

Address by
Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey
Vice President of the United States
to
National Governors' Conference
Los Angeles, California
July 6, 1966



"Today, the making of history lies in our hands to a greater degree than has been afforded to any nation before. . . .

With all of our incredible economic and military power, the qualities which will be of greatest value to us are patience, persistence, courage and tenacity.

We must never lose our perspective in the crisis of the moment. We must exercise American power to help those who cannot defend themselves from aggression—not in arrogance, not in passion, but in sober determination."



This week we celebrated the 190th anniversary of the adoption, in Philadelphia by the Continental Congress, of the Declaration of Independence. What a glorious day for the cause of man's freedom.

But in celebration of that day, we should not, I think, lose sight of the events that followed it.

The seat of our government moved in those next months from Philadelphia to Baltimore and then to Philadelphia again; to Lancaster to York and back to Philadelphia; to Princeton to Annapolis to Trenton; to New York City and then to Washington.

The Articles of Confederation were adopted in 1777, but they were not ratified by all the states until 1781.

Then, in 1787, delegates from each state were invited to come to Philadelphia on May 14 to draft a Constitution. But it was not until May 25 that enough delegates had arrived to start the meeting—29 in all. Finally, several weeks later, some 55 delegates had arrived, representing 12 states. Rhode Island never did send anybody.

Finally, by September 15, it was time for a vote on a draft Constitution. By then, 13 of the delegates had gone home.

The remaining 42 argued all day, but they reached agreement. Even then, three of the delegates refused to sign. And it was another three years before Rhode Island finally decided to join the Union.

Well, it all came to something—although it wasn't until 1865 that we really knew we were in business as one nation.

My point is this: We have to take the long view.

For we live in a world in which the impetuous act, the grasp for short-run gain, the sudden loss of judgment could plunge us all into disaster. And in such a world, it doesn't seem to make much sense to take anything *but* the long view.

It isn't always so easy to do it. Mention, for instance, Vietnam, and you get a response which makes me think of the lines from Horatius: "Those behind cried Forward! And those before cried Back!"

I am not here to debate with those who cry either "Forward" or "Back" in Vietnam. But I will give my case for why I think Vietnam must be seen in the long view and in the perspective of history.

Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy

I believe our present policy in Vietnam to be part of a coherent, restrained and responsible bi-partisan American foreign policy that has emerged over the past 20 years.

It is a foreign policy directed toward the building, day-by-day, brick-by-brick, of a world of peaceful nations living together in the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

It is a foreign policy that has been successful both in preventing the expansion of Communist totalitarianism and of avoiding nuclear war—all the while working toward the time when political self-determination, economic well-being, and social justice might be more widely enjoyed through the world.

It is a foreign policy that has combined firm resolve in the face of international bullying with the capacity to do international business in the cause of peace: Resistance to nuclear blackmail in Cuba followed by the Test Ban Treaty; resistance to a Communist "war of national liberation" in Vietnam at the same time we propose a non-proliferation agreement on nuclear weapons and a development program which could include a non-aggressive North Vietnam.

It is a foreign policy that has carefully avoided the dangerous courses either of appeasement or of nuclear risk-taking.

Hubert Humphrey is no "status quo" man. He is for change—change to meet the needs and priorities of the times. And I believe our foreign policy has, above all, met the need for change while still remaining true both to principle and national self-interest.

The United Nations . . . The Marshall Plan . . . Point Four . . . the Alliance for Progress . . . the Peace Corps . . . the Asian Development Bank . . . the International Monetary Fund and World Bank . . . Food for Peace and Food for Freedom . . . the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—all these things come from American initiative since World War II.

Firmness in Berlin . . . aid to Greece and Turkey . . . the founding of NATO, CENTO, and SEATO . . . the support of Iran when her integrity was threatened . . . resistance

to aggression in Korea . . . the determination that nuclear missiles should not be introduced into the Western Hemisphere—these things, too, have come from our initiative.

In the past 20 years we have provided some 120 billion dollars of assistance to others. This has included billions of dollars in food—without which millions of our fellow men would have starved.

And in the past 20 years our armed forces have suffered more than 165 thousand casualties on foreign soil.

We have faced the challenges of the past 20 years with the particular measures required to meet them.

Resisting Communist Aggression

During that time we have met many forms of Communist aggression.

In Greece, for instance, we saw the trial run of the war of national liberation—that split-level assault which combines external assistance and direction, from a "sanctuary," with internal subversion. We helped Greece face that challenge.

President Truman and Secretary Acheson were abused for getting involved in a "civil war," as our President has been today.

We were told on the highest journalistic authority that the cause was lost, that the Greek people preferred Communist rule, and that, after all, Greece probably belonged in the Communist sphere of influence. They said we should get out.

But we saw it through and one day the Greek insurgency collapsed. The Yugoslavs, having broken with Moscow, closed the border and stopped underwriting the rebels. And subsequent elections showed the Greek Communists to be in a small minority.

To my knowledge, none of his critics wrote President Truman to acknowledge the courage or wisdom of his policy. Many of them were too busy attacking our stand in Berlin. (Other critics, at the same time, were calling for the launching of a preventive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union.)

In Korea we faced a different kind of Communist threat—conventional invasion. We met that challenge too.

There were those who wanted to withdraw from Korea when we were forced back into the Pusan perimeter.

There were others who wanted to drop nuclear bombs on Communist China. But we stuck with the difficult middle

course and saw it through, and the Communists saw again they could not work their will by force.

Over the next few years we lived with a dozen threats of a "hail of rockets," but we neither fell back nor responded with our own hail of rockets.

Then, in 1962, Chairman Khrushchev tried to alter the basic equilibrium of world nuclear power with his gamble in Cuba.

In those terrifying days President Kennedy, in the cool exercise of measured power, convinced Chairman Khrushchev to withdraw his missiles. Yet he did not fall victim to the temptations either to destroy Castro's Cuba or to press the Soviet Union into a tunnel of no return.

Our point was made and the peace was preserved.

Avoiding Extremes In Foreign Policy

A year earlier, at the University of Washington in Seattle, President Kennedy set forth, on behalf of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration, what remains the position of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration today.

There are in our country, President Kennedy said, "two groups of frustrated citizens, far apart in their views yet very much alike in their approach. On the one hand there are those who urge upon us what I regard to be the pathway to surrender—appeasing our enemies, compromising our commitments, purchasing peace at any price, disavowing our arms, our friends, our obligations. If their view had prevailed, the world of free choice would be smaller today.

"On the other hand are those who urge upon us what I regard to be the pathway of war: Equating negotiations with appeasement and substituting rigidity for firmness. If their view had prevailed, we would be at war today, and in more than one place . . .

"The essential fact that both of these groups fail to grasp is that diplomacy and defense are not substitutes for one another. Either alone would fail. A willingness to resist force, unaccompanied by a willingness to talk, could provoke belligerence—while a willingness to talk, unaccompanied by a willingness to resist force, could invite disaster."

Pointing out that "while we shall negotiate freely, we shall not negotiate freedom," President Kennedy concluded "we are neither 'warmongers' nor 'appeasers,' neither 'hard' nor 'soft.' We are Americans, determined to defend the fron-

tiers of freedom, by an honorable peace if peace is possible, but by arms if arms are used against us."

It is against this background of twenty years of confrontation, first with the Soviet monolith and subsequently with aggressive national communisms, that the current struggle in Vietnam must be placed. Like the Greek insurgency, it is split-level attack from a sanctuary.

You can get a good many frustrations out of your system by cursing history. But cursing history is no substitute for facing the options that exist in 1966.

Choices In Vietnam

There are, most basically, two options: Stay or get out.

I believe that getting out could only encourage further Communist aggression in Asia.

There are those who suggest that we should stay, but be quiet about it; that we should fight, but not vigorously.

I say that we must stay and fight and work in South Vietnam until we have achieved our objectives—the halt of aggression from the North, the independence of South Vietnam, and peace in Southeast Asia.

President Johnson has repeatedly emphasized—and said again in Omaha only last week—that we have no designs against the sovereignty or territory of North Vietnam.

We seek one victory—self-determination for 15 million South Vietnamese. To seek less would be to abandon these people to the rigid totalitarianism of North Vietnam.

There is nothing "liberal" or "conservative" about turning 15 million people over to communism.

At stake is not merely the independence of the South Vietnamese, but the course of future events in Asia.

For, as the Prime Minister of Singapore said a few days ago to the people of Europe: All the independent nations of Asia feel the pressure from the north; all of them feel they have a stake in what is happening in Vietnam.

I found on my mission to Asia and the Pacific that not one national leader opposed our presence in Vietnam or our role there.

We are fighting in Vietnam to convince the Communists that the price of aggression comes too high . . . to convince them that, just as nuclear blackmail failed and conventional invasion failed, wars of liberation too will fail.

The cost of educating them has been enormous over the past generation, but freedom from totalitarianism is hardly an item for cost accounting.

At the other end of the spectrum, there are those who argue we should get out of Vietnam and rely on nuclear weapons to contain Asian communism.

I frankly confess to you that I cannot conceive of a more immoral and potentially disastrous policy.

If we are not able to contain aggression at less than the nuclear threshold, we will continually face in the years ahead this choice: Risk nuclear war or capitulate.

It is a choice we do not—and must not—have to make.

Progress In Asia

Now, for a moment, let us take stock of where we stand in our latest test in these postwar years.

When I returned from Asia and the Pacific earlier this year I reported to the American people that I believed we had reason for measured optimism. I believe that this is more true today than it was then.

Asia is astir with the promise of the future. And there are tangible signs of progress.

In April, the Japanese were host to the economic ministers of free Asia at a conference in Tokyo.

And two weeks ago nine nations of Asia formed a new organization to be known as the Asian and Pacific Council.

This organization was formed to strengthen these nations' cooperation and peaceful development.

Faced with Communist pressure, the independent non-Communist states in Asia are today working together to strengthen themselves and to inoculate themselves against future aggression. Old quarrels and disagreements are being pushed aside.

Our allies, Australia and New Zealand, are working with their neighbors in Southeast Asia on a far greater scale than ever before.

Burma is emerging from her isolation.

Japan—our second trading partner—and South Korea, who three years ago were unable to agree on anything, have signed a treaty of friendship and commerce.

Indonesia and Malaysia are today ending their confronta-

tion. The Communist thrust for power in Indonesia has been crushed.

India and Pakistan, less than a year ago at war, are today at peace and dedicated to investment in the works of peaceful development.

Ceylon increasingly looks West and to cooperation with her neighbors.

The Philippines is led by a dynamic new President, Ferdinand Marcos.

South Korea and Taiwan are enjoying startling economic growth—both above 7 per cent a year.

Thailand, while resisting Communist incursions into border areas of her own country, is enjoying growth that is almost as rapid.

Laos, written off by many people only a few months ago, is gaining stability and is resisting, too, the Communist forces in her country.

Since the first of this year, Australia, South Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand have made new military commitments in South Vietnam.

Communist China still looms as a powerful force in Asia. But today Communist China is being torn by power struggle—a struggle with other Communist nations, a struggle, too, from within. At the same time her neighbors are achieving a new unity of purpose and action.

Achievements In Vietnam

In Vietnam we are gaining on all four major fronts—the economic front . . . the political front . . . the diplomatic front . . . and the military front.

On the economic front, Vietnam is taking the steps and decisions necessary to carry forward a program of economic development, and defeat inflation.

Land is being redistributed. Wells are being dug. Schools are being built. Agricultural production steadily increases. Hospitals and roads are being completed. New leadership is being trained.

These things are not dramatic. But every day the Vietnamese economy—and the life of the Vietnamese citizen—becomes a little better, despite calculated Communist disruption and terror.

On the political front, work goes forward toward election this September for a constituent assembly. Representatives of all major South Vietnamese groups have been meeting to prepare the way for democratic government.

This is a nation trying to create stable, representative institutions in the midst of war and disorder—a nation with dozens of political, ethnic and religious groups all seeking their own place in the future.

In this there is confusion and tumult. But is the tumult in the South not preferable to the icy silence in the Hanoi police state?

The Vietnamese people are finding their way toward self-government, and they are doing it their own way and not under the direction of any Communist commissar.

In all the political ferment in South Vietnam there has been no call for a Communist government.

The people of South Vietnam know the Communists for what they are.

Our Efforts For Peace

On the diplomatic front, we continue our search for a just and peaceful solution to the conflict.

We have repeated again and again our willingness to come to the conference table anywhere, anytime, under any auspices, in order to bring the violence to an end. Again and again we have said that there is no bar to the inclusion of the Viet Cong in any such negotiations.

But let us be clear about this: The obstacle to peace is not in Saigon or Washington. It is in Hanoi and Peking.

We shall continue these efforts. And we shall maintain our offer to aid in the peaceful development of *North* as well as South Vietnam if only Hanoi will leave her neighbors alone.

Allied Military Successes

On the military front, we are gaining each day.

The American troops in Vietnam are the finest men who have ever worn this nation's uniform. They are superbly led. They are superbly trained. They are superbly equipped.

And they perform as brilliantly in civic action, in rebuilding villages, as they do in combat. They are great citizen soldiers.

A succession of smashing defeats has been dealt to the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong main force units in recent months. Clearly the initiative has shifted to the allied forces.

The enemy no longer remains undetected.

The jungle or cave is no longer a sure refuge. His supply can be cut off. He can no longer choose his own time and place to fight.

And, perhaps most important, he can no longer count on the discipline of his own troops. The rate of defection has sharply increased—particularly among squad and platoon leaders and officers.

The recent bombing of the oil storage depots around Hanoi was a military action against clear military objectives. The decision was carefully weighed. It was designed for two purposes—to slow down the rate of infiltration, which has been taking a toll of allied lives; and to help convince the North Vietnamese leadership that their aggression in the South will be too costly to sustain.

Today there must be some hard thinking taking place in Hanoi.

Our adversary must know that time is *not* on his side—that what President Johnson said more than a year ago remains true today:

“We will not be defeated.

“We will not grow tired.

“We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement. . . .”

Advances In Recent History

Finally, may I say this: If we indeed take the long view, I think we have good reason for pride, and encouragement, concerning the course of postwar history.

Despite the troubles of our time—and we read of them every day—we have come to the threshold of a new era of opportunity.

In the past 20 years over one billion people have been freed from foreign rule. Over 70 new countries have been born—but none has turned to Communism.

Western Europe—with our help—stands prosperous and secure, while the nations of Eastern Europe restlessly grope their way to new independence.

The Alianza moves forward in Latin America and the Inter-American system grows and matures. The Dominican

Republic—only a year ago the victim of violent revolution—is today led by a freely elected President and Congress.

In the Dominican Republic, as throughout this hemisphere, there is increasing understanding of, and determination to initiate and carry through, the fundamental economic and social changes which have made the Republic of Mexico, for example, such a beacon of hope for others.

In this revolutionary effort, we stand with our friends throughout Latin America.

In Africa, millions of people—rejecting the lures of communism—are reaching out for “Freedom Now.” And we are with them.

Our own strong, rich land is alive with the great adventure of creation; Creation of a society where the old barriers are being torn down, where every man stands next to his neighbor—unbowed, proud, healthy, free—ready to meet the world on its own terms and make it a better world.

There is good news in the world and, in our concern with crisis, we should not overlook it.

The Communists are wrong—history is not their ally.

America's Responsibility

Today, the making of history lies in our hands to a greater degree than has been afforded to any nation before.

No doubt we shall meet in Asia, as in the rest of the world, frustration, disappointment, and disillusionment, time and again. With all of our incredible economic and military power, the qualities which will be of greatest value to us are patience, persistence, courage and tenacity.

We must never lose our perspective in the crisis of the moment. We must exercise American power to help those who cannot defend themselves from aggression—not in arrogance, not in passion, but in sober determination.

It is the powerful who can most afford compassion and humility.

It is the prosperous who can most afford patience and perseverance.

We are powerful and we are prosperous; we must be both compassionate and patient.

At this time of our history I am reminded of the words of Lincoln, which remain today as a standard of conduct for our international policy: “With malice toward none, with

charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in . . . to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”

Those are words to live by and they constitute the key to the future of a world in which nations, large and small alike, may live in peace and freedom.

Briefing
Today -

Harrison, Rostow, &
General Goodpastor

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

NATIONAL GOVERNORS CONFERENCE

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

JULY 6, 1966

Gov Read -

Gov Brown

Gov Chafee - R.I.

Gov Sawyer - New

Gov Smalley - Idaho

Gov King - N.H.

Gov Romney

Mr H -
Waverly
Wives 1924
7th

Report on the
State of our
Foreign Policy
& National Security.

Let's
take a
look
at the
Record

This week we celebrated the 190th anniversary of the adoption, in Philadelphia, by the Continental Congress of the Declaration of Independence. What a glorious day for the cause of man's freedom.

But in celebration of that day, we should not, I think, lose sight of the events that followed it.

The seat of our government moved in those next months from Philadelphia to Baltimore and then to Philadelphia again; to Lancaster to York and back to Philadelphia; to Princeton to Annapolis to Trenton; to New York City and then to Washington.

The Articles of Confederation were adopted in 1777, but they were not ratified by all the states until 1781.

↳ Then, in 1787, delegates from each state were invited to come to Philadelphia on May 14 to draft a Constitution. But it was not until May 25 that enough delegates had arrived to start the meeting -- 29 in all. Finally, several weeks later, some 55 delegates had arrived, representing 12 states. Rhode Island never did send anybody.

↳ Finally, by September 15, it was time for a vote on a draft Constitution. By then, 13 of the delegates had gone home. 55 came, 42 stayed, 39 signed

The remaining 42 argued all day, but they reached agreement. Even then, three of the delegates refused to sign. And it was another three years before Rhode Island finally decided to join the Union.

grand and historic

Well, it all came to something -- although it wasn't until 1865 that we really knew we were in business as one nation.

My point is this: We have to take the long view. *Had there been T.V. & headlines every day for every development we might have perished in despair.*

I've been told that people who take a long view in public office often take a long rest -- at request of the voters.

~~Yet~~ We live in a world in which the impetuous act, the grasp for short-run gain, the sudden loss of judgment could plunge us all into disaster. And in such a world, it doesn't seem to make much sense to take anything but the long view.

But It isn't always so easy to do it. Mention, for instance, Vietnam, and you get a response which makes me think of the lines from Horatius: "Those behind cried Forward! And those before cried Back!"

↳ I am not here to debate with those who cry either "Forward" or "Back" in Vietnam, But I will give my case for why I think Vietnam must be seen in the long view and in the perspective of history.

↳ I believe our present policy in Vietnam to be part of a coherent, restrained and responsible bi-partisan American foreign policy that has emerged over the past 20 years.

↳ It is a foreign policy directed toward the building, day-by-day, brick-by-brick, a world of peaceful nations living together in the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

↳ It is a foreign policy that has been successful both in preventing the expansion of Communist totalitarianism and of avoiding nuclear war -- all the while working toward the time when political self-determination, economic well-being, and social justice might be more widely enjoyed through the world.

↳ It is a foreign policy that has combined firm resolve
^{The} in face of international bullying with the capacity to do
international business in the cause of peace: Resistance to
nuclear blackmail in Cuba followed by the Test Ban Treaty;
resistance to a Communist "war of national liberation" in
Vietnam at the same time we propose a non-proliferation
agreement on nuclear weapons and ³ Mekong Valley development
which could include a non-aggressive North Vietnam.

↳ It is a foreign policy that has carefully avoided the
dangerous courses either of appeasement or of nuclear
risk-taking.

↳ Hubert Humphrey is no "status quo" man. He is for
change -- change to meet the needs and priorities of the
times. And I believe our foreign policy has, above all, met
the need for change while still remaining true both to
principle and national self-interest.

The United Nations . . . The Marshall Plan . . .
Point Four . . . the Alliance for Progress . . . the
Peace Corps . . . the Asian Development Bank . . . the
International Monetary Fund and World Bank . . . Food
for Peace and Food for Freedom . . . the Nuclear Test Ban
Treaty -- all these things have come from American initiative
since World War II.

∟ Firmness in Berlin . . . aid to Greece and Turkey
. . . the founding of NATO, CENTO and SEATO . . . the
support of Iran when her ~~integrity was~~ ^{border were} threatened . . .
resistance to aggression in Korea . . . the determination
that ~~no Soviet~~ ^{no Soviet} nuclear missiles should not be introduced into the
Western Hemisphere -- these things, too, have come from
our initiative.

∟ In the past 20 years we have provided some 120 billion
dollars of assistance to others. ^{and} This has included billions
of dollars in food -- without which millions of our fellow
men would have starved.

and In the past 20 years our armed forces have suffered more than 165 thousand casualties on foreign soil *in defense of their N. charter + independence.*

We have faced the challenges of the past 20 years with the particular measures required to meet them.

↳ During that time we have met many forms of Communist aggression.

↳ In Greece, for instance, we saw the trial run of the "war of national liberation" -- that split-level assault which combines external assistance and direction, from a "sanctuary," with internal subversion. We helped ^{Greece} face that challenge.

↳ President Truman and Secretary Acheson were abused for getting involved in a "civil war," as our President has been today.

↳ We were told on the highest journalistic authority that the cause was lost, that the Greek people preferred Communist rule, and that, after all, Greece probably belonged in the Communist sphere of influence. They said we should get out.

↳ But we saw it through and one day the Greek insurgency collapsed. The Yugoslavs, having broken with Moscow, closed the border and stopped underwriting the rebels. And subsequent elections showed the Greek Communists to be in a small minority.

↳ To my knowledge, none of his critics wrote President Truman to acknowledge the courage or wisdom of his policy.

Many of them were too busy attacking our stand in Berlin.

FI and other critics, at the same time, were calling for the launching of a preventive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union).

↳ In Korea we faced a different kind of Communist threat to power: Conventional invasion. We met that challenge too.

↳ There were those who wanted to withdraw from Korea when we were forced back into the Pusan perimeter.

There were others who wanted to drop nuclear bombs on Communist China. But we stuck with the difficult middle course and saw it through, and the Communists saw again

they could not work their will by force. *The aggression was*

Stopped - South Korea lines on.

Over the next few years we lived with a dozen threats

of a "hail of rockets," but we neither fell back nor responded

with our own hail of rockets.

*In 1956, President Eisenhower
Saved the Peace by the Landing
of U.S. Forces in Lebanon*

Then, in 1962, Chairman Khrushchev tried to alter the basic equilibrium of world nuclear power with his gamble in Cuba.

In those terrifying days President Kennedy, in the cool exercise of measured power, convinced Chairman Khrushchev to withdraw his missiles. Yet he did not fall victim to the temptations either to destroy Castro's Cuba or to press the Soviet Union into a tunnel of no return.

↳ Our point was made and the peace was preserved.

↳ A year earlier, at the University of Washington in Seattle, President Kennedy set forth, on behalf of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration, what ~~remains~~ ^{continues to be} the position of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration today.

There are in our country, President Kennedy said, "two groups of frustrated citizens, far apart in their views yet very much alike in their approach. On the one hand there are those who urge upon us what I regard to be the pathway to surrender -- appeasing our enemies, compromising our commitments, purchasing peace at any price, disavowing our arms, our friends, our obligations. If their view had prevailed, the world of free choice would be smaller today."

↳ "On the other hand are those who urge upon us what I regard to be the pathway of war; Equating negotiations with appeasement and substituting rigidity for firmness. If their view had prevailed, we would be at war today, and in more than one place " . . .

"The essential fact that both of these groups fail to grasp is that diplomacy and defense are not substitutes for one another. Either alone would fail. A willingness to resist force, unaccompanied by a willingness to talk, could provoke belligerence -- while a willingness to talk, unaccompanied by a willingness to resist force, could invite disaster."

↳ Pointing out that "while we shall negotiate freely, we shall not negotiate freedom," President Kennedy concluded "we are neither 'warmongers' nor 'appeasers,' neither 'hard' nor 'soft.' We are Americans, determined to defend the frontiers of freedom, by an honorable peace if peace is possible, but by arms if arms are used against us."

↳ It is against this background of twenty years of confrontation, first with the Soviet monolith and subsequently with aggressive national communisms, that the current struggle in Vietnam must be placed. Like the Greek insurgency, it is a split-level attack from a sanctuary.

This assault was undertaken in an area which could not have been more unfavorable from the viewpoint of the defense. We could hardly, however, expect the Communists to attack us at a point of our choice nor do we have the option of moving the war to a preferable spot, say an island in the Indian Ocean.

↳ You can get a good many frustrations out of your system by cursing history. But cursing history is no substitute for facing the options that exist in 1966.

There are, ~~most~~ basically, two options: Stay or get out.

I believe that getting out could only encourage further Communist aggression in Asia and would jeopardize the integrity of the independent nations of that part of the world.

↳ There are those who suggest that we should stay, but be quiet about it, that we should fight, but not vigorously.

I am not sure whether they fully support a half-war, or give halfway support to a full war.

∟ I say that we must stay and fight and work in South Vietnam until we have achieved our objectives -- the halt of aggression from the North, / ^{the safety and} independence of South Vietnam, and peace in Southeast Asia.

~~President Johnson has repeatedly emphasized -- and said again in Omaha only last week -- that we have no designs against the sovereignty or territory of North Vietnam.~~

Keep

∟ We seek one victory -- self-determination for 15 million South Vietnamese. To seek less would be to abandon these people to the rigid totalitarianism of North Vietnam.

One thing which I think we can all accept -- despite the efforts of a small minority to cloud the issue -- there is nothing "liberal" or "conservative" about turning 15 million people over to communism.

↳ At stake is not merely the independence of the South Vietnamese, but the course of future events in Asia.

~~For, AS~~ the President of Singapore made clear a few days ago to the people of Europe: All The independent nations of Asia feel the pressure from the North; all of them feel they have a stake in what is happening in Vietnam.

↳ I found on my mission to Asia and the Pacific that not one national leader opposed our presence in Vietnam or our role there. They know that,

↳ We are fighting in Vietnam to convince the Communists again --/we have before -- that the price of aggression comes too high . . .

we are there
 . . . to convince *the communist leaders* them that just as nuclear blackmail
failed *in Cuba* and conventional invasion failed *in Korea*, wars of liberation
 too will fail.

The cost of educating *"the Aggressors"* them has been enormous over
 the past generation, but freedom from totalitarianism is
 hardly an item for cost accounting!

↳ At the other end of the spectrum, there are those
 who argue we should get out of Vietnam and rely on nuclear
 weapons to contain Asian communism.

~~I frankly confess to you that I can not conceive of a~~
 more immoral and potentially disastrous *dangerous and* policy.

↳ If we are not able to contain aggression at less than
 the nuclear threshold, we will continually face in the years
 ahead this choice: Risk nuclear war or capitulate.

!! ↳ It is a choice we do not -- and must not -- have to make.

#

↳ Now, for a moment, let us take stock of where we stand in our latest test in these postwar years.

↳ When I returned from Asia and the Pacific earlier this year I reported to the American people that I believed we had reason for measured optimism. ~~I believe that~~

↳ this is more true today than it was then.

↳ Asia is astir with the promise of the future. And there are tangible signs of progress.

↳ In April, the Japanese were host to the economic ministers of free Asia at a conference in Tokyo.

↳ And two weeks ago nine nations of Asia ^{meeting in Seoul Korea} formed a new organization to be known as the Asian and Pacific Council.

This organization was formed to strengthen ~~these nations'~~
cooperation and peaceful development, but also -- as the
final communique put it -- "to preserve their integrity
and sovereignty in the face of external aggression."

↳ This is but one of the things that can give us reason
for encouragement.

↳ Faced with Communist pressure, the independent non-
Communist states in Asia are today working together to

strengthen themselves and to inoculate themselves against future aggression. Old quarrels and disagreements are being pushed aside.

↳ Our allies, Australia and New Zealand, are working with their neighbors in Southeast Asia on a far greater scale than ever before.

↳ Burma is emerging from her isolation.

*Prime Minister U Win
has accepted
an invitation to visit*

↳ Japan -- our second trading partner -- and South Korea, who three years ago were unable to agree on anything, have signed a treaty of friendship and commerce.

↳ Indonesia and Malaysia are today ending their confrontation. The Communist thrust for power in Indonesia has been crushed.

↳ India and Pakistan, less than a year ago at war, are today at peace and dedicated to investment in the works of peaceful development.

↳ Ceylon increasingly looks West and to cooperation with her neighbors.

↳ The Philippines/^{is} led by a dynamic new President, Ferdinand Marcos.

↳ South Korea and Taiwan are enjoying startling economic growth -- both above 7 per cent a year.

↳ Thailand, while resisting Communist incursions into border areas of her own country, is enjoying ^{economic} growth ~~that~~ ^{and} ~~is almost as rapid.~~ ^{is strengthening}

↳ Laos, written off ^{to be lost} by many people only a few months ago, is gaining stability and is ^{successfully} resisting ~~too~~ the Communist forces in her country,

↳ Since the first of this year, Australia, South Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand have made new military commitments in South Vietnam.

↳ These things are not dramatic. But every day the Vietnamese economy -- and the life of the Vietnamese citizen -- becomes a little better, despite calculated Communist disruption and terror.

a new 80 man military + civilian council to help unify the nation has been installed - and

(2) ↳ On the political front, work goes forward toward election this September for a constituent assembly. Representatives of all major South Vietnamese groups have been meeting to prepare the way for democratic government.

↳ This is a nation trying to create stable, representative institutions in the midst of war and disorder -- a nation with dozens of political, ethnic and religious groups -- all seeking their own place in the future,

↳ In this there is confusion and tumult. But is the tumult ^{*of free people*} in the South not preferable to the icy silence in the Hanoi police state?

↳ The Vietnamese people are finding their way toward self-government, and they are doing it their own way and not under the direction of any Communist commissar.

↳ In all the political ferment in South Vietnam there has been no call for a Communist government.

↳ The people of South Vietnam know the Communists for what they are. *Communist Aggression is not a subject of academic discussion - it is a life & death matter.*
(3) ↳ On the diplomatic front, we continue our search for a just and peaceful solution to the conflict.

We have repeated again and again our willingness to come to the conference table anywhere, anytime, under any auspices, in order to bring the violence to an end. Again and again we have said that there is no bar to the inclusion of the Viet Cong in any such negotiations.

↳ But let us be clear about this: The obstacle to peace is not in Saigon or Washington. It is in Hanoi and Peking.

We shall continue these efforts. And we shall maintain our offer to aid in the peaceful development of North as well as South Vietnam if only Hanoi will leave her neighbors alone.

4 L On the military front, we are gaining, each day.

The American troops in Vietnam are the finest men who have ever worn this nation's uniform. They are superbly led. They are superbly trained. They are superbly equipped.

L And they perform as brilliantly in civic action, in rebuilding villages, as they do in combat. They are great citizen soldiers, ~~under the command of~~

L A succession of smashing defeats has been dealt to the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong main force units in recent months. Clearly the initiative has shifted to the allied forces.

L The enemy no longer remains undetected.

↳ The jungle or cave is no longer a sure refuge. His supply can be cut off. He can no longer choose his own time and place to fight.

And, perhaps most important, he can no longer count on the discipline of his own troops -- the rate of defection *of men* has sharply increased.

and off from

~~In the last six months of 1965 more than 8,000 Communist defectors left his ranks. In the first five months of this year he has lost more than 11,000 defectors -- and more and more of them have been squad and platoon leaders and officers.~~

↳ The recent bombing of the oil storage depots around *Hauptong* *and* Hanoi was a military action against clear military objectives. The decision was carefully weighed. It was designed for two purposes -- to slow down the rate of infiltration, which has been taking a toll of allied lives; and to help convince

the North Vietnamese leadership that their aggression in the South will be too costly to sustain,

↳ Today there must be some hard thinking taking place in Hanoi.

↳ Our adversary must know that time is not on his side -- that what President Johnson said more than a year ago remains true today:

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement . . . "

↳ Finally, may I say this: If we indeed take the long view, I think we have good reason for pride, and encouragement, concerning the course of postwar history.

↳ Despite the troubles of our time -- and we read of them everyday -- we have come to the threshold of a new era of opportunity *for a changing world.*

↳ In the past 20 years over one billion people have been freed from foreign rule. Over 70 new countries have been born -- but none has turned to communism.

↳ Western Europe -- with our help -- stands prosperous and secure, while the nations of Eastern Europe restlessly grope their way to new independence.

↳ The Alianza moves forward in Latin America and the Inter-American system grows and matures. The Dominican Republic -- only a year ago the victim of violent revolution -- is today led by a freely elected President and Congress.

I was in Santo Domingo only last weekend, to witness the installation of President Balaguer and to demonstrate the United States' immense satisfaction at the conduct of the Dominican people in carrying through this orderly change in government.

↳ The difficult decision by President Johnson of May 1965
~~year~~ ago has been proven right by events.

↳ In the Dominican Republic, as throughout this hemisphere, there is increasing understanding of, and determination to initiate and carry through, the fundamental economic and social changes which have made the Republic of Mexico, for example, such a beacon of hope for others.

↳ In this revolutionary effort, we stand with our friends throughout Latin America.

↳ In Africa, millions of people -- rejecting the lures of communism -- are reaching out for "Freedom Now."

And we are with them.

↳ But what of Vietnam?

↳ Vietnam is under attack, yet the great nations of the sub-continent, India and Pakistan, remain at peace; and other nations of Asia and the Pacific -- with our help -- come together in the cause of hope and progress.

and here at home - 27 -

Our own strong, rich land is alive with the great adventure of creation: Creation of a society where the old barriers are being torn down, where every man stands next to his neighbor -- unbowed, proud, healthy, free -- ready to meet the world on its own terms and make it a better world. And to the North, across open, unfortified border, stands our neighbor Canada — growing and prospering.

There is good news in the world and, in our concern with crisis, we should not overlook it.

The Communists ~~are~~ wrong -- history is not their ally.

Today, the making of history lies in our hands to a greater degree than has been afforded to any nation ^{ever} before.

No doubt we shall meet in Asia, as in the rest of the world, frustration, disappointment, and disillusionment, time and again. With all of our incredible economic and military power, the qualities which will be of greatest value to us are patience, perseverance, persistence, courage and tenacity.

↳ We must never lose our perspective in the crisis of the moment.

↳ We must exercise American power to help those who cannot defend themselves from aggression -- not in arrogance, not in passion, but in sober determination.

↳ It is the powerful who can most afford compassion and humility.

↳ It is the prosperous who can most afford patience and perseverance.

↳ We are powerful and we are prosperous; we must be both compassionate and patient.

*↳ We must be firm without being rigid.
- strong without being belligerent
- Resolute without being arrogant
- Compassionate without being weak.*

Lincoln ↳ At this time of our history I am reminded of the words of Lincoln,

which remain today as a standard of conduct for our international

policy: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with

firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive

on to finish the work we are in . . . to do all which may achieve and

cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."



Those are words to live by and they constitute the key to the future of a world in which nations, large and small alike, may live in peace and freedom.

#

[Transcript]

BURROWS REPORTING SERVICE

COURT & CONVENTION REPORTING

~~MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE~~

~~WASHINGTON, D.C.~~

318 24th Street
Virginia Beach, Virginia

July 22, 1966

Miss Beverly Macht
Room 5121
New Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Miss Macht:

Enclosed is the address of The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, before the 58th Annual Governors' Conference in Los Angeles on July 6, 1966, per your request.

Very truly yours,


Thomas D. Burrows

A D D R E S S

By

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Vice President of the United States

Before the

58th Annual Governors' Conference

Century Plaza Hotel

Los Angeles, California

July 6, 1966

GOVERNOR REED: One of the real privileges of serving as Chairman of the National Governors' Conference is becoming acquainted with the highest elective officials in our country. So I feel our Conference today is singularly honored to have the Vice President of the United States here to address us. You will all recall the fact that we were the recipient of his generous hospitality during our 1965 Conference in Minneapolis, making it one of the finest Conferences in the history of this Governors' Conference.

Our guest's career is one of the real success sagas of our times. In climbing the heights to international prominence, he has indeed overcome great obstacles through determination, hard work, great native ability and dedication to American principles. I am certain that everybody in this room and every Governor shares my pride in having the Vice President here. I am indeed greatly honored to present to the Governors of the United States and to this audience The Honorable Hubert Humphrey, Vice President of the United States. [Rising applause]

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Governor Reed. I want to thank Governor Brown and this distinguished escort that was so gracious and kind as to receive me - Governor Chafee, Governor Sawyer, Governor Smylie and

Governor King. Distinguished Governors, one and all, Ladies and Gentlemen: First of all, may I say that Mrs. Humphrey and I miss you this year. Our little cottage out at Lake Waverly is in even better shape than it was last year because we had to rush the job for you then. I want to bring you a note of good news since I last saw you. Believing that every family ought to have two cars, I have added to my 1931 model a 1924 Model T. And I can assure you that it runs well. This is out of respect for tradition. It does not in any way indicate any philosophy, I want you to know! [Laughter]

We have been reading with great interest your deliberations. I come here as a friend and as a fellow public servant. I do not come here to expound what you and I might call the verities because that is rather difficult to do. But I do come here to thank you on behalf of a President and a Federal Government who are for your cooperation, for your understanding, for your willingness to work together as a part of this great American government team. Needless to say, in a free society, such as ours, there are different approaches to common problems. But it is out of that diversity of approach that we find the answer, not the answer to dogma or even doctrine but through pragmatic experience, through trial and error and through the refinements of our approaches. I come here today

to report to you as an official of your country on the state of our foreign policy and on the state of our defenses - our national security. I do hope that during the day I might be privileged to visit with some of you on matters that relate to federal-state relationships and federal-state-local relationships. This whole subject has been very close to my heart and I know that it is the very essence of your administration and of your needs. But let me today confine myself in a reporting session to you.

You are going to have later on, as you know, at our request and by the desire of the President of the United States, President Johnson, an executive briefing by three of the top officers of this government - Ambassador Harriman, Mr. Walter Rostow and General Goodpaster. I can think of no three men in government that can do a better job for you. And, as in the past, I believe at least on two other occasions in the past year or so, you will be given all information, not just part of it - the good and the bad, the sensitive and the nonsensitive, the secret and the nonsecret. It is an everlasting tribute and compliment to you Governors that not once has there been a violation of what we call the executive session. I think this is most remarkable. It is a further compliment to you and one richly deserved, that every session with the President, every

meeting that you have had has been one that was helpful to him and, I believe, informative to you and of great comfort to the American people. Because the American people look to you and trust you. You are the leaders of the commonwealth, the states, of this great United States of America.

This past week we celebrated the 190th anniversary of the adoption, in Philadelphia, by the Continental Congress, of the Declaration of Independence. I am not going to make any Independence Day oration. In fact, Independence Day this year, with the exception of our little family saluting of the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance, my Independence Day activities were primarily going over to the local Independence Day parade at Delano, Minnesota, one of the thriving metropolis of Wright County. And it is not in California, Governor! [Laughter] Or within metropolitan Los Angeles. Almost, though! And I spent a little time there in the parade driving my favorite vehicle and then on the merry-go-round with my granddaughter. So I am going to be within that friendly spirit, just talking and visiting with fellow public servants. But what a glorious day, Independence Day, for the cause of men's freedom, and a glorious day for many people beyond our shores. But I suggest that in celebration of that day we should not lose sight of the events that followed it. Let me just put our history in perspective, because I think it

gives you a better approach and maybe a better understanding of the world in which we live today.

The seat of our government following July 4, 1776 moved from Philadelphia to Baltimore and then to Philadelphia again, to Lancaster to York and back to Philadelphia; to Princeton to Annapolis to Trenton; and then to New York City and finally to Washington. That was the stability of government that we had in the United States from 1776 to 1789. I venture to say that no people have traveled quite so far in search of a national city or a center for its national government. The Articles of Confederation were adopted in 1777 - our first Constitution. But they were not ratified by all of the states until 1781. And then in 1787, delegates from each state were invited to come to Philadelphia on May 14 to draft a Constitution because the first one did not seem to work too well. But it was not until May 25 that enough delegates had arrived at Philadelphia to start the meeting - 29 in all. These were our Founding Fathers. Finally, several weeks later, 55 delegates had arrived, out of over 150 that had been invited, representing 12 states. Governor Chafee, Rhode Island never did send anybody. It was a very independent state. Finally, by September 15, it was time for a vote on a draft Constitution. And by then, of the 55 delegates who had arrived, 13 had gone home. So 55 came, 42 stayed and only 39

signed. The remaining 42 that stayed argued all day and finally they reached an agreement. But, as I noted, even then three delegates refused to sign and little Rhode Island did not sign until three years later when it decided to join the Union. So when you think of Africa or Latin America, be tolerant, will you, or at least be students of American history, where it all came to something glorious and wonderful. Although it can be said that it wasn't until 1865 that we really knew we were in business as one nation. And, frankly, it took many years after that terrible struggle between the states to bind up the wounds. In fact, we are still binding them. My point is this: We have to take the long view. I suspect that had we had TV and daily press coverage five or six times a day or news on the hour every hour, that the American people in those early days of our Republic would have given up in despair, because there was nothing but defeat, confusion and turmoil and tension and riot for years and years and years. Now we live in a world in which the impetuous act, the grasp for short-run gain, the sudden loss of judgment could plunge us all into disaster. And in such a world, it doesn't seem to make much sense to take anything but the long view. But it isn't always so easy to do it. Mention, for instance, Viet Nam, which is the subject of everyone's conversation, and you get a response which makes me think of the

lines from Horatius: "Those behind cried, 'Forward!' And those before cried, 'Back!'"

I am not here to debate with those who cry either "Forward" or "Back" in Viet Nam. But I will give you my case and our government's case for why I think Viet Nam must be seen in the long view and in the perspective of history rather than a subject of current events.

I believe our present policy in Viet Nam to be a part of a coherent, restrained and responsible bi-partisan American foreign policy that has emerged over the past 20 years, a policy that has not been based upon the narrow prejudices of partisan advantage but rather upon the broad gauge needs of a great Republic. It is a foreign policy directed toward the building, day-by-day, brick-by-brick, of a world of peaceful nations living together in the spirit of the United Nations Charter. Because peace is not a hope or is it even a prayer. It is work and sacrifice and building. It is a foreign policy that has been successful both in preventing the expansion of Communist totalitarianism and, above all, of avoiding nuclear war and all the while working toward the time when political self-determination, economic well-being and social justice might be more widely enjoyed throughout the world. It is a foreign policy that has combined firm resolve in face of international bullying with the

capacity at the same time to do international business in the cause of peace: For example, resistance to nuclear blackmail in Cuba followed by the Test Ban Treaty; resistance to a Communist "war of national liberation" in Viet Nam at the same time we propose a non-proliferation agreement on nuclear weapons and general disarmament and Mekong Valley development which would include a non-aggressive North Viet Nam. It is a foreign policy, gentlemen, that has carefully avoided the dangerous courses either of appeasement or of nuclear risk-taking. And it is a foreign policy that has been adhered to by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, without regard to party.

I don't think I need to tell you that Hubert Humphrey is no "status quo" man nor is the President of the United States nor are you. We are for change - change to meet the needs and priorities of the times. And I believe our foreign policy has, above all, met this need for change while still remaining true both to principle and national self-interest. And there is nothing wrong in being concerned about national self-interest.

The United Nations, The Marshall Plan, Point Four, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, the Asian Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, Food for Peace and Food for Freedom, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty - all of these things have come from American initiative since World War II,

not from a tired nation but from an active nation, not from tired leadership but from leadership that can see ahead.

Firmness in Berlin, aid to Greece and Turkey, the founding of NATO, CENTO and SEATO, the support of Iran when her integrity was threatened, resistance to aggression in Korea, the determination that Soviet nuclear missiles should not be introduced into the Western Hemisphere - these things, too, have come from the initiative of your leaders and our country.

You see, I think the time is at hand for a few of us to stand up and speak up for this country. I don't believe it is all bad. And I don't believe we are where we are today because of the constant series of mistakes as some would have us believe. I believe we are where we are today because we have tried, because our cause has been one of peace and justice and because we have not been afraid. We have had courage when it was needed and we have had patience when it was needed. And we have had judgment when it was needed, as best as humans can do. We are not gods nor God. We are fallible, not infallible. We are humans, not devines. And it is about time, it seems to me, that leaders of our country spoke up, not only for Americans but for the world, not out of pride but out of sober reflection and review of history that we have done fairly well for a nation with the burden that this nation has had on its shoulders this past

generation. [Applause]

In the past 20 years we have provided some 120 billion dollars of assistance to others. This has included billions of dollars in food supplies which have fed millions and saved the lives of millions. In the past 20 years our armed forces have suffered more than 165 thousand casualties on foreign soil for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and for their freedom and our national interest. We have faced the challenges of the past 20 years with the particular measures designed at the time required to meet those challenges. We don't have any blueprints. We have no so-called mystical vision of everything that is to come and every way to handle it. We have to face up to the realities of the time as they come, just as you do. We are in the public service. During that time we have met many forms of Communist aggression.

In Greece, for example, we saw the trial run of the war of national liberation -- that split-level assault which combines external assistance and direction, from a "sanctuary," with internal subversion. And we helped face that challenge. President Truman and Secretary Acheson were abused for getting involved in a "civil war," as our President has been today. We were told on the highest journalistic authority that the cause

was lost; that you couldn't win; that we ought not to be there; that the Greek people preferred Communist rule, and that, after all, Greece probably belonged in the Communist sphere of influence. They said we should get out. But we didn't! We saw it through and you backed us. And one day the Greek insurgency collapsed. The Yugoslavs, having broken with Moscow, closed the border and stopped underwriting the rebels. And subsequent elections showed the Greek Communists to be a mighty small minority. To my knowledge, none of his critics wrote President Truman to acknowledge the courage or wisdom of his policy. Many of them were too busy with a new angle - attacking our stand in Berlin. While today that stand is heroic, at the time that it was taken it was under caustic criticism. Other critics, at the same time, were calling for the launching of a preventive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union.

In Korea we faced a different kind of Communist threat to power - conventional invasion. We met that challenge, too. There were those who wanted to withdraw from Korea when we were forced, as you will recall, back into the Pusan perimeter, when it looked bleak and dismal. There were others who wanted to drop nuclear bombs on Communist China. But we stuck with the difficult middle course and saw it through, and the Communists saw again they could not work their will by force. The aggression was

stopped and free South Korea lives and gains to prosper.

Over the next few years we lived with a dozen threats during President Eisenhower's Administration when Khrushchev and others threatened with a "hail of rockets," but we neither fell back nor responded with our own hail of rockets. As you will recall, in the middle fifties, President Eisenhower saved the peace in the Middle East by the landing of United States forces in Lebanon, not because he wanted to conquer but because it was in the cause of peace and our own national self-interest. Then in 1962, Chairman Khrushchev tried to alter the basic equilibrium of world nuclear power with his gamble in Cuba. In those terrifying days, President Kennedy, in the cool exercise of measured power, convinced Chairman Khrushchev to withdraw his missiles. Yet he did not fall victim to the temptations either to destroy Castro's Cuba or to press the Soviet Union into a tunnel of no return, which could have meant nuclear war. Our point was made and the peace was preserved.

A year earlier, at the University of Washington in Seattle, President Kennedy set forth, on behalf of the then Kennedy-Johnson Administration, what continues to be the position of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration today and what I think is pretty much your position. Here is what he said: "There are in our country two groups of frustrated citizens, far apart in their

views yet very much alike in their approach. On the one hand there are those who urge upon us what I regard to be the pathway to surrender -- appeasing our enemies, compromising our commitments, purchasing peace at any price, disavowing our arms, our friends, our obligations. If their view had prevailed, the world of free choice would be smaller today." President Kennedy said: "On the other hand are those who urge upon us what I regard to be the pathway of war -- equating negotiations with appeasement and substituting rigidity for firmness. If their view had prevailed, we would be at war today, and in more than one place. The essential fact that both of these groups fail to grasp is that diplomacy and defense are not substitutes for one another. Either alone would fail. A willingness to resist force, unaccompanied by a willingness to talk, could provoke belligerence; while a willingness to talk, unaccompanied by a willingness to resist force, could invite disaster." Pointing out that "while we shall negotiate freely, we shall not negotiate freedom," President Kennedy concluded with these words, "we are neither 'warmongers' nor 'appeasers' neither 'hard' nor 'soft'. We are Americans, determined to defend the frontiers of freedom by an honorable peace if peace is possible, but by arms if arms are used against us."

Now, my friends, it is against this background of 20

years of confrontation, first with the Soviet monolith and subsequently with aggressive national communisms, such as we see in Asia today, that the current struggle in Viet Nam must be placed. Like the Greek insurgency, it is a split-level attack from a sanctuary. You can get a good many frustrations out of your system by cursing history. I have done it and I wouldn't be a bit surprised that others might have been tempted to try it. But cursing history is no substitute for facing the options that exist in 1966. It does little good to say what we ought to have done. The question is: what are we doing? And what should we do?

There are basically two options for us: stay or get out.

I believe that getting out would encourage further Communist aggression in Asia and elsewhere. There are those who suggest that we should stay but be quiet about it. Don't tell anybody. That we should fight but not too vigorously. I say that we must stay and fight and work in South Viet Nam until we have achieved our objectives. What objectives? The halt of aggression from the north, the independence of South Viet Nam and peace in southeast Asia. And those are honorable objectives. It would seem to me that most Americans should be for them. We seek only one victory - self-determination for 15 million South

Vietnamese. To seek less would be to abandon these people to the rigid totalitarianism of North Viet Nam. And I submit, gentlemen, there is nothing "liberal" or "conservative" about turning 15 million people over to communism. And that is what would happen if we were to slacken our effort or withdraw. At stake is not merely the independence of the South Vietnamese, but, I think, the course of future events in Asia, which basically affects the well-being of this nation for generations yet to come. As the President of Singapore, who, by the way, has not been known as any rabid fan of the United States, made clear a few days ago to the people of Europe, and I now paraphrase his speech: All the independent nations of Asia feel the pressure from the North; all of them feel they have a stake in what is happening in Viet Nam.

I found on my mission to Asia and the Pacific that not one national leader in the free countries that I had visited opposed our presence in Viet Nam or our role there, not one. Not one asked us to leave. All understood our problem. They know that we are fighting in Viet Nam for them as well as for ourselves. They know that we are fighting in Viet Nam to convince the Communists once again, as we have before, that the price of their aggression comes too high. And that aggression in a nuclear age is too dangerous. We are there to convince the

Communist leaders that just as nuclear blackmail failed and as conventional invasion failed in Korea, wars of national liberation, too, will fail. The cost of educating them has been enormous over the past generation, but freedom from totalitarianism is hardly an item for cost accounting.

Now, at the other end of the spectrum, there are those who argue that we should get out of Viet Nam and rely on nuclear weapons to contain Asian Communism. I frankly confess to you that I cannot conceive of a more immoral and potentially disastrous policy for this country or for the world. If we are not able to contain aggression at less than the nuclear threshold, we will continually face in the years ahead this choice: Risk nuclear war or capitulate. But I submit, it is a choice we do not and must not have to make. So for a moment, let us take stock of where we stand in our latest test in these postwar years.

When I returned from Asia and the Pacific earlier this year, having visited 14 countries on this occasion, I reported to the American people and the President that I believed we had reason for measured optimism. I must confess that those words brought down upon my head a storm of criticism, but I had reason for them, having seen the plans of General Westmoreland and our allies, knowing a little bit about the inside information of what

we had in store for the enemy. I submit that this measured optimism that I reported in February is more true today than it was then. Asia is astir with the promise of its future. And there are tangible signs of progress. I met with the Prime Minister of Japan in January of this year and urged upon him Japanese initiative throughout Asia and particularly in Indonesia. I am happy to report to you that out of those conversations came a proposal where the Japanese were host to the Economic Ministers of Free Asia at a conference in Tokyo - Japan's first venture into international leadership since World War II. And two weeks ago nine nations of Asia, meeting in Seoul, Korea, formed a new organization, to be known as the Asian and Pacific Council. On two occasions I discussed this matter at length in early January and in February with President Park of Korea and his foreign minister, urging their initiative. This organization was formed to strengthen these nations' cooperation and peaceful development, but also, as the final communique put it, "To preserve their integrity and sovereignty in the face of external aggression."

Faced with communist pressure, these independent non-communist states in Asia are working together to strengthen themselves and to inoculate themselves against future aggression. Old quarrels and disagreements that have taken up their time and energy are being pushed aside. Our allies, Australia and

New Zealand, are working with their neighbors in Southeast Asia on a far greater scale than ever before. Burma, once considered a Chinese hostage, is emerging from isolation. And Prime Minister Ne Win has accepted our invitation to come to Washington, D. C. Japan, our second trading partner, and South Korea, who three years ago were unable to agree on anything, have signed a treaty of friendship and economic cooperation. Indonesia and Malaysia are today ending their confrontation. The Communist thrust for power in Indonesia has been crushed. Do you think that that would have happened had Viet Nam been the victim of communist aggression? I will leave that answer to you. India and Pakistan, less than a year ago at war, are today at peace and dedicated to investment in the works of peaceful development. Ceylon, only two years ago looking with yearning eyes to China, increasingly today looks to the West and to cooperation with their neighbors. The Philippines is led by a dynamic new President, Ferdinand Marcos, one of the bright lights of the Asian scene. South Korea and Taiwan are enjoying startling economic growth - both above 7 per cent a year. Thailand, while resisting Communist incursions into border areas of her own country, is enjoying economic growth and is strengthening her resistance. Laos, written off by many people only a few months ago, is gaining stability and successfully resisting the Communist forces. Since the first

of this year, Australia, South Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand have made new military commitments in South Viet Nam. We are not there alone. We have brave allies.

Communist China, yes, still looms as a powerful force. But today Communist China is being torn by power struggle - a struggle with other Communist nations, a struggle, too, from within. I would rather have our problems than hers. At the same time her neighbors are achieving a new unity of purpose and action.

In Viet Nam we are gaining on all four major fronts. And there are four fronts that move in synchronization - the economic, the political, the diplomatic and the military fronts. On the economic front, Viet Nam is taking the steps and decisions necessary to carry forward a program of economic development and defeat inflation. Land is being redistributed. Wells are being dug. Schools are being built. Agricultural production steadily increases. Hospitals and roads are being completed. New leadership is being trained. I know these things are not dramatic. They don't make the headlines but they are the substance of life of a nation. Every day the Vietnamese economy, and the life of the Vietnamese citizen, becomes a little better, despite calculated Communist disruption and terror.

On the political front, a new 80-man military and civilian

council has been established to help unify the nation. Work goes forward toward election this September for a constituent assembly. Representatives of all major South Vietnamese groups have been meeting to prepare the way for free government - democratic government.

Now, gentlemen, you know what it means to deal with turbulence and with difficulty and tension. This is a nation, this Viet Nam, trying to create stable, representative institutions in the midst of war and disorder -- hundreds of years of colonial rule and 25 years of war; a nation with dozens of political, ethnic and religious groups -- all seeking their own place in the future. In this there is confusion and tumult. But is the tumult and confusion of a free people in the South not preferable to the icy silence of the people in the Hanoi police state? I might add that these people are today arguing about a South Viet Nam that will be. A year ago they were not arguing because a little over a year ago there was serious doubt as to whether there could be any South Viet Nam. They are arguing now on the future of South Viet Nam, which is a sign of health, not weakness. The Vietnamese people are groping and struggling and finding their way toward self-government, and they are doing it in their own way. We did it in ours and it wasn't very tidy either. They are doing it in their own way and not under any communist commissar.

In all of the political ferment in South Viet Nam, there has not been one single leader call for a communist government. There is a lot of talk about the United States about what we ought to do to appease the Communists. But I can assure you that there is no known responsible political leader in South Viet Nam that has called for any cooperation and collaboration with the Communist forces and surely not with a Communist government. The people of South Viet Nam know the Communists for what they are. With them it is not a topic of academic discussion - teach-ins or sit-ins. It is a matter of life and death. And they know what it means to them if they lose. And, gentlemen, I suggest that our fellow Americans should contemplate that, too.

On the diplomatic front we continue our search for a just and peaceful solution. We have repeated again and again our willingness to come to the conference table, gentlemen, anywhere, anytime, under any auspices, in order to bring the violence to an end. Again and again we have said that there is no bar to the inclusion of the Viet Cong in any such negotiations. But let us be perfectly clear about this: The obstacle to peace is not in Saigon or Washington. The obstacle to peace, as you well know, is in Hanoi and Peking. It is not you or your President or the American people or the government in Saigon that is causing the delay for peace. There can be peace tomorrow if the enemy

will cease its aggression. We are prepared for a cease fire but on both sides. President Johnson wants peace. Governor Reed wants peace. You want peace. I want peace. But you cannot have peace alone. We are going to continue our efforts. And we shall maintain our offer to aid the peaceful development of North as well as South Viet Nam, if only Hanoi will leave her neighbors alone.

On the military front -- the good news -- we are gaining every day. And it is time that the American people let our men in Viet Nam know that we have faith and confidence in their ability to achieve this victory. [Applause] I know I speak for you and me when I say that the American troops in Viet Nam are the finest men who have ever worn this nation's uniform. You have seen them and so have I. [Applause] They are superbly led. They are superbly trained. They are superbly equipped. And they perform as brilliantly in civic action, in rebuilding villages, as they do in combat, in saving lives as well as in defending the freedom of South Viet Nam. They are great citizen soldiers. A succession of smashing defeats has been dealt to the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong main force units in recent months. Clearly, the initiative has shifted to the allied forces. The enemy no longer remains undetected. The jungle or cave is no longer a sure refuge. His supply can be cut off and is. He can no longer choose his own

time and place to fight. And, perhaps most important, he can no longer count the discipline of his own troops. The rate of defection of men and officers has sharply increased. The recent bombings of the oil storage depots around Haiphong and Hanoi was a military action for a military purpose against clear military objectives. This decision, of which I was a part, was carefully weighed, thought over for weeks and supported by every senior military officer of your government. It was designed for two purposes to slow down the rate of infiltration from the north, which has been taking a toll of allied lives, the lives of your boys, and to help convince the North Vietnamese leadership that their aggression in the South will be too costly to sustain. Today there must be some hard thinking taking place in Hanoi. Our adversary must know that time is not on his side; that what President Johnson said more than a year ago remains even more true today:

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Those are the words of the Commander-in-Chief and they are beginning to sink in, at home and abroad.

Finally, may I say this: If we take the long view --

and as students of history we should -- I think we have good reason for pride and encouragement concerning the course of postwar history. We made mistakes. We have had errors of judgment but on balance I think that it is an encouraging report. Despite the troubles of our time, we have come to the threshold of a new era of opportunity for a rapidly changing world. In the past 20 years over one billion people have been freed from foreign rule. Over 70 new countries have been born and not one has turned to communism. In fact, communism is on the retreat in Africa, in Latin America and in Asia. Western Europe has its problems with NATO, to be sure. But I might say that 14 of the 15 seek to be with us. But Western Europe, with our help, stands prosperous and secure today, while the nations of Eastern Europe restlessly grope their way to new independence. The Alaienza - Alliance for Progress - moves forward in Latin America and the inter-American system with all its difficulties grows and matures.

I have just come back from the Dominican Republic. The Dominican Republic -- only a year ago the victim of violent revolution -- is today led by a freely elected President and Congress. I am sure you recall the decision that President Johnson was called upon to make a year ago last May when we faced the possibility of another Castro in the Dominican Republic. Well,

that difficult decision has been proven right by events. In the Dominican Republic, as throughout this Hemisphere, there is increasing understanding of, and determination to initiate and carry through, the fundamental economic and social changes which have made the Republic of Mexico, for example, such a beacon of hope for others. In this revolutionary effort, we stand with our friends throughout Latin America. There is a pretty good record to point to. In Africa, millions of people -- rejecting the lures of communism; many of them primitive people -- are reaching out for "Freedom Now." They know that we are with them - here and at home.

Our own strong, rich land is alive with the great adventure of creation: creation of a society where the old barriers are being torn down, where every man stands next to his neighbor -- unbowed, proud, healthy, free -- ready to meet the world on its own terms and make it a better world. There is something wonderful going on in our country and we are a part of it. And to the North, across open, unfortified border, stands our neighbor Canada - growing and prospering, coming into its own. Yes, Governors, there is good news in the world if you but look for it. And in our concern with crisis, we should not overlook it. You see, the Communists are wrong. History is not their ally. They would like to have you believe it but it is not.

Today, the making of history lies with free people and it lies in our hands to a greater degree than has ever been afforded to any other nation in all of recorded history. No doubt, we shall meet in Asia, as in the rest of the world, in the days ahead, frustration, disappointment and disillusionment. With all of our incredible economic and military power, the qualities which will be of greatest value to us are our courage, patience, persistence, perseverance, the tenacity to stand tall and firm when the going gets rough and not to constantly change course and to run. We are not that kind of a people. We must never lose our perspective in the crisis of the moment. We must exercise American power to help those who cannot defend themselves from aggression, not the power merely of force but the power of our example, of our ideals, of our compassion, of our goods, of our economy, of our sense of decency; to exercise this power not in arrogance, not in passion but in sober determination. It is the powerful who can most afford compassion and humility. It is the prosperous who can most afford patience and perseverance. And, gentlemen, we are powerful, oh, so powerful. And we are prosperous. Therefore, we must be both compassionate and patient. We must be firm without being rigid, strong without being belligerent, resolute without being arrogant and compassionate without being weak.

I am reminded of those immortal words of Lincoln, which remain today as a standard of conduct for our international policy. Let these words be seared into our memory and our hearts because I think they give us the standard that we need: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right ... let us strive on to finish the works we are in ... to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and all nations."

Those words are so timely. Written, yes, 101 years ago, they are as contemporary today as if uttered on this moment. And those are words, gentlemen, to live by and I submit that they constitute the key to the future of a world in which nations, large and small, may live in peace and freedom. What a privilege it is to be an American in the second half of the 20th Century, and to know that in our hands, more than in anyone else's, lies the opportunity and the responsibility to write a glorious chapter of history in the cause of freedom and human dignity. Thank you very much. [Rising applause]

GOVERNOR REED: Mr. Vice President, on behalf of the Governors and all persons assembled here, I would like to express our appreciation for your being here and for giving a remarkable address - frank and candid, an honest appraisal of the

international situation. I would like you to know that the theme of our Conference this year is "The Integrity of the American Society." In my mind, your speech was indeed a symbol of the basic foundations of our free American society. It certainly has added great luster and a high note in our Conference of 1966. We are deeply honored to have you, one of our great leaders, here on this occasion. [Applause.]

ERASABLE

Wentworth

ERASABLE

Wentworth



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