

SPEECH

BY

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

19TH ANNUAL CONVENTION BANQUET

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

APRIL 23, 1966

We are gathered here tonight -- old friends and new -- to celebrate the nineteenth birthday of Americans for Democratic Action. As I thought over the events of this period, it first seemed to me that nineteen years had rushed by quite painlessly: Looking around this room I see a number of old colleagues who haven't aged at all. And I trust they will return the compliment. Even though in realistic terms, it may be that we have spent too much time in the same elevator to have much perspective on each other.

Yet, on second thought, when we inject some perspective into our journey together, we must realize that the last nineteen years have been a period of incredible change. The American people have faced great challenges and, despite temporary setbacks, have responded in a fashion which validates our basic faith in the democratic process.

The state of democratic action in America -- and of Americans for Democratic Action -- is good.

The ADA resolutions of the 1950's have become the laws and government programs of the '60's.

The difference between heresy and prophecy is often one of sequence. Heresy often turns out to have been prophecy -- properly aged.

ADA has not only dreamed great dreams, it has helped them become realities.

Those who founded ADA had no illusion that they could simply ride the locomotive of history to a preordained liberal destination.

What organization spoke out earlier or more forcefully on the great moral issues of civil rights and civil liberties . . . or on the test ban treaty . . . or on the right to equal legislative representation . . . or the need to modernize our economic policies . . . or the importance of larger federal investments in education, health services, and housing?

And we not only spoke out on these great issues, we fought hard and effectively for them. We really lived up to our name -- Americans for Democratic Action.

Of course, we have not always been in perfect agreement among ourselves.

Indeed, I recall once when our Foreign Policy Commission came up with four different

(Con.)

minority reports and no majority report at all. No other organization can make that statement.

It seems as if hundreds of times over the last nineteen years a newspaperman, or critic, has come up to me with a triumphant look in his eye and said: "How do you explain ADA's position on Madagascar? or Guam? or the Straits of Magellan?"

(I sometimes wonder: Is there anything we haven't taken a position on at least once?)

If, every time any one of us had been outvoted, he had picked up his principles and walked out, there wouldn't be more than a corporal's guard here tonight.

To put it another way, ADA is a political group, not a utopian sect.

We have been concerned with communication, not excommunication. We have practiced self-determination, not self-extermination. We believe in the democratic process, and respect what results from it.

This belief in self-determination, in the right of individuals and of peoples to choose for themselves, has been at the heart of American purposes at home and abroad.

As the author Thomas Wolfe put it a generation ago:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity -- to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him -- this . . . is the promise of America."

In this spirit, Franklin Roosevelt set forth his Four Freedoms as goals of national and international democratic action: Freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear -- everywhere in the world.

These are the four pillars on which we seek to build the better world of the future, a world of freedom and justice under law -- yes, a world of security and self-determination for every nation and every human being.

These are the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, which the United States has at all times supported and cherished.

These are the principles on which we acted when we came to the support of the beleaguered nations in World War II . . . the principles underlying too the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and NATO.

We were not afraid to be far-reaching and controversial. We in ADA vigorously supported these policies, even though some other liberals -- some genuine liberals and some not so genuine -- denounced and opposed them.

Now we face a new test, calling for equal courage -- the need to help the nations of Asia shape their own futures.

Saigon is as close to this ballroom tonight as London was in 1940.

The inescapable agony and pain of Vietnam have compelled us to face the stark realities of an Asia in turmoil and revolution.

Nowhere are the challenges more formidable than they are in Asia, where two-thirds of the human race lives.

Asia is rich in peoples, rich in culture and rich in resources. It is also rich in trouble.

We seek nothing in Asia except to help these nations in their troubles and in whatever way we can to bring about human dignity and material well-being for the hundreds of millions who have rarely known it.

What this effort demands is nothing less than an Asian New Deal. . . a doctrine of no less compassion, scope and imagination than that which lifted our country from the depths of the Depression . . . a doctrine embodying the same commitment which helped raise Europe from the ashes of World War II.

We have seen the first steps in the President's historic Johns

Hopkins address . . . in the Honolulu Declaration . . . in the beginnings of the Asian Development Bank and Mekong River Development.

But it is not enough to help build nations without helping to protect them.

For physical security without human welfare is little better than a prison and welfare without security is no more than an illusion.

I know that there are differences within this room as to just how we should meet our responsibilities in Asia, and particularly in Vietnam.

The right to differ is one of the basic freedoms we seek to secure and extend. But there is also the right to advocate and, with your permission, I shall exercise it tonight.

We begin with a common set of premises.

No sane human being seeks war -- anyplace.

No liberal can tolerate aggression.

Today in Vietnam we meet aggression -- aggression by Vietnamese communism, a particularly militant strain with its own published program of expansion.

While Peking undoubtedly has a strong strategic interest and great influence in Hanoi, it would be a gross over-simplification of a complex relationship to consider North Vietnam merely a satellite of Communist China.

But still a basic question: Does the National Liberation Front represent the majority of the Vietnamese people?

The overwhelming weight of the evidence demonstrates that it does not.

Twice in recent months the NLF, in an effort to show its strength, has called for a general strike in South Vietnam. Both these efforts have been total failures. The reason: Lack of popular support.

Some 800,000 refugees have fled to government-controlled areas in South Vietnam during the past year-and-a-half. Like Berliners, they voted with their feet.

In all the years right up to now -- April 23 -- not one single recognized nationalist, religious, labor or student leader in South Vietnam has identified himself with the Front -- not even leaders who were imprisoned by the Late President Diem, not even determined and articulate opponents of the present government.

And not one has called for a coalition government with the Viet Cong since Ho Chi Minh's abortive "popular front" efforts in 1946 and 1947.

It is not necessary to explain to an ADA audience how the Communists operate, how the demand for "coalitions" is a staging point in the application of what Rakosi cynically called "salami tactics" -- slicing up the non-Communists. No one here needs to be informed about "transmission belts" or fronts, the standard Communist techniques of infiltration.

The reality is that the NLF is exactly what it was set up to be by Ho Chi Minh in 1959: A front for Hanoi . . . the vehicle for the seizure of power in South Vietnam.

The people of South Vietnam have strong and diverse views about many things, and they do not hesitate to express them -- as we know so well.

But on two things all their leaders are agreed -- and this includes the students, the Buddhists and, notably, Tri Quang himself.

First, they do not want to live under communism.

Second, they do not want us to abandon them.

Yet another question remains: Isn't our intervention in South Vietnam basically wrong, even immoral?

On this point, I will cite an observation by John Stuart Mill which is as pertinent now as when he made it.

"The doctrine of non-intervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments.

The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free States. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right."

If we had applied the doctrine of non-intervention in Greece after the war, that country would be controlled by the Communists today. If the British had applied it in Malaya, the same thing would have happened there.

In both cases, but for timely outside aid, militant and determined Communist minorities would have seized and held power. In both cases, subsequent elections have conclusively demonstrated that the Communists were indeed a minority -- and a small one, at that.

(Con.)

And, I might add, if we had left South Korea alone in the face of Communist aggression from the North, there would be no South Korea today. History should have taught us by now that Communists are dedicated to seeking power in whatever way they can get it.

If they succeed in seizing power by force in one country, they will be tempted to try it in others. Indeed, "Liberation Fronts" have already been set up for both Thailand and Malaysia.

I agree with what Adlai Stevenson wrote in a letter answering the Vietnam critics, and made public by his family after his death:

"I do not believe . . . retreat in Asia or anywhere else would make any contribution whatsoever to the idea that violence shall not be the final arbitrator in world affairs."

All of us believe that every people have the right to determine their own future peacefully -- not have it determined for them by the disciplined minority which happens to be adept at guerrilla warfare. None of us believes that aggression should become an acceptable means of attaining political power -- and that is why we are determined to prevent its success.

The task in South Vietnam is, of course -- as in the rest of Asia -- much more than military.

It is social revolution.

It is helping in the basic institutional development of a modern state, in which all its citizens have a voice and a stake.

In the midst of war, against an adversary who has made terror a science, it is no easy task to achieve social, economic, and political objectives which would be difficult even under the most peaceful conditions.

The birth of a nation seldom comes without pain and suffering. The South Vietnamese, bled white by the calculated assassination of many of their able leaders, are fumbling their way toward a democratic order. In this there is confusion and tumult. But from our standpoint as liberals: Is the tumult not infinitely preferable to the monolithic silence in Hanoi?

Indeed, on the fundamental level of commitment, we are fighting in South Vietnam to make it possible for the South Vietnamese to quarrel among themselves, to prevent the icy hand of Communism totalitarianism from destroying the diversity of this vital people.

And may I add this: The social, economic and political effort in South Vietnam is difficult. But it is not impossible. The fact is that today we are making progress in helping the South Vietnamese in their basic programs to better the land, the health,

(Con.)

the education, the daily life of the Vietnamese people. This progress may not be in our morning headlines. But it is there and it will continue.

And our help in fostering social and economic development will continue at a rising scale, limited only by security and logistic considerations. We seek to give the highest priority to such assistance.

The people of South Vietnam will have the opportunity to elect a constituent assembly this summer. There will be many candidates and a variety of parties. They will hold meetings and make speeches. They will have access to the press, the radio, and TV. Both the campaign and the election itself will be observed and reported by journalists from many nations.

We support the decision of the South Vietnamese government to hold this election and the right of the elected assembly to adopt a constitution. We shall cooperate willingly and gladly with any government the people of South Vietnam freely choose.

Indeed, I challenge the Hanoi regime to hold an election under the same ground rules -- with full freedom for campaigning and full access to the proceedings by the world press. If such an election were genuinely free, and if the Communists should by any chance win it, it would be the first time they have ever won a free election anytime, anywhere in the world. It's no wonder that they don't risk free elections.

Finally, I will say it again: The United States is ready to move this matter from the battlefield to the peace table. We are prepared to go anywhere, under any auspices, to achieve peace -- Rangoon, Tokyo, or anywhere on earth. We are willing to talk to anyone. It is not we who are resisting negotiations for peace.

The prospect for peace in Vietnam . . . for peace in Asia is fundamentally affected by the action and conduct of Communist China.

I have said on a number of occasions that we do not seek the isolation of Communist China, but only her containment. This is the policy of our government. It is the policy we have followed with the Soviet Union -- a policy that has resulted in a growing realism and even moderation among Soviet leaders.

This took a good deal of time, and it will take time with Communist China as well.

The proposals we have recently made have been rejected out of hand. But I am convinced that we should persist in them, prudently and patiently.

World peace requires that the Chinese Communists come to realize that an international course of action based upon force and the threat of force cannot succeed. We would welcome the time when a peaceful China -- willing to accept the responsibilities that go with membership in the family of nations -- might be ready to live in harmony with her neighbors.

Therefore, we are pursuing in Asia a policy of vigilant resistance to aggression and subversion, coupled with an equally vigilant search for every avenue to peace.

It was in this spirit that the late President Kennedy said in his 1961 State of the Union Message:

"Our task is to convince (the Communist powers) that aggression and subversion will not be profitable routes to pursue (their) ends... . Open and peaceful competition -- for prestige, for markets, for scientific achievement, even for men's minds -- is something else again. For if freedom and communism were to compete for man's allegiance in a world of peace, I would look to the future with ever-increasing confidence."

Our ability to successfully engage in this competition -- and, indeed, fulfill the responsibilities of world leadership -- rest, in the last analysis, on the strength and soundness of our own society.

We cannot effectively preach self-determination and freedom of choice abroad unless we practice them at home.

Our task at home remains one of providing to each individual maximum opportunity to exercise freedom of choice in the vital aspects of his life.

To provide this opportunity for personal choice surely lies at the heart of our concerns about civil rights, the urban ghetto, the war-on-poverty, education and health services. Examine any aspect of the urban ghetto -- housing, schools, jobs, welfare, public services -- and you discover a highly complex, ingrained, and self-sustaining system which ruthlessly and systematically denies to residents of these areas any opportunity for meaningful choice -- any opportunity to become real persons.

Living in a rat-infested tenement or a rural shanty: Is that meaningful choice?

Attending a third-rate, overcrowded and understaffed school or dropping out in despair: Is that a meaningful choice?

Being the last-hired and first-fired in a low-paying degrading job, or collecting unemployment insurance (if you qualify and until it runs out): Is that a meaningful choice?

Struggling with costly and inadequate mass transit, playing on littered or empty lots: Are these areas of life where the poor exert meaningful choice?

It is this inability to choose -- this denial of the right to chart one's destiny or to be real participants in the social, economic or political life of this country -- which produces the frustration, the bitterness, hopelessness and outrage we encounter today in the urban ghettos of America.

And it is only as we succeed in breaking this vicious pattern -- in providing better schools, housing, jobs, public service and assuring justice -- that we can expect this outrage to fade away.

Only as persons experience actual freedom of choice in these vital areas of life can we expect them to develop a personal stake in maintaining and improving our society as a whole. For as these opportunities become real, cynicism will be transformed into faith -- apathy into initiative -- and alienation into a sense of community and participation.

To assure each human being the chance to choose -- to become everything that he is capable of becoming -- this is what the American democratic system is all about. And we can never rest until every American has this opportunity.

Much has been done at home and abroad, and much remains to be done. And we have the resources to do the job. As President Johnson has said:

"This nation is mighty enough -- its society is healthy enough -- its people are strong enough -- to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while still building a Great Society here at home."

We must always remember that democracy is a human means for achieving human ends. It will grow and flourish only as it produces visible and tangible results for the people -- the opportunity for a fuller and better life, freely chosen and freely determined.

This is our purpose in the United States, and this is our purpose in the world.

Finally, a personal note. It has been my privilege, with your help, to play a role in the drama of American democratic action for over two decades.

We've come a long way together and we've been through a good many battles.

But tomorrow will always be the time for us.

Tomorrow could be a cataclysm of nuclear destruction. Or tomorrow can be the opening of a bright new era of human freedom and expression.

If we keep our wits about us . . . if we hold our nerve . . . if we never cease working, we can have a world of brotherhood and peace -- the world we've dreamed of.

John Wesseler - U.S. Speeches - ^{Monkey} ~~U.S.~~ Burger
U.S. Speeches

There was a crusty old farm leader in Washington during the early days of the New Deal. His name was George Peek.

George Peek said: "The common characteristic of all uplifters
is an unquenchable thirst for conversation. They are all
chain talkers."

Ken
Galbraith

Joe Raab - President

Paul Dubinsky Tribute
(Hustler)

Father Vizzard

- Jim Koch
- Don Edwards
KEYNOTE SPEECH

① ~~Mickey~~ Berger
② Dave Dubinsky

"Hostile Audience"
Story - Mummy
Jungle -

Leon, Prayer
"Stop interrupting me
when I'm saying
Israel"

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

"Hostile Audience"
Ken Galbraith
~~Murphy~~
~~Johnson~~

APRIL 23, 1966

Dispersed our forces
Marshall, John Rook,

Dave
Dubinsky
+
Buzby
+
Jim Walsh

We are gathered here tonight -- old friends and new -- to celebrate the nineteenth birthday of Americans for Democratic Action. As I thought over the events of this period, it first seemed to me that nineteen years had rushed by quite painlessly: Looking around this room I see a number of old colleagues who haven't aged at all. And I trust they will return the compliment. Even though in realistic terms, it may be that we have spent too much time in the same elevator to have much perspective on each other.

Jimmy
Art!

Yet, on second thought, when we ^{do} inject some perspective into our journey together, we must realize that the last nineteen years have been a period of incredible change. The American people have faced great challenges and, despite temporary setbacks, have responded in a fashion which validates our basic faith in the democratic process.

So, ^{to the size we can say} The state of democratic action in America -- and of Americans for Democratic Action -- is good.

The ADA resolutions of the 1950's ^{that became structural to pass} have become the laws and government programs of the '60's.

The difference between heresy and prophecy is often one of sequence. Heresy often turns out to have been prophecy -- properly aged.

ADA has not only dreamed great dreams, it has helped them become realities.

*Concededly -
From the 80th
DCA thing Congress
to the 89th DO
Everything"*

He

↳ Those who founded ADA had no illusion that they could simply ride the locomotive of history to a preordained liberal destination. —

↳ What organization spoke out earlier or more forcefully on the great moral issues of civil rights and civil liberties . . . or on the test ban treaty . . . or on the right to equal legislative representation . . . or the need to modernize our economic policies . . . or the importance of larger federal investments in education, health services, and housing *and our cities?*

And we not only spoke out on these great issues, we fought hard and effectively for them. We really lived up to our name -- Americans for Democratic Action.

↳ Of course, we have not always been in perfect agreement among ourselves.

Indeed, I recall once when our Foreign Policy Commission came up with four different minority reports and no majority report at all. No other organization can make that statement. !!

It seems as if hundreds of times over the last nineteen years a newspaperman, or critic, has come up to me with a triumphant look in his eye and said: "How do you explain ADA's position on Madagascar? or Guam? or the Straits of Magellan?"

(I sometimes wonder: Is there anything we haven't taken a position on at least once?)

But If, every time any one of us had been outvoted, he had picked up his principles and walked out, there wouldn't be more than a corporal's guard here tonight.

To put it another way, ADA is a political group, not a utopian sect. !

↳ We have been concerned with communication, not excommunication. ↳ We have practiced self-determination, not self-extermination. ↳ We believe in the democratic process, and respect what results from it. ◦

↳ This belief in self-determination, in the right of individuals and of peoples to choose for themselves, has been at the heart of American purposes at home and abroad. ◦

As the author Thomas Wolfe put it a generation ago:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity -- to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him -- this . . . is the promise of America."

(Anna Roosevelt Hatfield New)

FDR

In this spirit, Franklin Roosevelt set forth his Four Freedoms as goals of national and international democratic action: Freedom of speech, freedom of worship,

freedom from want, and freedom from fear ^{and} everywhere
in the world. !

↳ These are the four pillars on which we seek to build
the better world of the future, a world of freedom and
justice under law -- yes, a world of security and self-
determination for every nation and every human being.

↳ These are the principles embodied in the Charter
of the United Nations, which the United States has at
all times supported and cherished.

↳ These are the principles on which we acted when
we came to the support of the beleaguered nations in
World War II . . . the principles underlying ~~to~~ the
Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and NATO.

↳ We were not afraid to be far-reaching and controversial.

↳ We in ADA vigorously supported these policies, even
though some other liberals -- some genuine liberals and
some not so genuine -- denounced and opposed them. !

Now we face a new test, calling for equal courage *and*
Equal Vision the need to help the nations of Asia shape their own
futures.

Saigon is as close to this ballroom tonight as London
was in 1940. Every nation is today our neighbor.

The inescapable agony and pain of Vietnam have compelled
us to face the stark realities of an Asia in turmoil and
revolution.

and, Nowhere are the challenges more formidable than
they are in Asia, where two-thirds of the human race
lives.

Asia is rich in peoples, rich in culture and rich
in resources. It is also rich in trouble. *And Asia is a waste*

with We seek nothing in Asia except to help these nations
help themselves - to help bring
in their troubles and in whatever way we can to bring

about human dignity and material well-being for the
hundreds of million who have rarely known it.

This is a monumental task. There are those who doubt it can be done - But We Know it must be done.

What this effort demands is nothing less than an Asian New Deal. . . a doctrine of no less compassion, scope and imagination than that which helped raise

Europe from the ashes of World War II. . . *recognizing that the problems are very different.*

We have seen the first steps in the President's historic John Hopkins address. . . in the Honolulu Declaration. . . in the beginnings of the Asian Development Band and Mekong River

Development. *in our aid to India + Pakistan*

We seek, on the subcontinent to help India and Pakistan find the road to peaceful and democratic progress. *Indeed, the success of the Indian*

T.V
on
here

experiment in democracy can well hold the key
to the future of Asia.

↳ But, it is not enough to help build nations
without helping to protect them.

↳ We know that
~~for~~ physical security without human welfare
is little better than a prison; and welfare without
security is no more than an illusion.

TV
I know there are differences within this room as to just how we should meet our responsibilities in Asia, and particularly in Vietnam, ~~and~~ I respect those differences.

Men equally dedicated to the preservation of liberty and the extension of freedom can reach varying conclusions and judgments in this terribly complex matter!

Indeed, the right to differ is one of the basic freedoms we seek to secure and extend. But there is also the right to advocate and, with your permission, I shall exercise it tonight.

We begin with a common set of premises.

No sane human being seeks war -- anyplace.

No liberal can tolerate aggression.

Today, in Vietnam we meet aggression -- aggression by Vietnamese communism, a particularly militant strain with its own published program of expansion.

While Peking undoubtedly has a strong strategic interest and great influence in Hanoi, it would be a

gross over-simplification of a complex relationship to consider North Vietnam merely a satellite of Communist China.

TV
↳ But still a basic question: Does the National Liberation Front represent the majority of the Vietnamese people?

↳ The overwhelming weight of the evidence demonstrates that it does not.

↳ Twice in recent months the NLF, in an effort to show its strength, has called for a general strike in South Vietnam. Both these efforts have been total failures. The reason: Lack of popular support.

↳ Some 800,000 refugees have fled to government - controlled areas in South Vietnam during the past year- and-a-half. Like Berliners, they voted with their feet.

1 1/2 yrs

TV
/ In all the years right up to now -- April 23 1966,
not one single recognized nationalist, religious, labor
or student leader in South Vietnam has identified himself
with the Front -- not even leaders who were imprisoned
by the late President Diem, not even determined and
articulate opponents of the present government.

And not one has called for a coalition government
with the Viet Cong since Ho Chi Minh's abortive "popular
front" efforts in 1946 and 1947.

/ It is not necessary to explain to an ADA audience
how the Communists operate, how the demand for "coalitions"
is a staging point in the application of what ^{Rak-Ko-Si} Rakosi cynically
called "salami tactics" -- slicing up the non-Communists.

/ No one here needs to be informed about "transmission belts"
or "fronts", the standard Communist techniques of infiltration.

✓ { The reality is that the NLF is exactly what it was set up to be by Ho Chi Minh in 1959: A front for Hanoi . . . the vehicle for the seizure of power in South Vietnam. !!

{ The people of South Vietnam have strong and diverse views about many things, and they do not hesitate to express them -- as we know so well.

{ But on two things all their leaders are agreed -- and this includes the students, the Buddhists and, notably, Tri Quang himself.

① { First, they do not want to live under communism.

② { Second, they do not want us to abandon them.

{ Yet another question remains: Isn't our intervention in South Vietnam basically wrong, even immoral?

{ On this point, I will cite an observation by John Stuart Mill which is as pertinent now as when he made it.

"The doctrine of non-intervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments.

(And I believe Arthur Schlesinger used that quotation in his book).

"1000 Days"

The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free States. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right." —

↳ If we had applied the doctrine of non-intervention in Greece after the war, that country would be controlled by the Communists today. ↳ If the British had applied it in Malaya, the same thing would have happened there.

↳ In both cases, but for timely outside aid, militant and determined Communist minorities would have seized and held power. ↳ In both cases, subsequent elections have conclusively demonstrated that the Communists were indeed a minority -- and a small one, at that.

↳ And, I might add, if we had left South Korea alone in the face of Communist aggression from the North, there would be no South Korea today.

History should have taught us by now that Communists are dedicated to seeking power in whatever way they can get it.

If they succeed in seizing power by force in one country, they will be tempted to try it in others. Indeed, "Liberation Fronts" have already been set up for both Thailand and Malaysia.

Adlai

our beloved friend
I ~~agree with what~~ Adlai Stevenson wrote in a letter answering the Vietnam critics, and made public by his family after his death:

"I do not believe . . . retreat in Asia or anywhere else would make any contribution whatsoever to the idea that violence shall not be the final arbitrator in world affairs."

(X) All of us believe that every people have the right to determine their own future peacefully -- not have it determined for them by the disciplined ~~minority~~ minority which happens to be adept at guerrilla warfare.

None of us believes that aggression should become an acceptable means of attaining political power -- and that is why we are determined to prevent its success.

The task in South Vietnam is, of course -- as in the rest of Asia -- much more than military.

It is social revolution. It is Nation Building.

It is helping in the basic institutional development of a modern state, in which all its citizens have a voice and a stake.

In the midst of war, against an adversary who has made terror a science, it is no easy task to achieve social, economic, and political objectives which would be difficult even under the most peaceful conditions.

The birth of a nation seldom comes without pain and suffering. The South Vietnamese, bled white by the calculated assassination of many of their able leaders, are fumbling their way toward a democratic order.

In this there is confusion and tumult. But from our standpoint as liberals: Is the tumult not infinitely preferable to the monolithic silence in Hanoi? —

↳ Indeed, on the fundamental level of commitment, we are fighting in South Vietnam to make it possible for the South Vietnamese to quarrel among themselves, ~~to~~ to prevent the icy hand of Communist totalitarianism from destroying the diversity of this vital people.

↳ ~~We know~~ And may I add this: The social, economic and political effort in South Vietnam is difficult. But it is not impossible! ~~The fact is that today~~ we are making progress in helping the South Vietnamese in their basic programs to better the land, the health, the education, the daily life of the Vietnamese people! This progress may not be in our morning headlines. But it is there ^{in Vietnam} and it will continue.

∟ And our help in fostering social and economic development will continue at a rising scale, limited only by security and logistic considerations. ~~We seek to give the highest priority to such assistance.~~

∟ The people of South Vietnam will have the opportunity to elect a constituent assembly this summer. There will be many candidates and a variety of parties. They will hold meetings and make speeches. They will have access to the press, the radio, and TV. Both the campaign and the election itself will be observed and reported by journalists from many nations.

and ∟ We support the decision of the South Vietnamese government to hold this election and the right of the elected assembly to adopt a constitution. We shall cooperate willingly and gladly with any government the people of South Vietnam freely choose.

Indeed, I challenge the Hanoi regime to hold an election under the same ground rules -- with full freedom for campaigning and full access to the proceedings by the world press. If such an election were genuinely free, and if the Communists should by any chance win it, it would be the first time they have ever won a free ^{NATIONAL} election anytime, anywhere in the world. It's no wonder that they don't risk free elections. (Peace)

Finally, I will say it again: The United States is ready to move this matter from the battlefield to the peace table. We are prepared to go anywhere, under any auspices, to achieve peace -- Rangoon, Tokyo, or anywhere on earth. We are willing to talk to anyone. It is not we who are resisting negotiations for peace.

But, The prospect for peace in Vietnam . . . for peace in Asia is fundamentally affected by the action and conduct of Communist China.

TV

LBS-
Peace

TV

TV
I have said on a number of occasions that we do not seek the isolation of Communist China, but only her containment. This is the policy of our government. It is the policy we have followed with the Soviet Union -- a policy that has resulted in a growing realism and even moderation among Soviet leaders.

This took a good deal of time, and it will take time with Communist China as well.

The proposals we have recently made have been rejected out of hand. But I am convinced that we should persist in them, prudently and patiently.

World peace requires that the Chinese Communists come to realize that an international course of action based upon force and the threat of force cannot succeed.

We would welcome the time when a peaceful China -- willing to accept the responsibilities that go with membership in the family of nations -- might be ready to live in harmony with her neighbors.

TV
Therefore, we are pursuing in Asia a policy of vigilant resistance to aggression and subversion, coupled with an equally vigilant search for every avenue to peace.

It was in this spirit that the late President Kennedy said in his 1961 State of the Union Message:

"Our task is to convince (the Communist powers) that aggression and subversion will not be profitable routes to pursue (their) ends . . . Open and peaceful competition -- for prestige, for markets, for scientific achievement, even for men's minds -- is something else again. For if freedom and communism were to compete for man's allegiance in a world of peace, I would look to the future with ever-increasing confidence."

Our ability to successfully engage in this competition -- and, indeed, ^{fulfill} fulfill the responsibilities of world leadership -- rest, in the last analysis, on the strength and soundness of our own society.

We cannot effectively preach self-determination and freedom of choice abroad unless we practice them at home.

Our task at home remains one of providing to each individual maximum opportunity to exercise freedom of choice in the vital aspects of his life.

↳ To provide this opportunity for personal choice surely lies at the heart of our concerns about civil rights, the urban ghetto, the war-on-poverty, education and health services.

↳ Examine any aspect of the urban ghetto -- housing, schools, jobs, welfare, public services -- and you discover a highly complex, ingrained, and self-sustaining system which ruthlessly and systematically denies to residents of these areas any opportunity for meaningful choice -- any opportunity to become real persons.

↳ Living in a rat-infested tenement or a rural shanty: ?
Is that meaningful choice? 1

↳ Attending a third-rate, overcrowded and understaffed school or dropping out in despair: Is that a meaningful choice?

↳ Being the last-hired and first-fired in a low-paying degrading job, or collecting unemployment insurance (if you qualify and until it runs out): Is that a meaningful choice?

↳ Struggling with costly and inadequate mass transit, playing on littered or empty lots: Are these areas of life where the poor exert meaningful choice?

↳ It is this inability to choose -- this denial of the right to chart one's destiny or to be real participants in the social, economic or political life of this country -- which produces the frustration, the bitterness, hopelessness and outrage we encounter today in the urban ghettos of America.

↳ And it is only as we succeed in breaking this vicious pattern of denial that we can expect this outrage to fade away.

yo↳ Only as persons experience actual freedom of choice in these vital areas of life can we expect them to develop a personal stake in maintaining and improving our society as a whole. For as these opportunities become real, cynicism will be transformed into faith -- apathy into initiative -- and alienation into a sense of community and participation.!

↳ For this reason larger investments by governments at all levels are needed . . . and will be made. We have begun -- and will expand -- a coordinated attack on the interrelated problems of housing, education, jobs, health, recreation, and public services as the only way to break the downward spiral of poverty and deprivation.

These victories cannot be won easily or quickly. But they can be won. And we can unravel generations of injustice, pain and hopelessness.

↳ To assure each human being the chance to choose -- to become everything that he is capable of becoming -- this is what the American democratic system is all about. And we can never rest until every American has this opportunity.

↳ Much has been done at home and abroad, and much remains to be done. And we have the resources to do the job. As President Johnson has said:

"This nation is mighty enough -- its society is healthy enough -- its people are strong enough -- to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while still building a Great Society here at home."

↳ And may I just say here that President Johnson has been faithful to his word. . . that his deeds have matched his promises.

↳ No liberal in this room could have predicted the scope and the depth and the success of the legislation passed by the 89th Congress and drafted and spurred by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. Yes I am proud to have been a part of that historic liberal achievement.

↳ We must always remember that democracy is a human means for achieving human ends. It will grow and flourish only as it produces visible and tangible results for the people -- the opportunity for a fuller and better

life, freely chosen and freely determined.

This is our purpose in the United States, and this is our purpose in the world.

↳ Finally, a personal note. It has been my privilege, with your help, to play a role in the drama of American democratic action for over two decades.

We've come a long way together and we've been through a good many battles.

But tomorrow will always be the time for us!

↳ Tomorrow could be a cataclysm of nuclear destruction. Or, tomorrow can be the opening of a bright new era of human freedom and expression.

↳ If we keep our wits about us. . .if we hold our nerve . . . if we never cease working, we can have a world of brotherhood and peace -- the world we've dreamed of.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

BEFORE

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

APRIL 23, 1966

We are gathered here tonight -- old friends and new -- to celebrate the nineteenth birthday of Americans for Democratic Action.

Reflecting on the events of this period, it first seemed to me that these two decades have rushed by painlessly -- looking around this room I see a number of old colleagues who haven't aged at all.

On second thought, when we view our journey together in perspective, we must realize that the last 19 years have been a period of incredible change. The American people have faced great challenges and their response validates our faith in the democratic process. My message this evening is this: the state of democratic action in America is good.

This fact should not erase from our memory the possibility that there were other roads which could have been taken. There is no mystery about

the last 19 years because we in 1966 have read the last chapters of the story. But there is no greater error one can make than to assume that what has happened had to happen.

The state of democratic action was not always good. It was not good in 1947 when a small band of liberals set about forming Americans for Democratic Action. In 1947 there was little optimism among us. We had ominous forebodings about the future direction of American society -- And with good reason.

Did the Republican landslide in the elections of 1946 presage a revival of the old order -- a repudiation of the New Deal? Was the United States going to repeat the pattern of 1920 and junk all the great accomplishments of the New Deal as it had those of Woodrow Wilson? Were all the basic social and economic questions we thought to be closed open for reargument? Was the hard-won legitimacy of the trade union movement to be repudiated?

In another sector, was the United States going to move decisively against its ancient curse of racism? Or was the Negro going to be left in the limbo designed for him at the end of Reconstruction? Would "separate but equal" -- which in practice meant "separate and unequal" remain the constitutional definition of equality?

In the area of international relations, would the United States learn the somber lesson of the 1930's and accept its responsibilities in the world as a guardian of at best freedom, at least diversity, against the surging force of communist totalitarianism? Or, as seemed highly probably to many of us at that time, would the "Fortress America" mentality lead to a new isolationism, a selfish doctrine of "affluence in one country?"

In 1947 the future was up for grabs. Those who founded ADA had no illusion that they could simply ride the locomotive of history to a pre-ordained liberal destination.

These founders had no failure of nerve. They had the nerve of failure -- and the courage to go out and fight for seemingly lost causes.

Even in those dark days, ADA recognized that its major task was the persuasion of the electorate -- it considered itself to be a political action group, not a utopian sect.

This commitment to the democratic political process -- to democratic action -- has given ADA its distinctive character. It has made possible a common loyalty to the organization among men and women of strong convictions and opinions, who have often differed vigorously among themselves.

As you well know, ADA's views are rarely unanimous. I recall a Foreign Policy Commission at one Convention submitting four minority reports, and no majority report. Undoubtedly, each ADA member has a list of policy questions where he has been on the losing end of a vote.

But if every time anyone lost a vote, he walked out -- ADA would have collapsed in 1948. No political action organization can survive, let alone be effective, if every vote becomes a matter of principle.

What we have had in ADA is an atmosphere of mutual trust which transcends whatever immediate differences we may have over policy questions.

As a political group we are interested in communication -- not excommunication. We are a body of men and women dedicated to working out our ideals in a complex, contingent universe. Although we may differ strongly with each other, we do not convert these honest disagreements into accusations of immorality.

Fundamentally we respect the integrity of our opponents. And this sense of community, is ADA's most precious possession.

Because of this commitment to action, founded on the sturdy foundation of community, the creative energies and intellectual ferment of ADA have helped shape the state of democratic action over the past 19 years.

What organization spoke out earlier or more forcefully on the great moral question of civil rights -- or the test ban treaty -- or the right to equal legislative representation -- or the adoption of fiscal and

monetary policies based on Keynesian economics -- or the need for larger federal investments in education, health services and housing?

Without dismissing for one moment the imposing agenda of unfinished business which confronts this country, I believe it is appropriate to recognize the remarkable accomplishments of the past two decades -- and to note the important role which ADA has played in these turbulent -- yet productive-- years.

ADA has for two decades sought to maximize the element of rationality in politics. Any experienced political leader knows that one of the difficulties of being reasonable in an irrational world is that you have a small clientele. Few organizations in our time have done more to enlarge the clientele of reason in politics than the ADA.

But all of this is relevant only if it helps us to tackle the many tasks yet left undone. And, I assume, this is what you have been about this weekend.

Our task at home -- as it is abroad -- remains one of providing to each individual maximum opportunity to exercise freedom of choice in vital aspects of his life.

To provide this opportunity for personal choice surely lies at the heart of our concerns about civil rights, the urban ghetto, the war on poverty, education, health services and related matters. Examine any aspect of the urban ghetto, housing, schools, jobs, welfare, public services -- and you discover a highly complex, ingrained and self-sustaining system which ruthlessly and systematically denies to residents of these areas any opportunity for meaningful choice.

Live in a rat-infested tenement, an abandoned car, or on the streets .. Is that meaningful choice?

Attend a third-rate, custodial, overcrowded and understaffed school, or just drop out entirely -- Is that meaningful choice?

Be the last hired and first fired in a low-paying, degrading job, or collect unemployment insurance (if you qualify and until it runs out)--

Is that meaningful choice?

Breathe polluted air, struggle with expensive and inadequate mass transit systems, play on littered streets or empty lots . . . are these areas of life where ghetto residents exercise meaningful choices?

It is this inability to choose -- this denial of the right to chart one's destiny or to be real participants in the social, economic or political life of this country -- which produces the frustration, the bitterness, hopelessness and outrage we encounter today in the urban ghettos of America.

And it is only as we succeed in breaking this pattern -- in providing hard, visible evidence in terms of better schools, housing, jobs, and public services -- that we can expect this outrage to subside.

We should also recognize two other aspects of this problem. First, only as persons experience actual freedom of choice in these vital areas of life can we expect them to develop a personal stake in maintaining and improving our society as a whole. For as these opportunities become real,

cynicism will be transformed into faith- apathy into initiative -- and alienation into a sense of community and participation.

Second, the whole concept of free choice leaves open the question of what will be chosen. When even a body of like-minded persons who comprise the ADA do not agree on many important matters of public policy, it is not surprising that residents of a particular ghetto neighborhood may seek certain social and economic goals which certain other persons oppose. Yet they must have the opportunity to make these choices, and then to accept responsibility for their decision.

The opportunity to choose necessarily entails diversity -- not conformity. We seek to liberate the human spirit -- to foster human creativity -- and this can only occur as we demonstrate the willingness to accept -- and respect decisions of the people involved.

To achieve this goal requires many things. Let me emphasize only those items I consider most important:

-- Larger investments by governments at all levels are needed to break the downward spiral of poverty and deprivation. Today we see clearly that we must attack simultaneously the interrelated problems of housing, education, jobs, health, recreation, and public services. This attack also assumes broad participation of the private sector in carrying out many of these programs.

-- We must continue to strive toward providing a just family income for all. Further improvement in our social security system, minimum wage, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, medicare and other programs of income maintenance will carry us toward this goal.

An important aspect of this objective is providing constructive and socially useful jobs for the hard-core unemployed. This is precisely the kind of hard, visible evidence which is so urgently needed today.

-- Upgrading the process of education in our deprived areas must receive priority attention. Our urban ghettos must have the best schools --

not the worst -- because these resources would provide a real opportunity to transform a life of despair and defeat into one of achievement and hope.

To provide each person with a chance to choose -- to become all he is capable of becoming -- this is what the American democratic system is all about. And we can never rest until every American has this opportunity. Whether or not we succeed in fulfilling the promise of America for those who presently feel betrayed will, in my opinion, largely determine how posterity judges the democratic action of this generation.

If ADA can share credit for success at home, it also can appreciate the consequences of success abroad. For two decades the power and purpose of the United States contained Communist expansionism around the world. But this is not our only aim. More importantly, we have sought "to make the world safe for diversity" in President Kennedy's phrase, to make sure that no one nation or group of nations ever gains the right to define world order, let alone to manage it.

Two decades of hard experience have taught us that diversity alone is not enough - a world of diversity with safety is what we seek.

The threat to this goal in post-war Europe was clear and visible - the ominous specter of an aggressive Soviet Government backed by menacing military might. Today the Soviet threat to Europe has receded and we and our European allies face the complexities of world politics without the unifying cement of fear that held the alliance together for two decades.

Many had hoped that the break-up of the bipolar world in which

basic decisions of war and peace were largely made by the Soviet Union and the United States would lead to a reduction of our involvement in world affairs. We know now that the rise of a number of independent centers of power and decision has changed our involvement but it has not diminished it. This is because in an age of ultimate weapons, those who possess them must measure each local dispute by its potential for escalation to general war. The price of power is involvement.

Since the Cuban confrontation of 1962 and the test ban treaty of 1963 the emergence of a nuclear stalemate has weakened the inhibiting fear that local wars would lead to nuclear wars. The result has been an increase in the number of local conflicts -- some of which soon involve those who see their own interests served by the spread of chaos and violence.

Our current involvement in Asia, for example is designed to prove to Communist supported aggressors that clandestine attack does not pay any more than overt.

Today the focus of clandestine attack is in Vietnam. Three Presidents have considered it in our interest to prevent the Communists from imposing their power on the people of South Vietnam. They have engaged American power and prestige to assist the South Vietnamese people to prevent local communist forces, directed from North Vietnam, from taking over the country.

They have involved American power to help assure the South Vietnamese people the right to decide their own futures, freely and without intimidation.

It is not necessary to trace the history of our involvement in Vietnam or to detail our present strategy there. This has been done many times. .

I would only comment briefly on our involvement there today.

Our experience of the past year has confirmed once again what many confrontations with Communist tyranny have proven: that there is no substitute for the use of power in the face of premeditated determined

attack. These are times when it must be used.

American military power has been effective ^{in Vietnam} -- and the ominous trend of a year ago has been reversed.

But the headlines of today remind us once again that the struggle in Vietnam will not be won by military power alone. It must be accompanied by the credible promise of a better life. For millions of people in Vietnam - who have known only the ravages of war for twenty years, the status quo is no longer a burden to be patiently borne but an oppressor to be cast off.

To hold the allegiance of the people, the government now recognizes that a true social and economic

revolution is essential. The Government of Vietnam has committed itself to achieving this revolution -- and the United States has affirmed its vigorous support in the Declaration of Honolulu. The waging of the "other war" in Vietnam, the war against poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance, will have a priority second to none.

Events of the past weeks have shown once again that a stable peace requires a government that commands the support of the people. In war torn Vietnam one cannot insist that a model democracy be established while the war is being prosecuted. But the Vietnamese know that only a Government broadly representative of the principal groups in the country can be effective. The Government has taken action toward achieving this goal and elections are now scheduled in August of this year.

We have always believed that the Vietnamese people and their government will have primary responsibility for preserving their independence. In the political sphere in particular, the basic decisions must

be Vietnamese decisions. Those who call for "total victory" in Vietnam should always remember that this is a war for independence -- and no lasting independence can be imposed by foreign armies.

By now there should be no doubt that we will stay in Vietnam -- until the security of the South Vietnamese people has been established. We will not be driven out. We have pledged our support to the people of Vietnam -- and President Johnson has shown that we intend to keep it. We have let the world know - friend and foe alike - that we do not abandon our allies, that we have the will and determination to persevere in the struggle to defend a brave people desiring to preserve their freedom and independence.

Yet as I discovered in my recent trip to Asia, public debate in this country is sometimes interpreted as a weakening of purpose. Our firm resolution in Vietnam in no way affects our dedication to the right of free discussion and dissent.

Members of the ADA will agree that John Stuart Mill's advice

remains valid: " We can never be sure that the opinion we are endeavoring to stifle is a false opinion; and if we were sure, stifling it would be an evil still. "

I would add that long experience in politics has taught me that the difference between a heretic and a prophet is often one of sequence. Often prophecy is heresy - properly aged.

The United States Government has repeatedly sought to move the struggle in Vietnam from the battlefield to the Conference table. The leaders of Hanoi and the Vietcong have not responded to our unconditional offer of negotiation -- an offer which still stands -- nor have they responded to the good offices of other nations, or the United Nations, of the Pope and other religious leaders who seek to bring the conflict to the conference table.

And they have not responded, I am sure, because they still believe that time is on their side . . . that we will ultimately tire and withdraw , either abandoning South Vietnam or accepting a settlement which will give the

Viet Cong victory.

We shall always leave the door open to an honorable negotiated settlement in Vietnam. But while waiting for Hanoi to abandon its designs on South Vietnam, we shall not be diverted from the larger tasks facing free men in Asia.

Nowhere are the challenges more formidable than they are in Asia where two-thirds of the human race lives. We had never joined in the Western domination of vast reaches of Asia. After World II we supported the national independence movements of Asia. We seek nothing in Asia except to help in whatever way we can to bring about human dignity and material well-being for the hundreds of millions who have rarely known it. This objective has engaged the energy and skills of thousands of selfless Americans and of billions of American dollars. It is an objective that is challenged chiefly by a currently militant Communist China whose bellicose threats have cast fear throughout all of Asia.

Chinese expansionism has had to be contained in Korea, resisted in Malaysia, India and Indonesia. Today its outward thrust is in Indo China.

We have made it clear however, that if China should moderate her behavior, we are ready to welcome her to the family of nations. We seek only containment of an aggressive China, not her isolation.

While the immediate prospect for improvement of relations with China is not hopeful, the progress of her neighbor India is most encouraging. Members of ADA who have taken a keen interest in India from the day of her independence will appreciate the scope of India's accomplishment -- in preserving representative democracy despite draught and famine, attack by China, war with Pakistan. Twice in three years she has achieved a peaceful transfer of power -- while losing her great leaders Nehru and Shastri. The U.S. has and will continue to take the lead in providing economic and technical assistance to India.

As you can see from this brief review of the Asian scene -- the state of democratic action in that vast continent is more hopeful than the daily headlines may suggest. The worries and anxieties engendered by political turmoil are often balanced by the strengthening of political institutions or the acceleration of economic progress in the subcontinent, in the Philippines or Japan.

We must ask ourselves, is it rational to build and not to protect in Asia ... Here, of all places I know what the answer will be. If physical security without human welfare is no better than a prison, social welfare programs without physical security is no more than an illusion. I also know that there will be differences within this room as to just how we should protect the democratic cause in Asia and its

outpost in Vietnam. What is the precise mix of military, political, economic, diplomatic measures? I say there can and should and will be disagreements on these questions -- disagreements that can be argued without questioning each others motives or honesty.

In all Asia we pursue a policy of vigilant resistance, equally vigilant lookout for possibilities of reconciliation .. We are in a sense surrogates for the millions who, for various reasons, cannot act on their own behalf... We are, if you will, stand-ins for a world community that has not yet been able to establish its own institutions of self-protection and that never will be able to do so unless somebody undertakes to resist the forces of world disorganization. Whoever does so will risk

the world's opprobrium and stand accused of seeking world domination. But whoever is capable of doing so - yet does not - will earn the contempt of generations to come.

This, then, is my report to you on The State of Democratic Action, the kind of action you organized for XX years ago. It has been my privilege to play a role in the unfolding of this long record. In the course of the unfolding, this role has changed, and changing roles in government impose changing responsibilities. The separation of legislative and executive functions in our constitutional system is deliberate and wise. The responsibilities and opportunities of a United States Senator are not those of a mayor or a Vice President, nor should they be. But the men who fill these roles cannot, in their essential characteristics change. I look back on my satisfying - and I hope still incomplete- life in democratic action with deep gratitude to the people who helped make it possible. Whatever I have been as a man in the past I will continue to be in the future in whatever role I might play.



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