to follow the difficult middle course:

the course we have followed since the end of World War II . . . the course of choosing the durable way and the long solution.

We are engaged today with other nations by treaty and mutual security agreement - treaty and agreement which shield both those nations and ourselves from Communist aggression. It is the integrity of our commitment that provides hope for peace.

What would be the result next week in Europe if we failed to keep our commitment in Berlin?

What would be the result next month in the rest of Asia, in the Middle East if we did not honor our commitment in Vietnam?

What would be the result in Peking if the leaders of Communist China had reason to believe we would falter or retreat?

The answer to these questions is self-evident.

I believe Americans have learned the lessons of history so that we may not be doomed to repeat them.

We have learned that the appetite of aggressors is never satisfied. Aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed.

We have learned that a threat to freedom elsewhere can soon become a threat to freedom here.

But we must face up to some other realities.

Can we accept the possibility that the struggle against Communist expansion can go on for years ahead?

Can we adapt the use of our military power to achieve limited goals while possessing military power in almost limitless quantity?

Can we persevere in our search for peaceful negotiation in the face of rejection by our adversaries?

Can we devote ourselves to patient efforts toward economic and social progress in an environment of violence and terror?

Can we maintain our own devotion to free institutions while opposed by those without regard for them?

Can we, finally, convince those who live by force that time is on our side?

Can we demonstrate to them that we are too strong to be afraid, too determined to be defeated?

I answer: Yes, we can and we shall.

Adlai Stevenson once said:

"America's life story is the record of a marvelous growth of body, mind and character. Now at maturity we shoulder the heaviest burdens of greatness, for in the last analysis, the epic struggle for our civilization, for government by consent of the governed, will be determined by what Americans are capable of."

And Americans are capable of waging the long, hard battle for freedom around the globe for as long as freedom is threatened.

We have the leadership and the resolution to fulfill our responsibility as leader of the free world. We have the courage and the will to build for peace even as we resist the aggressor.

~~Your Excellency~~ Bishop Cody
~~Very Rev Msgr~~ Daniel Cantwell
Mr. Michael Kennedy, Dinner Chairman
Michael Kennedy

✓ Ambassador Rivkin
✓ Governor Kerner
✓ Mayor Daley

REMARKS

Sisters
Rev clergy
& my fellow
Americans!

Mayor
looks
rested
&
tanned

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
TENTH ANNIVERSARY DINNER
THE CATHOLIC ADULT EDUCATION CENTER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 31, 1966

Warm Welcome!

It is a privilege and a pleasure to participate in the tenth anniversary celebration of the Catholic Adult Education Center of Chicago. It is a special pleasure to join you in honoring Adlai Stevenson through the Adlai Stevenson Award. *and I'm singularly honored to be the first recipient*

Adlai Stevenson would cherish this award. For him, spirited discussion of public issues was indispensable to the functioning of democratic government, to the health of a free society.

↳ For him free discussion included public airing of issues whose time had not arrived. "Our country," Stevenson stated in October 1952, "was built on unpopular ideas, on unorthodox opinions, My definition of a free society is a society where it is safe to be unpopular."

↳ As a man who spent much of his professional life in this community, Adlai Stevenson knew and valued the contribution of this Center in probing the controversial issues of the present and the future. ↳ During the past ten years, under the distinguished leadership of Monsignor Daniel Cantwell, Dr. Russell Barta, and Mr. ^{VAIL} Vaile Scott, you have practiced that "free speech in the Church" which the German theologian Karl Rahner has described as essential to the formation of the Christian conscience.

↳ You have debated within the community those hard issues which Adlai Stevenson aired for over a decade before the American people -- the issues of nuclear war and peace, of social inequality and injustice at home and abroad, of urban blight and rural decay brought by technological revolution, of freedom and dissent at home while challenged by tyranny abroad.

↳ For many Americans, his views once sounded faintly heretical. In politics, the difference between a heretic and a prophet is often one of sequence. ↳ Often prophecy is heresy -- properly aged. ↳ An essential quality of a statesman is a willingness to risk being prematurely wise -- and an unwillingness to hide one's wisdom. The man whom you honor epitomized this concept of statesmanship.

h Adlai Stevenson sought to maximize the element of rationality in politics. As an experienced political leader, he knew that one of the difficulties of being reasonable in an irrational world is that you have a small clientele. No public man in our time did more to enlarge the clientele of reason in politics.

Direct

~~he made, for in our own country~~ it was Adlai Stevenson more than anyone else who brought back to American life the spirit described by John Adams as one of "public happiness."

4 A

- # -

This spirit is reflected in "delight in participation in public discussion and public action, a joy in citizenship, in self-government, in self-control, in self-discipline and in dedication." In this spirit Severson attracted to public life in its broadest sense the many talented men and women who today serve their country and the world community. Many of these are in this room tonight.

He brought dignity and honor to public affairs. He graced the term politics with the nobility of his spirit, the brilliance of his mind, and the eloquence of his speech.

stop

Inspired by his words and his work, let us go forth to build a civilization of which he would be proud.

#####

43

A free society such as ours cannot flourish without the enlightenment which private groups like the Adult Education Center bring to public life. "The essence of republican government," Adlai Stevenson once said, "is not command. It is consent."

The enlightened consensus required for ~~republican~~ ^{Representative} government to function is created when public spirited individuals provide the leadership and the platform for searching scrutiny of the burning issues of our time.

↳ Today a burning issue of our time is the role of the United States in Southeast Asia.

↳ Responsible citizens are divided on the policy we should pursue.

There are those who believe that we have overreached ourselves in involving ourselves so deeply in the defense of a country and a people thousands of miles from home.

↳ They suggest that we reduce our commitments in areas outside what they believe to be our natural "sphere of influence."

↳ There are citizens, too, who counsel deeper involvement through a sharply-increased escalation of the war -- including possible use of nuclear weapons.

↳ But, it seems to me, both overlook the facts of mid-twentieth Century life.

Neither of these views provides a firm premise for the foreign policy of a world power in the 20th Century.

The first overlooks the ^{indivisibility} indissolubility of freedom, the interdependence of the defense of freedom in all areas of the world.

This position further overlooks the attempt by Asian Communists to prove that peaceful coexistence is a fraud . . . that the misnamed "wars of national liberation" will bring Communist victories over non-Communist states which ultimately will lack the will to oppose them.

An abrupt withdrawal from Asia might bring short-term comfort at home, but only at the expense of freedom abroad -- the freedom of the Vietnamese people in this case. To sacrifice the people of Vietnam would only leave other Asian countries defenseless before new Communist aggression unchecked and in fact encouraged.

To those who counsel ^{- 7 -} deeper + more intense involvement,

We could tomorrow destroy the war potential of both North Vietnam and Communist China by using the powerful weapons that underpin our national military strength.

But with what result?

Our days of nuclear monopoly have passed. Who among us is the one who wishes to pull the nuclear trigger? — ~~to set off the nuclear Holocaust.~~

Finally, both arguments are inconsistent with our American traditions of self-determination and of humanism.

↳ Those who call for withdrawal must ask themselves: Will you bear personal responsibility for the millions of men, women and children we would leave behind to meet their inevitable fates?

- 7A -

Those who call for a quick nuclear victory must ask themselves: Will you bear personal responsibility for the possible unleashing of World War III -- and for the possible ~~blow against humanity that is a nuclear attack?~~ nuclear holocaust that would

follow nuclear attack.?

↳ I believe we have no choice but to follow the difficult middle course -- the course described some 12 years ago by Adlai Stevenson in a lecture at Harvard University:

"The task is to work with allied and friendly countries to create a world environment favorable to the steady growth of free institutions. This means political arrangements which will make possible the unity of action essential to survival but which at the same time are consistent with diversity . . . The task never ends. Progress will be slow . . . To search for a 'solution' prematurely is more likely to produce war than peace.

of
"Because of the nature of free societies, it is/the utmost importance to prevent war, if possible, and if this is not possible, to keep any future war as severely limited in scope as possible. ↳ It is a sign of strength, not of weakness, to be able to keep war limited.

↳ To generalize hostilities to a world scale would imperil the very institutions we seek to save by war.

"Our objective is not the destruction of communism by war. Our objective is not the incitement of others to violence. Our objective is not to rectify the boundaries and correct the unnatural divisions that afflict the world by force, but by peaceful processes. ↳ Our objective is a peace consistent with decency and justice. And our prayer is that history will not say that we led a noble war but a lost cause."

Governor Stevenson then went on to say that men's hopes were contained in "our ability to convince the rulers of the other (Communist) world that they cannot extend their system by force, or by stealth, and that unless they use force against us we will not use force against them;

that our coalition (of free nations) exists but to serve and to save the imperishable principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

"Intolerant power respects power, not weakness."

↳ What Adlai Stevenson said 12 years ago remains true *today*.

We do not seek, by force or stealth, to impose our social and political system on others. And -- lest the world be plunged into a disastrous spiral of lawlessness -- we must oppose those who do.

↳ An old Senate colleague of mine used to say, when the debate got thick and heavy: "Don't interrupt me now, I don't want to be handicapped by too many realities."

Today, we dare not shrink from the recognition of "too many realities."

Let me enumerate some of the "realities" of this struggle.

↳ First, there is the reality that we face in South Vietnam no mild-mannered liberal evolutionary reformist party. We face dedicated Communist-led ^{or movement} revolutionaries ^{terrorists} seeking by force to subject a nation to their will. Some of these revolutionaries are from the South. Some are from the North. Some are irregulars. Some are regular North Vietnamese soldiers. Some of their supply and direction comes from the South. Some of it comes from Hanoi. Some of it comes from Peking. Their creed is communism and their means is terror. *-murder-violence-war-*

#2 ↳ Second, there is the reality that what is happening in Vietnam is not an isolated occurrence, unconnected to events elsewhere. ↳ Those who inspire and support the use of force in Vietnam have made their plans clear.

Those plans include the use of subversion, of propaganda,
of assassination, of sabotage, and of outright military
action to gain their objectives throughout the world. In
some places, such as Vietnam, aggression has come in
the guise of a war of national liberation. In others,
such as India and Korea, it has come as movement of
regular troops across a national frontier.

↳ The Communist-backed terrorism in Vietnam is being
felt not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Latin
America.

#3 ↳ Third, I would point to the reality that -- faced with
this aggressive force -- our response has been measured
and our objective peaceful.

↳ Last April President Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, made clear the unconditional nature of our offer toward peaceful negotiation. ↳ He has reiterated that offer many times. He has emphasized that so-called National Liberation Front representatives could be represented in the negotiations.

↳ Last May the President ordered suspension of bombing in the North in the hope that this might stimulate negotiation. ↳ In December we suspended the bombing again *and for 37 days.*

In the past several weeks, the President has sent emissaries throughout the world to seek some means *leading* toward peaceful negotiation. ↳ Initiatives outside our own -- by the UN Secretary General, by 17 non-aligned nations, by the United Kingdom, Ghana, India and other Commonwealth nations; by Japan, by the United Arab Republic; by Pope Paul VI -- have been undertaken without success. - *all of*

these we have supported and embraced.

↳ We have stated unequivocally^{again + Again} that we support any effort toward negotiation, no matter where initiated. And we have directly communicated to Hanoi our willingness to begin immediately unconditional discussions.

↳ What has been the response from Hanoi and Peking?
I read from Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday:

" . . . The U.S. imperialists are clamoring about their desire for peace and their readiness to engage in unconditional discussion in the hope of fooling world opinion and the American people . . .

~~"Obviously the U.S. search for peace is only designed to conceal its scheme for intensifying the war of aggression."~~

↳ From Peking has come an unusually violent torrent of hate propaganda regarding President Johnson's-and I quote- "filthy and vicious . . . basket of peace." !

Democracy
fell but
will
win!

It is clear that -- in this time as in the past -- those whose creed is force disbelieve the determination of democratic societies to resist their force. *The communists believe*

Given this response to the U.S. peace offensive, President Johnson had no choice but to take steps to restore military pressure on North Vietnam. He announced his decision this morning to resume air attacks on military installations in North Vietnam.

but, In announcing this decision, the President emphasized that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our own pursuit of peace."

Ambassador Goldberg has been instructed to request an immediate meeting of the UN Security Council. *and he has done so.* We shall do all we can to implement the Pope's suggestion that the full resources of the United Nations be used to achieve a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

The President's statement this morning indicates that we will continue to follow the difficult middle course: the course we have followed since the end of World War II . . . the course of choosing the durable way and the long solution.

↳ We are engaged today with other nations by treaty and mutual security agreement -- treaty and agreement which shield both those nations and ourselves from Communist aggression. It is the integrity of our commitment that provides hope for peace.

↳ What would be the result next week in Europe if we failed to keep our commitment in Berlin?

↳ What would be the result next month in the rest of Asia, in the Middle East if we did not honor our commitment in Vietnam?

↳ What would be the result in Peking if the leaders of Communist China had reason to believe we would falter or retreat? *The answer to these questions is self evident.*

↳ I believe Americans have learned the lessons of history so that we may not be doomed to repeat them.

↳ We have learned that the appetite of aggressors is never satisfied. *Aggression unchecked, is aggression unleashed.*

↳ We have learned that a threat to freedom elsewhere can soon become a threat to freedom here. *But we must focus on some other areas.*

↳ Can we accept the possibility that the struggle against Communist expansion can go on for years ahead?

↳ Can we adapt the use of our military power to achieve limited goals while possessing military power in almost limitless quantity?

↳ Can we persevere in our search for peaceful negotiation in the face of rejection by our adversaries?

↳ Can we devote ourselves to patient efforts toward economic and social progress in an environment of violence and terror?

↳ Can we maintain our own devotion to free institutions while opposed by those without regard for them?

↳ Can we, finally, convince those who live by force that time is on our side?

↳ Can we demonstrate to them that we are too strong to be afraid, too determined to be defeated?

↳ I answer: Yes, we can and we shall.

Adlai Stevenson once said:

"America's life story is the record of a marvelous growth of body, mind and character. Now at maturity we shoulder the heaviest burdens of greatness, for in the last analysis, the epic struggle for our civilization, for government by consent of the governed, will be determined by what Americans are capable of."

and < Americans are capable of waging the long, hard battle for freedom around the globe for as long as freedom is threatened < We have the leadership and the resolution to fulfill our responsibility as leader of the free world.

We have the Courage and the will ~~strength~~ to build for ~~peace~~ ~~seen as we~~ resist the aggressor - For it is in ~~Peace that~~ freemen.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
AT TENTH ANNIVERSARY DINNER
THE CATHOLIC ADULT EDUCATION CENTER
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JANUARY 31, 1966

It is a privilege and a pleasure to participate in the tenth anniversary celebration of the Catholic Adult Education Center of Chicago. It is a special pleasure to join you in honoring Adlai Stevenson through the Adlai Stevenson Award.

Adlai Stevenson would cherish this award. For him, spirited discussion of public issues was indispensable to the functioning of democratic government, to the health of a free society.

For him free discussion included public airing of issues whose time had not arrived. "Our country," Stevenson stated in October 1952, "was built on unpopular ideas, on unorthodox opinions. My definition of a free society is a society where it is safe to be unpopular."

As a man who spent much of his professional life in this community, Adlai Stevenson knew and valued the contribution of this Center in probing the controversial issues of the present and the future. During the past ten years, under the distinguished leadership of Monsignor Daniel Cantwell, Dr. Russell Barta, and Mr. Vaile Scott, you have practiced that "free speech in the Church" which the German theologian Karl Rahner has described as essential to the formation of the Christian conscience.

You have debated within the community those hard issues which Adlai Stevenson aired for over a decade before the American people--the issues of nuclear war and peace, of social inequality and injustice at home and abroad, of urban blight and rural decay brought by technological revolution, of freedom and dissent at home while challenged by tyranny abroad.

For many Americans, his views once sounded faintly heretical. In politics, the difference between a heretic and a prophet is often one of sequence. Often prophecy is heresy -- properly aged. An essential quality of a statesman is a willingness to risk being prematurely wise -- and an unwillingness to hide one's wisdom. The man whom you honor epitomized this concept of statesmanship.

Adlai Stevenson sought to maximize the element of rationality in politics. As an experienced political leader, he knew that one of the difficulties of being reasonable in an irrational world is that you have a small clientele. No public man in our time did more to enlarge the clientele of reason in politics.

A free society such as ours cannot flourish without the enlightenment which private groups like the Adult Education Center bring to public life. "The essence of republican government," Adlai Stevenson once said, "is not command. It is consent."

The enlightened consensus required for republican government to function is created when public spirited individuals provide the leadership and the platform for searching scrutiny of the burning issues of our time.

Today a burning issue of our time is the role of the United States in Southeast Asia.

Responsible citizens are divided on the policy we should pursue.

There are those who believe that we have overreached ourselves in involving ourselves so deeply in the defense of a country and a people thousands of miles from home. They suggest that we reduce our commitments in areas outside what they believe to be our natural "sphere of influence."

There are citizens, too, who counsel deeper involvement through a sharply-increased escalation of the war -- including possible use of nuclear weapons.

But, it seems to me, both overlook the facts of mid-twentieth Century life.

Neither of these views provides a firm premise for the foreign policy of a world power in the 20th Century.

The first overlooks the indissolubility of freedom, the interdependence of the defense of freedom in all areas of the world.

This position further overlooks the attempt by Asian Communists to prove that peaceful coexistence is a fraud...that the misnamed "wars of national liberation" will bring Communist victories over non-Communist states which ultimately will lack the will to oppose them.

An abrupt withdrawal from Asia might bring short-term comfort at home, but only at the expense of freedom abroad -- the freedom of the Vietnamese people in this case. To sacrifice the people of Vietnam would only leave other Asian countries defenseless before new Communist aggression unchecked and in fact encouraged.

We could tomorrow destroy the war potential of both North Vietnam and Communist China by using the powerful weapons that underpin our national military strength.

But with what result?

Our days of nuclear monopoly have passed. Who among us is the one who wishes to pull the nuclear trigger?

Finally, both arguments are inconsistent with our American traditions of self-determination and of humanism.

Those who call for withdrawal must ask themselves: Will you bear personal responsibility for the millions of men, women and children we would leave behind to meet their inevitable fates?

Those who call for a quick nuclear victory must ask themselves: Will you bear personal responsibility for the possible unleashing of World War III -- and for the blow against humanity that is a nuclear attack?

I believe we have no choice but to follow the difficult middle course -- the course described some 12 years ago by Adlai Stevenson in a lecture at Harvard University:

*The task is to work with allied and friendly countries to create a world environment favorable to the steady growth of free institutions. This means political arrangements which will make possible the unity of action essential to survival but which at the same time are consistent with diversity... The task never ends. Progress will be slow... To search for a 'solution' prematurely is more likely to produce war than peace.

*Because of the nature of free societies, it is of the utmost importance to prevent war, if possible, and if this is not possible, to keep any future war as severely limited in scope as possible. It is a sign of strength, not of weakness, to be able to keep war limited. To generalize hostilities to a world scale would imperil the very institutions we seek to save by war.

"Our objective is not the destruction of communism by war. Our objective is not the incitement of others to violence. Our objective is not to rectify the boundaries and correct the unnatural divisions that afflict the world by force, but by peaceful processes. Our objective is a peace consistent with decency and justice. And our prayer is that history will not say that we led a noble war but a lost cause.*"

Governor Stevenson then went on to say that men's hopes were contained in "our ability to convince the rulers of the other (Communist) world that

they cannot extend their system by force, or by stealth, and that unless they use force against us we will not use force against them; that our coalition (of free nations) exists but to serve and to save the imperishable principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

"Intolerant power respects power, not weakness."

What Adlai Stevenson said 12 years ago remains true. We do not seek, by force or stealth, to impose our social and political system on others. And -- lest the world be plunged into a disastrous spiral of lawlessness -- we must oppose those who do.

An old Senate colleague of mine used to say, when the debate got thick and heavy: "Don't interrupt me now, I don't want to be handicapped by too many realities."

Today, we dare not shrink from the recognition of "too many realities."

Let me enumerate some of the "realities" of this struggle.

First, there is the reality that we face in South Vietnam no mild-mannered liberal evolutionary reformist party. We face dedicated Communist-led revolutionaries seeking by force to subject a nation to their will. Some of these revolutionaries are from the South. Some are from the North. Some are irregulars. Some are regular North Vietnamese soldiers. Some of their supply and direction comes from the South. Some of it comes from Hanoi. Some of it comes from Peking. Their creed is communism and their means is terror.

Second, there is the reality that what is happening in Vietnam is not an isolated occurrence, unconnected to events elsewhere. Those who inspire and support the use of force in Vietnam have made their plans clear. Those plans include the use of subversion, of propaganda, of assassination, of

sabotage, and of outright military action to gain their objectives throughout the world. In some places, such as Vietnam, aggression has come in the guise of a war of national liberation. In others, such as India and Korea, it has come as movement of regular troops across a national frontier.

The Communist-backed terrorism in Vietnam is being felt not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Latin America.

Third, I would point to the reality that -- faced with this aggressive force -- our response has been measured and our objective peaceful.

Last April President Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, made clear the unconditional nature of our offer toward peaceful negotiation. He has reiterated that offer many times. He has emphasized that so-called National Liberation Front representatives could be represented in the negotiations.

Last May the President ordered suspension of bombing in the North in the hope that this might stimulate negotiation. In December we suspended the bombing again.

In the past several weeks, the President has sent emissaries throughout the world to seek some means toward peaceful negotiation. Initiatives outside of our own -- by the UN Secretary General; by 17 non-aligned nations; by the United Kingdom, Ghana, India and other Commonwealth nations; by Japan, by the United Arab Republic; by Pope Paul VI -- have been undertaken without success.

We have stated unequivocally that we support any effort toward negotiation, no matter where initiated. And we have directly communicated to Hanoi our willingness to begin immediately unconditional discussions.

What has been the response from Hanoi and Peking? I read from Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday:

"....The U.S. imperialists are clamoring about their desire for peace and their readiness to engage in unconditional discussion in the hope of fooling world opinion and the American people....

"Obviously the U.S. search for peace is only designed to conceal its scheme for intensifying the war of aggression."

From Peking has come an unusually violent torrent of hate propaganda regarding President Johnson's-and I quote-"filthy and vicious.....basket of peace."

It is clear that -- in this time as in the past -- those whose creed is force disbelieve the determination of democratic societies to resist their force.

Given this response to the U.S. peace offensive, President Johnson had no choice but to take steps to restore military pressure on North Vietnam. He announced his decision this morning to resume air attacks on military installations in North Vietnam.

In announcing this decision, the President emphasized that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our own pursuit of peace."

Ambassador Goldberg has been instructed to request an immediate meeting of the UN Security Council. We shall do all we can to implement the Pope's suggestion that the full resources of the United Nations be used to achieve a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

The President's statement this morning indicates that we will continue to follow the difficult middle course: the course we have followed since the end of World War II.....the course of choosing the durable way and the long solution.

We are engaged today with other nations by treaty and mutual security agreement -- treaty and agreement which shield both those nations and ourselves from Communist aggression. It is the integrity of our commitment that provides hope for peace.

What would be the result next week in Europe if we failed to keep our commitment in Berlin?

What would be the result next month in the rest of Asia, in the Middle East if we did not honor our commitment in Vietnam?

What would be the result in Peking if the leaders of Communist China had reason to believe we would falter or retreat?

I believe Americans have learned the lessons of history so that we may not be doomed to repeat them.

We have learned that the appetite of aggressors is never satisfied.

We have learned that a threat to freedom elsewhere can soon become a threat to freedom here.

Can we accept the possibility that the struggle against Communist expansion can go on for years ahead?

Can we adapt the use of our military power to achieve limited goals while possessing military power in almost limitless quantity?

Can we persevere in our search for peaceful negotiation in the face of rejection by our adversaries?

Can we devote ourselves to patient efforts toward economic and social progress in an environment of violence and terror?

Can we maintain our own devotion to free institutions while opposed by those without regard for them?

Can we, finally, convince those who live by force that time is on our side?

Can we demonstrate to them that we are too strong to be afraid, too determined to be defeated?

I answer: Yes, we can and we shall.

Adlai Stevenson once said:

"America's life story is the record of a marvelous growth of body, mind and character. Now at maturity we shoulder the heaviest burdens of greatness, for in the last analysis the epic struggle for our civilization, for government by consent of the governed, will be determined by what Americans are capable of."

Americans are capable of waging the long, hard battle for freedom around the globe for as long as freedom is threatened. We have the leadership and the resolution to fulfill our responsibility as leader of the free world.

#####



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